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Abstract

Research findings show that interaction can provide the factors necessary for second language learning, namely input that is comprehensible, produced as output that is comprehensible, with feedback from interlocutors to the output in the following communication. This thesis examines the differences in language learning for academic achievement by Bangladeshis, that may arise from differences in proficiency of the population within the learning milieu, with the presence or absence of native English speakers.

Two groups of secondary school children, one containing 96% Bangladeshis, (a homogeneous setting), the other containing 50% Bangladeshis, the other half consisting of native English speakers and speakers of other languages, (a mixed setting) were studied for this process-product research.

The product, the Bangladeshis' development of proficiency in English over an eight month period was measured through linguistic tests at the beginning and end of the period. Their process of development was sampled through audio-recordings of their classroom interaction in three subjects, at intervals during the study period.

Bangladeshis in homogeneous setting used more English in longer utterances and developed better in the productive skills, particularly in Speaking, while those in the mixed setting used more Bengali but showed trends of greater improvement in the receptive skills, particularly Listening. The learners in the homogeneous group became more similar in their range of linguistic and academic performance, while a greater dispersion developed between members of the mixed group.

Observation of the mixed group showed a greater scope of support from teachers, but disruptions in learning caused by frictions between groups. In the homogeneous group external factors caused gaps in regular learning, while positive intragroup forces operated to help the students learn. Coding of observation on COLT showed that classroom interaction was allowed more consistently within the homogeneous group.

The findings are discussed for implications for future pedagogy.
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Introduction

The underachievement of the Bangladeshi immigrant children in schools of Britain, particularly among the population in London, is on record. Although they come from similar ethnic background as the Indian and Pakistani population in U.K., the Bangladeshis are achieving well below the national average, while the Indians and Pakistanis are at the top of the 'league table'. This was established by a survey of the performance of children on the basis of ethnicity, in the school-leaving examinations of 1985-86, conducted by the now defunct Inner London Education Authority (ILEA 1987).

In 1986, the Home Affairs Committee Report, 'Bangladeshis in Britain' (HACR 1986) suggested that the linguistic inadequacy of this group was the main factor responsible for their lack of achievement, even among the children born and reared in the U.K. While the language difficulty is admittedly a major factor for the low achievement, the Tower Hamlets Association for Racial Equality (THARE 1987, 1988) point to other factors of social deprivation in every sphere, the discrimination and racial harassment that Bangladeshis encounter more than any other immigrant group in this society, and which the HACR (1986) also admits to, to be factors that aggravate the debilitatory effect of their low linguistic proficiency to produce their low academic achievement. Their difficulties are increased through problems of immigration. Many of these children arrive well after the mandatory school-starting age, to face two learning problems simultaneously. They have to learn English for operating in this society; they also have to acquire their academic learning and the expression of this learning, in English.

The dimension of their underachievement becomes clearer when one learns that this group forms the largest single ethnic minority group in the schools of many boroughs of London.

The bulk of the Bangladeshi population is found in London, where their settlements are more concentrated in some areas than in others. As a result they are found in varying proportions in the mixed ability
classrooms of secondary comprehensive schools of London where their learning take place in either of the two settings.

It can be in a mixed or multicultural setting where the immigrant learners of many language background are put in the same classroom with the indigenous population to be partners in the learning process. In this setting they are exposed to English as spoken by native speakers, and can enter into social interactions with members of that group which can dispose them positively towards learning the target language. Alternatively, the learning can be in a homogeneous setting with other Bangladeshi learners only, where the presence of members of their own language background can give them reassurance in a strange environment, allowing them to progress academically through the use of their own language as they learn English through interaction and other means.

As they learn to use the language through interaction, the operation of the factors helpful for language learning will be determined by certain factors: the proficiency of their interlocutors, the level to which interaction is allowed by the teaching organisations (that may or may not allow them to interact), and by the learners' willingness to interact and use the target language in their interaction.

Since, at a similar academic level in all schools the academic pressure will be similar, the needs for using the language for academic purpose will be similar in both groups. However, there will be more pressure to use it for interpersonal interaction within the mixed group, where there may be available a better quality of input and feedback.

Within the classrooms the education of these children tends to follow one of two patterns of organisation. Some classes consist of teacher-fronted input, through lectures for the whole time. Others can consist of some teacher-fronted input, followed by the students' active participation in tasks based on this input, during which they may or may not interact.

The teacher-fronted input gives them content-related input, using subject-specific words in structures that can help them to express
content-related meaning accurately. But this may overwhelm the Bangladeshis of varying levels of linguistic proficiency, who can react by 'switching off' or not attending. This cuts them off not only from the content but also from the linguistic input necessary for expressing the content. Such teaching pattern allows them little scope for negotiating the comprehensibility of input.

Classes organised around tasks generally allow the learners to talk to each other as they perform. Rather than being the passive recipients of the input, they can negotiate the input, of both content and language, at their own level of understanding. This can help them learn both the content and language.

The Bangladeshis learning the second language are not well-initiated into habits of Reading and Writing even in their first language. Speaking is the skill they are most conversant with, in their own and the second language. Classes that allow them to speak can help them to learn the content and the language simultaneously, through use of the skill they have developed to an extent, rather than leave them to attempt to access the language and content through skills they have yet to develop well, ie, through Reading and Writing.

When the interaction and negotiation is with more proficient English speakers, the factors can be of better quality. So, the setting that contains more proficient users of English may help learners to reach a greater level of accuracy than is possible in the setting where most learners are at a similar lower level of proficiency. Interacting for carrying out academic learning can provide a genuine purpose for interaction which can develop into social relationships with other groups in the classroom and help language learning through positive attitudes towards English speakers.

The present research adopts a process-product approach to look into the language learning that took place in two contrastive settings in two secondary schools London while the learners progressed through their fourth year, when work of the GCSE course for the school final examination begins.
It quantifies the product of language learning by measuring the development of proficiency in language use of the two groups of Bangladeshi learners. The measurement took place at the beginning and end of an observation period of eight months, on two sets of linguistic tests. The difference between the performance on the tests is the product of their language learning.

To gain insight into differences in language use during their process of learning, their conversation in the classroom was recorded as they interacted on the classwork in three subjects. The observation and recording took place at intervals over the eight months. Some of these classrooms were also videoed for looking into the intergroup mixing that took place within the classroom, and the supportiveness of teachers, while coding on COLT showed the length of time the learners could speak in the classroom and were allowed to interact with others.

The classroom may not be wholly facilitative for language learning, since there may be socio-psychological forces of intergroup boundaries and relationships operating that may not allow language learning to take place freely. These forces could not be measured satisfactorily, but were observed through qualitative means to be operating in the environment to cause non-learning.

Through the analysis of language used during the various types of classroom organisations, the research aimed to identify the differences of language use in the two settings, in relation to the variation in the organisation of learning in the two settings.

In order to unify the results of the investigations into the process and product into a holistic picture of the differences within the classrooms that may give rise to differences of learning, it was necessary to adopt a paradigm that allowed the use of data from multiple sources to explain why learning did/ did not take place. The process of 'illuminative evaluation' put forth by Parlett & Hamilton (1972) helped to co-ordinate the results of diverse data into an explanatory picture of the two classrooms.
The two groups in this research were opportunity samples. Their numbers were small, so the results attained from this investigation can not provide the basis for any generalisation. However, further research with larger and more systematic sampling of classrooms of similar populations will help to verify the tendencies observed in this research. In the meantime, the insights provided by the trends observed through this research in the real classrooms can offer some directions to thoughts on future pedagogy.
Chapter 1
Deprivation And Its Implications For The Education Of A Minority Community

In this chapter I shall consider the Bangladeshis as a group and see how the learning of second language by these children is affected by the status of these people in this country. The chapter is divided into two parts. The first part describes the problem behind educational underachievement among the Bangladeshis, focussing on the distinguishing characteristics of this group that affect their academic and language learning.

The second section discusses the effect of socio-economic status on language learning and education, and surveys the group in the light of the factors that determine socio-economic position in British society, and the effect of these factors on the academic performance of their children at the school final level.

1.1. Educational problems and social status of Bangladeshis

The problems that Bangladeshis encounter in their education arise partly from their recent immigration and partly from their social status in this country. The issue of general underachievement by the children of ethnic minority groups in U.K. has dominated discussions of race and education by teachers and by the communities themselves and has resulted in many official reports on its causes and effects. One of the most important is the Swann Report (DES 1985), an official enquiry into the underachievement of the ethnic communities and the reasons that lie behind their low academic performance.

Some researchers (e.g. Eysenck 1971) tried to show in the past that ability and achievement varies between ethnic groups, and that the lower educational attainment among immigrant children is primarily due to their lower level of innate ability. Others like Bagley (1975) have refuted this idea through systematic studies that controlled for a range of relevant factors. Through their work they demonstrated that there is no difference in the potential ability of various ethnic groups. The results of their investigations anticipated Swann's claim in 1985 that the
difference in performance between black and white pupils cannot be explained by genetically determined IQ.

The Swann Committee was set up to enquire into the role of education in improving race relations and for providing equal opportunities to ethnic minority children at a time when education was becoming an increasingly explosive issue. Commenting on the academic performance of various ethnic groups, for the first time it officially documented the underachievement of the Bangladeshi community in relation to other ethnic groups.

Subsequently, an ethnicity-based analysis of the school-leaving examination results of Inner London schools showed the Bangladeshi group to be performing well below the national average (ILEA 1987b). This report found that Bangladeshi pupils in London schools were less likely to be entered for public examinations, and obtained fewer graded results than other minority groups. In 1987, 34% of Bangladeshis were not entered at all at 16+, and those who were entered performed well below average (ILEA 1990).

The underachievement of Bangladeshi children and the disadvantages suffered by this group began to catch people's attention. Surveys showed that the borough of Tower Hamlets in London, where eighty-three percent of the minority group learners are Bangladeshis (ILEA 1989c), was at the top of the table on indices of social deprivation, and at the bottom for good health, educational achievement and economic prosperity (Harrison 1982). Within the borough, Spitalfields ward which has the largest concentration of Bangladeshis in U.K. was acknowledged to be one of the most deprived areas of England (LBTH 1983, SHAPRS 1981). Gradually there was a consciousness that socio-economic deprivation on such a large scale could be at least partially responsible for the Bangladeshis' low educational achievement.

An outcome of the consciousness was a special committee set up by the House of Commons to survey the Bangladeshis' situation of disadvantage and make recommendations to remedy the situation. The Home Affairs Committee Report (HACR) of 1986, 'Bangladeshis In Britain' came about as a result of this enquiry and brought out clearly the
multiple problems suffered by the group, emphasising that their low English proficiency was the major cause of their underachievement. I shall now survey the characteristics and social status of the group which are held to be affecting the group's language and learning opportunities and propensities by the HACR (1986) and other reports.

1.1.1. Bangladeshis and their Characteristics

The Bangladeshis are the most recently arrived and the last major ethnic minority group to be reunited with their families in Britain, according to the HACR (1986). The instability which followed the political partition of the Indian Sub-continent, together with various natural calamities caused a large number of its people to migrate during the latter half of this century (Learmouth & Rolt 1981). Punetha, Giles & Young (1988) have compiled a general description of the Asian immigrant groups in Britain, which can also describe some general characteristics of this group.

Like all other groups of immigrants from the sub-continent, Bangladeshis have a 'dream' of returning to their country. In them the idea persisted much longer than in the other communities, so that their members were much slower than others in sending for their wives and families to join them in Britain (Husain, 1991). As a result, their children's length of residence in this country and their exposure to the language and culture of the target group is less than for other groups.

The family is an essential part of their identity: help giving and help taking are considered legitimate acts in the religious ethics of the Asian groups (Anwar 1979; Ballard & Ballard 1979). The sizable and continuous migration and settlement of the South-east Asian groups in Britain was possible only because of their strong ingroup ties and social values. Every member expects help from other members, especially within the family (DES 1985).

Their strong family ties make the Bangladeshis maintain contact with the family in the home country even after immigration, through long and extended visits which make the children forget their previous learning and miss out on ongoing learning.
The immigrant groups transmit the values to succeeding generations through their language, which they consider a necessary vehicle for cultural and value maintenance (Taft 1977), so that language for them is an important marker of group membership. Ninety-five percent of the Bangladeshis have family origins and continuing connection with Sylhet, a single region of Bangladesh, so that most of them speak the same regional dialect. The dual bonds of origin and language weave a special bond of unity between the members of the group. Their love for their language and the power this wields in uniting them can be seen in the words of this gazetteer:

"...the people of Sylhet are very fond of their dialect. They hardly use any language other than their own dialect for conversation with the people of their own district, wherever they may be and whatever their own education and cultural attainments." (Rizvi 1974).

Maintenance of language has great value and is a principle marker of group identity, providing a strong social support network within this extensive group. Their linguistic cohesion makes them reluctant to use English with members of their own group.

Reinforcing their linguistic cohesion is their religious homogeneity (HACR 1986). Virtually all Bangladeshis in Britain are Muslims, which has particular implications for schools in matters of dress, diet and preference for single-sex schools. The members also share the bonds of adversity. The proportion of long-term unemployment among the group members is high: some people have been unemployed ever since losing the jobs which originally attracted them to Britain. At present the work tends to be shared out among family and friends (HACR 1986).

Their length of stay in this country is lower than others, giving them less exposure to English language and culture. Their love for their language makes it difficult for them to use English among themselves. Their dependency on own group members for all needs limits their possibility of interaction with others for meaningful purpose. The common bonds of language, culture, religion and economic disadvantage create a strong and unifying cohesion within the group, hardening the group boundary, making it difficult for them to adopt the socio-cultural values of the target group. However, even the adult members of this group are
'keenly aware of their need for better knowledge of English' (para 16, HACR 1986; Tomlinson & Hutchinson, 1991) as shown by the parents' attitude.

1.1.2. Bangladeshi parents' attitude to education and Learning English

The Bangladeshi parents have a low level of education, but have a high regard for the value of education for their children. They realise that to have access to better jobs and economic benefits of this society, their children require to have qualifications with which they can compete with others. Access to the knowledge and skills necessary for jobs can only be through education.

The 1986 ILEA survey of Bangladeshi parents' attitudes towards education (ILEA 1986) shows that the idea of the importance of learning English is "shared..by...most Bangladeshi parents". It revealed that 99% of parents wanted their children to learn English and maths, 94% wanted the maintenance of the mother tongue. 89% of the parents in the survey wanted religion on the curriculum, for the maintenance of cultural differences since the parents realise:

'...that a totally western teaching and curricula results in identity crises and a danger that children will reject one or other culture, the British or the Bangladeshi, with obvious disruptive effects for home life or educational progress or both.' (HACR 1986,para 65).

From another source, the parents, 'wanted their children to be taught in English in order to adapt to life in this country whilst at the same time maintaining at least some of their own culture.' (ILEA 1986: 6),

while learning English is also seen by them to be necessary in order to overcome racism (ibid: 5).

The Bangladesh Youth League survey (1988) reveals that the parents' expectation from education is well-behaved, obedient children with respect for their own culture. They expect the rising generation to have the knowledge and skills for employment, with the ability and confidence to move easily in the new society, but not at the cost of
their cultural distinctiveness. These and other comments volunteered by parents indicate clearly that education but not cultural assimilation is the desired goal of this community.

Parents are supportive of the need for their children to learn English but are conscious of the need for preservation of their own cultural identity. They want access to the institutionalised privileges of the target society through education, in accordance with the findings of Punetha, Giles & Young (1988), an economic incorporation rather than an assimilation. Their attitude would deter the children from identifying too closely with the host culture, language and society.

In spite of the parents' realisation of their children's need to learn English, certain factors within their social status and characteristics as a group prevent this learning to support higher academic achievement.

1.2. Social factors affecting academic achievement

Success in educational performance depends on proficiency in the language in which this learning is to be accessed and expressed, an ability that seems to be tied to the social class or the socio-economic status (SES) of the learner. The Swann Report (DES 1985) attributed the underachievement of the ethnic groups to a great many relevant factors, notable among which is the socio-economic status (SES) of the group.

All factors for good achievement in school show a strong correlation to the elements held to determine the socio-economic status rating, or the class of the individual. Consideration of Bangladeshis in the light of the factors that determine status in British society can reveal how the factors affect their children's educational potentiality.

1.2.1. The social class composition of Bangladeshis in Britain

An immigrant group, according to Edwards (1981), is a minority within a dominant majority host community, occupying a subordinate
position, in a relation based on the distribution of power and status in society. Bangladeshis hold a minority status within the British community through factor of immigration and also through other elements that determine social status within British society: education, occupation, income, and general housing environment.

1.2.1.1. Educational qualification of Bangladeshis

The Bangladeshi population in U.K., especially in Tower Hamlets came in directly from the peasant society of the rural areas of Sylhet in Bangladesh, with limited educational experience (Dove 1983). Literacy in Bangladesh stood at only 22% in 1983 (ibid). Sylhet, from where most of the Bangladeshi settlers have come, has had a traditionally lower rate of literacy than the rest of the country (Ghuman & Gallop 1981). There are fewer schools in Sylhet than in the rest of the country, with fewer children enrolled (Goodall 1968). As a result, the education of most of the members of the group, both parents and children is generally limited to the village school, and many are not literate in Bengali.

Effect: The HACR (1986) describes the effect of the parents' lack of education on the children in the following words:

"...lack of English, their own lack of education and limited knowledge of Britain's education system makes it difficult for parents to assist their children. There is little scope for reading aloud to children at home. They tend not to keep contact with the school or teachers, and do not make demands on the education system." (para 55)

A 1984 survey shows that among the Bangladeshi population in the U.K., fifty percent of men and seventy-six percent of women speak English slightly or not at all (para 15, HACR 1986). The parents' lack of the language forces them to use the children as interpreters when conducting business in offices or hospitals, making the children miss out on learning time. This disrupts schooling and interferes with their classwork, putting them behind with their test scores for coursework, which can mean that these learners cannot be entered for the school leaving examinations. Not being educated, the parents do not realise the damage that even short breaks in studies do to their children's academic achievement.
The parents' inability to speak English makes it difficult for them to communicate with their children's schools to find out about the education system and bring pressure accordingly on their children and teachers for better achievement. Lacking experience of formal education and contact with the school, they do not understand the school's expectation from the pupils, and cannot supervise or support their children academically with homework and school lessons. Part of the underachievement of Bangladeshi learners is blamed on the lack of communication between home and school which arises partly from a language mismatch and partly from cultural differences.

The general need for better communication between home and school for the children's proper development was identified by the Plowden Report (1967). The HACR (1986) and other reports recommended the need for bilingual staff in schools for liaising between home and school in areas with a high percentage of PHLOEs. Although some staff have been appointed and institutional and academic information are now circulated in various languages, there is still not enough communication between parents and the schools which can allow parents to exercise their legal rights in the matter of their children's education (Tomlinson & Hutchinson, 1991).

1.2.1.2. Occupation of Bangladeshis

Occupation is another factor held to determine the status of people. According to Husain (1991), the unemployment rate in Tower Hamlets is one of the highest in the country. According to BYL (1988) the unemployment among Bangladeshi parents is 49.6%. THARE (1987: 49) believes that it is the highest in all age groups among all ethnic groups.

The statistical survey of the parental occupation of all Inner London pupils through 1987-88 (ILEA 1989a) show Tower Hamlets to have the highest number of pupils from families with non-wage-earning (44% and 40% respectively) and the lowest number of non-manual parents at both the primary and the secondary levels (8.4% and 8.9% respectively). According to the HACR (1986):
"...Bangladeshis have not yet branched out much into the wider employment market. In some areas employment is predominantly in catering. Some now run their own restaurants...or shops, and others have developed new areas of the garment trade, in suede and leather, but there is a relatively weak business sector compared with other Asian communities and there are few Bangladeshis in the professions" (para 14).

The parents are either unemployed or employed at a low level. The vast majority of those who are employed, are in unskilled jobs and in the manufacturing industries (Jupp, Roberts & Cook-Gumperz, 1985).

**Effect:** The low level of employment affects the children's education in two ways. The younger members do not see many of their group in jobs requiring better academic qualifications, which gives them a negative perception of the benefits of education. Another effect is that it gives them very little access to career information about better employment opportunities that can come from higher academic achievement.

In ethnically mixed schools, Lambert (1980) finds that the learners' perception of the power group depends on the extent that school authorities involve minority group adults in administrative and teaching posts. The low level of employment of the Bangladeshis in the schools in U.K. (HACR 1986) appears to give these learners the impression that they are not suitable for a career in education (THARE 1987, BYL 1988), or other better careers.

The low self-perception may be responsible for the low educational and career aspirations of these learners, who limit their aims to their father's and peer group's activities as being the maximum possible extent of their socio-economic attainment, so that they do not see much value in higher education or better educational achievement (Verma & Ashworth 1986). Even among L1 learners, Wells (1971) finds that without the example and the support of parents, learners do not value the skills associated with literacy and may not have the motivation to persist with efforts required for education. For powerless minority learners, the motivation may be further reduced.
1.2.1.3. Income of Bangladeshis

The income of a group is dependent on their general level of occupation. The lower levels of employment held by the Bangladeshi people and their lack of skills for well-paid employment is reflected in the earnings of the group. A 1984 survey quoted in HACR (1986) showed their weekly median pay to be £ 88.50, the nearest for Asians being £ 106.2 for Pakistanis (HACR, para 14).

The children of parents who are unemployed or who earn below the subsistence level in U.K. are eligible for free meals, an indicator of income below a certain level. Tower Hamlets, with the highest number of Bangladeshi learners, also has the highest number of pupils eligible for free meals at both primary and secondary school levels (ILEA 1989a).

Effect: Bangladeshis who have larger families than others, also have financial obligations towards the members in the country of origin, like all South Asian groups. An income lower than for others, has to go a longer way, so that there is a greater prevalence of poverty in Bangladeshi homes (Taylor & Hegarty 1985: 66).

Educationally it means that there is very little money available for educational 'extras' for a greater number of children. Motivationally, the parents' low level of income acts as pressure on the children to start work as soon as possible, and leave off education.

1.2.1.4. Accommodation of Bangladeshis

Employment, or lack of it has serious repercussions on housing. The impact of unemployment and the low level of income is most apparent in the type and quality of accommodation the Bangladeshis occupy. Ninety percent of those registered as homeless in London were Bangladeshis, as were eighty percent of those families placed in temporary accommodation while nine thousand people were on the increasingly long waiting list for housing in 1986 (HACR 1986). Bangladeshis are disproportionately represented in the worst and most
over-crowded council accommodation, according to the report (HACR 1986, para 25).

**Effect:** Apart from being a disadvantage in itself, bad or temporary housing has obvious effects on education. The dreadful condition of the houses results in high incidence of ill health and weakness among the members from living in unsuitable conditions, which lead in turn to absence from school and inability to keep up with coursework.

The temporary nature of the accommodation also gives a sense of insecurity to the occupants. Families in temporary accommodation may be shifted several times before they are allotted permanent accommodation. Relocation disrupts schooling even when places in schools in the new area are available, but often children can have to wait up to eighteen months for a place in school (THARE 1988; Tomlinson & Hutchinson 1991).

The average Bangladeshi family consists of four-plus children in comparison to the two-plus children of the indigenous families. Tower Hamlets schools have the highest proportion of children from large families, with 4+ children (THARE 1988, ILEA 1990). Floud (1970) finds the size of the family influences educational performance, and that learners from small families at all social levels tend to perform better at school and on IQ tests. On average there are seven people to four rooms in the Bangladeshi household (HARC 1986). Educationally this means that there is very little space at home for children to study undisturbed.

An additional factor of social adversity, racial harassment influences the school attendance and the academic achievement of the group.

**1.2.1.5. Racial harassment**

Bangladeshis and other blacks face a deeply embedded tradition of overt racism among the white working class people in the East end of London where immigrant communities concentrate. The Rampton Report
(DES 1981) explicitly identified racism as a major issue affecting the academic success of minority learners in Britain. Two hundred and five incidents of racial harassment were recorded by the police in Tower Hamlets between May and December 1982, the highest in any metropolitan city area (GLC 1983).

The situation has not improved over the years. The Financial Times of 6th Jan, 1990 cites Home Office evidence to comment that:

'the vulnerability of the Asian community to racial attacks worsened between 1981 and 1987'.

The Times of 12th September, 1989 report that Asian children in the Tower Hamlets living less than a mile from school have to be transported every day to avoid racial attacks. The ILEA survey of 1985 showed that 11% of mothers felt their children had problems related to racism.

Effect: Children cannot go to school regularly without some protection. Fear of racial harassment makes parents prefer to put children in schools nearest their home, where they feel the children may be safe from such attacks. This creates pressure on some schools more than others, causing children to be out of school from lack of school place (Tomlinson & Hutchinson, 1991). It makes them lose out on learning time.

Employment opportunities also appear to be affected strongly by racist discrimination. The HACR (1986) quotes the Labour Force Survey reports saying that even the possession of a higher level of qualification does not reduce unemployment rates among the ethnic minorities as it does among the whites. Rampton (1987) corroborates this, quoting the Job Centre staff that a black applicant needs to have higher qualifications than a white applicant to get a similar job.

A Financial Times Report in 1990 quotes the Commission for Racial Equality as saying that in their final year 72% of ethnic minority graduates in Britain from a 1985 sample received no job offer, compared to 53% of the matched white graduate sample. This was in spite of
ethnic minority students submitting more job applications. Discrimination makes the benefits of better academic achievements appear unattainable to the Bangladeshis, reducing the possibility of their access to economic benefits even were they to be academically successful.

On all the factors that determine the social status of a group, the emerging picture confirms the words of Smith (1985):

'the well-researched, and now largely undisputed existence of institutionalised racism in terms of housing, education, employment, immigration law...racist policing procedures, means that the Bangladeshis tend to be pushed to the very bottom of the national, social structure.'

1.2.2. Influence of social class on language and learning

The social class of a group is believed by some to affect the educational attainments at school, through the type of pre-school learning that takes place at home. For the Bangladeshis, their social status within their rural background did not provide them education for access to a 'decontextualised' use of L1. In Britain, their acquisition of English is limited to the level of their interlocutors who tend to be others from the same social class, who use less literacy-related variety of English.

Researchers hold that the capacity for being educated or 'educability' is linked to the social class of the learner, and claim that children's linguistic experience at the pre-school stage is the predictor of their subsequent response to educational opportunity. Stubbs (1976) draws attention to the fact that working class children do not do as well at school as middle class children. Whether or not this is due to the middle-class bias of formal education, Floud (1970) found a positive relationship between socio-economic status as judged by father's occupation, and the child's success in school. Skutnabb-Kangas (1984) cites the research by Mastute-Bianci (1982) among the Spanish speakers in USA to demonstrate that performance on IQ tests and achievement is lower for low-SES learners. Verma & Ashworth (1986) also confirm similar findings in their work, particularly in the achievement for males. Skehan (1986) finds even second language learning in an instructional situation to have a strong relationship with a set of measures relating to family background, parental literacy and parental education.
Looking into the causes, Ellis & Wells (1980) attribute this class-related difference in achievement to the difference in the language used at home in the pre-school stage. They find that the quality of adults' contribution to conversation relates strongly to the children's rate of oral language development at home. Researching in L1, Wells (1981) finds that the elaborated verbalisation of language at home, the quality of the parents' responses to the children's conversational initiations as they pick up everyday events in talk and make their meanings more coherent through extended conversation, help this development to come about.

This advantage of familiarity with elaborate verbal language comes about through experience of literacy through pre-school readings among the middle class children (Wells et al 1983; Wells et al 1985). The experience of literacy gives them the 'decontextualisation ability' which relates to understanding and producing the symbolic aspects of the language, removed from the immediate context (Donaldson 1978). It teaches them to 'disembed' their thinking from the supportive context of actual experience that they have been used to, and bring it under control of the meanings that are encoded in the message alone (ibid).

At school, the language used for academic purpose requires to be progressively more explicit, context-free, logical and expository (Wong Fillmore & Valadez, 1986). The decontextualisation ability that is developed in the middle class children from the home as a product of their social class and literacy comes to their aid at school.

Apparently, the socially lower status children are not so initiated to literacy at the pre-school stage, and do not develop this ability for decontextualisation. Language use for them is less literacy-based. Their oral expression too is less extended, more context-embedded, serving a more interpersonal function. As a result, when they begin school they are not ready for the strong emphasis on more context-free language in the reading and teacher-input they often encounter in the instructional situation.

This differentiation in analyticity of language use between children of the higher and lower social status resembles Cummins' (1984)
conceptualisation of language proficiency and may be illustrated by his representation of proficiency on two intersecting continuums categorised as:

-the degree of cognitive effort involved;
-the degree of contextual support necessary.

On the horizontal continuum that represents the support available for language use, depending on the extent that the language use is embedded within context, the lower status Bangladeshis are acquainted with only the expressiveness of language used within the context are at the 'context-embedded' end. The middle class children come to school with the experience of language used in literacy in various contexts away from the immediate context, at a more context-reduced or 'decontextualised' level. The language that the middle class children are familiar with before going to school can be placed towards the context-reduced or 'decontextualised' direction of the horizontal continuum. The Bangladeshis have to learn to express relationship between ideas though extended use of language in a situation far removed from context.

Middle class children start school with the advantage of being familiar with literacy and requisite language use, while children from lesser backgrounds have to acquaint themselves with literacy, together with the use of 'decontextualised' language as the means of learning academically at school. Through the 'context-embedded' language use they are familiar with, education needs to develop in them the extended analyticity of 'decontextualisation' ability. These learners require to master expressions to convey an increasing level of abstraction of ideas

Range of Contextual Support and Degree of Cognitive Involvement in Communicative Activities (Cummins, 1984: 139)
through extended utterances and appropriate words. The language production system that is geared mainly to interpersonal conversation has to be converted to operate with decreasing support of the context in order to be able to function by itself for academic expression.

The social status of the Bangladeshis affects the children's scope for exposure to English, particularly of 'decontextualised' type of use for academic performance, spoken by qualified interlocutors. They do not have access to an environment where they can meet such people.

This above survey of the disadvantages of the group has revealed the multiple causes which may be responsible for bringing about their low linguistic ability and low academic achievement. Whatever the reason for their low English proficiency and academic underachievement, their demography can convey the immediacy of the need to counter the problem of the low achievement of this group.

1.2.3. Demography of the group

The Bangladeshi community in U.K. is growing at the rate of 9000 people a year. The membership of this group has expanded rapidly during the last ten years, both from births to the people already here and from immigration of family members joining the men in U.K. The addition from immigration is about 5000 people a year (HACR 1986).

The rate of their growth was sudden and substantial. In 1981 the number of learners from this group in London Inner City schools was 5,377. By 1989 their number had increased to 20,113 (ILEA 1989c), a four-fold increase in eight years. This figure did not include the remaining dependents whose arrival in U.K. was being delayed through the lengthy immigration procedures. The HACR (1986) mentioned at least 48,000 more members of divided families still waiting to come in at the time, a rough estimate.

As the arrivals of the members of this group has been staggered, the increases of their numbers in this country are noted not only as increases at the entry point at school but also as increases of their
number in each age cohort, resulting in a mixture of ability in each classroom.

Over the years there has been a decline in the number of figures of children of divided families granted entry. The number of Bangladeshi children granted entry in 1981 was 4400 while in 1989 it was 2730 (HMSO 1989). But such is the magnitude of their numbers that even with the lower number of entries, the intake of Bengali speakers at schools in 1989 was thirty-three percent higher than those leaving schools at the final year, or through transfers, in spite of the fact that Bangladeshis have one of the lowest staying-on rates (ILEA 1989c). Any decline in the number of immigrants over the years would be offset by increase in clearances for fiancées and newly-married spouses since there was an excess of unmarried males over females, particularly among the fifteen to twenty-four year olds (HACR 1986).

The figures before 1986 showed that just over half of all Bangladeshis in Britain were aged fifteen or under as compared to a fifth of Britain's total population (HACR 1986). There would soon be a high proportion of women of childbearing age. Since the current fertility rate is high among Bangladeshi women (ibid), any fall in the growth through immigration over the next few years is likely to be compensated by births in the new country.

By 1989 Bengali was the only ethnic minority language to account for over one half of the total roll of any school in London (ILEA 1989c). According to the 1989 census report Bangladeshis formed 28.6 per cent of the total of bilingual pupils in the Inner London area: the largest single bilingual group of 11,848 was in the borough of Tower Hamlets, which contained a fifth of all Britain's Bangladeshis (HACR 1986). At present the Bangladeshi group has by far the highest number of members among all ethnic minority groups within Inner London Schools.

A study of the percentage of pupils who have joined school during the school year 1987/1988 shows Westminster, Tower Hamlets and Camden as having the highest number of joiners at the Primary and Secondary level (ILEA 1989a). These boroughs also have the highest number of Bangladeshi learners (ILEA 1989c).
While the number of entries through transfer from Bangladesh or from other schools when families are relocated, is falling, the percentage of learners fluent in English has also fallen, a factor that makes better educational performance more problematic for learners of this group. The demographic potential of this community makes the HACR (1986) comment:

"The present is therefore a crucial time for the Bangladeshi community, particularly in respect of education: if its problems are not tackled now they will persist into the next generation, affecting a much larger Bangladeshi community than the present one" (para 2),

and recommend that the DES conducts further investigations to find means to reduce the problem of underachievement of Bangladeshi learners.

1.2.4. A source of the problem: low English proficiency

The HACR (1986) holds the poor command of English of the members of this group to be the major cause of their low educational performance. Other reports, eg, Bangladesh Youth League (1987) and Tower Hamlets Association for Racial Equality (1988) suggest that while linguistic inadequacy is a major factor of these children's low achievement, their deprivation contributes to and aggravates its effect negatively.

An immediate problem of the Bangladeshi learners' low academic performance seems to be the need to acquire fluency in 'decontextualised' English, for which they need access to a place where all the factors for language learning can come together.

1.3. Summary

In this chapter I have surveyed the problems of the low academic achievement of the Bangladeshi immigrant children in this country, that make them start after the mandatory school-going age in U.K., and experience disruption and disadvantage within the time that they study.

While their low proficiency in English is often held by some official reports to be chiefly responsible for their low academic
achievement, others point out that their deprivation contributes equally towards this underachievement. Their low social status in British society makes it difficult for Bangladeshis to have access to situations where the factors for learning English for academic purpose operate. The potential of their low achievement can be immense since Bangladeshis form the largest single ethnic group in the schools of five boroughs of London, and show a high potential for demographic increase.
Chapter 2

Theories Of Language Learning

As I am looking at language learning, it may be helpful to survey some theories of language acquisition that have been current in the recent years. These theories are however adopted only as a starting point and may need adjustment or extension in the light of the subsequent research.

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section contains a discussion of some of the general theoretical issues held by linguists about the factors that help to set in motion the innate process of language learning. The second section considers the socio-psychological theories relating to the social aspects of language learning, which see the learners as a group in the society where their need for learning the second language may be offset or augmented by their status in the society or their attitudes to the target society. The third section hypothesises about a suitable educational setting for these learners while the fourth section discusses the manner in which members of this group can optimally learn the language as well as the content, taking into account the adversities of their situation.

Looking into acquisition patterns across cultures and languages, Chomsky (1965) claims that the propensity for language acquisition has its roots in the biological makeup of every human being, endowing each with the capacity to learn one or more languages. No one as yet knows definitely how or why language is learnt, but linguists identify two aspects within the process of language acquisition. These are, the innate psycholinguistic aspect that makes the language learning possible, and the external aspect of social communication for which it is used. Looking at the process of first and second language learning from either of these two aspects, linguists and applied linguists have emphasised different factors at different times as being crucially important for the learning to take place. They have propounded various theories of language learning, emphasising the factor that each considers to be most relevant to the issue of second language learning. They suggest that the level of proficiency in a second language often
differs from the first, because of the differences in the extent to which these factors may or may not be present in the learning environment.

Some applied linguists hold that language proficiency depends on the result of contact that is possible between the learner and the target language community, and the exposure to and scope for interaction the learner has with the users of the second language. Others suggest that proficiency in the second language may depend on the level of learning of the first language, or even on the age at which the learners are exposed to the second language. Yet others hold that the social setting within the society where the language is being learnt affects the psychological process of learning the second language: the learners, like the Bangladeshis can belong to a minority group within a dominant majority society where their own needs, problems and feelings towards the language of the powerful group and its users may conflict with the practical needs for learning the language.

2.1. **Linguistic theories of language learning**

The linguistic theories aim to identify the factors that are presumed to trigger the innate faculty for language learning, each applied linguist emphasising a different factor. People such as Krashen (1981) propose that passive exposure to linguistic input that is comprehensible, is the main variable necessary for language learning. Others such as Long (1981,1983) claim that rather than input per se, it is the input accessed through active interaction and negotiation which causes learning. Still others like the Canadian researchers Harley and Swain (1984) hold that it is only when there is an opportunity to use the language received through the input as output in production, that actual linguistic proficiency can be attained. These theories will now be considered at greater length.

2.1.1. The Comprehensible Input Model of SLA

Some applied linguists make comparisons of first and second language development and of morpheme acquisitions and suggest that language learning is a process of creative construction by the Learner or the Language Acquisition Device within the learner, an innate faculty
which is activated when input that is comprehensible is available. It is a natural process, the route of which is predetermined, so that it is relatively impervious to teaching. The learning remains the same however one may teach the learners, and teaching may even inhibit the process of learning.

Based on such premises Krashen's Input Hypothesis (1981) claims that language learning begins by understanding messages strictly from receiving 'Comprehensible Input'. 'Input' is defined by Ellis (1986) as the language that is addressed to the second language learner either by a native speaker (NS) or by another learner. When one's level of linguistic knowledge is 'i', one progresses to the next level, ('i+1') by understanding input that contains ('i+1') level of language. This advanced level of input is made comprehensible through the linguistic and contextual cues. Making the relation between form and meaning salient helps one to progress to the next level of learning (Wagner-Gough and Hatch 1975, Krashen 1976). The gap perceived by the learner between his/ her current competence and the input, is held by these researchers to trigger acquisition.

The learner requires time for building up a repertoire of linguistic forms and items before the knowledge can be accessed for production. This time is termed by Krashen as the 'Silent Period'. Giving the learner a silent period of building-up time ensures a better command of the language in production than forcing it into production from the beginning of the process.

The learner does not take in all input as learning, however, as his/ her 'affective filter' determines what input will be allowed in for learning. This 'filter', according to Krashen (1982), Dulay & Burt (1977) consists of conscious and unconscious needs, attitudes and emotional states which together contribute to determine the learners' preferences for the aspects of the language to be acquired, for different types of input, and when this acquisition should cease. The 'affective filter' is limited to the linguistic input only, not the output.

Language can be made comprehensible by being simplified, as in 'caretaker speech' which is considered to be a sample of such
'comprehensible input'. 'Caretaker speech' which is said to cause learning is defined by Hatch (1983) as the input which is addressed towards a learner by a NS. It is characterised by a louder and slower rate of speech, longer pauses, common vocabulary, few idioms, more repetitions, a greater use of gestures, shorter utterances, more summaries of preceding utterances, and more deliberate articulation. According to Hatch, such simplified input must be directed to the learner by a concerned NS to be maximally comprehensible, and be embedded in a context of social interaction that can help to make the meaning clear. The learner requires the speech to be addressed directly to him/herself for learning, as in 'motherese'.

Krashen considers bilingual education to be a useful source of comprehensible input for SLA, since the use of L1 in instruction can help make L2 input comprehensible.

The necessary and sufficiency conditions in the Input Model of language learning are:
i) the learners must focus on meaning, wish to communicate, and the communication must be successful;
ii) comprehensible input (i+1) must occur with frequency.

According to Krashen the role of comprehensible input is the crucial and the only causative variable for SLA. If the available input is not comprehensible it cannot serve acquisition at all. For the Bangladeshi learners this means that they have to be in a situation where they can have frequent access to comprehensible input in English in involving communicative situations where they focus on the meaning rather than on the form.

Most applied linguists agree with Krashen about the primacy of the need for comprehensible input for language learning, but they criticise him on other points of his theory (e.g. McLaughlin 1987). They have shown that that in many communities children learn language in spite of never being directly addressed, and that in many cases of learning the input has been perceived to be much above the learners' level of understanding. Some studies have also indicated that formal instruction has helped the course of second language acquisition.
The Interaction Model of language learning challenges Krashen's stand on comprehensible input itself, the idea that mere passive exposure to input can ensure language acquisition.

2.1.2. The Interaction Model of SLA

The advocates of the Interaction Model of second language acquisition hold that a passive exposure to the input, or even the simplification of input through 'caretaker speech' without consideration for the learners' reaction to it is not enough for acquisition. To them the idea that one can learn or absorb a second language simply by osmosis or the exposure to it does not seem feasible. The Interactionists hold that language learning occurs through and during active participation in speech events or Interactions.

According to Long (1981, 1983a), Scarcella & Higa (1981) and Ellis (1986), the comprehensibility of the input to the learners can be ensured through interaction and active negotiation between the learner and the interlocutor, to bring it to the learners' own level of comprehension. Input factors for them include factors related to language form eg., syntax, while interaction factors relate to features of negotiation of meaning, eg, comprehension checks. The interaction can be modified without modifying the input, and it is modified interaction that is the important determinant of language acquisition. The negotiation involves them in a dynamic interplay of external and internal forces through which they can make formal and informal adjustments to ensure the comprehensibility of input. It is not solely to what extent learners are exposed to the target language but to what extent they are engaged in meaningful interaction in that language, dealing with matters that are of direct relevance to the learners that can help to cause language learning.

Further, the Interactionists add that not only is the presence of input essential, for native-like acquisition the quality of the input is important too, and this can come only from interaction with NSs in a variety of situations. Porter (1986) finds that it is only contact with NS that can develop in the learner the sociocultural appropriacy necessary to be communicatively successful.
There is as yet no direct evidence of a relationship between such speech modification through interaction and second language acquisition. But research suggests that adjustments made through interaction lead to comprehensibility, which can lead to SLA (Long 1985). Learners expend considerable effort in trying to control what is said to them and how it is said, by eliciting, rephrasing, repeating, simplifying etc. Even children have to negotiate input for themselves. The Interactionists hold that the process of interaction provides the learners with rich opportunities to develop and try out a range of communicative strategies, receptive and productive, and to exploit fully the limited knowledge at their disposal. In fact, Ellis (1986) claims that input is the result of interaction, some of which is attended to and some not. Wells (1979), researching in L1, holds that it makes one take account of the situation, and the knowledge and purpose of the listener in order to make one's meaning explicit. It also teaches one that meaning is complex and changeable, according to the situation.

Some of the models of language acquisition may make it appear that one acquires the forms or items of language before learning to put them together syntactically as discourse. Researchers like Hatch (1978) contradict this, saying that the pattern of the discourse must be acquired first and filled in gradually with the appropriate forms for expressing our meaning. They say that one does this by engaging in and creating discourse through interaction. They suggest that even at the elementary stage language learning evolves out of learning how to carry on conversations. Verbal interactions teach one to identify and manipulate objects within immediate experience, and to converse. Wagner-Gough (1975) claims that repetitions and incorporations of language items occur while creating a conversation by 'scaffolding' it with the limited resources at the learners' command. Examples of such 'scaffolding' are extensive and appropriate in child-child conversations and contribute greatly to language learning among children.

For the Bangladeshis it appears that being in a situation that required them to interact and negotiate with others in realistic discourse would make them acquire the patterns of discourse as a means of language learning while they could also acquire the linguistic items to
be used within the discourse. The demands of the situation could make them exert themselves to express intended meaning through 'scaffolding', exploiting a natural and therefore an effective tendency for the purpose of language development.

2.1.3. The Comprehensible Output Model of SLA

Researchers in Canada (e.g., Harley & Swain 1984) hold that the 'comprehensible input' of Krashen is certainly a necessary factor but not sufficient by itself for grammatical development and productive control of the language. For them too, the process of language learning begins with exposure to 'comprehensible input' but this by itself is not sufficient for acquiring target-like proficiency.

Harley & Swain (1984) offer as evidence the results of their work with immersion students in Canada. They say that despite receiving a great deal of comprehensible input, the learners in the immersion programme for seven years 'differed considerably in grammatical and lexical ways' from native speakers in their productive use of the second language'. The researchers established that the meaning of the input had been clearly comprehensible to the learners. But in spite of this the immersion learners were non-target-like in their grammar performance even after seven years' learning. This showed that the learners were concentrating on the meaning, not the form of the language (Swain 1985) and did not need to attend to the syntax in order to understand the meaning of the utterance.

Comprehensible input had been available to the learners without their being involved in negotiation, but this clearly did not seem to be sufficient in itself to give learners the grammatical mastery. According to Swain, the comprehensibility of input may be possible even without negotiation, but ensuring comprehensibility is not sufficient for the mastery of language. Swain (1985) goes on to claim that in addition to comprehensibility of input, mastery of the language require the learners to be involved in productive activities which would lead them to use the forms for 'Comprehensible Output' in meaningful situations. According to her, the linguistic elements that one receives through the semantic analysis necessary for comprehension are reorganised through
a syntactic processing into the intended meaning only when one wants to produce it in output. Whereas comprehension can take place simply by attending to the meaning of words, production may focus the learners' attention to the formal features of the language, make one notice the syntactic item.

The process of learning as proposed by them is confirmed by Faerch and Kasper (1986) who agree that language comprehension is an interactive process between what is already known by the hearer, and new information, or the 'input'. Faerch and Kasper claim that when the new input matches the learner's prior knowledge of the world, comprehension takes place. Often a perfect match is not possible, so the input is not comprehended. There appears a gap between the input and the learner's knowledge, either through 'noise' or through incompleteness of input or even through lack of knowledge of the world. Learners become aware of the gap only when they do not comprehend the input. If the object for comprehension is important enough, the learners will make efforts to overcome or bridge the gap, and during this process the learning takes place. The process of bridging the gap between input and comprehension draws the learner's attention to the item for acquisition. Interaction seems to be the process that can help bridge the gap. Negotiating meaning is the first step to grammatical acquisition: by being understood it allows learners to focus on form.

Swain (1985) finds that the comprehension of meaning precedes the comprehension of form, and contends that the necessity for producing the language as output may be the trigger that forces learners to pay attention to the syntactic means necessary for the expression of the intended meaning. The process is linear. She says that development comes through reacting to the 'negative input' (Schachter 1984) from native speakers to the learners' productions, which lead them to discover what they must do differently in order to be understood perfectly.

The necessity of output of the language for learning it is confirmed by others. Gass (1988) holds that production may be the factor that forces learners to a sophisticated analysis of grammar. When learners engage in interaction, once the message is clear it seems
to leave the interlocutor free in the following discourse to pay attention to the form, which gives them the grammatical input necessary to develop the syntactic knowledge.

A little differently, Sharwood Smith (1986) proposes that comprehension is simultaneous and takes place at both syntactic and propositional levels simultaneously. The production of language achieves the interface between the various types of knowledge comprehended, the ability for accessing both the semantic knowledge and its syntactic representation at the same time.

However it happens, all of them agree that output causes the learner to focus attention on the grammatical and semantic aspects of language and bring them together for acquisition.

According to Harley & Swain (1984), output can be written as well as verbal. Interaction is a mode of output that helps the learner not only to organise the syntactic and the semantic into one's intended meaning verbally, but also to receive 'negative input' to what s/he may be doing wrong. It is the need for output that can focus the learners' attention to grammar through critical feedback, and for this the interaction needs to be with knowledgeable speakers who can give them such feedback as well as good quality input.

They suggest that the limitation of the learning by the immersion students was partly due to their limited scope for interaction and the negotiation of meaning with native speakers. The quality of the language encountered in interaction with peers of the same L1 background was acknowledged to be poor, as the peers were at the same level of L2 proficiency. Interactions with native speakers and the negative input that can result from such interactions are indicated as most desirable for the development of grammar. Greater grammaticality, according to Harley & Swain, can come from focused teaching.

It is significant however that the immersion learners who had similar overall exposure to the target language but with more emphasis on written texts, showed more target-like segmentation in their oral production (Swain 1985, Harley & Swain 1978, 1984). According to Swain
the pressure towards more written output seems to develop not only the discourse ability, but also the grammaticality of the learners.

This may indicate that while various modes of output may give the learner varying levels of control on the language, writing gives the highest control on the language, and this control may be transferable across sub-skills. Organising one's linguistic knowledge for output in writing may make one most attentive to all aspects of the language data, making it possible for the learner to reach a more target-like proficiency. Apart from this the skill developed in one area of the language does not seem to be readily transferable to another area. Language proficiency appears to be structured from several components that develop relatively independently. Whichever skill receives the more productive use seems to be developed better.

Besides the development of grammatical appropriacy, output as communicative interaction is also necessary for bringing about improvement in a feature of language use emphasised by Canale and Swain (1980), namely 'sociolinguistic competence', which gives one the ability to handle the new language in a manner that is socioculturally appropriate. This ability is said to consist of various factors: how to speak appropriately in different situations; how to understand and interpret the complex and subtle signals for taking turns at speaking; how to sustain a coherent dialogue over a number of turns (Keenan 1974); and how to interpret the social meaning of utterances (Holmes 1978). Porter (1986) finds that in order to develop this sense of sociocultural appropriacy, learners need to interact with NSs or to have explicit classroom teaching focused on these aspects.

To sum up, Swain's (1985) stance is that the key facilitator for language learning is output rather than input. Her arguments are:
- only the production of language as output can provide opportunity for testing out hypotheses by the learner about the structure and function of L2, to see if they work;
- using the language as opposed to simply comprehending the language may force the learner to move from semantic to syntactic processing;
- development in any aspect of language proficiency e.g. grammar or sociolinguistic appropriacy, depends on the opportunities available for output and feedback in that area;
- negative input from interlocutors may cause the learner to make restatements and push him/her towards greater precision and appropriacy in expression, a concept parallel to the (i+1) of 'Comprehensible Input', in output. Comprehensibility of input leaves the learner's attention free to focus on grammar and thereby develop accuracy.

2.1.4. The role of Interaction within language learning

Theories

The theories of SLA discussed above hypothesise about the importance of different factors within the process of language learning, for success in the acquisition of a Second Language. The aspects emphasised by them are:
- to receive 'Comprehensible Input',
- to ensure comprehensibility of input through Interaction and Negotiation, which also provides input and output;
- to engage in 'Comprehensible Output' that can ensure feedback.

For language learning the three elements emphasised by them as necessary are: Input that is Comprehensible; Interaction and Negotiation, and Output that is Comprehensible. In all three models of language learning Interaction holds a crucial position.

The Input Model considers the presence of comprehensible input to be the only causative variable for language learning. Here the role of the learner is of passive participation in the Interaction which takes place.

The Interaction Model holds that only active participation in Interaction can ensure the comprehensibility of Input to the learner, which can assure that acquisition takes place. But it emphasises that within the interaction the quality of the input needs to be good for the results of acquisition to be more target-like.
The Outputtists hold language production to be the only means of mastery. Interaction is one of these modes of production while writing is another. They agree with the Interactionists about the need for interlocutors to be good for the acquisition to be native-like, and emphasise that the scope of immediate feedback from native speakers can give learners the proficiency in both grammatical as well as sociolinguistic accuracy in the use of the second language.

While the second and the third models specifically emphasise the need for interaction, the first does not discount its importance. Interaction therefore appears to be of great value to the process of acquisition, for different reasons. While the second group sees it as the means to comprehensible input for language learning, the third group values it for the scope it provides for output or production of the language, during which process it can draw attention to the learner's gaps or inaccuracies in grammatical as well as sociolinguistic knowledge of the second language. Altogether, there seems to be no fundamental difference in the stance of the Interactionists and the Outputtists, except that the latter take a broader view of output. Other researchers like Aston (1986) and Allwright et al (1991) are not sure that extensive interaction is really so beneficial for language learning. Aston holds that interaction may not necessarily indicate a greater 'negotiation of meaning' or entail more appropriate input for acquisitional purpose. On the other hand the excessive use of negotiation may raise the learners' affective filter and prevent acquisition.

To apply these models to Bangladeshis, these people are strongly bound within their own group (Ch 1) which reduces the possibility of sustained social and linguistic interaction with other groups, limiting the generation of linguistic elements helpful for language learning. To learn the second language fast and well the implication is that they should be able to come in contact with interlocutors with whom they can interact in the second language. They need access to a setting where they can interact with native English speakers to receive grammatically and socioculturally accurate input and feedback to their output. The purpose of the interaction should be involving and meaningful so that the learners persist in their attempt to be understood. For attaining
higher levels of accuracy they require focused grammatical teaching and to produce the L2 in writing.

The linguistic theories discussed so far deal with the factors that may activate the language learning process within the learner. There are others who think that language learning is determined by external aspects of social communication for which language is used. For interaction to take place, there have to be interlocutors. So language learning has an immediate social aspect: the learners have to use the second language to talk to others. How far they do so may depend on the opportunity they have for interaction, the attitude they have towards the second language and its users, and their need to use the second language. The socio-psycholinguists consider the learner as a person in a society, who may have positive or negative feelings and attitudes towards the second language and to its speakers. Thus for example, attending to better input and the process of self-correction for better approximation to target norms could depend on the learners' attitude and willingness to attain greater accuracy. These socio-psychological theories look at the learner's relation to the target language society and identify the socio-psychological forces operating in that situation which may affect their second language learning.

2.2. Socio-Psychological Theories

Language is used for communicating by members within society, and the socio-psychological theories consider language learning as more of a social process which takes place within the conflicting pressures of this society, determining relationships between individuals and groups.

The social psychologists hold that not only must the linguistic factors for acquisition be present and be accessible, but that the social environment requires to be favourable so that the learners allow the linguistic forces to work. However favourable the linguistic conditions may be, the learning will not progress beyond a level of proficiency unless certain social and personal conditions are perceived by the learner to exist between his/her group and the target language group.
Hinnenkamp (1980), from his work on Turkish learners of German sees communication as a phenomenon of social relation between groups and classes operating within concrete social power structures. For the group that is learning the new language, the act of learning may appear to be a simultaneous rejection and elimination of previous elements in their identity and cultural background, especially when they perceive their language to be a principle marker of group identity.

According to the social psychologists, people learning a new language have strong feelings about their own language or language variety in relation to the target language. These feelings may act as a deterrent or incentive to SLA, depending on the way in which the target community and the learner’s community view each other. If the feelings are positive, they may enhance the effect of the linguistic factors, while negative feelings will retard and limit the learning. According to them, language learning will take place only when the social factors that prevail are perceived to be positive by the learner. If the factors are seen to be negative, language learning will not progress far, even though the linguistic factors may be optimally present in the environment.

When the learner’s perception is positive s/he may utilise all chances for attending to the input or generating comprehensible input by entering into interaction with NSs, and attending to the critical feedback whenever available. When learners are willing to learn, the ‘affective filter’ will be low, permitting maximum input to go in. Attention to the feedback will lead the learner to produce more accurate output whenever necessary and possible.

Conversely, if the learner considers language learning to be a threat to self and group identity s/he may be averse to entering into communication with NS or others in the target language. In such a case the availability of linguistic input and the scope for using the language in output will be low. Even when interaction is necessary s/he may not attend to the input or the critical feedback to the language produced, and perhaps practice the correct form in output only temporarily or minimally. In a situation of negative perception the
learner may not make the effort to approximate towards a more correct form of the language and choose to remain at a low level of learning.

Just as the linguists differ in the emphasis they place on the particular aspect of linguistic process which they consider to be the most important for acquisition, each social-psychologist also views the social phenomenon of language-learning from a slightly different perspective, and emphasises different factors within the social situation as being crucially important for predicting the learner's inclination to master a second language.

In the following section I shall consider the work of Lambert, Gardner and Giles as representative of the most important work in this area. The 'Social Process Models' of language learning as delineated by Gardner (1985), are concerned with the cultural and socio-psychological factors that can motivate individuals to learn languages or discourage them from doing so, despite the presence of the various linguistic factors necessary for SLA discussed so far. These theories stress that the social milieu of the learners and forces within it determine the social relationships between the groups. In turn these factors influence the process of language acquisition and cause individual differences within SLA.

2.2.1. The Speech Accommodation Theory of SLA

The Speech Accommodation Model of Giles et al (1973, 1977) attempts to describe and explain speech shifts and also the speakers' reaction to speech variation. This theory focuses on the interaction between speakers in terms of their feelings, values and motives. It tries to focus on two things simultaneously: what people actually do when they vary their speech in the short-term, and the way they evaluate others who vary their speech.

Based on four established psychological theories by Tajfel (1974, 1978) and others, this theory emphasises the learner's perception of the social distance between groups. On the basis of their perception they balance the costs of learning the second language and the rewards to be attained by learning it. The extent of language learning will depend
on how well these two factors balance each other. The extent of personal contact with the target group and the threat to one's identity are the two variables most related to SLA.

When there is interaction, the speakers adjust to each other in a process of Accommodation. The accommodation may work in two opposite ways. The first way is convergence, where the speaker tries to identify with the hearer by using the language the hearer knows or likes best. The second is divergence. Here the speaker tries to create distance between himself and the hearer by maximising differences in language use. The greater the effort at convergence perceived in the learner, the more favourable is the assessment by the listeners. This results in more encouragement to converge (Giles et al 1973). For bilingualism to be desirable to the individual, there has to be a delicate balance between the motivational rewards of convergence to the target group, and the costs of this convergence.

Convergence involves costs for the speaker in terms of identity change and expended efforts. These costs should be compensated by the rewards of the listeners' approval which should have more weight with the speaker than the prospective loss of social identity. The goal for the speaker is to evoke the listeners' social approval and to attain communicative efficiency and maintain a positive self identity through social and economic gains in the host society.

Both convergence and divergence takes place in the manner of the output or production by the Learner. In a situation where learners value the target group's opinion and are willing to converge, the personal reactions of their interlocutors and the linguistic feedback would prompt them to approximate towards more target-like production of the language. Where the learners do not value the opinion of the target group enough to adopt their language norms, the learners will be unwilling to appear to become like the interlocutors and will not use the accurate linguistic input in interaction. In such situations linguistic divergence takes place in spite of the presence of the linguistic elements in the immediate environment. In this way the theory of Accommodation can explain and account for short-term variability of performance within and between learners (Beebe and Zuengler 1983).
Another social-psychological theory, the Intergroup Model of second language acquisition (Giles and Byrne 1982) also focuses on the variability of speech and is, according to Beebe (1988), a variation of the Accommodation Theory, but occurring over a longer term.

In a social situation where more than one language or variety is spoken, there is often an unequal distribution of power, social or economic, among the groups of speakers. The subordinate group struggles for survival in the face of a threatened assimilation by the more powerful dominant majority groups. Since language is an important marker of group identity, the loss of identity with one's own group may be one of the most costly consequences which for some is not balanced by the rewards. So the second language learners may have ambivalent attitudes towards the target language: the mastery of L2 is important for economic success, but becoming fluent speakers may mean losing part of their central identity. A compromise solution is to use various strategies in ones output to maintain one's identity even while learning the L2, through accented speech or code-switching.

The Intergroup Model stresses the maintenance of a positive self-image and social identity by group members. It becomes relevant for SLA by the minority group when group membership is based on language. This theory is an extension of the previous theory, but here the change towards or away from the target language norm is more permanent. This is because accommodation here is based on the social attitudes between groups which could be less changeable than attitudes between individuals.

When the learners have positive attitude towards the target language group, they may wish to converge by learning the language to a high level of accuracy and seek out opportunities for interaction with that community in the process. Their positive attitude and the high social value they attach to the opinion of target language speakers could make them willing to conform to the standards of that group and persist in the effort to become more like that group.

On the other hand, a negative social attitude towards the target group could make learners hold the benefits of learning the language to
be lower than the costs. It could impose a high affective filter on the input, deterring learners from learning even when exposed to the language. They would try to diverge as much possible through some linguistic means, ignoring the negative input and the opportunities for interaction they may have with speakers of that language. As a result the learners would stabilise at a low level of language proficiency.

Not all variation in language learning is however a matter of linguistic accommodation caused by the social perception between groups. Other sociolinguists identify slightly different factors operating behind the social situation which can also cause variation in the level attained in learning. This can be seen in the following theories.

2.2.2. Attitude and Motivation in SLA

Lambert’s (1963, 1974) Attitude and Motivational Model of language learning considers SLA that occurs in a bilingual environment and its implications for the learner's identity. He holds that linguistic distinctiveness is a basic component of personal identity which originates early in the child’s socialisation process, promoted by the parents by making contrasts between their own and other communities. For learning a second language the learner must be able and willing to adopt various aspects of the distinctive behaviour, including verbal behaviour, of the target group, giving up the behaviour that identifies the learner's own group. Focusing on these affective factors, Lambert's theory particularly distinguishes the attitudes of the learner’s community and the target community towards each other, based on the outcome or goal of learning the target language. The learners’ motivation for acquiring the language is responsible for the level reached in learning it since his/ her attitudes support and influence the motivation which causes learning.

Attitudes are considered to affect learning since they influence one’s beliefs, feelings and behaviour towards the object or goal of the activity. Gardner and Lambert (1972) specify two kinds of orientation or reasons for learning the second language:
a) an **integrative orientation** which fosters SLA for the purpose of understanding the target group, for behaving like them, for identifying with them and making friends;
b) an **instrumental orientation** which fosters SLA as the means to an end, of economic stability and social recognition, through employment, etc.

**Motivation** is the primary determinant of competence (Gardner 1985). It is related to **goal-directed, purposeful behaviour** from emotional attachment or for the enhancement of self-concept through new skills. It determines why a person desires to engage in a particular activity and how strongly s/he desires to do so. The learners' attitudes and orientation for learning the second language together make up their motivation. The more positive the motivation, the higher is the determination to make use of the formal and informal contexts for learning in the classroom, to create opportunities to use the L2 through their eagerness to answer questions and interact with others (Gardner et al 1976). There is a controversy about the direction of causality: success in learning the L2 may dispose the learner positively towards the language group and thereby motivate towards further learning. Conversely, learners with more L2 experience may have more positive attitude towards the L2 culture than the lower proficiency group, which may promote better L2 learning.

Some of the other researchers who have been associated with Lambert, e.g., Gardner and Lambert (1972), Gardner and Smythe (1975) claim that the learners' attitude towards the target group and their language, together with the learners' motivation for learning are the personal factors that lead to success or failure in language learning. Gardner and Smythe (ibid) predict the integrative orientation to be a greater indicator of success in language learning within a bilingual, bicultural setting like Quebec where it is capable of taking the learner to higher levels of linguistic proficiency. In a more unilingual setting like the Phillipines or the USA, Gardner and Lambert (1972) find that the instrumental orientation, or a combination of both orientations can lead to a better learning of English.
Krashen (1981b) agrees with the importance of attitudinal factors for language acquisition. He sees them at work through the 'affective filter' which controls the intake of input through communication, and the utilisation of the linguistic intake. He differs with Gardner and Lambert and predicts a lower affective filter and more effective learning from instrumental orientation when acquisition has some practical purpose or end. But this learning is expected to be at a lower level than the learning from integrative orientation since it will cease to develop as soon as the necessary aspects are learnt, so that communicatively less important aspects of language, e.g. accent and morphology which are not essential for getting one's meaning across, will not be acquired. This suggests that although high practical value and frequent use could be more urgent and powerful instrumental predictors of a low-level of second language learning, an integrative orientation may lead to a better and more native-like second language proficiency.

The dynamics of intergroup relations can influence the learner in the direction of additive or subtractive bilingualism. Positive changes in self-identity may lead to an L2 proficiency that does not replace the L1. This is known as additive bilingualism. But when the acquisition of L2 poses a threat to L1, it can cause the loss of cultural identity with one's own group, resulting in social alienation and subtractive bilingualism.

2.2.3. Comparison of the Models

Each theory looks at language learning from an increasingly wider perspective and tries to account for differences in learning in terms of the psychological or social reason that each finds to be most important. The linguistic models look at language learning without focussing on the situation, and point to the psychological factor that may help one learn the language. But second language learning always takes place in a context: there is always an idea of greater power accruing to one of the languages more than to the other. The learners' perception of the power relationship between the two language groups in society determines their attitude towards the target group and the goal for language learning. The socio-psychological theories explain the learning that takes place, in terms of the learners' feeling to the speakers of the
second language, or the goal that one can achieve by speaking the second language. Only a positive perception can make the learners make use of the linguistic elements of language learning for the acquisition of a second language. How well they make use of the elements depends on how attractive or positive is the goal or their perception of the other group, which also depends on how positively the target group views the learners.

The social aspects of the learning situation determines whether the socio-psychological cost of compromising one's identity by learning the second language is balanced by the socio-economic benefits that can accrue from learning it. This will decide whether or not the learners want to accommodate to the target group and utilise the linguistic factors necessary for language learning. The learners' purpose for acquiring the second language will determine the extent of their accommodation.

The Accommodation Model and the Intergroup Model both look at the actual linguistic phenomena within communication situations and consider the speaker's willingness to converge or diverge from the target language speaker. While the former looks at it from the individual level, the latter sees the same phenomena operating between groups, emphasising the need for positive self-image and social identification with one's group. The Attitude and Motivation Model on the other hand looks for the personal goal and psychological factors within the social perspective which affect second language learning.

The relationship between the Intergroup Model and the Attitude and Motivation Model is that, a positive social relationship between the learner and the target language group can give Integrative motivation or the willingness to Converge through learning. A more ambivalent perception can give an Instrumental motivation to learn, underscoring the learners' need to maintain their own identity through learning it only as far as necessary. This could also be a model of linguistic Divergence. Unlike the Attitude and Motivation model, the Accommodation and Intergroup models of learning are not restricted to second language situations only, but can apply to speakers within the same language group.
For the Bangladeshis the cost of learning English in terms of lost identity would be high for members of this group for whom language has a high value in determining group unity and identity. The benefits from learning it would have to be substantially high to balance the costs. Further, they would have to be able to perceive these benefits to be present there in society, accessible to them through a process that begins with learning the language. This could be through an integrative motivation, where they would like to converge to the target society, and would be encouraged by that society to do so. But integration may be difficult for them as the religious, social and cultural difference between the groups is so extensive (Ch 1). They could consider the social distance between themselves and the host group to be too great, in which case they could be motivated instrumentally where the costs of learning could be perceived to be less than the rewards. To make them learn, the reward would have to appear to be attainable to them, so that they would be willing to sacrifice some amount of self-identity. Additionally, they would need access to people who could provide them such input through sustained conversation on involving topic where appropriate feedback would help them to develop grammatical and linguistic appropriacy.

2.3. Requirements within a language learning situation

To learn the language better, motivationally these learners need to be in a situation that requires them to use English instrumentally, for achieving something immediately necessary and ultimately valuable. The learning situation needs to provide them with such motivation. They also need to have access to a place and a setting where they can meet and interact with NS on a more equal footing, so that their self-esteem is preserved while their perception of distance between the groups is reduced. It can help them to develop positive feelings towards NSs, and make them willing to adopt some of their values and norms.

Within such a motivational situation they require to have access to comprehensible 'decontextualised' input directed to them, which they can try out in interaction, and negotiate meanings that they do not understand, in order to achieve some useful goal. To their output in use they require knowledgeable and comprehensible feedback. If the
situation could bring the Bangladeshis and NSs together for some purpose, it could help generate positive attitudes between the groups for better language learning.

To be able to realise that the goal of language learning is desirable and attainable to them, the learners require exposure to some role-models who have adopted some values of the NSs, and have succeeded socio-economically through academic achievement. This could show Bangladeshi learners that there was a trade-off between the costs of learning the language to become more similar to the NSs, and the rewards to be derived from it. These are the factors necessary for bringing about successful language learning for academic purpose by Bangladeshi children. These factors can come together most conveniently in the instructional setting, the classroom.

2.3.1. The instructional setting for academic and language Learning

For the Bangladeshis, learning the 'decontextualised' form of the language while learning academically can be most economic with the time available to them. The classroom is the setting which can ideally provide them access to the linguistic elements necessary for the type of English they need for academic performance, nut it needs to organise their learning in a way that can utilise the skills that they have to develop the skills they need.

Stubbs (1976) holds that language is a central factor in schooling, and that classrooms are the place where learners can get maximum exposure to and be involved in learning activities in ways that can facilitate the operation of the factors necessary for SLA.

The instructional setting can provide opportunities for the factors of language acquisition to operate to the optimum, according to Long (1988), and raise the learners' awareness of grammatical and syntactic details. The error correction and negative input from teachers and peers (Schachter 1984; Ellis 1984) within the classroom can help learners to discover what they need to do differently, both linguistically and
sociolinguistically in order to be comprehended accurately (Swain 1985; Faerch and Kasper 1986).

The comprehensible input can come from peers, and also through 'teacher talk', the instructional variation of 'caretaker speech' (Hatch 1983). As they progress, teachers can select appropriate instructional material to match the language elements that would come next on the learner's natural developmental sequence (Pienemann 1985) while books and materials for private reading can help provide additional input and exposure to samples of appropriate language use.

The classroom can provide the opportunity to resolve the incomprehensibility of any input that one feels is important, through negotiation (Gass & Varonis 1985) with peers who are available as interlocutors. One can try out the language in output in a non-threatening context with peers, while the need to perform academically in the classroom can afford an immediate instrumental orientation (Gardner & Lambert 1972) for language learning.

From the socio-psychological standpoint, the classroom can maximise the possibilities for socialisation between groups by organising learning activities which can stimulate the learners' need and motivation to learn as well as to interact for acquiring language that is grammatically and socially appropriate. The influence of interaction and proximity may make them want to adopt some of the target group's values. Peers may also provide information about better career opportunities that can become available through better academic achievement. This can provide an instrumental orientation to language learning (Ch 2).

The necessity and motivation to induce learning, the presence of linguistic factors necessary for making learning possible, with the necessary feedback to ascertain accuracy that can operate in the classroom, can together pressurise Bangladeshi learners to acquire the academic form of English in the classroom.
2.3.2. Classroom support for Bangladeshi learners

The 1989 Language Census (ILEA 1989c) of ILEA estimated 25% of London's total school population, numbering 70,221 to be Pupils with a Home Language Other than or in addition to English (PHLOE). Of this number, 20,113 were Bengali speaking. There was a great variation in the fluency in English of the second language learners, so ILEA developed a four-stage categorisation system for measuring the learners' fluency in English (ILEA 1987):

Stage 1: Able to engage in classroom learning activities through the mother tongue but needs support to operate in English;

Stage 2: Able to participate in all non-written learning activities in English, but requires considerable support for written activities;

Stage 3: Able to engage in oral and written activities in English, but requires further support;

Stage 4: Fluent and does not need additional support.

According to the ILEA 1989 language census (ILEA 1989c), Tower Hamlets had the highest number of learners in the beginner level and also of learners who were at stages 1, 2, and 3 (12,404). By 1989 only 10% of the Bangladeshi learners were fluent in English, the lowest among all PHLOEs. To function academically these learners not only have to acquire the second language, but have to learn the 'decontextualised' type of second language, and simultaneously learn academic content through the use of 'decontextualised' type of language in the classroom.

The situation is most acute for those who arrive after fourteen years of age, since the academic course for this age group at the schools in England and Wales aims to cover the syllabus for GCSE, the school-leaving examination, in five terms. Entry after the start of the five-term GCSE course beginning from the fourth year makes it difficult for learners to acquire the type of language necessary for academic performance. Additionally, the late entry reduces the time at their disposal for completing coursework and requisite tests in order to qualify for the more valuable subjects in GCSE. Low proficiency in the type of language necessary to function at this level makes performance
more difficult, and pulls down their achievement in the examination which determines their future careers and possibilities of economic mobility.

According to Snow & Hoefnagel-Hohle (1978) and Cummins (1984) second language learners require a minimum of five years to acquire grade norms in L2 academic skills, but Bangladeshi late-comers do not have the necessary extra time to acquire the language before they go on to the content class. They need to start to learn immediately. They need to learn the language as they learn the content, through their L1 and whatever knowledge they have of context-embedded English, through teaching that is adapted to their proficiency and learning capability. For such multiple learning to take place simultaneously, these PHLOEs require more support than others within the classroom. Instruction in language through withdrawal classes would give access to the language only, not the curriculum, while unadapted curriculum teaching without the language support would not be comprehensible so that these learners would not benefit from the experience.

The Bullock Report (DES 1975) found that learners at secondary stage received very little ESL or other support which could help them perform in the classroom. Ten years later the Swann Report (DES 1985) found that withdrawal of learners from their mainstream classes for language support segregated and stigmatised the children. The report recommended that language support should be built into mainstream teaching. The Bullock Report and the EC Directive for the promotion of 'mother tongue' and culture in the classroom together made the use of L1 possible in the classroom, for at least bilingual help rather than losing valuable learning time in segregating learners for language instruction.

Wong Fillmore & Valadez (1986) hold that the use of L1 even temporarily would allow the use of previously-developed skills while learning new ones. If knowledge and concepts learnt in one language can be transferred to another through a common underlying proficiency, as claimed by Cummins (1981, 1984b), the use of L1 would benefit the learners' cognitive proficiency before they reached the necessary English proficiency (Swain 1981). It could have a beneficial
psychological effect, as learners could master the concepts before they tried to transfer it to the language they did not yet understand.

In the Inner City classroom the sources of support for second language learners are the ESL and bilingual teachers (ILEA 1985 b). They are the support and service agents within the school mainstream who help the learners to understand the curriculum and language through restatements as well as translations, and help colleagues to modify the classroom tasks. But as 25% of the school-going children in London are PHLOEs and have more than one language (ILEA 1989c), there are never enough ESL teachers to support all learners across the curriculum. Even where some support teachers are available, a mismatch exists between ideas regarding the responsibility of ESL teachers and the subject teachers for the children's learning of language and academic content (ILEA 1985 b).

The deficit can partly be made good through the support from the bilingual peers within the classroom, particularly if the organisation of the teaching allows the peers to discuss the content in the classroom and offer help to each other through such discussions. Bangladeshis acquainted with the context-embedded form of language use will find it easier to respond to the dual pressure of learning that was moderated through the use of similar context-embedded communication rather than 'decontextualised', third-person oriented reportings of others' doings (Smith 1981). The use of a known pattern would reduce their cognitive load for such dual learning. It can make learning immediately accessible through previously developed 'context-embedded' skills in L1 and L2, which can make learning interesting and motivating.

2.4. Pedagogic issues for learning by Bangladeshi children

The potentiality of discussion for facilitating language and academic learning in the classroom is increasingly well supported by research in pedagogy at school level during the recent years. Talk is the means of transmitting information that can intervene between the dependent variable of teaching and the independent variable of learning. It can reflect how learners perceive and organise the immediate academic teaching in their effort to assimilate classroom knowledge. According to
the theories of language learning (Ch 2), it can also provide the means of access to linguistic input and output for Bangladeshis.

Official reports too have picked up the importance of talk in the learning situation. The Bullock Report (DES 1975) encourages the development of policies which will provide richer opportunities for the children to 'learn by talking and writing' (4: 10).

An HMI Report on the need for improvement in education (HMI 1978:27) echoes a similar need for student talk in the classroom, saying learners need more opportunities than are observable in the classroom to find their own solutions to problems, to argue, to discuss and to ask questions.

The need to 'learn by talking and writing' as emphasised by such reports inspired ILEA to look into the learning situation under its jurisdiction. An ILEA report in 1984 notes that older pupils often suffer from a decline in the opportunities open to them for classroom talk in order to generate questions and explore their own alternative answers through which they could attain an adult level of articulation (ILEA 1984: 7).

The increasing importance of communication in the classroom also drew attention to the opportunities for socialisation that exist in classrooms and can be utilised more effectively for learning better. Learner talk can serve as the means to combine the factors for language learning—input, interaction, negotiation and output in a way that may be monitored. Conversation between peers is a means of reflecting equality of status, the process of establishing camaraderie that can instil and inspire motivation to converge, to integrate. It can achieve an interface between the linguistic and the social-psychological factors emphasised by researchers, the benefits of which could be maximised through organisation and manipulation of classroom learning activities.

Classroom teaching for Bangladeshis can arrange activities that can give the newcomers an opportunity to learn the content through help from peers and from support teachers through using L1 and L2 in
discussions, particularly if it allows them to use the context-embedded use of language skill with which they are already familiar.

2.4.1. Types of teaching organisation

To discover how far the organisation of teaching in the classrooms where Bangladeshi students study allow the learners to interact, I visited some classrooms in Tower Hamlets. An initial observation showed that basically two types of teaching organisation were used within these classes. All classes contained some amount of input from the teacher. But while in some classes this would be followed by some activity when the learners could interact, there were others where the teacher-fronted input continued for the whole time, interspersed with some display or comprehension questions. In these classes there was only the transmission of input from the teacher to the learners, with very little interaction between the learners, while in the other there was some transmission followed by interaction and negotiation on the tasks. So, the two patterns seemed to be:

--a session of teacher-input, with some interaction between students and the teacher at points; or,
--a session of teacher-input, followed by some activity,
followed by an optional session of teacher-input.

While the first pattern contained only input, in the second pattern the organisation allowed the learners to actively manage their learning for some of the time.

The teacher-fronted input gives the learners much language and content input, but it does not allow them the time to ascertain its comprehensibility through negotiation. The teacher is in charge, the person who can allow or initiate conversation in the classroom. Turn transition and turn distribution is predictable, and generally adopts the (Initiation-Response-Feedback) pattern where they can talk for one-third of the total time, the response time, while the teacher uses the other two-thirds (Flanders 1970). As Pica (1987) suggests, the unequal relationship between the teacher and the learners limits the scope of classroom activities to
produce communication that can generate the linguistic and the sociolinguistic factors for general SLA.

As the speech occurs sequentially in the teacher-fronted input pattern, it is easy to see that not all members of a classroom can get a chance to engage in sustained conversation within the limited time. Neither is the opportunity that each receives for oral output sufficient for their development of second language proficiency to a high degree. Some of the students do ask questions for comprehension, but learners of low-proficiency may feel shy to ask the teacher for clarification or to show incomprehension. Learners who do not get a chance to talk can lose interest in the proceedings and stop paying attention to the talk (van Lier 1988: 106).

To generate more conversation by the pupils one would have to change the balance of power in favour of the learners, making the organisation of learning more student-centred. A reduction in teacher-domination could give the learners more power to speak, and generate more language use between participants for varied purposes. Cathcart (1986) claims that situational variables and interlocutor difference can affect the information-sharing behaviour of speakers. She finds that the power for conversational control can affect the production of speech and the number and overall variety of communicative acts or functions within this speech. The change in the power distribution in the classroom can result in the use of more linguistic elements in various functions in the Hallidayan sense (1973), for greater all-round language proficiency.

Simply giving power to learners to communicate within the classroom however, could become an activity without focus unless it directed itself towards the achievement of some academic goal. Ur (1981) suggests that the most natural and effective way for learners to talk is for them to engage freely in some discussion on some problem where as many students as possible can say as much as possible. To make this a genuine discourse the students need a topic, with a purpose or reason for saying something about it. In the secondary classroom the academic content can furnish the topic, while performing a course-
related task on that topic can produce sustained interaction to facilitate language learning.

Tasks with a particular focus or learning purpose can be used for teaching Bangladeshis in the classroom by teachers to give purpose, shape and direction to communication between learners.

2.4.1.1. Tasks for SLA

The growing realisation of the need for input, interaction and output for language learning has led to an increasing use of classroom tasks with emphasis on verbal production prior to written output in schools where there are large numbers of second language learners, eg, low proficiency Bangladeshis.

Brown and Yule (1983) hold that seeing or hearing others interact does not provide the crucial input that direct participation provides. So the most important characteristic of tasks for SLA is the participation in verbal transfer of information that can take place between participants. As noted in Ch. 1, interaction between learner and interlocutor is the factor that can facilitate second language learning. Classroom tasks can provide Bangladeshi learners this opportunity for active participation in interaction.

A Task is defined by Crookes (1986) as:

'a piece of work or an activity, usually with a specified objective, undertaken as part of an educational course, at work, or used to elicit data for research.'

Doyle (1983) analyses schoolwork in terms of tasks and outlines three salient aspects:
- the givens or the resources available for generating the product,
- the operations to generate the product, and
- the product itself.

Discussion for understanding all three aspects of a task can provide opportunity for generating interaction between learners.
While generating the necessary linguistic elements, tasks can also facilitate the process of socialisation among Bangladeshis and other learners which in turn can lead them to make use of the linguistic factors for learning, while it can help to reduce the distance perceived between groups. For language learning by minority learners like the Bangladeshis, tasks may be used to help generate the linguistic and positive socio-psychological factors simultaneously as they learn academically.

2.4.1.2. Task classification

Tasks for SLA are seen by some as information-gap activities which can be classified on the basis of the language they help to produce. Various people have categorised tasks on the basis of the manner that the transfer of information takes place. These are:

- one-way/ two-way (Long 1981);
- problem solving/ discussion (Porter 1983);
- negotiation of meaning/ negotiation of output (Young 1984);
- convergent/ divergent (Duff 1986);
- production-related/ process-related (Morris 1966).

Despite such variety in categorisation, the borderline between task types is not always distinct. The definitions by different researchers often overlap so that the same type of task can appear under different representations, e.g. problem solving/ discussion tasks are quite similar to convergent/ divergent tasks. I shall now talk of the more distinctive types of tasks.

2.4.1.2.1. One-way/ Two-way tasks

In one-way tasks the information is allocated to one party only, who has to transfer it to another person who then completes the task. The role of the latter remains mainly passive. There is little shared assumption between the participants on these tasks. The burden of maintaining the communication depends principally on one participant, so the dialogue is relatively one-sided and there are chances of communication breakdown.
One-way tasks can give rise to longer tracts of speech which have to be comprehensible to the interlocutor for the tasks to be performed. There may be some negotiation to ensure comprehensibility. Such tasks would give rise to the use of more 'decontextualised' language (Ch 1).

In two-way tasks on the other hand, information is held by each participant who is required to transfer it verbally to others in order to complete the task. Each learner has to contribute in the task in order to achieve a common product or goal. The learners generally share common 'givens' or assumptions so there exists less need for negotiation and more possibility of dialogue.

According to Long (1980) the advantage of two-way tasks over one-way is that the former constrain the learners to make greater efforts to ensure comprehensibility to other learners in order to generate the product. This necessitates more interactional modifications in two-way than in one-way tasks, and increases the likelihood of generating verbal interactions that may lead to language learning.

The use of two-way tasks for Bangladeshis could give a better and surer chance for participation by all. Although researchers like Aston (1986) question the benefit of extensive interaction and negotiation, if a greater use of the language in output is the more effective way of learning it, two-way tasks should be of more useful for enabling learners to generate more language as interaction.

Two-way tasks generally have some 'givens' or assumptions shared by the participants and do not require the use of long utterances for the clarification of this aspect. But the three aspects outlined by Doyle (1983) need to be discussed for the task to be completed. The discussion can be conducted through the knowledge of the more 'context-embedded' pattern of communication. So the use of two-way tasks in the classroom for learners who are at the beginner level in language and content learning, can form the basis for the automatisation of known language skills at the context-embedded end of Cummins' (1984) continuum (Ch 1). This may aid the gradual
development of 'decontextualised' skills necessary for the expression of more abstract academic knowledge.

For Bangladeshi learners who know some English, it would mean that they would be able to perform the classwork, using their previously developed 'context-embedded' skills. For those who know no English, they could use their knowledge of L1 to get across. The ability to interact with others on such tasks would acquaint them with the sounds of the new language, where meanings could be conveyed through the context and some use of L1. The recycling of linguistic structures during the performance of two-way tasks can help them to master the words and structures and form the basis for further development.

Psycho-socially, two-way tasks assign a partnership role to participants, giving learners some role of equality. They can constrain Bangladeshi learners to be involved in interaction, on some kind of equal status. Their self esteem and identity is likely to feel less threatened, so that it could form a way in to reduction of the perceived distance between groups and engender attitudes of some social and linguistic convergence.

Both one-way and two-way tasks have pedagogic and psycholinguistic value for SLA since they can supplement and reinforce each other to help develop different forms of linguistic proficiency at various stages of learning. But for Bangladeshi learners who are mostly at the elementary stage, the use of one-way tasks would not be very useful at the early stages. While the role of the passive performer would offer little chance for use of the language, the role of the active partner who has to plan and use long utterances to talk at length could be beyond the learners' ability.

Two-way tasks may be more useful for their learning purpose by enabling them to generate more language as they also help nurture positive attitudes towards the target language speakers. This may induce Bangladeshi learners to attend to and make optimum use of the linguistic factors and opportunities for language use.
Within two-way tasks, Porter's (1983) distinction between problem-solving and discussion tasks on the basis of the focus of one member in relation to another in the interaction closely resembles Duff's (1986) categorisation as Convergent and Divergent tasks, so I shall describe one, Duffs' pattern of categorisation.

2.4.1.2.2. Convergent/ Divergent tasks

Convergent and Divergent tasks, according to Duff (1986) are both two-way tasks since they require exchange of information by both the participants. The crucial difference is the amount and type of language each necessitates.

Convergent tasks, like Discussion tasks of Porter (1983) have many of the assumptions shared by the participants so that antecedents in an utterance do not always need to be stated. This can make the turns shorter so that these tasks have the potentiality to allow more learners to contribute and participate, providing greater scope for output. They can generate greater frequency of questions with more attention to details. Interaction on shared 'givens' (Doyle 1983) towards shared goals on convergent tasks can give rise to more negotiation to ascertain greater comprehensibility of the linguistic input. Learners can make use of linguistic items from each others' utterance for 'scaffolding' their discourse (Ch 2) to attain the goal.

The interaction and negotiation to reach similar goals can help create social accord which can induce learners to want to converge linguistically and socially through fellow-feeling. This can help to reduce distance between groups, while the need to reach the same goal for a task can provide the instrumental motivation (Ch 2) to use the language and lead to learning the 'decontextualised' language better.

In Divergent tasks such as debates, the learners start with differing standpoints and goals. The tasks require learners to put forth their arguments in terms of abstract ideas and concepts in order to present arguments and convince interlocutors. As learners progress towards the goal they need to convince others of the validity of their own point of view. As a result, turns can be long, reducing the
possibility of negotiation. The greater syntactic complexity necessary for planning longer turns, and the lack of negotiation may limit the possibility of input being comprehensible in divergent tasks.

Any response or retaliation on the part of a learner on a divergent task requires an analysis of others' presentation, with expressive and terminological precision in framing one's turn. The incorporation of others' ideas into one's contributions may lead to higher levels of recycling of ideas and language, and reinforce learning while it can help enhance the memory-load capacity and develop the learners' cognitive capability. Divergent tasks can teach learners take account of the others' point of view, within the task as well as socially, and reduce the perceived distance between groups.

Linguistically and pedagogically, convergent and divergent tasks have the potentiality to pressurise learners to use different types of discourse and develop a variety of language skills. They can also help reduce intergroup boundaries and induce learners to integrate to some of the norms of target society through positive affective feelings.

2.4.1.3. Comparison of tasks

Two-way tasks may be more useful than one-way tasks for language learning, particularly by Bangladeshis at the earlier stage of learning. They not only give rise to more active use of the language by all participants, but also allow more even participation that may lead to better language learning, while the resulting negotiation may lead to better social interaction and understanding between peers. Bangladeshis who may be acquainted with context-embedded use of language may be able to participate through their prior knowledge of that discourse pattern (Ch 2) and can progress to the pattern of 'decontextualised' language use.

Within two-way tasks, convergent tasks begin with shared assumptions and aspire towards the same goal, while divergent tasks start with different starting points and aim towards opposite goals. For the purposes of this research I shall categorise tasks used in
classrooms as convergent and divergent tasks, performed in groups or individually.

2.4.1.4. Advantages of task-based approach to teaching

The various advantages of using tasks for teaching Bangladeshis can be summarised as follows:

Integration of the learning elements: Interaction while performing tasks can provide an integrative basis where input, interaction and output for language and content learning can be brought together to operate naturally. Bangladeshi learners with limited scope for exposure to second language have the opportunity to use the language for genuine communicative functions with interlocutors.

Tasks that allow interaction, give students a reason to collaborate and make use of grammar, sociolinguistic, discourse, content and strategic competence proposed by Canale and Swain (1980) for product generation. The need to perform on tasks can pressurise even the Bangladeshi beginners to use the target language, even partially, to attain some results. It can provide an instrumental motivation for their language learning.

Suitability to needs: Pedagogically, tasks are adaptable to different content and language ability levels that exist among the Bangladeshis and allow them to use language to work at their own level. Tasks set at different levels can individualise instruction by suiting materials to the needs of mixed ability Bangladeshis better than whole class teaching. Long (1985) considers that tasks can suit the content of teaching to be within the reach of learners of varied ability better than other methods.

Motivational: Since they can involve learners in first-person-oriented activities like the face-to-face context-embedded interaction that the Bangladeshi learners may have learnt in L1 or even L2, tasks can be motivational by being accessible. Interaction with others of different language background to attain a goal in L2 can
impose a natural requirement for Bangladeshis to function in L2, an instrumental orientation. Interaction on convergent tasks in proximity can create rapport between peers of different language background, and reduce their perception of social distance.

2.4.1.5. The disadvantages of tasks

Tasks-based teaching suffer certain drawbacks. Planning and preparing different work sheets for various ability groups is time consuming and increases the work load enormously for teachers, particularly language teachers (Varnava 1975). The increased workload can be overwhelming, while the tasks would be only as good as the teacher who devises the tasks.

When interaction is allowed, the peers are the main source of input for the learners. If the input is degenerate the learning will not be target-like. Emphasis during interaction is on communication, not form. Consequently, interlingual, deviant forms are used and learnt by pupils and accepted by teachers (Long 1985). In classrooms where Bangladeshi learners study, interaction with other Bangladeshis may not lead to greater accuracy unless more proficient peers and teachers are also present as interlocutors, to give critical feedback to their speech.

The tasks discussed so far are those devised specifically for second language learning. But tasks devised on similar lines may be used for teaching other subjects across the curriculum, to give rise to 'speaking and writing' so that Bangladeshis not only have the opportunity to learn the language by interacting with peers but can also receive their support for learning the content. Immersion programmes in Canada have shown that language acquisition is optimum when it is a means for learning subject matter at school, towards a worthwhile goal rather than when it is an end in itself. The potentiality of a task-based teaching organisation to use academic topics to make language learning appear more attractive and motivating can make tasks of value to teachers in schools where Bangladeshi learners study.
2.4.1.6. Tasks performed as groupwork

As seen on my initial observations, some tasks are set up as groupwork where the interaction is built in as an integral part of performance, as on the tasks discussed above. Alternatively they can be set up to be performed individually. On such tasks the teacher may or may not allow interaction as part of the process of peer support during performance. Tasks performed in groups or through discussions allow more interaction to take place and offer better opportunities for language use for SLA factors to operate, than teacher-fronted input classes and tasks performed individually can allow.

Groupwork offers better opportunities for SLA since potentially the learners are more available to each other than the teacher is to any of them. The decrease in the number of participants in the interaction can increase the scope for speech that can be uttered by each learner, as demonstrated by Pica & Doughty (1985). So groupwork in a learning situation offers greater chances of interaction as it involves only a few learners rather than a whole class.

In the whole-class situation, the 'audience effect' may inhibit production (Barnes 1973), while in the presence of a few members in a group the learners are more likely to respond with less self-consciousness since their mistakes will be heard by a few only. Groupwork can involve Bangladeshi learners in the lesson at a more personal level and thereby capture their attention better. Whoever is speaking is only a small distance away, clearly audible and addressing them personally. The whole activity is immediate and 'involving', according to Ur (1981). The mutual help, correction and the constructive criticism from peers in a small group is more easily acceptable to the learners and can develop in the Bangladeshis the perception and awareness of mistakes. It facilitates the pooling of resources and creates a feeling of collective learning. Groupwork on convergent tasks can allow pupils to make frequent use of one another's contributions in a collaborative social relationship, by extending or modifying them. Learners are involved in conveying some meaning that is important to both, and socio-psychologically this may help to bring the Bangladeshis and other language groups together.
Tasks performed as groupwork can expose Bangladeshi students to meaningful, context-embedded, self-generated communication in the L2. It can give them the freedom to initiate their own utterances and use their language store in a greater variety of language functions with partners, asking questions and answering them as equals. According to di Pietro (1987) the motivation for learning comes through the visual and concrete support the activities provide for the comprehension and production of new target words and structures which can be particularly useful for low-ability Bangladeshis.

Discussion in groups and pairs with peers as interlocutors can promote the use of a greater variety of realistic speech acts, while feedback from knowledgeable NS interlocutors can help develop socially appropriate language (Long et al 1976) for Bangladeshis. Groupwork has been seen as capable of increasing the potential quantity of oral practice time for learners from one-third of the total time for all students (Flanders 1970) to five hundred percent more practice time for each student (Long and Porter 1985), and can compensate the Bangladeshis' lack of scope for practice to some extent.

2.4.1.7. Problems for schools with second language learners

Setting up tasks and organising groupwork poses certain problems for the schools where Bangladeshi pupils mainly study. Some general problems are:

Linguistic adjustment: The grouping of children by age leads to the presence of a variety of language proficiency among the children in the same class. Reaching all the students to explain and teach them requires a high level of expertise for linguistic adjustment from the teacher (HACR 1986), that the teacher may not have.

Work load: The variation in educational experience of the children requires the preparation of task sheets or cards at different levels for the same topic. During the task performance the learners have to be supported at different levels simultaneously. In group work an intelligent elite can take the discussion out of reach of the least able
in the group who needs the practice most may be afraid to participate in the discussion. Such problems intensify the pressure on the teachers (Collier 1982).

Control: Mixed ability groups where each child operates on a different level or perform groupwork, are more difficult to control. Maintaining discipline that allows all members in the classroom to progress with their work is difficult, calling for much patience and management expertise from teachers.

Teacher turn-over: Whether through the pressures of work or other reasons, there is a high rate of teacher turnover in the schools of Tower Hamlets (Tomlinson & Hutchinson 1991). HACR (1986) records the frequent change of teachers in Tower Hamlets as a reason for the underachievement of the Bangladeshis (para 45). THARE (1987: 38) explains that due to the high rate of teacher turnover a large number of children are taught by supply teachers, acting heads of departments and other temporary measures in Tower Hamlets schools.

Individualised teaching in the mixed ability classroom through the preparation of well-thought-out tasks for every stage of learning requires trained and dedicated staff who are difficult to find and difficult to keep unless promotion is forthcoming, a problem that is acute in periods of economic cutbacks, in areas of deprivation like the Tower Hamlets. The problem of recruiting teachers in the area makes it difficult to have sufficient numbers of teachers with some level of expertise for teaching learners like Bangladeshis efficiently. As a result, according to THARE,

'... while the teacher/ pupil ratio is high, the number of appropriately qualified and experienced teachers is low and the quality of education provided is also necessarily low.' (THARE 1988: 13).

In the next chapter I shall frame the problems of the Bangladeshis into a research problem and select methods that can allow research into the language use that various teaching organisation give rise to for Bangladeshis in two schools of London, and frame hypotheses about the learning that can result for these children.
2.5. Summary

The factors of language learning suggested as crucial by the theories surveyed in this chapter are clearly relevant to the situation of the Bangladeshis in London schools. Language learning can only begin for them when the linguistic factors of comprehensible input, interaction and comprehensible output are available. But how far the learners makes use of these factors may depend on how the social situation affects the learners' self-perception as individuals and as members of a group. Unless the costs balance the benefits, second language learning may not occur even when the linguistic factors are available. A positive self-perception as an individual and as member of a group is central to second language learning, particularly by a minority community within a majority setting.

Immigrants in a host country are often a subordinate group in the power structure. Like all such groups, Bangladeshis are not in a social position to have easy access to the linguistic factors, particularly to prolonged interaction with native speakers on involving topics for a purpose. Their lower social status in the host country may make them hold the social distance to be too great for convergence: the costs could be higher to them than the benefits of second language learning in terms of self and group perception.

In that case, an instrumental motivation may be the best basis for effective learning. If learning English can appear as the means to educational achievement and social and economic success, it can make the social situation look more positive to Bangladeshis and motivate them to learn English. Within such a motivational situation, the Bangladeshi learners will still require access to the linguistic factors held necessary for learning English more successfully. For these learners the instructional setting is the ideal place that can provide factors of language learning while learning academically.

The classroom can motivate them instrumentally with the goal of economic benefits from better academic achievement, combining the language and content learning factors in activities that involve pupils in interaction with other learners on academic tasks, where they can use
their previously developed linguistic skills. Such activities or tasks for language learning have been categorised as one way and two-way, depending on the pattern of exchange of information. Among two-way tasks, convergent and divergent tasks can give rise to complementary types of language use for learners, while tasks performed as groupwork can give rise to more interaction among learners, and can help develop positive social attitudes to help learn English better.
Chapter 3

The Planning Of The Research

In the previous chapters I have surveyed the theories of language learning and have considered Bangladeshi learners in London in the light of these theories. I have also considered the pedagogic aspect of their need for dual learning of language and academic content which needs to be economic with time. In this chapter I shall discuss the planning and designing of research around the problem that Bangladeshi learners have in learning English for better academic performance. Real students in classrooms should have to be involved to help identify the factors within the learning milieu that could help Bangladeshi learners acquire the language to perform better academically.

This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section focuses on the problem and raises the questions for research. The second section frames these questions into a research design and sets up certain hypotheses about the learning that takes place. The third section discusses the general and particular issues of the research design relating to settings that were chosen for the research, the methods that were adopted and the instruments used for investigating the development of proficiency in second language use by Bangladeshi learners. The fourth section describes a pilot study of the linguistic test used for the research and its results.

3.1. Assessment of the problem

The problem as discussed so far is that the immigrant Bangladeshi learners arrive in U.K. at various ages, with little formal education and minimal English proficiency. Most of the parents lack formal education as well as knowledge of English, the language of the host society and of the schools within this society (Ch 1). As a result the parents are unable to help their children with academic or language learning. All members of the group need to develop proficiency in English to adapt to this society, while the children need to learn it immediately for access to British education which alone can give them the economic benefits of this society.
The social needs of this large, cohesive and expanding group are generally met through its own people, so the scope or the need for members to interact with other groups can be very limited. This makes school the only place where the children can have access to the factors to help them to learn the second language. The opportunity to interact with others in this society who can give them adequate linguistic input may not happen otherwise for Bangladeshis. Schools provide a setting where Bangladeshis can meet members of the target society, while it can also provide the need for members of various groups to interact with each other. So the need to interact with each other can come together with the scope for interaction, within the learning activities in the classroom.

Even though pupils from various language backgrounds may be learning within the same classroom, there may not arise any need for these students to mix socially or interact, unless the teaching organisation requires them to do so. The forces of language learning may not operate unless the interaction that can generate them, takes place.

The need for interaction can vary as a function of the organisation of the classroom activities, just as the factors within the interaction can vary with the proficiency of the participants of the interaction. As discussed in Ch 2, all types of organisations may not provide similar needs to interact, nor give rise to the same pattern of interaction. Activities such as task-based groupwork offer more opportunity for language use than individual tasks or teacher-fronted input classes, with the potential for better language and academic learning. During the interaction, talk between more and less proficient learners can give rise to better quality of input and feedback than interaction between similar proficiencies (Porter 1986).

As mentioned before, in organisations like teacher-fronted input classes, the teaching may not allow much learner-talk. While some of the factors for language learning, eg. input, may be available during such teaching, it may not be comprehensible to all due to lack of opportunity for negotiation. Even when understood, the form or item
may not be acquired due to the lack of practice in output. When the organisation of instructional activities makes it necessary for the learners to interact for some genuine purpose in the classroom, such as academic learning, the language learning factors may operate more integratively. During such activities, the presence of more proficient interlocutors can give rise to better quality language in terms of input at (i+1) level, and more accurate feedback.

Accordingly, this research would look into the opportunities for language learning that could arise while Bangladeshis learnt academically with peers from the same language background, or mixed with NSs and speakers of different languages. It would focus on the differences in the language production during learning different subjects across two contrasting settings which could give rise to differences in language learning. As the learners interacted on various subjects, the language use could allow the forces of language learning to operate. But since the proficiency of the interlocutors would differ, the factors would operate differently in the two contrastive settings. This could cause differences in language learning by the Bangladeshis.

3.1.1. Educational context and participation opportunities

The research was to be based in a real-life environment of classrooms, within the real pressures of academic learning, even though it could offer many difficulties. Researchers like Parlett & Hamilton (1972) criticise studies conducted within 'tidy' laboratory conditions as the results from such studies cannot be generalised to the 'untidy' reality of the 'learning milieu'(1972:5). They define the learning milieu as the

"social-psychological and material environment in which students and teachers work together....a unique pattern of circumstances, pressures, customs, opinions, and work styles which suffuse the teaching and learning that occur there" (1972:11).

According to them, a research in the real situation tests out the results during the process of research rather than wait for it to be evaluated after the research. Although they speak with particular focus on material assessment, this can hold true of all other domains of classroom research, including this research on effectiveness of two
classroom settings. Pedagogic research begins and ends in the real classroom, the 'learning milieu'. Since the results have to be true of the forces operating in the 'untidy' world of the real classroom, the results of any research that has been conducted in the 'learning milieu', has the advantage of having faced the trial of the pressure of the numerous factors that operate in any real classroom.

The learning problems of the Bangladeshis need some immediate attention from pedagogy. Any answer towards a better language learning environment, determined within a real classroom under the pressure of multiple forces operating there, can offer some directions to more extensive research into pedagogic issues for better achievement by these learners.

The comprehensive school was selected as a suitable setting for this study since, in all boroughs where there is a rising population of Bangladeshis, they are entered in the comprehensive schools. All the schools in Tower Hamlets, where the Bangladeshis are concentrated, are comprehensive in nature (BYL 1988), while a recent survey of the ethnic minority graduates (Brennen & McGeevor, 1990) shows that minority group learners like Bangladeshis are more likely to have received a comprehensive education than the majority group.

Under the policy of the now-defunct Inner London Education Authority, the comprehensive school is a county school that has a policy of not streaming pupils into ability groups. It takes in pupils of all abilities and divides them into three categories: above average, average, and below average. Each tutor set of each form within these schools contains a certain percentage of pupils of each category of ability. While these groups do not correspond to the PHLOE groups discussed in Ch. 2, it is obvious that at least the members of the second and the third groups will require support to perform their academic work in the classroom.

Visits to education offices of the two boroughs with the highest number of Bangladeshi pupils, Tower Hamlets and Camden showed that two clearly different contrasting settings were becoming increasingly typical of the comprehensive schools of these two areas of London. Due
to the pressure of the rising Bangladeshi population on some schools more than others (Ch 1), some of these comprehensive schools consist of an almost wholly Bangladeshi population of learners, while in areas where the pressure is more recent, the rising Bangladeshi population nears the fifty percent level of the school roll.

To study any variation in learning of the general population of Bangladeshi children that could be caused by variation of the people they learnt with, these two clearly contrastive settings were selected as being likely to show if the language learning differed due to detectable differences within the interaction that took place within these settings over a period to allow some development. I decided to select two groups of pupils with particular percentage of Bangladeshi and other learners in order to investigate certain research questions.

The needs of preparing for GCSE in the real classroom would not allow the division of pupils into experimental and control groups. The groups of pupils selected for observation would have to be considered intact.

One setting would consist predominantly of Bangladeshi learners (approximately 96%), with few native speakers and speakers of other languages. The second setting would have a mixed population consisting of approximately 50% Bangladeshi learners, with native speakers and speakers of other languages making up the other fifty percent.

In order to select the schools for the purpose of the research, I visited the Education offices of the two divisions where some of Education and Social Welfare (ESW) officers put me in touch with heads of schools where the school population contained the requisite proportion of ethnicity. I explained my research project and the work it would involve within the classroom. In turn, heads of institutions to co-operate put me in touch with the respective teachers to whom I re-explained the whole procedure. The time table for the research work was set up in consultation with the teachers.
3.1.1.1. Advantage of particular settings

**Mixed group:** Clearly, in the mixed group the advantages would be the increased possibilities of exposure to varied English input ('i' as well as 'i+1': Ch 2) from NS and NNS peers with whom the Bangladeshis would have to interact in English on academic and interpersonal matters. The input would contain samples of the English spoken appropriately by NSs as models, and there would also be opportunity for appropriate feedback from interlocutors. To make the input comprehensible to partners during the performance of academic tasks, there could be the possibility of negotiation as a function of the teaching pattern, with interlocutors who could be proficient speakers of L2, available and willing to give 'negative input' to the learners' output (Ch 2).

Socio-psychologically, the proximity of the NS group in the mixed setting and the scope for interaction with them could help lower intergroup boundaries and foster positive attitudes toward the target group (Ch 2). This could induce social convergence to the target group and encourage better learning of English through integrative orientation towards the target group (Ch 2). The mixed composition of the classroom pupils would require Bangladeshis to use English as the lingua franca for communication outside their own language group. The need to interact with peers for academic and social reasons could give them a strong instrumental orientation for acquiring the language, a useful predictor of learning (Ch 2). The proximity of proficient interlocutors within the same classroom where learners were provided with a need to interact with each other, could provide instrumental orientation for language learning. Pupils could also develop an integrative orientation through an increasing fluency in English (Ch 2).

**Homogeneous group:** In the Homogeneous group, the presence of members from the same linguistic and cultural background would be a source of positive affective support to the learners (Ch 2), particularly for the newcomers. It could help lower the 'affective filter' (Ch 2) of all learners, which would allow in maximal input for learning (Ch 2). The presence of own group members could give the
learners the psychological support for maintaining a positive self-image that would help second language acquisition (Ch 2).

The linguistic advantage could be the availability of exposure to English input at the learners' own level of learning ('i'), (Ch 2) so that they could develop fluency in its use. This could lead to a more positive attitude to English. There would not be available sufficient input at 'i+1' level, with little critical feedback, the two factors which could pressurise these learners to develop towards more target-like use of language that was also socially appropriate (Ch 2). Since they could be understood by peers of the same language background, and by their teachers even when they used deviant forms, (Ch 2), there would be less pressure to develop towards higher levels of accuracy. In this setting the Bangladeshis would be able to use their L1 along with English for discussion and clarification of academic concepts and language points. While this could help them advance academically as they learned English (Ch 1), it would allow them to stabilise at a lower level of 'interlanguage' (Selinker 1972) and not exert pressure on them to develop further for better expression of increasingly complex academic ideas.

3.2. Research questions

The consideration of the factors operating within the classrooms showed that three variables within the instructional situation could affect the generation of the factors of language learning within the classroom:

-the composition of the group of learners in each school which made up the Setting of each classroom;
-the academic Subject on which the learners were working;
-and finally,
-the Organisation used for teaching the subject in the classroom.

The research questions framed in relation to these three factors were:
- Do the two contrastive settings organise learning differently?

Since the pupils in both settings were passing through a similar stage of the same academic course, their teachers could organise the teaching similarly. But it is possible that factors that operated differently within each learning milieu could necessitate the use of certain organisations more than others. A comparison between the organisations used by the two settings for teaching the same subject, within the same syllabus for the same examination, would show if teachers organised learning in any way that was markedly different across settings.

- Does the use of the similar organisation give rise to difference in language use in the two settings?

Comparison of the language used in similar teaching organisation across subjects and settings could show how far each subject gave rise to the factors of language use that are said to help language learning. When the classrooms are composed of learners of differing proficiency, as in the two contrastive settings, the quality of input and feedback available in each setting should vary with the proficiency of the members generating the interaction. The input from more proficient speakers in the mixed setting should contain more accurate and complex language, with greater number of lower-frequency words used in longer utterances. In the homogeneous setting the possibility of the learners' exposure to extended and complex language use and lower-frequency words would be limited, from their teachers only. Also, being from the same language background, there would be the possibility of reverting to the shared L1.

- Does difference in language use relate to differences in language learning?

Observation across subjects in each setting could reveal consistent differences of language use that could be related to differences between the learners' proficiency developed at the end of a period. As the mixed setting would contain members with greater
English proficiency than in the homogeneous setting, the language used in the mixed setting should make greater use of better quality of input and feedback than in the homogeneous setting. When Bangladeshis in the mixed setting emulated such language in output, they could develop the use of extended utterances, with more accurate expression of meaning through greater use of lower frequency words. There would be more appropriate feedback to their use. For the homogeneous group the input would be less native-like, with less inducement for them to use L2. Since learners tend to copy peers more than their teachers (Burt & Dulay 1981), the homogeneous group could also tend to diverge from teachers and converge to their own group members by using more L1 and deviant L2. All such factors could cause learners to develop differently in the two ‘milieux’ so that at the end of a period their proficiencies could be distinguishably different.

A comparison of the learners' language proficiency developed at the end of an observation period within each setting could also show whether the presence or absence of NS peers as interlocutors had any observable effect on the development of their linguistic appropriacy.

The answers to these general research questions about the development of possible variation in language learning in the two contrastive settings, and identification of the factors that could lead to this variation, led to certain hypotheses being framed about the language use that could take place in the two settings, and the language learning that could develop at the end of an observation period.

3.3. Hypotheses

On the basis of an assessment of the educational context for the Bangladeshi children together with a reading of the relevant literature (Ch 2) several hypotheses were generated regarding the process of learning as viewed through the classroom interaction, and the outcome of learning that took place within two groups of learners in the two contrastive settings where Bangladeshi learners study in great numbers. (A setting consisting of mainly Bangladeshi learners is the Homogeneous setting, while a setting with fifty percent Bangladeshis among NS and
other NNSs is the Mixed setting.) (These hypotheses are reassessed in Ch 8 in the light of the findings of the analysis of the data in Ch 4 - 7)

**Hypothesis 1)** The greater the use of English by the learners for interaction in the classroom, the better will be their English proficiency.

The prediction is that the second language use would be greater in the Mixed setting, so that over an observation period the learning of English in this setting would be more than in the Homogeneous setting.

**Justification:** The presence of native speakers and speakers of other languages would constrain learners to use English in the Mixed setting for most interaction, so that these learners would be more exposed to the potential factors for language learning. The greater use of English for negotiating input and planning their output would give more practice in learning and using new lexis and structures for various types of discourse, with more potential for feedback. The learners’ general preference for models from within the peer group (Ch 2) would dispose them to copy models of their English speaking peers present in the Mixed setting, more readily than the model provided by only the NS teachers who were present in both settings.

**Measure:** The quantity of language used by the learners in both settings had to be captured and measured in each setting in order to be compared across settings.

The learners’ language proficiency in both settings had to be measured and quantified at the beginning and the end of the observation period, a comparison of which could show the development in their use of English over the period. This development could be compared across settings to show the greater improvement in performance over time. This record of linguistic development could be related to the quantification of language use to see if the group with the greater use of English over the observation period showed the greater improvement over time.
Hypothesis 2) The scope for interaction with native speakers within the peergroup will lead to the development of greater sociolinguistic appropriacy in language production at the end of the period, particularly in Speaking skill.

In the Mixed setting which contained English speakers, there would be more scope for Bangladeshi pupils of interaction with native speaker peers on equal footing. The improvement in sociolinguistic appropriacy of speech would be greater in the Mixed setting than in the Homogeneous setting where the possibility of interaction with native speaker peers would be less.

Justification: Exposure to NS models within the peergroup in the Mixed setting would provide more examples of use of language, more opportunity for putting this language into practice in use, with feedback to indicate the appropriacy of this use, so that learners in the Mixed setting would develop better, particularly in the sociolinguistic appropriacy of language in speaking.

Measure: The learners' use of language skills and sub-skills would have to be measured on tests at the beginning and end of an observation period to determine the development of sociolinguistic appropriacy over time. This would have to be related to the setting to see which nurtured the better development in the particular sub-skill, sociolinguistic appropriacy.

Hypothesis 3) The greater the use of L1, the more uniform or homogeneous will be the development of English ability among the members of that setting.

After a period, the range or the difference in the performance between the high and low achievers in English would be smaller in the Homogeneous setting than within the Mixed setting where the use of L1 would be less.

Justification: Learners who shared the same L1 would find it easier to talk to each other and ask for help in L1 for the appropriate lexis, structure or the grammar of English. Even at a low level of development of English, they would be comprehensible to each other
when they practised it among themselves, even when they were not so
to others (Ch 2). Their input from each other would tend to be at a
similar level of proficiency. While this would prevent conversational
breakdowns, there would be no 'push' from better quality input or from
'negative input' to help them develop greater accuracy. This could
make most of them stabilise at a lower level of language development,
causing greater homogeneity in performance.

In a Mixed setting with peers from different backgrounds, there
would be less scope of using the L1 for clarification of L2. Those for
whom the input was comprehensible, would develop while others would
tend to remain at a level nearer to where they were at the beginning of
the period. For newcomer second language learners, the higher level
of English proficiency among peers could give negative self-image and
prevent practising and learning language through reduced motivation
(Ch 2). These factors would contribute to maintaining a greater range
or spread within the academic performance of the Mixed setting.

Measure: The use of L1 on interaction within the two settings would
have to be captured and quantified. The learners' development of
proficiency over an observation period in both settings would have to
be determined through a comparison of performance on tests at the
beginning and end of an observation period.

A comparison of the dispersion of these scores around their means
at the beginning and end of the observation period would show which
setting had developed the smaller dispersion from the mean over time,
indicating a greater homogeneity. Where the dispersion of the posttest
scores was lower than the pretests it would indicate that the
performance had become more uniform or closer to each other over time.
The lower the dispersion or the standard deviation, the more uniform
the performance. Relating the dispersion to the use of L1 would show if
a greater L1 use had nurtured a greater uniformity within their
language proficiency developed over the period.

Hypothesis 4) The greater the use of L1 for academic talk in the
classroom by the learners, the more uniform will be the learning of
academic content by all.
The use of L1 would be greater within the Homogeneous setting, where the range of difference between the higher and lower achievers on content learning would be lower than in the Mixed setting where the use of L1 would be less.

**Justification:** In the Homogeneous setting the use of L1 for discussion and explanation between peers would lead to better comprehension and conceptualisation of academic topics and instructions by all learners. As a result the academic achievement scores in the Homogeneous setting would be closer together and more uniform.

In the Mixed setting, the range of the academic achievement of the learners would be greater due to less possibility for negotiation and peer-tutoring across various languages and ability in English.

**Measure:** Capturing the learners' classroom interaction would show the extent of use of L1 on academic discussion in both settings. This could be compared with the performance average of the groups on the academic subjects observed in the classrooms. Relating the average score to the quantity of L1 used in each setting would indicate if the setting using more L1 had a more uniform content learning at the end of the observation period.

**Hypothesis 5)** The setting that uses more task-based classroom organisation for teaching will have greater development in the 'context-embedded' linguistic skills than the setting that uses more teacher-fronted input.

**Justification:** The use of tasks (Ch 2), particularly convergent tasks where learners operated on shared assumptions, would give rise to greater interaction between peers than classes organised as teacher-fronted input (Ch 2). Tasks used more frequently for classroom teaching would encourage greater interaction among the learners and cause them to use the 'context-embedded' type of language use in English even for discussion of academic matters. This would lead them to acquire greater proficiency in the use of this type of language skills in English.
Measure: The learners’ development of proficiency in the use of 'context-embedded' language in English would have to be measured on tests at the beginning and end of a period, and compared across the two settings to show which setting performed better.

A categorisation of teaching organisations used in classrooms of both settings would show what percentage of these were task-based as opposed to teacher-fronted input. The measurement of proficiency on the 'context-embedded' skills would have to be related to the percentage of classes organised as task-based teaching in each setting to see if there was a consistent variation between these two factors, which would show that there could be a probable relationship between the two factors.

Hypothesis 6) The setting that shows a consistent use of language consisting of longer stretches of coherent utterances, with the use of a greater number of low-frequency words will show a better development of the 'decontextualised' use of English.

Justification: The pressure created by the need to perform in the classroom will cause learners in both settings to attend to input and generate output in language, framing longer and coherent sentences within longer stretches of discourse, using lower-frequency words to express thoughts more precisely. The use of such language in output would pressurise learners to develop and practice their linguistic resources accurately and effectively towards developing the 'decontextualised' use of language necessary for academic performance.

Measure: The learners' development of proficiency on 'decontextualised' language use would have to be measured on tests, the results of which could be compared across settings to identify the setting of greater improvement.

The learners' use of utterances in interaction would have to be captured, measured and quantified across settings to determine the setting and organisation that gave rise to use of longer structures. The low-frequency words used within the interaction would have to be identified and quantified. The development in language use proficiency
at the end of an observation period would have to be related to the length of structures used during the period, and to the level of use of low-frequency words. This could show if development of proficiency in 'decontextualised' use of language related to the pattern of language used for interaction.

After framing the hypotheses it was necessary to select an adequate methodology for conducting the research that would generate sufficient pertinent data to enable me to test the hypotheses.

3.4. Focus of the observation

The choice of method had to be made after determining the areas that required to be observed so that the necessary data could be accessed for testing the hypotheses regarding the expected learning outcomes within the two contrastive settings. The method selected would have to provide data to account for:
- any learning that took place;
- the linguistic differences within the process that may have led to any difference between the development in the two settings at the end of the period; and,
- the intergroup forces or other forces that may have led to differences in the operation of the linguistic forces.

3.5. Consideration of alternative research methods

The use of a dual system or method was indicated for linking what was observed during a period, or the process, to what developed at the end of the period, or the product, through a possible relationship of consistent variation. For such a process-product research Croll (1986) suggests the use of tests or other assessment techniques for gathering the product data. This can be set against the process data generated by systematic observation of what was going on.

To decide on a method adequate for the research, it was necessary to consider the aspects involved in the study. It would be necessary to measure the language learning that developed over a period. One would then have to look into the language used in
interaction during the period and analyse the factors within it that may have helped to cause the language development. After testing the hypotheses in the light of the data, one would then need to interpret the results, so that both the process and product could be organised into an acceptable pattern, explaining the intergroup and other forces that may have affected the process of language learning by these pupils.

In order to investigate the classroom process, Chaudron (1988) surveys the different methods available. I examined some of the methods for the purpose of this study.

**Psychometric:** Use of psychometric instruments would enable quantification of language proficiency at any point of time. In order to make quantitative statements about the effect of any classroom activity on learning, I could measure the conditions before and after a period of language learning, and compare the results to show that change in learning had/ had not occurred. A more detailed measurement instrument could even identify the particular areas of this change, eg, appropriacy.

The advantage is that quantification is easy to understand and lends itself nicely to comparison. The method is replicable, and with a reliable measure, it can also be dependable. The disadvantage is that it can only help to measure and quantify a product but cannot identify variables that may be responsible for any change observed.

All psychometric instruments are said to be biased in some way. Researchers agree that there is no such thing as a culture-free intelligence or aptitude test (Samuda 1975) and research evidence has demonstrated that even the non-verbal and performance tests are culture-loaded, so that the tests devised for whites may be fundamentally biased and not valid for other communities (Verma & Mallick 1982), eg. Bangladeshis. However, when used for measuring within a homogeneous group, the instruments could show less bias than when used across cultural groups.
Interaction Analysis And Discourse Analysis: Any statement about the process of development would require observation and recording of the classroom process in action to note the changes that occur. As interaction is recognised by various language learning models to be the crucially important event (Ch 2), the process of language development in the two settings could be accessed through systematic observation and recording of the interaction between learners and their interlocutors.

The advantage of systematic observation is that it gives a complete account of the communication taking place within each of the activities one observes. Such records of interaction can be quantitatively or qualitatively analysed in terms of components one has selected as important data for testing the hypotheses. Analysis of the data can serve to show the differences in the operation of factors that are held to facilitate development of language proficiency.

Apart from the language use, other activities of the classroom process could also be systematically recorded on an observation system to help classify the activities and the frequencies of their occurrences within the classroom. Such observation can give insights into other aspects of the behaviour of participants, e.g., the distribution of the time during different teaching organisations for certain type of activity within the classroom, the interaction that a particular organisation can generate, or how long certain organisations allow learners to be in control of the topic and interact among themselves, etc. Compared across settings, such record of behaviour could help to show if the pattern changes consistently with the organisation, or with any other factor. On the basis of a series of such observations one can measure and make generalised statements about operation of factors that influence the systematic production of language within the two settings.

The disadvantage of such systematic observation, as Long (1980) points out, is that it limits the observation to a number of pre-defined categories to capture the classroom process, constraining the researcher to select and record only a partial view of the classroom limited to those categories. The emerging picture depends on the usefulness of the
categories selected. The data collected through this method can give insight into what happens, the process. It cannot help to link the product to the process.

The use of each of these different methods would generate data from a particular area of the learning situation. To bring together the data from multiple sources, a research paradigm was needed which could take account of the data generated by measurement techniques that would help to test the hypotheses. It would also have to help relate the process to the product within the particular setting, which would require the use of more qualitative data to explain the context and the operation of multiple forces within a classroom.

Parlett & Hamilton (1972) devises a model of research, the 'illuminative evaluation' which can measure the product in the 'learning milieu' and interpret it in the light of qualitative factors. The qualitative data consists of observation at the classroom level and interviewing of participating teachers and students. The method allows interpretation of results of tests in the light of the qualitative data.

It is not a standard methodological package, but a general research strategy, and aims to be both adaptable and eclectic. The choice of research tactics follows from the problem: no method with its built-in limitation is used exclusively, but different techniques can be combined to throw light on a common problem, a triangulation that allows cross-checking of tentative findings.

The illuminative approach allows the researcher to use data from multiple sources, qualitative and quantitative, in an attempt to construct a picture of the process and the product of the learning within a particular environment. It allows experiential data to explain variations within the process that may have brought about differences in the product. The method does not attempt to control or eliminate variables in the situation because it accepts the complex scene within a 'learning milieu' as 'given'.

The methodology for the present research required to take into account the quantitative data, but also needed to interpret these data in
the light of more qualitative data such as observation of the classroom and interviews. It needed to take the insights from one to interpret the other, the variations within the language learning, as the 'illuminative' approach allows research to do.

The 'illuminative' procedure involves three stages: observation, further enquiry, and attempt to interpret and explain. The period of initial observation within the classrooms for familiarisation with the problem and the settings enabled me to experience the difficulties of the Bangladeshis in the classrooms, and set up their problem of language learning as a research problem. The stage of further enquiry would entail the measurement of process and product of learning, with accompanying observation of the classroom through my eyes and others' for insights into other factors operating in the interval. Finally, these results would have to be put together, not only to test the hypotheses, but also to interpret the whole emerging picture in order to give some message for pedagogy.

3.6. The methods selected for the research

To test the hypotheses regarding any development in learning I would require to make comparisons based on psychometric measurement of the learners' initial and final proficiency on some standardised instrument that could be used at the beginning and end of an observation period. The instrument selected was a set of standardised tests, The English Language Skills Profile (TELS) devised by Hutchinson & Pollitt (1987) with two parallel sets of tests devised on the same pattern, on similar topics to make it suitable as pre and post tests. A more detailed description of the instruments is provided later in this chapter.

For testing the hypotheses regarding their language use, their classroom interaction would need to be recorded during the observation period. For this purpose I decided to audio record the interaction of groups within the classrooms. This could be quantified and analysed under selected headings, for discovering identifiable trends and the differences between the language use pattern in the two settings.
For determining the learners' freedom to interact between themselves I needed a coding system with the means to determine this aspect of the classroom process. A coding system named Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT), was selected for this purpose of coding some aspects of the classroom process in real time. This instrument will be described later in details.

Since the learners' attitude towards English and the NSs could reflect the operation of intergroup factors that could affect language learning (Ch 2), I decided to record a picture of the learners' attitudes towards the target group on the Semantic Differential Scale devised by Osgood et al (1957) which can allow one to measure the attitudes of people through the way they grade the object in question on a scale of adjectives selected to represent the psychological meaning of that concept.

Video recording would give also provide insight into the details of the intergroup mixing and interaction that took place within the classrooms so that operation of intergroup barriers could be recognised within the two settings. The video recordings would also show how much support the Bangladeshi learners received within the classroom, factors that could not be simultaneously and separately captured on the other instruments.

These methods of data collection would be supplemented by my own observations of the proceedings, and some interviews of the teachers and students, whenever possible. These forms of data could account for other variables that operated within the real-life classrooms, and could help to explain some of the results of the research and add meaning to the general answers.

3.7. Some parameters of the research

Having formulated the hypotheses and selected the research method and instruments, I had to make other decisions that were necessary to systematise the work of the research. The choices of factors necessary for the research had to be made within the constraints of the real-life classroom.
3.7.1. Data collection

I had to determine the level of education and the academic areas from which the data of classroom interaction should be collected.

**Academic level of learners:** In order to be able to record some linguistic development, the research would look at the learning that took place when learners had the greatest access to the language learning factors: input, interaction and output, when there would also be pressures, motivation and willingness on the learners' part to attend to and make use of those factors (Ch 2). Considered in this light the fourth year of the secondary school was the likely choice.

The preparation for the GCSE school final examination in U.K. begins from the fourth year of secondary school and continues into the fifth year. During this period the learners have maximum exposure to concentrated input related to their examination syllabus. Simultaneously, they are tested at regular intervals and also have to compile a folder of coursework for most subjects as part of their requisite output for examination assessment. The folder of work has to be completed and assessed by the second term of the fifth year, when they also sit for the GCSE public examination.

Within the fourth year at secondary school the examination requirements cause learners to undergo simultaneously, a succession of input, the need to attend closely to the input, with the pressure to produce it as output in order to accumulate the coursework and acquire necessary test marks to qualify for taking the GCSE examinations. During this process there could be the opportunity for interaction and negotiation between learners, depending on the organisation used for teaching.

In view of the above factors, the research would focus on the learning of two groups of Bangladeshi students in the fourth year of the GCSE project-based teaching in two comprehensive schools that had the requisite school population of the two contrastive types, of settings mentioned before. Since the research would take place in the real
classroom where the learners would be under pressure to complete their GCSE syllabus, nothing that could interfere with their normal course of studies would be permitted.

The areas for the data collection: It would not be possible or necessary to cover all the academic subjects, so choice had to be made of the subject(s) to be observed. Since the study centred around the language development of learners for academic performance, in this case the GCSE, I chose one subject that is compulsory for all students in GCSE, and two from subjects that are optional. The compulsory subject selected was English, while the optional subjects were Science and Geography. Since the nature of the subjects is very different, task performance for each of these subjects could give rise to different types of language use during interaction in the classroom. But the differing forces operating in contrastive milieux might produce differences in the language use across settings to cause differences in language learning.

English is a language-based subject and should require extensive creative language work and output while it could provide opportunities for focussed teaching on grammatical and linguistic points, that Long (1983 b) holds to be a benefit of the instructional situation (Ch 2) and Harley & Swain (1984) hold to be necessary for second language learners to attain higher levels of accuracy. The more proficient learners in the mixed setting could be more creative with language, giving Bangladeshis access to a better quality of input that they could use in output.

Science is a highly demonstrable subject that should require less language output to express more content learning. But within the reduced language requirement it would necessitate a precision of lexis and the use of 'decontextualised' expression for an accurate communication of relationship between abstract ideas and concepts. The use of appropriate low-frequency words would be more available to the learners in the mixed setting, giving them a better quality of more available input containing more appropriate language use.
Language use in Geography lies midway on a continuum between the accuracy and abstraction of science on the one hand, and the creativity and unpredictability of language use in English on the other.

Science, and some aspects of Geography are demonstrable through activities and group work, while other aspects of the latter can require more creative use of language. But the terminological precision they require for the expression of abstract concepts can cause difficulty in one's weaker language. Exposure to more proficient language use during task performance in the mixed setting can enable learners to use such language in output, with ensuing feedback to ensure correct use.

Discussion of one's observations and understandings in small group activities in the L1 in the homogeneous setting could have a favourable effect on the development of learning as well as on second language development (Ch 2). So the three selected subjects could give rise to some amount of interaction, that could be different across settings.

The frequency of the data collection: It was obvious on preliminary visits that outsiders were not welcome to visit classrooms too frequently. To avoid creating unnecessary problems it was decided that visits would be made four times for each academic subject in each setting. Due to various constraints it had to be reduced to three visits in some cases (e.g. English).

3.7.2. The duration of the research

The observation period had to be long enough to allow some linguistic development to take place as the learners progressed through the GCSE course. The study would take place during the academic session of 1989-1990, while the observation period would extend over eight months during that period. However, after the observation and recording in the classroom started, the first Mixed school, School B refused further access for recording of data, which they claimed could be used 'politically'. Their unwillingness and apprehension was due to a problem with a school project unrelated to my research. But as a result
of this a new school had to be found where similar fieldwork had to be completed. Take place from the start of the next academic year, 1990-1991, and the fieldwork of the research extended to June, 1991.

3.8. The research design

The research was to take place within two comprehensive schools of London. In one there was a concentration of 96% Bangladeshi pupils while in the other there was a fifty percent population of Bangladeshis, the other fifty percent consisting of NSs and speakers of other languages.

The research would look into the variation in language development of a group of learners in each of the two schools selected, caused by differing levels of operation of factors that help language learning.

These groups of learners would be in their fourth year of secondary education and would be observed for eight months during the fourth and fifth year as they prepared for the GCSE school-leaving examination, when the pressure of input and output for learning is at its most intense on them, and is moderated through interaction.

For determining the linguistic proficiency that these learners developed within the eight months, their proficiency would be tested for measurement at the beginning and end of the observation period on a set of linguistic tests. For determining aspects of the process that helped to bring about this change the interaction of the learners would be audio-recorded and analysed for identifying and demarcating the extent of operation of the factors of language use, which would be related to the development in proficiency.

For determining other factors that could influence language learning, certain aspects of the activities would be coded on COLT, a system for recording the classroom process. Some of the classrooms would also be video-recorded, while teachers and students would be interviewed whenever possible, to provide greater insight into the other factors that operated within the classroom. Data from these multiple
sources would be used within an 'illuminative evaluation' paradigm to explain and cross-check each other.

I shall now describe certain aspects of the research design in greater details.

3.8.1. The research setting

The settings for the research were in two comprehensive schools in the Tower Hamlets of London.

The Schools:

School A: This was the homogeneous setting, with 96% Bangladeshis in the school. In the group selected for the research, all the pupils were Bangladeshis, speaking the same dialect of Bengali.

From initial visits to this classroom it appeared that while all teacher-learner interaction was in English, much of the peer interaction took place in Bengali. The teachers gave all instructions in English. The more fluent learners sometimes explained the content and the language of the tasks to less able learners through Bengali. Teachers too would on occasions, ask more proficient learners to explain a difficult point in L1 to less fluent peers. Peer-discussion and explanations appeared to be a common feature of the classrooms when the learners worked on tasks, giving it the potential advantage of a bilingual teaching situation (Ch 2).

The Learners: The group consisted of twenty-three Bangladeshi pupils only, so the group was very homogeneous. Their age ranged between fifteen and sixteen years at the time of observation. All had English and science as subjects, while most of them also had geography as an optional subject.

School C: This school in the Tower Hamlets had a catchment area where families from many ethnic groups lived. A rising population
of Bangladeshis in the area was resulting in a rising number of Bangladeshis within the school population, around the 50% level.

The Learners: The selected tutor set had a total of twenty-four learners in the group, of whom eleven were Bangladeshis. In the observation of the mixed group the focus was on the Bangladeshi students. All the students had English and science, while approximately half of them had geography. However, to avoid making the Bangladeshis feel conspicuous and attaching denigrative connotation to the research, it was decided to include all the pupils in the observation.

Similarities between the schools: Both schools were mixed ability, and both tutor groups had learners drawn from the three ability bands devised by ILEA (Ch 2).

There was a great variation in the learners' length of stay in this country: some were born here while others had entered the country during the previous six months. Between individuals there was thus a great difference in the amount and type of education received, and the exposure to English language and culture that each had had, so that there was a marked variation in their English proficiency. The form and extent of the use of the L1 and English among the learners in each classroom seemed to vary according to the number of each language speakers and the extent of their needs.

Most learners of these schools were eligible for free school meals, an indicator of the income level and a component of their SES (Ch 1). Teaching was monolingually in English in these classrooms, although ESL teachers were present in some classes to aid the less fluent learners within the mainstream education (Ch 2). According to the teachers' statements the support of ESL teachers was available across subjects on the average of twenty five to fifty percent of the time. As the available resource of classroom support was limited, the amount of support provided during the fifth year depended on the school's policy.

To summarise, the samples selected for the research were 15+ year old learners in the fourth year of secondary school in the boroughs of
London where the concentration of Bangladeshi learners is high. They were from the low socio-economic status within this society (Ch 1). In each class there was a wide range of linguistic ability varying from the beginner to the proficient. The groups were at a similar point of preparation for General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE), the school-leaving examination in U.K.

The groups were similar in their:
- age and socio-economic background;
- the course of studies they followed;
- composition as mixed ability learners.

The groups were dissimilar in:
- the proportion of NS in each group;
- the proportion of Bangladeshis in each group;
- the number of speakers of other languages,

factors that could necessitate a greater use of English for interaction in one setting more than the other.

During the process of academic learning, some factors favourable for language learning would be operating in both groups. A comparison across the two settings at the end of the observation period would show how the factors within each setting had helped its learners to develop linguistically.

3.8.2. The research instruments

I shall now describe the instruments that were used to measure the learners' linguistic ability for the research.

The standardised set of tests known as The English Language Skills (TELS) Profile was selected for the measurement of the learners' initial and the final linguistic proficiency at the beginning and the end of the research period. A reason for the choice was that it had been trialled extensively by the authors on learners from the age group selected for this research, and Bangladeshis would require to have proficiency similar to those pupils to qualify in the school-final examinations.
The on-going process of their learning through the input received and practised as output during the process of interaction would be recorded on part A of the Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT) observation system, in real time.

3.8.2.1. The TELS Tests (See Appendix 1 to Chapter 3)

The English Language Skills (TELS) Profile pack was devised by Hutchinson & Pollitt (1987) with Lilian Munro of the Godfrey Thomson Unit of Edinburgh University.

According to the authors, the tests are based on theories of competence proposed by by Canale and Swain (1980) and incorporate as traits the following components of communicative competence identified by them, in terms of a realistic set of tests:
the sub-competences of grammar, discourse, sociolinguistic appropriacy and strategic competence, which together form the ability for a language user to communicate in all kinds of situations. The breakdown of items into tests of each sub-skill would allow a finely tuned appraisal of the learners' development.

The authors claim to have devised the tests for the formative assessment of language teaching and planning language development programme for fourteen and fifteen year old secondary students in U.K., the age group under consideration in this research.

The pack consists of two completely parallel sets of test, devised for use as as a pre and post test of proficiency. Each set is based on a central theme: 'Relationships' and 'Community'. The average difficulty of the 'Relationships' set is claimed to be lower than the 'Community'(p. 14) so that the former is suggested as suitable for use as pre and the latter as post tests.

The learners would be tested on the 'Relationship' set for the pretest at the beginning of the observation period, while the 'Community' set would be used for the post test at the end of the period, to establish their initial and final levels of linguistic proficiency.
The TELS is said to incorporate oral and literacy based tasks as methods, which are designed to involve the use of language in 'realistic' and unpredictable ways, taking the context into account, using more than one skill integratively for performance on each test. Each of the four skills, reading, writing, speaking and listening has a separate set of tests. The authors claim to have designed the tasks so that within each skill, performance becomes progressively more difficult with each following task, requiring the knowledge and use of more specific types of language. Some of the questions test more than the knowledge of use, e.g., the questions on Craft in the Receptive skills which aim to test the learners' awareness of language style. The test of each skill with its tasks will be briefly introduced now.

The Skills and the Sub-skills: The Receptive skills are tested by questions in different formats, e.g., multiple choice, cloze, summarising and one-word answers requiring very little language to answer them. The number of questions on the sub-skills of each skill varies across the tasks.

Reading: The Reading test consists of six different tasks in two parts, of which the authors claim that part one is intellectually and conceptually easier. For this research, tests from part one were used, to make most tasks accessible to the highest number of learners.

The sub-skills tested by the reading tasks are: reading for information, for overall meaning, for inferring the inherent meaning, and to ascertain the writer's style. All the tasks do not test all of these sub-skills.

Listening: The three tasks for Listening aim to assess the learners' ability to listen: for specific information, for the overall meaning, and for inferring and evaluating the writer's style.

The questions adopt a format similar to Reading tests and require very little language to answer. Like the Reading tests, all Listening tasks do not test all sub-skills, and the number of questions on each sub-skill varies across tasks.
Speaking: There are two Speaking tasks designed to assess the learners' ability to cope with an unusual set of circumstances and to engage in different types of talk, grammatically and appropriately. The first is devised as a group discussion and the second is a pair discussion.

Writing: There are five written tasks to assess the learners' ability to produce different types of writing with a clearly defined audience and purpose. The selection, structuring and the presentation of material is tested on the sub-skills of appropriacy, ideas and expression. The five types of writing are: an informal letter; a formal report; an editorial; an imaginative extension of the situation presented in the group discussion; and a personal response to the ideas in a short poem.

Task Difficulty: Task difficulty of these tests is achieved at various stages. Firstly, the 'Relationships' set of tests is set at slightly lower level of difficulty as a whole than the 'Community' set (p 14), so that they can be used as pre and post tests.

Within each set of tests the questions for Reading and the instructions for Writing are devised on the same material at two levels of difficulty. In Writing the difficulty is controlled through the degree of support given at the lower level, taking the form of extra guidance on the content and structuring of response. I decided to use the easier version of the questions in all tests, to enable most learners to perform.

Again, each skill has more than one test set on it, and the difficulty of the questions at both levels of each following task tends to increase gradually over the tests, requiring an increasing degree of linguistic abstraction.

Texts: The texts are from various types of writing with differing emphases, depending on the writer's purpose, e.g.: public information; statistical table of figures and text; newspaper report; literary extract, and passage from a novel.
System of Grading: The grading system for the tasks is based on an analysis of the tasks in terms of their component skills, and assessed discretely on a complex matrix of their component traits and methods to reveal the learner's proficiency in each sub-skill. The assessment is guided by a description of the performance that will be judged as adequate for its completion at that level.

The tasks for the receptive skills use questions that can be assessed objectively on a 1/0 basis, on the sub-skills involved in understanding the text. The total score on the whole test is the measure of performance in that skill.

In the productive skills, the output is analysed in terms of the component skills identified by Canale and Swain (1980). The assessment uses the performance descriptors for each component skill, on a grade-related criteria at four levels, specifying performance characteristics at each grade level from 0 to 3.

Timing: The suggestion for timing the first test is during the first term of the fourth year in secondary schools in U.K., while the second term of the fourth/fifth year is suggested as suitable for the second test. The TELS does not recommend the imposition of a time limit for performance.

3.8.2.2. The Classroom Observation Scheme

For the observation of factors within the organisation of the learning activities it was decided to use the COLT (Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching) system of coding the classroom process, devised by Allen, Frohlich and Spada (1983) to investigate the communicative orientation of English classrooms. COLT aims to capture significant features of the English classroom interaction. The coding system is divided into two parts, of which only a section of Part A was used.

Part A records the classroom events at the activity level and is divided under five heads given below, defining the parameters of
activity. The coding takes place at the beginning of each activity for one minute and is resumed after two-minute interval.

- **Activity Type:** formal/functional; authentic/non-authentic; observer describes the activity with episodes;
- **Participant Organisation:** whole class/group work/group and individual work; how the teacher is working with the class and how the particular groups are constructed;
- **Content:** management/focus on language/other topics/topic control; what the learners and teacher are talking and writing about, who selects the topic being talked about;
- **Student Modality:** if the learners are writing, speaking, listening or reading or something other than these;
- **Materials:** written, audio or visual, with their length.

Of these five categories, the two aspects that were used for the classroom observation were **Content** and **Student Modality**.

The aspect of **Student Modality** would show what skills were used most in the particular classroom while the aspect of **Topic Control** under Content would show who selected the topic: the teacher, the teacher/student, or the student. Whenever the organisation gave the student the power to be in control of the topic instead of the teacher, there could be potentially more freedom for the learners to interact.

Besides the psychometric instrument, TELS, and the COLT system for coding the classroom process, I would also audio record the learners' classroom interaction as the record of the process of learning to be analysed later to quantify the factors of language use. The headings for analysis of the recorded language will be discussed in Ch 6.

For gaining insight into the operation of intergroup interaction as well as the barriers, and the extent of classroom support given to the Bangladeshi learners, some classrooms would also be video recorded.
3.8.3. The research timetable

A pilot study for trialling the tests took place from November to December, 1989. The pretests in the main research took place in January and February, 1990. The classroom observation started from March and continued to October, 1990, followed by the posttests in School A. Due to the problem with School B, the work of testing had to begin anew in School C, from September, 1990. The observation in this school started in October, 1990 and continued to May, 1991, when the posttests took place.

In the intervening period between the pre and post tests the learners were observed in the classroom on three different subjects of their GCSE course, English, Science and Geography. The observation took place four times in most subjects.

3.9. The pilot of the TELS

The authors of the TELS test pack trialled the TELS pack in schools throughout U.K. but bilingual learners are not mentioned by them as being part of the samples. I did not know the problems that the use of these tests could give rise to, or how far they would be able to discriminate between the Bangladeshi learners' ability. In order to familiarise myself with the tests and their problems when tried with Bangladeshis learners, it was decided to conduct a pilot study in a school similar to the 'homogeneous' setting, with a preponderance of Bangladeshi learners.

A school in Tower Hamlets with ninety-seven percent Bangladeshi pupils from Sylhet (Ch 1) was selected for the purpose, where the learners of the fourth year were tested in a pilot during November and December, 1989.

The Group: The pilot tutor-group consisted of twenty-four Bangladeshi pupils of fourteen to sixteen years. They had varying lengths of residence in this country. The learners were from similar low-SES background as the population targeted for this research. The group consisted of mixed-ability students from the same year as the
learners for the main study, covering a similar academic curriculum in preparation for GCSE so that they were working under similar academic pressures.

Problem of Time Constraint: A problem encountered before administering the tests was to persuade teachers to give up enough class time for the tests. Under the pressure of syllabus completion for GCSE coursework, the teachers were unable to oblige with class time beyond a limit. This made it necessary to select some of the tests from the original set to occupy a shorter time period.

Test Selection: Choices had to be made within the TELS pack to select some of the tasks so that they were comprehensive enough to provide the data in necessary details.

One important criterion for this selection had to be, for each skill there had to be a test of the more 'context-embedded' use as well as the more 'decontextualised' use of English, on the basis of the difference in the specificity and abstraction in language use required for performing on the two tests of each skill. This research would also show how far the pressures of the GCSE coursework helped the selected groups of learners to develop in the use of these two types of language use.

The guidelines for the selection were:
- to cover all the linguistic skills and sub-skills that are recognised to be components of proficiency by the authors;
- to cover the skills and subskills through the smallest number of tests;
- to cover both the 'decontextualised' and the 'context-embedded' types of language use. As the authors claim that the tests are graded so that they get progressively more difficult, the first test of each skill and another test was selected for use.
- to select the test that can give the higher scope for output to each speaker in the oral component.
Working on the above basis, two tests were selected for each of the three skills, Reading, Writing and Listening while only one test was selected for Speaking which required more time and more help with administration than for the other skills.

- 2 reading tests: the first and the third texts:

Reading 1: This is based on a discursive text intended to inform and persuade, and is a public information extract produced especially for young people, according to TELS.

Reading 2: The text for this is 'a piece of newspaper reporting about statistical information, but with a discernible bias on the part of the journalist' (TELS).

The first text uses little rhetoric and talks directly of the problems of teenagers that these learners should be able to relate to. The second test requires the interpretation of certain statistical information in order to understand what the text is trying to say. The language of the second text is more rhetorical and idiomatic. The difficulty of the language as well as the difficulty of the content of the text is greater in the second than the first. Understanding and performing on the second test calls for the use of a more 'decontextualisation' ability of L2 than the first test. The first would test the learners' more 'context-embedded' ability, while the second would test their more 'decontextualisation' ability.

- 2 listening tests: the first and the second tests.

Listening 1: The recorded extract is a story from 'Ramayana', the Hindu mythology, narrated in English by an Indian.

Listening 2: The recorded extract is from an interview of a girl on the Scottish Radio about her experience as a Community Service Volunteer.

According to Anderson & Lynch (1988), some of the factors that increase the difficulty of processing listening texts is, the number of speakers and whether they are speaking directly to the listeners or among themselves. To look at the tasks in this light, in the first test,
there is only one speaker, telling a story directly to the listeners. In the second there are two speakers, talking among themselves in two different accents, about matters that is not directly relevant to the listeners.

Comparing between the two tests, the first was more 'context-embedded' since the genre of story where the speaker is addressing the learners, was more familiar. The second is more removed from their experience, more 'decontextualised' as the topic is of things that did not immediately concern the listeners. There are two speakers talking to each other within the genre of an interview that is more analytical and 'decontextualised' than of a short story. So the first would test the more 'context-embedded' use of language while the second would test the more 'decontextualised' use.

- 2 writing tests: the first and second tests.

Writing 1: This is a personal letter by the learner in response to one from a contemporary from another culture.

Writing 2: The text for this task is a report based on tabular representation of an opinion poll on proposed changes at a school. The task that learners had to perform was to give their reactions and recommendations to similar changes at their school, a hypothetical and context-reduced situation.

The personal letter called for 'context-embedded' use of English as it required the learner to perform in own person and context, while the stimulus letter provided the support of the format to be followed. The genre of a report required the learners to hypothesise analytically about an unfamiliar context, using precise language within a requisite format. So the first would test the more 'context-embedded' use while the second would test the more 'decontextualised' use of English.

- 1 speaking test: the pair work.

Speaking: This is a paired interview based on a hypothetical Community project. Learners are given written information about a proposed
project and asked to discuss their own community's need for such a project, and aspects of its implementation in pairs, with a view to convince an interlocutor, a 'Councillor', of their community's ability to run such a project.

The speaking task requires the learners to hypothesise about a proposed situation, analyse the possible solutions and frame proposals to inform and persuade through language that is precise and argumentative. So this test would call for a more 'decontextualised' use of English. Due to the time constraint there could be only one test of Speaking.

Time Limit: The TELS tasks do not advocate the imposition of a time limit. But from the initial class observations it had been apparent that a time limit was necessary to make the learners concentrate and finish the task.

3.9.1. Test administration

Since second language learners are held to be weaker readers than L1 readers (MacNamara 1979), the text and the questions were read out to the learners in the administration of all the tests to reduce the reading load and focus the learners' attention on the comprehension of the text. The procedure for answering the questions was explained and reexplained in response to the learners' questions.

Reading 1 was administered first. Vocabulary posed a problem in the learners' understanding of the text, but were not explained as the knowledge of lexis was part of the test too. A time limit of forty minutes was announced.

The Writing I task, the personal letter to a contemporary did not pose problems as the model of the stimulus letter provided visual support. The learners' questions had a cultural bias: how to address an unknown girl in a letter (Dear Friend/ Dear Miriam?), and were answered. A time limit of thirty minutes was imposed.
For Listening 1 the tape was played for the practice session. After this the Listening 1 text was played and replayed since the learners' unfamiliarity with the mode seemed to make them unable to perform without it. The Listening 2 was administered the next day in a similar manner.

For Reading 2 the stimulus text was from a response to a report in a medical journal where the vocabulary and idiomatic expressions posed problems for the learners, but were not explained. A time limit of forty minutes was imposed.

Writing 2 was administered the next week. The learners did not seem familiar with the concept or the format of writing a report and some of them could not complete the task in spite of repeated explanations.

The Speaking test took place the same day. The learners had not read through the lengthy instruction sheets which had been distributed earlier. These instructions had to be read out and explained which took up much of the time. Only three pairs of learners could perform the task within the time available. Their discussion was audio-recorded to be assessed later.

3.9.2. Results (Appendix 2, Chapter 3)

The results of the pilot of the tests would show how useful the instruments would be for my purpose when used with the Bangladeshis.

The Data: The average scores of the learners in the pilot study are presented below in terms of the Receptive and the Productive skills.

Table showing means of scores on the Receptive skills and sub-skills:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Infer</th>
<th>Infer</th>
<th>Eval</th>
<th>Craft</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading 1:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading 2:</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening 1:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening 2:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table showing means of scores on the Productive skills and sub-skills:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Expr</th>
<th>Idea</th>
<th>Approp</th>
<th>Int. skl</th>
<th>Supt</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing 1:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing 2:</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking :</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sup. fl)(Coh. fl)

The following tendencies emerge from a comparison of the test scores:

1) The higher mean scores on the first than the second test of each skill shows a better performance in the use of the 'context-embedded' use of skills. The score on Reading 2 was skewed by three high-scorers, without which the score of Reading 2 would also have conformed to this pattern.

2) The range of scores or dispersion between the higher and lower achievers is greater on the first test or 'context-embedded' use of each skill, showing that while some learners do not perform well, others within the group perform much better on the second test.

Listening 2 and Writing 2, the two type of tasks with which they were least familiar, have lower means and dispersion than other skills. The learners seem to find performance on these skills more difficult than on other skills with which they were more familiar.

3) Performance on the Receptive skills seems to be easier than on the Productive skills, as the mean and s.d. of the scores of Listening and Reading are higher than the score of Writing and Speaking, despite the unfamiliarity of Listening.

The pattern shown by the pilot is that the Bangladeshi learners found performance on the receptive skills easier than on the productive...
skills. Within each skill, they found performance on the more ‘context-embedded’ test easier than in the more ‘decontextualised’ test. The pattern of performance showed a systematicity within the scores across skills, which indicated that the tests could differentiate consistently between the ability of these learners, and would be a reliable instrument for my purpose.

3.9.3. The problems with TELS and their solutions

A general problem arose from the learners’ tendency to discuss content, ideas, task procedures and the probable answers of classwork within themselves. They tended to do the same during the tests, which confounded the purpose of the tests. In relation to particular skills the problems encountered were:

Reading: To ensure that the tasks assessed reading comprehension only, the TELS uses the multiple-choice, fill-in-the-blank and single-word answer modes. While the use of these modes made assessment of the test reliable, they also made it easy for learners to transmit answers to each other, while it also allowed them to guess the answers.

Solution: It was decided to explain the purpose of the tests so that the learners refrained from discussion. Form tutor and teachers would be requested to help, and to keep discussion to a minimum.

Writing: Writing on GCSE coursework can continue over a period of time, so the learners were slow to start, and reluctant to hand in the task after the announced time limit was over.

Solution: Teachers were asked to give encouragement to the learners, but explain the purpose of the tests while reminding them that the tests were practice for similar tests they would have to perform for GCSE.

Listening: Of all the tests, Listening appeared to be most difficult because of the learners’ unfamiliarity with this mode. The texts did not appear interesting, while the multiple-choice and single-word responses were easy to discuss and complete with others’ help, as on Reading.
Solution: The tape would be replayed after the questions were read out, to give learners more idea of the information to look for, which could give them more confidence to perform.

Involving the English teachers and the form teachers in the administration would help reduce the discussion and make the learners feel that the tests were important to the teachers. This could help to give the tests some value in their eyes, so that they performed as well as possible.

Speaking: The instructional component of the Speaking Task is long (six pages), and seemed to be difficult for these learners to manage on their own. A problem encountered during the administration was that one learner from each pair tended to dominate the interaction, even though the other learner was a competent speaker.

Solution: Extra time would have to be arranged for the reading and discussion of the test instructions. Extra teachers would have to be requested to serve as interlocutors to help finish the test within the available time. The involvement of their regular teachers could make pupils contribute more evenly during the interaction.

The results of the pilot study revealed the problems but also the advantages of the tests as an instrument for assessment.

3.9.4. Evaluation of TELS

The TELS packs provide a basis of differentiating not only between the ability of the learners to perform on skills and sub-skills, but also between performance on types of use of each skill, requiring a differing abstraction in language use. One could monitor the development of these learners, not only on types of use of each skill but also their development on the sub-components of these skills.

Assessment of the tests is easier and more reliable than on integrative tests where the grading would be more impressionistic. The tasks do not require much support to administer. The themes are issues that are culture-specific and not so relevant for the
Bangladeshis. But as some of the tasks resemble the GCSE English assessment tasks, particularly the oral and the Writing component, the tasks become relevant as practice opportunity for GCSE for the Bangladeshi learners.

The grading of the tasks, as more and less difficult by the authors makes it possible to choose between them for particular group of learners. It also makes it possible to use them to measure the proficiency in more and less 'decontextualised' use of language. The similarity of the tasks across the two sets makes them particularly useful for pre and post test.

Regarding the problem of test bias, it is not possible to find one without any bias. Being devised for learners of this age group and educational level, this test would tend to be least biased. Used for comparing within members of a homogeneous group, the bias would be less than when comparing between diverse groups. If used carefully these tests, despite their bias may nevertheless contribute to an overall view of language development.

The other test that was piloted was the Semantic Differential Scales, on two concepts: Your School, and Your English Teacher, represented in terms of bi-polar adjectives. However, the use of the Scale during the pilot study did not provide useful information as the learners did not understand the bi-polar adjectives. Even after certain adjustments were made, its administration in School A also did not yield better information. So I decided to omit this test of attitudes, and depend on observation and other qualitative sources of data for indications of intergroup attitudes.

The pilot showed the problems that their administration of tests could offer, and helped to determine the adjustments necessary to make them useful for my purpose, and the time necessary to administer the selected battery. After making the changes indicated above, the work of the main research began at the start of the next calendar year. In the next chapter I shall discuss this work which began with the administration of the pre and post test in the selected settings.
3.10. Summary

In this chapter I have designed the learning process of the Bangladeshi group as a research problem and considered the methodological issues in framing the research design. The problem has a process-product orientation where the hypotheses relate to the comparative language use and the development of proficiency in language use by some members of this group within the two contrastive settings. In order to conduct such a multifaceted research it was necessary to select a method that could allow not only the use of measurement techniques but also qualitative data from observation to help arrive at an answer that could relate the process to the product by explaining relationships between them.

The research would involve two groups of real learners who would be tested on pre and post tests before and after an eight month observation period. It would also follow their learning process during this interim period by recording their interaction in the classroom in three subjects.

A pilot study was conducted for testing the effectiveness of the psychometric instrument. This gave the guidelines for adapting the test instrument for the purpose of measuring the second language proficiency of Bangladeshi learners.
Chapter 4

Psychometric Measures

The work of the main research started in January, 1990 with the administration of the pretest, after making necessary arrangements with the school authorities for its administration. The 'Relationship' set of TELS was used for the pretest while the 'Community' set was used for the posttest at the end of the observation period (Ch 3). The pre and post test scores provided the measure of the linguistic performance ability of the learners at the two points of time on the type of language necessary for academic performance and for personal interaction. The difference between the test scores at the two points constituted the measure of the learners' development in the use of these type of skills in English over the observation period.

This chapter consists of a statement of the learners' development in language learning, the product, with the analysis of the measurement of this learning in the two settings. Comparison of the performance of the learners in the two settings can help to show i) whether they developed similarly or differently during the observation period, and ii) if there was a difference in the development, in which area was the difference most noticeable.

The chapter is divided into three sections. The first section describes the administration of the Pre and Post tests in the two settings at the beginning and end of the observation period. The second section compares the performance of the learners in the two settings on the tests, through the means and the standard deviations of the scores, and compares the tendencies that are visible within this development in the learning in the two settings. It points out their similarities and differences within the development. The third section states some of the problems of conducting research within real-life school settings.

As the fieldwork of the research had to start anew in School C, the tests and the observations took place in the two settings A and C at different times. The sequence of the pre and posttests followed in all schools was the same as in the pilot test.
4.1. The Tests and their administration

The work of the main research started in January, 1990 in Schools A and B with the administration of the pretest to the two groups of learners originally selected for the research. The pretest in School C took place in September, 1990.

4.1.1. The Pretest

The 'Relationship' set of the TELS tests, trialled in the pilot study, was used as the pretest for the main research. A month before the tests commenced, sample copies of the test booklets were given to the English teachers in both schools to reassure them about the tests and let them know what these tests involved.

To be able to judge the learners' linguistic development as correctly as possible, it was necessary to ensure that they performed as well as possible. Experience during the pilot study had shown that the learners could be easier to manage and would perform better on the tests if their regular teachers were involved in the administration. So it was negotiated for the tests to be administered during the English lesson, by their teachers. The tests took place during the first lesson of the day, when the learners were fresh and rested. The teachers helped to control the learners, while it was felt that the familiarity of their presence reassured the learners, helping them to perform well.

As suggested by the authors, the testing started with Reading 1, the easier test of a Receptive skill, and concluded with Speaking, the Productive skill, in the sequence tried out in the Pilot. The procedure of the administration of the tests closely followed the Pilot. To keep the test administration as uniform as possible, the teachers were requested to read out the texts and the accompanying questions for all the tests, and explain the procedure for answering these questions. For each test the learners were given a time limit to perform. On each Listening test the time limit was ten minutes for performance, on the Reading and Writing tests it was thirty five minutes, while on the Speaking tests each pair was given ten minutes.
Reading 1: The teachers read out the text and the questions. In School A connections were drawn during the reading, between work being done in class at the time and the text of the test.

Writing 1: The teachers read out the stimulus letter, with the following questions. They gave the procedural instructions for writing a personal letter, drawing attention to its format, and explained the points the learners should include in their writing.

Listening 1 and 2: Both tests were administered during the same period. After the practice session, the text for Listening 1 was played. The teachers then read the questions out and explained the procedures for answering them. The tape was replayed after this and the learners were told to answer the questions after the replay finished. Some of the learners in School A however, performed this test while listening instead of post-listening, giving a non-standard performance that pushed up the mean score for this group in this test unrealistically.

Listening 2 was administered immediately after Listening 1. The pattern of administration was similar, while students in both schools performed it as post-listening.

Reading 2: The teachers read out the text and explained some difficult lexical terms through illustrations. This was followed by reading out of the questions, with explanations of procedures for answering them.

Writing 2: The text was read out by the teachers, with explanation of some of the figures and headings of the bar graph in the survey report. This was followed by reading and explanation of the questions. The learners discussed their preferences for some time before starting to write. Procedures were re-explained by teachers to individuals who had not understood.

Speaking: The information text for the Speaking test was lengthy (Ch 3) so the material was given to the teachers for distribution to the learners a day before the test, to give them sufficient time to read it and prepare for the task. But as on the pilot test, the learners had
not read them, so the teachers read it out before the performance. In School A the teacher itemised the points on the board for easy understanding and discussion while in School C the teacher gave a general explanation.

The learners performed in three groups, in charge of two teachers and myself. Their performance was recorded to be assessed later. As none of the groups had made previous preparations it was an extempore discussion for all.

4.1.2. The Posttest

The posttests were administered in School A in November, 1990, while in School C it took place in May, 1991. By then the students of School A were in the fifth year, preparing for GCSE, while in School C they were at the end of their fourth form.

The learners were busy completing their GCSE coursework and preparing for their school-final examination, so the students in both schools appeared preoccupied and less attentive than during the pretests. More teachers had to be called in to help manage them, but their preoccupation may have affected their test performance negatively. The administration of the posttest in the two schools was quite similar to the pretests, so I shall not describe it again. By this time learners in both schools had become familiar with the idea and format of the tests, and with what was required of them, so they could function with less repeated explanations.

Just as the set of tests used for Pretest is devised around the theme of 'Relationship', the set for Posttest is devised around the theme of 'Community'. The style and genre of the texts and tasks parallel that of the pretests. As with the previous set, this set is devised on two levels, of which the easier, level one was used.

As on the pretests, the teachers read out the texts and the accompanying questions to the learners, and explained the procedures while I supervised to ensure a level of similarity in the administration. In each test the questions were read out and explained, giving the
learners the guidelines for answering them. A time limit was set for performance on every test.

The scores of the two settings on the Pretest and Posttest (Appendix 1, Ch 4) will now be compared through the means, and the standard deviations of the test scores. Insight from qualitative sources will help explain tendencies detected within the development, determined through the comparison.

4.2. Assessment of performance on tests

To make the analysis of the results of the psychometric tests pertinent to the requirements for testing the hypotheses, I shall recapitulate the points of focus necessitated by the predictions of the hypotheses.

In order to determine any difference in the development in the two settings over the observation period, the analysis of the test scores required comparison to be made between settings to determine the extent of their development in:

1) the general proficiency in use of English, which would help to assess Hypothesis 1;
2) the range of linguistic ability between the highest and lowest performers within a group, which would help to assess Hypothesis 3;
3) the learners' ability to use the 'context-embedded' form of the language skills, which would help to assess Hypothesis 5;
4) the learners' ability to use the 'decontextualised' form of the language skills, which would help to assess Hypothesis 6;
5) the learners' ability to use sub-skills of individual language skills, which would help to assess Hypothesis 2.

With these specific needs in mind I compared the results of the pre and posttests to determine any difference in the development in language use in the two settings. I looked at the range and extent of
their general development as well as at the way they developed in particular areas of language use. The comparisons were made within each settings, through the means and standard deviations of the psychometric scores on the pre and posttests.

The scores of the pre and post tests give the measurement of the learners' ability at those points of time. The difference between the scores of the pre test and the post test will give the measure of the development in each setting over the intervening time. Comparison of the difference between the scores of the two tests will show whether there is a variation in the language learning that relates to the setting. If the difference between the means of the pre and post test is similar across the two groups of learners, it will mean that the setting did not affect the learning in different manners in the contrastive settings and that both groups developed very similarly. But if there is a variation between the difference of the pre and posttest score means of the two groups, it is possible that this difference in language learning was being caused by the variation in the classroom population of the two groups even while they progressed through a similar period and pressures of academic learning. Comparison of the difference between means of the pre and posttest scores will show the direction in which the homogeneous and the mixed setting developed over the period.

4.2.1. Comparison of general development in language use

The means of scores of learners' performance at any point of time indicates the central tendency of the group's performance at that time. A general trend of increase in the means of the posttest over the pretest indicates an improvement in the learners' performance during the observation period.

A comparison of the pre and post test scores within each setting will help to determine the pattern of development in each over the observation period and help to compare the pattern across settings for the assessment of Hypothesis 1. In all the following comparisons, the test for Speaking is considered for the 'decontextualised' use of
language only since the time constraint had allowed only one test for Speaking, as in the Pilot.

The key below serves for all tables in this chapter. The scores, their means and standard deviations are given in Appendix 2, Chapter 4.

Key:

R1=Reading 1; R2=Reading 2; W1=Writing 1; W2=Writing 2;
L1=Listening 1; L2= Listening 2; S=Speaking;
Approp=Appropriacy; Ide=Ideas; Expr=Expression; Tot=Total;
School A= Homogeneous School; School C= Mixed School.

Table 1 showing the means of scores in the pre and post tests in School A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In School A, the homogeneous setting, a comparison of the means of the pre and posttest scores shows an increase in the post test of the means of three out of the seven skills tested: Reading 2, Writing 2 and Speaking. This indicates an improvement in the learners' use of these particular skills at the end of the observation period. It can be seen that the score for Listening 1 in School A is much higher than all other scores as some of the learners had performed the task as 'while-listening' instead of as 'post-listening' as the task was meant to be performed, giving an exaggerated impression of ability.

On Writing 1, the means are very similar, indicating that their performance ability in this skill remained quite similar over time. In both the Listening skills there is a decrease, showing that there may have been a change in the opposite direction, a deterioration over time. Altogether, there is improvement in three of the skills, a decline in three others, while performance in the seventh skill, Writing 1 remained stable.
Table 2 showing the means of pre and post test scores in School C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest:</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest:</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>+16</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In School C, the mixed setting, a comparison of the means of the pre and posttest scores shows an increase in the means of three skills: Reading 2, Writing 2 and Listening 2 in the posttest. This indicates an improvement in the learners' use of these three skills at the end of the observation period. In the other four skills the change is in the other direction, a regression. In Listening 1 and Speaking, the decrease is more pronounced than in Reading 1 and Writing 1.

Comparing the difference between the means of the posttest over the pretest scores of the two settings, there is an improvement in performance in three of the seven skills in School C as also in School A. In four other skills there is a decline in performance at the end of the period in both groups. Part of the negative performance of both groups may have been due to the learners' preoccupation with their approaching GCSE examination, inclining them to take less care with something not directly related to the course.

So, from a general comparison of the mean scores of pre and post test within each school, the linguistic ability appeared to have developed in very similar manner in both settings, showing no apparent difference between the development pattern in language use at the end of the period. To discover how far the apparent similarity of general development extends into the use of each particular linguistic skill areas I shall compare their development in particular skill areas.

4.2.2. Comparison of development in particular aspects of Language use

I shall first compare the development in the learners' performance in the two types of use, tested through test 1 and test 2 in each skill to see if the pupils in both settings performed similarly in the two types of tests of a skill over time. A difference between the development could be evidence of variation caused by difference of
factors within the two settings, and help to assess Hypotheses 3, 5 and 6 better.

Table 3 comparing means of pre and post test scores of test 1 and test 2 of each skill in the two settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>diff.</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>diff.</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>diff.</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School C</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>diff.</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>diff.</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>diff.</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>+01</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of the difference between the mean scores of test 1 and test 2 in the pre and posttest in each setting shows that in the pretest, the learners in both settings perform better in test 1 than test 2 of each skill.

In the posttest, while the pattern still persists, the means of scores within both settings show that the difference between performance in test 1 and 2 has been reduced. The pattern varies only for Reading. While in School A the learners still perform better in test 1 than test 2, in School C the learners perform better in test 2 than test 1. The change in the pattern of performance is striking and may have been caused by some difference in factors within the two contrastive settings.

4.2.2.1. Comparison of the learners' ability to use the 'context-embedded' and the 'decontextualised' form of language

In the previous section the performance in tests 1 and 2 of skills was compared to note the development between the performance on these two types of use at each point of time. I shall now compare the development within each type of use of the skills separately. This will show the development in each type of use across settings: 'context-embedded' use (test 1) for the assessment of Hypothesis 5, and 'decontextualised' use (test 2) for the assessment of Hypothesis 6.

The 'context-embedded' Use of Skills

Comparison of the mean scores of the pre and
posttests on test 1 of each skill will help to show the changes on the more 'context-embedded' use of Reading, Writing and Listening, in order to assess Hypotheses 5 better. As mentioned before, there was no test of the Speaking skill for this type of use, so there are scores for three skills only.

Table 4 comparing the mean scores on the pre and posttest of Test 1, the more 'context-embedded' use of skill in each setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A:</th>
<th>School C:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1 W1 L1</td>
<td>R1 W1 L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest:</td>
<td>Pretest:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 49 83</td>
<td>39 38 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest:</td>
<td>Posttest:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 48 38</td>
<td>35 33 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-09 -01 -45</td>
<td>-04 -05 -20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both settings, the results show that the means of the tests of the 'context-embedded' use of skills are lower on the posttests than on the pretests. No positive development appears to have taken place in either setting over time. This indicates that no improvement took place in either setting on this type of use of skills by the learners as they progressed through their academic learning and performance for GCSE. Within this decrease however, the decline in scores of Reading and Writing is much less than the decline in Listening. This seems to indicate that there may have been some factor operating in both settings that helped to reduce the decline in proficiency in Reading and Writing more than in Listening. Although this suggests a possible regression in the proficiency of the students, these scores may of course have been influenced by other factors, such as increased preoccupation with GCSE preparation.

The sharp difference in performance in Listening in School A is partly caused by non-standard performance of some learners who did it while-listening rather than post-listening, as it was meant to be performed. The tendency of decline in the posttest however would have remained even if they had performed as others, although with more equal performance conditions the regression in Listening may have been similar across settings. This would make the average, decline in performance on the context-embedded skills similar in both settings.
Comparison of the means of the pre and posttests on paired T-test shows that the decreases between the pre and posttest means of Reading 1 and Listening 1 are systematic and significant at .1 level (Appendix 3, Ch 4). As the number in the sample is low, I have taken a higher level of significance than is usual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Diff.of Mean</th>
<th>Diff.of St.Dev.</th>
<th>2-tailed Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While taking into account the fact that the score of School A in Listening 1 had been unrealistically high through non-standard performance, the real decrease in Listening 1 also may been significant at .1 level. This means that the decrease in the scores of the more 'context-embedded' use of the two skills Reading and Listening, is high enough to be systematic in both settings, and did not occur by chance, while the decrease in Writing may be accidental.

In linguistic terms such significant decreases indicate that the academic learning that produced the factors of language learning in the classroom, did not exert pressure for bringing this type of language skills into use. As a result, the development in both settings was similar. The differences between the settings could not affect the development in the use of the 'context-embedded' skills. Absence of pressure for positive development may have meant the non-operation of the factors of language learning. The factors for language learning were similarly absent in both settings as there was no need for them to operate, and produced a similar regression in proficiency in these skills in both settings, two of them significantly. So, the setting does not appear to have caused any variation within the negative pattern of development in the more 'context-embedded' use of skills.

The 'decontextualised' Use of Skills A comparison of the pre and posttest scores of test 2 of the skills, Reading, Writing Listening and Speaking in this section will
show the learners' development in the more 'decontextualised' use of linguistic skills in order to assess Hypothesis 6.

Table 5 comparing the mean scores on the pre and posttest of Test 2, the more 'decontextualised' use of each skill in each setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest:</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest:</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean scores of more 'decontextualised' use of skills show a similar trend of improvement in both settings in three of the four skills, while in both groups there is decline in the fourth. In both groups there is an increase in the posttest over pretest in the means of Reading and Writing. The similarity in the areas of improvement across groups indicates that the factors within academic learning for GCSE may have helped to trigger the operation of factors of language learning similarly in both settings for 'decontextualised' use of these two skills. But within the similarity it can be seen that, while the improvement in Writing is quite similar in the two groups, learners in School C made greater improvement in Reading.

As the improvement in the use of the more 'decontextualised' use of skills occurred in both settings while the learners were progressing through a very similar process of schoolwork, it is possible that the language learning factors that brought about the development of proficiency, particularly for Reading and Writing operated in both settings. Since these learners were similarly involved in GCSE coursework, it is possible that the common factor of coursework operating in both settings may have contributed at least partly to the development that occurred similarly in both settings.

There had been the pressure to produce the academic input received through Reading and Listening as written academic output in both settings, on tests, on homework, on project work for GCSE, and in spoken output as learners discussed their work. These linguistic
factors that prevailed in common in both settings may have helped to bring about development in Reading 2 and Writing 2 in both groups.

Comparison of the development of the two groups in Listening and Speaking shows that while the mixed setting improved in Listening but regressed in Speaking, the homogeneous setting improved in Speaking but regressed in Listening. Although the similar pressure of the GCSE may have raised their 'affective filter' so that they did not perform as well as before on these tests, there is a distinct difference in the pattern of development of these two skills in the two settings.

Table of Paired T-Test of Means of Pre and Posttests of Skills. Significance level held at .1 or 10% (Appendix 3, Ch 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Diff. of Mean</th>
<th>Diff. of St. Dev.</th>
<th>2-tailed Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of the means of the pre and posttest on a T-test shows that the increase in Reading 2 and Speaking are significant at 10% level. As the number in the sample is so low, the level of significance is taken to be at this high level. This shows that the improvement in both groups in Reading 2 was significant in both groups. In Speaking the change, ie, the trend of improvement in homogeneous group and regression in the mixed group were both significant.

School C also shows improvement in 'decontextualised' Listening or Listening 2 over the observation period, while School A does not. To look for a reason behind this difference in development, one needs to look at the texts of the tests. The texts of Listening 2 tests were spoken by NSs. The better performance of School C on this test may have been due to their greater exposure to speech of native speakers among the peers and teachers, with greater practice in listening to and understanding a variety of NS intonation and rhythm of language use over the observation period. Since in School C, there were native speaker teachers as well as peers, there had been more scope for listening to academic input from these speakers in L2, even when the speech may not have been directed to them.
In School A, which contained homogeneously Bengali-speaking peers, their exposure to English spoken by NSs was limited to their teachers only, particularly for the 'decontextualised' variety. Their academic input in L2 may have been from the NS teachers only, and not sufficient for the homogeneous group to develop their Listening capability as well as in School C, for deciphering more 'decontextualised' English spoken by NSs. This could be the reason for the learners in School C to perform better in the more 'decontextualised' Listening, showing a positive development in Listening while learners in School A regressed.

Looking at the fourth skill, Speaking, School A showed improvement over the observation period, while School C did not. With a greater number of NSs present in the classroom, the linguistic factors for developing speaking skill should have been more available in School C than in School A. But the better development in School A indicates that while the learners in School A may have availed all opportunities to use language in spoken output (Seliger's HIG:1977), the learners in School C may have not.

Such a clear difference in development shows that learners in School C may not have interacted in English in spite of potential speaking opportunities with NSs. It is possible that these learners did not feel motivated by the social factors operating in the environment to make use of the linguistic factors that could have helped them to develop proficiency in the skill. On the one hand the attitude of the NSs may not have encouraged them to use English to 'converge' to the English-speakers, while on the other hand the sociological circumstances may not have made these learners wish to converge to the NSs by speaking English. In either case the costs of using the language in speaking may have appeared higher to them than the benefits (Ch 2), so that in the mixed setting the learners may not have tried out their developing speaking skills in English extensively for interaction with NSs and other interlocutors.

In the homogeneous setting where there was no NS group present to discourage or encourage convergence, such adverse social factors may not have been operating so that the benefits of using English in
speaking could appear to be higher than the costs to the learners in that setting, which allowed them to use more English in speech. (This will have to be borne out by the analysis of language use in classroom interaction). Although Listening and Speaking are complementary skills, a greater quantity of use of language in speaking in School A could improve their Speaking skills but not improve their Listening skill in L2 as spoken by NSs, since their interlocutors were generally peers from their own language background rather than NSs. The quality of the input may have been different in School A from that in School C.

The general improvement in Reading 2 and Writing 2 in both settings may have helped to arrest the decline that was noted to be taking place in the 'context-embedded' use of Reading and Writing over time. It is possible that some of the components of the sub-skills Reading 2 and Writing 2 in which the learners had become more proficient, may be transferable across uses within the same skill, which helped to reduce the decline in Reading 1 and Writing 1 so that the decrease in Reading 1 and Writing 1 was less than in Listening 1.

Putting the results together, although both groups show similarity in their development in the more 'decontextualised' use of language skills, there is also a difference in certain areas. The mixed group shows improvement in Listening while the homogeneous group shows improvement in Speaking. Both groups improve in Reading and Writing. The improvement in Writing is similar but the improvement in Reading is more marked in the mixed group.

The general regression in the use of more 'context-embedded' use of the skills seems to show that the GCSE did not exert pressure for the use of these skills in input or output. Had these skills been called into use, the varying pattern of interaction in the two groups could have shown a difference in their pattern of development.

4.2.2.2. Comparison of development in Receptive and Productive skills

In this section I shall compare the development of the two groups separately in the receptive and productive skills.
Table 6 Comparing development of Receptive and Productive skills in School A:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptive skills</th>
<th>Productive skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of the development in the Receptive skills in School A shows a regression in performance in three of the four skills. Although the extent of decline in Listening 1 is not realistic, the trend of decline in the performance seems to be indicated by the scores. So among the receptive skills, there is improvement in the more 'decontextualised' Reading in the homogeneous setting over time.

Comparison of the means of the pre and posttest of the Productive skills in School A shows improvement in two skills, 'decontextualised' Writing and Speaking. The decline in 'context-embedded' Writing is minimal, which may indicate that their performance ability in Writing 1 remained similar over the period.

Taking their performance in both types of use of skills together, the homogeneous group shows a greater improvement in the Productive use of the language skills than in the Receptive use.

Table 7 Comparing development of Receptive and Productive skills in School C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptive skills</th>
<th>Productive skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the mixed group, a comparison of the means of pre and posttest scores of the Receptive skills shows increase in two of the skills and decline in the other two. A comparison of the development in the Productive skills shows improvement in one but regression in two of the skills. So although the development in the mixed group does not show a marked change in any direction in the Receptive skills, there
seems to be a greater trend of improvement in the Receptive than in the Productive skills in the mixed group.

Comparing the pattern of development of the two groups in the Receptive skills, the mixed group seems to improve more than the homogeneous group in the use of Reading and Listening. Comparing the pattern of development in the Productive skills, the homogeneous group appears to show greater trends of improvement in Writing and Speaking than the mixed group. Altogether, the homogeneous group shows greater improvement in productive skills while the mixed group tends to improve more in the Receptive skills.

4.2.2.3. Comparison of development of ability to use Individual sub-skills

In this section I will consider the development of the groups in the sub-skills of Speaking and Writing in order to determine if the two groups develop differently in sociolinguistic appropriacy of language use for better assessment of Hypothesis 2. The development of this sub-skill can be determined by comparing the means of their performance on the subskills of identified by the authors of TELS as 'Appropriacy' in Writing and Speaking in the pre and posttests.

Table 8 showing the pre and posttest scores of Writing 1 & 2 in the two settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing 1</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tot. Approp Ideas Exp</td>
<td>Tot. Approp Ideas Exp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>49 40 53 53</td>
<td>38 50 46 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>48 55 43 43</td>
<td>33 40 33 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing 2</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tot. Approp Ideas Exp</td>
<td>Tot. Approp Ideas Exp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>36 32 39 35</td>
<td>22 21 29 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>42 41 51 37</td>
<td>28 36 49 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the development of the two groups in Writing 1 and 2, both groups show improvements in Appropriacy in the 'decontextualised' use of English, the improvement in the mixed group being more marked. The similar pattern of improvement in both groups may be the result of feedback from teachers to written output in preparation for GCSE, and to the classroom work in both groups. The greater improvement in
School C may be the effect of exposure to more appropriate input spoken by proficient users.

In Writing 1, the homogeneous group improved but not the mixed group, which may be due to work done differently in the classrooms in the two settings. It is worth noting that in both Writing 1 and 2, the mixed group shows a consistent tendency to perform better in the sub-skill 'Expression', while the homogeneous setting shows a consistent tendency to deteriorate in this skill. It is possible that a better quality of the expression that the learners in the mixed setting received as input helped to bring about their improvement over the period in this sub-skill as well, while the lack of such consistently good input in the environment was responsible for the deterioration in the homogeneous group's performance in this sub-skill. This shows that the quality of the input may affect individual sub-skill areas even when it does not affect the skill as a whole.

Table 9 showing means of the pre and posttest scores of Speaking in the two settings

| School A: Total Appropriacy Coherent Superficial Interactive Fluency Fluency Skill |
|--------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Pretest:                      | 41     | 47     | 36     | 36     | 36     |
| Posttest:                     | 51     | 31     | 39     | 39     | 33     |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School C:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest:</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Speaking in School A, while there was improvement in the overall skill, there was a decline in performance on Appropriacy at the end of observation period. The tendency in the mixed setting is the reverse: while there was a decline in performance in the overall skill, there was an increase in the score of Appropriacy. This indicates that although the learners in School A interacted enough in English to improve their speaking skill, they did not have sufficient accurate input or feedback to improve their sociolinguistic appropriacy in speech over time. In School C, on the other hand, while the learners did not interact enough to improve their speaking skills, they had better quality of input, and some accurate feedback to improve their appropriacy in speech.
The variation in the factors operating within the two settings have influenced the development in Speaking across the settings differently. Improvement in spoken sociolinguistic appropriacy took place in School C where the classroom contained a greater number of NSs, but did not occur in School A, where the learners’ exposure to NSs was more limited. It is possible that at least a part of this improvement, confined to School C only, could be because of the more appropriate input that the learners received, and the more appropriate feedback that they could have from NSs inside and outside the classroom. This too lends weight to the observation about development in 'Expression' in Writing: improvement in sub-skill areas may come about through better quality input.

The comparison of means of scores show that even when there was general improvement in the more 'decontextualised' use of the total skill, there was not a corresponding improvement in the component sub-skills. Improvement in the overall skill does not appear to extend to all constituent sub-skills similarly. Each skill or sub-skill develops according to the appropriate input available in the environment, and opportunity for the skill to be utilised in output, with the possibility of response as feedback to show that the use has been successful. The quality of the language learnt, particularly through interaction, seems to depend on the quality of the input, on the proficiency of language users present within the learning milieu, to make the factors available.

In line with Swains' argument (1985) that language ability is not a monolithic whole but is built up of several components, the findings above show that the learner does not develop similar proficiency across all skills, or types of use of each skill as s/he learns. Neither does development in a skill imply similar development in all its component subskills, and vice versa. Development seems to take place individually in each component section depending on scope for input and output.
4.2.3. Comparison of variation in development between Settings

The comparison of means of the scores of pre and posttest show that in both settings there was some development in the performance of learners between the two points of time.

It was necessary to find out how far this pattern of development was similar or different in the two groups. A difference in development could be the product of the difference in the composition of the groups. If comparison of the scores shows a similarity in the pattern development in both groups between the pre and posttest, it will mean that there is no effect of the contrastive settings on the language learning. But if a variation can be identified within the pattern of development, it may have been due at least partly to the variation in setting. This will help to assess all the hypotheses generally.

If the development that occurs between the pre and posttest in School A can be shown to be different from that in School C, one can say that this variation between development is due at least partly to the difference in the composition of the two groups, i.e., to the contrastive classroom population of the two settings which gave rise to differences within the factors of language learning.

To determine any systematic variation within the means of the two settings, the statistical test, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used. It could compare within and between the means of scores of tests in the two settings, taking the school factor continuously into consideration. Through the interaction of the factors of the schools and the tests, ANOVA could help to show whether there was any consistent and significant difference between the way in which the means of test scores varied between the pre and posttest. If there was such difference, it was the effect of the factor of school on the learners' performance.

The two variables within the ANOVA were, the School (setting) and the Test scores, both of which operated on two levels. There were two schools (School A and School C), in which there were two test scores (Pretest and Posttest). If the result of the ANOVA was significant in
any skill, it would mean that the difference in the performance on pre and posttest varied significantly across the settings in that skill. It would show that the school setting affected the learners' performance on tests differently at the end of a developmental period, showing consistent pattern of difference in language use proficiency. This would mean that the learners had developed differently in the intervening period between the two tests, due to differences between the settings.

Table 11 showing the significant results of the interaction of schools and tests on the ANOVA test (Appendix 3: Ch 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST</th>
<th>School A Pretest</th>
<th>School A Posttest</th>
<th>School C Pretest</th>
<th>School C Posttest</th>
<th>Significance of Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LISTENING 1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISTENING 2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEAKING</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the sample was so small, the significance level of the test result was held at 10% or .10 level. The summary of results of ANOVA (Appendix 3: Ch 4) between the scores of the two test on the skills, and the two schools showed the variation between the pre and posttest scores of Listening 1, Listening 2 and Speaking to be significant at .10 level. On the rest of the skills the differences between the performance on the pre and posttests were not large enough to be significant.

The scores of the variation in performance of the two settings on these skills in the table below show that the learners' differential performance or variance between the pre and posttest in Listening and Speaking, develops significantly differently across the settings.

In Listening 1 the trend in both schools is similar: both settings show decrease in posttest scores, but the decline of the scores of School A is sharper than in School C. The sharp decline occurred as some learners performed the test as 'while listening' rather than 'post listening' as all the others did. So it is possible that such non-standard performance altered the trend that may have been similar across settings and would not have been significant with standard
performance. For this reason, I shall not consider the variance score for Listening 1.

In Listening 2 or more 'decontextualised' listening, the learners in the two settings perform differently from each other: while School A showed a decline in performance over time, School C showed an improvement over time. The ANOVA shows that this pattern of performance is significant at 10% level, and that the contrastive tendency relates to the interactive factor of school.

In Speaking, again there is a difference between the performance of the learners in the two settings. This time, while School A shows improvement, School C shows a decline in ability over the observation period, a tendency converse to that on Listening. The ANOVA shows that this pattern in the performance is also significant at 10% level, and relates consistently to the factor of school.

According to the results of the ANOVA test, the variation in Reading and Writing skills is not significant, and are affected by the pressures for use in both settings similarly. But development of Listening and Speaking are affected significantly differently by the factors within settings. There is an improvement in Listening 2 in School C while in School A there is a decline. In contrast, there is improvement in Speaking in School A while in School C there is a decline. Such contrastive pattern in development as the learners pass through similar academic pressures for learning, show that there may be a significant difference in the manner in which the setting helped the operation of the factors to develop these two linguistic skills in the two groups.

Learners in both settings could listen to input from teachers who were predominantly NSs of L2. But this factor alone may not have been sufficient for them to develop adequate listening skills for more 'decontextualised' purpose as the teachers may have moderated their output as 'caretaker speech' for maximum comprehension (Ch 2). Learners in School C had the additional benefit of exposure to and being able to listen to NS peers verbalising on academic content, using some 'decontextualised' English. This experience may have helped them
to understand the texts of the Listening tests, in order to perform better. Learners in School A, who did not have similar scope of listening to various types of NS speech in English, did not perform so well in any type of Listening skill. It is possible that the additional source of input from NS peers in English may have caused the improvement in the performance of learners in School C, while the absence of it in School A may have contributed to their decline in performance over the observation period.

I have already discussed the possible reason for the decline in speaking skill in one setting while the other setting showed improvement, although the learners in both were passing through similar academic experience.

The improvement in Listening but decline in Speaking within the same setting over the same time period endorses Swain's theory that Output is necessary for development of proficiency in any area, but less output may be necessary for developing receptive skills. While the learners in School C could listen to NS peers speaking English, they may not have been interacting with them or using the L2 for their own interaction. So while their receptive skill of Listening in L2 could improve, their productive skill of Speaking in L2 did not, as there was less scope for proficient feedback to their language use. On the other hand, in School A, although the learners did not listen to NS using English, they could be using it for interaction among themselves. A greater use of English as spoken output may be the reason for the improvement of the learners in speaking in School A, but not in Listening comprehension of English.

As the number of subjects in the research samples was so low, the conclusions drawn from the results of the statistical tests can only be indicative of the tendencies visible within the samples of this research, rather than form the basis of generalisations applicable to other settings. On the other hand they are highly suggestive and may support provisional hypotheses about the behaviour of similar groups. Although not generaliseable in a statistical sense, in other words they may form the basis of provisional generalisations in a more qualitative sense.
4.2.4. Comparison of development of dispersion of Proficiency

The testing of Hypotheses 4 required the comparison of the development of dispersion of the scores in each skill, between the highest and lowest achievers in relation to the mean or central tendency. The standard deviations of the pre and posttest scores can show this range of the learners' scores, and the development of dispersion within their scores in each skill around the central tendency. An increase in the standard deviations of the posttest over the pretest indicates that the dispersal of the learners' ability about the mean score has increased. In the skills where the means show improvement, this generally means that while there are some learners who are scoring low, there are others who are performing better than before and scoring higher, which has made the range relatively bigger.

A decrease in the standard deviations of the posttest over the pretest shows that the range has become smaller and the dispersal has become closer to the central tendency. This means that while the lower achievers may have generally improved, the higher achievers have not improved in that scale, so that the difference between the performance of the higher and lower achievers has become smaller than before, and the learners have become more uniform and homogeneous in their language use.

'Homogeneous' in performance means that the learners' scores cluster closely around the mean score, so that the spread between the highest and the lowest achiever is relatively small, and the performance of the learners across the class is more similar than before, in comparison to others.

To see what development occurred in dispersion of ability within each setting, I shall compare the standard deviations of the pre and posttest scores within each setting.
Table 10 Comparing the standard deviation of the pre and posttest scores within each setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>School C</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of the standard deviation of the pre and posttests scores in School A shows a decrease in the standard deviation at the end of the observation period, in five of the seven skills (lower scores are shown in bold): Writing 2 and Listening 1 are exceptions where there was an increase. Within the skills where the learners have become more homogeneous, the greatest development has taken place in Speaking.

In School C the range of dispersal of scores of language use became lower on three of the seven skills over time, while on four other skills it registered an increase.

Of the skills where the learners have become dispersed, Speaking has been the area for the greatest development of dispersal.

A comparison of the development of the two groups shows that, in School A the dispersion in performance ability decreased over a greater number of linguistic skills over the period, while in School C the dispersion increased in a greater number of skills over time. So while learners in School A developed a greater homogeneity, learners in School C developed a greater heterogeneity in their language use over time.

The 'illuminative' explanation for the greater homogeneity in School A is that in School A, the similar level of proficiency of the learners ensured a quantity of input that was at the learners' own level, ('i'), but not much input was available at the ('i+1)' level. The feedback in School A also may not have been of a high level of accuracy to help to push these pupils to improve to a higher level of proficiency.

On the other hand, to explain the greater heterogeneity in the mixed group there was a variety of input available, at ('i') level from other Bangladeshis, as well as ('i+1) level from proficient NSs. Within the mixed group, those who wanted to adopt more of the target norms (Ch 2) may have made use of the input at higher level to improve their
proficiency, (as the HIGs of Seliger: 1977). Those who did not want to develop to such levels, (like the LIGs of Seliger: 1977) may have made use of input at 'i' level only. The exposure to and the use of differing levels of input and feedback available from interlocutors of varying abilities within the mixed setting may have caused the development of greater heterogeneity in School C than School A.

In both groups there has been the greatest development in Speaking. In School A the pupils have become most similar in Speaking while in School C the pupils have become most dissimilar in Speaking. The factors within the setting that may have caused greater overall homogeneity in School A and greater heterogeneity in School C also seem to have influenced this contrasting pattern of development in Speaking within the two groups.

Output in speech during interaction forms the input most readily available for pupils, from which they can learn most easily. In School A, the quality of this input was very similar, while in School C this input was quite dissimilar. The contrasting trend in the development of dispersion in all the skills can also help to explain the contrasting performance in Speaking in the two groups, which may also reflect intergroup attitudes.

Production in the target language can be a sure way of showing attitudes of convergence or divergence (Ch 2). When learners produce English in writing, not many people except the teacher can see their efforts at native-like output, so the attitude the learners may convey through writing is not important. But when they use English in speaking to others, they make their declaration of attitude of convergence or divergence publicly and clearly for all to see. So, where the declaration of convergence or divergence is important, eg, in the mixed group, with members of the other group present, the difference in development can reflect the difference in attitudes of individual learners. Those who wanted to converge, adopted the norms of the NSs in speech and developed greater proficiency, while the ones who did not, diverged and remained at a low level of proficiency. The variety in attitude may have been reflected in the variety in development, through a bigger standard deviation in the mixed setting.
Exposure of attitude was not important in the homogeneous setting, which may have helped their homogeneity to became more pronounced.

4.3. Findings of Psychometric measurement

I shall now summarise the findings from the psychometric measurements of language proficiency in the two settings.

One can see that the pressure of GCSE coursework, a factor that exists similarly in both settings, may set in motion certain forces that help second language learning. Language learning took place in both settings but did not develop similarly in all the skill areas. This may have been caused by differences between the settings.

A comparison of the performance showed that in both settings there were rises in three of the seven skills tested, while there were decreases in others. So the pressure that may be helping language acquisition during the preparation for GCSE seemed to be productive in some areas in both groups, but did not affect all areas uniformly.

Comparison of their performance in test 1 and test 2 of each skill showed that both groups performed better in test 1 than test 2 of all three skills in the pretest. In the posttest the difference between performance on the two tests of each skill had decreased. The homogeneous group continued to perform better in test 1 than test 2 of the skills. But while the mixed group also continued to perform better on test 1 in Writing and Listening, it showed a greater improvement in test 2 of Reading so that the learners in the mixed group were performing better in Reading 2 than Reading 1 in the posttests. Such an improvement in performance in the mixed setting that was different from the homogeneous setting, could be due to some factor that operated in one but not the other setting.

Comparison of the two groups' performance in the test of more 'context-embedded' use, test 1, showed a similar pattern of regression or decline in performance in all the skills in both groups over the period. While the regression in Reading and Writing was less, the regression in Listening was more marked, in both settings. So the factors of
differences within the groups did not affect their performance in the more 'context-embedded' use of skills, where there was no positive development. There was no comparison for Speaking which had only one test due to the lack of time.

Comparing the two groups' performance in the test of more 'decontextualised' use, test 2 showed a similar pattern of improvement in Reading and Writing, the improvement in Reading in the mixed group was more marked. In their performance in the other skills, the homogeneous group showed an improvement in Speaking but regression in Listening, while the mixed group showed improvement in Listening but regression in Speaking. Comparison on ANOVA showed the differential development to be significantly affected by the school factor, the level of significance taken to be at 10% within such a small sample. Such a distinct difference between the developmental pattern of the two groups was due to the effect of the setting or school, influencing the operation of the language learning factors differently.

Comparison of the sub-skills of the productive skills to note their development in appropriacy showed that both groups improved in appropriacy in 'decontextualised' Writing, Writing 2. But while the homogeneous group improved in Speaking, it did not improve in the sub-skill of appropriacy. On the other hand, the mixed group regressed in Speaking but improved in appropriacy, showing a difference in the pattern of development across the two groups. This difference may be related to differences between the settings. The two groups also showed a difference in performance in the sub-skill 'Expression'. While the mixed group showed improvement in this sub-skill in both tests of Writing, the homogeneous group showed decreases in both tests in this sub-skill.

A comparison of development between the Receptive and Productive skills showed that the homogeneous group made greater improvement Productive skills, showing increases in two out of three skills. The mixed group showed a tendency to perform better in the Receptive skills, showing improvement in two and decreases in two.
A comparison of the development of dispersion of ability to perform in each skill showed that School A developed a greater homogeneity over the period, by developing lower standard deviations in five of the seven skills tested. School C, in contrast, developed a greater heterogeneity in performance, with a higher s. d. in four of the seven skills. The contrastive trend in development can best be seen in Speaking. School A registered the greatest decrease in s. d. in Speaking while School C showed the greatest increase in it.

Improvement took place in the 'decontextualised' use of Reading and Writing in both groups, showing that similar academic learning that went on during the observation period, caused pressure for the use of those language skills in both groups. Both groups showed decline in performance in the context-embedded use of skills showing that the academic learning did not bear sufficient pressure for development in this type of use of skills. In both groups the learners performed better on type 1, the 'context-embedded' than type 2, the 'decontextualised' use of skills in the pretest. In both groups the difference between the performance on tests of type 1 and 2 of each skill decreased over time. But School C showed a greater improvement, performing better in Reading 2 than Reading 1.

4.4. Factors affecting real-life classroom research

Before ending this chapter I shall point out some factors that affect real-life classroom research, and hampered the progress of my work on this research, during the administration of the pre and post test, and during the classroom observation.

The Power of the Local Teacher: The need to take permission for the research from each teacher present in the classroom made difficulties for the research, since teachers were not always available to sanction it before the event. The process did not grow easier with time. Their power was further demonstrated in School B, where some teachers' reluctance to allow further recording compelled me to re-start the fieldwork in another setting.
Teachers' Resistance and Objection: Teachers' general reluctance to allow an observer into classrooms for long periods was manifested itself as non-co-operation, particularly in the Mixed settings. Appointments for observation would be cancelled without notice, necessitating rescheduling of observation dates, or equipments promised earlier would not be made 'available'.

Teachers' Objections to the Tests: All teachers reacted negatively to the assessment of their students' performance through testing. The English teachers in particular showed strong resentment of the tests and expressed this quite similarly across schools, holding the tests to be 'old-fashioned' and unsuitable, particularly in the tests' use of the multiple choice format.

English teachers were also generally reluctant to allow observation and recording in their classes. The reason may be that, unlike content subjects like Science and Geography, the syllabus for teaching a language may not be able to stand the scrutiny of observation, which may have made English teachers defensive about holding their subject or their teaching open to critics. They may also have feared that the performance of their pupils on these tests would be a negative comment on their capability as teachers.

In defence of the tests, the authors of TELS claim that the texts have been taken from many different sources of recent publications in U.K. They also claim to have trialled the tests for over eighteen months from 1985 to 1986 in twenty eight schools of local authority and private sector in Britain, on two thousand students of all ability levels, between fourteen and sixteen years of age (Hutchinson & Pollitt 1987: 138). The feedback from the participants and the teachers in those schools were used for making adaptations to the tests.

For the purpose of this research, the pilot test (Ch 3) showed that the results were quite systematic across the skills. They were useful in differentiating between the ability of these learners, establishing a detailed picture of their linguistic performance ability, in details of skills and sub-skills. This would provide a record of the change that
took place in specific areas, a combination of which would help to give a
general picture of their linguistic development.

**Differences Through Uneven Test Administration:** The
administration of the tests through the regular teachers across schools
may have made some differences. Administration by me in both settings
could have ensured a greater degree of uniformity in the process. But
the learners' unfamiliarity with me could make them react negatively,
apart from attaching less importance to the test itself. This could affect
their performance adversely. As I wanted their best performance, I
used their regular teachers for the work, within certain guidelines set
down by the TELS.

**4.5. Summary**

In this chapter I have dealt with the product of learning, as
assessed through the linguistic tests, TELS pre and posttest, measuring
the learners' linguistic ability at the beginning and end of the period.
The results of the comparative analysis of the means of the scores show
certain similar trends in both settings, that both groups made progress
in the skills related to the more 'decontextualised' use of the language,
but showed decline in performance on more 'context-embedded' use.
Beyond these similarities there were differences in their pattern of
development. While the homogeneous group showed a greater
improvement in Speaking, the mixed group improved in Listening. While
the mixed group improved in appropriacy, the homogeneous group
regressed in proficiency in this sub-skill. While pupils in School A
became more homogeneous, those in School C became more heterogeneous
over time in the dispersion of ability among the members. Such
differences in the pattern of development of two groups passing
through a similar academic experience, suggests that variations in the
settings may have helped to cause these differences.
Chapter 5

The Classroom Process

In this chapter I shall talk of one of the variables within the process of language learning, the organisation of teaching in the classroom, accessed through systematic observation. Comparison between settings could show differences within the way that the two settings set up its teaching, that could give rise to the differences in the operation of factors of language learning, leading to differences in the product of learning discussed in the last chapter. The other variable, that of language use within the organisations will be discussed in the next chapter.

The observation of the classrooms in the two settings took place over eight months to allow some development to take place within the language learning. Some aspects of the classrooms activities were recorded on the COLT coding sheet for recording the time given to learners to control the topic of conversation, and their use of skills during the class. The results from this would supplement and strengthen the results from other means of observation.

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section describes the organisation of learning within the classrooms observed. The second section presents an analysis of the process coded on COLT. The third section describes the speech units used for quantification of the recorded language with the procedure for using these units.

5.1. Classroom observation

As mentioned before, it had been noticed during preliminary observations in these classrooms that no setting used only task-based organisation for teaching, just as no setting used only classes organised as teacher-fronted input. All teachers used a certain number of classes of each type, and it is possible that the composition of the classroom population influenced this choice of organisation. Categorisation of classes would help to determine if the two settings organised their learning in identifiably different ways.
The use of more task-based organisation could give rise to greater use of language for interaction and negotiation between learners, than classes using only teacher-fronted input (Ch 2). Within classes organised around tasks, the use of more groupwork could give rise to greater negotiation and interaction than tasks performed individually, while the use of divergent tasks could necessitate the use of a different type of language use than convergent tasks (Ch 2). So, if due to any factor that operated within the setting, the teacher used one type of organisation more than another, it could lead to the generation of greater or lesser amount of interaction, expressed through the use of systematically longer or shorter utterances, leading to the development of differences in language proficiency. Since I had no reason to believe that the classes observed were unusual with respect to the organisation used in the classroom, I have assumed that they were typical of the proportion of each of these organisations used by teachers in each setting.

The classes in each subject were to be observed at similar intervals over the eight-month period. As teachers were not always cooperative about allowing entry to their classes for observation and recording (Ch 3), some variation occurred in the time gap, and on certain subjects the number of classes observed had to be reduced to three (e.g., English).

I shall review the instruments used within the classroom for observation of classes before going on to describe and categorise the organisation.

5.1.1. The instruments

The students were audio recorded as they engaged in interaction in the classroom. The recording of their interaction formed the main data of the process to show the extent of the operation of the language learning factors within each classroom, the dependent variable that could be influenced by the independent variable of the setting. The tape recorders were placed on the learners' tables.
In some of the classrooms, the process was coded on the COLT system to show how much of the class time was occupied by teacher talk and how much of it was given to the learners to control the topic of conversation. The coding also showed the use of each language skill during each class. These two factors would be compared across settings i) to see if the time given to learners to initiate topics varied across settings; ii) to see if the use of Speaking skill, allowing interaction, varied across settings.

Comparison would show if factors in the setting could allow teachers to permit students to control topic equally in both settings.

The aspect of 'Topic Control' within COLT would indicate the learners' freedom to initiate conversation in the classroom. In a classroom, when the teacher talks to the whole class, s/he is in control of the topic. When the teacher talks to the students but also allows students to talk back and raise issues at will, both teacher and students can initiate turns. In this case they are both in control of the topic. When the teacher leaves the interaction entirely to the students and allows them to interact between themselves, the students are in control of the topic, with more freedom to select and approach a topic in any way they like. In such interaction they may use the language in more different ways than when they only respond to the teachers' questions.

Video recording of some classrooms would give an impression of the operation of the intergroup boundaries in the classrooms as learners progressed through academic activities.

I shall now enumerate some of the problems encountered in using these instruments. Although similar problems were experienced in both settings, the teachers in the homogeneous settings, in the pilot and the main study, were less resistant to the research.
5.1.2. Problems of data collection

In using the audio and video recorders for recording the classroom interaction, various problems imposed certain limitations on the effectiveness of the results.

**Problems of Audio-recording:** Many of the teachers were suspicious of audio-recording, particularly of the use to be made of the recorded material. Perhaps because of this they were often uncooperative in various ways (Ch 4).

**Non-academic Problems:** Some non-academic problems affected the total quantity of the data collected across classrooms.

The number of recorders available varied from day to day, so the number of groups recorded in each classroom varied. Placed on the learners' tables, the audio-recorders were visible so that the learners were always conscious of being recorded and tended to behave awkwardly, or talk in whispers. They would manipulate the machine to wipe out, or make sections of the interaction inaudible by turning the volume down. During Science practical tasks the learners would move around as they worked, so that part of their interaction was missed when they moved out of the recorders' range. Monitoring of the machines was intrusive and not welcomed by the teachers who often considered the recording to be disruptive for their classes.

**Academic:** Variation in quantity was also caused by academic factors. When tasks extended over many weeks, the stage of the task recorded varied, depending on when observation was allowed by the teacher. The interaction at the beginning of a task could be greater as the learners were interacting and negotiating to understand and clarify the three aspects of task (Doyle 1983), than at the later stages when they had resolved their problems through discussions and were producing the goal, mostly in writing. But as the learners in both settings were doing very similar work, the variation across settings caused by this factor would be reasonably similar in both.
Despite these academic and non-academic factors which combined to produce variation in the quantity of recording across classes, a substantial amount of language data was recorded from the two settings.

**Problems of Video Recording:** Video recording created problems in all schools. Many of the teachers resented being recorded, refusing to allow it in their classroom. Even those who allowed it were critical of it and tended to blame any disruptive classroom behaviour of the learners to the presence of the video.

Technically, there was no secure point in any classroom where the camcorder could be placed to record the whole process unobtrusively, as recommended by van Lier (1988). This necessitated holding up the camcorder manually, which made the learners self-conscious and they tended to behave differently from usual. Holding the camcorder did not allow coding on the COLT sheet in real time.

Another problem was, due to a technical fault, no sound was recorded for some of the video-recording. However, since their speech was being recorded separately, and considering that the focus of the video recording was on the intergroup interaction and on the amount of teacher support received in the classroom by the Bangladeshi learners, this did not make very material difference.

The resistance from the teachers, particularly in the mixed settings seemed to be a product of their suspicion of the use that the data would be put to. Some thought the recorded matter could be used 'politically', as in the first mixed school, School B, which stopped my work there. As a result, when the teachers in Schools A and C showed signs of being disturbed by the video recording, I abandoned this manner of recording rather than risk being disallowed access to the classrooms again. So the number of video recordings were few, but sufficient to give an idea of the intergroup mixing and the extent of support for the students in the classroom.
5.1.3. Description and categorisation of teaching
Organisations

I shall now describe and categorise the organisation used for teaching each subject in the two settings. This will help to assess Hypothesis 5 better.

As mentioned before, teaching can be wholly teacher-fronted input (T-I), or there can be a session of teacher-fronted input followed by a task based on this input. The classes consisting only of teacher-fronted input have been categorised as 'teacher-fronted input'. Classes where the input was followed by performance of some task, have been categorised as task-based learning.

For each class organised around tasks, the type of task used by teachers was identified. In such cases the description of the classroom is followed by the description and categorisation of the task according to whether they are convergent (C) or divergent (D), and whether they are performed as groupwork (G) or individually (I) (Ch 2). The average language production in the classrooms was considered in relation to the organisation of teaching to see if the organisation could be seen to vary consistently with the length and quantity of language produced. This could mean that there was some relation between the organisation and the pattern of language production. Comparison of the organisations across settings would show if the setting influenced the use of one type of teaching pattern more than another. Quantification of language use (Ch 6) would show if there was a variation relating to the organisation in each setting. Comparison across teaching in the two settings will show any pattern in variation of methods adopted within each subject. Any consistent variation in the organisation of teaching may be due to a necessity imposed by factors within a setting.

The observation and recording of the classroom took place for tasks of English, Science and Geography in the two settings. Although four observations had been planned, it was necessary to reduce it to three in some cases.
5.1.3.1. Organisations in English

School A

The English teacher in this school did not allow video recording in the classrooms.

Class One: 4.1990: The class was organised as a discussion task, to be performed in groups according to the seating pattern. The learners were given task sheets and assigned roles by the teacher who read out the instructions and explained the task. Performance was extempore, where many were not sure of what to do. The teacher circulated between groups, explaining and helping them to develop and focus their arguments. Most learners finished their performance on the task quickly.

Task: It was a discussion task on 'The Dangers of Passive Smoking', designed for groups of four where each had a specific role: a doctor, a cinema owner, a restaurant owner and a club worker. Each learner had to argue the issue, in order to convince and persuade others. Since the task allowed learners to adopt different viewpoints from which each could aim towards different goals, the task was Divergent, performed in Groups. D/G

COLT: The learners were in control of the topic for twenty three minutes. The skills they used mostly were Speaking and Listening.

Class Two: 6.1990: This was a discussion task on a poem, performed in groups on the basis of their seating pattern. Their interaction was audio-recorded for assessment of oral skill proficiency as practice for GCSE. The recording was uneven as some of the groups switched off the machines during the preparatory discussion.

Task: There were two parts to this discussion task. The first was to replace missing words in a poem about South Africa, from which some words had been deleted. All gaps could be filled with a single word: the learners had to work in groups to find the best fit through contextual clues. The second part was a discussion of the life of the
Black population of South Africa, as revealed through the poem. The assumptions of the poem were shared, through the task sheet. The goals were shared too, so that the task was Convergent, performed in groups. C/G

COLT: The learners were free to control the topic for twenty four minutes. The skills they used most were Speaking and Listening.

Class Three: 10.1991: This was another discussion task. A support teacher was present to help start off the discussion with individual groups. Scores would be assigned on the performance on a group basis, so there was more effort made by all participants to contribute and to persuade group members to do so.

Task: The task was a discussion of three South African poems. The learners had to discuss the literary merits and the meaning and message of each poem. They had to reach a general conclusion through an overview of the poems.

This was a Convergent task where the learners had to understand the poems through group discussion, and share their assumptions towards an increasing understanding of the content and the context. Learners tended to identify personally with the topic and the subject of discussion. C/G

COLT: The learners were free to initiate topics for thirty minutes. The skills they used most were Reading and Speaking.

**School C**

All English classes in School C were supported by the highest number of teachers among all classrooms observed, with at least two extra teachers at any time.

Class One: 10.1990: The learners sat in language groups, and were curious about the recording. After I explained my research purpose to them, they were cautious about speaking near the recorder and would whisper, making it difficult to decipher their talk. During this class the
learners became disruptive after twenty minutes, so that much of the time after that was spent in trying to calm them down.

**Task:** The topic was 'Images' and involved the description of people in pictures provided, and the learners' reactions to them in a written composition. The task had been started the previous week. On this, the second day on the task, they were to write the composition which would form a part of their GCSE coursework and had to be done individually. However, they were allowed to discuss with their peers as they performed. Although the stimulus task sheets was the same, the learners’ reactions were to be individual, giving their reasons. The task was Divergent, performed individually. D/I

**Video:** The learners could control the topic for about thirty-three minutes. The skills they used mostly were Speaking and Writing.

Class Two: 1.1991: The usual teacher was away on training, so the class was in the charge of a substitute teacher with support teachers. The teachers read out from a book on the GCSE syllabus, interspersed with comprehension questions. There were some disruptions from a NS and a Somali boy which distracted the others. The class was audio recorded and coded on the COLT system.

**Task:** The teacher-input consisted of reading from the book, followed by the distribution of a task sheet containing questions on the text. Work was to be done individually. Interaction was not encouraged. The assumptions of the story were shared by all, while the goal was the same for all. The task was Convergent, performed individually. C/I

**COLT:** The topic was never in the learners’ control. The skills mostly used were Listening and Reading during the input, and Writing during the performance of task.

Class Three: 4.1991: In the previous class the learners had worked on a poem about learning a second language. This class started with feedback, followed by the task of the day. This related to the topic of the poem. The writing of the task could be completed at home.
Task: It was a written task, giving account of the process of, and the best environment for, learning a language. It was to be based on the learners' own experience so that the topic was most personal of all the tasks observed. It was a Convergent piece of writing, performed individually C/I.

COLT: The topic was in the learners' control for twenty-two minutes. The skills they mainly used were Listening and Speaking, with some Writing.

Comparison of organisations in English

Comparison of the teaching of English in the two settings shows that in both groups the teaching was organised around tasks.

In the mixed group all classes in English were organised to be performed individually. While the learners were allowed to interact in two of the classes, in the third the teacher did not encourage student-talk, so that discussions that took place occurred only when the teacher could not observe it. When interaction was not allowed freely, it was done briefly. Interaction was not a necessary part of task performance in any class, but was sometimes allowed by the teacher.

In the homogeneous group all tasks were performed in groups, where interaction was not only encouraged, but formed part of the function of the task. So the interaction was more free than in the mixed group where restraint was imposed in some of the classes. The group tasks required learners to elaborate their ideas at greater length, particularly in the divergent task which could give learners the chance to express their point of view through longer utterances that needed to contain not only their opponents' point of view but also their own rebuttal of it.

While in the homogeneous setting all the tasks were to be performed in groups, in the mixed group all the tasks were to be performed individually. While the group tasks in the homogeneous setting required discussions to develop towards expression of generalisations and abstractions by the learners, the individual tasks in
the mixed group would focus the learners' attention on the clarification of the task, the method of performing it, and the language to be used for the expression of task goal. Such a consistent pattern of difference indicates a tendency for teachers in each setting to organise their classes differently.

5.1.3.2. Organisations in Geography

School A

The teacher was co-operative about observation and recording by audio and video. The classroom had no vantage point to mount the camcorder unobtrusively, as suggested by van Lier (1989). So it had to be hand held and it was not possible to record the events on COLT in real time.

Class One: 3.1990: The class was recorded both on audio and video.

Task: The task was the Measurement of Discharge of Rivers. The learners had started the work a few weeks ago when they had been taken to the Epping Forest to work in groups on measuring a stream and collecting related data. They had finished their fieldwork and were collating the data for a report of their findings and observations. During this class they were discussing and compiling the data. As this was not the first class on the task, there was not a significant amount of teacher-input.

The task was Convergent, performed in groups where all members had collected different sections of the data and were working on putting them together in groups, to attain the result. The final report had to be individually written by each learner for coursework assessment. C/G

Video: The learners were in control of the topic for approximately thirty minutes. The skills they used most were Reading and Speaking.

Class Two: 3.1990: The students were observed again a fortnight later while they continued to work on the first task, as the quality of the video recording on the previous occasion had not been good. On this
day they were working in groups on writing up the report of the project, a Convergent task on Measuring the Discharge. C/G.

Video: The learners were in control of the topic for about thirty minutes. The skills they mostly used were Listening and Speaking.

Class Three: 5.1990: There was a long teacher-input explaining the GCSE grading system. A support teacher was present, the only time when any geography lesson was supported during the classes observed. The class was audio and video-recorded.

Task: The learners had to do a survey of opinion of shoppers and shop-keepers at their local shopping centre, and produce a report on the basis of this data, on whether their locality required a new shopping centre. The learners had devised questionnaires and interviewed people. They were now producing their reports with their suggestions, on the basis of these data.

On this task the assumptions were not the same, neither would the data and their the conclusions be the same for all learners. The learners could differ in their view and needed to convince readers of their points of view by substantiating their arguments with evidence of data. This was a Divergent task, performed in groups, although the product would have to be presented individually. D/G

Video: The learners were in control of the topic for twenty-five minutes. The skills used most were Listening and Reading during the input session, and Speaking and Writing during performance.

Class Four: 10.1990: This took place in a new classroom as the original classroom was undergoing repairs. The students were both audio and video recorded. There was a long input followed by a task on a work sheet, to be done individually.

Task: This was a project on the pattern of world industrialisation. The learners started the task with similar assumptions and aimed at the same goal. The task was Convergent, performed individually. Discussion was allowed during performance. C/I
Video: The learners were in control of the topic for fifteen minutes. The skills used most were Listening during the input, and Reading and Speaking during performance.

School C

The learners sat at six clusters of tables in groups of various sizes.

Class One: 9.1990: There was a session of input from the teacher, followed by the task given on a sheet, to be performed individually. The teacher re-explained the task and the procedure for performing it, for a low proficiency Bangladeshi learner.

Task: The topic was 'Housing in Britain'. The learners had to describe the types of housing available and the factors leading to homelessness. The assumptions were similar, the results would also be similar. The task was Convergent, performed individually. Interaction was not allowed. C/I.

COLT: The learners were not in control of the topic at any time. The skills mainly used were Reading and Writing.

Class Two: 27.11.1990: A session of teacher input was followed by distribution of a task sheet which they had to do individually. Interaction was not allowed.

Task: The topic was 'Housing in Britain'. The task was to find the percentage of different occupations of people living in different types of housing in Britain. These data had to be presented in various easily comprehended forms. The assumptions of the task were the same, and the product would be similar. This was a Convergent task, performed individually. C/I

COLT: The learners were not in control of the topic at any time. The skills mainly used were Reading and Writing.

Class Three: 3.1991: The learners finished a previous task during the first part of the period and received feedback before going on to the
task of the day. The teacher read out and explained a text, followed by the new task. The learners worked on it during the class period but would finish it at home.

**Task:** The previous task was performed individually and was corrected by the students as the teacher spoke out the correct answers. The new topic was 'Changing the flow of rivers'. The task was to answer questions on a task sheet. The learners worked individually. The assumptions of the task were shared by all learners, while the task goal was the same for all. It was a **Convergent** task, to be performed individually. Interaction was not allowed. C/I

**C/OLT:** The learners were not in control of the topic at any time. The skills mainly used were Listening, Reading, with some Writing.

**Comparison of organisations in Geography**

In both groups the classes were organised around tasks. But while most tasks in the homogeneous group were organised to be performed in **groups**, all tasks in the mixed group were organised to be performed individually. **Group tasks** offer each learner more partners as interlocutors, and greater opportunities for interaction, with more potential for language learning (Ch 2). In the **homogeneous setting** one of the tasks was organised to allow divergence of opinion, where learners could discuss various points of view, justifying their arguments with evidence from their fieldwork data. The needs of the task could give rise to utterances in which they needed to combine their arguments with their data in order to produce the task goal. In the task organised to be performed individually, interaction was allowed among peers for mutual help.

In the **mixed setting**, not only were the tasks required to be performed individually, restraint was imposed on their interaction by frequent disciplining of talk among students, not allowing clarification of language or content. Whatever interaction did take place was without the teacher's sanction, and briefly expressed when the teacher could not see it.
So, in geography, the homogeneous group generally organised tasks to be performed as groupwork, and even allowed the learners to hold and justify divergent opinions. The mixed group on the other hand, organised tasks to be performed individually, where conversation was actively discouraged. While the use of convergent tasks in the homogeneous group allowed interaction, in the mixed group it did not. Comparing the time that the learners were allowed to be in control of the topic, in the homogeneous group, the learners were in control of the topic from 15 to 30 minutes, depending on the length of the input and feedback. In the mixed group the learners were never free to control the topic, so that in geography there was an identifiable difference imposed by a greater restriction in the mixed group, on the extent that the factors of language learning could operate.

5.1.3.3. Organisations in Science

School A

The science teacher was co-operative about observation and recording. The classes took place in a laboratory where students sat on stools behind long tables. Science was taught in sessions of double classes. When both classes were recorded consecutively, each has been categorised as a separate class with a separate task.

Class One: 3.1990: Only the first class was observed and recorded on this day.

Teacher input: The topic was 'Storage of electricity', consisting mainly of input. During the last quarter of the period, the students were formed into pairs and equipments were distributed to them to be set up for a practical task after lunch. Since there was no performance on a task, the class was categorised as Teacher-fronted input. T-I

Video: The learners were in control of the topic for ten minutes while setting up the apparatus. The skills they used mostly were Listening and Writing.
Class Two: 5.6.1990: The topic for the day was Chemical Change resulting from Electrolysis. Both of the double periods were observed, each of which has been considered as a separate class and task. The learners were audio recorded.

Task: The class consisted of a long input on Electrolysis, followed by setting up equipments for the experiment. The teacher demonstrated part of the process, which was followed by some discussion. The experiment was performed during the next period. Since part of the period was spent on the task performed in groups with shared assumptions, it is categorised as a Convergent task. C/G.

COLT: The learners were in control of the topic for sixteen minutes. The skills they used most were Listening and Writing during the input, and Speaking while setting up the equipments.

Class Three: 6.1990: This was the second of the double period session on Electrolysis. It consisted of the performance of the practical task in pairs. The task was followed by a feedback session.

Task: The learners performed the practical task on Electrolysis, discussing among themselves and with the teacher. After the performance they wrote out some of their findings, followed by a session of feedback. The learners worked on shared assumptions, towards a similar goal. The task was Convergent, performed in pairs. C/G

COLT: The learners were in control of the topic and could move around for thirty-three minutes during which their interlocutors could change. The skills they used mostly were Speaking and Writing.

Class Four: 10.1990: By this time, there was a change in the structure of the tutor group. The more able learners were grouped together with similar students from another group to form Group A, while the less able of both groups formed Group B. Both groups had science during the same period in adjoining portacabins, in charge of a new regular teacher. Group B had a support teacher.
Recorders were set up in both classrooms. I divided the time between the two classrooms, first with Group A, then Group B.

**Group A: Teacher input:** It was teacher-fronted input on Combustion, followed by display questions to check comprehension. It was a T-fronted input session. T-I

**COLT:** The learners were not free to control the topic at any time. The skill used mostly was Listening, with some Reading.

**Group B: Teacher input:** The session consisted mainly of input and comprehension questions by the teacher on human physiology and metabolism, followed by comprehension questions and summing up. It was a T-fronted input session. T-I

**COLT:** The learners were not free to control the topic at all during the observation. The skill mainly used was Listening.

Since the two groups together formed the class being observed in this setting, and used the same form of teaching organisation, I have counted both the groups as one class for the purpose of making comparisons across settings.

**School C**

The teachers were co-operative about observation and recording. As in School A, Science in School C was taught in single and double periods.

**Class One: 9.1990:** This was a double period session in a laboratory, where only the first period was observed. A support teacher was present.

**Task:** It was a task on Flammability. The learners worked on an experiment, followed by writing up the process of the experiment. Support for the writing was provided through a task sheet where the process was written out, in the wrong order. The learners could use this to guide the writing. The assumptions were shared, while the goal
was the same for all. This was a Convergent task that had to be performed individually. C/I

Video: The learners could control the topic and move around for thirty minutes. The skills mainly used were Listening and Writing.

Class Two: 11.1990: The class was held in a smaller classroom, where learners sat on benches facing the teacher. A support teacher worked with the students to help simplify the input.

Teacher input: The topic was Power supply and Electric circuits. The teacher input was followed by some comprehension questions by the teacher, recapitulating previous topics. The class was organised as Teacher-fronted input. T-I

Video: The learners were not in control of the topic at any time. The skill mainly used was Listening.

Class Three: 1.1991: The class was the first of a double period session, in a laboratory. There was a session of input. Two pupils disrupted the class and were sent out. The apparatus were handed out to the learners who worked in pairs on the task and on writing the report.

Task: It was pair work on Germination of Seeds. The learners did the experiment, followed by writing the report of the process. The assumptions for the task and the goal were shared. The task was a Convergent task performed in pairs. C/G.

COLT: The learners were in control of the topic and could move around for thirty-three minutes. The skills mainly used were Listening and Speaking, with some Writing.

Class Four: 4.1991: There was a session of input, followed by individual written work. The teachers helped with support and advice. Two learners disturbed the class for some time.

Task: The topic was 'What is oil used for?' The task involved the calculation and representation of percentage of production. The
learners worked individually although discussion was allowed during performance. The learners worked with similar assumptions and had to reach the same answer to the questions. It was a Convergent task performed individually. C/I

COLT: The learners were in control of the topic for thirty-five minutes. The skills mainly used were Reading and Writing, with some Speaking.

Comparison of organisations in Science

In Science there was a greater similarity in the way teaching was organised across the settings than in other subjects. The nature of the subject may oblige teachers across settings to organise their teaching so similarly.

Some classes in both groups were organised as teacher-fronted input. While such classes did not allow interaction, they gave learners much content-related input in subject-specific language. The use of this method was higher in the homogeneous than the mixed group.

Some classes in both groups were organised around tasks. In the homogeneous setting, most tasks were organised to be performed in groups, which would facilitate interaction and the generation of the language learning factors. Interaction was also allowed in the task set up to be performed individually.

In the mixed group, some tasks were organised to be performed individually, but science is the only subject where the teachers in the mixed setting also organised tasks to be performed in groups.

So in Science, while interaction was not possible in some of the classes that were set up as teacher-fronted input in each setting, some of the task-based classes were organised to be performed in groups in both settings. But within this similarity, the homogeneous setting used more groupwork as well as more teacher-fronted input. During the tasks set up to be performed individually, both settings allowed interaction, showing a greater similarity between teaching organisations across settings in science.
5.1.3.4. Findings of categorisation

The categorisation of the various types of organisations used in the classrooms across the settings are presented on the table below to help assess Hypothesis 5:

Table showing the organisation of the total number of classes observed in both settings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divergent (Group) task = 2</td>
<td>Divergent (Individual) task = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent (Group) task = 6</td>
<td>Convergent (Group) task = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent (Individual) task = 1</td>
<td>Convergent (Individual) task = 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-fronted Input = 2</td>
<td>Teacher-fronted Input = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total = 11</td>
<td>Total = 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-based classes = 9</td>
<td>Task-based classes = 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groupwork = 8</td>
<td>Groupwork = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual work = 1</td>
<td>Individual work = 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-fronted Input = 2</td>
<td>Teacher-fronted Input = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total = 11</td>
<td>Total = 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A survey of the total number and type of classroom organisations used across the settings presented on the table above shows that both School A and C used the same number of task-based classes for teaching, although for School C it formed a higher percentage of the total. But the difference between the two settings is, while School C organised only one of its observed classes as groupwork, School A organised eight as groupwork. Conversely, eight of School C's classes were organised to be performed individually, while only one of School A's class was organised to be individual work. So School A seemed able and willing to utilise the advantages of groupwork for task performance more than School C.

Although the number of classes observed was too small to allow generalisations, the survey of the organisation of teaching in the two settings show that tasks in the homogeneous setting are more consistently set up to be performed in groups, with greater potential for interaction that is necessary and encouraged. Learners not only can converge in their ideas and opinions, but can also practice to diverge in expression and opinion through performance on divergent tasks that teach them to take account of others' point of view, and to support their own point of view through arguments. On tasks set up to
be performed individually, interaction is generally allowed in this setting during performance.

On the other hand, tasks in the mixed setting are generally set up to be performed individually. In such tasks, interaction is generally not encouraged. Only in science, groupwork is used and interaction is allowed for tasks to be performed individually.

The difference in the organisation in the two settings is striking enough to make one wonder about its possible cause. It shows that teachers in the mixed setting consistently tended to restrict the interaction of the learners, while teachers in the homogeneous setting encouraged learner interaction, through the way they set up their teaching. It is possible that factors within the setting exerted pressure on them to organise teaching in such markedly different ways. It shows that it is not the inclination of a single teacher for one subject, since the similarity is noticed across teachers in all three subjects.

The 'illuminative' explanation seems to be that in the mixed group the presence of various language groups makes it difficult for the members to dispense with the behaviour pattern of their own group, a marker of their group identity, in order to adopt the pattern of the target group which prevails in the classroom. There can exist a mismatch, a maladjustment, between the pattern of behaviour that each group considers acceptable within a classroom, so that rather than cause convergence between groups, it can become difficult for groups to interact harmoniously and work together on a task to achieve a goal. Their differences may make difficulties for adjustments, which can manifest itself as classroom fights and misdemeanours. This makes it difficult for teachers to control them if they work together. It was noticed that in classes where interaction was allowed there were regular occurrences of disruptions of the learning process. To allow all learners to work in the classroom, teachers may prefer them to work individually, when there will be less possibility of friction.

In the homogeneous group with only one language group present in the classroom, the behavioural norms may have been similar for all so that evidences of mismatch were not visible as disruptions. This allowed
teachers to use groupwork, and even allowed the pupils to perform on divergent tasks without causing disruptions through friction between learners.

The use of teacher-fronted input may require more disciplined and attentive behaviour in the classroom. Through their mismatch of expectations and norms of classroom behaviour, the learners in the mixed group may not be responsive to such needs for discipline during a long session of teacher input, which they may not be able to comprehend well. The homogeneous group with similar code of behaviour may be more capable of maintaining a more uniform level of discipline even when they did not understand, so that teachers in the homogeneous setting could use teacher-fronted input more frequently than in the mixed setting.

5.2. Observation on COLT (Appendix 1, Ch 5)

Most of the classrooms observed were coded on the COLT observation system in order to compare the length of time that learners could control the topic. It also focused on the use of particular skills in each classroom, to see how far the use of skills, particularly Speaking, varied across settings within similar organisations. These information have already been given for individual classrooms. I shall now make general comparisons to see if there was any identifiable consistent variation on these two headings across settings. Taken together, these data would help to reveal 'illuminative' factors operating in the classroom that helped to bring about differences in language learning.

5.2.1. Opportunity for interaction

The area of 'topic control' in the COLT coding sheet offers three alternatives of people who can control the topic. It can be the teacher only, or both the teacher and learner, or alternatively, it can be the learner only.

In calculating the length of time when learners were in control of the topic, I have included the time when the topic was in the students' control, as well as when it was in the teachers' and students'
control, since the time coded under both headings gave learners some freedom to be in control of topics. The second heading included the periods of time when the teacher interacted with some learners in a group, while others were free to initiate topics and to interact.

The table in Appendix 1 to Chapter 5 shows the time allowed for free interaction between learners in each class, with the skills used most during these classes. Comparing the time allowed the learners to control topics across teaching organisations, there appears to be a consistent variation between the type of organisation used for teaching and the time allowed for topic control by learners: teachers allow learners to be in control of the topic for a longer period during task-based organisations than during teacher-fronted input.

Looking at the length of time when the learners are in control of the topic in relation to the subject, in both settings the teacher-fronted input classes did not allow any time for topic initiation by learners. Within task-based classes, teachers consistently allowed students the control of topic for a greater length of time in classes set up as Groupwork than Individual work. The lowest length of time given to learners to initiate topics independently within group tasks was twenty-five minutes while in individual tasks it was zero minutes. Within individual tasks, some teachers allow pupils more freedom to initiate topics, to ask and answer questions, to make learning discoveries with each other's help. Other teachers seem to prefer the transmission of information through input from the teacher, from which the pupils individually deduce answers to the learning questions.

Comparing the use of organisations generally, the homogeneous setting consistently allowed learners some time for topic initiation in all task-based classes. But in the mixed setting, while the learners were allowed control of topic in some of the task-based classes, it was not uniformly so. In English, the homogeneous setting was allowed to initiate topic in all classes, but the mixed setting was not allowed to at any time during the second class. In geography the homogeneous setting was allowed topic control in all classes but the mixed setting was not allowed to at any time in any of the classes. Science was the only subject where topic initiation was allowed in both groups in the task-
based classes. The nature of science appears to influence the teaching method to be similar across differing settings. So, in two subjects out of three, learners in the homogeneous group had far greater control of topic than the mixed group.

5.2.2. The use of language skills

All classes necessitated the use of the four skills integratively, to a greater or lesser extent. Of these, the skills used more heavily during the period have been listed with the organisation used for teaching, in Appendix 2, Ch 5, from the coding on COLT. The use of skills shows a relationship with the type of work being done in class. All classes are prefaced by some amount of input from the teacher, so the Listening skills for academic purpose was used most commonly in all classrooms, particularly in classes organised as teacher-fronted input.

Teacher fronted classes show the least length of time allowed for free interaction between learners, and the skills mainly used during such classes were Listening, sometimes accompanied by Writing. On the other hand, most task-based organisations seemed to call for the Speaking and Listening skills.

Comparison between settings shows that the skills used during teacher-fronted input in both settings are Listening and Reading or Writing, but not much Speaking. In task-based classes, most subjects give rise to the use of Speaking, but not similarly across settings.

In English, all classes in the homogeneous group show Speaking as the skill used most. In the mixed group one of the classes does not show the use of Speaking, but it is used in the others.

In geography, the homogeneous group shows the use of Speaking in all classes, the second most used skill. In the mixed setting Speaking is not mentioned, showing that it was not used much.

In the task-based classes in science, both classes in the homogeneous group give rise to the use of Speaking. In the mixed group two of the task-based classes show the use of Speaking as the
skill used most, but the third task does not show any use of Speaking. This indicates that even in science there was some restrictions on Speaking in the mixed group.

To sum up, classes organised as teacher-fronted input did not allow Speaking in any setting. Teaching organised around tasks gave rise to the use of different skills in the two settings, so that Speaking was not always the main skill used. In the homogeneous group all task-based classes used the Speaking skill so that the factors of language learning may have operated during all such classes. In the mixed group, task-based classes in geography did not show use of Speaking. In English and science some of the classes gave rise to Speaking, but not all. If the use of skills is compared, the learners in the homogeneous group had scope to practice their language learning skills through interaction at more frequent intervals, in classes organised around tasks in all subjects, than did the learners in the mixed setting.

5.2.3. Disturbances within classrooms

The coding on COLT helped to show incidence of classroom disturbances from fights and misdemeanours in School C which resulted in loss of learning time for students. There were no corresponding incidence of fights during the classes observed in School A. While this could be a coincidence, 'illuminative' insight from observation shows that when learners in a classroom came from different language backgrounds, as in School C, the idea of acceptable behaviour could vary between groups. These pupils not only needed to learn the language and the content but also learn the pattern of behaviour conducive for social co-existence that could allow learning to progress.

In School A where the learners were from the same background, behavioural codes were shared by all. This could account for fewer disruptions from such misdemeanours than in School C where disruptions from such sources were more observable.
5.3. Categories for quantification of interaction

Having categorised the classroom organisation and made possible generalisations from the observation on COLT I shall now discuss the headings to be used for analysis of interaction for quantification of factors helpful for language learning.

5.3.1. Focus of quantification

In order to make the analysis pertinent for the purpose of testing the hypotheses, it had to focus on the following aspects of the language use. It had to:

- quantify the use of English (L2) within each setting;
- quantify the use of Bengali (L1) within each setting;
- quantify the number of utterances learners made during a class;
- differentiate the number of utterances made towards the teacher from utterances made towards a peer;
- measure the length of utterances used by each learner during a class;
- identify the number of low frequency words within the interaction during a class.

To analyse the interaction systematically in order to isolate these factors, I had to determine the speech units under which to analyse and quantify the language of the interaction systematically.

5.3.2. The Speech Units for quantification

The following Speech Units were used for the quantification of language used during the process of development for classroom interaction to generate data pertinent for testing Hypotheses 1, 3, 4 and 6.

Turns: The largest unit for quantification of learner speech was Turns. This was the total amount of speech in terms of number of words, that any one speaker (or group of speakers in unison) uttered at one time,
before someone else took over the 'floor', or before a long silence, indicating either the end of conversation or a breakdown in communication. Turns could be of various lengths depending on the number and length of the communicative units which composed them.

**Communicative Units:** Loban (1963) defines a Communicative unit or C-Unit as a group of words which cannot be further divided without loss of meaning. Duff (1986) uses this speech unit in a later research, and defines it as a word, phrase or sentence that in some way contributes pragmatic or semantic meaning to a conversation. Following them, I have taken the communicative unit to be a word, phrase, or a sentence that cannot be further divided without loss of meaning. It conveys one comprehensible message and adds semantic meaning to a conversation.

Each turn was divided into one or more component Communicative Units. Since a communicative unit conveys one comprehensible message, a turn that consisted of more than one c-unit could be conveying more than one simple message which would be interrelated through their meaning or the syntax.

The use of longer turns with more c-units may help language development in two ways. Such extended utterances can require more extensive planning to relate them logically and linguistically in order to make one's meaning clear in discussions. The expression of abstract ideas on different academic subjects and topics can require the use of different lengths of turns composed of interrelated c-units.

As the pupils learn to compose turns of a variety of length, depending on the needs of expression for the particular subject, they learn to express a total meaning through a combination of the meaning of the language units and through the syntax, using more 'decontextualised' expression rather than use the physical context of speech for its meaning, as in more 'context-embedded' language. In this process they develop the use of more 'decontextualised' second language to talk of 'displaced' contexts, of abstract and complex ideas in different academic subjects.
The use of a greater number of c-units can help language development by necessitating the use of more vocabulary, recycled from what the learner already knows ('i' level (Ch 2), and also from what s/he is receiving as input from the teacher and peers ('i+1') level, (Ch 2) during the interaction. The acquisition of vocabulary in the new language forms a weak point in the learning for second language learners (Ben-Zeev 1984), through which they can identify and categorise entities within their experiences. If the input in the classroom can provide learners with more accurate and low-frequency vocabulary, and the following work can induce them to use these words to express their meaning precisely for reaching the goal of the task (which is important for them), it may lead them to acquire the requisite vocabulary for expression of the abstractions of academic learning.

To be able to compare lengths of c-units across settings, both turns and c-units were measured in terms of words, the smallest unit within the speech.

Topics: The communicative units were divided into two categories, Academic Talk and Non-academic Talk, a binary division on the basis of the topic of each unit depending on whether it was for academic discussion or for non-academic (e.g. interpersonal) discussion, in order to help assess Hypothesis 4.

The testing of the hypotheses required comparison to be made between the language used for academic discussion separately from language used for non-academic discussion. The total quantity of language used on each the topic, academic and non-academic would be compared across settings, and related separately to the type of organisation of teaching used in the classroom, and to the development of proficiency in the more 'decontextualised' and more 'context-embedded' type of language use.

Academic Talk: Under this head was included all language use for performing, elaborating or defining any aspect of the academic work of the classroom or work related to it. Discussion on academic topics for any purpose, whether it was for negotiating the meaning of academic
content, the language, or the format for producing academic work was included under this category.

Non-academic Talk: Since the division within topics was binary, all interaction other than for academic purpose, eg. directives, discussion on personal topics or for any other purpose of language function enumerated by Halliday (1973), eg., regulatory and interpersonal, were included under the category of Non-academic Talk.

Words: The smallest speech unit to be quantified was the words used in the interaction. All other units enumerated so far were quantified in terms of words used in each of those units to give the total number of words that each group of learners produced during each class. Words were counted on the following basis in order to maintain systematicity:

-Parts of words that had not been wholly deciphered were counted as one word;

-When learners spelt words for each other, the total spelling was counted as one word;

-Repetition of words and phrases, false starts, back-channelling were included in the count;

-Onomatopoeic words and exclamations were counted as words;

-Articulations while writing and otherwise were included in the count;

-Numbers of up to two digits were counted as one word (e.g. twenty-two= one word, one hundred and twenty-two= four words);

-Contractions and elisions were counted as one word (e.g. innit= one word; d'you= one word)

-Components of names have been counted as two words (Miss Quintana= two words)

-Exact repetitions have been counted within the same C-Unit (e.g. Give it to me, give it to me= one
By manipulating more and more words in different contexts pupils would learn to use them more and more in the 'decontextualised' manner, on the basis of the internal meaning of words, using them to give shape and meaning to contexts during their discussions, rather than depend on the context to give utterances their meaning. In this way they would progress towards language that was less context-embedded.

According to Donaldson (1978), one can acquire the decontextualisation ability through manipulating words in various contexts to express different types of meaning. Discussion of abstract academic ideas necessitated by classroom work can help the acquisition of the vocabulary and the pattern of the syntax. This can help to develop language that is increasingly explicit, context-free, logical and expository, and 'push' Bangladeshis towards better expression of academic content.

I shall now explain how these speech units were used for quantification.

5.3.3. Procedure for quantification

The procedure for the quantification of the interaction in the classroom necessitated identifying and counting the number of each type of unit used by each group recorded during a class.

The count began with the largest unit, the turn. Each time a new speaker made an identifiable utterance, it was a turn. The total number of turns used by each group of learners during each class was counted.

Turns were divided into the interaction with peers and with teachers. When learners talked with teachers, the teacher controls the topic. The imbalance of power between participants makes it unidirectional rather than interactional. Interaction with peers is between equals, allowing each partner to be in control of the topic, with greater scope for each to use the language in various functions in the Hallidayan categories (1973). Distributing language use between interaction with peers and dialogue with teacher would show how far each setting allowed the learners to interact within a certain teaching organisation, corroborating evidence of COLT. While a high level of peer
interaction in one class in one subject could indicate a lack of control by the teacher, a consistent pattern of variation within an organisation between settings could mean that factors within the setting must influence the interaction in a way to cause this difference.

The turns were divided into the communicative units that made up each turn. The c-units were counted to find their total number used by each group during a class. The number of c-units divided by the number of turns used by each group showed the length of an average turn in terms of c-units used by the group. Since each communicative unit conveyed a comprehensible message, the more the number of c-units in each turn, the more complex could be the message being conveyed during that class within that subject.

If one could identify a consistent variation between settings in the use of similar speech units, it could mean that there was some factor operating differently in the two settings to give rise to these differences in their response even as the learners were progressing through a very similar set of behavioural stimulus. While the course and the work on it was similar in both settings, providing a similar pressure or stimulus, systematic and discernible differences could indicate that the difference was being caused by factors within the contrastive settings.

During their interaction the learners used L1 frequently in their conversation. As the grammar pattern and number of words necessary for representing similar concepts vary between Bengali and English, it was felt that having the interaction in one language rather than two would make it easier to compare between the language use across settings. So the use of Bengali, the L1 was translated into English, with the indication that it was spoken in L1. The Bengali used by the pupils consisted of a particular dialect which had to be translated with the help of a young speaker of the variety who not only spoke and understood the dialect but also the slang used by the age group.

The c-units within each turn were divided into two categories, according to their topic: Academic Talk and Non-academic Talk, and were subdivided on the basis of the language in which they were
spoken, English or Bengali. This helped to quantify the use they made
of each language within the classroom for each topic. It also showed
the learners' preference for either language for talking on the academic
and non-academic topic within each subject.

The process of quantification can be represented as:
Words-->C-units-->((L1+L2)-->(Academic+Non-academic)-->Turns
-->(T-L)+(L-L)--->Total Interaction

If the differences within settings can be shown to relate
consistently to an increase or decrease in the quantity of language
produced, and to the length of utterances produced within that
language use, it could be indication for pedagogy about the pattern the
future classroom population should follow. The use of one type of
setting rather than another could give rise to different opportunities
and type of language use, leading to better language learning for
academic achievement.

To sum up, the basis for the analysis of the corpus of the
learner's utterances during their interaction was as follows:
-the total number of turns taken by the learner of
each group were counted;
-the turns were divided on the basis of interlocutor
whether they were directed towards the teacher
(Teacher- Learner), or to a peer (Learner- Learner);
-the turns were divided into Communicative Units;
-the Communicative Units were divided on the basis of
their topic.
If they were used for discussion related to classroom
academic performance, they were categorised as
Academic Talk.
If they were used to convey messages that had non-
academic purpose (eg. interpersonal use of language),
they were categorised as Non-Academic Talk.
-the communicative units were divided on the basis of
the language used for the interaction, English or
Bengali;
- the number of words in the total turns were counted to give the total quantity of language used by the learner of each group;
- the words used by the learners were screened for their frequency.

For each group recorded during the classes the total interaction was analysed and assigned under each heading specified above. The quantities under each heading were added up to give the total speech produced by all the groups within the class under that heading during that class. This would enable comparison between settings in the language use in subjects and organisations.

5.3.4. Some problems of quantification

During the process of quantification certain problems within the data caused difficulties in organising the language of the interaction systematically. From the difference in the number of pupils in each setting, the availability of recorders and from other problems mentioned before, recording of interaction across settings and classes was uneven, so that while in some classes only one group may have been recorded, in other classes there could be four.

To equalise the basis of comparison and solve the problem of unevenness I decided to take the arithmetical mean of the total language production under each heading by all the groups in each classroom. To arrive at the arithmetical mean, the language produced by all the groups within a class under each heading was totalled and divided by the number of groups that had contributed to produce the language. This would give the average speech units under each heading.

The number of speech units under each heading derived in this way represented the average language production in terms of that speech unit, for all the groups in that class. To illustrate with an example, in Task 3 of Geography in School A, four groups were recorded. The total number of turns produced by each of the four groups was: 187, 156, 285 and 245 respectively, which add up to a total of 873. To get the arithmetical mean of the number of turns produced
by this group, the total number of turns, 873, was divided by four, the number of participating groups. The result, 218 approximately, was the average number of turns produced by the groups on that task. In this manner the number of speech units under each heading were averaged. To get a summary profile of language production for a subject within a setting, the averages for each class under each heading were totalled and divided by the number of classes observed in that subject in that setting.

The learners' manner of interaction gave rise to problems in deciphering their interaction for making the transcripts. There were interruptions and much simultaneous talk, so the interaction often overlapped. The groups talked quite loudly, so that one group's conversation intruded upon and masked the interaction of others, making it hard to distinguish words. Some of the utterances that were distinguished were not complete. Since the interaction continued, it was presumed that the utterances captured incompletely, must have conveyed meanings during the interaction. So these utterances have also been marked as c-units.

For the calculation of the total number of words used by learners during the interaction, the utterances in L1 were counted in the translation, not in the original. This would give a consistency in the comparison of language use across organisations in various subjects.

In the next chapter I shall consider the quantity of language use in relation to the pattern of organisation used in each classroom. The frequency of use of these speech units within interaction will be related to linguistic proficiency of the learners in each setting to see if the greater use of any factor can be seen to relate to better performance on the linguistic tests. Illuminative evaluation can help to relate the difference in language use to factors within each setting that may have helped to give rise to it.

5.4. Summary

In this chapter I have described the classes observed and identified the organisation used for teaching in each class as teacher-
fronted input or task-based, organised for performance in groups or individually.

The homogeneous setting showed a greater use of teacher-fronted input classes, of divergent tasks and of groupwork while the mixed setting used more convergent task and individual work. The coding on the COLT system showed the skills used most in each class, and the extent of time that each type of organisation allowed learners to control topics in the particular classroom, which indicates a greater freedom to interact. It showed that teacher-fronted classes in any setting did not allow Speaking. While the task-based classes in homogeneous setting allowed Speaking, many of such classes in the mixed setting did not. Learners in the homogeneous group were allowed some time for topic initiation in all task-based classes but the learners in the mixed group were not allowed to initiate topics in all such classes. The COLT showed differences within the use of Speaking between settings, the skill with which both groups were most familiar and would give rise to the operation of the factors for language learning.

I have described the speech units used for quantifying the interaction in the classroom, the largest unit being turns and the smallest being words. I have also explained the procedure for using the units in order to quantify the language use systematically. In the next chapter I shall compare the results of the quantification and try to interpret the results through illuminative evaluation.
Chapter 6

Classroom Interaction

In the last chapter I surveyed the patterns of organisation used for teaching in the two settings. The differences between them were striking enough to indicate that the arrangement may not have been arbitrary on the part of the teachers of the three subjects but may have been influenced by factors inherent within the settings, namely, the intergroup factors which compelled the teachers to organise the pedagogy differently. In this chapter I shall see if the difference in organisation gave rise to any differences in the interaction which may lead to differences in the operation of linguistic factors within the input and output.

The units adopted for analysing the language use to enable comparison between settings, have been described in the last chapter. I shall now compare the results of the quantification of the learners' language use from the application of these units (Appendix 1 to Chapter 6). This will show what variation occurred between the production of linguistic factors in the language use of the two settings.

This chapter is divided into two parts. The first part looks at the general aspects of language used in the classrooms while the second part looks at particular aspects of this language use.

In the first part, the interaction on the three subjects is analysed longitudinally, in relation to the organisation used for teaching in individual classrooms. The quantity of the language use is given in terms of average quantity of learner talk generated in each classroom, under each heading per class (explained in Ch 5).

The second part is divided into three sections. Section 1 looks at the use of L1 in the classrooms across the settings, to see the variation of its use across subjects in each setting. The use of L1 and L2 together constitutes the total language used in a classroom, so the use of L1 also indicates the use of L2.

Section 2 surveys the quantity of peer interaction in relation to the classroom organisation in each setting.
Section 3 compares looks at the use of low-frequency words across settings in the three subjects to determine any variation between settings.

6.1. Analysis of interaction

The quantity of language produced longitudinally in each setting will now be considered analytically, in relation to the way teaching was organised in each subject. This will help to assess Hypothesis 1. The language produced has been quantified and averaged under the headings set forth in Chapter 5, calculated in the manner explained. Since learners in both settings were undergoing similar pressures of academic learning exerted by the GCSE syllabus, it is possible that there would be similarities between their language production. But differences could also exist between the language use due to the differences between the proficiency of the interlocutors, and between the teaching organisations used in each setting. I shall compare the language production between the groups in different subjects, drawing out the similarities and differences between settings. The following key serves for all tables in this chapter.

Key:

Date=Date; Sc= School; A= Homogeneous setting; C= Mixed Setting;
TP Org= The type of classroom organisation/ task used in the particular class (Ch 2),
T-I= Teacher Input D= Divergent C= Convergent
G= Group I= Individual (Ch 2)
AV WD= Average number of words generated per class
AV TN = Average number of turns generated per class
AV C-U= Average number of communicative units generated per class
AV WD/C-U= Average number of words per communicative unit generated per class
AV WD/TN = Average number of words per turn generated per class
AV WD/AcTk = Average number of words on academic talk generated per class.
% WD/AcTk = Words on academic talk as percentage of total words per class.
Wd L1=Words in L1;
%=Percentage
Tot CU=Total Communicative Units
CU/L1=Communicative Units in Bengali
AcTk= Academic Talk NAcTk=Non-academic Talk
6.1.1. Interaction in English

Table showing the quantity of the language produced in English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A:</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>% WD/</th>
<th>% WD/</th>
<th>% WD/</th>
<th>% WD/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>WD/</td>
<td>AV WD/</td>
<td>WD/</td>
<td>WD/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr, 90</td>
<td>Org</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>C-U</td>
<td>C-U</td>
<td>AcTk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/G</td>
<td></td>
<td>754</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun, 90</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct, 90</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School C:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>% WD/</th>
<th>% WD/</th>
<th>% WD/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct, 90</td>
<td>D/I</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan, 91</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr, 91</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classes in English in both settings were organised around tasks. The differences between the tasks across settings were, all tasks in School A were oriented towards output in discussion while in School C the tasks required a written output. Also, while all tasks in School A were to be performed in groups, tasks in School C were to be performed individually. Not all tasks gave rise to a similar use of language. In both groups, performance on the divergent task gave rise to the use of the longest turns.

The length of the teacher input and feedback session reduced the potential time for learner output, as seen on class 2 and 3 in School C.

The table above shows certain differences and similarities between the performance of the two settings in English. The average language use is higher in School A. The two groups differ in the average number of turns produced per class. The number of turns in School C is uniformly higher than in School A, but both settings give rise to the use of similar number of words on average. As a result, the length of turns in School A is uniformly longer than in School C, which may be the effect of the mode, oral or written, in which the goal required to be generated.

The percentage of turns used for academic discussion is consistently higher in School A which used group tasks than in School
C which used individual tasks. This is surprising since, although the
time given for topic control in two tasks in School C was similar to
School A (Appendix 1, Ch 5), teacher control on interaction would be
higher during individual tasks, inducing more attention and talk for
academic performance. The high percentage of academic talk in School A
may be due to shutting off of the recorders by the learners during
interpersonal conversation, as can be seen by the abruptness of some of
the conversation.

School A: English: 3/1

114L: What do you understand by the word...(blank) (abruptly)
115L: We're going to discuss the apartheid laws and how it hit the
ordinary people.

In the following there was no preparatory discussion at all but started
directly with:

School A: English: 1/3

001: Hello, are you the restaurant owner?

And in School A: English: 2/2

001: The missing word in the poem is 'apple'

**Turns in School A are consistently longer** than in School C. In
School A, the homogeneous setting, on average the turns are 1 to 2.5
words longer than a communicative unit. In School C, the mixed setting
they are .4 to .9 words or less than a word longer. This shows that in
the mixed setting the meaning that learners were expressing were
shorter, often consisting of one communicative unit, requiring less
interconnection. In School A the learners were using turns that
consisted of more interconnected ideas, requiring the use of more than
one communicative unit.

In both groups, the language production is highest during the
third class. But since the language use does not increase
progressively, it does not seem to be the effect of time. The higher
language use may be due to the nature of the topic. In both groups
the learners had to, or tended to identify personally with the topic of
the third task (Ch 5), where the highest level of language production
took place. The sense of personal identification is present under the
surface in the discussion but comes out more explicitly in the following utterances:

**School A: 3/3**(while one tries to identify, another disagrees):

055: The **person** who who says, you know, showing how their life is like, you know.
056: No, we dont know, we're separate people, man, separate people.

**School C: 3/1:**(identification is explicit):

094: We followed people, how they talk, we followed people in England, how they talk you know, we went to school and...

In English, the learners in the homogeneous setting show a greater use of language in terms of average words. They used longer turns than the mixed group, which should help the development of greater proficiency in 'decontextualised' language. A greater percentage of the turns in School A are used for academic discussion than in School C, although this may be due to the manipulation of the recorders.

6.1.2. Interaction in Science

In both schools Science was taught in single or double periods. In School A the first of the double periods was generally taken up by teacher-input while the second was used for a practical task based on the input, followed by feedback. In School C the input was generally more brief, but repeated during the class. Learners in the mixed group could start interacting and working on the task during the first period. Since input sessions did not allow Speaking (Ch 5), its length of teacher-input limited the time available for interaction and could affect the total language produced by learners.
Table showing average interaction in Science in the two settings (Key at the beginning of the chapter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Org</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>WD/</th>
<th>WD/</th>
<th>WD/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>WD/</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>WD/</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>Org</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>C-U</td>
<td>AcTk</td>
<td>AcTk</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar,90</td>
<td>T-I</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>46 Battery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun,90</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>54 Electro.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan,90</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>64 Electro.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct,90</td>
<td>T-I</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>76 Oxidation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>337</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/Metabolism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School C:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Org</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>WD/</th>
<th>WD/</th>
<th>WD/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep,90</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>67 Flammability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov,90</td>
<td>T-I</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>95 Circuits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan,91</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>52 Germination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar,91</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>42 Use of Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>572</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison between settings show that in science teachers in both groups organised classes as teacher-fronted input as well as around tasks. But no divergent task was used in any setting, which may be the effect of the subject where propositions learnt at this level are axiomatically true.

Comparison of the language production in the two settings shows that the total language use was higher in School C than School A. The number of turns used in School A was consistently lower, relating to a greater use of teacher-fronted input classes and longer sessions of teacher-input in the task-based classes in the homogeneous groups than in the mixed group (Ch 5), that reduced the potentiality for interaction.

The turns in the teacher-fronted input classes in both settings were shorter than on task-based classes, closely following the length of c-units. This shows that there was less elaboration of speech in teacher-learner discussion that took place during teacher-fronted input classes, than learner-learner discussion that took place during task-based classes. So teacher-fronted classes could have less potential for extensive language learning, although its use could familiarise learners with more specialised words and structures for development of 'decontextualised' language.
Language use was higher in task-based classes, with longer turns and the communicative units. Among tasks-based classes, more language was used in group tasks, involving the use of longer tracts of speech. The length of turns and c-units were similar across settings, but School C which had more task-based classes, used longer turns more consistently than School A.

The percentage of language use for academic talk was higher in School C than A. In both settings the distribution of turns on academic use was higher in the teacher-fronted classes than in the task-based classes, showing that a greater pressure for academic discussion existed during such classes. So, in both settings, science taught through teacher-fronted input could help produce a greater use of language for academic purpose. This could use subject-specific words in appropriate structures, that could lead to the development of 'decontextualised' language.

In science there were more similarities than differences between the settings. In both settings the use of language was consistently lower on the teacher-fronted input than on task-based classes, but a higher proportion of the language use in teacher-fronted classes was for academic talk. Turns were of size similar to communicative units in both settings. This shows that in both settings, performance on science tasks did not involve extended utterances, and rarely consisted of more than one c-unit in either setting.
6.1.3. Interaction in Geography

Table showing average interaction on Geography classes in School A: (Key at the beginning of the chapter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Org/Word</th>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Ave/Wor/d</th>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Ave/Wor/d</th>
<th>C-U</th>
<th>Ave/Wor/d</th>
<th>%Word/</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar, 90</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discharge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar, 90</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discharge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 90</td>
<td>D/G</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whitechpl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct, 90</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>655</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School C:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Org/Word</th>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Ave/Wor/d</th>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Ave/Wor/d</th>
<th>C-U</th>
<th>Ave/Wor/d</th>
<th>%Word/</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep, 90</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov, 90</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar, 91</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In geography both settings organised the teaching around tasks. But while School A generally used group tasks, School C used individual work. The total language used in School A, the homogeneous group was higher than School C, in the mixed group.

Turns in School A were consistently longer than communicative units by .4 to .8 words, while in the mixed group the turns and communicative units were of almost the same length. Since a communicative unit contains one comprehensible message, this shows that meaning in interaction in the mixed group was expressed as briefly as possible, relating to evidence from COLT that these learners were not allowed control of topic at any time in geography (Ch 5). However, a high percentage of the interaction that did occur in the mixed setting was for academic talk. Speaking was not allowed during these tasks organised to be performed individually. So the learners' need for help in task performance was briefly expressed and answered, focusing primarily on academic purpose:

School C: Geography: 1/2

009: What page?
010: Page 39.
011: What's the space for...?
012: Let's just write the percentages.
In the homogeneous group, the interaction during the task performed individually had a higher percentage of turns on academic discussion. So, individual tasks seemed to give rise to a higher distribution of turns on academic discussion than did groupwork.

The preponderance of academic talk in School A's group tasks shows that all groups were engrossed in the work of organising the data and preparing the report.

In the homogeneous setting the divergent task gave rise to the highest use of words, but turns were shorter than on convergent group task recorded at a similar stage of performance. The percentage of language use for academic talk was lowest in the divergent task. While most groups worked on the project, some learners discussed personal matters, which may have been due to the topic, set in their own area.

A long session of input can cut down on the interaction potential for the learners, as in task 4, School A. Additionally, in School A where the tasks extended over a few weeks, there appears to be some relation between the stage of the task and the language output. At the first stage while learners negotiated the understanding of the three aspects of a task (Ch 2) word production was higher and the turns longer. While the goal was being produced the word production fell and the turns became shorter. In School C, where the tasks were shorter, the language production was generally lower, relating to reduced time for topic control.

In School A the c-units in geography were shorter than in English, while in School C they were of similar length on both subjects. This could be because the English tasks in School A were discussion tasks, while the goal for all other tasks required to be in writing. C-units in science were the shortest in both groups.

6.1.4. Conclusions of interaction analysis

I shall draw together the conclusions of the comparison between the language use on the three subjects in the two settings for the assessment of Hypotheses 1, 3, 4 and 6.
Table showing the averages of the language produced in the two settings in the three subjects: (Key at the beginning of chapter) (Higher figures are shown in bold)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Ave D</th>
<th>Ave C</th>
<th>Wd/ TN</th>
<th>TN C-U</th>
<th>C-U Actk</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>T-I</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Ave</td>
<td>Ave</td>
<td>Ave</td>
<td>Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>9.7-6.1</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>5.5-4</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>4.2-2.5</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>4.6-2.1</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>5.6-3.3</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.9-2.3</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A 582/</td>
<td>A 112/</td>
<td>A 130/</td>
<td>A 367/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The summary table of language use above shows that the average language used in term of words was higher in two subjects out of three in School A, English and Geography. So, on average, School A showed a greater use of total language.

The average number of turns as well as c-units used in School A was lower in two subjects out of three in School A, English and science. So, on average, the number of turns and c-units used in School C was higher on average.

Turns were longer in School A in two subjects out of three, English and geography. So, on average, turns used in School A were longer than those used in School C, in term of words.

The average percentage of words used for academic talk in School A was lower than School C in two subjects out of three, science and geography. So on average, the percentage of words used for academic talk was higher in School C, relating to higher teacher control of the topic. The average language use in School A was higher, used in longer turns and c-units. But the percentage of language used for academic talk was higher in School C.

Certain specific tendencies within the settings show up within this analysis of language use, that may be explained 'illuminatively'. The differences in the language use in the two settings may have resulted from the difference between the organisation of teaching in the two settings. School A used more teacher-fronted input, in science, which
allows less language production. Within the other classes, both settings used a similar number of task-based classes. So the difference in favour of School A must be from the way the tasks were to be performed. More groupwork and divergent tasks were used in School A, while more individual work in School C. This may have helped to produce the longer tracts of speech and the greater quantity of language in School A.

In English the goal for tasks in the homogeneous group was discussion only, while in mixed group the goal had to be produced in writing, although discussion was allowed in two classes out of three.

Tasks whose goal was verbal showed the use of longer language structures than tasks where the verbal language use was incidental to a written or practical output. Turns and communicative units were longest of all in English in School A, in the fully discussion tasks. Explicit expression of ideas that cannot be demonstrated, in a 'decontextualised' situation, appear to require the use of longer structures. In tasks devised around a task-sheet, or the practical performance of some experiment (eg, in science), the language can refer to the 'context' of the demonstrable or to the information on the task-sheet through more 'context-embedded' use of language that does not need to be as explicit.

English seemed to require the most 'decontextualised' expression to ensure comprehension of ideas by interlocutors, among the three subjects. The nature of English seems to make it possible to set up discussion tasks while both geography and English allowed the use of divergent tasks, necessitating the use of longer turns and c-units.

In Science the classroom organisation included a larger number of teacher-fronted classes in the homogeneous than the mixed group, while in the task-based classes the length of the teacher input was longer in the homogeneous group (Ch 5), reducing the time available and potentiality of interaction. This seems to be the reason for a lower language use in School A in science. In the mixed setting the length of the input was shorter, which indicates that the mixed linguistic and cultural background of the
groups may have made it difficult for learners to attend to longer tracts of input attentively.

Utterances were longer and the number of words used was more numerous in English than in Science in both settings. Judging from this similarity, it could mean that learners required less words to express their meaning clearly on a demonstrable subject like Science than on English.

In Geography the total language use in homogeneous group was higher than in the mixed group. Turns were longer on average than communicative units in the homogeneous setting, while in the mixed setting turns were almost the same length as the c-units, showing that meaning in the mixed group was more briefly expressed. The great variation in language use across geography in the two settings relates to higher or lower control of the topic by learners within a similar type of organisation.

The performance of the learners in the mixed setting shows that they were able to produce longer turns (eg., in English), but did not often choose to do so. While the need to perform individually on tasks may have imposed some restraint on their interaction, it is possible that the presence of the NSs exerted a restraining influence so that they were reluctant to make a greater effort. Greater understanding between language groups could have allowed more hypothesis testing through language use without the fear of appearing stupid.

Purely discussion tasks were never used in the mixed setting. The reason may be that, discussion tasks generally require to be set up as groupwork in order to give all learners a chance to talk. Teachers in School C showed very little use of groupwork. The restraint on speaking and on the use of groupwork in School C may have helped to produce the greater percentage of language use on academic talk in this setting.

Certain tendencies surface within the language use which appears to relate to the use of particular teaching organisation.
When tasks were performed over a few classes, the stage of the performance appears to influence the word production. Towards the beginning of a task the learners needed to negotiate to comprehend the 'givens' of the task and the means of reaching the 'goal', giving rise to more discussion involving longer utterances than when they had comprehended the task and learners were attempting to produce the goal in writing. The mode of performance also appeared to affect the language production. A task aimed towards a written goal seemed to give rise to less language use than tasks aimed at discussion only.

The topic was a predictor of the quantity of interaction, particularly on English. A topic that involved the learners personally gave rise to more discussion than topics that involved them only academically.

Task-based classes gave rise to more interaction than teacher-fronted classes. Divergent tasks produced the highest amount and percentage of interaction on any subject where they were used. In Science divergent tasks were not used at all, while on the other subjects they were less commonly used than convergent tasks.

Group tasks, more commonly used in the homogeneous setting, were better stimulators of interaction than individual tasks. On individual tasks, more commonly used in the mixed group, the turns were shorter, and the amount of interaction could vary depending on the extent of topic control allowed to the learners. Teacher-fronted classes gave rise to the least amount of interaction, but much of the interaction during teacher-fronted classes was for academic purpose, necessitating the use and understanding of words and structures for 'decontextualised' language use.

6.2. Analysis of interaction: Particular aspects

Having looked at the general difference in language production between settings, I shall now look at the differences within particular aspects of language use, eg, the distribution of English and Bengali within the interaction, and the amount of interaction with peers as compared to interaction with teachers.
6.2.1. Distribution of peer interaction in the classroom

According to the theories of language learning reviewed in Ch 1, a greater scope for using the second language in output for hypotheses-testing, and of critical feedback to that use, were predicted to help attain greater proficiency in the target language. The socio-psychological theories indicate that the more the learners engaged in interaction with peers of target language group on a basis of equality, better would be the intergroup relationship which could help SLA. So, classroom organisations that allowed more peer interaction could encourage acquisition by making the use of second language necessary and available for hypothesis testing through input and output, while giving learners more equal status as partners in the learning process. The feeling of similar status could help lower inter-group barriers and arouse positive feelings for convergence while it could also help lower the affective filter against learning the second language.

As discussed before, teacher-fronted input classes allowed little time to practice the language and mainly allowed pupils to learn to answer teacher's questions. The speaking rights are one-sided and there is little opportunity for the learners to initiate conversation as equal partners, which could provide opportunity for learning other ways of using the language.

If the organisation of the classroom activities allowed and induces interaction between peers, more equal speaking rights could result. Variety within interlocutors can result in the need for and the use of, a greater variety within the types of language produced as well as within the quantity of this language (Cathcart 1986). So, when second language learners get scope to control the topic and initiate turns, they could learn a greater variety of language functions in Halliday's (1973) sense, than is possible through answering teachers' questions only. Learning a greater variety of language use can also be useful outside the classroom.

I shall now look at the distribution of learners' interaction with peers as compared to interaction with teachers across settings on different subjects. This also relates to topic control surveyed in Ch 5,
since learners could only interact with peers when they were allowed control of the topic.

6.2.1.1. Peer interaction in English

Table showing the distribution of language use between Interlocutors in English in relation to time for topic control by learners, given in minutes: (Key at the beginning of chapter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A: Type AV</th>
<th>School C: Type AV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 90</td>
<td>D/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct, 90</td>
<td>C/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan, 91</td>
<td>C/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the percentage that peer interaction forms of the total, divergent tasks seem to give rise to the highest amount of peer interaction within the shortest time for topic control (Ch 5), followed by convergent tasks performed in groups.

Since the homogeneous setting used divergent task, the learners there had chance to be involved in greater amount of interaction. Convergent tasks helped to produce the highest number of turns between peers in both settings, while divergent tasks gave rise to a higher percentage of peer interaction. While learners could ask for clarification from teachers on convergent tasks, on divergent tasks they appeared to function more independently.

Although the classroom organisation allowed the learners to produce similar number of turns in each setting on average (78 turns), the percentage of these turns for interaction between peers was much higher in the homogeneous than in the mixed group, reflecting the greater freedom to control topics across classes in this setting. In the mixed group the extent of interaction with the teachers was similar to the interaction with peers. This was influenced by long sessions of input and feedback on some tasks.
It showed a greater restraint on peer interaction in this setting, limiting the learners' choice of interlocutors and the possible variety within language use, mentioned by Cathcart (1986).

The percentage of average peers interaction was much higher in the homogeneous group than in the mixed group. In the mixed group the percentages of interaction with peers were similar to interaction with teachers.

Organisation of all tasks in the homogeneous setting to be performed in groups, while all tasks in the mixed setting were to be performed individually, seems to have contributed to the higher peer-interaction in the homogeneous setting.

6.2.1.2. Peer interaction in Science

Table showing the distribution of language use between Interlocutors in Science in relation to time for topic control by learners, given in minutes: (Key at the beginning of chapter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School A:</th>
<th>School C:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tp</td>
<td>AV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dat</td>
<td>Org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar, 90</td>
<td>T-I</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun, 90</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun, 90</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct, 90</td>
<td>T-I</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the time the learners were given the control of topic and language production, the highest interaction tended to be produced during convergent tasks performed in groups, although this did not always hold true.

In both schools teaching took place through teacher-fronted as well as task-based organisation. Although School A used more teacher-fronted classes than C, where turns were used more for interaction with teacher, it also used more group tasks which may have compensated for
the teacher-fronted classes to make the percentage of peer interaction higher than in School C.

The number of turns for peer interaction was lower in the teacher-fronted classes than on task-based classes, and higher in convergent tasks performed in groups than individually. Despite the use of a greater number of teacher-fronted input classes in Science, which reduced peer-interaction, the percentage that peer interaction formed of the total interaction was higher in School A. In general, peer interaction tended to be lower in Science.

6.2.1.3. Peer interaction in Geography

Table showing the distribution of language use between Interlocutors in Geography in relation to time for topic control by learners, given in minutes: (Key at the beginning of chapter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A:</th>
<th>School C:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tp AV</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tp AV</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dat Org TN</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dat Org TN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-L L-L Time</td>
<td>T-L L-L Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar, 90 C/G 154</td>
<td>Sept, 90 C/I 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 133</td>
<td>18 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14% 86% 27</td>
<td>75% 25% 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar, 90 C/G 107</td>
<td>Nov, 90 C/I 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 95</td>
<td>06 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% 89% 30</td>
<td>13% 87% 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun, 90 D/G 218</td>
<td>Mar, 91 C/I 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 179</td>
<td>29 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18% 82% 25</td>
<td>43% 57% 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct, 90 C/I 84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27% 73% 15</td>
<td>3% 97% 03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117 or 83%</td>
<td>29 or 56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the time given to the learners to be in control of the topic in geography, the divergent task produced the highest amount of language within the shortest time, followed by convergent tasks performed in groups.

In Geography the average peer interaction in terms of number of turns was higher in School A than School C. While the average number in School A was 117, in School C it was 45. It was also higher in terms of percentage: 83% in the homogeneous setting against 56% in the mixed setting.
In School C the total amount of interaction in geography was lower than on any other subject in either setting. Compared to other subjects within the same school, the low interaction in this subject within the same group of learners indicates that there may have been some effect of the high teacher control of the topic (Ch 5).

In geography, divergent tasks gave rise to a higher number of turns for peer interaction than convergent tasks, although the percentage it forms of the total is lower. Convergent tasks performed in groups gave rise to a higher number of peer-interaction turns. They allowed learners to use linguistic resources in either language to interact and help each other to perform, more than the individual tasks. Teacher-fronted input classes allowed the least peer interaction. Tasks performed in groups seem to have the greatest potential for allowing factors of language learning to operate.

On tasks where interaction was permitted, the extent of this interaction could be reduced by the length of T-input, and any feedback session. Interaction on individual tasks could depend on the attitude of individual teachers, who could allow learners more or less control of the topic and more or less opportunity to interact. The teachers' decision could depend on factors within the classrooms which related to manageability of students of various language groups within a setting.

6.2.1.4. Conclusions of analysis of peer interaction

A comparison across the settings shows that the percentage of peer interaction was consistently higher in School A than in School C. The higher percentage and number of turns generated between peers may have been from the greater number of group tasks used in School A, and relates to greater length of time for topic control by learners, indicates a greater degree of autonomy for learners to interact in the homogeneous classroom.

Peer-interaction was not allowed during any teacher-input session, giving rise to the lowest amount of peer interaction. But it was encouraged in most settings during the performance of tasks,
particularly those performed in groups. In all classes the opportunity for peer interaction could be reduced by the length of the teacher-input session, and the length of any feedback session, since only the teacher could control the topic during these sessions. Apart from this the classroom observation has shown in the last chapter that it can be reduced by the restrictions imposed on topic control by learners.

In both schools, divergent tasks produced a higher percentage of peer interaction than convergent tasks, particularly when performed in groups. All group tasks had the opportunity for interaction built into them and gave rise to more peer talk than individual tasks which allowed interaction. Giving learners the power to interact could be influenced by factors within the classroom, eg, diversity of group boundaries and norms operating differently within each learning milieu, the setting.

6.2.2. Distribution of the two languages in classroom interaction

To test the predictions of the hypotheses 3 and 4, it was necessary to determine the distribution of languages within the classroom interaction. The greater use of L1 for academic discussion was predicted to lead to more uniform learning of content and of English by all learners within a setting, while a greater use of English as output was predicted to help the learners in the mixed setting (through the constraints within the setting) to use it more and learn it to higher levels of accuracy.

With the focus on the predictions of these two hypotheses I shall now compare the learners' use of the two languages in the classrooms across settings to determine any variation between the settings. As most teachers were NSs of English, Bengali was used between Bangladeshi learners only.

Within each classroom the use of the two languages was complementary, so a greater use of L1 indicated a lesser use of L2, and vice versa. The extent of the use of L2, ie, English can be derived from this.
6.2.2.1. Use of L1 during English classes

Table showing the average use of L1 during English classes in the two settings (Key given at the beginning of chapter)(Higher figures are shown in bold)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tp</th>
<th>Ave</th>
<th>Wd</th>
<th>Wd/ % AcTk</th>
<th>Total CU in L1</th>
<th>Ave</th>
<th>Wd</th>
<th>Wd/ % AcTk</th>
<th>Total CU in L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scl</td>
<td>Orgn</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>AcTk</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AcTk</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>D/G</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>754</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D/I</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>740</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the general use of L1 between settings in English, the average use was higher in School C than in School A. On average it was 32 words in School A, while it was 84 words in School C.

Comparing the average use of L1 for academic and non-academic talk between settings, School C used L1 more extensively for both purposes. In terms of c-units, the use of L1 for academic talk was higher in School C with 07 c-units on average against 02 c-units in School A. For non-academic talk, School C used L1 more, with 10 c-units on average against 03 c-units in School A.

So, in terms of average words as well as c-units used for the purposes of both academic and non-academic talk in English, School C showed a higher use of L1 than School A.

As the use of languages is complementary, it means that the proportion of use of L2 was higher in School A, for both academic and non-academic talk.

Specific Observations: Comparing the purposes of language use, in both schools the use of L1 was higher for non-academic than academic talk. The higher use of L1 for non-academic purpose in both settings showed a similarity of needs across settings to fall back on the L1 to express more personal matters, during English classes.
There was a great homogeneity across settings in the low use of L1 for academic discussion in English. In School A there was 4% use of L1 on average, while in School C the use was 10%. This showed a common preference for L2 for the performance of all types of tasks on English which may be an effect of the academic subject.

6.2.2.2. Use of L1 during Science classes

Table showing the average use of L1 during Science classes in the two settings (Key given at the beginning of the chapter) (Higher figures are given in bold)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tp</th>
<th>Ave</th>
<th>Wd</th>
<th>Wd/ Total</th>
<th>CU in L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>Orgn</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>T-I</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>T-I</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>T-I</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>337</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison on the basis of the total word count in L1 shows that while School A used 104 words in L1 on average, School C used 212 words, showing a higher use of total number of words in L1 on Science.

Comparing the distribution of use for academic and non-academic purpose, School A used 11 c-units in L1 for academic talk while School C used 21, showing a higher use of L1 for academic talk on science. For non-academic talk, while School A used 13 c-units on average, School C used 18 c-units. So, on both academic and non-academic talk in Science, School C showed the greater use of L1 than School A.

Since the use of L1 and L2 in the classroom is complementary, this means that School A showed the greater use of L2 on Science. Among the task-based classes, group tasks gave rise to the higher average number of words in L1 than individual tasks in both School A
and School C. Group tasks also showed the highest use of words in L1 for academic purpose in both settings for clarification and performance.

Specific Observations: Comparing between the use of L1 in English and science, both settings used it more for non-academic purpose in English. In science there is a variation in its use in the two settings. While the homogeneous group used more English for academic talk, the mixed group used more Bengali for academic talk.

The use of L1 shows some consistent relationship to the teaching organisation in Science. In both settings, the teacher-fronted input classes showed the lowest use of L1, indicating the highest use of English. So, the setting that used a greater number of teacher-fronted input in science, could compel learners to a greater use of subject-related English.

6.2.2.3. Use of L1 during Geography classes

Table showing the average use of L1 during Geography classes in the two settings (Key given at the beginning of chapter) (Higher figures are shown in bold)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scl</th>
<th>Orgn</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Wd</th>
<th>Wd/</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>CU in L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>AcTk</td>
<td></td>
<td>AcTk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>D/G</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>652</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scl</th>
<th>Orgn</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Wd</th>
<th>Wd/</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>CU in L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>AcTk</td>
<td></td>
<td>AcTk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the total number of words used in L1 in the two settings, School A used 177 words on average while School C used 25 words. So in geography the use of L1 in terms of average words was higher in School A than in School C.
Comparing the distribution of L1 for particular purposes, School A used 24 c-units in L1 while School C used 04 c-units in L1 on average. So School A had the higher use of L1 for academic talk. Comparing the use of L1 for non-academic talk, School A used 18 c-units in L1 on average while School C used 03 c-units. So, the distribution of use of L1 for particular purposes in geography was higher in School A than in School C for both academic and non-academic talk. As the use of L1 and L2 in the classroom was complementary, School C showed the higher use of L2 in Geography. Comparing between the use of L1 for academic and non-academic purposes within each school, in geography the use of L1 is higher for academic talk in both schools.

Specific Observations: The greater use of group performance in tasks, giving rise to interaction between learners who could use the L1, rather than with the teacher who would use the L2 only, helped to produce the higher use of L1 in School A in geography. The restraint imposed on peer-interaction in the mixed group restricted interaction as a whole, and particularly the use of L1 in that setting.

6.2.2.4. Conclusions on the use of L1

I shall now draw conclusions on the use of L1 across the settings.

Summary Table Showing Averages of the Use of L1 in C-units in the three academic subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English A</th>
<th>English C</th>
<th>Science A</th>
<th>Science C</th>
<th>Geography A</th>
<th>Geography C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total C-Units</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU in}: AcademicTalk</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 }-NonAcademicTalk</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing between settings in English and Science, the use of L1 was higher in School C, the mixed setting, but lower in Geography. Since the use of L1 was higher in School C on two out of three academic subjects, it can be said that the average use of L1 was higher in School C, the mixed setting, which means that the average use of L2 was higher in School A.
Comparing the average distribution of L1 for academic and non-academic use across settings, its general use was higher for academic than for non-academic purpose. Learners needed to use the L1 more for expression and clarification of academic topics for which they had not developed adequate language, than for non-academic discussion in 'context-embedded' English. The use of L1 is higher for academic talk in the more scientific subjects, showing that discussion of processes and concepts in these subjects were beyond their command of English, an inability they may have been reluctant to expose. They need to learn to express academic topic in English for better academic achievement. The need seemed to be higher in School C. This could come about through greater interaction with proficient teachers.

In English the use of L1 was higher for non-academic use while on Science and Geography it was used more for academic talk. The highest use of L1 was in science in both schools, where the learners could move away from teachers or other English speakers and control of the topic for much of the time (Ch 5).

Both settings showed the lowest use of L1 in English classes, particularly for academic discussion. Since this particular tendency prevailed in English only, it may be the effect of the academic subject.

Divergent tasks appeared to give rise to the use of more words, in both L1 and L2. In both settings the use of L1 was higher on convergent tasks performed in groups than individually. An exception was Class three in English in School C where a personal topic gave rise to a high number of words in L1 in task performed individually but with discussion. Teacher-fronted classes had the lowest use of L1, leading to a lower use of L1 in School A in science where there was a greater use of teacher-fronted classes.

The setting appeared to cause differences in language use since, within similar organisation in a subject, the learners in one setting showed preference for the use of one language more than the other. The homogeneous setting used more English while the mixed setting used more Bengali.
The findings of the quantitative analysis of interaction show that on average, the use of L1 was higher in School C, while a higher proportion of the classroom talk in School A was conducted in L2. The prediction of the hypotheses had been that the use of L1 would be higher within the homogeneous setting where all the learners were from the same language background, rather than in the mixed setting where the presence of speakers of other languages and NSs should have necessitated a greater use of English.

Since the results are so different from the predictions, one has to look for an 'illuminative' explanation. In the light of the Socio-psychological theories of language learning propounded by Giles (Ch 1), the presence of other groups in the same classroom may act as a threat to inter-group boundary. Instead of helping to lower the barriers to encourage linguistic convergence in Bangladeshis, the presence of other groups may have helped to strengthen these boundaries. The use of L1 may have been the learners' way of emphasising differences between groups. Simultaneously, the presence of NSs of English may have acted as a deterrent for beginners who may not have liked to appear incapable and ridiculous as shown below:

School C: English: 3/1:

156: You know, in the first stage I didn't want to look a fool.

In the homogeneous setting there was only the learners' own group, so there were no adverse group boundaries operating. Since the NS group was not present, the learners did not see the use of English as an indication of convergence towards the target group. While using English among themselves, these learners would be less concerned about using it wrongly, since it was not their first language.

I shall now consider another particular aspect of language use in the classroom, the variation in the use of lower-frequency words across settings.

6.2.3. Use of low-frequency words in interaction

In order to determine the difference in the language used in classroom interaction across the settings, one of the criterion used was
to look at the frequency of words used by learners, according to some index to determine their frequency. According to Hypothesis 6, the prediction about the use of low-frequency words was that the setting that used the higher number of these words would show greater development of accuracy in linguistic expression over the observation period and perform better on the linguistic posttest.

Accordingly, the less-frequently used words were selected from the classroom conversation during each class observed on each subject, and categorised according to their frequency. For determining the frequency of the selected words, the Thorndike English Dictionary (1948) was used as reference. The principle on which the use of words is cited in this dictionary is explained in Appendix 2, Chapter 6.

Most of the words used for interaction by these learners were of higher frequency, ranging from 50 uses per million words to 100 or more uses per million. Words of lower frequency have been selected from the interaction to determine their number used by the learners across settings.

The lower-frequency words for each class is given in Appendix 2 to Chapter 6, with their frequency of use. The reference used for determining the use of words, cites their frequency of use on a range from 1/2 to 49 uses per million words. Words which were not cited have been included within the low frequency counts and indicated in the list by a question mark (?) in the place of frequency.

The number of such words used in the interaction will now be compared to see how their use varies across settings in each subject.

6.2.3.1. Limitations of the reference used for Categorisation of words

Certain limitations of the reference became apparent while using it to determine the frequency of words used by bilinguals forty-three years after its publication. Words, particularly those relating to scientific advancement which were less in currency at the time of the
Compilation of this dictionary, are more in use now, eg. 'tape' as in 'tape recorder'.

Compound words eg., sulphur- dioxide, pie- graph, etc. are not cited. Various words used by the learners have come into currency after the publication of the dictionary, eg. 'apartheid', and are not cited. Other forms of words eg. 'racism', 'racists', 'reactive' are not cited in these forms, but their root words 'race' and 'react' are cited, which have been taken as the indicator of the frequency of use.

Subject-specific words that occur easily in a classroom do not have the same frequency of occurrence in general conversation eg. oxygen, cytoplasm, glucose etc.

In spite of the limitations, since the purpose of the categorisation was only to differentiate between the settings in the number of such words used by them rather than compare between the frequency of words used by them, any error made by using this reference would be similar across settings, so the dictionary could serve the purpose of this research adequately.

The use of the dictionary is also justified on the consideration that words that were of lower frequency at the time of compilation may be of higher frequency now for native speakers, but not for Bangladeshis who are just being exposed to these words in a new language: for these learners the use of vocabulary may be more similar to the frequency cited in the outdated dictionary than to a more recent publication.
6.2.3.2. Use of low-frequency words in English

Table showing the distribution of low-frequency words in English in the two settings (Key given at beginning of chapter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Type of Organisation</th>
<th>Academic Talk Number</th>
<th>NonAcademic Talk Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>D/G</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D/I</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: A38/10C A1/9C

The average use of low-frequency words was higher in the homogeneous setting. In English there was a higher distribution of low-frequency words for academic talk. If one breaks down the use of the words into the purpose, for academic or non-academic talk, their use for academic talk was higher in School A, but for non-academic talk it was higher in School C.

School C showed a more even distribution in the use of these words across academic and non-academic talk. The highest number of low-frequency words were used during divergent tasks in both settings.

6.2.3.3. Use of low-frequency words in Science

Table showing the distribution of low-frequency words in Science in the two settings (Key at the beginning of chapter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Type of Organisation</th>
<th>Academic Talk Number</th>
<th>Non Academic Talk Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>T-I</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>T-I</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>T-I</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: A27/10C A4/3C
In Science as in English, there was a higher use of low-frequency words for academic talk. On average, the homogeneous setting made a greater use of lower-frequency words in science. Breaking down the distribution of words into their use for academic and non-academic purpose, School A made a greater use of these words for academic purpose. For non-academic talk the use in both settings was similar, but a little higher in School A.

In both settings the highest number of low-frequency words occurred during Teacher-fronted Input classes, for academic talk. As in English, there was a more even distribution of low-frequency words in School C for both academic and non-academic talk in Science.

6.2.3.4. Use of low-frequency words in Geography

Table showing the distribution of low-frequency words in Geography in the two settings(Key at the beginning of chapter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Academic Talk</th>
<th>Non academic Talk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>D/G</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>A31/06C</td>
<td>A08/00C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In geography as on the other subjects, the use of lower-frequency words was higher for academic talk than non-academic talk. School A showed a higher use of low-frequency words for both academic and non-academic talk than School C. Unlike in the other subjects, School C showed no use of low-frequency words for non-academic talk during geography class, when the learners did not have control of the topic at any time.
6.2.3.5. Conclusions on the use of low-frequency words

I shall now compare the total use of low-frequency words across the two settings.

Summary Table Showing the Average use of Low-frequency Words across the three subjects in the two settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Academic Talk Number</th>
<th>Non academic Talk Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>A32/09C</td>
<td>A04/ 04C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all classes, a greater number of the lower-frequency words were used for academic than non-academic talk.

A comparison of the average number of these words used for academic purpose in each setting demonstrated that in all three subjects School A showed a higher use of low-frequency words than School C. The use of greater number of teacher-fronted input classes in School A helped to give rise to the use of greater number of lower-frequency words in School A than C.

For non-academic talk, School A shows a higher use of lower-frequency words on two out of three subjects. This indicates that in non-academic talk also, School A showed a higher use of low-frequency words on average, than School C.

Although School A showed a greater use of lower-frequency words than School C on average, School C shows a more even distribution of these words across academic and non-academic talk during task-based classes, where learners were allowed control of the topic.

For low-frequency words that can be used for non-academic or interpersonal discussion, there needs to be input containing such words from NS or more proficient peers, in the use of the second language for
non-academic talk. Learners in the mixed setting who had NS peers among them had greater access to input containing lower-frequency words for non-academic talk. But although School C showed some use of lower-frequency words, on average it was similar to that used in School A, and not higher, as expected under the circumstances.

Lower-frequency words for expression of academic talk should have been available similarly in both settings from the subject-related input from the teachers, which could be used similarly by learners in both settings. In the mixed setting the words should also have been available through the interaction of more proficient peers on academic and interpersonal topics. But the greater use of these words by the learners in the homogeneous group shows a discrepancy between the expected and real outcome. 'Illumination' can explain it as a reluctance for hypotheses testing by Bangladeshis in the mixed group, through the operation of group boundaries, a reticence that may have expressed itself in the difference between the use of lower-frequency words across settings.

6.3. Summary

In this chapter I have looked at the learners' recorded interaction, analysed and quantified under certain headings, for making comparisons between the language use in the two settings. A comparison of the average language used across the three subjects showed that the total language use on classroom interaction was higher in School A than School C in terms of words, while the turns were longer, consisting of more and longer communicative units. School A conducted a higher percentage of its interaction with peers, using more English, while School C used more Bengali. Their use of lower-frequency words was higher than in School C, more often used for academic talk. School C used a higher percentage of its interaction for academic talk than School A, which related to the higher teacher control of the topic.

While the product of learning showed clearly different tendencies when measured by the language tests, the process of learning also showed that the teaching had been organised differently, exerting
different amounts of control on the learners' interaction, giving rise to differences in language use.

Teacher-fronted classes gave rise to the least interaction, but most of this was for academic purpose using greater number of low-frequency words. More teacher-fronted classes were used in School A, which also showed greater use of lower-frequency words. The use of low-frequency words for academic and non-academic discussion on all three subjects was higher in School A than School C. But the distribution of low-frequency words was more even across academic and non-academic purpose in School C.

Divergent tasks that gave rise to greater use of language involving longer turns, were more used in School A than C. Group tasks which gave rise to greater peer interaction than individual tasks, were used more in School A than C. Within individual tasks, there could be a great variation in the quantity of peer interaction, relating to the length of time learners were allowed to be in control of the topic in individual classrooms. The percentage of peer-interaction was higher in School A than C, showing a greater freedom to interact despite the use of more teacher-fronted classes.

In the next chapter I shall examine the qualitative data which will also help to illuminate the results from other sources.
In this chapter I shall discuss the qualitative data derived through video recording of some of the classrooms, through interviews of teachers, through the learners' classroom interaction, and finally from my own impression of the two settings received through observation of the classrooms. The evidence from these sources can help to interpret and make connections between the outcome of the investigation into the process and product in each setting, and 'illuminate' differing forces operating in the two learning milieux to explain the variation between the learning of the two groups of Bangladeshis from similar backgrounds even though they were passing through the pressures of similar coursework of the same syllabus. The process of inquiry showed certain contradictions between the expectation and reality within the process of language learning and product of language learning.

In order to explain and connect these aspects plausibly, Parlett & Hamilton's (1972) paradigm of 'illuminative' approach adopted for this research allows the use of quantitative and qualitative data to construct a picture of the learning milieu where the process and product of the learning may be plausibly connected together to guide further research into pedagogy. The paradigm interprets and explains rather than proves. So, while the hypotheses set up for this research served to give direction to the stage of further inquiry within the paradigm, with an expectation of the outcome, the illumination from other sources of data within the paradigm could help to interpret and explain the results of assessment of the hypotheses that may be contrary to expectations.

The first section of this chapter contains a summary of their teachers' comments about the problems and benefits of the teaching that these pupils undergo and factors within the learning situation that contribute to their underachievement. Many of the teachers did not like to be recorded, so while some of their discussions were recorded (Appendix 1, Ch 7), others' points were noted.

The second section focuses on the intergroup mixing and the support that Bangladeshi learners received in the classroom from teachers, as seen through the video recordings.
The third section summarises my observations of the incidents that contributed differently to prevent the progress of learning in the classrooms in both settings.

The fourth section reveals the difficulties that these pupils faced linguistically as they learnt in these classrooms, revealed through their classroom interaction. Their problems are illustrated by excerpts from their conversation.

The last three sections summarise and draw conclusions from the evidence surveyed, looking at the implications of these findings for the education of these Bangladeshi learners.

7.1. Comments of Teachers (Appendix 1, Ch 7)

The teachers across the two settings made several general and particular comments about the problems in their own teaching situation, that beset the education of these groups of learners. Speaking of very similar problems, they reflected the problems of bilingual learners in general within these schools.

The deprivation that Bangladeshis suffer generally (Ch 1), including the deprivation within the school situation, was the source of these problems. The teachers' comments helped to bring out the effect of these problems on the education of these two particular groups, affecting one group more than the other.

7.1.1. Problems mentioned by teachers

Certain recurrent factors contributed to reduce effective learning time for the pupils in the two settings during the observation period.

Supply teachers: The lack of regular teachers through absence, illness or departures, often required classes to be taught by series of supply teachers, a problem recognised to be endemic in the Tower Hamlets schools (Ch 2). In School C classes were frequently left for short periods in charge of supply teachers, requiring me to reschedule observation dates. In School A, in addition to short substitutions,
science in the group under observation had been taught for six months by a series of supply teachers, (who often 'didn't know what they're doing', according to the science teacher, Appendix 1, Ch 7), so that while in School C the gaps were short, in School A there had been one long gap for science.

The gaps in these pupils' learning, created by lack of regular teachers showed most obviously in their coursework test marks for science which went towards their grade received in GCSE. As the science teacher put it, 'If they're with a teacher they are used to, their marks go up....massively, not just like a slight drop in marks or slight increase. There is a massive increase in marks.'(ibid) His emphasis helps to underline these learners' academic loss, quite apart from the loss in language learning opportunities that could have resulted from continuity in learning with a regular teacher.

Such gaps in regular teaching deprived the learners of regular academic and linguistic input, causing their academic performance to deteriorate and motivation to decline. The lack of regular teachers reduced learning time in School A more than in School C.

Lack of maintenance: Large scale building repair work became necessary in School A during the period of this research. The pupils were sent home until temporary arrangements were made for classes, when teachers had to commute between multiple sites. There could be no practical work for subjects that required it, as there was no access to a laboratory. Education particularly suffered for the groups in the final years of school in the homogeneous group. When the pupils returned to their regular classrooms, teacher-fronted input was the only way to cover the syllabus before the examination, and make up for the time lost. This organisation of teaching reduced the potential for the homogeneous group's exposure to language development factors (Ch 6).

Problems with their school building not only caused disruptions in academic and linguistic progress, but also meant disruption with revision work for these pupils. Owing to lack of space at home and of people who could help with their studies (Ch 1), children in School A and C
used their classrooms before and after class hours for doing their homework and revision, where some teacher could be present to help them. The inaccessibility of the school building prevented this in School A, reducing their scope for extra, out-of-hours exposure to the language learning factors, demonstrating clearly how the lack of financial resources could influence the quality and quantity of learning for Bangladeshi children. School C did not suffer such drastic occurrences to reduce their learning time during the observation period.

**Vocabulary:** The reduced learning opportunities particularly limited their exposure to and input in English which could bring to their notice the use of appropriate structures and low-frequency words in the new language for learning (Ch 1). Unless they learnt to identify the item or the concept, they could not talk about it, as shown by their greater use of L1 for academic discussion, particularly in scientific subjects where accurate words are crucial for correct expression of ideas. Students were often put off by single words in an examination question (e.g., 'hypermarket'), even though they knew the total concept and could answer if they had continued to read (Appendix 1, Ch 7). Reduction of learning time through any cause accentuated lack of vocabulary, increasing their disadvantage in expression for academic achievement.

Reduction of learning time also reduced scope for feedback relating to language during content classes like science or geography. According to the teachers of science and geography, there simply was not enough time to give learners individual feedback to language used in written work, unless it misstated concepts. So reduced learning time meant reduced opportunity for developing accuracy in language, particularly in School A.

There were other factors that reduced the learning potential, more in School A than C.

**Support teachers:** Lower proficiency bilinguals like Bangladeshis require more support teachers to help with their dual learning of a new language, and the academic content in the new language, than first language learners (Ch 2). They would learnt faster in classrooms where there was increased support from extra teachers in the classrooms.
According to the English teacher, School A,

'...if you're just one teacher...you're under enormous pressure because demands are being made of you all the time...when there's two teachers...we can go round and work with individual groups and with individual boys...'.

Another teacher felt that while discussions in L1 helped clarify understanding of concepts, the same topics needed to be talked over in English under the guidance of some teacher. Support teachers could supervise these discussions to benefit Bangladeshi learners linguistically.

From the evidence of the observations, support teachers in School A were far less in number than in School C, in the classes observed. This reduced the potentiality for learning that could have occurred in School A than C.

I shall now look at the combined effect of these process factors for any variation they caused between the learning product of the two settings.

7.1.2. Effect on academic performance

Studies of academic achievement (eg, statistical studies byILEA: Ch 2) generally use the learners' performance on public examinations, GCSE or 'A' levels, as the measure of learners' academic performance. The factors mentioned above affected the learners' progress in learning by reducing their time for regular education during the eight months of observation, while effective use of the full time would have given them not only the academic input but also good quality linguistic input. For learners in School A where teachers were the main source of such linguistic input, gaps in their learning opportunities must have affected their progress more negatively than in School C.

Effect, During the Preparations for GCSE: The interruptions in the educational process through the lack of maintenance of school, etc made learners lose out on instruction and revision time, on practical work for subjects that required it. This reduced their opportunity for input in subject-special language, comprehension of this language and content.
through interaction, and practice of this language in output, more in School A than C.

The lack of sufficient support teachers during the final years was more noticeable in School A. A greater number of support teachers in the classroom could have helped to explain the language and content through focused input and feedback, and could also have helped practice the content and the related language in extended output. The lower number of support teachers in School A than C reduced their opportunity for learning the language and content.

Effect on the Examination Performance: The disruptions in education during the final school years must have negatively affected the performance of the learners during their examinations.

In both settings, their lack of vocabulary made examination questions difficult to understand, diminishing performance even when the concepts were known. The reduced practice time meant lower ability to produce extended writing on topics where extensive answers to questions could lead to better scores in examinations.

Although the factors mentioned by the teachers affected the learning in both settings, their greater prevalence in School A could have made their negative effect more acute in School A than School C. That the cumulative presence of these factors was greater in School A than in School C was probably accidental, and not due to factors inherent in the setting. But when one compares the language learning product at the end of the observation period one needs to take into account the possible debilitatory effect of these external factors.

7.1.3. Benefits of mixed ability classrooms

Teachers commented positively on the benefits of mixed ability groups as a learning environment for bilingual pupils, particularly for lower proficiency learners (comments of teachers in School A and C). Had these students been streamed, their general low level of language ability may have relegated most of them to the lower streams, which
could have discouraged them, preventing them from learning the content or language effectively.

**Psychological benefit:** According to the teachers, their experience shows that streaming gives pupils a feeling of being branded as failures. This is a dispiriting and demotivating phenomenon, so that the educational process ends for them in non-achievement.

In a mixed ability classroom in any setting, there is no judgment passed on the ability of learners, no limit set on the level that each learner can hope to reach. The more proficient have pupils of similar ability to give them their measure and the impetus to achieve better. In turn these learners provide models for the less proficient to emulate, setting them a standard they can hope to reach. According to the teachers, the beneficial effect of being with better-achieving group members had already been proved by improving GCSE results in both schools. The motivation through the hope of achieving a goal they see others to have attained in learning, is a prime benefit in these classrooms.

**Scope for Assistance:** Performance of the classwork can be enhanced by discussions for clarification of the procedures and concepts, providing a purpose to the classroom interaction for helping language and content learning. If the scope of help from teachers is limited, mixed ability peers within the classroom can provide help to each other (Ch 2). The less proficient can be helped to achieve something, which can motivate them instrumentally within the mixed ability setup to achieve better (comment of science and form tutor, School A).

The more proficient learners can use both L1 and L2 to get meaning of language and concepts across to peers, which the teacher using the L2 only, may not. Being able to understand better may inspire the less able to achieve better scores on academic tests, by learning the language better, so that content learning can draw along language learning in the mixed ability classroom, from an instrumental motivation. For the more able, making explanations of concepts to others gives them practice in producing their own understanding as accurate output, making their own comprehension clearer while it also
provides them opportunity to use the content-related language. Helping each other was however confined within own language group members even within the mixed setting, where it was also less extensive.

**Group Identity:** In mixed ability classes, pride in membership of the class group can give pupils the motivation to want to perform as well as the others in order to improve and preserve the good image of the group, an instrumental motivation for better language and content learning. Such groups in a school can provide role models for other class groups.

Such feelings of group membership operating in School A led the less able pupils to copy from peers to finish and submit homework, an instrumental motivation to perform to preserve the good image. It led to forming self-help groups where the more able helped and were models for, the less able for discussing the homework, the coursework and for doing revision for the tests, all aimed instrumentally to improve their image as a group.

The positive effects of mixed ability seemed to operate more in School A where pupils from the same language background could aspire more readily to the level attained by members of their own group, rather than aspire to levels of other groups. So, motivationally the homogeneous group seems to be more supportive of higher aspirations for Bangladeshis, provided there are motivated high achievers within their group.

The consolidation of the pupils in School A into a group where all members were (instrumentally) motivated to try harder to create and maintain a good image of the group, was mentioned by the teachers in School A but not in School C. It is possible that within the mixed classroom the members required to retain their language group identity through maintaining high group boundaries which did not allow much intergroup mixing. They were not ready to incur the costs of sacrificing their own group identity for the benefits belonging to a larger classroom 'group' (Ch 2). But the instrumental motivation did not seem to operate for them to make efforts to enhance to the image of the group by doing as well or better than the other groups. Motivationally,
the mixed ability setting seems to benefit pupils in the homogeneous setting more than the mixed setting.

7.2. Video Recordings of classrooms (Appendix 2, Ch 7)

The video recordings of a few of the classrooms yielded data on some aspects of classroom life of the two groups of Bangladeshis in order to throw some light on the other variables operating in the classrooms. According to Marshall & Rossman (1989) any research film documenting the life of group under study needs to determine the photographer's interest and intent. Within the classrooms that were video-recorded, the aim was to see how far the Bangladeshi learners interacted with the other members of the classroom, and how much of this interaction in the mixed classroom was with members of other language groups. The main advantage of the mixed group over the homogeneous group was their potentiality for intergroup mixing that could lead to better language learning through exposure to better quality of linguistic factors that could also lead to positive intergroup attitudes. The more the groups mixed, the more varied could be their language use and the better could be their attitudes towards each other as they got to know each other better. Interaction could give them a feeling of equality and help to lower their intergroup boundaries to encourage integrative motivation for language learning (Ch 2).

Within the classroom, groups of students sat at tables for their classroom work. Preliminary observation had shown that these groups could consist exclusively of language groups, or they could be mixed. Interaction between Language groups could take place in two ways: either the members could move between tables to interact, or they could interact as they sat at the same table. Movement between the tables for conversation was not encouraged within the classroom, except in science. So intergroup interaction could only take place when members of various language groups sat together. Bangladeshi learners would be able to interact with members of other language groups if they were sitting at the same table. The video would look into the interaction taking place between members at a table, to see how far this interaction of Bangladeshis took place with NSs and members of other language groups.
The other focus within the filming was to be on the support that Bangladeshi learners received from the teachers in the classrooms. The length of time that groups of learners were supported in the classroom would also be quantified to be compared across settings. 'Support' in this context means the individual help given to learners with their academic work. It is not the general help given to all pupils equally through the task sheet or through general input, but the special help given to each learner or group of learners through an understanding of their problems with the classroom work. It is more individual and private, and involves more sustained interaction with each learner or a few learners together, than general support, or the supervision within the classroom where the teachers oversee as students perform, to ensure that all learners are working.

It was observed in the classrooms, that after the session of input was over and a task was set, teachers generally supervised as students worked. A systematic supervision could turn into support for learners identified as having problems.

The video recordings were made within a few of the classrooms in the two schools. In order to look at the aspects systematically, I decided on two heading under which the observations would be charted. The first was 'Interaction', which was divided into, 'Interaction within tables' and 'Interaction between tables'. Each of these was again divided into, 'With Bangladeshis', and 'With other language groups'.

The second heading was 'Support', which was divided into two, 'Supervision' and 'Help'. When the teacher went to a student but did not interact, it was coded under 'Supervision'. When there was interaction it was coded as 'Help'. Each of these was divided into two, on the basis of whether it was provided by the main teacher or the support teacher. Under each heading the entry was in terms of the time that each incident occupied, in terms of minutes or half-minute approximately. Put together the table looked as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within tables</td>
<td>Between tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Bangladeshis</td>
<td>With Other Language Groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the following sections I shall discuss the results of coding the movements and activities observed in the videos. (Appendix 2, Ch 7)

Video recording: School A The recordings in School A were of Science and Geography classes only as the English teacher did not allow it. The learners sat in friendship groups. They were homogeneously Bangladeshi in science classes. In the geography classes there were two speakers of other language present. Interaction was not permitted during the teacher-input session but was generally allowed during the performance of the classwork in both subjects.

Science: Class One Only the subject teacher was present in the classroom. The teaching consisted mainly of teacher-fronted input, during which the students listened and wrote. Interaction was not allowed during the input, but some of the less proficient students talked softly among themselves. The learners were sitting away from the teacher so that some of them could interact without being observed.

Support: After the input the teacher went to one of the groups, to give support for under a minute, the only instance of support given during this class.

Interaction: Some less proficient learners interacted during the input sessions. After the input the learners interacted within and between members of groups sitting at each table as they moved around setting up the instruments. Some members changed places when they resumed seats. The seating and the group patterns seemed changeable, so that groups could form and re-form in this class.

Geography: Class 2 There was a support teacher with the main teacher. During the session of teacher input of over ten minutes, the students followed the input on the information sheets given to them. After this they continued their work on a task begun previously.

Support: During the teacher-input the support teacher stood behind a lower-ability group. After the students started to work he went systematically from group to group to give support, from under a minute to fifteen minutes for a low-ability group. One group near the
camcorder was left out. They seemed unable to do the work, but did not ask for help.

The main teacher went round supervising some of the groups. He supported three of the groups briefly, from fifteen seconds to two minutes. Apart from this he generally sat at his table. Students did not ask for his help. Some learners walked across the classroom to another groups to ask for some.

**Interaction:** There was interaction within members of the groups at each table as they worked. Where other language groups sat with Bangladeshis, there was also interaction with them throughout the time when they were allowed to interact.

**Geography: Class 4** The subject teacher was alone. He delivered input for fifteen minutes. There was also a concluding session of teacher-talk for five minutes. During these sessions the learners listened and read.

**Interaction:** In the intervening period the learners talked within their groups at tables. Pupils got up and moved around five times, but only once one of them spoke to a member at another table.

**Support:** The teacher went around the class to supervise. He gave support to two groups for about a minute each, one of the groups had asked for his help. The rest of the time he stood at the head or the side of the class to supervise. The students asked him task-related clarification questions briefly from time to time.

**General Comment:** Within-group interaction went on whenever it was allowed. Pupils did not move around between tables for the purpose of interaction but generally to give or take some item for classwork.

The potential level of support in this school was low: of the three classes videoed, there was support available in only one, while in another class that was observed but not videoed, a support teacher had been specially called in to help administer an English task. When support teachers were present, help was systematically and continually given. Giving extended and systematic help and support to the
students while they performed seemed to be the support teacher's responsibility rather than the main subject teacher's, whose efforts seemed to be more brief. Students generally did not get sustained help if there was no support teacher present. The main teacher gave help when it was solicited, but most of the Bangladeshi learners did not seem to be able or willing to ask for help, apart from asking some comprehension questions.

Video Recording: School C: In this school the video recording took place during science and English classes. The learners generally sat in their language groups, but a few fluent speakers of English sat with the NSs. The Bangladeshis sat together in groups of various sizes.

Science: Class One This was Teacher-fronted input in a classroom where the learners sat on parallel benches facing the teacher at the head of the class, closer to the teacher's desk. This reduced the scope for peer interaction during input. The learners listened, answering the teacher's questions, or writing.

Interaction & Support: Low-proficiency learners sat at the back away from the teacher, interacting between themselves. They did not participate in the learning. The Bangladeshi learners interacted within themselves briefly five times, during questioning sessions, and once while the teacher demonstrated. Support was given by one teacher to two students, six times for 20 seconds to one minute duration.

During teacher-fronted classes, support was generally not given, or given only briefly. So, if a greater number of classes were organised as teacher-fronted, the scope of understanding language and content through help from teacher (or peers) was limited.

English: Class One Two support teachers were present to help the main teacher. The learners sat in their language groups. A Bangladeshi group sat nearest to the main teacher's desk. There was a session of input and feedback, followed by the task which was mainly reading and writing. A fight cut short the recording.
Interaction: There was interaction within the learners of each group from after the input. One instance of interaction between a Bangladeshi and a NS occurred when one asked the other for a pencil sharpener.

Support: The support teacher worked with a low ability group. The main teacher supervised and supported two groups Bangladeshis three times, from 20 seconds to 2 minutes.

Science: Class Three This class took place in laboratory where the main teacher was supported by two teachers for some of the time. One teacher was Somali, for supporting only Somali children.

Support: The input session was followed by individual written work during which the support teacher went round the class and helped some of the learners. The main teacher supervised as the learners started on their experiment. She gave support five times to Bangladeshis, from 20 seconds to three minutes. The support teacher supervised and gave support frequently to Bangladeshis, from 10 seconds to three minutes.

Interaction: Movement was quite free as the learners stood while working. In this proximity, the members of different language groups interacted briefly about eight times.

English: Class Three The main teacher was supported by two teachers. The learners sat in usual language groups. A session of input was followed by the learners writing about an illustration. The video-recording had to stop when some learners started fighting, and the teachers did not want the incident to be filmed. Videoing stopped after this as the teachers blamed classroom disturbances on by the presence of the video.

Support: The support teachers worked with different groups. One teacher sat with a low-proficiency group while the other helped three groups for two to five minutes. The main teacher supervised and gave support to Bangladeshi groups, for up to seven minutes. Some students moved around.
Interaction: No interaction between the Bangladeshi group and the other language groups was visible.

General Comment: English classes in this school were generally supported by two or more teachers, so that even when the help given was brief, the Bangladeshis in this setting could receive regular help during each class.

In demonstrable subjects like science, learners seemed to be able to do some work without sustained support. While the more proficient appeared to work on their own in most classes, the less proficient imitated the performance of the more able, or even copy from their writing to do some of the work. In language-based classes like English, they seemed to require more individual support to produce some output.

Performance in English required extended creative writing. The lower proficiency learners did not seem to be able to perform any part of such work by themselves and required repeated help from teachers. Many learners did not ask for help but could receive it only when support teachers went round supervising their work.

In both groups, the main teacher in the classroom generally delivered the input, set and explained the task and supervised, while the support teachers seemed to be responsible for giving help to individuals and groups for performing in the classroom. As a result, during classes with no support teachers students had far less opportunity of negotiating learning with proficient people. Some teachers, eg. in English were exceptions to this, and provided support in addition to teaching.

Some intergroup interaction could be seen to take place in classes where they could move around in proximity (eg. Science). Boundaries seemed to be lower during such classes than when the learners sat down at tables. In science classes in the mixed group, learners seemed to be more able and willing to ask the supervising teacher's help. In others there was very little interaction between groups.
Indiscipline in the mixed setting disrupted learning frequently for five to ten minutes, taking away learning time from the classes in which they were allowed to initiate topics and interact.

7.2.1. Insights from video recordings

In the mixed schools the students generally sat in language groups when they were in large enough number. When the numbers were few, NSs would sit with others of higher L2 proficiency. Bangladeshis generally sat in their own groups. Although they briefly interacted with other language groups on occasion, they never were seen to interact with NSs even when movement was allowed, except once very briefly. The pattern of seating seemed to be rigid, never changing from day to day. As the Bangladeshis did not sit or interact with other language groups within the classes observed, it is possible that inter-group seating or interaction did not occur during other classes as well. So the benefit of the mixed setting for access to better input and feedback from peers did not really operate.

Intergroup boundaries seemed to be lower during classes where the learners could move about and perform in proximity, as in science classes, where common needs and goals sometimes made them interact. Classes where they remained seated in groups did not allow them to break the group pattern, so the group boundaries seemed to operate more strongly when they remained seated.

In the mixed group it is possible that the presence of NSs who were far more proficient could make the learning seem unattainable to the less proficient Bangladeshis and reduce motivation through low self perception. The mixed setting may have more negative than positive effects on these mixed ability learners.

Participation by the less proficient in the learning process appeared to depend on the accessibility of the subject. On demonstrable subjects, or during less extensive written work, all learners seemed to be able to do some work with less support. But for language-based work like English, and much of geography, some of the
learners did not seem to be able to work without some support from others.

Within the classrooms videoed, the main teachers' prerogative seemed to be to deliver input, to set work, to supervise and discipline students, and to collect their work. Giving help and support to the students seemed to be the responsibility of the support teachers, as and when present. In the absence of support teachers the students could ask the main teacher for help, but the less proficient Bangladeshis tended not to ask for help to perform in the classroom.

The number of support teachers available varied across settings. School A had a much lower number than School C to support their final year students. The variation in the support available across settings could make difference in the performance of learners in the availability of comprehensible input of content and language, and in providing practice opportunities with proficient speakers who could provide feedback. Generally speaking, the mixed setting had more support available than the homogeneous setting, so the potentiality of the Bangladeshi learners receiving help with language and content was higher in School C.

7.3. Comments from personal observations

During observation of classrooms on the video and in real time, I noticed certain factors which may have affected the pupils' performance. Although these factors have been already mentioned, I shall mention them here as a summary of the tendencies observed.

Teaching Patterns: Academic concepts appeared to require more repeated explanations in the mixed classroom than in the homogeneous classroom. As a result the input for classes in the mixed setting was less extended, limiting learners' scope for exposure to extended language structures of good quality input and subject-specific vocabulary. During sessions of teacher-input, learners often repeated the new words introduced by the teacher during the input, for completing teachers' statements, so that teacher-input sessions not only provided the words but also gave
practice in using and understanding the subject-specific words and structures.

**Need of Support for Lower Ability Learners:** Low ability learners tended not to ask for teachers’ help. They seemed not to want to draw attention to their lack of ability. When a group working on a task was composed of only the less able learners, they appeared to have difficulty in focusing upon the task and starting on the work. Unless the teachers noticed them and supported them, they did not do any work. Sometimes the teacher did start them off, as in English in School A, and geography Class Two, School A. But often the sustained help they required depended on the number of support teachers available. In Geography Class Two, School A, groups that were supported intermittently worked with concentration, but those that did not receive recurrent help did not seem to do much. Even when it was for very short periods, the presence of greater number of support teachers gave more pupils help in learning in the mixed group than in the homogeneous group.

**Behaviour Pattern:** The occurrence of fights and misdemeanours within the classroom was frequent in the mixed setting. In School A they did not occur during any of the classes observed. A large portion of teaching time had to be spent in disciplining students.

In a multicultural classroom the idea of acceptable behaviour may vary more widely between groups, which could give rise to problems of harmonious relationships, particularly when they could interact. The pupils had not learnt how to resolve their differences and learn together within the same milieu. A greater requirement seemed to be to teach learners from different language backgrounds how to be competent members of a classroom, to interact and work co-operatively for academic achievement. While the learners in School A lost time through external factors, learners in School C lost time through internal factors of maladjustment.

The difficulty for groups to work in concord seems to be a reason for the use of individual work in School C more than groupwork, and for many teacher’s policy of not allowing peer interaction within the
classroom (eg, geography). In School A where the learners shared similar codes of conduct, more groupwork was used for the performance of tasks, with less disruptions. Keeping discipline within the classrooms to allow others to work could be a reason for presence of multiple support teachers within the mixed classroom. Learners in the multi-group classroom seemed to need not only to learn the academic and linguistic aspects for better achievement, but also to learn competent membership and participation pattern within the classroom.

During teacher-input, the less able students seemed to have problems with concentrating, and tended to sit away from the teacher. Being near to the teacher and being with more able pupils could help lower-ability pupils to concentrate better.

**Intergroup boundaries:** Interaction generally never took place between Bangladeshis and NSs, and mixing between Bangladeshis and other language groups was little in evidence. It is possible that as they were always in quite a large number, there was less need for them to interact outside their group. But it also seemed to indicate that the NSs were not ready to interact with Bangladeshis. By the end of secondary school the learners' group boundaries appear to be set firmly in place, not to be broken easily. Measures for countering these boundaries may be more effective if they were adopted from an earlier stage during primary education, to bring the positive effects into play at the secondary stage.

So far I have discussed problems observed by myself or by the teachers, to be affecting the learning of the two groups. I shall now hold up some of the problems that the learners themselves were conscious of as existing in their performance.

**7.4 Comments of learners**

During their performance of academic work the students encountered linguistic problems which created difficulties in their academic expression and achievement. Their personal experience of problems revealed through their interaction were similar across the two groups, so the setting did not seem to make a difference in this, nor in
the manner in which they tried to get around them. However, the advantage of being able to interact freely allowed the members of the homogeneous setting to help each other more often than in the mixed setting. I shall now outline their problems, and quote relevant dialogues as illustration.

7.4.1. Difficulty with using language

According to the comments of the pupils, the input from the teacher provided difficulty for some, as in

C:Science: Class 1/2

T(M): Try to understand what she's saying, then......
132L: I can't understand.

Generally however, they had less difficulty with the spoken input. When they had to read and understand the task sheets or books on their own, a common source of difficulty for these learners was the lack of vocabulary for understanding written input independently, eg,

A: Geography: 1/4

110: Speed is the sole difference.
111: What does 'sole' mean?

and in

C: English: Class 3/1

150L: I had... I don't know now... what is the... what are the advantages? T: What are the advantages... when you write about how you learn English... how you learn... I know you can't... but how you felt (cont.)

Consciousness of their own inability to understand and produce academic language, many Bangladeshi pupils were happier when task performance required less language use, or offered alternatives to using language, eg., drawing pictures or tables. While such tasks were less taxing for them, they also enabled the lower-proficiency learners to participate in the academic process as they saw their higher ability peers do, giving them a sense of equality.
126L: How do we do the experiment....?
T: This is the experiment here.
127L: What is it called?
T: We call this....you can draw it if you want.
128L: Uh, man! We dont have to use words!

Some students seemed to be conscious that their lack of proficiency in the second language disadvantaged them socially within the classroom society:

C: Science: Class 1/2

101L: (L1) That person abuses me in English. You see I dont know English.
R: (L1) You'll learn.
102L: (L1) I would have learnt, but....

Apparently the problem of learning appeared insurmountable. Some learners realised the importance of producing output in writing in the second language, while others did not share their view:

A: Science: Class 2/3.

066L: (L1) What do you have at ten?
067L: (L1) English.
068L: (L1) I dont know how to finish it. I dont like English. You have to write so much!
069L: (L1) Writing is good for you.
070L: Boring, boring!

They lacked vocabulary and the ability to organise words syntactically into an appropriate expression of the concepts. In their conversation they tried to overcome the problem by using the term 'thingey' as a substitute lexis for conveying all types of meaning in academic and non-academic conversation, and also to indicate areas where they wanted help. Examples of their use of 'thingey' are common across subjects in both settings, used for various purposes.

A: English: Class 3/2: (used as substitute for 'apartheid')

059L: Or could have been banned.
060L: Or or it could be a thingey, black people banned from the restricted areas for whites only.

C: English: Class 2/2: (the student asks for a spelling)

132L: Its Kino, just Kino, isn't it?
133L: Yeah, from what we've done.
134L: How do you write the thingey?...S-a--have you done the..?

A: Science: Class 4/3L: (in speaking of combustion)

T: Bit of a harder question. Anybody?
120L: Yes, sir. It takes off the thingey sir, the aluminium needs oxygen to lead the...

C: Science: Class 1/2: (in talking about an equipment)

T: Why not that one?
034L: Then we used the thingey on....

A: Geography: Class 1/4: (to refer to the fieldwork data)

001L: Its the same method, right? ....I'm just going to put the thingey on the board....

When learners required to be more specific and needed to get the meaning across accurately for academic purpose or for avoiding conversational breakdowns, they had to find the right word and the spelling of the word, requiring extensive help from proficient speakers such as teachers to overcome their problems. According to the teacher of geography they often knew the concept well but lacked appropriate subject-specific words, with correct spellings to express their intended meaning, particularly in writing. Proficient English speakers like the teacher could be the source for this input, if students asked for help.

A: Geography: 1/4:

094: Then we got the speedometer, or what was that called?
104: Be quiet, be quiet... measure the trapezium. Sir, what was the speed thing called, sir?
105: Speedometer?
T: Flowmeter.
106: Flowmeter, see!
The teacher could also supply the correct term for a synonym.

C:Science: Class 3/3:

T: What do you mean you don't know what the name is?  
T: No, I am talking of the conditions needed.

T: Well, we got soil. Anything else?

Teachers had to be easily available for rendering the help, and that was more possible if more than one teacher was present in the classroom. The process of enquiry itself could make the learner remember the correct vocabulary:

A:Geography: Class 1/3:

038L: Lets do the thingey now, what's it called? Lets do, no, the introduction.

The process of interaction helped pupils to reduce their problem of using language through help from teachers, from their own previous learning and from peers when teachers were not available. I shall now look at the help particularly provided by peers through interaction in the classroom in both settings.

7.4.2: Peer support within the classroom

As mentioned before, one of the benefits of mixed ability classrooms is the peer support possible, particularly when discussion is allowed. In addition to the support from the teachers, the support given and received through discussions help learners to understand concepts and to bridge gaps in their knowledge that arise from gaps in their learning that can be caused by various factors including non-understanding. When interaction is restricted or disallowed, the possibility of such help is cut off.

When interaction was allowed in these classrooms peers helped each other with spellings, meanings, and even provided the language structures for producing their written reports. Although such support
was most evident in the geography classes in School A, the learners could be heard to discuss the content and the performance procedure in their interaction. Peers helped each other with the wordings:

A: Geography: 1/1:

092: Samad, what did you say, 'small stretch of river'? 093: Small river.

And by dictating the structures:

A: Geography: 1/4:

013: into the water 014: in-to-the-water-
058: On the other side of the bank. 059: on-the-other-side-of-the-bank.

They helped to check each other’s spelling:

A: Science: 2/3

075: (L1) What do you mean it is b-r-i-n? It is i-n-e.

The difficulty that many students experienced with understanding academic language arose from an inability to understand the vocabulary. Explanations by English-speaking teachers sometimes did not get across to the low-proficiency learners who did not understand the equivalents used for making the explanations. In such instances peers could get across more effectively with the meaning where the teachers could not, as in:

A: English: 3/3:

042: Prohibited.
043: Allowed, man.
044: Its sort of not allowed or...

C: English: 3/1:

178: Advantages.
179: Advantages, the good things. Whats the good of learning English?

Peers helped each other with the correct pronunciation of words:

C: English: 3/2:

144: Determine.
145:Determine.
146:Determine. Don't want to say it that way. I'll say it this way.
147:That's wrong.
148:O.K. I'll say 'determine'.

A:English:2/1:

105:Now boys, let's discuss 'appetite'.
106:We are discussing the apartheid laws.

They corrected others' use of words in certain contexts of use.

A:English:3/3:

054:The geezer who says
055:The person who says.

A:Geography:1/3:(peers help to check each other's work)

012:(L1) He wrote 'accurately' here, but wrote 'accurately' in his book.

They also gave feedback to each other:

C:English:3/2:

196:Words-in-English..words-in-thats it..finished.
197:What do you mean? It does not make sense at all.

And helped to provide others with the right lexis:

A:Geography:3/3:

040:Is the angle measurement called 'protector'? 
041:Right.
044:The one with the measurement of angle.. 'protector' or 'protractor'? 
045:Protractor.

Sometimes their peer interlocutor could comprehend the intended meaning, and supplied the word accordingly:

A:Geography:3/2:

045:Pie graph?
046:(L1) Not that.
047:Pie chart.
Giving and receiving help with language for performance of classwork occurred more often in the homogeneous than the mixed setting, one of the reasons for which was that interaction was encouraged and allowed more often in the homogeneous setting than the mixed setting.

It was noticeable that although the Bangladeshis in School C asked the teacher and their Bangladeshi peers for help, they were never heard to ask native speaker peers for help with English language. The reason may be that this needed the breaking down of intergroup boundaries, with a simultaneous acknowledgement of the NS peers' superior linguistic ability in addition to the social superiority, which the Bangladeshis may not like to concede. Their need to be equal with NS peers at least within the classroom would have been diminished by such acknowledgement. On the other hand, the rigidity of seating orders, the lack of interaction with Bangladeshis indicated that requests for help from NSs may not be responded to positively. So the scope for help from peers remained limited to same language group in both settings while the scope of help from teachers was higher in the mixed setting.

7.5. Conclusions from the evidence

The sources of information reviewed above help to show close up the particular difficulties that two groups of Bangladeshi second language learners encountered within the school and the classroom, factors other than the effect of differing proportions of ethnic groups in the classrooms. While some of the difficulties operated similarly in both settings, others operated more in one setting than the other, creating a difference between the learning that could take place in each.
These external factors made a difference between settings in the learning time that was available in each setting.

Academically, interruptions of learning in the general classroom were caused by absence of regular teachers, by disruptive students, and even from poor maintenance of schools. For these students with a dual burden of learning, gaps in learning meant interruptions, not only in the academic input but also in the content-related language input the learners could have received through the academic teaching, and of the feedback to output that could help them develop accuracy in language use to achieve better. It also meant a gap in their opportunities for revising for tests and for doing homework. For these students in the final years of school it produced an additional disadvantage of 'massive' reductions in coursework test marks and hurriedly-finished teaching of the syllabus for the GCSE (teachers' comments). Although the extent of disruption through student misdemeanour in the mixed group was not measured, these adverse factors seemed to affect the learners in School A more extensively than in School C.

During the time that they had uninterrupted teaching, their academic and linguistic development depended on their comprehension of the input, which could depend on the amount of support they had from teachers within the classroom. As far as could be seen, the number of support teachers and the extent of support from them available within the classrooms during these final years was lower in School A than in School C.

The classroom support from peers which could counter this lack of support from teachers, was dependent on certain factors: it was possible only when discussion was allowed within the classroom so that it was not possible during teaching that did not allow interaction (Appendix 2, Ch 5). In School A interaction was generally more freely allowed than in School C, so that help through peer support could operate more during more extensive interaction in School A.

When interaction was allowed for performance, peers helped each other with spellings, vocabulary, structures, explanation of concepts,
and even for copying parts of it to finish the work as written output, to the limits of their own proficiency. However, peer help was only as good as the proficiency of the learners sitting together.

Within the mixed classroom, there was the potentiality of better quality of peer support from NSs helping the Bangladeshis. But observation showed that learners sat in language groups that rarely mingled. Group boundaries appeared to operate too strongly, so that Bangladeshi learners were often with others like them, rather than with other language groups. Disruptions from intergroup frictions disrupted learning in the mixed setting, while in the homogeneous setting the disruptions from external factors was greater.

7.6. Implications for education

For bilinguals and immigrants, the mixed ability classroom appears to be a better setting than the streamed classroom because it can reduce some of the sense of the inequality they suffer in society, allowing them to aspire to achieve with the best of learners in the classroom.

It had been expected (Ch 3) that when Bangladeshi pupils learnt with NSs and others from many language backgrounds, there would be a natural process of social mixing and interaction that could help to bring the factors of language learning into play. But during the process of observation it appeared that being together in the same classroom with pupils of other language background did not necessarily bring about intergroup mixing within the classrooms observed, even outside the classroom. These boundaries were strong enough in classrooms not to allow different language groups to sit together, reducing the possibility of their mixing or interaction. Such strong group boundaries must have affected the attitudes and the second language learning by Bangladeshis in the mixed more than in the homogeneous group. In the homogeneous setting there was no other group present, so that no group boundary operated there. As a result of this they could be unified into a secondary boundary of a class group, and try to achieve better to improve group image.
To help to bring about interaction among the members within a mixed setting, the teaching organisation needs to intervene and involve the learners in activities where they have to work with members of all language groups. This could help to develop a habit of mixing with other group members where the physical proximity could induce better interaction and help to bring about some psychological convergence. Although this would not break down all barriers between groups, it could help to relax them.

Within a mixed ability classroom teachers need to ensure that the less proficient have access to a higher level of language input, (i+1) by listening to or participating in interaction with the more proficient. Influencing the pattern of seating during some of the classes can make such input available for the less proficient while it may help them to concentrate during teacher-input sessions. Allowing interaction with peers as a part of the process of learning could help the more able to explain language and academic concepts to the less able peers. This could help the more proficient to reach a greater degree of accuracy in their expression of academic concepts and language use through ‘comprehensible output’ while it provided ‘comprehensible input’ for others.

Where support teachers were not available, students required to be allowed to interact with peers in order to avail the help and support that was possible between peers. Within mixed ability classrooms, such code for interaction and acceptable classroom behaviour needed to be taught to pupils, in order to allow all members within such classrooms to have learning opportunities which were less interrupted by clashes.

7.7. Summary

In this chapter I have looked at some of the qualitative factors that influenced the learning of the Bangladeshi learners in the two settings. The problems of personal inability to manipulate the second language that these learners have were revealed through their own comments. The scope for greater interaction in the homogeneous classroom allowed peers within that group to help each other more than in the mixed classroom, for learning the language simultaneously with
the content. However, other factors operated to reduce their effective learning time and prevented them from achieving better.

There were external factors that reduced their academic achievement: the lack of regular teachers, the lack of regular and extensive classroom support, the administrative problems, all combined to make them miss out on the academic content and language input and scope for learning, and also to miss out 'massively' on coursework marks that formed a part of their GCSE results. These factors were revealed by the teachers' comments.

The videos of some of the classrooms showed that while there was no intergroup mixing in the mixed setting, support from teachers was more available for Bangladeshi learners in the mixed setting. The facilitative factors of peer support within operated through greater scope for interaction within the classroom in the homogeneous setting to counter some of the negative factors operating within the school and help the pupils to learn.
Chapter 8

Findings Of The Research

In the previous chapters the data gathered through the qualitative and quantitative instruments have been analysed to determine the trends in language development in the two settings. I have considered the learners' linguistic proficiency measured by psychometric tests, and have analysed the scores of these tests comparatively within the two settings. I have also quantified and analysed the language used for interaction in the classroom, derived through recordings of the classroom conversations in the three subjects over eight months' observation in each setting.

Figures and measurements, however, cannot show the whole picture that can link aspects of process with the product. Measurement technology can not account for the multiple factors that operate within an 'untidy' learning milieu. So the results of measurement need to be interpreted by means of more qualitative evidence allowed by the 'illuminative evaluation' paradigm. This can explain trends that have developed as an effect of 'the interplay of numerous factors' within 'the learning milieu in any particular classroom' (Parlett & Hamilton 1972).

So, while the hypotheses regarding the relationship between the process and product of language learning need to be surveyed in the light of the data derived from measurement of the process and product, the whole picture of a process leading to a product that can be different in two contrastive settings, needs to be interpreted with the help of insight into other factors, derived through qualitative evidence.

I shall now discuss the hypotheses set up at the start of this research, to see how far the results help to support the hypotheses and how the trends in the development in the two groups can be explained by differential operation of the forces of language learning in the two settings.

The first section of this chapter relates the multiple aspects of the process and product of language learning, to investigate how far the hypotheses about the differences in learning were supported by the evidence.
The second section considers the results of the qualitative evidence from the classrooms to help interpret the results of testing the hypotheses, and relate the findings into a contrastive picture of the learning in the two settings.

The next three sections discuss the findings and their implications for the education of the two groups of learners. The results can provide the basis for further, more detailed and systematic research into pedagogy for other Bangladeshi learners.

8.1. The Hypotheses in the light of the results

In this section I shall examine each hypothesis in the light of the results of measurement of learning product and language use.

Hypothesis 1) The greater the use of English by the learners for interaction in the classroom, the better will be their English proficiency.

The prediction was that the second language use would be greater in the Mixed setting, School C, where there would be the need to use it to interact with NSs and speakers of other languages. The greater compulsion to use English would result in better development of English in School C. Over the period of observation, the greater need for use, with more accurate feedback within the mixed setting would help to develop English better in the mixed setting than in the homogeneous setting.

To examine the hypothesis in the light of the results, I shall break it up into its constituent propositions:

i) one of the two settings will have a greater use of English;

ii) one of the two settings will have a greater development of proficiency in English.

The hypothesis predicted that in both cases School C the mixed setting would be identified. If this was not so, the hypothesis would not stand supported by the evidence of the data.
To answer the first proposition and determine the setting that had the greater use of L2, the summary of the average use of language in interaction surveyed in Ch. 6 needs to be referred to.

The quantification of the language used in the classroom gave the total use of language as well as the total use of L1. Since the use of L1 and L2 together constituted the total language used in a classroom, the deduction of the use of L1 from the total language use showed the use of L2. On the basis of such deduction it had already been established in Ch 6 that School A showed the higher use of total language on two subjects out of three. This will be seen on the table below.

Key: This serves for most tables in this chapter.
Sc=School; A=Homogeneous Setting; C=Mixed Setting; Eng=English; Sci=Science; Geog=Geography; L1=Bengali; L2=English; C-Unit=Communicative Unit; R1=Reading 1; R2=Reading 2; W1=Writing 1; W2=Writing 2; L1=Listening 1; L2=Listening 2; S=Speaking.
AcTk=Academic Talk; NonAcTk=NonAcademic Talk; Tot C-U=Total communicative units.
CU/ L1=Communicative units in Bengali.

Summary Table showing the use of average words in L2 across the three subjects in the two settings (higher figures mentioned are shown in bold)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total Words</th>
<th>Words in L1</th>
<th>Words in L2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that the average use of language was higher in School A in English and geography, ie, in two subjects out of three. This indicates that on average, School A used a greater amount of total language than School C. Within this pattern of language use, School C used a higher quantity of L1 in two subjects out of three, ie, in English and science, which indicates that on average the use of L1 was higher in School C. Since the use of the two languages in a classroom was complementary (ie, Use of L1+ Use of L2= Total language use), this also indicates that School A had the higher use of L2 on average (Ch 6).
The trend was for the homogeneous setting to use a greater quantity of L2 than the mixed setting for interaction during the observation period. But according to the predictions of the hypothesis the use of L2 should have been higher in the mixed setting, School C. The results of the analysis of the data did not support the prediction of the hypothesis.

To answer the second proposition, the setting where greater development in language had taken place during the observation period, had to be identified. In my research design I had decided to measure the learners' development of proficiency in language use through their performance in the linguistic pre and post tests. The difference between the mean scores of the post over the pre test was the measure of development of proficiency in language use during the observation period.

To identify the setting that showed the greater language development, the mean scores of the pre and post tests in the two settings have been compared in Ch 4. Any increase of the posttest scores over the pretest was taken as the indication of improvement in the learners' ability to use that skill over time. The results of the linguistic tests and their mean scores derived in Ch 4 are now presented in the table below to help test the proposition:

Table showing Mean Scores of Pre and Post tests of the two Settings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A: R1 R2 W1 W2 L1 L2</th>
<th>School C: R1 R2 W1 W2 L1 L2</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1  63 25 49 36 83 28 41</td>
<td>R1  39 20 38 22 61 29 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2  54 33 48 42 38 21 51</td>
<td>R2  35 36 33 28 41 37 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1  36 33 42 48 21 61 37</td>
<td>W1  26 28 33 28 41 37 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2  28 38 41 51 21 7 27</td>
<td>W2  19 29 38 41 21 7 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1  41 37 21 51 28 41 37</td>
<td>L1  35 36 33 28 41 37 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2  28 41 37 27 41 37 27</td>
<td>L2  28 41 37 27 41 37 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparison of the mean scores of the pre and posttest within each setting showed that there had taken place a very similar pattern of improvement across settings. The scores of both schools had improved in three of the seven skills in the post test over the pre test. There were decreases in performance in the other four skills. So both settings showed a similar pattern of increase in the same number of skills and decrease in corresponding number of skills. A closer comparison showed that in School C the improvements were greater while the decreases were less sharp than in School A. The score of Listening
1 in School A was made unrealistically high by the non-standard performance of some pupils, so the actual difference between the pre and posttest would be less. In spite of this the greater improvement and lesser deterioration in School C than in School A indicated that as far as measurement could show, the general improvement in the mixed setting was greater than in the homogeneous setting.

Putting the answers to the two propositions together shows that

i) School A used the higher number of words in L2, and
ii) While both schools made very similar improvements on the posttest over the pretest, School C made greater improvements than School A at the end of the observation period.

The results of the analyses of the data do not support the predictions of this hypothesis, as they show that improvement in proficiency of language use occurred in the setting where the use of L2 was lower. To put it in specific terms, School A, the homogeneous setting used more L2 during their classroom interaction. But the measurement of the development of proficiency at the end of the period shows that, while both schools showed similar trends of improvement and deterioration in the posttest over the pretest, School C showed a greater improvement in proficiency scores. While the extent of improvement in School C was higher than in School A, the extent of deterioration was lower in School C than School A. So, a general comparison of performance shows that the mixed setting made greater improvement than the homogeneous setting. The results of the interaction analysis and the psychometric tests do not support the predictions, so the hypothesis is falsified.

The improvement in School C's proficiency in L2 despite using less L2 than School A seems to indicate that while the pressure to perform the GCSE coursework was present in both settings, the exposure to the use of English by a greater number of NS teachers and peers may have helped to produce a higher level of proficiency in some skill areas for the learners in School C than A, while it also tended to reduce the decline in other skill areas, more in School C than A. This will be discussed later at greater length.
Hypothesis 2) The greater scope for interaction with native speakers will lead to the development of more sociolinguistic appropriacy in language production at the end of the period, particularly in Speaking skill.

The exposure to native speakers and the critical feedback from them will help develop greater sense of sociolinguistic appropriacy in spoken language among learners in School C than School A. In the homogeneous setting where there was less scope for interaction with native speakers, the development of sociolinguistic appropriacy will be less.

To test the hypothesis in the light of the results, the mean scores of the Speaking skill with its component sub-skills that include 'Appropriacy', on the pre and posttest will be compared across the two settings.

Table showing Mean Scores of pre and post tests in the Speaking skill in each setting: (figures in bold show the higher scores)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coh. Fluency = Coherent Fluency; Sup. Fluency = Superficial Fluency; Int. Skill = Interactive Skill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A</th>
<th>Total Appropriacy</th>
<th>Coh. Fluency</th>
<th>Sup. Fluency</th>
<th>Int. Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School C</th>
<th>Total Appropriacy</th>
<th>Coh. Fluency</th>
<th>Sup. Fluency</th>
<th>Int. Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean scores for Speaking show that the proficiency of the learners in School A increased in the total speaking skill over the observation period from 41 to 51, while the proficiency in School C showed a regression, from 38 to 27. An increase in the mean scores of posttest over the pretest indicates better performance in the post test, and an improvement in performance in the skill over the observation period.

To look at the scores of 'Appropriacy' which indicates the sub-skill of sociolinguistic appropriacy in Speaking, the table above shows
that in School A there was a regression in the learners' proficiency in the use of this skill over time from 47 to 31. In School C the mean score in the subskill of 'Appropriacy' on the pretest was 35 while in the posttest it increased to 38. This means that in School A there was a regression in the proficiency of spoken sociolinguistic appropriacy while in School C there was an improvement in the use of this sub-skill over time.

So, while in School A the mean scores of performance in the total skill of Speaking improved, in School C the score of the total skill declined. In contrast, in School A, while the learners' mean scores on the subskill of sociolinguistic appropriacy declined, in School C the mean scores of their sociolinguistic appropriacy of language use improved on the posttest. This indicates that while in the homogeneous setting the learners improved in Speaking skill as a whole, they did not improve in their sociolinguistic appropriacy. In the mixed setting, in a contrastive trend, the learners did not improve in the total skill but did improve in their sense of sociolinguistic appropriacy in Speaking during the observation period. The comparison in other productive skill, Writing also showed that both settings made similar improvements in appropriacy in Writing 2 (Ch 4), which may be from feedback to academic writing for GCSE coursework available in both settings.

The results of the psychometric tests supported the predictions of this hypothesis, that learners in School C, the mixed setting would improve their sense appropriacy in Speaking at the end of the period. The learners in School A, the homogeneous setting did not improve similarly in 'Appropriacy' in Speaking, in spite of the fact that they were progressing through a similar period in their education. This shows that a greater scope for exposure to the L2 as spoken by NSs, may help learners to develop a better sense of appropriacy in the spoken use of the second language. Feedback to written output can help improve written appropriacy. Development of appropriacy in one area may not carry over into another skill area.

Hypothesis 3) The greater the use of L1, the more uniform or homogeneous will be the development of L2 ability among the members of that setting.
After a period of learning, the range or the difference between the high and low performers in L2 will be smaller in the homogeneous setting than within the mixed setting where the use of L1 will be less.

This hypothesis can be stated in terms of the following propositions:

i) that the use of L1 will be higher in one of the two settings during the observation period;

ii) that the learning of L2 will be more uniform at the end of the observation period than at the beginning, in one of the two settings.

According to the hypothesis School A, the homogeneous setting should be identified in both cases.

To determine the setting that showed the higher average use of L1 over time, I shall refer to the summary of the results of the interaction analysis in Ch. 6 for the comparative use of Bengali (L1) in each classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Table Showing Class Averages of the Use of L1 in C-units in the Three Subjects (Key at the beginning of chapter)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total C-Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CU in AcademicTalk</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L1 Non AcademicTalk</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above presents the total use of L1 in terms of average communicative units used on each subject in each setting. According to the figures of the table, the use of L1 in English and Science in terms of C-units was higher in School C, the mixed setting, but lower in Geography. On average the use of L1 in English was 05 C-units in School A but 17 C-units in School C. In Science it was 24 C-units in School A but 39 C-units in School C. Only in geography the use was higher in School A. Since the use of L1 was higher in School C on two out of three of the subjects, the average use of L1 has been taken to be higher in School C, the mixed setting than in School A, the homogeneous setting.
The second proposition requires to determine the change in the range of scores around their mean in linguistic proficiency tests at the end of the observation period from what it was at the beginning. In order to do this, the dispersion of scores of the learners in the pre and post test within each setting needs to be compared through their standard deviations.

The standard deviation of the scores of tests at each time would show the distribution of their range of scores of proficiency at the beginning and end of the observation period. A lower s.d. of the posttest scores in comparison with the pretest scores would indicate that the range of the posttest scores had become smaller as the scores clustered closer together around the central tendency. This meant that the learners performed more similarly on the posttests than on the pretests. On the other hand a higher s.d. would indicate that the range had become larger as the scores were more dispersed from the central tendency than before.

Table showing the Standard deviation of Scores of Pre and Post Test:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School C</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows the range or the spread of the scores across the skills on the pre and post tests in each setting. In School A there was a decrease in the standard deviation in five of the seven skills (shown in bold). In Listening 1 in the pretest of School A, the performance on the test was uneven. As a result the s.d. of the pretest may not be showing the true range of ability, and it is possible that the range of ability in Listening I in School A remained the same over time. If this was so, there was an increase in the dispersion on only one skill in School A over time, W2, while there was a decrease in other five skills (R1,R2,W1,L2 & S).

In School C the range or dispersal of scores of language use around the mean became lower on three of the seven skills over time (shown in bold), while in the other four skills there was an increase.
So the decrease in the standard deviations in School C took place in three skills while in School A it took place in five skills.

Comparing the development in the two settings, the decrease in the dispersion of posttest scores at the end of the observation period took place over a greater number of linguistic skills in School A, the homogeneous group, while in School C, the mixed group the increase in dispersal took place over a greater number of skills. This signifies that while the ability to use the second language became more uniform or closer to the mean in the homogeneous setting, the ability among the members of the mixed setting became more varied over the observation period.

To put the answers to the propositions together, i) the use of L1 was higher in School C than School A, while ii) linguistic performance became more homogeneous in School A than in School C over the observation period.

The prediction had been that the setting where the use of L1 was higher, would develop greater homogeneity in the linguistic performance of the learners over time. But since the answers to the two propositions were not the same, the hypothesis was not supported by the data. The results showed that while the use of L1 was higher in School C than A, the homogeneity in linguistic proficiency that it should have helped to bring about, was greater in School A than C during the observation.

It is possible that other intervening factors operating in the learning milieu, not selected for observation may have been responsible for the development of greater homogeneity in linguistic performance of School A than C.

Hypothesis 4) The greater the use of L1 for academic discussion in the classroom by the learners, the more uniform will be the learning of academic content by all.

The use of L1 will be greater within the homogeneous setting, where the range of difference between the higher and lower achievers...
on content learning will be lower at the end of a period, than in the mixed setting where the use of L1 will be less.

This hypothesis can be divided into two propositions:

i) the use of L1 for academic talk will be higher in one of the two settings;
ii) at the end of the observation period the performance on tests of academic subjects will be more uniform in one of the two settings.

According to this hypothesis, School A should be identified in both cases.

In answer to the first proposition, the identification of the setting with the higher use of L1 for academic talk, the summary of the analysis of interaction in Ch. 6 has shown the following distribution of the use of L1 for academic purposes in terms of c-units:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the table above, the results of the analysis of interaction show that the use of communicative units in L1 for academic talk was higher in School C in English and science, in two subjects out of three. On average this indicates that the use of L1 for academic talk was higher in School C than in School A, just as the discussion on hypothesis 3 has shown that the total use of L1 was higher in School C than School A.

To answer the second proposition, that the scores of tests on the three academic subjects will be more homogeneous in one of the two settings, comparison has to be made between the standard deviations of the scores that the learners in each setting received on their academic work towards the beginning and the end of the observation period (Appendix 1, Ch 8).

The standard deviation of the academic scores shows the spread of scores of the learners' performance in each subject at the beginning and end of the observation period. When the scores are spread far
away from their mean, or the difference between the highest and the lowest scores in the class is big, the standard deviation will be higher than when the difference between the highest and the lowest scores is smaller.

The following table presents the standard deviations of the academic scores of the learners received at the beginning and the end of the observation period on coursework in the respective subjects (Appendix 1, Ch 8).

**Key:**

I= Test one. II= Test two. s.d=Standard deviations. difference=difference between the s.d. of first and second test.

**Table showing the S.D. of Academic Scores in the two settings**

**School A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English: difference</th>
<th>Science: difference</th>
<th>Geography: difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English: difference</th>
<th>Science: difference</th>
<th>Geography: difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows the standard deviation of the scores, indicating the spread of scores around the mean in the two settings on the three academic subjects. The difference between the standard deviation at the two points of time shown as 'difference' on the table, is the measure of the change that has taken place in learners' academic performance over the observation period. A lower increase in the s.d. at the end of the period indicates a greater homogeneity over the period, while a greater increase indicates a greater dispersion or diversity between the performance of the higher and lower achievers in the class than before.

The scores on the table above show that there was a general tendency for the range of scores to increase over time in both settings in most subjects observed, showing that in both settings the difference between the performance of the higher and lower achievers tended to
increase over the observation period. But a closer examination shows that while in School C there were increases in the s.d. of all three subjects, in School A there were increases in two subjects out of three. So it can be said that on average, the range of academic scores in School C, the mixed setting became more dispersed than in School A, the homogeneous setting at the end of the observation period. The trend in academic performance follows the trend in linguistic performance surveyed in Hypothesis 3.

In terms of academic performance this means that although the dispersion increased in both settings over time, showing an increase in the difference between performance of higher and lower achievers, the increase was greater in School C than in School A. In School A the lower achievers seem to have improved more than the higher achievers, which kept their scores closer, while in School C the higher achievers seem to have improved more than the lower achievers, so that the range between the higher and lower achievers had increased more than in School A.

To put the results of the two propositions together, the use of L1 was higher in School C during the observation period, but the academic scores became more homogeneous, or closer together to the mean in School A by the end of the observation period.

According to the hypothesis, the same setting should have been identified in answer to both propositions so that, if the use of L1 was higher in School C, the range of the academic scores should have been more homogeneous in School C at the end of the observation period. But as the results of the analysis of the data identify two different settings for answer, the hypothesis is not supported by the data. It appears that the use of L1 for classroom discussion may not be the principal factor that helps to produce more uniform content learning by these pupils.

Hypothesis 5) The setting that uses more task-based classroom organisation for teaching will have greater development in the 'context-embedded' use of linguistic skills than the setting that uses more teacher-fronted input.
There are two propositions in this hypothesis, that:

i) one of the two settings will have a higher use of task-based classroom organisation than teacher-fronted input;

ii) one of the two settings will have a better development of more 'context-embedded' use of language.

According to the predictions of the hypothesis, the answer to both propositions should identify the same setting.

The first proposition, that one of the two settings made the greater use of task-based teaching, can be answered from the results of the categorisation of the organisations of teaching in the classrooms observed, in Ch 5. Since I did not have any reason to believe that the teaching in the classrooms observed was organised differently from what was observed, I have assumed that the organisations that were observed were similar to the proportion of teaching organisations generally used in each setting for these subjects.

A survey of the total number and type of teaching organisations used across the settings (Appendix 2, Ch 5) shows that School A organised nine classes out of eleven as task-based teaching, while School C used nine classes out of ten. So the proportion of task-based classes used was higher in School C. To look at the second half of the proposition, the proportion of teacher-fronted classes used was higher in School A. Had the number of classes observed been higher, it is possible that the difference in the use of these two types of organisation between the two settings would have been more marked. However, as it stands, in answer to the proposition,

- the use of task-based classes was higher in School C, the mixed group, while
- the use of teacher-fronted classes was higher in School A, the homogeneous group.

To determine the setting that showed the greater development in context-embedded use of English at the end of the period, a comparison of the results of the analysis of psychometric tests for the 'Context-embedded' test of skills can help to provide the answer. As mentioned in Ch 3, the first test on each skill, tested the learners'
proficiency in the more 'context-embedded' use of the language. So the mean scores of the first test of each skill shall now be compared between settings to determine the greater development of proficiency. The scores for only three skills are shown here, as only one test was used for Speaking skill, which showed proficiency in the more 'decontextualised' use of language.

Table showing the mean scores of more 'context-embedded' use of language in the pre and post tests:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>School C</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest:</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Pretest:</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest:</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Posttest:</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease:</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>Decrease:</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores of Listening 1 in School A was influenced by the uneven performance by some of the learners who did the test as 'while listening' instead of 'post listening' as the others. This may have pushed up the mean score for the pretest, but the difference of the scores suggests that the trend of decline in the posttest over the pretest would have remained similar even had the learners performed in the standard manner. The difference could have been less sharp, but the pretest mean would still have been higher than the posttest.

A comparison of the scores on the table above show that there was no improvement over the observation period in the 'context-embedded' use of any skill in either setting. The pattern of decline in the posttest over the pretest was quite similar across the two settings. But since the decrease was less sharp in School C than in School A on two skills out of three, it is possible to say that the decline in the learners' ability was less marked in School C than the decline in School A. If one can take a reduced regression in performance on the posttests of the 'context-embedded' tests of English to be the indication of less bad performance in School C than School A, the hypothesis is supported by data that is negative in nature. School C had a higher proportion of classes organised around tasks, and also showed less deterioration in the use of more 'context-embedded' skills. While remembering that there were doubts about the second test results, these negative psychometric measurements can be said to support the hypothesis.
There was a striking difference between the two settings in the way each setting organised the tasks in the classroom. While School A used groupwork for eight classes out of nine, School C used groupwork for one class out of nine. While School A used individual work for one class out of nine, School C used individual work for eight classes out of nine.

Since groupwork is held to give rise to greater interaction between peers on a basis of equality (Ch 2), the setting where its use is higher should give rise to greater use of L2 and an increasing proficiency in 'context-embedded' use of English. In the light of this factor, the improvement in the proficiency in the use of 'context-embedded' use of English should have been greater in School A than School C. But the negative results of the tests do not show greater improvements in School A. This means that the use of group tasks in the homogeneous setting did not give rise to the use of language that could help in the acquisition of more 'context-embedded' English. It is possible that the absence of more appropriate input in School A, through lack of NSs and differences in the population, prevented their better acquisition of 'context-embedded' language.

The next hypothesis was:

**Hypothesis 6)** Learners in the setting that induces the use of more sustained speech consisting of longer stretches of coherent utterances, and the use of more low-frequency words, will show a better proficiency in the 'decontextualised' use of English.

This hypothesis can be divided into three propositions, that:

i) one of the two settings will show the use of longer utterances;

ii) one of the two settings will show the greater use of low-frequency words;

iii) one of the two settings will show the better development of 'decontextualised' use of language over time.

The answers to the three propositions should identify the same setting, not indicated by the hypothesis.
The answer to the first two propositions can be derived from the Summary table from Ch 6 given below. It presents the summary of the average quantity of language used on each subject, with the average length of turns and communicative units used in the two settings, in terms of words.

Table showing the averages of the language produced in the two settings in the three subjects: (Key at the beginning of chapter) (Higher figures are shown in bold)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>T-I</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV WD/</th>
<th>AV WD/</th>
<th>WD/ %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>C-U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English A 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>9.7-6.1</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English C 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>5.5-4</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science A 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.2-2.5</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science C 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>4.8-2.1</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography A0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>5.6-3.3</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography C0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.9-2.3</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: A 582/ A130/ A367/ 490C 119C 133C 298C

In answer to the first proposition, to determine the setting that shows the use of longer utterances, the length of turns on the table above can provide the answer. The average length of turns is presented in terms of length of turns used in interaction, measured in terms of words. The figures show that on two subjects out of three (English and geography) School A used longer turns than School C, on average. This means that the utterances used by the learners in School A were longer than those used by learners in School C, for their interaction on two subjects out of three. So, judged in terms of average words, School A used longer stretches of utterances for interaction in the classroom than School C.

For the second proposition, to determine the setting that showed the greater use of low-frequency words, the table below presents the summary of the use of low-frequency words across classes observed in the two settings, from the analysis of interaction in Ch 6.
The use of low-frequency words had been divided into the purpose of talk they had been used for, academic or non-academic, depending on the category of the communicative units in which they had been used. On the table above, School A shows the use of a greater number of low-frequency words for academic purpose on all three subjects. For non-academic purpose, School A used a greater number of these words on two subjects out of three although the average is similar. So, it can be said that for both purposes of language use, the use of low-frequency words was higher in School A, the homogeneous setting than in School C, the mixed setting.

The third proposition, that one of the two settings will show a greater development of 'decontextualised' use of language over time, can be answered from the categorisation of the tests in Ch. 3 and from the results of the psychometric tests. According to the criteria for selection of the tests, the second of the tests on each skill reflected the learners' proficiency in the more 'decontextualised' use of language, held to be necessary for better academic expression (Ch 1). So the means of the scores on the second psychometric test on each skill on the table below, from the psychometric measurement discussed in Ch 4, reflect the learners' development of proficiency in the more 'decontextualised' use of language in each setting.

Table showing the Means of tests of 'decontextualised' use of Skills on the pre and post tests across settings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Average Words on Academic Talk</th>
<th>Average Words on Non Academic Talk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third proposition, that one of the two settings will show a greater development of 'decontextualised' use of language over time, can be answered from the categorisation of the tests in Ch. 3 and from the results of the psychometric tests. According to the criteria for selection of the tests, the second of the tests on each skill reflected the learners' proficiency in the more 'decontextualised' use of language, held to be necessary for better academic expression (Ch 1). So the means of the scores on the second psychometric test on each skill on the table below, from the psychometric measurement discussed in Ch 4, reflect the learners' development of proficiency in the more 'decontextualised' use of language in each setting.

Table showing the Means of tests of 'decontextualised' use of Skills on the pre and post tests across settings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A: R2</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>School C: R2</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest:</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest:</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference:</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>+16</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis of the means of scores of the pre and post tests within each school in Ch 4 shows a similar trend of improvement in both schools. The scores indicate that there was improvement in performance in the same number of skills on the posttest over the pretest in both settings, over time. To determine the setting where the greater improvement took place, the difference of the posttest mean over the pretest mean of each skill helps to derive the answer. A greater positive difference between the means indicates a greater increase in scores over time, showing a greater improvement. A comparison of the means in the table above showed the difference to be higher in School C than in School A on two of the three skills. If one takes in the negative difference, in School A it was = (+8, +6, -7, +10), giving an average of 4, while in School C it was = (+16, +6, +12, -11), giving an average of 6 approximately. One may take this to indicate that the improvement in the 'decontextualised' use of English during the observation period was greater in School C than School A, just as the overall improvement was greater in School C, shown in discussion of Hypothesis 1.

Putting together the results of the analysis of the data, the answers to the three propositions are:
-the use of low-frequency words was higher in School A;
-the use of longer structures took place in the interaction in School A;
-while both settings show very similar trends of improvement in the 'decontextualised' use of language, the improvement within the observation period can be said to have been greater in this type of use of skills in School C, the mixed setting.

Although the responses to the first and second propositions, of the operation of the factors that were supposed to help cause improvement in the use of 'decontextualised' type of language, identified School A, the response to the third proposition showed that greater improvement during the observation period in the proficiency in use of such language, took place in School C. Putting the answers together to the three propositions shows that the hypothesis is not supported by the results of the analysis of the data.
This can mean one of two things. Either the proficiency in the 'decontextualised' use of language does not come about through the use of lower frequency words and longer utterances, or some intervening factor that has not been taken into account, has affected the learning.

8.1.1. Results of the investigation

I shall now put the results of the investigation of the hypotheses together, in order to see the trends within the language learning that took place in each of the two settings over the observation period:

School A, the homogeneous school with 96% Bangladeshis:
- School A showed a greater use of total speech as well as the use of L2;
- School A developed a greater homogeneity in second language proficiency as well as in content learning.
- School A showed the use of longer utterances and of a greater number of low-frequency words during the observation period.
- While both schools showed a similar use of task-based teaching, School A showed a greater use of tasks performed through groupwork, and also of classes organised as teacher-fronted input.

School C, the mixed school with less than 50% Bangladeshis, the other pupils consisting of NSs and speakers of other languages:
- While both schools showed a similar pattern of development at the end of the observation period, School C showed the greater development in general proficiency in the use of English. It showed greater improvement in the more 'decontextualised' language and a lesser regression in the use of more 'context-embedded' use of linguistic skills.
- School C showed a better development of sociolinguistic appropriacy in Speaking.
- School C showed the greater use of L1 as a whole, as well as a greater use of it for academic talk.

The hypotheses regarding the process and product of learning that are supported at the end of the research are only two:
- the development of sociolinguistic appropriacy took place in School C where there were more NSs, and
- a comparatively smaller regression of proficiency in the more 'context-embedded' use of English related to the use of a greater number of
task-based classes in School C, the mixed group, showing a 'less bad' development in the use of more 'context-embedded' English.

All the other findings were contrary to the predictions of the hypotheses, so that those hypotheses were not supported by the data.

Having examined the hypotheses in the light of the measurement data, I shall now see how far the qualitative data helps to illuminate and interpret the results of the investigation that are apparently contradictory.

8.2. Interpretation of the findings in the light of the qualitative data

In this section I shall try to interpret the results of the examination the hypotheses in the light of the qualitative data.

Hypothesis 1: The greater the use of L2 by the learners for interaction in the classroom, the better will be their L2 proficiency.

The data of the interaction showed that although the trend of general development was greater in School C at the end of a comparable period of time, their use of L2 within the interaction was lower than in School A during the period.

In linguistic terms this could mean that the proficiency had increased in School C even without the language being used as profusely in output. In School A it meant that proficiency had not increased in spite of their greater use of language in output, which had been expected to lead to better English learning by those pupils. To find some answers to these propositions that contradict the theories of language learning, I shall compare the scores of the pre and post tests once more.

Table Comparing the Mean Scores of the two Settings on the Pre and Post tests: (Higher scores are shown in bold) (Key given above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R1 R2 W1 W2 L1 L2 S</td>
<td>R1 R2 W1 W2 L1 L2 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>63 25 49 36 83 28 41</td>
<td>Pretest 39 20 38 22 61 29 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>54 33 48 42 38 21 61</td>
<td>Posttest 35 36 33 28 41 37 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One can see here that the greater improvement that took place in the posttests in School C had been more in the Receptive skills, Reading and Listening, rather than the Productive skills, Writing and Speaking, although there was improvement in Writing also. The predictions of the hypothesis had been that the greater use of L2 would lead to greater proficiency in L2. The use of L2 indicated in the hypothesis, had been verbal output in L2 (recorded in the classrooms), predicted to lead to better overall improvement. But this did not happen. The reason for this was that the hypothesis predicted too global an improvement, in both Receptive and Productive skills through use of language in output in one productive skill only. If linguistic skills tend to develop individually, through the use of individual skill, verbal output should lead to the development of oral and other productive skills rather than to a more general improvement.

If the hypothesis was reframed to predict that a higher verbal output in L2 would lead to a better development in spoken skills, the hypothesis would have been more correct. Looking at the evidence of the posttest scores over the pretest, one can see that this hypothesis would have been supported by the scores of the two settings.

On the table above, while School A scored 41 on Speaking on the pretest, it scored 51 on the posttest, showing an improvement in proficiency. In School C, the score of the pretest was 38 while the score of the posttest was 27, a decline in proficiency over time.

The scores of the other productive skill in School A also shows greater improvement than in School C. While both settings showed improvement in this skill, the scores of School A's increase was from 30s to 40s while in the mixed group the increase was in 20s. In scoring on tests, it may be easier to improve from 20 to 30 than it may be to improve from 30 to 40. One can not be sure that School C would have continued to improve steadily after reaching the observed level of proficiency, whereas School A has reached this higher level of proficiency. School A's regression on the other productive skill is minimal, from 49 to 48. In Writing 1 School A remained stable. Taken together, this means that improvement in the productive skills Writing 2 and Speaking, while skill in Writing 1 remained at the same level may
have been due to the greater use of language for hypotheses testing in output in the homogeneous setting. Sub-skills operating in common across the productive skills may have been developed similarly by the greater use of extended language in interaction. So, the use of language in output seems to lead to a greater proficiency in the productive use of language, while the receptive skills seem to require less use in production for development of proficiency.

I shall now look for a 'illuminative' interpretation to explain greater general linguistic improvement in School C than School A, in spite of lower use of English in interaction in School C.

Reason: Learners in School C were exposed to more native-like input from peers using it around them. The presence of multiple support teachers in the classrooms (Video and personal observation, Ch. 7) made available more critical feedback to their use of English from the teachers than was possible in School A where support from proficient speakers was far less (ibid).

Even though the use of English among themselves was lower than in School A, and there was no evidence of intergroup mixing, the learners in School C were listening to more input of better quality from English speaking peers, and receiving greater amount of immediate critical feedback from teachers to their own use. The mixed group had help from multiple support teachers in the classroom during English classes who helped the learners with their reading and provided them with simplified explanations in the classroom to enable comprehension. This may have helped to bring about their marked improvement in Reading 2. School A did not have the benefit of listening to NS peers, neither did they have means of regular support from proficient teachers (they were supported only once during the classes observed, to specially help administer a task).

The pilot test (Ch 3) had shown that learners in the homogeneous setting tended to perform badly on the Listening tests, possibly because of their limited exposure to, and the need to understand English spoken in various accents, by NSs or by speakers of other languages. Learners in the mixed setting had greater exposure to such varied input
of better quality for Listening, as well as to feedback from a greater number of teachers who were proficient speakers of English. This seems to have affected their performance in the Receptive skills positively during the observation period. Although the homogeneous group used English more, the quality of this input and feedback was limited to their own proficiency level rather than the more accurate English input in School C. It is possible that learners in School C tried out their linguistic input as output in other places, e.g., at home, as shown in the following excerpt:

School C: English 3/1

200: (L1) Don't you talk at home? I talk with my brother-in-law, my brother, my sister. My mother scolds me, asking, what are you talking about? I don't understand. If we have any secret, we tell our sister and her husband in English. My mother asks, what are you saying? I don't understand, explain to me what you are saying.

Although School C used English less in output, the better input and the scope of greater interaction with teachers may have led to development in the receptive skills Reading 2 and Listening 2, while the regressions on the other receptive skills in this setting were smaller than in School A. Their improvement may seem to be over a greater number of skills, as only one test for speaking had been used from the constraint of time, reducing the number of productive skills.

From this evidence it appears that better quality of input and feedback can lead to greater improvement in the Receptive skills than the productive skills. Less output may be necessary for improvement in Receptive skills than in Productive skills. Production of language in output seems to bring about about proficiency in production skills.

Hypothesis 2: In the mixed setting the scope for interaction with English speakers within the peer group will lead to the development of greater sociolinguistic appropriacy in language use at the end of the period, particularly in the speaking skill.

The prediction was that the input and the feedback from English speaking peers would help to develop a better sense of sociolinguistic appropriacy in School C where there was a greater number of NSs present than in School A. Although there was no visible interaction
between Bangladeshis and the NSs or the speakers of other languages, the results of the analysis of the scores of the linguistic tests confirm the predictions of the hypothesis. While the use of L2 was higher in School A, the learners of that school did not develop their sense of appropriacy as well as the learners in School C, who developed greater sense of appropriacy even though they did not interact much with other language groups. The quantity of use did not appear to influence the development of appropriacy in language use.

**Reason:** Even though there was not much direct conversation between the English speakers and the non-English speakers, it is possible that listening to input from a greater number of English speaking peers, and to good quality input and feedback from a greater number of NS teachers within the classroom, particularly during English classes, may have been a factor that helped the learners in School C develop a greater sense of social appropriacy.

The learners in the homogeneous setting did not have exposure to the same kind of models within the peer group in the classroom. They were restricted to using the second language with members of their own group who had not developed a high sense of appropriacy. Lacking good quality feedback from proficient English speakers within the learning milieu to tell them what they needed to do differently, they continued to use an inappropriate form of the language that was easily understood by peers from the same language background, and by teachers who were used to their speech and so did not always give negative feedback. So while they attained greater fluency in Speaking, they did not improve their sense of appropriacy.

Swain (1985) in her investigation into learning of French by English speakers in Canadian immersion classrooms, found that learners interacting with peers from the same language background were understood by them and by their teachers, who did not always give them 'negative input', so that they did not develop beyond a certain level of grammaticality despite using L2 consistently. These factors that also operated in the homogeneous setting, did not help to develop the learners' sense of sociolinguistic appropriacy in the spoken production of the second language as much as the learners in the mixed setting.
did, in spite of a greater use of English in the classroom conversation of the homogeneous setting.

Hypothesis 3: A greater use of L1 will lead to more uniform development of L2.

The prediction here was that the use of L1 would be greater in School A where the learners were homogeneously Bengali-speaking. In this setting the development of English would be more uniform, i.e., the range or the difference between the lower and higher achiever would be lower than it would be in School C.

The analysis showed that the use of L1 was higher in School C, the mixed school, while the development of English became more uniform in School A over time.

In Ch. 6 I discussed the 'illuminative' explanation of the higher use of L2 in School A which I shall restate here. In School C where there were many language groups present, including members of the English-speaker group, the Bangladeshis may have felt their identity to be threatened, particularly because of their low social status in the larger society (Ch 1). Use of the L2 in such a situation could appear to them to be a sign of convergence to the target group, conforming to the powerful majority and a sacrifice of their own identity (Ch 2). This feeling may have made them uphold the group barriers by emphasising the signs of group identity through using their L1 more. The costs in term of sacrifice of self-identity in this case may have appeared to be higher to them than benefits of better academic performance. But this helped to make the group barriers stronger and exclude groups from each other. With such strong group barriers, learners with lower English ability would not like 'to look a fool' (School C: English 3/1: turn 156) before the other groups by using incorrect English.

In contrast in School A, there were no other groups present to challenge their status or identity. For them, using the L2 could be as easy and value-free as using the L1, since it did not denote convergence to the target group. There was no requirement for emphasising group identity through language, as boundaries did not
exist within the homogeneous community of the predominantly Bangladeshi-populated school: there was a greater requirement to emphasise distinctive group identity of the class within the homogeneous group of the school, through better academic performance. Since there were no other groups, there were no group barriers. The use of L2 was functional here, used for the instrumental purpose. It did not carry the social significance symbolising a desire to integrate that it assumed in the mixed setting.

Reason: To explain the greater homogeneity in School A in spite of a greater use of L1 in School C, I shall first explain what homogeneity is. It means that while the more proficient do not develop very much, the less proficient do, bringing the performance of the whole group closer to the mean.

In School A there was some use of L1 which could be making their use of English comprehensible to the less proficient, making these learners improve in their use of English. Speaking generally, although the learners in School A were using a greater amount of L2, it was not a target-like form of L2. The input was not of target-like quality, and there was no 'push' of 'negative input' from peers or teachers for them to improve, as in the Canadian classrooms (Swain 1985), neither did they have many proficient models among peers, or a greater number of teachers to give them good quality input that they could emulate. As a result the proficiency of all developed to a lower level of accuracy, nearer the mean.

In School C in contrast, while the less proficient did not make much progress, the more proficient did. So the range between the highest and the lowest scorer at the end of the period was higher than at the start of the observation period. The greater use of L1 in School C could be helping to hold the less proficient where they were, since they could get by in this manner without using the L2 much in output, which also helped to preserve their identity. But within the same setting there was exposure to input from the English speaking peers and teachers as they talked between themselves or to other learners, which they could be trying out in places not observed, eg, at home. This could have been helping the more proficient and those who wanted
to adopt some of the NS norms, to develop further levels of accuracy particularly in the receptive skills. Despite using a greater amount of L1, listening to input from English speaker peers and teachers, with feedback from teachers in School C could have been the factors helping the language use of some of the learners to become more accurate over time, creating greater diversity in ability in spite of a lower average use of English within the classroom interaction.

So while both groups improved in certain areas, there are two reasons why the development in School A was more homogeneous while the development in School C was more diverse. The reasons for this were two:

--the variety available within the linguistic factors in the learning environment; and
--the willingness of the learners to adopt the available norms, depending on the intergroup relationship.

In School C there was a greater variety of input and feedback available, from the variety of proficiency of the people present within the setting. The learners could choose to use it or not, according to the operation of intergroup boundaries, which would determine the extent they wanted to converge to the target group. Their extent of accommodation (Ch 2) would depend on their reaction to the target language speakers present within the same classroom. The willingness could vary from pupil to pupil depending on the intergroup relationship within the classroom, and how far each viewed the presence of these members to be a threat to his own identity. These two factors, the variety in the quality of linguistic factors and the variety of the pupils' attitudes towards the target group who were in close proximity may have helped to bring about the variety in language learning in School C.

In School A, the linguistic variation within the members was low. Although there was a greater use of extended utterances, the input and feedback were more homogeneous in quality than in School C, so the product would be more homogeneous. Secondly, as there was no members of the target group within the learning environment, the
learners attitudes would not differ greatly to influence their use of English within this milieu. One may generalise that

homogeneity in linguistic factors in the environment can lead to homogeneity in learning, while homogeneity in the background of group members can lead to homogeneity of attitudes, which can allow language learning to be similar. Conversely, heterogeneity in the linguistic factors in the environment can lead to heterogeneity in learning, and the heterogeneity within the background of members of the group can lead to heterogeneity of attitudes which can lead to differences within the level to which learners adopt the target language norms.

Hypothesis 4: The greater the use of L1 for academic discussion by learners, the more uniform will be the learning of academic content by all.

According to the results of the interaction analysis, the use of L1 in terms of communicative units for academic talk is higher in School C than in School A. But contrary to the predictions, the development in content learning is more homogeneous in School A.

In this the 'uncontrollable variables that are engendered by the learning milieu' mentioned by Parlett and Hamilton (1972) came into play. According to the teachers in School A (Appendix 1, Ch 7), sessions of peer teaching were being organised by the learners before the later set of academic tests. In School A, the learners who had become motivated to improve their results to enhance the group image, organised revision classes on a voluntary basis, where they were the teachers as well as the students. Each learner taught part of the content as the 'expert', during which sessions their explanations could be challenged by others. Output for explanations, the need to get across to others, and the need to attend to the input from a desire to improve and become worthy of the classroom group, all these considerations may have made the learners attend to the input of both concept and language, with the scope for expressing this concept, for better learning.

The learners used L1 as well as L2 in their teaching, and discussions. The additional language use that the revision entailed may have helped them to become more homogeneous in their linguistic
performance. This source of extra learning through the use of both languages contributed to these learners' greater homogeneity in academic performance, while it may also have helped the development of greater homogeneity in linguistic proficiency through more use of L1 than recorded. The need to do well may have lowered their 'affective filter' during their voluntary self-help classes so that they learnt the content and the related language better.

This intervening factor which occurred much after the start of the research was not known to me at the time of framing the hypotheses. It could have helped the learners in the homogeneous group to develop a greater uniformity in their academic performance over time. The operation of positive intergroup factors helped to make learners in the homogeneous setting exert themselves to help everybody perform better, leading to greater uniformity. In the mixed setting the groups remained polarised, leading to more diversity and individuality in learning.

In School C, the operation of any such intervening factors to affect the normal course of academic studies, was not mentioned by teachers. Within the classrooms in School C, there appeared to occur less interaction between the less and the more proficient than in School A. In School C, the greater use of L1 may have made the concepts comprehensible, but the extent of interaction in English with teachers or peers may not have been sufficient for all members of the mixed setting to learn. This may have helped to keep the proficiencies more polarised.

So in this case, the hypothesis was not supported due to the possible influence of factors within the learning milieu other than those selected for observation.

Hypothesis 5: The setting that uses more task-based classroom organisation will show greater development in the proficiency of the 'context-embedded' use of English than the setting that uses more teacher-fronted input.

The analysis of the classroom organisations showed
that School C used more task-based classes while School A used more teacher-fronted classes. Although there was no improvement in any setting, there was smaller regression in the 'context-embedded' ability in School C which used more tasks. To this extent the results confirmed the predictions of the hypothesis.

Reason: There may be two factors contributing to the smaller regression in the 'context-embedded' skills in School C. One of the factors may be the exposure that these learners had to the better quality of 'context-embedded' English used by their English speaking peers and the greater number of support teachers in School C. Even when this use was not directed to the Bangladeshi learners, its use in the classroom between others may have given them input of the use of English in the 'context-embedded' manner, which they may have tried as output when not recorded. Lacking such possibility of exposure to 'context-embedded' use of language, the development in School A was lower.

The second factor is, while both groups made improvements in Reading 2 and Writing 2, School C's improvements were greater. It is possible that the similarity in development was due to proficiency in certain sub-skills common to type 1 and 2 within the use of each skill. These common sub-skills may be transferable through the 'common underlying proficiency' mentioned by Cummins (1984) from type 2 to type 1 within each of the the two skills Reading and Writing in both settings. This could have helped to reduce the deterioration in both settings, but more so in School C where the improvement in type 2 of Writing had been similar but significantly higher in Reading 2 (Ch 4).

To explain the greater use of tasks in School C than A, the heterogeneous language background of the classroom population may have been a factor behind the use of more task-based classes. Getting across to individual pupils may be difficult in the mixed classroom, even with support teachers present. When language proves to be a problem and is a barrier for learning, task-based teaching, or practical work and demonstration may allow the teachers to get the content across to pupils, as shown by pupils' enthusiasm for less language-based work (Ch 7). After the teacher-input these students could learn
with the help of the peers, or by copying what they saw others doing (Appendix 1, Ch 7).

The peer help available within the same language group (Ch 7) may make the understanding of the content and some of the accompanying language, easier within the task-based classes, particularly for classrooms with multi-language groups.

**Hypothesis 6:** The setting that induces learners to use more sustained speech consisting of longer stretches of coherent utterances, and also the use of more low-frequency words, will show a better proficiency in the use of academic language over time.

The analysis of classroom interaction showed that while learners in School A used longer utterances and a greater number of low-frequency words than School C in their interaction, there was a greater development in School C in their proficiency in 'decontextualised' use of L2 over time. I shall now examine this more closely.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table showing the Means of tests of 'decontextualised' use of Skills across settings (the scores mentioned are shown in bold; key given at beginning of chapter)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School A:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reconsidering the hypothesis in the light of the theories of language learning, it appears to predict too general an improvement. The use of longer structures in production should predict the development of proficiency of the Productive skills rather than Receptive skills. The Writing and Speaking skills should profit more from the use of the longer structures and lower-frequency words in output, so that these two skills should develop better from sustained output using more lower frequency words. The use of such language in production should lead to greater proficiency in Productive skills only, rather than contributing to a global proficiency in 'decontextualised' type of language use.
To examine the mean scores of the pre and posttests in this light, School A shows improvement in both the productive skills while School C shows improvement in one, Writing but not in Speaking. The pressure to produce all coursework in writing may have affected both settings similarly to improve in more 'decontextualised' writing. But the production of longer utterances where more low-frequency words were used, appears to have helped the homogeneous group to improve in Speaking while the mixed group showed a decline in Speaking.

As far as the effect on language development through using longer utterances and lower-frequency words, School A does show better scores in Speaking than School C on the post tests. School A improved in Speaking and Writing 2. While School C did not improve in Speaking, it did improve in Writing 2 by a similar margin. It is possible that School A's greater proficiency in Speaking helped them to develop Writing 2 at a higher level of proficiency, scoring at higher men level than School C. One cannot predict that School C would continue to improve at the same level in Writing 2 after this observation was over.

So this hypothesis that was predictive of more general improvement than the theories of language learning can allow it to be, stands supported when it is limited to the Productive skills only, particularly in Speaking, rather than a global improvement.

Reason: Although neither setting showed improvement in Writing 1, the reasons for better trend of improvement in the productive skills in School A but not School C, particularly in Speaking has been discussed before, which I shall summarise here. The group boundaries operated less in School A where the learners used English more, for testing hypotheses about the L2 structures and lower-frequency words. In comparison, in School C where there were members of other groups present, the learners may have required to uphold the group barriers strongly rather than try to converge. The seating in strictly separate language groups, particularly for the Bangladeshis who never mingled with NSs or other language speakers, seemed to reflect this clearly. On the other hand there did not appear to be any encouragement from the NSs towards the Bangladeshis for intergroup mixing. In the
homogeneous group, the lack of any other group in the classroom took away the possibility of second language use signifying convergence. So they could use English more easily.

This restraint between the groups in School C did not allow them to use English freely to test their hypotheses about English, with the NSs or other speakers or even within themselves as much as the learners in School A. The presence of multiple language groups with different behavioural codes within a classroom may also have compelled teachers to allow learners less scope to interact. This was shown through organisation of classwork to be performed through individual rather than groupwork. Speaking was generally less encouraged, which also helped to reduce the use of English.

The reason for improvement in Receptive skills in School C but not in A has been discussed before, that their greater familiarity with better quality input contributed to their greater improvement. The receptive skills may not require as much production as productive skills to be developed to the same extent. Receptive skills may not require as great a production in output as the productive skills to be developed.

8.3. Discussion of the findings

I shall now look at the insights that the research gave into the learning process of these two groups of Bangladeshis. The groups were small, and selected on the basis of opportunity rather than randomly. These factors detract from its generaliseability. But its basis in the reality of learning milieu gives its results the authority of surviving the cross-currents of the multiple factors that operate in the classroom, and standing true in the light of those factors, according to the paradigm of Parlett & Hamilton (1972).

The research investigated if two groups of learners from a similar social background developed proficiency in English differently while undergoing pressures of the same academic course entailing similar learning output, experienced within two different milieux composed of varying proportions of Bangladeshis and NSs.
From the results it appears that within the observation period the learners in the two groups developed differently, in different areas of language skills.

In both settings, language learning took place simultaneously with content learning. Performance for GCSE appeared to cause similar improvements in both settings in the use of more 'decontextualised' Reading and Writing, while both groups also improved in their academic scores. The learners also deteriorated similarly in the more 'context-embedded' use of the three skills tested, Reading, Writing and Listening, the type of use that may not have been called into use by their academic coursework. Some of the deterioration may also have been due to affective filter raised by the imminence of the GCSE examinations, showing that while the input may be influenced by the affective filter, as claimed by Krashen (Ch 2), the output also may be similarly influenced.

Apart from these similarities, the mixed setting improved more in the receptive skills, which they may have developed through exposure to better quality of input and feedback on discussions of academic matters that was available in their learning milieu. The homogeneous setting on the other hand showed greater development in the productive skills, which may have developed from greater use of English in Speaking, using longer structures and more low-frequency words.

Within this development there was a difference. While the homogeneous group improved in Speaking skill, it did not improve in the sub-skill of sociolinguistic appropriacy, within a setting where appropriate input was limited. On the other hand, while the mixed group did not improve in Speaking, it showed improvement in appropriacy, that may have been gained from exposure to more appropriate use of English.

The setting appeared to influence the academic and language learning by pupils of the higher and lower second language proficiency differently.
The mixed setting developed a greater heterogeneity in the range of their linguistic and academic ability within the members of the group. There was a greater use of L1 in the mixed group. This may have been through the need to uphold group identities. But this may have helped to keep the learning of the lower ability nearer to where they had started, while the higher ability members benefited from exposure to better quality input from more proficient English users, and made greater improvements than in the homogeneous group.

Learners in the homogeneous setting, on the other hand, grew more similar to each other, and in spite of a greater use of English, acquiring greater uniformity, not only in language proficiency but also in academic performance. Linguistically, the uniform quality of input that was available to them from each other, may have helped to bring about the uniformity in language learning. It is possible that if the homogeneous group had more support from greater number of proficient teachers, and their learning time was not reduced by external factors, their homogeneity at a higher level of performance would be more desirable than the diversity within the mixed group. It would give everyone the chance to achieve better generally.

The learners in School A developed more homogeneously in the productive skill areas, while the learners in School C developed in a varied manner in the receptive skill areas. The rate of improvement in the mixed setting was faster during the observation period. This may indicate that motivation within the mixed setting is higher. But a comparison of the performance of the two settings in the posttest shows that the final proficiency level was still higher in the homogeneous setting in four skills out of seven. Longer observation may have shown whether the mixed setting continued to improve, or stabilised after reaching the level of the homogeneous setting.

Such distinct patterns of difference in linguistic development in the two settings indicate that they may have arisen from the differences in the group population that affected not only the linguistic and the socio-psycholinguistic factors for language learning but also the extent to which these factors could be allowed to operate, through the organisation of classroom teaching.
The difference in classroom population seems to have influenced the organisation of teaching to be different for the two settings. In the mixed setting the teachers organised learning more as individual work so that there was less possibility and need for learners to interact. In the homogeneous setting the teachers organised more classes as groupwork, encouraging interaction. They also used more teacher-fronted input classes. The analysis of the time for Speaking, for topic control and the percentage of peer interaction, all showed that the mixed group had less time to control topic and interact with peers. More of their interaction was with teachers. While this provided them with better quality of input, it showed that interaction for them was more restricted than in the homogeneous group.

Coming from different language backgrounds, learners in the mixed group often clashed and disrupted the classroom process when they were allowed to interact freely, perhaps from a mismatch of code of acceptable behaviour. Throughout most classes, there was a greater restraint imposed on the interaction of learners, which may have been from this diversity. That the presence of multiple groups may have helped to cause the classroom misdemeanours can be supported with an anecdote. A teacher returning to teach in School A after five years claimed to be aware of less tension within the school since he had worked there last five years ago, when there had been a higher number of NSs and other language groups, with a high incidence of fights. In School A now where there were very few pupils of other language groups, there were no incidents of classroom fights during the classes observed.

The diversity of groups also may have made group barriers stronger, making the Bangladeshis use more Bengali than English. It appears that the presence of various groups within the same classroom had helped to strengthen the intergroup boundaries rather than to lower them. In the mixed setting this may have motivated the use of a greater amount of L1 in order to preserve their own identity and group boundary (Ch 2). Within the homogeneous setting where there was no other group present and therefore no fear of compromising or losing
their own identity or appearing to converge to a NS group not present in the classroom, the learners used English more often.

So it appears that differences in the population of learning milieu can make differences in learning in various ways. Some of the difference can arise from the quality of the input and feedback. It could arise from the access to better quality of input that the learners in the mixed setting could have, while the homogeneous setting would be limited to less proficient input from their own ability group.

It could arise from intergroup barriers that may conflict. As they performed, the multi-group structure could make learners reluctant to use the language of the more powerful group for the social connotations it might have. Even when they used it, it could be less extensive, from unwillingness to appear foolish or to test hypotheses about the language. Within the homogeneous setting, the second language use did not assume adverse social connotations, so that learners could use it freely and extensively.

Finally, some factors of differences could be imposed by the teacher. The differences in behavioural pattern of different groups could prevent their harmonious co-existence within the classroom. This could lead teachers to arrange the learning organisations differently. While in one setting teachers could use groupwork with no fear of disruptions, in the other setting they would have to restrict opportunities for pupils to interact to avoid conflicts, by arranging work to be done individually.

Putting various language groups into the same classroom for learning together as 'equals' seems to be necessary but not sufficient for setting in motion the forces necessary to bring about language learning even during performance of tasks. Observation shows that the various group boundaries remain strongly in place, judging from the seating and interaction pattern over time in all the mixed classrooms. Interaction does not take place between the Bangladeshis and the English speakers, nor do the target language speakers seem to encourage it. This requires intervention from teachers, to organise more direct interaction between the groups for a greater improvement.
in proficiency. Such organisations seem beset by problems of management of multiple linguistic groups within a classroom. The diversity that should be an advantage for language learning seems to become a disadvantage because of the undisciplined and disruptive behaviour it helps to engender. Although the differences between School A and C suggests the effects of differing proportions of ethnic groups, they may also have been influenced by the variations in interruptions in learning in the two settings caused by the lack of regular teachers and other factors.

Teaching methods need to be varied to benefit all abilities within a classroom, as each type of teaching offers some advantage for learning. Teacher-fronted input sessions can give concentrated academic and linguistic input that the more proficient can utilise to perform better on the school final examinations. While the less proficient get some exposure to low-frequency words and language structures, they also have access to some academic input which they can negotiate to comprehend during task-based work. But for lower-proficiency pupils and those with learning difficulties, reliance on only this method of teaching may not bring about effective learning. Learners with low language ability who may not understand the input well, can become disruptive and waste others' learning time. So the use of teacher-fronted input needs to be judiciously intermixed with task-based teaching.

Task-based classes allow the learners to practice their language learning to express various types of meanings through engaging in interaction with other learners and teachers. During such performance the peers can help each other with ideas and language. Learners can benefit more from task-based classes where the input is moderated and interspersed with tasks offering them the scope to participate. Where the students face difficulties, they can depend on peer support given through discussions and demonstration. So discussions need to be allowed in classes where mixed ability students are learning. But the teacher needs to make clear his/her expectation of the level and type of disciplined behaviour that the students have to maintain in the class.
The use of a number of teacher-fronted classes interspersed with the use of task-based classes could give the higher and middle ability learners the input necessary for them to perform at the level required for achieving better examination scores. At the same time, performing tasks together could give lower ability learners more explicit knowledge of the content through practical and theoretical performance on some content-related work in collaboration with peers. Task performance could offer all ability learners the scope to practice the content-related language while the scope for such interaction on a more equal footing could help to bring members of various groups closer together.

Interaction on tasks can bring together some amount of the language use and academic knowledge for all abilities. It has dual benefits. Interaction can benefit the ones who are directly engaged in it, as scope for output, as in the Speaking skill in School A. It can also benefit the ones who listen to interaction, even without participating, and helps to develop their Listening skill, as in School C. The quality of input seems to affect the quality of learning.

According to the teachers, the scope for language teaching decreased markedly during the final years of secondary, with less time for individual feedback on language points. Interaction with more proficient teachers or peers could allow learners to negotiate their own learning where it was possible.

Group tasks and organisations seem to give rise to the greatest amount of interaction. Divergent tasks give rise to longer stretches of utterances for individual learners, while Convergent tasks performed in groups give rise to higher total language use. While divergent tasks can train the learner to produce longer utterances to express opinions and points of view suitably, convergent tasks can train them to repeat and recycle language and negotiate meaning through the use of greater number of turns which can help pupils to learn words and structures in a co-operative effort. Within the classroom, the use of both types of tasks can help develop various types of linguistic proficiency necessary for academic performance.
Teacher-fronted classes do not allow peer interaction, but they have the advantage of being able to impart the necessary input and instruction to learners. The language use by learners during such classes is low, but the evidence of interaction analysis in Ch. 6 shows the use of the highest number of lower-frequency words during such classes, which learners can repeat in response to teachers' questions. This can give pupils an understanding of the word and the related concept.

Among the academic subjects, not all subjects lend themselves equally to setting up of various types of teaching organisations. English lent itself to framing tasks that aim at discussion only. Science allowed convergent tasks only, since its concepts and propositions generally had one correct answer that the students needed to attain. Differences of opinion does not seem possible in science, so that divergent tasks were not easy to set up for Science, while they were used for English and Geography. Convergent tasks were used for all subjects, while teacher-input was used in all tasks as well as in teacher-fronted input classes.

8.4. Implications for education of Bangladeshi learners

The sample for this research was small, so the findings cannot provide a basis for firm generalisations to other settings. But the strength of this research is that as the trends observed here have stood the test of the operation of multiple factors of the real classroom. Insights from it can help teachers to arrange the learning to allow the positive factors to operate more freely for the education of similar groups.

From the evidence of the research, the mixed setting nurtured a greater improvement of receptive skills through the exposure to greater quantity of better quality input while the homogeneous setting allowed a greater use of language use in output, leading to the development of productive skills. The mixed setting led to a faster rate of improvement, while it also nurtured a greater range within the proficiency of learners in the same environment. The homogeneous setting developed more similarly, at a slower rate.
Learning in a homogeneous setting seems to be potentially a better environment for SLA by the lower ability groups. In the mixed setting there could be less support available for them from peers, due to restrictions on interaction through which peers could help. There could also be less help from teachers, since they could easily overlook learners who do not ask for help. In the homogeneous setting some of this support could come from peers.

The pupils in the homogeneous setting require the support of a greater number of proficient English speakers to provide better quality of input and feedback to push the learners to higher levels of proficiency. Additionally, the pedagogy needs to introduce more focused teaching of grammar, as suggested by Harley & Swain (1984). Reduction of loss of actual teaching time through external factors surveyed in Ch. 7 can also have positive effects.

On the other hand, the higher ability learners have the scope of developing better in the mixed setting. The presence of NSs and other group members within the same classroom may help the acquisition of better receptive linguistic skills but may not always help to engender intergroup convergence. On the contrary it can nurture stronger group boundaries. Although the mixed setting can help some learners to adopt some NS norms and learn English better, it does not help all learners to aspire a higher linguistic level for academic achievement. To encourage greater amity between groups, teachers can organise group tasks from the beginning of secondary where they must indicate the level of discipline that students must maintain, and rule breakers must be dealt with equally and strongly so that others realise that they need to learn to work in accord.

For pupils who join the education in U.K. from the beginning, their education at the primary level may benefit from taking place in a homogeneous setting to give them a uniform learning of language and content. Starting with a more even level of learning across the board, a mixed setting at the secondary level may provide the necessary force to pressurise them to learn and perform better in the school leaving examinations and to aspire towards higher qualifications. The mixed
setting could provide the pressure for language use and the scope for
exposure necessary for them to develop to a higher language proficiency
in their preparation for the school-leaving examination. Their
individual achievement goals could be pushed up by being with members
of other groups who could provide access to information of careers and
jobs, of social expectations that members of other groups have, which
could work on the Bangladeshis to make them aim further and higher in
education and career.

At the primary stages of learning, convergent tasks performed
in groups would be a good way for involving the learners in co-
operative learning efforts where they would negotiate and recycle
language items in English to learn it, and also learn the content in the
process.

At the secondary level, the use of divergent tasks can supplement
the use of convergent tasks to give learners practice in framing longer
tracts of sustained argumentative utterances, using increasingly complex
structures and precise language, while teacher-fronted input can
provide the concentrated academic and linguistic input necessary for
academic progress and better academic performance.

Pedagogies which organised more activities to involve all learners
in two-way interaction and exchange of information from the very
beginning of the secondary level would seem to be beneficial for all. If
teachers arranged the group members for performance of some of the
tasks, not allowing learners to work in friendship groups all the time,
pupils from various backgrounds would learn to work with each other,
recognising it to be an integral part of the learning process. Learners
could become more accustomed to working with diverse group members,
and accept this as a necessary part of classroom learning. Combining
such classes with exposure to subject-related input through the
teacher-fronted classes could make the mixed setting potentially better-
suited to instil higher levels of language learning and intergroup
socialisation at the secondary level.

The negative performance in the 'context-embedded' skills of L2 in
both settings shows that the pressures created by the GCSE coursework
are not sufficient to help develop appropriate 'context-based' use of the language by Bangladeshis. Although this ability may not be essential for academic achievement, a restructuring of the GCSE syllabus could lead to a more all-round learning of English by Bangladeshis.

8.5. Summary

In this chapter the results of the research have been brought together to test the hypotheses and interpret the results in the light of qualitative data. The learners in the homogeneous setting used more English in the classroom, with longer turns on average and more low-frequency words, which related to improvements in their productive skills. Learning in this group became more uniform over the observation period.

The mixed setting used more L1 in the classroom, but developed more in their proficiency in the receptive skills during the observation period, with a better sense of appropriacy in Speaking. This improvement related to their exposure to more proficient speakers of English, eg teachers and NS peers. The differences in language use appears to be a product of the differences of the group composition in each setting.

This research has shown that in both settings, the pressure of GCSE coursework that operated equally in both groups helped to improve proficiency in the use of 'decontextualised' English in Reading and Writing, while it also helped the general distribution of academic achievement scores to become more dispersed over time. The coursework however related to regression in the 'context-embedded' use of English in both groups.
Conclusion

This research used two small groups of pupils who were opportunity samples from two selected schools, so these results have to be verified through work with larger groups sampled more systematically than was possible here. But as these results were attained within the factors operating within the real learning milieu, they have a tentative generaliseability that can guide thoughts on the education of other groups of Bangladeshis in U.K.

This study was conducted to determine the more facilitative setting for language learning towards better academic performance by Bangladeshi children as they learnt academically in schools of London. To do this, the children's proficiency was measured on linguistic pre and posttests to identify differences of development in performance in each area of language skill. The language used in interaction over the period was recorded and analysed under certain headings to show the lengths of utterances and of communicative units. This allowed comparisons to be made across settings of the learners' ability to use more extended language, consisting of multiple communicative units, interrelated to convey more complex meaning. The use of low-frequency words that could help convey academic meanings more accurately, was also examined.

In both groups, the learners developed in similar ways in some skill areas, showing improvements in the more 'decontextualised' use of Reading and Writing, and deteriorations in the more 'context-embedded' use of all skills. These similarities in development related to and seemed to be the effect of, a similar pressure from the academic programme of learning.

The linguistic tests also showed differences in development. The homogeneous group improved in the use of the productive skills, particularly in speaking, which related to their greater use of English, in longer turns and more c-units, with more low-frequency words. This group also showed minimal regression in the use of 'context-embedded' use of writing, the other productive skill; proficiency in one productive skill appeared to affect the others positively.
The mixed group showed improvement in the receptive skills, particularly in the use of more 'decontextualised' Listening and also a greater degree of sociolinguistic appropriacy in speech. Observation showed that although they used more L1 in interaction, their development related to greater exposure to NSs who could have used better quality of English within the learning milieu.

The homogeneous setting also showed a greater uniformity in the linguistic and academic performance of all members over the period. The range in the academic and linguistic performance of the group became smaller, while the mixed group developed a greater heterogeneity between the performance of the members of the group. This variation in development between the two groups was most obvious in Speaking. The homogeneous group members became most similar in the Speaking skill over time. This may have been from the similar level of input and feedback available, as well as from the need to converge to the peer group. Conversely, among all the skills, the mixed group became most diverse in speaking. This may have been from the diversity of proficiency of interlocutors in the setting, as well as the diversity of attitudes of learners towards the target group which could lead to variety in the use of the factors of language learning.

The organisation of learning in the two settings varied, and seemed to be influenced by differences between behavioural norms of the members of the settings. While teachers in the homogeneous group generally allowed and encouraged interaction in their teaching, the mixed group used organisations to generally restrict interaction. Within the time that learners were allowed to interact, the Bangladeshis in the mixed setting seemed to be inhibited by the presence of the other group members, and were less willing to test linguistic hypothesis in extended speech. The homogeneous setting which generally had no members of other groups, used all opportunities to try out its learning of English.

These systematic differences within the organisation of teaching, within the right to interact freely, within the willingness to use the second language and finally within the observed learning, related
consistently to the differences in the population of the two settings which may have affected the operation of the factors of learning.

The 'illuminative' observation is, homogeneity allows and can lead to, increased opportunities as well as willingness to interact in the second language so that the input can become comprehensible to all. This can lead to greater uniformity in the level of language development. Heterogeneity, on the other hand requires greater control in its management, that can restrict the extent of negotiation for comprehensibility of input. While the input can be of better quality in the mixed setting, it may not be comprehensible to all, through reduced scope for interaction. This can lead to better learning by some for whom it is comprehensible, but not by others. Ability becomes increasingly polarised, through differences in comprehensibility, and through reduced desire to practice, from the operation of group boundaries. While some may want to converge to the target group, others may not. The schools have the choice of the benefits of different settings and need to make their choice based on their objective of homogeneity or heterogeneity in achievement for Bangladeshi learners.
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TEXT BOUND INTO

THE SPINE
The guy who did it best was James Dean. Antihero of the movie that turned on a generation: Rebel Without a Cause

He had a pout, a streak of pure cussedness, and matching chips on either shoulder. A million teenyboppers wanted to take him home, a million mothers fainted at the thought, and when he died in a sports car crash in his twenties he finally became the martyr he'd portrayed so vividly.

James Dean gave a two-fingered salute to the world, and that portion of it which was the same age thought he was pretty magic.

Twenty years on it's difficult to see what all the fuss was about. Compared with some of today's kids he had precious little to moan about. Because today's young generation are a new breed of rebel and they have a new set of concerns.

Think about it. Most people over 40 left school knowing that they would find a job without too much difficulty. The big decision wasn't how to get a job, it was which to go after.

Nowadays, in a world concerned about unemployment, it would be a pretty insensitive kid who didn't worry about his first job. That first job is pretty crucial. It gives you an identity. It lets both you and the world know that you made it into independent adulthood. Then there is the small matter of the big wide world that's been bequeathed them. If they think their parents haven't made too smart a job of it, who can blame them?

They see on TV pictures of people starving in Africa yet they know that the world produces enough food to eliminate hunger.

11. Teenagers of the 50s and 60s like to say they grew up in the shadow of the bomb. In the 80s kids worry that somebody might finally press that button before their lives have really begun.

12. Add to all that the notion that the business of growing up is pretty hard work at the best of times.

13. Just the very fact that your hormones go into overdrive means all kinds of rapid mood changes and, unfortunately for your nearest and dearest, they're most often in the firing line.

14. It's a confused time - sometimes fun and sometimes frustrating. A time when you have to start trying on life for size and doing it your way. Mistakes are things people just have to make for themselves, and they make a hell of a lot of them between 12 and 20 while they're figuring out just what they plan to do with themselves.

15. Some parents can't handle this too well. They want their mini-angel back not this monster who's taken out a five year lease on the bathroom.

16. Sorry, not possible. All you can do is be there, stay in touch, let your kids know that the back-up service is still intact if anything goes wrong in their lives.

17. Being a good parent doesn't really need an intimate knowledge of the charts, a crash course in trendy gear, or a special ability to handle heavy metal at illegal decibel counts.

18. But you do have to care, you do have to let your kids know that you do, even if that means setting down unpopular guidelines, and you do have to remember that teenagers are people too. Not just chips off the boring old block.
The short passage in your answer booklet is a SUMMARY of the ideas in the sections 5–11 of Rebels with a Cause. Some of the words of the summary are missing.

- Fill in the missing words, making sure that they really do put across the ideas in these sections of the passage. Use only ONE word in each gap. You may use your own words or words from the passage.

In sections 5–18 the writer of this passage quite often talks directly to the reader by using the words 'you' or 'your'.

- Write in the spaces provided:
  (a) the numbers of TWO sections where he talks to young people in this way;
  (b) the numbers of TWO sections where he addresses their parents.

In each of the five pairs of statements below, only ONE of each pair is correct according to the information in the passage.

- Write in the spaces provided the number, 1 or 2, of the correct statement in each pair.

1.4 Which of the following slogans best sums up the main message of this passage to parents of teenage children?
- Write A, B, C, or D in the space provided.

A. It's a tough world for teenagers: your kids need your support.
B. Teenagers are people too: leave them to get on with their own lives.
C. Your generation is out of date: make way for new ideas.
D. Your children will have the same problems that you had, so show them lots of sympathy.

James Dean was popular with women of all ages.
Older people disapproved of James Dean.

Adolescents tend to feel up one minute and down the next.
Adolescents tend to feel always confused and depressed.
Parents of teenagers do not seem to learn from their mistakes.
Parents of teenagers find it difficult to accept that everyone needs to make their own mistakes.

The best slogan is

James Dean was popular with women of all ages.
Older people disapproved of James Dean.
Each new generation faces a new set of ____________. Twenty-five years ago it was easy to find ____________. Today, most ____________ worry about their first ____________. Which is so ____________ for giving them identity and ____________. They feel that their parents do not ____________ things well. Although the ____________ produces plenty of ____________, there is widespread ____________; and there is always the possibility ____________ that ____________ war will prevent them from reaching ____________. 

The sections are
(a) ____________ and ____________
(b) ____________ and ____________

Write the correct answer in each space
A. ____________ B. ____________ C. ____________ D. ____________ E. ____________

The best slogan is ____________
The British Psychological Society's press release is not so exciting this time round, but it has its points of interest, outstanding among which is the claim made by Dr Ben Fletcher of Hatfield Polytechnic that there is a close correlation between the causes of death of women classified by their husband's occupation, and the cause of death in men in the same occupation. In practice (and English), this means that miners' wives, for example, are more likely than others to die of a lung disease. It does not mean that they are particularly prone to have roofs cave in on them.

Sticky ends seem to be the prerogative of doctors' wives who, like their spouses, 'are more likely to die from accidents, poisonings and violence'. This may well be, of course, that death from natural causes is rather more difficult for doctors and their wives to achieve, what with all that medical expertise sloshing around the domestic hearth and all those dire examples of ignoring same queuing up at the surgery every day. Policemen and their wives, curiously enough, 'are more likely than normal to die of circulatory diseases'.

Ah, but what is 'normal' I hope you are asking, as you wisely reject the Rice Crispies in favour of the All-Bran - unless, that is, you are already looking up solicitors in the Yellow Pages preparatory to suing for divorce (which, if you are a soldier's wife, I strongly advise you to do: being married to a soldier seems to be one of the commonest causes of cancer). What is 'normal', eh? Well actually I'm probably the last person you should ask, for it seems the closest I come to normal is in having the same number of arms, legs and heads as my fellows.
(a) In the first paragraph, the writer mentions HOW the British Psychological Society made Dr Ben Fletcher's ideas public.

Write in the space provided in your answer booklet the two words from the passage which describe this type of publication.

(b) Which two-word phrase from the last seven lines of the same paragraph means the OPPOSITE of 'very unlikely'?

Write your answer in the space provided.

(c) In the second paragraph, the writer refers to a doctor's patients in a very odd way. Which phrase does she use to describe them?

Write your answer in the space provided.

Why do you think the writer has included the last sentence of the first paragraph? ('It does not mean . . . . . . . is on them'.)

Write A, B, C or D in the space provided.

A. She wants to stress an important point made by Dr Fletcher in his report.
B. She is afraid people might get the wrong impression about miners' wives from the report.
C. She wants to make fun of the language used by Dr Fletcher in his report.
D. She wants to prove to the reader that she has read the whole report.

Read again the first lines of the last paragraph. ('Ah, but what . . . the All-Bran.') What do you think the writer is trying to tell us?

Write A, B, C or D in the space provided.

A. Dr Ben Fletcher doesn't understand what normal people are really like.
B. Normal people are more likely to eat All-Bran than Rice Crispies.
C. Eating healthy food is just as likely to affect your health as who you are married to.
D. Dr Ben Fletcher's report should be taken seriously by women who want to stay healthy.

3.4 The writer of this passage, Anne Smith, clearly finds it hard to accept what Dr Ben Fletcher says in his report.

From paragraphs 2 and 3, find TWO phrases which START sentences and which show that she is doubtful about his findings.

Write the first four or five words of the phrases in the spaces provided.

3.5 The short passage in your answer booklet is a SUMMARY of paragraphs 1 and 2 of the passage, but some of the key words are missing.

Fill in the missing words, putting only ONE word in each gap.

3.6 Which ONE of the following four extracts do you think comes from the same article as the passage? Take into account the language and point of view of the writer as well as the subject that is being written about.

Write A, B, C or D in the space provided.

A. So should parents stick together, however they feel, for the sake of the children? 'No,' he says, 'but we don't work hard enough to try to fix the marriage before we split.'
B. If the relationship is good, the marriage survives, if it is bad it ends, probably to be replaced by another in due course.
C. 49% of men who find themselves out of work in middle age (and 54% of such women) succumb sooner or later to chronic illness, against only one in three of those who have retained their job.
D. I bet Stanley's thighs overlap, eh? And such is the way of the world his wife will die of obesity – which I'm perfectly convinced is a form of boredom anyway.
### 3.1

(a) The words are ____________________

(b) The phrase is ____________________

(c) The phrase is ____________________

### 3.2

The correct answer is ____________

### 3.3

The best answer is ____________

### 3.4

The phrases are ____________________ and ____________________

### 3.5

Dr Ben Fletcher claims that there is a ____________________ between a husband's ____________________ and the likely ____________________ of his wife's ____________________. He has found, for example, that lung ____________________ is likely to affect women to ____________________. ____________________ and their wives are more likely to ____________________ violently which is surprising when you think of their ____________________ and experience of other people's ____________________.

### 3.6

The sentence from the same article is ____________
Your school is being ‘twinned’ with a school in Hong Kong. There will be exchanges of letters, and of books, computer programs, video tapes and other materials. Next term, one of your teachers will change places with a Hong Kong teacher, and it is hoped that in a year or so a few of the senior pupils will be able to exchange during the summer. You may get the chance either to go to Hong Kong or to have someone from there as a guest.

The Hong Kong school is starting the ‘twinning’ by carrying out a project on –

‘Growing up in the UK’

and some of the pupils have written to your class to find out what it is like to be a teenager in Britain.

The letter opposite is from a Chinese pupil in the ‘twin’ school on Hong Kong island. She tells you something about herself and her family, and about the things she and her brothers do, or don’t do.

- Write a letter replying to her letter.

You should tell her:

about your home and your family
about the things you are and are not allowed to do
about how adults treat you
what it’s like to be a teenager in Britain today.

Try to answer the questions she has asked, but feel free to add any extra comments or questions you like as well.

Miriam (or perhaps one of her brothers) will probably write to you again; remember, one day, in Britain or Hong Kong, you may even meet face to face!
Dear Friend,

你好嗎? 等了你的信很久未回，不知有否收到呢?

My name is Miriam Chan Lui Ming. I'm a fifteen-year-old F.4 student in an Anglo-Chinese secondary school in the middle of Hong Kong. I study Chinese, English, Mathematics, Biology and the other science subjects. English is my weakest one! My class is doing a project on 'Growing up in the U.K.', and I would like very much if you would tell me what life is like for you as a teen ager.

Being the youngest in the family, I am not allowed to stay out at night. So in my spare time, I also enjoy going to movies and restaurants with my family at weekends.

How about you? Do you have any brothers or sisters? (Well, I've got four elder brothers!) Do you live together with them? Have you got your own room? How big is your family, and how often do you have big family gatherings like those of mine? How do you spend your leisure? Are you free to do anything you like? I often have some of my friends come home with me after school.

I guess you would me a lot of interesting things. Perhaps, you wouldn't mind sending me a photo. Would you?

Looking forward to hear from you soon.

My address:
103 Prince Road 2/F Flat G.
Hong Kong

Miriam
Your school is reconsidering whether boys and girls should be educated together or separately.

The Governors have asked some schools which have already considered this question for their views. Various people, including yourself, have been asked to write reports on different schemes.

A mixed comprehensive in the north of Britain called Wackford Academy recently surveyed its pupils to find out whether they wanted to change from the existing system of completely mixed playgrounds, 'social rooms' and classes (except PE and Games). Some of their conclusions are given on the facing page.

- Prepare a written report for the Governors, telling them what you think of the scheme, both for Wackford itself and as a possible scheme for your school.

The Governors have asked for reports of 200–300 words (about 1 or 2 pages). They will want to know what you think about the following issues:

(a) Do you think the people at Wackford have made the right decisions, for their school?

I would prefer separate social rooms.

In free time I prefer active games to just sitting talking.

I'd rather be taught Maths by a woman than a man.

I'd rather be taught English by a man.

Conclusions reached by Wackford
Boys and girls aged 12–16 have very different needs. The present arrangement suits boys better than girls. A larger number of girls lose out on teacher attention and would be better off in 'girls only' classes.

Boys only' classes would be difficult for teachers to handle. Completely separate schooling for the sexes is unnatural.

The Proposed Scheme
The school will be divided into three parts:

- The Boys' School will consist of the New Wing (1) and the Science Block (2), together with the tennis courts (3) and the adjacent gardens.

- The Boys' School will contain the Old School (4) and the playing fields (5).

- The Common School will consist of the Music Building (6) and the huts (7), and will include all of the staff rooms.

Teaching of Maths, Physics, Chemistry, Languages, and PE and Games will be in boys and girls in the Boys' and Girls' Schools separately, all other classes will be mixed and in the Common School. All girls will be taught Maths by female teachers.
WACKFORD ACADEMY Survey

Exams are more important for boys than girls.

Teachers often ignore the girls.

I would learn more in separate classes.

I would talk more freely in separate classes.

I would prefer separate classes.

I would prefer separate playgrounds.

I would prefer separate social rooms.

In free time I prefer active games to just sitting talking.

I'd rather be taught Maths by a woman than a man.

I'd rather be taught English by a woman than a man.

Conclusions reached by Wackford
Boys and girls aged 12–16 have very different needs. The present arrangement suits boys better than girls. A large number of girls lose out on teacher attention, and would be better off in 'girls only' classes. 'Boys only' classes would be difficult for teachers to handle. Completely separate schooling for the sexes is unnatural.

The Proposed Scheme
The school will be divided into three parts. The Girls' School will contain the New Wing (1) and the New Science Block (2), together with the tennis courts (3) and the adjacent gardens. The Boys' School will contain the Old School (4) and the playing fields (5). The Common School will consist of the Beale Building (6) and the huts (7), and will include all of the staff rooms. Teaching of Maths, Physics, Chemistry, Languages, Art, PE and Games will be to boys and girls in the Boys' and Girls' Schools separately; all other classes will be mixed and in the Common School. All girls will be taught Maths by female teachers. Senior pupils will use the social rooms and quadrangle in the Common School; other pupils will remain in the separate schools at all times unless in classes in the Common School.
PRACTICE QUESTIONS

1. A. Most days  
   B. Two or three times a week  
   C. About once a week  
   D. Less than once a week

2. (See your answer booklet.)

3. (a) During English lessons, listening to taped and recorded material is  
   1. a regular part of our class work  
   2. not something we do on a regular basis  
(b) When teachers explain things in class, I generally  
   1. understand most things the first time they are said  
   2. need to hear things at least twice before I can really understand

4. (See your answer booklet.)

5. During my time in secondary school, I have  
   A. OCCASIONALLY  
   B. NEVER  
   C. SOMETIMES  
   used a language laboratory.  
   D. ONE  
   E. MORE THAN ONE  
   tape-recorder(s) available.

   The classroom where I do English usually has  
   A. OCCASIONALLY  
   B. NEVER  
   C. SOMETIMES  
   used a language laboratory.  
   D. ONE  
   E. MORE THAN ONE  
   tape-recorder(s) available.

   I feel  
   A. OCCASIONALLY  
   B. NEVER  
   C. SOMETIMES  
   about operating a tape-recorder myself.

6. When we do group work, the people who will work together in the groups are usually chosen by  
   A. We generally discuss things like  
   B.  
   C.  
   D.  
   E.  
   I find that group work is generally quite  
   because the people I work with are  

---

TAPe 1: DINESH JOSHI TELLS OF HANUMAN THE MONKEY GOD

As you listen, try to form a picture in your mind of what Dinesh Joshi describes.

DO NOT TURN OVER UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO
The following is a summary of the story recounted on the tape. Choose one word from each group of three alternatives which best fills the space.

Write the word you have chosen beside the corresponding numbers (1 to 14) in the answer booklet.

At the time when Sita was _BEWITCHED_ by the Evil One, Hanuman met Rama and Lakshman beside a _KIDNAPPED_ RIVER. Hanuman wrote _RAMA'S_ name on a _STONE_ and threw it into _LAKE_. His own piece of wood _WATER_ the _AIR_. Then he built a _BRIDGE_ where it landed. When Rama and Lakshman came over, Hanuman vowed that he would _SERVE_ Rama, giving up his _POSSESSIONS_ if necessary. Later, _LAKSHMAN_ was wounded during a battle, and could only be saved by a _SPELL_ made from a _FLOWER_. Hanuman went to find it, but could not _REMEMBER_ which was the right one; so he brought the whole _MOUNTAIN_ back with him. The _WITCH DOCTOR_ was then able to find what was needed to save the patient.
Tape 2: Laura, Community Service Volunteer

After you hear the tape you will be asked about:

- the nature of Laura's work;
- how the work differs from what she expected;
- the problems and challenges she faces;
- the advantages of doing this type of work;
- how the interviewer conducts the interview.

DO NOT TURN OVER UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO
2.1 Each of the following statements about the conditions in which Laura is living and working has been completed in two ways, but only one is correct according to what she says to the interviewer. Which is correct?

- Write the number of the correct answer (1 or 2) in the spaces beside the letters A to D in your answer booklet.

A. Laura works (1) on her own. (2) with another volunteer.

B. Laura’s duties were decided for her before she started. (2) are up to her to decide as she goes along.

C. Mrs Craig (1) lives in a home for the disabled. (2) lives in her own home.

D. Laura lives (1) in a hostel for volunteers. (2) in Mrs Craig’s house.

2.2 Laura says quite a lot about how what she is doing is different from what she expected, and from what she has been used to.

- Complete the following statements about the differences in your own words. In each case you are told what the statement is about.
- Write your answers in the spaces provided on your answer booklet. DO NOT write in this book.

A. Before she started, Laura’s house was (1) , but now she lives in (2) .

   (Statement A is about the environment where Laura lives.)

B. Before she started Laura was free to go out (1) , but now she has to be (2) .

   (Statement B is about the amount of freedom Laura has.)

C. Before she started Laura could (1) , but now she (2) .

   (Statement C is about Laura’s friends.)

2.3 Laura is clearly finding her job quite a challenge.

- Write two words, one in each of the spaces provided in your answer booklet, which sum up the sort of problems she faces.

2.4 Laura talks a bit about the good things about her job.

Which of the phrases below best sums up the advantages as she sees them?

- Write A, B, C or D in the space provided in your answer booklet.

A. It has given her the chance to live away from home and make new friends.

B. It has made Mrs Craig’s life a lot easier and more interesting.

C. It has given her the sort of experience she needs to get a job in social work.

D. It has changed the way she thinks about other people and her relationships with them.
The conversation you have just heard was part of a longer interview with Laura. Towards the end of their conversation, the interviewer asked Laura about her future plans. Which of the following questions is he most likely to have asked her? Think particularly about his style of speaking and tone of voice.

- Write A, B, C or D in the space provided in your answer booklet.

A. And what are you going to do next?

B. Well, I feel that an experience like yours is likely to have put you off continuing with community work. Would you agree?

C. And are you really into community work now, or has this job turned you right off it?

D. I wonder finally whether maybe your future plans have changed as a result of being a volunteer?

TAPE 3: THE WILTSHIRE ORACY PROJECT

After you hear the tape you will be asked about:

- the meaning of the word ‘oracy’;
- the benefits of the project;
- the activities involved in the project;
- reasons for possible lack of public support for the project;
- skills needed by young people in today’s world.
YOUTH COUNSELLING SCHEMES

1. A Mobile Counselling Bus or Van
   This would visit places in the area on a weekly rota basis, for a few hours at a time in each place.

2. A Room (or Rooms) in a Local School or College
   The room or rooms would be available on one or two evenings a week.

3. A Room (or Rooms) at the Local Community Centre
   As with the school premises, accommodation in the community centre would be available on one or two evenings a week.

4. Use of the Local Church or Religious Centre or Hall
   Would be available one day a week.

5. Rented Rooms in the Area
   These would possibly be shared with other organisations, and available at specified times.
FACILITIES AND USE OF AVAILABLE SPACE

The space and other facilities available vary between the different schemes, but in most cases there will be two rooms with the use of toilets and facilities for making tea and coffee. You must decide how to use the space. Note down two or three options from sections 1 and 2, and as many as you like from section 3 – but remember, some of these are expensive! You may also add suggestions of your own. You will make a final decision when you meet your local councillor.

Funding is available to cover only the basic cost of renting the accommodation (or in the case of the mobile unit, a grant to convert the bus and to run it). There will also be a small grant available for furnishings and equipment, but this will cover only basic items. Young people using the service are however free to raise additional money by whatever means they think appropriate, or to try to obtain the use of equipment etc. from other organisations at minimal cost.

1. Use of Rooms
   Possible options
   (a) Both rooms used as counselling rooms.
   (b) One counselling room, one lounge.
   (c) One counselling room, one reading room.
   (d) Both general purpose rooms; counselling carried out in same space.
   (e) One lounge, one reading room doubling as a counselling room.
   (f) Any other arrangement?

2. Furnishing of Rooms
   Possible options
   (a) Easy chairs and low tables in both rooms.
   (b) Easy chairs and low tables in one room; ordinary tables and chairs in the other.
   (c) Mixture of furniture in both rooms.
   (d) Any other arrangement?

3. Other Equipment
   Possible options
   (a) Bookstand with booklets, leaflets and pamphlets for information.
   (b) Small library with books etc. available for borrowing.
   (c) Audio-cassette player and audio cassettes.
   (d) Cassette library with:
       i) educational/information cassettes only;
       ii) music cassettes only;
       iii) a mixture of both types.
   (e) Television.
   (f) Television and Video.
   (g) Video Tape library with:
       i) educational/information tapes only;
       ii) entertainment tapes only;
       iii) a mixture of both.
   (h) Kettle and crockery.
   (i) Electric ring and small pans.
   (j) Vending machines:
       i) hot/cold drinks;
       ii) sweets/snacks;
       iii) other (please specify).
   (k) Any other suggestions?
ORGANISATION AND ADMINISTRATION

1. Counselling Service

You can now decide how the Counselling Service should operate, who should be involved in addition to young people and the paid counsellors, and what should be on offer at the counselling centre.

Which of the following types of counselling do you think would be best? Choose one from these three.

Possible options

A) Individual counselling only (i.e. one young person to one counsellor).
B) Group counselling only (i.e. counselling in an open session with one counsellor and any number of young people).
C) A combination of both types.

If you have chosen A or C, choose one of these:

Individual counselling should be:

Possible options

1) By appointment only
2) A ‘surgery’ type service – turn up and wait your turn
3) Any other?

If you have chosen B or C, choose any combination of these.

Group discussions or group counselling should be in:

Possible options

1 a) Formal sessions (counsellor/speaker with prepared talk with opportunity for questions and discussion after).
   b) Informal sessions (general discussion, counsellor present but no formal talk).
2 a) Topics decided on the spot.
   b) Topics decided in advance.
3 a) Discussions on a regular (e.g. weekly) basis at a fixed time.
   b) Discussions whenever enough people turn up.
4 a) Each discussion covering a variety of topics/problems.
   b) Each discussion devoted to a single topic.

2. Running Arrangements

Whichever scheme is chosen, funding will allow the counselling service to run for a maximum of eight hours per week. You must decide on the best way to use these eight hours. Which of the following do you think would provide the best service for you and your friends? Note down one option from each group of alternatives.

Possible options

1 a) Week-days only.
   b) Week-end only.
   c) One week day + either Saturday or Sunday.
2 a) Two evenings per week, 6–10pm.
   b) One evening 4–10pm + one evening 8–10pm.
   c) One evening 4–8pm + one evening 6–10pm.
   d) One day 3–6pm + one evening 6–10pm.
3 Any other suggestions?

3. Staffing

The scheme allows funds for paying two trained youth counsellors for up to eight hours per week. It may also be possible to get voluntary help from other adults. Which, if any, of the following do you think should be asked to help and how often? (e.g. regular, occasional, or not at all).

Possible options

a) Parents
b) School Guidance Staff
c) Health Workers
d) Social Workers
e) Police
f) Church/Religious Group
g) Any other?
4. Management Structure

The Authority needs a small management team to look after each local counselling service which it is funding. Each local group can decide who should be represented in its management team. It is suggested that the team have a minimum of six and a maximum of twelve members. The team will meet to discuss the general running of the service; spending priorities; fund-raising and special events; care of buildings and equipment; and will report to the Authority four times a year.

Which of these groups do you think should be represented on the team? Choose some or all of these.

Possible options
- a) Youth Counsellor(s).
- b) Central funding agency (i.e. The Regional/Metropolitan Authority who are providing the money to run the service).
- c) Young people using the service.
- d) Any others (e.g. community council, district council, local churches, schools, doctors).

How do you think the team should be chosen?

Choose one of the following.

Possible options
- a) All representatives nominated by Councillors (i.e. by the Regional or Metropolitan Authority).
- b) Each group represented nominates its own member.
- c) ‘Official’ groups nominate their own representative(s): young people elect theirs.
- d) All members elected in a local ballot.

How should the membership be divided between the groups represented? Note the groups you have chosen and the number of members from each group. Remember that the team must have at least 6 and no more than 12 members in total.
**LIVING WITH OTHERS**

Whether you live at home, in a hostel, or in a flat with friends, you will have to get on with other people. Even if you have a place of your own you will have other people staying close by. In all these ways of living, much the same things cause trouble, e.g., taking turns at doing things which need to be done, noise, keeping the place tidy, coming in late. What will you do if there are problems about these things or others?

**FIRST THINK** - can you change anything you do to get along better with others? Talk about the trouble with the others concerned. Try not to get angry. When things are talked out people often see what can be done to make things better, but this may mean everybody has to change a bit – even YOU!

**DON'T LEAVE HOME IN A HURRY**

There are times when most people feel that if they could live somewhere else everything would be better. If this happens to you, don't leave in a hurry – stop and think first! What would you miss if you went away? Could you cope if you were living somewhere else?

**WHY IT MAY BE HARD TO MANAGE AWAY FROM HOME**

- There is a shortage of good, cheap, rented housing everywhere.
- Many landlords, including most local authorities, will not let to people under 18.
- You need savings. Landlords may ask for 4 weeks' rent in advance and you may be asked for a deposit equal to a maximum of 2 months' rent to cover any breakages or damage.
- There are not many hostels for young people. Hostels can be expensive too.
- Jobs for young people are hard to find everywhere.
- You cannot claim Social Security, except in very special circumstances, unless you have an accommodation address.
- It is very hard to start paying the high rents which are often asked, though people on low income or Supplementary Benefit may be able to get some money once they have a place of their own.

**GOING AWAY FROM HOME TO STUDY**

As soon as you have a firm offer of a place at a college or university, write to the Accommodation Officer there. Ask about different types of accommodation you could live in. Try to see anything which is offered. If you cannot go, arrange to stay in one of the places offered to start with. Once you get to know the town a little, you will have a better chance of finding somewhere which suits you, and you may meet friends with whom you could share.

**LOOKING FOR WORK AWAY FROM HOME**

Don't believe friends who say it is easy to get work and a place to stay in London and other big cities. Jobs and accommodation are hard to find anywhere. So, if you are thinking of looking for work in places beyond daily travelling distance of your home, BEFORE YOU GO –

- Go to the Careers Office or Job Centre.
- Ask about your chances of finding work where you want to go.
- Ask for leaflets on the Job Search Scheme and the Employment Transfer Scheme. Ask if you can get help with expenses from these schemes.
1.1 The short passage on your answer booklet is a SUMMARY of the ideas in the first three paragraphs of Home or Away? Some of the words of the summary are missing.

- Fill in the missing words, making sure that they really do put across the ideas in the passage. Use only ONE word in each gap. You may use your own words or words from the passage.

1.2 Home or Away? is about three different sorts of problems faced by people leaving home.

- Put ONE word in each space in your answer booklet to show what types of problems these are.

3 In the SIX pairs of statements below, A-F, ONE of each pair is correct according to the information in Home or Away?

- Write in the spaces provided the number, 1 or 2, of the correct statement in each pair.

A. 1. If you want to work away from home, it is easier to find work in smaller towns and villages.
    2. If you want to work away from home, you should find out where you might get a job before you go.

B. 1. If the income from your job is low, you may be able to get help with your rent.
    2. If the income from your job is low, you will not be able to get help with your rent.

C. 1. Cheap Hostel Accommodation for young people is scarce.
    2. You are more likely to find Hostel Accommodation than a rented flat.

D. 1. The Accommodation Officer in the place you are going to will usually be able to suggest places to live while you look for work.
    2. If you are going away to study, you can get help with finding somewhere to live once you have a firm offer of a place.

E. 1. You will only need four weeks’ rent as a down payment on a rented flat or room.
    2. You may need to find as much as 12 weeks’ rent before you can move into a flat.

F. 1. Many Local Authorities do not allow landlords to offer housing to under-18’s.
    2. Many Local Authorities will not make housing available to under-18’s.

1.4 ONE of the four slogans below best sums up the main ideas in the passage.

- Choose the best slogan and write its LETTER in the space provided.

A. Tired of home? Get up and go!
B. No job to go to? Stay at home!
C. No job where you live? Try somewhere else!
D. There’s no place like home!
Wherever you live, you will have to share and deal with the other who live and deal with. You will have to share and deal with others. If difficulties arise, it may help to them together. This will probably mean carefully before in a somewhere else. You might be just as

A. Problems about
B. Problems about
C. Problems about

Write the correct answer in each space

A.  
B.  
C.  
D.  
E.  
F.  

The best slogan is  

Part I
Household appliances, such as fridges, telephones and colour televisions, are now so common that it is hard to find even a self-respecting squat without them, let alone a council house. Air pollution, despite the continuing acid rain argument, is sharply down from its former peaks. Road accident deaths, thanks to better engineering and now seat belts, have dropped 17% over the past couple of decades — even though vehicle numbers have doubled.

In some ways, the figures make their most dramatic impact when you turn them round, and contemplate the people who are not availing themselves of some particular amenity. What, for example, should we make of the 13% of presumably fairly affluent AB consumers who apparently do not deign to hold a current bank account? Or the fact that, even after all those charter flights to the Costa Plenta, 38% of Britons still have never set foot abroad?

Similarly, what of the fact that the highest income-earners no longer top the league in meat-eating or alcohol consumption, but concentrate their nutritional spending on fish, fruit and 'other foods' (all that caviar and foie gras, perhaps)? Or that as we near the centenary of the internal combustion engine, there are still 41% of households in this country with no motor car? Even that, though, is hardly as flummoxing as another table which appears to show that 5% of the unemployed have access to at least two.

There are similarly intriguing nuggets on every other page. But, overall, the impression they leave is of complacent stasis, and precious little sign of really radical change. There is physical mobility, but it amounts to little more than a marginal move from the crowded inner cities to rather more salubrious suburbs; there is barely a hint of real regional migration. Only prosperous East Anglia shows even a minute population growth, and elsewhere Norman Tebbit's bicycle is obviously still rusting in the garden shed.

3.1 In the first paragraph of this passage, the writer mixes FACTS, which can be worked out from a table of figures, with his own COMMENTS. Write in the spaces provided TWO PHRASES which are his own COMMENTS not based on figures. Do not write more than 12 words in each space.

3.2 In the second paragraph the writer suggests that we look at published statistics in a particular way. If you looked at the figures in the table for Passage 2 in the way the writer suggests, which of the following statements would best fit what you found? Write the letter corresponding to the best answer in the space in your answer booklet.

A. A surprisingly small number of people visited the cinema in the month before being interviewed.
B. More men than you would expect read books for pleasure in the month before being interviewed.
C. A surprisingly large number of young men did not play football in the month before being interviewed.
D. It is interesting that very few people went ten-pin bowling in the month before the interview.

3.3 The short passage in your answer booklet is a SUMMARY of paragraphs 2 and 3 of the passage, but some of the key words are missing. Fill in the missing words, putting only ONE word in each gap.

3.4 Read again the last sentence of the third paragraph. ('Even that... at least two...') What do you think the writer is trying to tell us about what this statistic means? Write in the space provided the letter which indicates the best answer.

A. He is shocked that some unemployed people have two cars.
B. Unemployed people may not be as poor as we think they are.
C. He thinks that there must be more to it than meets the eye.
D. He doesn't believe that it can be accurate.
3.5 (a) In the last paragraph, the writer says that he does *not* think things have really changed much.

- Write in each of the two spaces provided a 2-WORD PHRASE, one from each of the last two sentences, which for him *would* be signs of real change.

(b) Which 2-word phrase, from the *first two sentences* of this last paragraph, does the writer use to describe the *lack* of real change?

- Write the phrase in the space in your answer booklet.

3.6 Which ONE of the following four sentences do you think comes from the same article as the passage?

- Take into account the language and point of view of the writer as well as the subject he is writing about.

- Write the letter which indicates the best answer in the space provided.

A. There has also been a fall in the proportion of large households; the percentage of households including six or more people fell from 7% in 1961 to 3% in 1982.

B. Even among the top salary earners barely one in three owns up to possessing a single unit trust stake, let alone an equity share.

C. Mothers whose youngest dependent child is under 5 are the most likely not to be working; 73% of married mothers and 77% of lone mothers with children under 5 in 1980-1982 were not working.

D. Powerlessness, or the lack of knowledge and participation on the part of many adolescents, tends to render their understanding of the rural social system meaningless.
DO FIGURES TELL THE TRUTH?

3.1
One phrase is
The other is

3.2
The best statement is

3.3
Surprisingly, not all people use bank to manage their income groups and preferring to buy more foods. Many people still do not; nor do they venture despite cheap

3.4
The best answer is

3.5
(a) The two phrases are

and

(b) The phrase is

3.6
The best answer is
**LEISURE ACTIVITIES**

**2.1**
The phrase is

**2.2**
The sport is

**2.3**
The sports are

**2.4**
The sporting activity is

**2.5**
The answer is

**2.6**
Taking the *social and cultural* activities listed, men are far more likely than women to

whilst women are far more likely to

In the population as a whole,

is the most popular of the activities listed.
Your school is being 'twinne' with a school in the United States of America. There will be exchanges of letters, and of books, computer programs, video tapes and other materials. Next term, two of your teachers will change places with two American teachers, and in July the first groups of 12 pupils will be exchanged. You may get the chance either to go to America or to have an American as a guest.

The letter opposite is from an American in the 'twin' school in Denver, Colorado. He tells you something about himself and his family, about his school and about the activities that young people can enjoy in Denver.

Write a letter replying to his letter.

You should tell him:

- about your life
- about your school
- about the things you and your friends like to do
- what it's like to live where you live.

Try to answer the questions he has asked, but feel free to add any extra comments or questions you like as well. Remember, he (or perhaps his sister Suzy) will probably write to you again – you may even be in the July exchange and meet face to face!
Friday the 30th

Dear "Contemporary Student",

My name is Eric Fonshee and I am a 15-year-old junior in a school in Denver, Colorado, called Colorado Academy. It is a small school, but has nice people and a relatively relaxed atmosphere. Anyway, I study French, Art, Asian history, and Trigonometry and English. They are pretty good courses!

I love to play sports and spend a lot of time playing them. I play basketball and lacrosse at my school and racquetball, golf and I ski outside of school. I also love the movies and go to a lot of them with friends etc. Denver is a large city so there is a lot to do no matter what your interests are.

I guess I should ask you about yourself now. What kind of things do you and your friends like to do? Do you live in a large city or a small town? What subjects do you study? Describe yourself! (I am about 6 feet, brown hair and have bluish-green eyes.) Do you know what you want to do once you have grown up? (I really don't know yet myself.) Have you ever come to the United States before?

Do you have any brothers or sisters? I've a twin sister, Sury, who loves skiing too, and dancing and also does acting in our school. How about pets? We have two cats named Tigger and Tocelia. Also, do you live by the ocean? I love the ocean; it is really pretty. So are our mountains here, too!

Well maybe you will come visit the United States or I will visit you in July. Have fun! Take care!

Eric Fonshee

P.S. My address: 570 High St.
Denver
Colorado
80219
An extension to your school's facilities is to be built, for use as a Community Activities and Arts Education Centre.

The Community Council has been asked to consider several plans for the extension, and to collect people's reactions to them. Various people, including yourself, have been asked to write reports on the plans.

On the facing page is the plan for the extension which has been sent to you for your comments.

Prepare a written report for sending to the Council.

Give your opinion of the plan, both as a pupil of the school and as a future user of the facilities.

The council has asked for reports of 200–300 words (about 1 or 2 pages). They will want to know what you think about the following issues:

(a) The appearance of the building.
(b) The usefulness and value of the building.
(c) Your recommendations.

You might find the following questions useful in thinking what to put into your report.

You should not try to use all of them, and you may raise other points too.

You will also need to think about how to arrange your ideas.

Will the building be attractive? Popular?
Will the building be useful? To whom? For what?
What about safety, facilities, size, cost, convenience etc?
Would you like to use it? Will others?
Will it stay attractive? Can you suggest improvements?
Should this plan be used? Should any plan?

Architect's note:


Main hall, 11m x 15m, 7m high, stage 5m high at one end. Bench seating all round walls.

Smaller rooms 12, 24

Rooms 14, 24 for use as offices, preparation of food, etc.

Rooms 5, 4 can be used for changing rooms or storage.

The building has its own toilet facilities to main use at right and viewing school holdings.
Architect’s Notes

Multi-purpose facility, built in red brick, slate roof. Semi-circular perspex roof light along centre, glass panels at either end to allow maximum daylight.

Main Hall 11m x 15m, 7m high. Stage 2m high at one end. Bench seating all round walls.

Smaller rooms 1, 2, 3, 4

Rooms 1 & 2 for use as offices, preparation of food, etc.
Rooms 3 & 4 can be used for changing rooms or storage.

The building has its own toilet facilities to allow use at night and during school holidays.
PRACTICE QUESTIONS

1. A. Most days
   B. Two or three times a week
   C. About once a week
   D. Less than once a week

   (See your answer booklet.)

2. (See your answer booklet.)

3. (a) During English lessons, listening to taped and recorded material is
   1. a regular part of our class work
   2. not something we do on a regular basis

   (b) When teachers explain things in class, I generally
   1. understand most things the first time they are said
   2. need to hear things at least twice before I can really understand

   (See your answer booklet.)

4. A

5. During my time in secondary school, I have

   The classroom where I do English usually has

   C

   I feel

6. When we do group work, the people who will work together in the groups are usually chosen by

   (A) ___________. We generally discuss things like ___________.
   (B) ___________.

   and ___________. I find that group work is generally quite
   (C) ___________.
   (D) ___________, because the people I work with are ___________.

   (E)

---

TAPE 1: DINESH JOSHI TELLS OF HANUMAN THE MONKEY GOD

As you listen, try to form a picture in your mind of what Dinesh Joshi describes.

DO NOT TURN OVER UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO
The following is a summary of the story Alice recounts on the tape. Choose one word from each group of three alternatives which best fills the space.

Write the word you have chosen beside the corresponding numbers (1 to 15) on the answer booklet.

Alice tells of the time when she went to a suffragette meeting at the Colston Hall. There were two three four ladies on the platform: one of them was a working girl the daughter of a factory owner, and she was the lady kelly.

A organiserr chief speaker. The platform was decorated with chairwoman.

Organiser. Chief speaker. The platform was decorated with chairwoman. Colour, blue purple turquiose and green red maroon.

The organisers must have been expecting it to be hot because there were turquoise maroon. A lot of people extra chairs at the meeting. Alice and her friends decided to sit in the gallery.

At the front, in the gallery. At one point, a tomato was thrown at some flour near the door.

The speaker: it landed right on her hat bun, and lap. Confused alarmed her covered in embarrassment.

She just couldn't continue. Just went on speaking. Just burst into tears.
3.5 Community Councillors are people of different ___________ with a wide variety of jobs and ___________ who are concerned about local ___________. Although they have ___________ views, they are not selected to represent a particular ___________; and they spend their ___________ time in other ways, as well as being Councillors. Their main job is to find out what ___________ people think, and to work out what is ___________ for the community. They then ___________ their ideas to the ___________ and District Councils. They are given a small ___________ to spend, but don’t do any ___________ themselves.
For the purposes of this test, you are asked to imagine that your Community Council recently advertised for local people interested in working on various community projects. These projects will all be aimed at the young people in your area.

Quite a lot of people replied to the advertisement, and the Council interviewed about fifty people in all. Just over twenty were then put on to the Council's register of people to consider for particular jobs as funding became available.

At a recent meeting, the Council decided that one of six possible projects can now go ahead.

You and your partner have been chosen to represent the views of local young people at a meeting with a councillor. You are asked to decide between you which of the six projects sounds the most interesting and useful for the young people in your area, and to jot down in note form the reasons for your choice so that when you meet the councillor you can convince him/her to support it, in preference to the other five. You will find some details about the projects on the cards, and these include a description of the part-time job associated with each project.

Once you have chosen your project, look in the booklet containing job applications. This contains some information about eight of the people on the Council's register of possible project workers. The two of you will choose four or five of these to discuss at the meeting, and then, with the councillor's help, reduce this to two people who you think could do the job you have chosen from the cards, and who you would like to invite back for a second interview.

The councillor was at the first interview, and so has already met all the applicants. You on the other hand should be able to judge what is best for you and your own friends. You can find out from the councillor anything he/she knows about each person and then come to your decision.

To sum up

Before the meeting
1. Choose the project best suited to local people and needs.
2. Choose 4–5 people who look suitable to work on the project

During the meeting
1. Convince the councillor that this project deserves funding.
2. Choose two of your applicants for further interview.
JOB TITLES

1. Leisure Leader
   To arrange ‘tastes’ of various leisure and sporting activities for disadvantaged groups especially.

2. Editor of Community Newsletter
   To collect and print contributions from local organisations and individuals for (monthly) publication.

3. Young Handicapped Officer
   To promote interaction between able bodied and physically handicapped young people in the area, in day centres and through outdoor activities.

4. Welfare Rights and Information Officer
   To man a directory of welfare rights and useful information on local services and amenities.

5. Youth Festival Organiser
   To organise and administrate a festival of sports which will involve British and European participants.

6. Publicity Assistant
   To produce publicity materials for the council, and help local groups with the design and production of their own publicity materials.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Ann Drake</th>
<th>Age: 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status: Married</td>
<td>No. of children: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Address: 17 Beach Court</td>
<td>Ages:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Qualifications:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEE A: Italian A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Econ. C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College: Bachelor of Education (Primary Education)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Present Employment: None | Previous Employment: None |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interests, hobbies, relevant experience etc.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Vice Captain; Editor School Magazine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary; College Athletic Association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a qualified Primary Teacher (specialising in upper primary).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since marrying and moving here, I find myself at the end of the queue for teaching posts. I am not used to being idle and would consider anything that kept my mind active. While at college I taught myself to type, and, like any primary teacher, I can play the piano and paint a little. I would most like to work with children, but, I repeat, I will do ANYTHING!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Times at which you would be available to work:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any time up to 5:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**COMMUNITY COUNCIL PROJECTS**

**APPLICATION FOR POST OF PART-TIME ASSISTANT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Rohan Kumar</th>
<th>Age:</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status:</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>No. of children:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Address:</td>
<td>231d Pitt St</td>
<td>Ages:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education Qualifications:**

- A-levels: English B, Geography C
- O-levels: Maths B, Tech Drawing C, Music C, History D

**Present Employment:**

- Part-time barman (2 nights)

**Previous Employment:**

- None

**Interests, hobbies, relevant experience etc.:**

I have been a regular attender at the Youth Club ever since I was old enough to go. I can play almost any sport and last summer took a group of boys along the Pennine Way for 3 days. I am especially interested in chess, photography and cello, and run the YC darkroom. I want to go to college next year or the year after to become a community education worker, and would like to gain some useful experience by working with local youth and community groups in as many ways as possible.

**Times at which you would be available to work:**

- 8-6 pm any day: evenings Mon - Thu
### COMMUNITY COUNCIL PROJECTS

#### APPLICATION FOR POST OF PART-TIME ASSISTANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Gordon Simpson</th>
<th>Age:</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status:</td>
<td>MARRIED</td>
<td>No. of children:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Address:</td>
<td>17 Douglas Gardens</td>
<td>Ages:</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Education Qualifications:

- English
- Maths 1
- English 3
- Technical Drawing 2
- General Science 3
- Geography 4

#### Previous Employment:

- Production Line Engineer B.I.
- Garage Mechanic

#### Present Employment:

- UNEMPLOYED

#### Interests, hobbies, relevant experience etc.:

I did a lot of climbing and hillwalking when I worked for B.I. and since then I have helped with local kids on outings, expeditions, etc. Now I help out with the youth group once a week and some weekends more since I was unemployed.

I would like to work with kids (any age) specially out of doors, climbing, etc. or playcentre.

I can drive a minibus.

#### Times at which you would be available to work:

Any Time
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name:</strong></th>
<th>Andrew Philips</th>
<th><strong>Age:</strong></th>
<th>32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status:</strong></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td><strong>No. of children:</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home Address:</strong></td>
<td>32, Cranley Gardens</td>
<td><strong>Ages:</strong></td>
<td>11, 9, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education Qualifications:**

- B.Sc. Hons Physics (Lancaster)
- P.G.C.E. (Secondary) Horiton, Cambridge

**Present Employment:**

| Assistant Teacher of Physics |

**Previous Employment:**

| Laboratory Technician |

**Interests, hobbies, relevant experience etc.:**

Since starting to teach I have always been involved with outdoor activities with the school, and I also help with the local Youth Club at the church. The Youth Club is especially involved in helping and counselling local young people who may have been in trouble of one sort or another. I am in charge of organiseyng outings and holidays for the group. I would like to become involved in this sort of work on a more regular basis, especially if the work is with disadvantaged young people; but I am willing to contribute to the local community in any way I can.

**Times at which you would be available to work:**

- 4-9 weekdays, some weekends.
**APPLICATION FOR POST OF PART-TIME ASSISTANT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Simon Hastings</th>
<th>Age:</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status:</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>No. of children:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Address:</td>
<td>Wyndrift, Shrubland Rd</td>
<td>Ages:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education Qualifications:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Present Employment:**

Shop worker in Supermarket

**Previous Employment:**


**Interests, hobbies, relevant experience etc.:**

I have worked through the church fellowship, with the sick and elderly for several years, and since passing the driving test have done an evening travelling library service for housebound people. I also spent 3 months holiday work for Disability Income Group. My present job is rather soul destroying and I would gladly give it up for something more fulfilling. Eventually I would like to obtain full-time work in Community Service, preferably with the aged or handicapped.

**Times at which you would be available to work:** Any times.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Helen Parker</th>
<th>Age:</th>
<th>42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status:</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>No. of children:</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Address:</td>
<td>66 Buckingham Crescent</td>
<td>Ages:</td>
<td>20, 18, 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education Qualifications:**

**Present Employment:** Housewife

**Previous Employment:**

- Canteen Assistant
- Supermarket Store Assistant

**Interests, hobbies, relevant experience etc.:**

I like to help out with anything going on for the kids and old people round here. I help in the local day centre for pensioners and I used to help in the playgroup at the school when the kids were young.

I would like to work part-time in the area, where I know a lot of people and families already.

**Times at which you would be available to work:**

9-5 week days
**COMMUNITY COUNCIL PROJECTS**

**APPLICATION FOR POST OF PART-TIME ASSISTANT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Christina Mitchell</th>
<th>Age: 39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status:</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>No. of children: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Address:</td>
<td>3 Water Drive</td>
<td>Ages: 15, 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education Qualifications:**
- GCE 'A' level English (B)
- GCE 'O' level French (B)
- Geography (C)
- History (D)
- Commercial Subjects (B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Employment:</th>
<th>Previous Employment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Librarian's Assistant in Institute of Chartered Surveyors</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel Receptionist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interests, hobbies, relevant experience etc.:**

I have spent fifteen of the past eighteen years in Nigeria where I helped my husband to run his business. I also taught some English to local students, and had considerable involvement in the local community. More recently I have been used to dealing with problems and enquiries from students in the Institute. I enjoy working with young people and would prefer to work part-time, to have more time with my family. I feel that my experience with community affairs in Nigeria would be helpful in the types of jobs the community council is offering.

**Times at which you would be available to work:**

Weekdays 9 - 3.30
**APPLICATION FOR POST OF PART-TIME ASSISTANT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Sheila Robertson</th>
<th>Age: 38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status: Married</td>
<td>No. of children: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Address: 11 Southmaine Gdns</td>
<td>Ages: 11, 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education Qualifications:**
- English GCE 'A' Level - B
- Biology GCE 'A' Level - B
- Child Psychology - (London University, Extra Mural)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Employment:</th>
<th>Previous Employment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-time assistant to author/illustrator</td>
<td>Secretary to Newcastle Advertiser Secretary to Advertising Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interests, hobbies, relevant experience etc.:**

In my present job I have developed an interest in children's books, and in particular in aspects of Child Psychology, educational achievement and juvenile delinquency. I would like very much to work within the local community to help disadvantaged young people of all kinds. I can organise my time efficiently and methodically when faced with many different tasks.

**Times at which you would be available to work:** 9-3 weekdays; other times if necessary.
### Appendix 2 to Chapter 3

Table of the raw scores of the skills on the Pilot test

(99 = Missing values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### READING 1 & 2

Table showing scores for subskills of Reading in Pilot test:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In1</th>
<th>In2</th>
<th>If1</th>
<th>If2</th>
<th>Ev1</th>
<th>Ev2</th>
<th>Cft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table showing the scores for sub-skills of Listening in Pilot test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>In1</th>
<th>In2</th>
<th>If1</th>
<th>If2</th>
<th>Ev1</th>
<th>Ev2</th>
<th>Cft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table showing scores for sub-skills of Writing in Pilot test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Ap1</th>
<th>Ap2</th>
<th>Id1</th>
<th>Id2</th>
<th>Exp1</th>
<th>Exp2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table showing scores for sub-skills of Speaking in Pilot Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ap</th>
<th>CFL</th>
<th>SFL</th>
<th>ISk</th>
<th>Sup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1 to Chapter 4

Results of the Pre and Posttests
(99= Missing values)

Table showing the raw scores of the skills on the Pre and Posttests in the two settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table showing the raw scores of Reading sub-skills on the Pre and Posttests: (99 = Missing values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N Sc In1 In2 If1 If2 Ev1 Ev2 Cft</td>
<td>N Sc In1 In2 If1 If2 Ev1 Ev2 Cft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 80 89 36</td>
<td>1 75 78 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 85 89 36</td>
<td>1 82 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 87 78 90</td>
<td>1 72 78 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 87 78 90</td>
<td>1 85 89 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 87 78 90</td>
<td>1 87 78 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 87 78 90</td>
<td>1 87 78 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
<td>1 90 89 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table showing the scores for sub-skills for Listening in the Two settings. (99= Missing values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>In1</th>
<th>In2</th>
<th>If1</th>
<th>If2</th>
<th>Ev1</th>
<th>Ev2</th>
<th>Cft</th>
<th>In1</th>
<th>In2</th>
<th>If1</th>
<th>If2</th>
<th>Ev1</th>
<th>Ev2</th>
<th>Cft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table showing the raw scores for Writing in the two settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Sc</th>
<th>Ap1</th>
<th>Ap2</th>
<th>Id1</th>
<th>Id2</th>
<th>Exp1</th>
<th>Exp2</th>
<th>Ap1</th>
<th>Ap2</th>
<th>Id1</th>
<th>Id2</th>
<th>Exp1</th>
<th>Exp2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table showing the sub-skills for Speaking in the two Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pretest:</th>
<th>Posttest:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2, Chapter 4

Table showing Means and St. Dev. of Pre and Posttest Scores in the two settings: (99= Missing values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Number Mean St. Dev.</th>
<th>Number Mean St. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOR</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reading 1 & 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Number Mean St. Dev.</th>
<th>Number Mean St. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFOR1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFOR2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFER1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFER2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAL1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAL2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFT</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WRITING I & II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Number Mean St. Dev.</th>
<th>Number Mean St. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APP1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APP2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDA1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDA2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LISTENING I & II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Number Mean St. Dev.</th>
<th>Number Mean St. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFOR1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFOR2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFER1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFER2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAL1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAL2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 3 to Chapter 4

#### Table of Paired T-Test of Means of Pre and Posttests of Skills. Significance level held at .1 or 10%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>St.Dev.</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>St.Dev.</th>
<th>Diff.of Mean</th>
<th>Diff.of St.Dev</th>
<th>2-tailed Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 20</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>2 18</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>1 16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>2 16</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infer 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infer 2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eval 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eval 2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cft</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appro1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appro2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas 1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas 2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp 1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp 2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infer 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eval 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eval 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cft</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appro 1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.Flu</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.Flu</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int.Skl</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPEAKING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>St.Dev.</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>St.Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPROP</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.FLU.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.FLU.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT.SKL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table showing Summary of Results of Analysis of Variance for Various Skills by School.
Since the number of the samples is low, the level of significance has been taken to be at 10%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Level of Significance of Independent Variables</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading 1</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading 2</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing 1</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing 2</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening 1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening 2</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform 1</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform 2</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infer 1</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infer 2</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eval 1</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eval 2</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approp 1</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approp 2</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas 1</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas 2</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express1</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express2</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform 1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform 2</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infer 1</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infer 2</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eval 1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eval 2</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approp</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.Flu</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.Flu</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int.Skl.</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX 1

## Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT): Part A

|--------|---------|---------|-------|---------|---|-----------------|------|------|---------------|-----------|--------------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PARTIC ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>MATERIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>A come in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:05</td>
<td>T, Welcoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10</td>
<td>T, Requests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>T, Explains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20</td>
<td>T, Requests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:25</td>
<td>A, talking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:35</td>
<td>A, language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40</td>
<td>A, telling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>A, requesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50</td>
<td>A, presenting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT): Part A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PARTIC ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>MATERIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. a. Introduction</td>
<td>Class Group</td>
<td>Narrow Language</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. b. Task A</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Limited Language</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Manipulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. c. Task B</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Broad Language</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. d. Task C</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Topic Control</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. e. Task D</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Modality</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. f. Task E</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. g. Task F</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. h. Task G</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. i. Task H</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. j. Task I</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. k. Task J</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. l. Task K</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. m. Task L</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. n. Task M</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. o. Task N</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. p. Task O</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. q. Task P</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. r. Task Q</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. s. Task R</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. t. Task S</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. u. Task T</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. v. Task U</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. w. Task V</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. x. Task W</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. y. Task X</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. z. Task Y</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. a. Task A</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. b. Task B</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. c. Task C</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. d. Task D</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. e. Task E</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. f. Task F</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. g. Task G</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. h. Task H</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. i. Task I</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. j. Task J</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. k. Task K</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. l. Task L</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. m. Task M</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. n. Task N</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. o. Task O</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. p. Task P</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. q. Task Q</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. r. Task R</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. s. Task S</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. t. Task T</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. u. Task U</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. v. Task V</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. w. Task W</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. x. Task X</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. y. Task Y</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. z. Task Z</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. a. Task AA</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. b. Task BB</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. c. Task CC</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. d. Task DD</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. e. Task EE</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. f. Task FF</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. g. Task GG</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. h. Task HH</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. i. Task II</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. j. Task JJ</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. k. Task KK</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. l. Task LL</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. m. Task MM</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. n. Task NN</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. o. Task OO</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. p. Task PP</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. q. Task QQ</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. r. Task RR</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. s. Task SS</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. t. Task TT</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. u. Task UU</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. v. Task VV</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. w. Task WW</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. x. Task XX</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. y. Task YY</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>5. z. Task ZZ</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>PARTIC ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>CONTENT</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>MATERIALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LANGUAGE</td>
<td>TOPIC CONTROL</td>
<td>MODALITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>MAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zombie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45</td>
<td>la conversacion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:48</td>
<td>roll call</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:51</td>
<td>T teacher of task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:55</td>
<td>la discesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:59</td>
<td>la tarea de tarea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:03</td>
<td>la integracion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:07</td>
<td>T dicto texto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:11</td>
<td>la cuestion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>la tarea de tarea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:27</td>
<td>la tarea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>la preparar la tarea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT): Part A

### SCHOOL
- Subject: ENGLISH
- Teacher: Mrs. A
- Lesson (Minutes): 45

### TIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PARTIC ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>OTHER TOPICS</th>
<th>TOPIC CONTROL</th>
<th>MODALITY</th>
<th>MATERIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>MAN</td>
<td>LANGUAGE</td>
<td>Narrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 AM</td>
<td>LA introduc.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.05 AM</td>
<td>T asked intro.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10 AM</td>
<td>T discipline</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15 AM</td>
<td>T read</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20 AM</td>
<td>T called</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25 AM</td>
<td>T explained</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30 AM</td>
<td>T dictated</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.35 AM</td>
<td>T asked</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.40 AM</td>
<td>T asked</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.45 AM</td>
<td>T asked</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other World
- World 1: T

### Materials
- Text: ✓
- Audio: ✓
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**School Teacher Subject**

**Grade(s)**

**Lesson (Minutes)**

**Date**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Partic Organization</th>
<th>Language Content</th>
<th>Other Topics</th>
<th>Topic Control</th>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class Group Comb Man</td>
<td>Narrow Limited Broad</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher / Student</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## APPENDIX 1

### Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT): Part A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>GRADE(S)</th>
<th>LESSON (Minutes)</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>OBSERVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12/4/72</td>
<td>D. Luader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PARTIC ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>OTHER TOPICS</th>
<th>TOPIC CONTROL</th>
<th>MODALITY</th>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>MATERIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>MAN</td>
<td>LANGUAGE</td>
<td>NARROW</td>
<td>LIMITED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 1

### Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT): Part A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>GRADE(S)</th>
<th>LESSON (Minutes)</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>OBSERVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>JUN 1996</td>
<td>D ALLARD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PARTICIPATION</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>MATERIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class Group Comb MAN</td>
<td>LANGUAGE</td>
<td>OTHER TOPICS</td>
<td>TOPIC CONTROL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S Choral</td>
<td>Name Individual Let led</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Appendix 1

## Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT): Part A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>GRADE(S)</th>
<th>LESSON (Minutes)</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>OBSERVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>PARTICIPATION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE</th>
<th>OTHER TOPICS</th>
<th>TOPIC CONTROL</th>
<th>STUDENT MODALITY</th>
<th>MATERIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Details

- **Time:**
  - 00:10: la cermi
  - 00:21: T discplinc
  - 00:31: T discplinc
  - 00:41: T discplinc
  - 00:51: T discplinc
  - 1:01: T discplinc
  - 1:11: T discplinc

## Notes

- **Notes:**
  - [Additional notes related to the lesson and observations.]

## Conclusion

- **Conclusion:**
  - [Summary of the lesson and feedback.]

---

**Date:** Oct, 1990

**Observer:** D.A. Quader

---

---
## APPENDIX 1

### Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT): Part A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PARTIC ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>CONTENT LANGUAGE</th>
<th>OTHER TOPICS</th>
<th>TOPIC CONTROL</th>
<th>STUDENT MATERIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Notes:
- **TIME** is recorded in 10-minute intervals.
- **ACTIVITIES** include various teaching methods and exercises.
- **PARTIC ORGANIZATION** details the distribution of students among groups.
- **CONTENT LANGUAGE** and **OTHER TOPICS** cover the focus areas of the lesson.
- **TOPIC CONTROL** indicates the level of teacher control over the lesson.
- **STUDENT MATERIALS** list the types of materials used by students.
## APPENDIX 1

### Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT): Part A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>GRADES</th>
<th>AP (10s)</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>OBSERVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER</td>
<td>MR. C</td>
<td>LESSON (Minutes)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9.11.1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PARTIC ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>TOPIC CONTROL</th>
<th>MODALITY</th>
<th>MENTIONS</th>
<th>MATERIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class Group Comb</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Narrow</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Broad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Narrow</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Broad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Narrow</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Broad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Narrow</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Broad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Narrow</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Broad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PARTIC ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>TOPIC CONTROL</th>
<th>MODALITY</th>
<th>MENTIONS</th>
<th>MATERIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class Group Comb</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Narrow</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Broad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Narrow</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Broad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Narrow</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Broad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Narrow</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Broad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 1

**Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT): Part A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>GRADE(S)</th>
<th>LESSON (Minutes)</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>OBSERVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16/1/94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PARTIC ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT): Part A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>H3 J. LHR C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER</td>
<td>M3 J. LHR C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE(S)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESSON (Minutes)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSERVER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PARTIC ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>OTHER TOPICS</th>
<th>TOPIC CONTROL</th>
<th>MODALITY</th>
<th>MATERIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>MAN</td>
<td>LANGUAGE</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>I explained</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>I write</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>I write</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 1

### Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT): Part A

**Grade(s):**

**Lesson (Minutes):** 45

**Date:** MAR, 90

### Time Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Partic Organization</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Other Topics</th>
<th>Topic Control</th>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>T. talk</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Narrow</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>Audio-Pedag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>Broad</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Visual-Pedag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Visual-Pedag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- **Class:** Educational setting for instruction.
- **Group:** Objectives for instruction.
- **Comb:** Scope of instruction.
- **Narrow:** Specific language skills.
- **Limited:** Basic language skills.
- **Broad:** Advanced language skills.
- **Topic Control:** Instructional strategies.
- **Modality:** Delivery methods.
- **Student:** Learning outcomes.
- **Materials:** Instructional materials.
## APPENDIX 1

**Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT): Part A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>OBSERVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>LESSON (Minutes)</td>
<td>OCT, 1990</td>
<td>VIDEODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TIME | ACTIVITIES | PARTIC ORGANIZATION | CONTENT |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Comb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Col 1: 1-2 |
- Col 2: A-B |
- Col 3: CRITERIA |
- Col 4: DATE |
- Col 5: OBSERVER |
- Col 6: SCHOOL |
- Col 7: TEACHER |
- Col 8: SUBJECT |

**Columns:**
- Class, Group, Comb, MAN, LANGUAGE, NARROW, LIMITED, BROAD, TOPIC CONTROL, MODALITY, STUDENT, MATERIALS, Use
**APPENDIX 1**

**Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT): Part A**

**SCHOOL**
Mr. G

**TEACHER**

**SUBJECT**
Geography

**GRADE(S)**
10.5 ( Former AP )

**LESSON (Minutes)**
45 mins

**DATE**
12.3.1991

**OBSERVER**
D. A. Quader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PARTICIPATION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>MATERIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>MAN</td>
<td>LANGUAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Disciplined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>G. Ind.</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Prof. Bos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:25</td>
<td>LV settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:26</td>
<td>T reads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:36</td>
<td>T reads lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:38</td>
<td>T starts lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:43</td>
<td>T explains rule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:48</td>
<td>T explains rule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:49</td>
<td>T explains rule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:51</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:52</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:53</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:54</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:55</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:56</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:57</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:58</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:59</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:01</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:02</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:03</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:04</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:05</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:06</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:07</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:08</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:09</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:11</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:12</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:13</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:14</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:16</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:17</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:18</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:19</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:20</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:21</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:22</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:23</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:24</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:25</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:26</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:27</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:28</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:29</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:31</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:32</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:33</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:34</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:36</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:37</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:38</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:39</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:41</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:42</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:43</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:44</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45</td>
<td>We start with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX 1

## Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT): Part A

### SCHOOL
**TEACHER**
**SUBJECT**

### GRADE(S)
**LESSON (Minutes)**

### DATE
**OBSERVER**

### TIME
**ACTIVITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. Introduction to a new topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2. Discussion of the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3. Practice of new vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4. Role-playing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5. Writing a short story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6. Discussion of the writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7. Reading and comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8. Group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9. Individual work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10. Review of the lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11. Homework assignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PARTICIC ORGANIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clas</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Comb</th>
<th>MAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONTENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>OTHER TOPICS</th>
<th>BROAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NARROW</td>
<td>LIMITED</td>
<td>WIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STUDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>STUDENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>Modality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>Auditory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Notes
- The lesson focuses on the communicative aspect of language teaching, emphasizing interaction and practical use of language.
- The activities are designed to build vocabulary and comprehension skills.
- The lesson concludes with an assignment that encourages application of the learned vocabulary and concepts.
### Appendix 2 to Chapter 5

Table showing the Organisation of Teaching, the Time of Topic Control and the Use of Skills in the two settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Org</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Interaction Skills used (in order of greater use)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D/G</td>
<td>Apr, 90</td>
<td>23 Speaking, Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>Jun, 90</td>
<td>24 Speaking, Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>Oct, 90</td>
<td>30 Speaking, Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D/I</td>
<td>Oct, 90</td>
<td>33 Speaking, Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>Jan, 91</td>
<td>00 Listening, Reading, Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>Mar, 91</td>
<td>22 Listening, Speaking, Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>Jun, 90</td>
<td>33 Speaking, Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>T-I</td>
<td>Oct, 90</td>
<td>00 Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>Sept, 90</td>
<td>30 Listening, Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T-I</td>
<td>Nov, 90</td>
<td>00 Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>Jan, 91</td>
<td>33 Speaking, Listening, Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>Apr, 91</td>
<td>30 Speaking, Reading, Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>Mar, 90</td>
<td>27 Speaking, Reading, Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>Mar, 90</td>
<td>30 Listening, Speaking, Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D/G</td>
<td>Jun, 90</td>
<td>25 Listening, Speaking, Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>Oct, 90</td>
<td>15 Listening, Reading, Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>Sept, 90</td>
<td>00 Listening, Reading, Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>Nov, 90</td>
<td>00 Reading, Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>Mar, 91</td>
<td>00 Reading, Writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table showing distribution of c-units on academic and non-academic talk

<p>| Sc Sub Dat | AV WD TT CU CU AT AV WD/ AV WD L1 CU L1 L1 TT CU TN T-L L-L |
|------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| A Eng 4.90 | 234 00 24 00 00 00 24 5.6 34 06 28 |
| A 266 04 24 02 00 00 22 11 13 00 13 |
| A 238 01 37 00 00 00 37 6.4 21 00 21 |
| A 1185 414 232 42 00 00 217 7.9 147 16 131 |
| A Eng 4.90 | 754 84 114 09 04 95 7.2 78 06 72 |
| A Eng 6.90 | 835 17 161 04 01 125 5.2 140 32 108 |
| A 266 04 24 02 00 22 11 13 00 13 |
| A 238 01 37 00 00 00 37 6.4 21 00 21 |
| A 1185 414 232 42 00 00 217 7.9 147 16 131 |
| A Eng 4.90 | 520 02 98 02 01 88 5.1 85 20 65 |
| A Eng 10 90 | 1204 00 168 00 00 163 7.2 116 17 112 |
| A 963 00 158 00 00 132 6.1 105 00 105 |
| A 915 00 137 00 00 126 6.7 98 40 58 |
| A 868 25 157 07 05 146 5.5 129 00 116 |
| A Eng 10 90 | 988 06 155 02 01 142 6.4 112 14 98 |
| Sc Sub Dat | AV WD AV CU CU AT AV WD/ AV WD L1 CU L1 L1 TT CU TN T-L L-L |
|------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| C Eng 10 90 | 748 138 157 28 07 83 4.8 143 36 107 |
| C 529 00 120 00 00 67 4.4 91 30 61 |
| C Eng 10 90 | 639 69 139 14 02 75 4.6 117 33 84 |
| C Eng 1 91 | 164 00 64 00 00 41 2.6 64 61 03 |
| C 955 00 257 00 00 113 3.7 216 131 85 |
| C Eng 1 91 | 560 00 161 00 00 77 3.3 140 96 44 |
| C Eng 4 91 | 1052 471 281 95 48 189 3.7 238 122 116 |
| C 4 91 | 1035 78 249 17 07 127 4.2 223 84 95 |
| C 975 00 227 00 00 133 4.3 179 118 104 |
| C Eng 1021 183 252 37 18 150 4.1 213 108 105 |
| Sc Sub Dat | AV WD AV CU CU AT AV WD/ AV WD L1 CU L1 L1 TT CU TN T-L L-L |
|------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| A Sci 3.90 | 61 00 38 00 00 36 1.6 38 38 00 |
| A 3.90 | 94 13 50 03 00 38 1.9 49 39 10 |
| A 3.90 | 346 76 109 20 07 54 3.2 111 49 62 |
| A 3.90 | 63 00 37 00 00 58 1.7 37 26 11 |
| A Sci 3.90 | 141 22 59 06 02 47 2.1 59 38 21 |
| A Sci 6.90 | 667 166 144 41 12 75 4.6 183 60 123 |
| A 6.90 | 550 150 165 38 26 116 3.3 158 67 91 |
| A 6.90 | 320 219 149 44 20 89 2.1 140 61 79 |
| A 6.90 | 353 222 110 58 17 45 3.2 106 09 97 |
| A Sci 6.90 | 473 189 117 45 19 81 3.3 147 49 98 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sc</th>
<th>Sub</th>
<th>Dat</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>CU</th>
<th>CU/ AT</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>WD/ AV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sci</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>05</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sci</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sci</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>03</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sci</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>08</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>07</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td>03</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>07</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>09</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above contains data on various subjects with columns for different values such as AV, WD, etc.
Table showing the Average use of language in each subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sc</th>
<th>Sub</th>
<th>Dat</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>CU</th>
<th>CU/ AT</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>WD/ AV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>Sub</td>
<td>Dat</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU/ AT</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>WD/ AV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>Sub</td>
<td>Dat</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU/ AT</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>WD/ AV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>Sub</td>
<td>Dat</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU/ AT</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>WD/ AV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>Sub</td>
<td>Dat</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU/ AT</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>WD/ AV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>Sub</td>
<td>Dat</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>CU/ AT</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>WD/ AV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table showing the Average use of language in each subject.
Summary Table of use of language across subjects in the two settings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sc</th>
<th>Sub</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>CU</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>CU</th>
<th>TN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sci</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sci</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix & Chapter 6

Frequency count of Words

Key: (Thorndike, 1948, p. xviii)

AA=100 or over per million;
A = at least 50 per million and so many as 100 per million;
1/2= one occurrence per 2 million.
1 = at least 1 occurrence per million and not so many as 2 per million;
2 = at least 2 per million and not so many as 3 per million;
and similarly up to 49;
Words less widely used are not assigned any number of frequency.

English: School A: Class 1: Apr, 90:

Most words range within the A to AA frequency. The words the Ls use on task performance are of lower frequency:

Academic Talk:
- advertise-12
- affect-5
- billions-11
- cancer-5
- complaining-44
- extra-32
- ignore-17
- normally-6
- pension -13
- relax-17

Non-academic Talk:
- lick-22

Jun, 90: Class 2:
- frustration-1
- womb-3
- export-24

frustration -1 banquet-18 globe-41 ripeness-34
womb-3 horrible-27 starving-38 dirty-31
eexport-24 curly -14 yam- 1 neatly-28
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>wrapped-45</th>
<th>discussing-40</th>
<th>apartheid-?</th>
<th>package-38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>racism-6</td>
<td>wicket-1</td>
<td>specially-12</td>
<td>toilets-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discuss-29</td>
<td>racists-6</td>
<td>transported-28</td>
<td>visas-1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hanging-10</td>
<td>sunlight-32</td>
<td>maturity-6</td>
<td>imports-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abroad-48</td>
<td>exit-8</td>
<td>permission-22</td>
<td>normal-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing-2</td>
<td>facilities-23</td>
<td>abuse-22</td>
<td>transport-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overcrowded-3</td>
<td>supposed-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nov, 90: Class 3:**

**Academic Talk:**
- facilities-23 apartheid-? racism-? legal-28
- prohibited-12 disturbing-47 experienced-9 specially-12
- racist-6 restaurant-23 refreshments-12 separated-9
- available25 ministerial-1 administration-49 banned-5
- placards-3 restricted-9 normal-41 advertisement-11
- inner-29 educated-21 elections-49 manual-6
- initial-13 aspects-27 understand-12 weird-1/2
- bleed-16 discussing-40 paragraph-12 absolutely-36
- treatment-41 starvation-9 harassed-7 helpful-14

**Non-academic Talk:**
- stupid-24

**English: School C; Oct, 90: Class 1:**

**Academic Talk:**
- available-25 Images-31 supposed-14 tough-18
- normal-41 definition-09 finished-25
- extension-18

**Non-academic Talk:**
- borrowed-48 complaining-44 guilty-28 lucky-24
- mussed-01 properly-45 split-26 stingy-01
- sulking-03 sharpener-12

**Jan, 91: Class 2:**

**Academic Talk:**
- dive-21 grandfather-36 librarian-3 oysters-23
- stuck-35 pearl-47 youthful-20 scorpion-3

**Non-academic Talk:**
- cocaine-1 seriously-30 ignore-17 dealing-16
- technical-14 mixed-24 folder-2 program-46

**Apr, 91: Class 3:**

**Academic Talk:**
- behalf-18 commentary-5 extra-32 hindering-13
- impression-45 irritating-12 learning-27 lonely-35
- mess-17 obvious-23 patois-1/2 reassured-11
- relaxing-17 speaker-25

**Non-academic use:**
- addled-1/2 borrowed-48 equipment-31 lash-20
- lie-13 pardon-36 skiing-6 starving-38

**Science: School A: Class 1: Mar, 90:**
Academic Talk:
batteries-19 capacitor-? chemical-25 circuits-21
copper-46 dented-3 electricity-18 electrons-1
electrolysis-? energy-41 external-10 generator-2
kinetic-1/2 matches-25 mechanical-20 meter -6
tin-36 zinc-10

Class 2: Jun, 90:
Academic Talk:
alternate-11 atom-8 behave-22 brine-3
chemical-25 dissolves-29 electricity-18 freeze-32
hydrogen-16 lab(oratory)-16 mixed- 24 minus-2
negative-10 positives-16 reaction-21 soluble-4
sulphur-21 sulphur-dioxide-?? sodium chloride-??
socket-6 volts-2
Non-academic Talk
absolutely-36 folder-2 jealous-25 rotten-14
ripe-34 stink-4 upstairs-9

Class 3: Jun, 90:
Academic Talk
acid- 38 brine-3 chloride-2 chlorine- 3
dissolves-29 electrons- 1 electrolysis- ? handicap- 11
hydrogen-16 indicator- 2 liquid-31 negative-10
oxygen-25 positive- 15 rod-44 rubbish-8
sodium chloride-? solution-31 tube- 32
universal-40 volts-2
Non-academic Talk
beaten-28 paradise-29 scared- 37 teasing-14

Class 4: Oct, 90:
Academic Talk:
alight-1 aluminium-6 barium- 1/2 breathing-11
carbon dioxide-? chemical-25 combustible-1
combust- 9 competition-28 copper-46 crucible-2
cytoplasm-? dissolving-29 electricity-18 electrolysis-?
energy-41 evaporates-6 explodes- 9 explosion-15
extra-32 extract-16 flammable-? fuse-2
glucose-1/2 hole punch- 9 iron-8 juices-37
magnesium-3 method-3 membrane-6 modified-13
muscle-35 nitrogen-12 nucleus-? ore-18
oxide-4 oxygen-25 peroxide-1/2 plastic-3
printer-7 properly-45 reactive-5 reaction-21
ribbon-34 sodium-3 spit-12 sweat- 19
synthetic-2 tube-32
Non- academic Talk
failure-48 recorded-2 sulking-3 tape-3
truant-4 topic-19

Science C: Class 1: Sept, 90;
Academic Talk:
deadline- 1/2 discussion- 32 gloves-43 method- 3
shining-23
Non-academic Talk greedy-11 swear-21
Class 2: Nov, 90:
Academic Talk:
ammeter-?  amps-1/2  bend-48  energy-41
grill-4  generate-7  hydro-1/2  kilowatts-2
minor-19  nuclear-1/2  Ohm-1/2  resistor-?
rotates-6  transistor-?  underneath-21  vegetation-11
voltmeter-?  volts-2  watt-2

Non-academic Talk:
toilet-11  media-1/2  borrow-48  jealous-25
discuss-40

Class 3: Jan, 91:
Academic Talk:
carbon-dioxide-?  filter-8  germination-?  liquid- 31
method-3

Non-academic Talk:
toilet-11  media-1/2  borrow-48  jealous-25
discuss-40

Class 4: Apr, 91:
Academic Talk:
absolutely-36  calculator-1/2  domestic-49  deducting-3
folder-2  graph-1/2  multiplied-24  methods-3
percentages-13  ruler-32

Non-academic Talk:
kicked-47  minute-23  water-melon-1

Geography: A: March, 90: Class 1:
Academic Talk:
accurate-14  accurately-14  beginning-44  calculation-4
code-21  camouflage-2  caption-1  chart-15
centimeters-2  cubic-8  calculator-1/2  clipboard-?
depth-49  diagram-7  data-6  discharge-30
error-36  equipment-31  explanations-31  flowmeter-?
file-37  field trip-?  folder-2  geography-14
graph-1/2  introduction-31  method-3  neatest-28
photograph-35  platform-35  pie-graph-?  ruler-32
rubber-35  sample-15  site-21  session-19
shallow-27  sole-18  submit-40  speedometer-1
trapezium-1/2  urgent-7  width-28

Non-academic Talk:
alien-13  argument-48  barber-16  bully-10
combing-19  crazy-36  decent-18  drowning-42
extra-32  explode-9  filming-31  joking-32
swear-21  truly-43  tape recorder-8

Class 2: March, 90:
Academic Talk:
bar-8  chart-15  cleanly-5  confused-25
concession-10  cross-section-1/2  camouflage-2  discharge-30
diagram-7  graph-1/2  location-16  method-3
meanders-1  multiply-24  neatly-28  tape-8
velocity-8
### Non-academic Talk:
- cheque-2 convince-45 creak-9 disturbing-47
- diverted-11 permission-22 registration-5 swear-21 vision-45

### Class 3: Geography:

#### Academic Talk:
- analyse-10 angle-30 bar chart-? batch-3
- calculator-1/2 cancellation-1 compass-28 code-21
deadline-25 drawn-49 environment-13 equivalent-12
- file-37 graph-1/2 ignorant-24 introduction-31
- interviewed-26 label-7 landscape-19 leased-14
- minority-10 method-3 measurement-11 network-7
- opinion-? pie-charts-? photographs-35 properly-45
- protector-6 protractor-1/2 ridiculous-17 ruler-32
- relates-33 stationers-1 simplified-5 shopkeepers-3
- survey-32 traffic-36 weekly-25

#### Non-academic Talk:
- blackmail-4 brilliant-42 dubbing-4 exact-34

### Class 4; October, 90;

#### Academic Talk:
- accurate-14 arrow-37 basics-9 cactus-2
cycles-8 cultivation-13 classification-6 cultural-4
economic-1/2 extensive-20 farming-12 geography-14
- intensive-3 messy-1/2 output-17 plot-36
- primary-25 secondary-12 seriously-30 shifting-35
- sedentary-2 spell-15 supposed-14 tertiary-1
- tractor-12

#### Non-academic Talk:
- button-39 winner-10 properly-45

### Geography: School C:Class 1: Sept, 90:

#### Academic talk
- bungalow-8

### Class 2: Nov, 90:

#### Academic Talk:
- cooperate-10 decimal-1 handicapped-11 pensioners-2
- percentages-13 psychology-12 seconds-42 supplementary-2
- unemployed-8
Class 3: Mar, 91:

Academic Talk

concentrated-19 dam-18 deforestation-? drains-41
drainage-9 kilometres-3 location-16 occupation-34
perspiration-4 presentation-8 reclamation-2 urban-4
Appendix 1, Chapter 7

Teacher's Interview: School A: 5.2.1991

MR. K: Science Tutor

K: ...in September. Umm they had a series of teachers beforehand and they were quite disillusioned with science and because teachers were absent and the series of teachers so when I took them on and you'd be, the highest mark they got would be 55%. These are end of module tests and in Science we do 14 exams in two years which provide 45% of the total marks. So the 14 exams are very important. They are like public exams, all the teachers' marking. So the emphasis in each module lasts about four weeks although we did have to do some in three weeks so its very intensive learning and the emphasis is totally on how the pupils would express themselves in the written form.

Speech is not important and one important key to that is in understanding the material and so the emphasis in on understanding scientific concepts till the because we haven't got enough time for the teaching of the language. As long as we can understand in the writing as long as you can get an impression of understanding then the things are o.k.

And the exams themselves are set where you only have to use one-word answers. Sometimes they may have to use sentences and towards the end, to get the higher marks you do need to string you know maybe four five sentences together. But nothing more complicated than that. Um there is also ofcourse I've got over three-um five.. I think are really really good from Mr. A's group because I've gone to the top mark of 55 now. And only two boys, three boys are under fifties, I've now got 8 boys who are all over 70%. So its been a marked, a marked improvement. Probably thats worked in this class I think because 5W got a I think its got quite a strong identity as a group. There is a core of 8 or 9/ 10 boys and there is a, how can I say, I think beginning to believe in themselves as a group as being able to achieve things you know given a chance.

So emphasis is out on to try to get them to improve their results has been work that they themselves really do as individuals, although I know a lot of them used to copy their own work in the mornings whatever. But nevertheless the impetus of the motivation to do their work even if they were copying it. They didnt like coming into to the classroom not and I've not done the homework. So I think the major work has gone on at home or working together outside the classroom as a group. Where they have got their results in the science exams, can as a class they can be a bit chatty. You've got to sit down and tell them by any means ever a class that was...saying all the time. But they will do or I think, learnt the comfort to learn the advantages of doing regular homework and seeing how that benefits their coursework and how in the end it helps them to revise in term.

R: About the homework, was it very language-based or did it require only one or two words in answer, as you have mentioned before.
K: Right yeah, the homework was tending to be um, a little more advanced, the homework was pitched higher than the exams really, and their answers here again had to be about two or three sentences for each answer. You will find in the module tests that some of their answers only require to select a word from five to fill in a gap. So we are using skills that we'd already developed very well. Its only at the better questions where to get into the 70% you'd have to string a few sentences together.

R: In the examinations?

K: In the examination. As for homework we tend to have that kind of homework all the time. We have a pre-written work-sheet that there are 8 questions on. We do a practical now and again because of the constraints of the building program, show module thing it used to be just a demo where they would see me doing the experiment. Or even sometimes when it was impossible to get any apparatus, me describing an experiment using diagrams and they would then have to derive conclusions from that at home and answer, as I was saying, in a couple of sentences. But no more than that really.

So, the biggest factor again hasnt been anything to do with language or myself or what I dont know. Which is something groups started to get ...of, they've got a lot of confidence. And you know I think they did a lot of the work themselves. But thats how they were a group by the end. And also I think the module thing works for some of these students because you finish one course in four weeks and you start a completely new set. If you've done badly one time then the emphasis is right the emphasis is you score this time. What you got to do in the next exam is just make sure you get higher limit. So there is always an impetus whereas with continual working it is easy to sort of get disillusioned to to kind of bracket yourself you know as somebody being no good.

R: Hmm

K: You got good..yeah. Here when they first came Fokhrul got steady 17 in his last test he's getting 80%, thats like a very great, substantial improvement. Whereas you know with someone like F--- if he hadnt had a chance to be assessed and try to improve at each stage, which I think has been important, I think he would lose his sense of his own improvement. So the good thing about tests was that it did give the lads a chance to see himself his improvement. Which is not ofcourse the same standard you dont always get. I mean he used to do all his homework. He wasnt very good at sitting in exams.

So that would be the other key. From that secondarily I think the language improves. But the motivation's come from their test scores, trying to improve their test scores and so they've learnt to drag the language along behind them. But in order to get a higher test scores they'd have to try and improve their English. With their written work I have gone through, spellings where I can, things like punctuation but again it is difficult to go through every kid's piece of work.

R: You do say then that the exams in line with the homework these are the two things that do help them to progress?
K: Yes.

R: In the language as well of course in the content.

K: That's right. We've got two homeworks a week, which could be about thirty minutes. Often you'll find many of them will do the homework in school, although again you've got you know may be a hard core as the rest of the class would copy off. They do their homeworks. But even then just to do things in the class means they are helping each other. It shows some motivation. So their homework twice a week and test every four weeks really so they could monitor themselves and their improvements at regular intervals.

R: Do you think that this helping each other in the class and outside, does this have any effect on their language or other conceptual improvement?

K: Well once you get lads, I think it will help to a certain extent, but my emphasis would be, once you get boys you know that they copy, which is great. Alright, you don't accept that. Then you say, now listen, you know this is copying, it's not acceptable. But once you start a stage when they don't want to be seen not to hand their homework in, the next stage is, they do the work at home and that's where the real changes take place, specially in terms of, you're looking at achievement test.

R: I didn't mean the copying. I also meant the other kind of help you know, explaining things to each other.

K: Yes

R: Concepts

MR. A: Form Tutor.

A: May I come in here?

R: Yes, sure!

A: I think you know they come in every morning, some of them come in at 8 o'clock and now lately what is done is this, some of them come in and they got a team leader. Now he goes to the board and they fire questions at him especially when they are going to have a science tests.

K: Yeah

A: Now he becomes the expert for that moment. Now when he finishes another one will go to the board and I mean they just fire questions at him. But through this I think their language is gradually coming to improve. My worry is they should have started this earlier. Though I kept telling them, they should have started it in second year, they wouldn't be in the position they are now. When I look at their estimated grade for science there is nothing to be very happy about.

K: That's true, yeah.
A: Well I just described the sort of discussions they have in the morning.  You know one becoming expert for a period of time and then sort of swapping roles.  That is what I think is helping them.

R: Hmm so the spoken explanations that are taking place this is what is happening to help the one who is doing it or the ones who are listening?

A: Its helping both

R: Both.

A: When one goes to the board its not only spoken: they write on the board also.

R: Uuhh.

A: They can write the formulae, they write..if you are wrong, theres sort of lay men sitting but they point it out to the expert, you are wrong.

R: Uuhh.

A: And then he corrects it immediately.  Although he is supposed to be the expert he learns from those who are not so expert.

R: How long has this been going on?

A: Umm, just this term actually.  Only this term

R: Thats a pity because that is why I did not get to capture this in the test.

A: I I

R: And now?

A: When they started that I became so happy and I said, sure boys you should have started this ages ago.  If you had, by tis time all of you would have got 'A's and not 'C's and 'D's.

R: Yeah.

A: As I said, 5W is noted of their habit, a group of their unique identity.  Long ago our Mr... what is then Mr. W decided, picked 5W is because of that identity.  Now when they act as a unit when you go wrong they point it out to you, you are in the wrong.  At the moment Akmal, you havent seen him for a long long time because he is not coming to school.  Now they have gone to the extent of requesting me to get him taken off the group because he's letting the class down! Our percentage, attendence percentage is going down because he is being absent.

R: Ummh

A: So they come to me and say, Sir can you go to the authorities so they can take him off our role? And I said no, I cant do it.  Now anything which puts 5W in the, I mean a good sort of role relative to
the other classes is something they all fight for. And when they go
out they stick together. If one of their members is in trouble the
others speak up for him, even if it comes to fighting they decide to
fight for their mates. They did something at the, what do you call it,
J----. One of their boys was in trouble there, they all rushed there.
And they were involved in the fight. I had to rebuke them for doing
it. But thats 5W.

M said something a few weeks back. That he realised he
needs good grades for the future. He wants to become a programmer.
He realised he needs good grades. And the sort of marks he has been
getting in Science, wasnt going to help him. So he decided he was
going to start working hard. And surprisingly the time M started
working very hard, the time M--- started coming in at 8 A.M., others, I
mean sort of, followed him up. First it was N---- and M----. Then we
had A---- joining in. Now we have Tufail and now I----'s also coming.
Bit by bit we're getting large numbers. It is not going to be very
easy I mean sort of organising it if you are not if you have nothing to
do with the group as such. I couldnt go to the first year or the
second year and say boys can you come in and do some work.

R: No, thats not what I meant. What I meant is that you could give the
idea to their form teachers and they could try utilizing this concept
because definitely if your own, members of your own peer group try to
explain things to you you are more receptive. And the other thing is
that if you try to explain something to other people the concept has to
be very clear in your own mind.

A: Yeah.

R: So these are the two things that help people when they are
organising such groups. A: Its true but it also depends on the group,
they have got to realise that it is going to be beneficial. But I kept
on this I mean hammering it home. I didnt start this year. I started
from the third year, trying to get them to organise themselves, trying
to get them to work. They wouldnt, they wouldnt listen! Suddenly this
year they have. They started early.

R: Yeah, so you're trying to say that you cant impose it. They have to
realise it themselves.

A: Yeah.

MR. H: English Teacher.

H: As far as the standard of reading, I mean I have already said to you
that I would question the content of the material which you used in that
it was I think it was fairly alien to a lot of the reading that certainly
the boys do in English and I would suggest in other subjects. Lot of
the material was of a sociological nature with specialist language. Now
certainly when we do reading in English we aim books very carefully at
kids, I mean obviously we do a lot of the children's books, but we also
try to use literature that they can identify with, that they already
bring experience to.

And certainly when you are reading if there are any difficulties
you can stop and talk and do exercise from the book so there is proper
comprehension of the. We did not actually have this opportunity on the
reading tests but what we did, it was often just about reading in a, perhaps its just me or you reading out a passage and then the boys having to get on with doing the comprehension work in it. Now there were certainly, there were some boys who coped, you know, fairly well, certainly the more able boys in the class, the boys of the class who perhaps have been in the country longer who are more sophisticated in English generally. But there were large numbers there you see who just simply couldnt cope. Now in a normal teaching situation you know we have done reading as complicated as that but we paired it and we've sort of given boys opportunities to actually discuss reading matters in groups and discuss the you know the particular problems with teachers and with other boys. We didnt have that opportunity on this occasion.

As for improvements in writing, I can take no great credit for that except, I would like to think that they would make a natural progress over a period of a year or so because certainly in English they do a lot of writing, they have to provide a folder of course work, the whole examination results is based on that course work. So inevitably they do a lot of writing in class and they are expected to do a lot of writing at home. Then the

R: Let me just interrupt for a minute. But isnt that the same with all the other schools and all the other children in the other schools?

H: Yes it is but I would still say that the actual reading materials were inappropriate. I mean I think that you could design you know fairly difficult reading exercises which I think are more relevant to the pupils. No, what I am trying to say is that the reading material would be equally alien to the other children but what I'm trying to focus upon is the improvement in the writing. If you are trying to say that they are they have been doing a lot of writing for English, but so have all the other children in the other schools.

H: Yeah

R: Why the children in this school have a better rise in the rather a greater rate of improvement in the writing?

H: Well you know I cant offer justifications for that. You know that I have a special responsibility for reading so I mean I could take this personally I mean we have tried to do increase the opportunity for boys to read. Now I know that probably in the fourth and the fifth year, reading opportunities actually go down because there are other pressures of coursework in other subjects that the weekly reading lesson is often lost and I think you'd sort of agree with this, its often lost in the upper school because boys have got meetings to go to, they've got career meetings, they've got other activities to do during this reading lesson. So reading...is acquired in the lower school tutors do stick to reading so theres much more reading going on generally, I mean this is something that I have argued against, I mean I think that in many ways the crucial year for boys to do extra reading are the fourth and fifth year because they are close to leaving school and we want them to leave school as habitual readers. You know boys who've done regular reading in school are in many ways apart from their reading being reduced it should be increased. So that they carry on reading after leaving school. But apart from that I dont offer any excuses. I couldnt suggest reasons and..
R: Anything you see in the writing you do in class, anything particular, any means you adopt which could have pushed up their writing.

H: Well, we encourage boys to write at their own particular level and even when there are two teachers in, its very very hard work means we can go round and work with individual groups and with individual boys. So we also tend to give quite a lot of time in writing so that the emphasis is that all boys actually do the writing and manage to finish it. It is possible to give lots of different pieces of writing and the boys who are weakest would never finish any of it. They are continually starting work and never finishing it, we actually try to encourage boys to finish any writing they start and we give them time to do that in class and for homework. But obviously I think we need to say we have helped them because they do have to have this folder of written work so there is a lot of emphasis and importance particularly on that.

Perhaps in the fifth year the amount of reading decreases because a lot of the writing is based on books that they have read. As you get into the fifth year you become aware of you know the pressures to have a folder full of writing so perhaps the amount of reading in class does go down. But I've always seen reading and writing as connected and I would like to think boys who are doing a lot of writing and they would as you suggest improved in writing, it logically doesn't make sense that they can improve in writing and become weaker in reading. Its just not sensible.

R: How much of the time do you have help in your classroom, as you were saying that if there were two people, helps to supervise. H: Half the time, half the time. But this year the first half term I could not help because the other teacher was based on the other site. But since last half term I've had support teacher every two lesson. And the difference is just incredible because I mean if you're just one teacher you're working with the whole class, you are under enormous pressure because demands are being made of you all the time. And so the having somebody in just takes the pressure a lot of the pressure away. You are still working very hard but it means that you can target particular boys who are, you know the boys quite well by now but boys like F---, like M---, H---, N---, they can all write, they can all read, but at very basic level. You give them a little bit of help and encouragement above all, you know they can carry out and they can complete the same work that the more able boys are doing.

To me that's the advantage of mixed ability, but its also the advantage of having two teachers in a lesson. In a school like this its absolutely crucial. You know we have virtually 100% of our students bilingual learners.

R: Do you see anything in that particular group that you would like to mention as either have improved or not, any particular quality of that group.

H: I think I mentioned that already, mixed-ability, I think that is extremely important because students always watch each other. They are always aware of what other students are doing. And certainly we have boys of fairly high ability who are doing good work. I think
are always aware of what other students are doing. And certainly we have boys of fairly high ability who are doing good work. I think even the weaker boys try to emulate that, even if its only to complete a piece of work.

R: The criticism against mixed ability has been that it sort of pulls the better boys down to the lower ability level, I mean thats one of the criticism that has been levelled. How far do you agree with that? You spoke exactly against it.

H: I think our English results prove that our results have benefitted from mixed ability teaching, they are going up. We had forty passes between A and C last year in English using mixed ability. I think it works. I mean to be honest I refuse to accept your point there. From my sort of experience and knowledge and it is just not logical. I am not claiming that the class is going to get superb results. But I'd be very surprised if we didn't have at least five passes from A to C. But what would be more important to me will be that there will be very weak boys like F----, M--- and H--- who will record grade GCSE maybe an F or an E but it will be a score to record. Where in streaming boys like that would either have dropped out because they were always seen as failures or seen as losers or they would have been in a class where they wouldn't have been entered for examination anyway.

R: Can you confirm your statement this thing that you were saying about mixed ability boys perform better by any experience you have had in the streaming classes or

H: Well, I've always taught mixed ability. Now I teach sixth form level and I taught at A level, you know like the highest level.

R: But thats

H: That is a form of streaming because there they are people who are committed to doing English at A level, but nevertheless within a streamed class, it is still mixed ability. You know within a small class we still have the very able, the less able. But I have worked with so-called remedial extraction groups and years ago in my last school, and I can say it's a very depressing, very despiriting experience because what you have 's an attitude in children that they are failures. They may try very hard but you are up against this all the time that they are capitalized as failures, you are with them because they are failures in a small group. And I just found it the most difficult teaching that I ever had experienced, most difficult because of this attitude. Well, in the mixed ability you have weak case with more able case they always feel they have a chance to prove, they've got somebody to model themselves on and I think that makes them entirely different.
MR. B: Science Teacher.

B: Well to me it means nothing till the writing's improved like the writing is still... boys and writing is the only way that you as a classroom teacher have of checking afterwards what they have done. Like reading but it doesn't work like setting them aside. The reading is a problem because if they are to read in a subject because they are encouraged to let them interact basically if they can't read they don't read and nobody forces them to read because they just copy it off their friends or more often than not what they will do is they will find from their friend or from their teachers what the relevant answer is from the past papers and they will just copy that out without any realisation of the actual whether the language is right or the tense is right, they copy it. And there is no time certainly in science that I ever check that they have been reading. We don't do comprehensions in that way. We don't do things like in Arts we could do like give them 15 minutes to read something and then take it away. They wouldn't you know that would just freak them out doing that. So most of the assessment, certainly in science is done through writing or through doing few practical work.

R: And do they have to write the practical work out after performance?

B: Yeah, although there is a tendency away from that, there is a tendency to do and get results assessed by us on what they do rather than what they write. But there again you follow written instructions. But then again if you're in a classroom situation you can just watch what's going on elsewhere and usually you can prompt them by showing them, you do it properly the first time and that is just so you don't happen to... the boys who can't read... try to get away from them the reading and writing so that you get better assessment, which the boys have a written exam is a written GCSE exam every six weeks, which is a written exam which they have to write.

But they do have to read through the questions, they can get the questions read to them though and quite often a lot of them do ask, so the teachers in the hall can read the questions, that's all they can do. And they've got to write the response, so I don't think they can achieve the respite from being able to write and that's what half of their marks altogether, so even if they can't write, they can read. They can still get marks if they can write, they can write down what they are thinking in their head, lot of pressure, lot of small pressure for them to improve their writing.

R: Do you give a lot of homework?

B: Yeah

R: Do you think that's one of the pressures that has created in them to produce written work...

B: Yeah, like homework, almost 100% has to be in the written form or something like drawing, something like that. But even a drawing in science has got to be labelled, so you know what it is because with the best will in the world without that we can't accept and the boys facilities to use their own tapes... and the pressures are under us few times to issue tape recorders is not allowed. And the reality is that all
that effort, the pressure on us specially in the office skills is to increase their standards and the governors are not interested in boys who say, start with not being able to read and write at all and get up to a grade G, which I think is an achievement but the governors don't hold that as an achievement, they're only interested in As to Cs. So like in terms of like effort and time the pressure on us all is to get a lot of As to Cs and what's at the bottom does not matter so much.

R: So you are really advised to concentrate on the achievers rather than the underachievers.

B: That's what it seems. They are interested in underachievers if they are borderlines and when they get D and E if we can push them up. Like the biggest barrier for achievement's not reading and writing, its laziness.

R: (laugh)

B: That is... scientific treatment. That's laziness, you can't avoid that. Because at home there is very little understanding in home situation, what's going on. The other thing of course is at home that most of the families don't use English at home, so the only time the boys use English is here in the classroom, often in front of the teacher and no other time. There's no reason for them to use it.

R: But this laziness that you mentioned that they don't work through their laziness, do you think there is anything else involved within that laziness, or is it just sheer laziness.

B: They can get away with it, its because... but I believe that every child... I was. The reason I worked at school was because my parents checked because my parents knew what was the routine because the education system that I went through was the same as they had gone through.

R: Aha, so you're saying its the mismatch between the parents

B: Yeah

R: And the children

B: . anyway if only in terms of discipline and things like that, get the kids start working, doing homework, it only works if the parents support that. And actually getting the parents up here is very difficult.

R: Why do you think?

B: Language barrier. More often than not its got to be the father. You know in the society these boys are brought up in if the mother comes that has no effect whatsoever. It has to be the father or an older brother, or a male member. They often are working and don't want to come for one reason or other. And unless you get cooperation from parents, like you its just as well to give up. On the other hand there is very little pressure from the parents on us. Like basically like some parents unless you actually push they see us you'd never see them from the beginning of first year to the end of fifth year.
R: Does that mean that the parents are not interested in the education of their children, or does it mean that they feel that they are not able to face this cultural, sort of

B: Probably the second. I don't know, I think it is probably the second. It is very difficult like for me to get a parent up and I have to work through a translator and that's not an effective form of communication at all.

The other thing is that I don't know what's going on. I don't know what the interaction between the boy and the parent is like, you know I can't explain everything through the translator that this boy has done this that and everything and hasn't done this, the boy is chipping in and I haven't a clue what's going on. He could say, No he is lying or it's not like that, and there's no way I've got of knowing unless as I say the translator tells me what the boy is saying as well. I would tell him but I'd feel awkward. Plus the fact is that I get more free time than most teachers, I get my six lessons a week. One interview would take an hour.

R: Oh yes

B: A whole lesson. It's not just a five minutes chat. It's very difficult. The other thing is like, on parents evening when parents do come they haven't any idea what British education system is like.

R: Uhhuh

B: They only want to know if their boys are good or bad, whether they get an A, B, C, D or E, that's all they want to know. That's all it is. And once you've told them that, they... they want to go. There are exceptions but as a general rule that's what's found. So there is a big problem of communication with parents. A lot of letters, like a letter sits at home. Like the other... Sylheti is a spoken language it is not a written language. So we write only standard Bangla, which our parents can't read. Boys like... ripped him off will take them home and specially if it's bad news, will take them home. If they go through the post, if its written in English, even if its written in Bangla, it's often the boy who has to do the translation. And there are other boys, quite a number of them who have ripped in the past and they say you know we are telling parents nice things how some parents likes things... please come up to school. And they'll come back to school and they'll have filled a slip in. It's not an important issue but what amazes me especially the tutor, when you collect the notes, if you actually look at the notes of one boy, the amount of different signatures you get just to sign absence is amazing, it really is.

O. K., you say that if you are a good teacher why don't you follow that up? But it is incredible to follow that up. The amount of time it would take to find out. You know boys always have a reason, oh that's my auntie. Now you don't want a Ph. D. thesis, that how come you are aunt because the auntie lives with them and will be there. Or that's my uncle, or that's the man who's... who does these things for us, so its not just a case of like mother or father who does them, its a sort of extended family that's involved often nothing to do with family, so you never know really. And again the notes are often written by the boys and then signed because the boys write in English and the parents don't. So you haven't like I don't the most of them I saw were just
blandt forgeries. But to prove that is another thing. And you just
don't have the time as a classroom teacher. If you are a tutor as well
its very difficult. We did about start to follow a case like that up,
which is the problem..

R: Absolutely. Everywhere there is the shortage of time for everybody
and shortage of staff as well.

B: Unlike.. unless I speak .. myself theres no way I can stick up.. solve
something like that in a couple of minutes which is if I was in a school
in a where indigenous population with far more spoken English there as
a first there is a mother tongue along with me then its a couple of
minutes to solve something out. Because there is no breakdown of
communication at all.

The other thing is, changing. Let me take science that we teach
has changed, the courses change dramatically, so the parents get used
to one thing then its O levels then it is GCSEs now we're doing another
type of GCSEs, now they are getting to talk about bringing back an old
O level type of thing for fast achievers. Because for that reason it is
difficult for teachers to keep up let alone the parents.

R: Theres not enough information for them

B: Theres not, no, like parents evening tomorrow every parent will get a
letter from me, trying to explain it all, but I didnt a..one in English and
one in Bengali but like that wont get through to a majority of parents.

R: Because its in standard Bengali or

B:Yes,

R: Or because the concept is too difficult?B: Well, A, the concept is
difficult itself when it comes to new like you know the parents are not
familiar with course work well except for some practical skills are like a
lot of parents because they have been educated in Bangladesh are used
to very formal structured like grammar school type system. So they
understand it when the kids sit in the exam. and like they answer
questions to get marks, but the rest which is the majority of their
marks, they are not quite sure where they come from. So you know
they are going to keep on changing it but not using it..

R: Oh. Thank you so much Mr.B.

B: What I was saying yeah like one interesting factor I can certainly
say from my experiences that staff staying over is important because
the longer I spend here and I've been here five years now the easier it
is in class because the boys know what to expect from me. Most of
them have been taught by me as a boy and know what my standards
are so they dont know not to bother waste my time, it is amazing.
Uhh however because I'm like the head of my department I know the
classes, well, be perfectly, well perfectly good class with a normal
teacher like, I can say 5W is a case in point.

They've got Mr. K. just now, now when Mr. K. is there I never
have a problem with that class I never have to go to that class. As
soon as he is not there, whether its an illness or he is on a course, and
a supply teacher handles them, then it is a crazy time. And you
wouldn't believe it. Stupidity, like gross stupidity like anything to avoid doing work, um, like if you've got a school with a high turnover or a department with a high turnover in staff, and a lot of supply teachers in, then there is less work done because there the boys know that now work will never ever get back to the teacher, very rarely get back to the teacher, and like we've seen this because I have these exams every six weeks I can see how the performance goes and teachers. And if they have a new teacher who they know they can get away with things where I wouldn't try to, their marks go down. If they're with a teacher they are used to, their marks go up. It is quite significant and I talk like massively, not just like a slight drop in marks or a slight increase. There is a massive increase in marks.

R: This is one of the factors that has been mentioned by the HMSO report of 1986, as well as some other Tower Hamlets reports that have been prepared by people here. This high rate of teacher turnover which affected the performance of the students.

B: And although all classes for example find a way, meeting or something like that, and I've even worked. Even though I write a note to the boys in the front so they know it is from me then I say I'm going to collect it in, there's very little difference. I know that I might as well I can just say anything because it won't be done, it won't be done perfectly. Maybe it's because they don't like reading when they are on their own without much help from their teacher A: Hmm

B: Do you find that

A: Yeah, I remember first term when I used to be at Daneford, they reported to me any time at D---- my class did no work..

B: Yeah and they know you're going to come back and check and get annoyed with them, but if you're there they work. If you're not, and I at the moment think why you know its personal, you've personally decided not to take them daily. You find yourself you're trying to say, I'm sorry I've got to go to this meeting, I've got to go to these meetings. It is always when you've got us. Which is not true, it's just their perception, they feel sort of let down in a way. And their perception of supply teachers are very low.

R: Why is that? Just because they are temporary? Or

B: Yeah, they know that for example supply teacher will very rarely have the time or knowhow to follow things up. But if they know that probably they'll never get that supply teacher again for a long long time. And that the supply teacher would probably not have the time to follow up or the inclination to follow up. Specially in subjects like maths, science, languages, where unless you've got supply teachers who know what they are doing, then the teachers themselves unless they are careful will not be able to deliver in appropriate way what is going on even if they try to say what is easy or self-contained. The boys know that like the first time they get no from Sir I don't understand that, lets try work it out, they just give up. And in this school, a lot of.. specially W. I know for science W got a terrible deal last year with a teacher who was off for about six months of the year and they had a whole string of supply teachers. Then they had another teacher who had a problem with science, so there's a waste of time, we had to replace that teacher, and its showing in their science, like today they
were put in their groups for exam and W are like behind in terms of what they have actually got to do and we have to rush through the next lot with them.

R: I see.

B: I think that's had a lot to do with it.

MR. R: Geography Teacher

(In this part of the dialogue the Researcher is represented by letter 'D')

R: Right. In the geography 5W have been encouraged where possible in their geography course work to collect their own data on their course work. Once they've collected their own data then they have to decide how to use it. This involves a lot of discussion. A lot of that discussion took place in Bangla or Sylheti, but the final output had to be written in English. Because the groups were fairly mixed ability we found that some groups did a lot better than others. But we did find that between the first coursework being finished and the third one, standard had considerably improved. Particularly on the final section which required their own analysis. We found on the first coursework most of the course works were marked at level one, which was the lowest level. Their answers were fairly simple and basic, the analysis wasn't really done in depth. On the latest coursework done in the autumn term the analysis was at a much greater depth and the use of language was much more varied. And that was a big improvement.

What I'm still concerned about is their use of language in the exams. On the shorter answers they seem to be quite adequate, they can use data, they can write short answers. But a lot of the boys still have problems when it comes to the more extended essay type questions.

D: The organisational, or the lexis that they lack or both?

R: It's both. But look what we've got to do now is, we've seen a big improvement on coursework. If they can improve on coursework I also think they can improve on exam work. And we've got to focus on that.

D: Just one question. Do you find that they are lacking in comprehension or is it just the production that they lack, ability to produce.

R: Ability to produce.

D: They are taking in what you are teaching? Or rather what they are supposed to know, they have the idea?

R: Conceptual wise they are very good.

D: O. K.

R: Concepts they grasp very well. But it's the vocabulary which many of them do lack.

D: And what you give to them it's always in English of course, aided by certain graphs or worksheets.
R: Yeah. A lot of data response. But we find on the exam every year there is always a question with a word which we always take for granted that they know.

D: Uuhh.

R: Which is a common word in English usage, but they haven't come across. For example in the mock exam there was a question about a hyper market which hardly any of them had heard of a hyper market even though they had actually done it. Which you'd expect that to be a common word, a fairly common word in English usage, but many of them just haven't heard it.

D: Does that affect their performance in the exam?

R: Yes

D: Uuhh.

R: Because if they had read the question, they had continued to read the question they could have worked out what the hyper market was.

D: Ahah, but they stumbled over that word and they stopped.

R: They stumbled over that word and they appeared to lose confidence and then even then didn't come up to answer the questions. But it's giving them confidence to get the meaning of the word from the context its used in, that's what we need to concentrate on.

D: Anything else that you'd like to say about the group or the way they have developed through the year?

R: The group as a whole have developed very well. They've produced some very good work. The course work, particularly the third one they did at Spitalfields, some of the data they collected, you know are really excellent.

D: Can you comment on the improvement and like how many students performed at the first and compared to that how they performed at the third.

R: Compared to the number of students there ... double the number of students were marked at the higher level this time. I think we are talking of an increase from about four to at least about nine and ten now.

D: About eighteen of them take geography? Out of?

R: There's thirty two in this class.

D: Uhum! Thirty two!

R: Oh, from W. 2, 4, 6, 8, that's 14 from W. In this class.

D: And out of that, you were saying,
R: In this class, thats 1,2,3,4,5,6, got marked at the higher level.

D: Six out of fourteen?

R: Hum. One unfortunately S---, probably one of the brightest ones has left school. Which is a pity.

D: Yes. Anything else about the discussions that they do in class? That, do you think thats helpful or does it hold them back because most of the discussions are done in Bengali?

R: It can but I think theres a limit. Theres only so much discussion that should take place in Bengali. I think once they've got out the concepts some.. of the concepts or the discussions have been done in Bengali then I think the same thing should be done totally in English.

D: Is there any way you can do that, I mean persuade them to switch over to English, any teaching..

R: If I had more support in the class then they could be put in groups, and the discussions, discussion actually needs to be chaired, if you like. With somebody who is going to keep them to English and keep them to the same points. But I think its also needed because when it comes down to the exam they have to express themselves in English.

D: Do you have enough support in the classroom for having that kind of discussion at all?

R: No

D: At all?

R: No

D: Never?

D: How much..

R: I didnt get support this year with this class

D: At all?

R: At all.

D: Oh I see. You got it last year, I noticed in one of the classes

R: Yeah.

D: How much of the classes were supported last year? Thats in the fourth year?

R: In the fourth year, just one lesson per week supported

D: That is, ..50%, 25%?

R: 33%.

D: 33%. Anything else youd like to say?
Mr. A: Form Tutor.

R: This is Mr. A, the tutor in charge of the particular tutor set that has been considered for the research from School A. Mr. A, what are the problems that this particular group of students have had during their school years particularly at the secondary that you can think of which may have affected their performance in English, Science and Geography?

A: I can think of one or two problems. The first one is happened in the second year. Um we had a group of boys who sort of organised bunking off sessions. Apparently they used to come to school, register and then go off. And they would go off to shops. This happened for quite a long period of time without me being aware. I only happened to find out accidentally when I noticed the same set of boys being absent at the same time for a period of time then me talking to them. Then one of them sort of owned up that this is what they had been doing, going out to the shops, buying things, window shopping, that sort of things. I think that in a way that has contributed to the poor performance of the group.

Then we have those who went to Bangladesh for a long periods of time. I have R--- who was away for two good years. He's just come back from Bangladesh in the fifth year. He left in the third year and he's just come back. I cant see how he's going to be able to cover in anything. I have another boy, A--- who is very able, but he was away for a year and lost quite a lot. I have another, M, who was also away for a year. And there are some others like J, he was away for two terms. Some others who were away for a term, two or three weeks, six weeks, that sort of thing. I dont think this helps at all.

Then thirdly, we had the group's science teacher when they were in the fourth year, was absent for about six months. For no fault of theirs they were always landed with a supply teacher. And normally when boys have supply teachers they dont seem to take the lesson seriously. So they actually gave nothing for that period of six months. These boys are also sort of take the same sort of exams the other groups are taking and not having a teacher I cant see how they can manage to perform to the same level as the other groups.

This term we had an unfortunate situation. Because they lost so much they had to cram, the teacher now taking them had to sort of rush them cramming what should have been done in about four weeks into just a week or even two days. I was given notes, some handouts to be given to them a day prior to the examination. And I cant see how just a day giving something to learn and then having an exam the very next day. I am waiting to see the results whether they are good or bad but I dont think they are going to be good. So in the the main these are three areas where I think my boys have either by their own mistakes or things happening, they are not going to perform well in the exams.
R: What are the circumstances you visualise would have helped these students to perform better than they are going to perform in their GCSE?

A: I think if they had been able to organise the early morning sessions I told you of last time

R: Can you tell us a little more of the early morning sessions?

A: Oh this is an agreement between me and the boys that they could come in any time from 8 A.M. and get something done before the school day begins.

It only took off last term actually or the middle of last term when a few of them realised they had a whole lot to do before the exams. It started with one of them, M, one of those who went to Bangladesh realising he'd missed so much, he'd have to do extra work to catch up. When he started to come in he was able to convince two others, N and A to come with him. And this is how it all started.

R: Has this class affected their performance?

A: Yes, it has affected their performance greatly? It got to the stage, I think I told you about this, a few weeks back that at times when they are going to have a test, they have some sessions when one of them becomes an expert and the others fire questions at him and I think they learn a great deal from that. And you could see from the way they talk now that they are getting a lot more confident believing in themselves that at least they are going to get a better grades than they thought earlier. I am not saying they are going to get wonderful grades, but it is going to be an improvement on what they thought they were going to get earlier. If they had started this earlier, maybe a year or two ago, I kept telling them, asking them to do that, but they never listened.

R: Do you think it is the early morning session itself in your charge that helps or is it the peer teaching that you are talking about?

A: I think it is the peer teaching

R: Peer teaching

A: I think so

R: Ah, very important.

A: I am just some sort of, shall I say a catalyst? Someone urging them on to do it. But as I said I've tried it before, I've tried to get them to start doing this. They never listened to me. But the moment one of the group decided I am going to start doing it

R: So it had to come from within them, rather than from you.

A: Within them yeah.
R: Do you think the peer teaching gives them more confidence than being taught by a teacher? Or at least the revision or whatever it is opportunity that exists there,

A: I think it is the revision if that should be seen as a supplement to what a teacher does. If the teacher's withdrawn from the equation I dont think it will work at all. But the teacher can pass something to them and whoever picks it first, I mean becomes an expert to the others and they learn from him. Thats the way I see it.

R: Why, do you have any idea why they should learn it better from the peer rather than the teacher revising it a second time?

A: Many a time when they are doing this revision they use both English and Bengali. Now the teacher doesn't most of the teachers in this school dont understand Bengali. Something I want to get across to them, I might not be able to express, I mean to their level, I mean very well to their level. But when you have one of them, one of their number who seems to understand it and is able to explain it in Bengali, I think it gets through a little better.

Many a time I ask them to, when I am on the scene I ask them to speak English so I could also sort of partake to see whether they expert is really an expert. Now where he is going wrong I could come in and correct. But they find it difficult actually using English all the time, so they speak English and suddenly they switch to Bengali back and forth. Thats what happens.

Even then we are seeing the beginning of something good for the school. As I told you we have I think the boys in the second year, our present years are above the average, our average, I'm not talking of National average or Tower Hamlets average, I'm talking of School A, about our average, we have got three different tutorial groups. There are a core of three or four who are able to tackle level two of GCSE mathematics at the moment. They come to me as part of the tutorial group early in the morning or after school. And they seem to be doing very well.

R: So you think this second year group is going to be able to do better than your school has so far been doing?
A: That is my belief.

R: Why do you think..

A: If they continue.. or after school (tape ends)

T continued to say that First and Second Years at Secondary are more motivated and performing better: he presumes that it is through better language ability.

Supply teacher in School A said:

Relations between races were better now than (Bangladeshis 97%) before when there was a much higher proportion of NSs. There had been running fights and far more tension between Ls.
R.E. teacher in School A said:

There had been a case of theft and arson in the RE deptt of the school. The wardrobe containing the videos of various religion-based films and Qurans were set on fire while the TV was stolen. RE teacher also spoke of differential treatment of local NNS Ls by policement, harassment after school by NS boys.

Benefits of GCSE Coursework:

1- Emphasis on written expression beneficial for development of skill. Writing also gives accountability to teaching in the classroom, the evidence of learning.

2- Modular system of work that allows continual assessment is better impetus for improvement. If Ls have done badly on the tests of one module, it allows them to do better in the next. Continual work can bracket one as a non-achiever, whereas test scores allows them to monitor their own work and provides motivation for improvement. Higher scores require extended use of language for answering questions at length, and this can provide impetus for language learning.

3- Voluntary groups where learners teach in turn, and use speaking and writing for this purpose, both in L1 and in L2, for revision for tests, can lead to language improvement.

4- Helping each other with project work and preparation for tests through discussions helps foster the language as well as the spirit of the group through participation in interaction as equals.

5- GCSE exerts pressure to write but less pressure to read.
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School B: Response from teachers and students:

In March, 1990, a girl was beaten up after school on the school premises by three NS girls. Other incidents have also made tension run high between groups. Police are vigilant and the teachers are on the alert.

School C: Response from teachers

Letter from Teacher

Dear Dil,

Sorry for the long delay in writing but so much is going on at present. As far as the group is concerned that I am at present teaching, they have not as yet started on the 3 pieces of coursework necessary for the exam. We are starting unit (1) after half term on 'Can development be measured?'. We have already covered this topic in lessons both in the 3rd and 4th year so most students have a good understanding of the topic. Difficulties do arise when new pupils are suddenly put into the group & have missed the topic. However, other pupils in the group help the new ones - especially where language difficulties occur. I feel the groups at the different tables work well together & do help each other. We are getting to the stage where even girls at the back are discussing the exercise with the boys near them so barriers are being broken down. I try as often as possible to lead those less able - the more able ones of this group are very capable of working by themselves. I try to do a whole topic before starting on the piece of coursework so that they have become accustomed to the language they need. I also make them learn a glossary of perhaps 500 geographical terms or words that are constantly used in exam questions. These are constantly being revised at intervals. However, overall it is their lack of understanding of geographical terms that lets them down in the written exam often. I feel that if they could be allowed to use a dictionary in the exam, their results would be higher - even though we do get As and Bs in the exams each year. Hope this helps you,

Sincerely,

K.

School C: Interview With Teacher:

Mr. F: ESL & Bengali

- There is a lack of communication between parents and school, mainly through the lack of knowledge of the second language through which they can come to know about the education and the system.
- Improvement in education can be through direct one-to-one communication. Lack of communication affects students' academic performance, particularly through disciplinary problems. LS often do not like to help establish communication between home and school as this would allow their parents to know about their non-performance at school and misdemeanors. The students become erratic in attendance and badly behaved, undisciplined. Often students are the only interpreters of any communication from school. To defend themselves
from repercussions at home they misinterpret and misrepresent the written or verbal message.

Parents do not come to meetings with teachers because of genuine illnesses or through the necessity of working odd hours which they have to take up since not many jobs are available to them. They also avoid meetings because they lack the language to communicate.

- Co-education has positive effect on performance because it makes the learners want to appear to be doing well and in a positive light to others.
- Mixed ability gives weaker Ls a better deal, since they have a much less sense of failure.

Mixed cultural groups in the school setting creates much better sense of acceptance of the multi-cultural appearance of present society within the pupils. Weak beginners handled by ESL teachers and supported by them for core subjects in mainstream. Simplification, worksheets at different levels. Withdrawal in certain cases for varying length of time. Those not progressing are referred for Special Needs Education. Hearing Impaired are given special support. Lack of ambition among senior Ls. The first years are brighter and more motivated.

Pupils' response: Coursework, particularly the projects on geography has helped them develop their ability to analyse data and for extended scientific writing.
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Results of Video Recording:

School A: Science: Class 1: (no sound for half the time):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within tables</td>
<td>Help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between tables</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With With With With

BDs Oth/Langs BDs Oth/Langs Main T/Sup T Main T/Sup T

02 sec

(8 times during input by low proficiency learners)

1 min (getting equipment)

5 min ""

The teaching consists of teacher-input for most of the time. There is no support teacher. The learners sit around four tables and mainly listen, and write. No movement is allowed during the input. The teacher goes round to check what a group of students are writing. Teacher demonstrates how a battery works. The telephone rings, he leaves for a while.

All the learners are involved in doing something, whether it is copying from the board, or getting the equipment and setting it up. The less proficient appear to follow the others as they work. There is some talk between groups when they move around. The teacher goes around to supervise all groups as they set up the equipment. While they set up the equipment, the learners interact within their group and there is quite a lot of noise. Teacher writes the process on the board which some learners copy quietly. Other set up the equipment. Some learners come to try out the video. No member of other languages groups were present.
School A: Geography: Class 2: No sound:
One Support teacher present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within tables</td>
<td>Between tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With</td>
<td>With</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDs</td>
<td>Oth/Langs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main T/Sup T</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main T/Sup T</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(movement allowed after input)

5 secs
(5 times during input by low proficiency learners) 2 min 5 sec / 3 min
3 min / 30 sec / 10 sec 30 sec / 15 min 30 sec 3 min / 10 sec 2 min

There is a long session of teacher input when the learners listen and read. The less proficient boys appear to find it difficult to concentrate: they look around the classroom and wave at the camera during the input. A support teacher is present. This is the only geography classroom observed across settings that had a support teacher.

After the input the students interact within group and continue work they had started on before. There seems to be little pressure on them to work as some groups do while other do not. Some students move around and interact with other groups. Control on the learners’ interaction or movement is low, and some of them interact with members of other groups as they move around. The more proficient boys do not appear to be working.

The main teacher supervises groups briefly. He writes results on the board. The support teacher goes round the groups giving help for a long time to each group in turn. He misses one group near the camera. This group does not seem to be doing any work but does not ask for help. The members keep looking into the camera.
School A: Geography: Class 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within tables</td>
<td>Help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between tables</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With</td>
<td>With</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With</td>
<td>With</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDs</td>
<td>Oth/Langs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oth/Langs</td>
<td>Main T/Sup T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main T/Sup T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>30 sec</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a long teacher input during which the learners listen and copy from the board. This is followed by work on some task sheets. The learners interact with the members of their own table to do the work, but not with others. The teacher goes round the classroom briefly supervising the work. He then sits in the front of the class and answers questions that individuals ask. He gives general instructions but does not support individuals or groups in their performance. The teacher assigns the homework after he collects the classwork sheets. Some learners come out to try out the video.
School C: English: Class 1: There were two support teachers. (Written work)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within tables</strong></td>
<td><strong>Help</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between tables</strong></td>
<td><strong>Supervision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With BDs</td>
<td>1 min /full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Oth/Langs</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With BDs</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Oth/Langs</td>
<td>7 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>30 sec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This class took place in the usual classroom. The learners sat in their language groups, the Bangladeshi learners nearest to the teacher. There were two support teachers present. There was a session of combined input and feedback, with particular guidance for the task of the day. There was interaction from after the input, within each group.

The work was mainly reading and writing. The learners worked as they talked among themselves. All interaction was within one's own group. The lower proficiency Bangladeshi learners sat at the back and did not appear to work.

The support teacher worked with some of the groups, but not the less proficient Bangladeshi learners. The main teacher went round the classroom supervising, and gave support to three of the groups, including the less proficient Bangladeshis.
### Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Within tables</th>
<th>Between tables</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With BDs</td>
<td>With Oth/Langs</td>
<td>Help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With BDs</td>
<td>With Oth/Langs</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>5 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>7 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This class took place in the usual classroom where the Ls sat in their ethnic groups around clusters of low tables. The Bangladeshi group sat closest to the teacher's table. There were two support teachers present, working with different groups. Movement was quite freely allowed.

No interaction between the Bangladeshi group and the NS group was visible. The recording had to stop as some learners started fighting among themselves, and the teachers did not like the disruption to be filmed.

Filming had to stop after this as the teachers seemed to think that classroom disturbances were caused by the presence of the video.
School C: Science: One support teacher.
(Circuits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within tables</td>
<td>Help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between tables</td>
<td>With</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDs</td>
<td>Oth/Langs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>20 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class One: Science: This was Teacher-fronted input in a classroom where the learners sat facing the teacher. The classroom was small, and there was less scope for interaction between them. The right to initiate conversation was controlled by the teacher and had to be sanctioned by him. The learners listened, and occasionally wrote or answered the teacher's questions. They interacted when they were being asked questions and when the teacher demonstrated. There was some movement as learners were called to the board. The low-proficiency learners sat at the back and interacted between themselves, not participating in the learning.

There was little interaction. A support teacher sat with the learners and explained occasionally.
School C: Science: Class 3: Two support teachers periodically: (Put the process in order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within tables</td>
<td>Help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between tables</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With With</td>
<td>Main T/Sup T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDs/Other/Langs BDs/Other/Langs</td>
<td>Main T/Sup T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 min</th>
<th>2 min</th>
<th>1 min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 sec</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 sec</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>10 sec</td>
<td>10 sec</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 sec</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>30 sec</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another teacher comes in to control the class /

20 sec
1 min

This class took place in a laboratory where the main teacher was supported by one teacher for the whole time and one other for part of the time.

The input session was followed by individual written work the written portion of the task writing the method before going to do the experiment. The support teachers went round the class giving help, and the main teacher went round to supervise once the learners had commenced on the experiment. She frequently disciplined the learners and sent out one for misdemeanour. A teacher came in to discipline the class, after which the class became much quieter.

Movement was quite free except when the learners sat down to write the method. The learners stood in the aisles between the tables. In this proximity members of ethnic groups appeared to interact occasionally across groups. All learners were engaged in some kind of activity, listening, writing, or doing the experiment with another during this class.
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Table showing the Average Academic Scores in the two settings:

Key:
I= test towards the beginning of observation period
II= test towards the end of the observation period. s.d=Standard deviations. difference=difference between the s.d. of first and second test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A: Name</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Geography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School C: Name</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Geography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School D: Name</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Geography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>