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ABSTRACT

The objective of teaching English as a second language in the secondary schools in Sri Lanka is for oral communication. Between 1985 to 1999, the English Every Day (EED) learning materials were used in all Sri Lankan schools. These materials were informed by Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which advocates oral interaction. The available literature suggests that the teaching of English in Sri Lanka is not satisfactory and does not meet the needs of the majority of Sri Lankan students. Attempts have been made to find ways of improving the teaching of English by changing the curriculum regularly, yet very few classroom based studies have been conducted. The reasons for very little success in the teaching of English could be in part due to trying to find the best method to teach English rather than identifying the problems faced in learning English in the classroom.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the role of classroom interaction in second language acquisition in Sri Lanka. The study was guided by two main research questions. The first asked how the relationship between the teacher, the students and the learning materials provided opportunities for second language learning in selected second language classrooms; and the second how the teacher-pupil oral interactions in the classrooms promoted possibilities for second language development.

These questions were examined in relation to four schools selected from diverse socio-cultural backgrounds, using a predominantly ethnographic approach based on observational case studies. However, as the learning materials used in the classrooms were based on CLT, a more focussed approach drawing on CLT and Second Language Acquisition theories specific to oral interaction was used to complement the qualitative data collected for each case.

The selection of the four schools from diverse backgrounds permitted comparisons across the cases. In each school the main data gathering techniques were audio recordings of oral interactions and field notes. Open ended interviews with teachers, the collection of documentation such as student learning materials, lesson notes and teacher record books were used as supplementary data.

The socio-cultural and political influences on the historical development of English as a second language in Sri Lanka were investigated in order to understand the context in which English is taught. The learning materials used in the classrooms were analysed in relation to CLT principles to identify the teaching methodology used in the
classrooms and the potential areas of difficulties for teachers in promoting second language development in the classroom. The transcripts of recorded teacher-pupil interactions, interview data and field notes were analysed to examine how the classroom practices exemplify the principles on which the learning materials are based and the opportunities provided in each classroom for second language learning.

The findings of the study indicate that the interactions observed in the classrooms were the outcomes of a complex relationship between a heterogeneous group of students, their teachers who differed in terms of their experiences and preparation for teaching English, and the EED learning materials. The purpose for which the students learned English differed across schools, as well as between students, and was related to the culture of the school and the students socio-economic background. In addition, there was a mismatch between the recommended process-oriented teaching approach in the learning materials and the Sri Lankan product-based examination system. As a result of these complex factors, which are also related to the socio-cultural and political context in Sri Lanka, the opportunities provided for second language development were different in each of the observed classrooms in this study.

The findings in this study challenge the assumption in Sri Lanka that equal opportunities to learn English can be provided simply by using the same learning materials, based on the same teaching approach with all the students. These findings suggest the need for more classroom based ethnographic research to understand the complex factors affecting the teaching of English and to inform teacher education programs. It also underscores the differences between ESL classrooms across cultures and within cultures and the danger of advocating classroom practices as effective in all contexts.
Chapter One

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

1.1 Aim of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the role of classroom interaction in second language acquisition in Sri Lanka, with a view to gaining insights which will help promote the learning of English as a second language in Sri Lankan secondary classrooms. This introductory chapter will provide the context for the study through a description of the historical development of English as a second language in Sri Lanka, the background to the development of the English Every Day materials that were used in the classrooms at the time of the study and the rationale for focusing on classroom interaction. This will be followed by the research questions and an overview of the chapters to follow.

1.2 Background to the study

1.2.1 Historical Development of English as a second language prior to Independence.

Sri Lanka's introduction to the English language can be traced back nearly two centuries to 1796 when the British invaded the maritime provinces of the country then known as Ceylon. In 1815, the entire country became a British colony and English soon became the dominant language used for administrative purposes in the courts and in all areas of business and trade. The higher and more responsible posts were filled by recruits from Britain. However, a few Ceylonese were needed to occupy some middle level posts in the administrative system. Thus a need arose to establish English medium schools. The missionaries had already established schools where the instruction was provided in the mother tongue. However, they too saw the advantage of establishing a few English schools, perhaps for propagating Christianity and to educate the children of the higher social class. Thus, the missions, assisted by the government, established English secondary schools in the large towns. Two types of
schools developed, "English schools", where the medium of instruction was English and the "vernacular schools" in which the medium of instruction was the indigenous languages – Sinhala and Tamil. The "English schools", in spite of being subsidised by the state, were fee levying and as a result were available only to the affluent classes. On the other hand, "vernacular schools" were meant for the children of the masses and the education provided was free, but the quality of that education provided was very low (Jayasuriya, 1967).

To teach English, the English schools adopted the materials and methods that were in use in England at that time. All teachers, both those who taught English as a subject, as well as others, were competent in English and the number of teachers required was few. In 1880, the British examination system was introduced to Sri Lanka. In addition, a couple of scholarships were awarded annually for study at British universities. According to Cumaranatunga (1989, p.1) "this phase of English education in Sri Lanka, though limited in scope, was an outstanding success". "Success" was defined at that time as it is today, in terms of examinations. Thus, English education was considered a success as the Ceylonese students who sat the British examinations excelled (Udagama, 1999).

On the other hand, during this period, the indigenous languages, Sinhalese and Tamil, occupied an insignificant place. All resources were devoted to the fostering of "English, more English and better English" while the national schools attended by the 96 percent of the school-going population were neglected (Jayasuriya, 1969, p.64). This situation was further exacerbated when the Colebrooke Commission in 1831 commented that the government Parish schools were "extremely defective and inefficient" and recommended that all schoolmasters should be required to possess a "competent knowledge of English to enable them to give instruction in that language" (The Colebrook-Cameron papers, cited in Jayasuriya, 1967, pp.72-73). As a result, the ninety seven government Parish schools that existed in 1831 were reduced to five in 1832. In 1891, the Buddhist Theosophical Society was formed to satisfy the needs of the majority religion group of the population. Buddhist schools were opened in both urban and rural areas and were followed by Hindu and Muslim schools.

When universal adult franchise was granted in 1931, several dualities existed in the education system in Sri Lanka. Chief among these was the existence of two types of schools divided according to the medium of instruction and according to whether fees were being charged. Further, urban areas were served by both the English schools and vernacular schools while the rural areas were served almost exclusively by the
vernacular schools. The English schools provided a curriculum that led to good employment opportunities as well as to opportunities for higher education, while the vernacular education restricted the chances of higher level employment as well as higher education.

Different types of schools also led to different kinds of examinations: local examinations in vernacular languages; local examinations in the English medium and British examinations. While the schools which provided education in the vernacular languages prepared students for examinations in the mother tongue, the English medium schools catered to local examinations in the English language medium. After the introduction of British examinations such as the London Matriculation and the Cambridge Senior, the English medium schools preferred students to sit for these foreign examinations. The kind of examination undertaken in turn brought about different levels of employability (Nystrom, 1985; Rupasingha, 1982). This compounded existing social inequalities. An English-speaking minority enjoyed quality education, privilege and wealth while the non-English-speaking majority had the status of second class citizens. While English was socially divisive, it was partly integrative in the sense that it provided a medium of communication between the elites of the two major ethnic groups. On the other hand, English was not available to the majority of the Sinhalese and the Tamils and this created a vacuum in regard to a common language.

The granting of universal adult franchise enabled the people to elect national leaders to the Legislature. These leaders were in favour of democratisation of education and, with the support of the masses, began to agitate for the removal of the dualities that existed in the system of education at that time (Jayasuriya, 1969). Many writers such as Nystrom (1985), Rupasingha (1990) and Udagama (1999) attribute the initiation of the democratisation process to the first indigenous Minister of Education, Dr C. W.W. Kannangara.

The first step in making English available to the masses was taken in 1940 with the introduction of the Central School concept. Dr Kannangara, who initiated this project, expected to have a system whereby there would be one school, in the centre of a group of schools, which had facilities equivalent to those in the English medium schools (Jayasuriya, 1967). The Central School would only have post-primary education and the other schools in the group would have only primary classes. The group of schools would act as feeder schools to that Central School as much as possible. In 1944, forty free board and lodging scholarships were also awarded to
talented needy children. The establishment of the Central Schools and scholarships enabled the provision of English education at least to the most deserving students in the rural areas (Sumathipala, 1968).

In 1943, a special commission headed by Dr Kannangara was appointed by the State Council to look into the defects of the existing system of education. This report (Report of the Special Committee on Education, 1943) listed four major defects in the system of education in Ceylon at that time. One was the existence of the two types of education corresponding to the language of instruction used, namely, the majority of pupils were being taught in the vernacular schools, while a few were taught in English. The report objected to this system because, due to this duality, English had become a badge of social superiority dividing the population into two classes – English educated and vernacular educated. In the beginning, the vernacular languages were not taught at all in English schools. Further, pupils were discouraged and even punished for speaking to each other in their native languages (de Souza, 1979). The British examinations thrust upon the country a curriculum that was designed for students in England but which was alien to Sri Lankan students. Further, the British examinations discouraged the study of local languages (Jayasuriya, 1969). As a result, the development of the mother tongue was retarded. The commission also commented on the absence of equality of opportunity as discussed above (Report of the Special Committee on Education, 1943).

In order to redress this situation, the executive committee for Education made the following recommendations:

1. the medium of instruction in the primary school shall be the mother tongue.
2. the medium of instruction in the lower department of the post primary school may be either the mother tongue or bilingual.
3. the medium of instruction in the higher department of the post primary school may be either English, Sinhalese or Tamil, or bilingual.

(Report of the Special Committee on Education, 1943, p.138)

However, due to practical problems such as a lack of teachers and textbooks, the opinion of the committee was that the changes should be phased in over a number of years. Progressively, this policy was to be adopted at the secondary and tertiary levels and its implementation was to be completed around 1959-1960. These proposals, however, did not completely eliminate the teaching of English from the primary curriculum. For the first time, English was introduced as a second language in all
primary schools where it was not the language of instruction. In primary schools where English was the language of instruction, Sinhalese or Tamil was to be the second language subject. Further, the second language was to be introduced in the fourth year or the third standard. It was stated that the committee had "no objection to it [second language] being taught in a conversational way in the third year" (Report of the Special Committee on Education, 1943, p.50).

Another recommendation of the Special Committee on Education was the introduction of free education from kindergarten through to university for all children irrespective of ethnicity, language, cast, class, sex or economic status (Report of the Special Committee on Education, 1943). The free education scheme was implemented in 1945 and all schools except for a few private ones were nationalised. The foreign examinations of London and Cambridge were abolished in 1944 and were replaced by the local Senior School Certificate Examination, which changed to the General Certificate Examination (GCE) in 1952.

It was hoped that 'free education' would pave the way for the majority of the Sri Lankan population to have equality of educational opportunities. However, such a change did not happen immediately. At Independence, the enrolment of the 5-19 year age group in schools was 40 percent. In 1946, while 57.8 percent of the total population was literate only 6.3 percent was literate in English (Udagama, 1999, p.6).

1.2.2 Teaching of English after Independence

After gaining independence in 1948, Sri Lanka focused its efforts in education on two main areas: the transformation of a colonial education system to that of a national one, and the development of a system that catered to all (Udagama, 1999). Since Independence, political power has been shared by two major political parties: the United National Party (UNP) and Sri Lanka Freedom Party (SLFP). While the UNP is aligned more towards liberal-conservatism, SLFPs political ideology is more radical. At each election, there has often been a change of the ruling party and with that a change of education policy. However, some policies were continuously followed regardless of the government. The change of language of instruction to the national languages, teaching of English as a second language and free education are some such policies. For instance, in 1950 the first UNP government after independence published a White Paper on education. The recommendations contained within it were based on the major proposals of the Report of the Special
Committee, 1943. These proposals were enacted into law as the Education Amendment Act of 1951 and English was officially made a second language (Jayasuriya, 1967). The political parties that came to power since then have upheld this decision.

With the decision to teach English in all schools from Grade Four, a heavy responsibility fell on the State to provide the necessary facilities. Although the government embarked on this new policy, it seems to have done so without the full realisation of the problems involved. No concrete proposals were made as how to teach English as a second language (De Lanerolle Commission Report, 1973, p.34).

In 1947, 15.8 percent of the student population were in the English medium schools and the rest were in the vernacular schools where English was often not taught at all. (Udagama, 1999). According to the Department of Census and Statistics, the number of people literate in English in 1946 was only 6.3 percent. However, with the new policy, English had to be made available in all the schools. Yet, the number of competent teachers available was not sufficient to cater to this demand, so English classes were started when teachers with the least qualifications were available. This created a new problem – the supply of teachers (De Lanerolle Commission Report, 1973). According to the report of the commission appointed to look into the teaching of English in schools, one of the chief causes identified for the deterioration of standards was that the English was not taught by specially trained teachers (S.F.de Silva Commission Report, 1960). A specialist training college was established to train teachers of English. However, this was not sufficient to cater to the demand as indicated by the evidence of various reports (De Lanerolle Commission Report, 1973; The First Report of the National Education Commission Report, 1992; The White Paper, 1981) which continued to mention that teacher training was inadequate.

Even though there were adequate number of teachers in the former English medium schools, they faced another problem. Due to nationalisation, those schools were now available to the masses. As a result, students who had not studied English earlier and those who were not exposed to English at home were in the same classes as those who knew English. Therefore, those schools had to face the problem of heterogeneity in the student population.

Along with the lack of teachers there were also the problems of methodology and syllabus. Since no proposals were made as to how to teach or what to teach, each school selected its own text. The syllabus model the teachers knew was what they
used when English was the language of instruction. In the former vernacular schools, the teaching of English became "nobody's concern" and the inspectors reported that "the majority of the schools had failed to understand the implication of teaching English as a second language" (De Lanerolle Commission Report, 1973, p.54).

The ambiguity of the role of the second language was also one reason for this situation. Walatara (1965) defined the status of English in Sri Lanka as higher than that of a second language "as understood in Europe" and lower than that of a first language. When English was a first language or the language of instruction, there was a need to learn English as it was necessary to be educated. However, after making it the second language and the national languages the language of instruction in the schools and in the universities for the majority of the people, English was no longer necessary to gain a basic education. Those who knew English continued to have more opportunities for better employment and education, yet there appeared to be an expectancy among the masses that the "place" given to English would be changed and a more important role would be assigned to the national languages in all spheres of life.

It is said that colonial rule generates a reaction against the colonial culture and those who represent it in the indigenous population (Wriggins, 1960). Although most people realised the instrumental value of English, there was still resistance to a language which was associated with colonial dominance and later the language of a Westernised social elite. The attitude of most people towards English could be seen in the way reference was made to English as "kaduwa" (sword), symbolically expressing the power it yields. As a result, a nationalistic movement began which made the government that came to power in 1956 adopt a "Sinhala only Policy". Sinhala, the language of the majority ethnic group was made the official language (Official Language Act No.3, 1956). According to this Act, every person engaged in a state job had to be proficient in Sinhala. This move further affected the learning of English and also resulted in disharmony between the two main ethnic groups, the Sinhalese and the Tamils. The Tamils staged "sathyagraha" which resulted in riots. In 1958, the Tamil Language Special Privileges Act No. 28 was passed redressing some of the discrimination against the Tamil community. According to this Act, Tamil students in schools and universities were entitled to be instructed through the medium of the Tamil language and a person educated through the medium of the Tamil language was entitled to be examined through such a medium at any examination for admission to Public Service.
When the expected result of English being available to all was not being achieved, various commissions were appointed by the successive governments to look into the defects of the education system and especially into the teaching of English, and as a result, various curriculum reforms were proposed. The next section of this chapter will examine some of the major proposals and curriculum changes pertaining to the teaching of English during the period after English was made a second language.

1.3 Curriculum reforms and the teaching of English as a Second Language.

The first measures to address the issue of how to teach English as a second language were undertaken in 1953. According to the De Lanerolle Commission Report (1973), a syllabus was prepared for the teaching of English to primary students. Unfortunately, no details regarding the syllabus was available except that it was based on "literature on the teaching of English to immigrants in Australia" (De Lanerolle Commission Report, 1973, p.55). This syllabus does not appear to have helped teachers very much as the school inspectors reported that in the majority of the schools, teaching English as a second language was not successful (De Lanerolle Commission Report, 1973). There was no prescribed methodology and different textbooks were used in different schools. Although there was a syllabus, the teachers did not know how to teach it. Thus they followed the same methodology used to teach English as a first language.

A committee was appointed in 1957 by the Minister of Education to inquire into the teaching of English in Sri Lanka. The committee was to consider and make recommendations on issues such as the aims of teaching English, the methods of teaching, the textbooks to be used and the training and supply of teachers (S.F.de Silva Commission Report, 1960). According to the recommendations of the committee, the aim of teaching English was "the acquisition of competence in it" (S.F. de Silva Commission Report, 1960, p.7). It was suggested that a group of experts be appointed to prepare syllabuses. The commission also noted that there was no satisfactory series of English textbooks available for the primary and post primary classes. It was recommended that a Language Research Institute should be established and that it should produce books that are "interesting and graded in vocabulary and structure to suit our country" (S.F.de Silva Commission Report, 1960, p.18).
The committee did not propose to discuss or specify the teaching method in detail. However, it suggested some guidelines based on the "Direct Method" which was claimed to have been successfully used to teach modern languages in other parts of the world. The "Direct Method" advocated 'learning by doing'. Following are the guidelines suggested by the Commission regarding the teaching method to be employed:

1. The approach should be primarily oral.
2. Active methods of teaching should be used as far as possible.
3. The greatest possible use of the foreign tongue should be made in the classroom.
4. The difficulties of the foreign tongue in the matter of pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar should be carefully graded for presentation.
5. The teaching of a language should be considered more as the imparting of a skill than as the provision of information about the forms of the language. (S.F. de Silva Commission Report, 1960, p.44)

The Commission was of the view that although one of the implications of the "Direct Method" was that the use of the mother tongue should be avoided in learning the new language, it was not always possible. The Commission Report emphasised Dr Palmer's view that:

> The consensus of opinion today is that it is convenient and economical to use the vernacular even to a considerable extent for the purpose of conveying or explaining the meaning of new words, but the vernacular should be avoided as far as possible when we are exercising the pupil in using the new word. (Palmer, 1951 cited in S.F.de Silva Commission Report, 1960, italics in the original.)

The Report also suggested that there was no need to teach formal grammar as children learn to speak their mother tongue without learning any rules of grammar.

In response to the recommendations of the Committee appointed to look into the teaching of English (S.F.de Silva Commission Report, 1960), a syllabus was prepared by the Ministry of Education in 1963. However, this syllabus also appears not to have been very satisfactory. According to the committee which looked into the teaching of English in Sri Lanka in the 1970s, "the 1963 scheme was unrealistic and difficult to implement and confusion continued" (De Lanerolle Commission Report, 1973, p.68). As stated in the Report, although the teaching method advocated was the "Direct
Method" which focused on 'learning by doing', the syllabus which was prepared emphasised mainly the language structures to be taught. There seemed to have been an incompatibility between the syllabus, the prescribed textbooks and the methodology advocated. This was largely because the syllabus was based mainly on Hornby (1961) *The Teaching of Structural Words and Sentence Patterns*, stages 1, 11, and III which, as its title suggests, was structural. The objectives of lessons in speech, reading and writing were also stated in terms of Hornby's Tables as illustrated below:

By the end of the second term pupils should be able to read and write simple sentences of three or four words based on the early tables in Hornby (De Lanerolle Commission Report, 1973, p.65).

The "Direct Method" advocated that teachers use gestures, mimes and actions and that they teach language through meaningful situations, making the students both physically and mentally active (S.F.de Silva Commission Report, 1960). However, the suggested methodology of teaching Hornby's Tables in the primary classes was presentation, pattern practice, reading and writing. The textbooks prescribed for the post primary were also unrealistic as they advocated reading skills such as silent reading and reading for information while the syllabus specified continuing with the stages in Hornby's Grammar Tables. The teachers who were teaching Grade 6 classes faced the additional difficulty of catering to the large number of students who were admitted to these classes from less privileged feeder schools where they had not learnt English. The solution suggested in the scheme to this problem of heterogeneity was that all students at Grade 6 should be taught "Hornby's Tables" once again, despite the expectation that they were to be taught in Grades 3 to 5. According to the De Lanerolle Commission Report (1973, p.66), "the English language curriculum became a stultifying experience for all second language learners."

In 1965, in accordance with the government policy to provide textbooks at a fair price, it was decided to produce series of textbooks and course guides for English. However, a systematic study of the ESL situation does not appear to have taken place and the following features of the 1963 scheme were also characteristic of the new textbooks.

1. Its method of coping with the problem arising from difference in levels of ability.
2. Its adherence to the graded structural approach.

(De Lanerolle Committee Report, 1973, p.68)
The new set of textbooks, *An English Course* prepared by the Ministry of Education were the standard textbooks for all schools in the country. It was assumed that English would be used mainly as a means for additional reading at universities (Cumaranatunga, 1989; Mosback, 1984). Thus the stated objective of the ESL program in the schools at that time was to develop reading comprehension. On the other hand, the textbooks were written based on the graded structural approach (Cumaranatunga, 1989; Karunaratne, 1990). The structures were to be presented orally and learned through listening, with practising of structures followed by reinforcement exercises in reading and writing (De Lanerolle Commission Report, 1973). Thus, there was a mismatch between the stated objectives of the ESL program and the instructional materials developed to achieve them.

There was no systematic evaluation of this project. However, a questionnaire administered to a group of teachers by the De Lanerolle Commission revealed that only 62 schools reported favourably on the textbooks in contrast to the 128 schools reporting unfavourably. Those who favoured the textbooks thought that they related to the students' environment. Thus, the subject matter was understandable even by the beginners and the presentation of the structures systematic. On the other hand, the remaining respondent teachers claimed that the content was "uninteresting" and the methodology "artificial" and the learning "mechanical" (De Lanerolle Commission Report, 1973, p.65).

Even with locally produced textbooks, a new approach and a different methodology there seemed to be little improvement in the standard of English. This idea is supported by education historian Jayasuriya (1969, p.69) who stated that "compulsory English for all children in and above standard three is one of the greatest deceptions perpetrated on the people of this country". He cites two reasons in support of this claim. First, about 29 percent of the schools did not have a single English teacher. Secondly, those who were recruited as English teachers were not proficient in the language. As a result of this, only 10 percent of those who applied for English as a subject at the General Certificate Examination (Ordinary Level) passed.

Jayasuriya (1967) argues that as a consequence of the lack of facilities available in schools to learn English, students' knowledge of English was largely a function of the extent to which they were exposed to English in the home environment. The majority of students were disadvantaged as their poor knowledge of English deprived them of the chance of higher education or obtaining a good job. The latter was due to the fact
that proficiency in English was a requirement, expressed or implied, for most jobs in spite of the importance that was supposed to be paid to the national languages. By 1969, compulsory English had not resulted in equal opportunities and it was "still the preserve of a small and select minority" (Jayasuriya, 1969, p.71).

This comment is further supported by what happened in Sri Lanka in 1971. Although, the free education scheme had provided more opportunities for access to education it had not solved the problem of employability. By 1970, there were large numbers of unemployed educated youth. Even graduates from the universities could not find employment as they were unskilled and their knowledge of English was poor. Due to some of these grievances a youth rebel movement began in the south of the country which tried to over throw the government in power in 1971. A Commission was appointed in 1989 to look into the youth unrest and recommend remedial measures. According to this Committee's Report, "the use of English language by the urban elite as a sword of oppression, "kaduwa" to deny social mobility to rural youth was one reason for youth unrest" (Report of the Presidential Commission on Youth, 1990, p.xvii).

A decade later the situation was hardly changed. A seminar and workshop was held in 1977 in Colombo to discuss the socio-economic and other factors affecting the teaching of English in Sri Lanka. The participants were comprised of teacher educators from the various ESL institutes in Sri Lanka. One of the major outcomes of this seminar was the recognition that research and a re-examination of the ESL program were urgently needed.

Dr. Walatara, who spoke at this seminar on the socio-economic factors affecting the teaching of English, spoke of the student heterogeneity, and how it affects the teaching of English. He stated that "today there is still one socio-economic group in Sri Lanka whose home language is, if not fully, partially English" (1979, p.18), that is students whose parents spoke to each other in English and who generally had a university education. Some of the parents may have also studied in the English medium. He suggested that most visitors to these homes spoke in English as well and the students' peer groups belonged to homes with similar characteristics. However, out of the two million nine hundred and two thousand student population at that time, only about fifteen thousand fell into this category. The rest did not form one homogenous group but had their own problems (Walatara, 1979).
Among this heterogeneous group, Walatara (1979) identified two further groups: One group, comprised the most disadvantaged students who were economically underprivileged and deprived both culturally and linguistically. Some of the children in this group lived in congested areas where the housing was poor and sanitation was very low. Others may not have had a roof over their heads as they lived on the road. On the other hand, there was the second group who had entered the Central schools or the "prestigious" schools passing the fifth standard scholarship examination. They were usually highly intelligent and motivated to learn. However, due to lack of teachers they had not learnt English at all in the primary classes or the English education they had was inadequate. Therefore, they found it difficult to follow the English lessons. Students belonging to both these groups studied in the same class at post-primary level starting in Year 6 and followed the same curriculum. This heterogeneity of the student population made the gap between those who knew English and those who did not widen.

As a solution to this problem, De Silva (1979), another educationist argued for a stratified syllabus of three levels. She stated that according to the existing system, neither the students who came from English speaking backgrounds nor those who were deprived were benefitting. Often, the former group was left to their own devices while the latter could not be given all the attention and help they deserved and needed. However, this issue of student heterogeneity has still not been addressed and continues to affect the ESL program.

Teacher training was another issue, which was identified as affecting the teaching of English as a second language. de Souza (1979) argued that facilities for training teachers were not expanded in proportion to the number of teachers needed to provide compulsory English. He criticised the appointment of a large number of teachers to teach English, without qualifications and with very little knowledge of the language itself. de Souza even went on to the extent of saying that "the entire English teaching program in Sri Lanka is a frightful waste" and that "something is wrong with ends and means and targets and standards" (de Souza, 1979, p.40). Even though this may have been an exaggeration, the fact remains that even five decades after making English "available for all", this objective has not been achieved.

Based on a committee report on Education Reforms in 1979, a White Paper was published in 1981. According to this paper, despite the widespread provision for teaching English from Grade three, the decline in the standard of English in schools, which began in the fifties, had not been arrested. This paper argued that a
concentrated effort was needed to uplift the teaching of English. In order to do so, "as a matter of priority", certain measures were to be adopted. Teaching English from Grade Three, training more teachers to teach English and the establishment of a separate unit in the Ministry of Education to coordinate the work were some of the measures proposed (White Paper, 1981).

1.4 The development of the EED materials: a new teaching approach.

The beginning of the 1980s saw another change in the social, economic and political context in Sri Lanka. This change, as well as developments in the teaching of English in other parts of the world, had implications for the teaching of English in Sri Lanka. At the general elections held in 1977, there was a change of government. The newly elected UNP government introduced an open market economic policy. As a result more and more foreign investors opened up industries which created a demand for personnel with an ability to work in English.

This change in the economic context also resulted in an attitudinal change. It created "a new outlook that treated English not as a privilege, but as a utility which could hardly be dispensed with" (Cumaranatunga, 1989, p.4). Many of the youth who appeared before the Youth Commission as mentioned before, were of the opinion that a "place" should not be given to English which would affect the national languages, however, they strongly felt that English should be taught in the schools and made freely available. They were of the opinion that there was a "hidden conspiracy to deny them knowledge of English in order to restrict opportunities for social mobility" (Report of the Presidential Commission on Youth, 1990, pp79-80).

In addition, the need for a common link language was increasingly felt. The conflict between the Sinhalese and the Tamils which started in 1956 had aggravated over the years and flared into communal riots again in the early 1980s. Further, a militant group who had risen in the north of the country were fighting for a separate state (Spencer, 1990). Thus it was hoped that English would serve as the common language and help to foster better understanding between the two main ethnic groups.

The opening up of the Middle East job market, the tourist boom and the open market economy gave rise to a need among potential job seekers in Sri Lanka to be able to speak English. Similar trends were seen in other parts of the world with the growth of the European Common Market and many more people leaving their own countries
for jobs in Europe, which necessitated the development of programs to teach modern languages for communication. In this context, there was a growing disenchantment with the existing language teaching methodology.

The general view was that the language teaching methodology used in Sri Lanka at that time was not catering to this need to be able to communicate in the second language. There was growing concern that both the existing English textbooks and the methodology used was not equipping young people with the ability to communicate in English. (De Silva, 1979; Cumaranatunga, 1989). In October 1982, a seminar on "teaching English to meet communicative needs" was held in Sri Lanka. Here a representative group of people engaged in the teaching of English in Sri Lanka, as well as a few British experts discussed the existing textbooks and found them to be inadequate to cater to the present demand (Karunaratne, 1991). The decision was taken to produce a new set of textbooks based on Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and subsequently, a writing team was set up for this purpose and comprised a British consultant and twelve experienced Sri Lankan teachers (Mosback, 1984).

According to Mosback, who was the British consultant for the textbook writing project, the learning materials were prepared over a two year period, from 1982 to 1984. This "sampling period", he claimed, served several purposes. According to Mosback (1990, p.18), during this time "all the teachers and students in the country were introduced to the principles on which the course would be based" through workshops. It was also hoped that during the workshops, the teachers would prepare materials and activities "many of which would be incorporated into the final course books". This was expected to provide the course team on the job training in course writing and also receive feedback from the teachers regarding what was and was not acceptable to them (1990, p.18).

Prior to preparing the English Every Day (EED) materials, a supplementary manual was claimed to have been prepared titled "Talk English". The purpose of this manual was to help teachers adjust to the new methodology (Mosback, 1984). During the first two years of the project, "the emerging materials" and the "implicit" methodology were claimed to have been trailed through the "interchange between the entire teaching force in the schools, the pupils and the members of the materials team" (Mosback, 1990, p.19). According to the consultant at the end of the trial period, the materials writing team was confident that they knew the type of activities best suited to the different levels and the ability to use English that could be expected
at each yearly stage of each of the five years of secondary education in English (Mosback, 1990). Performance objectives were to be determined based on these levels. Finally, a series of EED textbooks were prepared based on a "grammatical ladder, or syllabus" underlying "the thematic and functional unity of each unit and book" (Mosback, 1990, p.23). This was the basis for English teaching in Sri Lanka at the time of this study and this syllabus will be discussed in detail in Chapter five.

Another policy decision taken by the UNP government was to provide free school textbooks. This was expected to be in conjunction with the policy of providing equality of opportunity. As a result, the EED Pupil's Books produced in 1984 were given to the students free of charge.

**Summary**

The above examination of the curriculum reforms from 1945-1991 reveals that a common objective has been to reduce the disparity in the availability of opportunities to learn English.

In order to achieve this objective, the following proposals have been repeatedly made:
- making English available to all;
- teaching English as a second language from Grade Three.
- training of English language teachers; and
- revision of learning materials and teaching methodology.

However, the problems connected with the ESL program continue. These problems however may not be entirely due to English language teaching but related to the prescribed practices. What is prescribed may be incompatible with the Sri Lankan classroom contexts. In the light of this assumption it is necessary to examine the current education reforms which claims to form a "National Education Policy" (Reforms in General Education, 1997, P.1)

**1.5 Current reforms**

In 1991, The National Education Commission (NEC) was entrusted with formulating a National policy on education and implementing the proposals of the Youth Commission. Some of the general observations made by the commission after a field study of a sample of classrooms on the island are as follows:
Classroom interaction is highly stereotyped and monotonous.
• The classroom is dominated by "rather dull talk sessions".
• There were occasional attempts to win the attention of pupils. There was little evidence of involving the pupils in learning.
• The classrooms appeared to be forgotten by the system.
(The First Report of the National Education Commission, 1992)

If this is the situation prevalent in the classrooms in general, it is logical to assume that the second language classrooms follow the same pattern.

After considering the preliminary findings and proposals by the NEC, a Presidential Task Force was appointed to prepare an action plan. The recommendations made by the Task Force are being currently implemented in Sri Lanka as the new Education Reforms (The First Report of the National Education Commission, 1992).

The improvement of English Language Teaching in schools is one of the priority areas identified in the current reforms. The recommendation was that the "English Language Teaching Program be upgraded to provide opportunities for pupils island-wide for equal access to English for comprehension and communication" (Reforms in General Education, 1997. p.14).

The main objective of the new reforms then, is to provide students with equal opportunities to learn English. As has already been argued in this chapter, this has continuously been the main objective of the ESL program. The implication appears to be that the objective of providing equal access to English has not yet been achieved and continues to be a challenge. In recognition of this challenge, the task force has proposed the following proposals:

1. Introduction of activity-based oral English in Grade One and Two in all primary schools.
2. Training adequate numbers of teachers.
3. Teaching of formal English from Grade Three.
4. Bilingual teaching of selected subjects at Junior Secondary level.
5. Alternative English syllabuses at Grades Ten and Eleven.
6. Two year optional English for comprehension and communication at GCE (AL) as optional subjects (General Education Reforms - Executive summary, 1997, p.5)

In comparing these proposals with the reforms between 1945-1995, as discussed in section 1.2, it can be seen that the training of teachers and the teaching of English as
a second language from Grade Three have been recurrent proposals. Thus, it seems that again not very much can be expected of the current reforms unless the causes for the failure in achieving the objectives of teaching English are identified.

As in the past, parallel to these reforms a curriculum revision is also under way. The preparation of a new set of textbooks for teaching English at the secondary level *The world through English* commenced in 1997. These books were to be introduced to the schools in stages, with the books for grade six and nine to be introduced in 1999. The textbook writing project was to be completed by 2001, with the introduction of the textbooks to grades seven and ten in year 2000 and grades eight and eleven in 2001.

The objectives of the language program and the textbooks developed to implement it changed from 'reading comprehension' in the 1950s to 'communication' in the 1990s to. The objective of the Teaching of English programme in the schools at present is "comprehension and communication". The rationale for the change of objective is that "learning is seen as a continuous process aiming at an incremental understanding of the language system and an increasing use of it in meaningful communication" (Teacher's Guide, 1999, p.3).

Although the learning materials, the objective of the ESL program and the teaching methodology have changed over the years very little systematic research has been done so far to evaluate the teaching materials or the methodology used and there has certainly been a need for such research.

According to Department of Examination statistics, about 75 percent of school candidates continue to fail in English at the GCE (O/L) examination each year. However, this does not mean that in every district or school on the island 25 percent of the candidates pass in English. For example, in the Colombo district in 1998, approximately 65 percent passed, while in Polonnaruwa only 15 percent passed. On the other hand, even in the Colombo district there are schools where not a single candidate passed. Therefore, there is a disparity in achievement inter-district as well as intra-district. Further, these statistics appear to suggest that the changes in the curriculum do not reflect positively in examination results.

The inter and intra district disparity in students' achievement appears to reflect the differences among the schools and the type of students in the schools. While several
writers such as Nystrom (1985) Rupasingha (1990) and Udagama (1999) discuss the disparities among the schools in relation to availability of resources and the students' socio-economic background. Karunaratne (1991) refers to how these differences affect the teaching of English. According to these writers, the heterogeneity of the student population that Walatara discussed in 1979 also continues in the 1990s.

These observations relating to disparities in the school system regarding the teaching of English lead to the assumption that the objective of "making English available to all" has not been achieved. One of the reasons for this failure could be that we have been looking at the same problem from the same perspective for too long, which is changing textbooks and teaching methodology rather than finding the reasons for the failure. Therefore, attempts must be made to find alternative ways of improving this situation.

As discussed before not much classroom based research has been conducted so far in Sri Lanka. Thus there was a need to examine closely the materials used and what happens in the second language classrooms. As a new textbook preparation project was underway ideally I would have liked to have been able to investigate the use of the new materials in the classrooms and this was my plan when I commenced my doctoral studies in Australia in late 1998. However, I was advised by a consultant on the textbook writing project that this would not be possible because she was doubtful whether the *World through English* book would be in schools by the beginning of 1999, as there was a printing delay. As I had to collect data when I returned to Sri Lanka for the period from January to June 1999, I was compelled to use the former textbooks – *English Every Day* as the new textbooks were not in schools and the teachers were using the old textbooks.

Although at present new textbooks are used the objective of teaching English continues to be for “communication and comprehension”. Therefore, in terms of learning objectives there is no significant difference between the old and the new learning materials. On the other hand, with the new learning materials the teachers are provided with a syllabus which specifies the learning content to be taught where as in the EED materials the syllabus was not specified but implied in the textbook. However, as discussed in chapter 5, there is not much difference between the new syllabus and the syllabus implied in the EED materials. It is stated that the “course has an integrated syllabus of grammar, communicative functions and the language skills – listening, speaking, reading and writing” (Teacher's Guide. Year 7, 2000, p.1) The Teacher's Guide claims that no single teaching approach is recommended.
However, it provides detailed instructions as suggested procedures to be followed during classroom activities. Most of these activities seemed to be similar to the activities in the EED materials. Although, some of the shortcomings in the EED materials such as a lack of a syllabus appears to have been remedied in the new materials there does not appear to be a radical change between the two books in terms of the syllabus, teaching objectives and the teaching methodology. Therefore, an analysis of the EED materials and their use in the classroom will be useful to teachers and teacher educators to help to improve the teaching practice in the classroom.

A study based on the EED materials will be useful in future classroom based studies. As not much research has been conducted on the effectiveness of the EED materials the findings of this study will provide base line data for follow up studies using the new learning materials.

1.6 Focus on the classroom

The importance of understanding classroom learning, in order to facilitate the learning process, is emphasised both in mainstream education (for example, Barnes, 1976; Gibbons, 1998; Mehan, 1979) as well as in ELT literature (Allwright & Bailey, 1991; Chaudron, 1988; Kumaravadivelu, 1994; Seedhouse, 1995; Tsui, 1995; van Lier, 1991). Classroom pedagogy can be understood as the relationship between teaching, learning and the content.

The importance of interaction in student learning is stressed in classroom research in general. While Mehan (1979) considers interaction as the process whereby lessons are "accomplished", Barnes (1976) believes that classroom learning is a negotiation between teachers and learners as they construct a shared understanding through face-to-face communication. These writers view classroom interaction as one component of understanding the process of better facilitating classroom learning.

Interest in ELT has shifted away from searching for the "best" teaching Method towards a focus on classroom interaction as one of the main characteristics in the instructed second language learning process (Seedhouse, 1995). While Allwright (1984, p.160) claims interaction as "the sine qua non of classroom pedagogy", Johnson (1995, p.5) argues that how teachers and students use language to communicate in second language classrooms "mediates between teaching, learning and second language acquisition". Thus the importance of interaction in language learning is acknowledged by many educators.
In classrooms such as those in Sri Lanka, where the objective of teaching English is for communication, the role of interaction, especially oral interaction is even more important. Many writers such as Allwright (1984; 1991) Chaudron (1988) Rivers (1987) and Tsui (1995) discuss the role of interaction in CLT in teaching how to use language to communicate. The need for classroom interaction is also supported by the claims of some second language acquisition (SLA) theorists. A classroom has been referred to as the 'crucible' - the place where teachers and learners come together and where language acquisition is expected to take place (Gaies, 1980). While Krashen (1981; 1982) focuses on the nature of the language input the learners receive, other theorists (for example, Long 1983) emphasise the type of interaction between the speakers and the second language learners. This theoretical shift has also resulted in a change in classroom centred research. As Gaies (1983, p.208) points out, this theoretical "reorientation" has resulted in the study of interactional patterns in the second language classrooms which may indicate how learners internalise the language. Thus both CLT methodology and SLA theories advocate oral interaction as providing opportunities for language development.

Allwright (1984, p.156) also considers interaction in the classroom "not just as an aspect of 'modern' language teaching methods, but as the fundamental fact of classroom pedagogy". He characterises the lesson as an interaction between the three elements of teacher, learner and materials. According to Allwright (1981) what this interaction produces is opportunities to learn. This idea is further developed by other writers (for example, Allwright & Bailey, 1991; Hutchinson & Torres, 1994) who assert that in order to provide the best possible opportunities to learn the language, the interaction has to be effectively managed by both teachers and learners. According to Hutchinson and Torres (1994), both teachers and students recognise the role of the textbook in this management process. Thus the relationship between the three elements of the teacher, learner and the learning materials as suggested by Hutchinson and Torres (1994) is illustrated in Figure 1.1
As stated before, it is claimed that "the classrooms appeared to be forgotten by the system" in Sri Lanka. Thus, one way of finding a solution to the "deteriorating standards of English" may be by shifting the focus of emphasis from looking for the 'right' teaching 'Method' as was the case in the past, to how language is learnt in the classroom. The importance of a focus on the classroom is further emphasised by the fact that for the majority of students, the classroom is the only, if not the most available, opportunity they have of interacting in English.

The few research studies conducted in Sri Lanka on classroom interaction and the learning materials reveal mixed results. The only study on the use of the *English Every Day* textbooks claimed that CLT has been a success and the textbooks are popular (Karunaratne, 1991). On the other hand, Silva (1993), who investigated interaction patterns in ten different classroom settings claimed that in most classrooms the teachers "induced" interaction. However, she also acknowledged that the data indicated "more instances of learners being ordered about, asked questions and given facts" (Silva, 1993, P.308). Thus her conclusions that majority of classrooms are interactive is questionable and needs to be investigated further, especially in the light of the findings of the National Education Commission Report that classroom interaction in Sri Lanka is "highly stereotyped and monotonous" and the teachers "relied most exclusively on the textbook" (The first Report of the National Education Commission, 1992, p.66).

1.7 **Broad issues affecting L2 pedagogy in Sri Lanka**

The objective of teaching English in Sri Lanka is for communication and the learning materials used are expected to be based on CLT. According to CLT the role of the
teacher, as will be discussed in chapter 2, should change from an authoritarian figure transmitting knowledge to a facilitator. However, cultural expectations of the role of the teacher are in conflict with this view. Traditional methodology assumed that the teacher should "manage", every thing that happened in the classroom. Therefore, classroom interaction was viewed as something unilaterally in the hands of the teacher. Many of the managerial decisions about who should talk, to whom, on what topic and in what language were made by the teacher.

These expectations of the teacher-student relationships are deeply embedded in Sri Lankan history and culture. Formal education in Sri Lanka prior to foreign invasion was conducted by the Brahmins as in India prior to the advent of Buddhism. Indian literature refers to the teacher as "Guru" and "Acharya". A guru stands in relation to his pupils as a religious leader or god (Year Book of Education, 1953). After the introduction of Buddhism in Sri Lanka, education gradually became the responsibility of the Buddhist clergy. Leaders of the country, parents and students looked up to the monks for guidance and advice on various matters. Even after the laymen took over the teaching, they were held in high esteem. It is said that students used to salute the teacher, prostrating before him and placing their forehead on his feet to obtain permission to start the lesson. Teachers were considered as 'fountains' of knowledge and students would not question them as it was felt to be disrespectful. With regard to the teacher of English, his/her status as the provider of knowledge is even more prominent as often he/she may be the only person proficient in English in the school.

Today, the teachers' status has changed. They may no longer be considered as "gods". Yet the cultural expectation is to be respectful to teachers and not question their authority. Such expectations are likely to be higher in schools that are considered as "prestigious" and uphold traditional values. On the other hand, in small schools which cater mostly to students coming from working class family backgrounds, such expectations are less likely.

The cultural expectations of students' roles are also related to gender. Girls are expected to conform more to the traditional role of passive students who follow what the teacher says without questioning. On the other hand, boys are allowed to be more aggressive and questioning.

In the classroom, the success of the lesson, as Fig.1.1 illustrates, will also depend on the learners' co-operation. CLT advocates that learners have to take responsibility for
their own learning. However, such a role may be new to the Sri Lankan students. Their expectation is usually for the teacher to take the initiative and be responsible for learning. Thus, even if the teacher is ready to delegate power to the students, they may not be ready to accept it. As Widdowson (1990, p.189) states, "the learner is never really independent, it is the kind of dependency which changes". This could be one of the reasons that there was "little evidence of involving the pupils in learning" (The First Report of the National Education Commission Report, 1992, p.66).

The textbook provided free of charge is the most readily available teaching/learning material for the teacher and student. Further, through the Teacher's Guide, comprehensive guidelines are provided for the teacher. The course writers expected that this would compensate for deficiencies in professional development and provide equal opportunities for learning English to students. Due to these reasons, the textbook is expected to play the second most important role in the class after the teacher. Textbooks are written on the assumption that they will promote oral interaction. Yet, the role of the learning materials in CLT is controversial. The process syllabus (Breen, 1984) or the versions of CLT that emphasise the method over the syllabus may not favour a fixed and permanent textbook. On the other hand, it has been argued that the textbook provides the structure that the teaching learning system needs, especially a system "in change" (Hutchinson and Torres, 1994, p.319). Further, the textbook provides the context for negotiation, which is an essential element of any interaction. Therefore, the textbook can be considered as the link between the teacher-pupil interactions. However, there are arguments that "ready made textbooks absolve teachers of responsibility" (Swan, 1992, 33). Therefore, it is necessary to find out the role the textbook plays in the Sri Lankan classrooms especially when a new textbook project is in progress.

The textbook used in the classrooms presupposes oral interaction, which is expected to facilitate second language development. On the other hand, the above discussion suggests that opportunities for learning depends on the relationship between the teacher, learner and the textbook. Thus, it is necessary to examine the relationship between the teacher, the learner and the learning materials in order to understand how they provide opportunities for learning. Against this context, the oral interaction between teachers and learners can be investigated to explore the possibilities for language development.
This investigation was carried out using case studies, field notes and analysis of classroom interaction in four classrooms selected from different categories of schools in Sri Lanka.

1.8 Research Questions and outline of the thesis

In order to achieve the broad aim of identifying the role of classroom interaction in second language acquisition in Sri Lanka, the following two research questions are proposed:

1. How does the relationship between the teacher, the learner and the learning materials in the classroom provide opportunities for learning the second language?

2. How does the teacher-pupil oral interaction in the classroom promote possibilities for second language development?

The thesis is organised around answering these questions.

Chapters two and three explore the theoretical bases of the study. They review the literature on Communicative Language Teaching, Second Language Acquisition and classroom interaction and explain how these relate to each other. Chapter four discusses the research paradigm, the methodology used and the rationale behind this choice. Chapter five explores the EED learning material based on the analysis of CLT theories in chapter two and chapters six and nine contain the analysis of the four case studies. The stories of the schools incorporate the analysis of the recorded lessons, field notes, interviews with the teachers and the learning materials in chapter four. Each analysis will be preceded by a description of the school, the teacher and the class. Chapter ten brings together the findings of chapters five to nine. It suggests a theory grounded in what actually happened in the classrooms. This is followed by suggestions for practical application of this theory to the Sri Lankan context.
Chapter Two

THEORIES OF SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING

2.1 Introduction

In Chapter one I explained how English developed as a second language in Sri Lanka. I also provided the background to the development and use of *English Every Day (EED)* materials for teaching English in the classroom. My observations in classrooms indicated that both teachers and learners depended very much on the EED materials as the main teaching and learning resource in the classroom. This chapter discusses the theoretical framework of CLT on which the EED learning materials are claimed to be based. This discussion will provide the context for the analysis of the learning materials in Chapter 5. It will also provide the means to identify some features of the teaching methodology which was expected to be adopted in the four classrooms that were observed for the purpose of this study.

2.2 Historical development of second language methodology

This section provides a brief discussion of the development of second language teaching methodology. This discussion is important for several reasons. Firstly, it provides the context for the development of CLT. Secondly, as was discussed in Chapter 1, the Sri Lankan English Language Teaching (ELT) field had also undergone several methodological changes and some of these changes may have parallels to the developmental phases in the ELT methodology throughout the rest of the world. Some of the participant teachers in this study had also experienced these transitions in the teaching methodology and such experiences may have influenced their classroom practices. Thirdly, some writers, such as Howatt (1988) and Nunan (1988), have claimed that CLT is a combination of features from methods that preceded it. If so, such features are also likely to be evident in CLT classroom practice.

The developments in ELT methodology during the last fifty years have been documented by many writers, such as Brown (1994), Howatt (1984), Kelly (1969),
Pica (1996) and Richards and Rodgers (1986). These writers consider the developments in ELT methodology as indicating a cyclical pattern with the new methods, while being different to the old methods, also retaining some of the features of the past methods. The main transitions in ELT methodology as documented by the above writers have been from "Grammar Translation" to "Direct Method", to "Audiolingualism", to "Cognitive Code Learning", to "Communicative Language Teaching". In addition, there have also been other methods such as "Silent Way", "Total Physical Response", "Suggestopedia" and "Counselling Learning" which are lesser known. This discussion will also focus only on the main methods, as it was those methods that were used in Sri Lanka. This discussion will examine the objectives, the techniques used, the type of students catered for and the role of the teachers in each of these methods.

The first documented method used to teach English as a second language was the Grammar Translation Method (GTM). This method, which had earlier been known as the Classical Method and was used to teach classical languages, was later developed to teach modern languages as well. According to Kelly (1976), this method, which had been known in the United States as the Prussian Method, was developed in the second half of the nineteenth century in Germany by Plotz to teach modern languages. It came to be known as the Grammar Translation Method and it spread rapidly to other parts of the world (Kelly, 1976; Richards and Rodgers, 1986; Rivers & Bernice, 1981).

The objective of the GTM was to inculcate an understanding of the grammar of the specified language and to help the students read and write accurately in the target language. These objectives were expected to be achieved in the classroom by teaching grammar deductively, that is by providing the students with grammatical explanations of the target language rules in their native language. This was followed by the students practising writing by applying the rules they learnt in the formation of sentences in the target language. Translating sentences and texts into and out of the target language was also considered as helping the students to understand the meaning of the texts. Reading and writing were the main foci of the method with less emphasis on listening and speaking. Vocabulary items based on the literary texts used for reading were taught through bilingual word lists and memorisation.

The GTM seemed to cater to students in different ways. Rivers and Bernice (1981, p.30) argued that The GTM could be considered successful in teaching students who are "highly intellectual and interested in abstract reasoning". Such students memorised the grammar rules and vocabulary lists for the purpose of translating texts accurately.
On the other hand, for "less intellectual students" and for students who were not interested in rote learning, the Grammar Translation Method was likely to become "tedious" (Richards and Rodgers, 1986, p.4) and "create frustration" (Rivers and Bernice, 1981, p.30).

The teacher was the authority in the class but the method was not too demanding on the teacher as it did not involve much preparation since they followed the exercises in the textbooks. The techniques described could be used with large groups of students and many of the corrections could be done by the students themselves while the teacher did the translation exercises on the board.

One of the criticisms against Grammar Translation Method as claimed by some writers (for example, Brown, 1994; Richards & Rodgers, 1986) is that it was not based on a linguistic, psychological or educational theory. However, it appears to follow the linguistic model that language is a unified entity, made up of fixed grammatical patterns and a core vocabulary. Another criticism is that, although there is much focus on learning language rules, there is very little training in the use of the language to express one's own ideas (Brown, 1994). In spite of these criticisms, as some writers such as Richards & Rodgers (1986) acknowledge, the Grammar Translation Method is still widely used in the world today.

Towards the mid nineteenth century there was an increased demand for oral proficiency in foreign languages due to more opportunities for communication among Europeans. As a result, newer approaches to teaching language were needed and a Reform Movement in language teaching developed. There was also an interest in developing principles of language teaching based on naturalistic principles of language learning similar to those discussed in relation to first language acquisition. This interest led to "natural methods" which later developed as the "Direct Method" (Brown, 1994; Richards and Rodgers, 1986).

The Direct Method became popular during the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century in France, Germany and later in the United States where it was used in commercial language schools by the applied linguist Charles Berlitz and thus became known as the Berlitz method (Brown, 1994; Richards and Rodgers, 1986). The objective of the Direct Method as stated by Rivers and Bernice (1981) was to develop the students' ability to think in the target language irrespective of whether they were speaking, reading or writing.
The proponents of the Direct Method advocated the learning of the new language through direct association of words and phrases with objects and actions, without using the native language (LI) by the teacher or student. LI was to be used only as a last resort. Speech preceded reading and students were discouraged in using translation as a means of aiding comprehension. Grammar was not taught explicitly and deductively as in the Grammar Translation Method but was taught inductively through practice. Students were encouraged to reflect on what they had learnt and form their own generalisations about grammar.

The Direct Method was popular and successful in private language schools where the students were highly motivated to learn the target language and the teachers were native speakers (Brown, 1994). However, as pointed out by a number of writers (Brown, 1994; Richards & Rodgers, 1986; Rivers & Bernice 1981), this method was not equally successful in public secondary schools due to practical problems with its implementation. The success of the method depended to a great extent on the skill and the personality of the teacher and the motivation of the students. Since the teacher needed to pay individual attention to the students, this method was not successful in public schools where there were large numbers in classes. In Sri Lanka also this method was used in the early 1950s and was not successful for perhaps the same reasons.

With the Second World War, a need arose in the USA to develop language programs that promoted oral proficiency. Americans needed to be proficient in the languages of both their enemies as well as their allies (Brown, 1994). Therefore, an "Army Method" developed which took features from the Direct Method, such as pronunciation activities and oral pattern drills. In the 1950s, as a result of the revival of interest in foreign language teaching in the United States, this method was adapted and used in the educational institutes and became known as the Audio Lingual Method (ALM).

The Audiolingual Method was influenced by both linguistic as well as psychological theories. At that time, linguists such as Fries (cited in Brown, 1994) and his colleagues at the Michigan University were influenced by the work of British linguist Harold Palmer (1920). They were engaged in analysing language into linguistic patterns. This influenced ALM and advocated teaching linguistic patterns which were isolated and ordered in a sequence of difficulty. At the same time, the Behaviourist psychologists such as Skinner (1957) advocated conditioning and habit formation models of language learning. As a result of the psychologists' views, ALM encouraged teaching language patterns through drills in order to condition the students to use a particular
structure and form a habit. The combination of the linguistic and the psychologists' views with the Audio Lingual Method was referred to as the Structural Approach. This approach advocated the teaching of structural patterns of the language through repetitive drills.

As was the case with the Direct Method, the focus of ALM was on the students gaining oral proficiency. Teaching reading and writing skills was assumed to depend upon prior oral skills; classroom practices were guided by a linguistic syllabus which contained the main features of phonology, morphology and syntax of the language. These features were graded and presented in the order of difficulty derived in part from contrastive analysis of the difference between native language and the target language. Dialogues and drills were the main teaching techniques used in the classroom. After a dialogue was presented and memorised, specific grammatical patterns in the dialogue were selected and became the focus of drills and pattern practice exercises. As was the case in the Direct Method, the teacher's role in this method was central. The teacher modelled the target language, controlled the pace of learning and monitored the learners' performance. The learners were expected to listen to the teacher, imitate accurately and respond and perform controlled tasks.

The Audio Lingual Method was popular for more than a decade. The greatest strength of this method, according to Brown (1994), was its theoretical foundation. However, by the 1960s, this foundation was challenged by the generative-transformational school of linguistics led by Chomsky and the views expressed by cognitive psychologists. The transformational linguists argued that an analysis of language based on observable performance was not sufficient as language has two levels - the surface structure and the deep structure. While the surface structure was what was observed, the deep structure was the underlying rules, which were believed to be common to all languages.

The cognitive psychologists argued that focusing mechanically on stimulus-response connections as advocated by behaviourists was not enough, as cognitive processes such as meaning, understanding and thinking are also involved in learning. Further, Chomsky made a distinction between "competence" and "performance". He referred to competence as the underlying knowledge of a system, the non-observable ability to perform something. On the other hand, performance was the observable manifestation of linguistic competence (Chomsky, 1965). Thus, he argued that any theory of language had to be a theory of competence and the structural view of language was unable to account for the underlying ability of the speaker.
Chomsky’s views on language challenged the Audiolingual Method, yet his views did not advocate an alternative teaching methodology. However, the Cognitive Code-learning approach was associated with his ideas and was popular in the United States for a short time in the 1970s. The objective of this method was to focus consciously on grammar teaching and was described as "a modified Grammar Translation Approach" (Rivers, 1979, p.14). However, no specific methodological guidelines were provided (Richards & Rodgers, 1986).

Chomsky’s views on language acquisition did, however, influence the Communicative Approach to language teaching. Chomsky (1965) criticised the existing structural theories of language as incapable of accounting for the creativity of language. In response to this criticism, other linguists, such as Hymes (1972) and Widdowson (1978) started to look at other aspects of language such as its social use. This led to the development of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT).

It could be seen that though the main focus of the teaching methods prior to CLT seemed to differ, they were concerned with two main views, that is, the first being that language learning meant mastery of language structures and the second being the mastery of 'oral skills'. However, there was not much integration of the two views in these methods. Whether the CLT achieves an integration of these views will be examined in Section 2.2.

2.3 Development of the Communicative Language Teaching

The "Communicative Approach", as pointed out by number of writers (for example, Nunan, 1988; Stern, 1992), is difficult to define. It has been influenced by a range of different schools of thought and the term conveys a variety of practices and activities. However, as some writers such as Johnson (1981) and Nunan (1988) suggest, these different approaches have a common purpose in that, they aim to develop "communicative competence". What is meant by communicative competence however has changed over the years and is perceived differently by different linguists. The purpose of this section is to understand the contributions of the different influences on CLT and how they have resulted in a change in the definition of communicative competence. This examination will be necessary to understand how CLT differs from other methods and the impact of these influences on CLT in Sri Lanka.
In America, the development of CLT can be traced back to Hymes' (1972) introduction of the concept of "communicative competence" in contrast to Chomsky's (1965) view of linguistic competence. Chomsky defined competence as the ability, which enables a person to produce grammatically correct sentences. On the other hand, Hymes defined competence as "what a speaker needs to know in order to be communicatively competent in a community" (Richards & Rodgers, 1986, p.66). Hymes took a more interactive view of competence and suggested that it involves both knowledge about language forms and the ability that enables a person to communicate functionally and interactively. He claimed that there are "rules of use without which the rules of grammar would be useless" (Hymes, 1972, p.278). Thus in Hyme's view a person who acquires communicative competence needs to acquire both a knowledge about language and the ability to use language.

Meanwhile in Britain, CLT was influenced by the work of philosophers, applied linguists and socio-linguists. In their speech act theories, the philosophers Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) had related language use to the intentions of the speakers. According to them, communication is a series of communicative acts or "speech acts" which are used to accomplish particular purposes. The Functional linguist Halliday (1973) drew on these speech act theories in his theory of the functions of language. Halliday was more concerned with language in its social context and described three main functions that language fulfils: ideational, interpersonal and textual. For him, language learning meant the mastery of language functions. Halliday's functional view of language is considered by some proponents of CLT, (for example, Brumfit & Johnson 1979; Savignon, 1983) to complement Hyme's ideas on communicative competence and as compatible with CLT.

Hymes' (1972) and Halliday's (1973) views on language were further developed by Widdowson (1978). He defined communicative competence "as an ability to interpret discourse" (Widdowson, 1978, p.144). Influenced by British functional linguists (for example, Firth, 1957; Halliday, 1973), he referred to discourse as the use of sentences in combination. He argued that teaching language focusing on the sentence as the basic unit had to change as one sentence might serve a number of functions, depending on the context or situation in which it was used. For Widdowson, knowing a language involves both knowing what "signification" a sentence has as an instance of language "usage," and what "value" it takes as an instance of "use". Communicative competence, therefore, involved both kinds of knowledge. Thus focusing on stretches of language above the sentence level enable learners to obtain what Hymes referred to as "rules of grammar" and "rules of use"(Hymes, 1972, p.279).
The definition of communicative competence was further developed by Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983). They identified four sub-categories of communicative competence: grammatical, discourse, socio-linguistic and strategic. Grammatical competence refers to the mastering of linguistic competence while discourse competence refers to the ability to connect sentences in stretches of discourse and to form a meaningful whole out of a series of utterances. Thus, these two categories refer to the use of the grammatical system and are compatible with Hymes (1972) and Widdowson's (1978) views on language. On the other hand, sociolinguistic competence is the knowledge of the sociocultural rules of language and of discourse and strategic competencies are described as "the verbal and non-verbal strategies that may be called into action to compensate for breakdowns in communication" (Canale & Swain, 1980, p.30). These two subcategories refer to the more functional aspect of communication and are related to Halliday's functional view of language. Canale and Swain's definition of communicative competence therefore appears to be more comprehensive, incorporating views of other linguists.

Communicative Language Teaching differs from the more traditional methods discussed earlier in this chapter, due to its objective of teaching communicative competence. As is evident from the discussion above, "at the level of language theory, it has a rich, if somewhat eclectic, theoretical base" (Richards and Rodgers, 1986, p.71). However, most definitions of communicative competence seem to agree that communication involves both linguistic (form) as well as functional knowledge (functions). Thus, it can be assumed that CLT involves teaching both a knowledge about language and assisting the learners to develop the ability to use the language. It is this emphasis that language learning involves both the mastery of language forms or structures as well as the ability to use the language that appears to make CLT different from the past language teaching methods.

2.4 Different approaches within CLT

Although there is agreement among CLT proponents regarding the purpose of CLT, there is confusion in interpreting it, that is, there are many different interpretations of CLT in the literature. However, it is possible to identify two main schools of thought: those who emphasis the "content" or what is to be taught and those who are more concerned with the "process" or how to teach. These two approaches will be discussed next, to identify how they influenced CLT in Sri Lanka.
2.4.1 Content Approach

Those proponents of CLT who were primarily interested in the "content" were concerned with the nature of the syllabus in terms of what aspects of language should be taught. These proponents were originally from Britain (for example, Corder, 1973 at the University of Edinburgh, and Burton, Candlin & Leather, 1976 at the University of Reading). The British concept of the syllabus included both the content of the course of study and the guiding principles for selecting and arranging the language content (Stern, 1981). According to this point of view, a language syllabus need not necessarily be based upon a principle of grammatical sequencing but could be based upon functional, notional (meaning), thematic, or situational criteria. One of the best known examples of the content approach to CLT is the Council of Europe Project (Trim, 1973). According to the consultant for the Sri Lankan textbook project, Mosback (1990), it is the Council of Europe project objectives which have been the guiding objectives for the Sri Lankan textbook project.

The Council of Europe Project

The Council of Europe project was initiated in May 1971 and was developed by a number of applied linguists and language teachers from different European countries (Rivers & Bernice, 1981). These experts were entrusted with the responsibility of creating "the conditions for the establishment of a suitable structural framework for the development, through international co-operation, of a coherent and progressive European policy in the field of adult language learning" (Trim, 1973, p.1). There was a need for such a project because of the number of adult workers leaving their homelands in search of better jobs in the European Economic Community. The inability to speak the language of the area in which they worked was a problem. The Council of Europe team had the difficult task of developing a framework for an unknown audience. This audience comprised adults whose country of origin, language needed to be mastered and the job expected to do could be any out of a number of options. Therefore, in order to be flexible it was decided to develop a "unit/credit system". In this system, areas of language use were divided into units. Students could select the units most relevant to them. Credits were granted for units completed and when a number of credits had been gained, a qualification was granted (Trim, 1973).

The European unit/credit system was developed on the basis of an analysis of the linguistic needs of adults in forty four occupational categories. The Council of Europe team was of the view that although adult needs are diverse there will be areas of interest common to all students, a "common core of" functions relevant to people such
as engineers, doctors and mechanics. Therefore, each learning level had a common core and a specialised area which students could select according to their needs. Further, for practical reasons it was decided that each language should have a range of five proficiency levels, and the first was called the *Threshold level*. The *Threshold level* was considered as "a minimum level of foreign language competency below which no further levels can be usefully distinguished" (van Ek, 1973, p.95). However, later, it was decided that a lower level below *Threshold level* was necessary. Thus, according to van Ek and Alexander (1980) a further level called *Waystage* was produced.

Johnson (1982, p.51) summarises the procedure suggested by van Ek's *Threshold level* as follows:

   a. roles (social and psychological)
   b. settings
   c. topics
2. Language activities specified in terms of four skills
3. Language functions
4. Notions
   a. related to particular topics
   b. general
5. Language forms specified according to:
   a. functions
   b. topic-related notions
   c. general notions
6. Degree of skill: How "well" the students must be able to speak, listen, write and, read.

In 1978 the Council of Europe Project was extended to the teaching of foreign languages in schools. As a result, the "*Threshold level for modern language learning in schools*", (van Ek, 1976) was published. According to van Ek (1976) the model used in preparing the *Threshold level for the schools* was similar to that of the adult version. "In fact, it had appeared that, as far as the content-specifications were concerned, the objectives were identical with respect to the language-functions and general notions and only differ in the choice of specific notions" (p.16). Further, the *Threshold Level for schools* included an analysis of various methodological implications of the approach. According to Richards and Rodgers (1986), these *Threshold level* specifications had a strong influence on the design of communicative language programs and textbooks in Europe. Since the EED materials are claimed to be based on these specifications (Mosback, 1990), they seem to have had a similar impact in Sri Lanka as well.
While van Ek (1976), developed the Council of Europe project to the secondary schools, Munby (1978) elaborated and extended the work of Wilkins and the Council of Europe to prepare syllabuses for adult students learning English for a specific purpose (ESP). He defined ESP courses as those "where the syllabus and materials are determined in all essentials by the prior analysis of the communication needs of the learner, rather than by the non learner-centred criteria such as the teacher's or institution's predetermined preference" (Munby, 1978, p.2). He designed a model, which was a detailed syllabus specification of the target communicative competence. Although Munby's work is often associated with CLT syllabus design, this model did not deal with materials development like the Council of Europe project.

The communicative syllabuses that emphasised the learning content were based on an analysis of learner needs. Whereas the syllabuses used in conjunction with traditional teaching methods were based on a list of structures, these syllabuses contained several lists such as notions, functions, settings, and topics. Johnson (1981, p.8) refers to these lists as in the Threshold level specification as "syllabus inventories". For the purpose of teaching in the traditional approaches, the structures had to be graded and combined into a sequence. In contrast, in the communicative syllabuses, as there are several lists, a "unit of organisation" had to be selected by the course planners for the syllabus inventory to be converted to the syllabus or "pedagogical syllabus". It is difficult to devise a program to teach language associated with each of the lists - for instance teaching 'notions' in term one and 'functions' in term two. Course planners have to decide whether the "unit of organisation" is going to be notions, functions or structure, that is they had to decide on the main focus of each unit. If it was to be functions, then the syllabus would be "functional" but the syllabus designers had to ensure that other features in the syllabus inventory such as notions, structures, themes and settings were taken account under the functional headings. As a result, a communicative syllabus based on a syllabus inventory like the Threshold level can lead to different syllabuses such as Functional, Notional or Structural depending on the unit of organisation (Johnson, 1981).

Even though the syllabus was considered an important element in CLT there was no agreement among its proponents as to the unit of organisation of its content. For Swan (1981, p.38) "a semantic syllabus is no more a blue print for communication on its own, than a structural syllabus is". Littlewood (1981) contends that the structural view of language on its own is not sufficient to explain how language is used as a means of communication. Wilkins (1976) suggests "synthetic" and "analytic" teaching strategies
as an attempt to link the structural and functional syllabus types. In a synthetic approach, the teacher isolates and orders the structures and presents them to the students gradually. On the other hand, in an analytical approach the language is presented to the student in the form of "natural chunks" and the student has to do the analysis of the structures. Wilkins (1976) believed that a syllabus could be placed somewhere on a continuum between the two. Due to the influence of these varied viewpoints, during the 1970s models of language, syllabuses changed from grammatical to notional/functional and later to "eclectic" or a combination of grammatical and functional models.

In keeping with this concept of combined or "eclectic" syllabuses, different syllabus models have been proposed. Brumfit (1981) describes a syllabus model with a functional spiral around a structural core. While the structural syllabus introduces points of grammar, a functional syllabus is expected to present language in a situation or setting. Thus, a combined syllabus may provide the context to illustrate a grammar point or function. He argues that in most secondary school situations, the English teachers will require a syllabus which "can be taught to large, not very well motivated classes in not very well equipped classrooms" (Brumfit, 1981, p.47). Thus, the students should have a grounding in basic structures of the language and also have experience of using language. Brumfit believed that a combination of structural - functional syllabus would cater to this need. Thus he advocates that "notional, functional and situational specifications can be conceived as a spiral around a basically grammatical core" (Brumfit, 1981). Syllabus models in support of a combined structural-functional syllabus were also proposed by Johnson (1977), Savignon (1983) and Swan (1981).

As this discussion suggests, there is no single model of syllabus design agreed upon by those who advocated a content approach to CLT. However, most of these models specify what is to be taught in terms of linguistic input and there appears to be agreement that especially for beginner second language learners, an "eclectic" syllabus model with a combination of situational, functional/notional features is more suitable than one based only on one feature.

The next section will discuss CLT from the point of view of those who advocated a "process approach" in order to facilitate communicative competence.
2.4.2 Process Approach

While those who advocated a content approach to CLT emphasised 'what' to teach, there were others, such as Breen (1984) and Prabhu (1979), who focused more on the process of learning, that is, on "how" language was learnt.

A shift in focus from the outcomes of instruction to the process of learning could be attributed to the result of the rejection of the behaviourist model of language learning by Chomsky as inadequate to account for the complexity of language learning (Chomsky, 1965). As some writers state, (for example, Stern, 1981 and Yalden, 1983) this shift in focus was more prevalent in North America with its emphasis on cognitive psychology. On the other hand, as acknowledged by Morrow (1981, p.59) in the UK, the interest had been "much more in what should be taught than in how". However, the impact of these two approaches influenced each other and soon spread to other parts of the world as well.

The assumption underlying the process approach is that as communication is a process, students must not only have knowledge of the language but should be able to interact using the language. According to Stern (1981), as attention is not focused on formal linguistic properties in normal conversation, second language learning also need not be a formal study of the language.

The concept of the process syllabus had resulted in "task based" or "procedural" syllabuses. These syllabuses specify the tasks and activities that learners will engage in class and not a list of linguistic items. Some proponents of this approach (for example, Breen, 1984, p.53) suggested that priority of the syllabus should be on the "process over content". The procedural syllabus advocated by Prabhu (1987) in his "Bangalore Project" is often cited in CLT literature as an example of the process approach. This project was based on the hypothesis that language structures could be learnt in the classroom entirely through a focus on meaning. In Prabhu's syllabus though the content was not specified in terms of linguistic categories it was planned according to tasks. The activities that formed the syllabus included problem solving tasks such as map reading and interpretation of timetables. Teaching procedures such as drilling and error correction that would focus on language forms were to be avoided and it was expected that students would acquire new language by doing the activities. However, an evaluation of this project by Beretta, (1992, P.257) claims that there appeared to be an "unconscious" move by some of the participant teachers to focus on form through error correction.
The process syllabuses resulted in a shift in focus from the outcomes of instruction to the processes, which lead to the outcomes. However, as Johnson (1982) points out these syllabuses were still consisted of list of items, with tasks and activities instead of linguistic items. Thus, it could be argued that the process syllabuses also specified 'what' to teach.

There is also the viewpoint according to Nunan (1988; 1991), that with the development of CLT, the traditional distinction between syllabus design as the selection and grading of linguistic and experiential content and methodology as the sequencing of learning tasks was difficult to sustain. Nunan's view is compatible with the "flexible methodology" proposed by Johnson (1982) and the functional/notional syllabus with its emphasis on the process as proposed by Brumfit (1979). Such syllabuses provided the linguistic input, together with extensive opportunities for the learners to interact through activities such as group work, role play and through the adaptation of traditional exercises such as drilling.

According to the above discussion then, there are two main views regarding the process approach. One view emphasises that in order to gain communicative competence, attention should be focused on the performance of tasks and activities, that is, the methodology rather than the language needed to perform them. The other group, while emphasising the importance of activities, also argues that classroom procedures should provide the students with opportunities to gain a knowledge of the language as well as opportunities to acquire the ability to use the language. Thus, the second view focuses on both the content of what to teach and the process of how to teach.

In their different ways, both the content and process approaches are concerned with specifying what is to be taught. Whereas the content approach specifies the content in relation to linguistic input, the process approach indicates the teaching content in terms of the activities to be done in class. Thus the content approach seems to be more representative of the traditional syllabus design (Nunan, 1988; 1991) and the process approach more aligned with teaching methodology. There is also the view that both the communicative and grammatical properties of language must be categorised into course content. Yet, as the evaluation of the Bangalore Project indicated, however communicative the syllabus is, it is the way the teachers realise the implications of the syllabus through their teaching methodology that decide whether communicative
competence is achieved or not. Thus, the teaching methodology is equally important as the syllabus.

2.5 Methodology

There have been criticisms that the developments in CLT at the level of syllabus design have not been accompanied by a coherent methodology (Andrews, 1983; Brumfit, 1979; James, 1983). It has also been pointed out by some writers, such as Richards and Rodgers (1986), that in contrast to the amount of literature on the communicative nature of language, not much has been discussed about learning theory.

According to Morrow (1981, p.59) a methodology "requires an underlying set of principles in the light of which specific procedures, activities or techniques can be evaluated". Richards (1990), while providing a similar definition, also considers the roles of the teacher, learner and the learning materials as part of the methodology. In the classrooms observed, the use of L1 was one of the techniques used by the teachers and in varying degrees this has been added for specific consideration.

2.5.1 Principles

The principles underlying CLT have been discussed by many writers such as Finocchiaro and Brumfit (1983), Morrow (1981) and Rivers and Bernice (1981). Three main principles which are widely mentioned by most writers have been identified by Richards and Rodgers (1986, p.72).

1. The communicative principle: activities that involve real communication which promote learning.
2. The task principle: According to this principle, activities in which language is used for carrying out meaningful tasks promote language learning.
3. The meaningfulness principle: According to this principle, language that is meaningful to the learner supports the learning process.

The implications of these principles are that methodology should ensure that classroom language use resembles real L2 language use outside the class as much as possible. The assumption is that learners will then be able to transfer knowledge and skills developed in the classroom to the real world context outside the class.
In addition to these principles, some second language acquisition theories (for example, Krashen, 1982) also express the view that language acquisition takes place as a result of using language for real communication. Though Krashen is not directly associated with CLT, as Richards and Rodgers (1986) point out, his views seem to be compatible with CLT principles.

2.5.2 Activities and procedures

In keeping with the CLT principles, learning activities are expected to be selected to enable the students to engage in authentic and meaningful language use. Larsen-Freeman (1986), Morrow (1981), Richards and Rodgers (1986) and others have identified three processes which they consider as features of authentic language: These are information gap, choice and feedback. According to Morrow, one of the major purposes of communication is to bridge an information gap, that is, if the speaker and the listener are in possession of the same information, communication can not take place. Thus, for instance, the activities the students engage in should provide opportunities where students share information not known to each other.

The second feature refers to the idea that, in communication, the speaker usually has a choice of what to say and how to say it. The assumption is that if classroom activities are highly controlled, for example like a language drill, the activities will not be communicative. Thirdly, for real communication to occur, a speaker should receive feedback from the listener. In order to include these features in classroom activities, it has been suggested that authentic materials such as newspapers or rail and bus timetables could be used in class, and that students could also be involved in activities such as role play, simulation, problem solving and language games.

While the proponents of "real world tasks" do not consider traditional activities such as language drills appropriate to a communicative classroom, not all advocates of CLT reject such procedures. This later group propose that the traditional activities can be adapted. The former view seems to be compatible with the "strong" version of CLT, while the latter view conforms to the "weak" version as discussed by Howatt (1984). Littlewood (1981) who appears to favour the "weak" version divides all learning activities into two broad groups – pre-communicative activities and communicative activities. In the pre-communicative activities, the teacher isolates specific elements of knowledge or skill, which promote communicative ability and provides the students with the opportunities to practise them separately. The purpose is to enable the students to produce language which is acceptable. The emphasis is therefore more on
form than on meaning. The activities that are advocated for this purpose are adaptations of traditional drills or question/answer types of activities. The drills however are contextualised so that the learners will be performing communicative acts in real life situations. In communicative activities, students are provided with the opportunities to integrate their pre-communicative knowledge and skills in using language. The emphasis is on the communication of meaning, and Littlewood (1981) suggests activities such as pair and group work to provide for the practice of the total skill of communication.

The type of activity also determines whether the focus is on accuracy or on fluency. As stated by some writers (for example, Johnson, 1979; Nunan, 1988), while the communicative activities foster fluency, the pre-communicative structured tasks are designed to develop accuracy. Thus, it could be argued that for the total development of language ability, both types of activities are necessary.

2.5.3 The role of the teacher and students.

The teacher's role is central to any teaching process, as the effectiveness of any method depends on the actual performance of the teachers and learners. In the light of the different interpretations of CLT discussed earlier in this chapter, the teacher's role is even more important.

In CLT, several roles are assigned to teachers. However, the importance of a particular role is determined by the view of CLT adopted (Richards & Rodgers, 1986). Two major roles are described by Breen and Candlin (1980). The first is to facilitate the communication process between all participants and the activities in the classroom. The second role is that of an independent participant within the learning-teaching group. In addition, Richards and Rodgers (1986) view the teacher's role as a needs analyst, counsellor and group process manager.

The main difference between the role of the teacher in the earlier approaches to teaching English and CLT is the change from a "lock step" class to a "learner centred class". Maley (1983, p.301) views this change as that of a "change in the power structure". He argues that this change can be achieved through rearranging the physical structure of the class through the procedures adopted and the activities used. Stevick (1980) considers this change as a gradual process of handing responsibility over to students. He discusses this in terms of teacher "control" and student "initiative".
According to him, control consists of two elements: the structuring of classroom activities and providing feedback on performance. He suggests that at the beginner stages of a program, both aspects of control should rest with the teacher in order to create a secure and stable environment. He argues that it would not be feasible to delegate these responsibilities to the students until they are ready. 'Initiative', on the other hand, is described in terms of the choices available to the students in making decisions regarding "who says what, to whom, and when".

The student's role is also expected to change in CLT, corresponding to the teacher's role (Maley, 1983). Students are not expected to be passive listeners but will have more freedom, responsibility and choice available to make decisions regarding their own learning.

### 2.5.4 The role of the learning materials

Different viewpoints have been expressed regarding the role of learning materials in CLT. This controversy can be traced to the different approaches to CLT. For those who favour the content approach, the learning materials may be one level at which the syllabus is realised in the classroom. Allwright (1981) considers the lesson as an interaction between the three elements of teacher, learner and materials, and the interactions provide learning opportunities. According to this view, the learning materials provide the input and structure to the lessons.

On the other hand, those who favour the "process approach" may consider the use of specially designed learning materials as "unnatural" and "non-communicative". The proponents of such approaches such as Breen (1984) would argue for the use of authentic materials. As Hutchinson and Torres (1994) discuss, such a view may imply that textbooks control the interaction that takes place in the classroom.

There is also the view expressed by some writers, such as Swan (1985) and Hawkes (1983), that both scripted and authentic material can be used in the classroom. From this point of view, while the scripted materials provide specific, controlled and simplified language input, the authentic materials provide real language use. Using a combination of scripted and authentic material may help in providing both "pre-communicative" and "communicative" tasks as well as providing both grammatical and communicative properties of language, thereby promoting the development of communicative competence.
However, all would agree that a textbook cannot generally meet the needs of all the individual teaching and learning situations, due to the range of needs that exist within any context. Thus, it is up to the teachers to exploit, adapt, and supplement a textbook to suit the context. Yet how far teachers can do so depends on how much freedom they have to move beyond the textbook within their particular context.

### 2.5.5 Use of the mother tongue

Based on the principle in order "to learn it one must do it", CLT assumes that in order for L2 development to occur, the target language must be used in the classroom (Cummins and Swain, 1986; Larsen-Freeman, 1986). Howatt (1988) considers the most significant feature CLT has adopted from past methods to be the "Direct Method" principle that "language should be taught in the target language, not in the pupil's mother tongue" (Howatt, 1988, p.25). Larsen-Freeman (1986, p.135) goes even further to state that "the students native language has no particular role in the Communicative Approach". She advocates that the target language should be used during communicative activities as well as during classroom management.

On the other hand, Finocchiaro and Brumfit (1983 p.92) acknowledge that "a judicious use of the native language is acceptable where feasible". Swan (1985) criticises CLT for failing to recognise the crucial role of the mother tongue in foreign language teaching. He argues that students always translate into and out of their language, that the majority of the errors they make are not due to mother tongue interference, and that a large portion of the correct features also contain a mother tongue element. Swan (1985) questions the rationale for inadequate attention being paid to the mother tongue in CLT methodology.

Referring to the gap in methodological literature in the assessment of the role of the native language in the classroom, Atkinson (1987) suggests that it could partly be responsible for the uneasiness many teachers feel about using LI in the classroom. Bolitho (1983) makes a distinction between the different types of translation and argues that there is a "big place for translation in the communicative classroom, but not as an end itself" (p.238). For example, learners can use L1 to communicate their experiences when they do not have the competency to do so in L2. In such instances the teacher can help them by translating. Pica (1997, p.20), citing research evidence, claims that the use of L1 "can be a helpful dimension of learners' and teachers' communicative competence". According to her, the main contributions according to
her are in the areas of management, guidance, clarification, preparation, and rapport building and anxiety reduction.

From a number of CLT proponent's point of view, there is a strong argument that LI in the classroom can be exploited positively. However, as pointed out by Spada and Frslhlich (1995), in a monolingual class, where the teacher and students share the same language ,there is the danger of overusing the native language. This aspect of the methodology becomes important in examining language learning in the Sri Lankan classrooms. In this study, LI was used to varying degrees for different purposes in the four classrooms.

2.6 CLT in practice

Having explored the features of theoretical underpinnings of CLT, I will now consider some instances of CLT in practice.

Based on observations of five classroom interactions Nunan (1987) stated that most classrooms that claim to be communicative are, after all, not very communicative. Similar viewpoints are expressed by Long and Sato (1983), Legutke and Thomas (1991) and Kumaravadivelu (1993). For instance, Kumaravadivelu (1994, p.13) claims that "research studies have shown that even teachers who are committed to CLT can fail to create opportunities for genuine interactions in their classrooms". Similarly, Legutke and Thomas (1991) feel that in spite of modern textbooks and teachers' manuals "very little is actually communicated in the classroom". Thornbury (1996) also expresses a similar view. These criticisms are based on the fact that in most of the classrooms that claim to be communicative, "grammar is the agenda" (Willis, 1990). Long and Sato (1983) claim that ESL teachers emphasise form and accuracy over meaning and fluency. According to these critics, CLT has failed because teachers continue to use traditional methodology in keeping with the structural approach. However, from the discussion above, it is clear that using the traditional methodology could also be considered as part of CLT. Thus, this may not be a valid criterion to judge whether the classrooms were communicative or not.

While some writers are critical of teachers and their application of CLT, there is another group of writers who criticise CLT saying that is has failed due to the misinterpretation of CLT theory. Swan (1985, p.11), while acknowledging that CLT has "in some ways done a lot of good", argued that its "philosophy is confused". According to him, the debate on "usage" and "use" does not have much relevance to
foreign language teaching. He argues that the "rules of use" that determine how a person interprets utterances are mostly "non-language-specific". Therefore, the interpretation depends on the situation rather than on the rules about the way words can be used. He argues that CLT should take into account the knowledge and skills the students bring with them from their mother tongue and their experience of the world.

Seedhouse (1996, p.16) goes beyond the view that CLT lacks a coherent methodology, to argue that some of the assumptions behind classroom methodology are false. He states that recent communicative approaches argue that one goal of English language teaching should be to replicate "genuine" or "natural" rather than "typical" or "traditional" classroom communication. He argues that such a goal is "paradoxical" and "unattainable". According to him, "genuine" communication, which is conversation and a non-institutional form of discourse, is different from classroom conversation, which is an institutional discourse.

Thompson (1996) is more positive about CLT and argues that it has some important characteristics, even though many teachers are confused by "misconceptions" about CLT. He discusses four main misconceptions about CLT which are held by teachers. These misconceptions refer to the teaching of grammar, oral skills, pair work and the teacher's role. According to him, for many teachers, CLT means not teaching grammar and he argues that it is not so. Another misconception is that "CLT means teaching only speaking" (p.11). This misconception often leads teachers to think that teacher talking time should be reduced. Yet, as Thompson points out, communication does not take place only through speech but also through writing. The third misconception is that, "CLT means pair work, which means role play" (1996, p.11). He agrees that "role play" can be a useful technique but argues that pair work should be used in more flexible ways to pass on more control and choice to learners regarding their learning. Finally, Thompson argues that some teachers believe that CLT expects too much from teachers. Thompson does not refute the claim that CLT places greater demands on the teachers than some of the other teaching methods. These demands include: the unpredictable nature of CLT lessons. the need for wider range of management skills, the need to interact with the students in the most natural way as possible and the higher level of English proficiency expected of non-native teachers. However, he argues that these demands can be exaggerated and, on the contrary, can be used as positive features of CLT for the teachers to "re-evaluate their beliefs and practices" (1996, p.14). Thompson considers the concern with the world outside the
classroom, the focus on the learner as an individual and the emphasis on language structures to perform language functions as positive features of CLT.

Cultural and context specific factors also affect the implementation of CLT methodology. As Anderson (1993) discusses, in relation to China, the cultural factors such as students not being risk takers, their attitudes towards learning, the importance placed on success in examination which do not test communicative skills and the demands placed upon the teacher were draw backs in the use of CLT. As Anderson states, CLT may not meet the needs of learners learning English in non-native speaking backgrounds, as they may have no necessity to use the language. In Japan, the teachers' linguistic and pedagogical abilities, cultural expectations of accepted teacher and student behaviour patterns and the mismatch between the stated aims of the ESL program and the actual practices have been claimed to result in tension and conflict with the CLT curriculum (LoCastro, 1996).

On the other hand, while writers such as Brown (2000), Hayes (1995) and Holliday (1994 ; 1997), acknowledge the debate in the modern ESL field around "importing" CLT techniques to state sector education systems in developing countries; they also suggest ways of minimising cultural conflicts. Based on his experience as a British Council adviser to teacher development projects in several developing countries including Sri Lanka, Brown (2000), argues that contact with current practices should be maintained while ensuring that "cultural continuity" is respected and change is gradual. Holliday (1994; 1997) perceives the problem as differences in interpretation of CLT techniques. He argues that what the "typical western specialist" may not consider as communicative may well be so. Thus, Holliday emphasises the need to "graft" what is new on to what is old. Hayes (1995), who was also an ODA adviser to the British government sponsored teacher trainer development projects in Malaysia and Thailand, argues that changes are unlikely to occur until teachers realise that innovations will provide benefits both to themselves and their learners. He suggests that this can be done during in service courses by teachers' reflecting on their own practice and using procedures such as problem solving.

The above discussion of CLT in practice indicates a high degree of uncertainty in the success at the point where theory is translated into practice. The uncertainty discussed regarding putting CLT theory into practice necessitates examining research on CLT in practice.
2. 7 Research on CLT in practice

This section examines studies in ESL classrooms in Pakistan, India and two studies in Hong Kong. While the studies conducted in Hong Kong explore the causes for communication failure in the classrooms, the studies in India and Pakistan investigate the consequences of large classes for CLT. Although these studies were carried out in varied geographical locations, they have a number of features in common with Sri Lanka such as the cultural and physical context in which English is taught and the curriculum being based on CLT. However, the relevance of these studies to the present study is most significant due to their concern with classroom practice and its effect on the quality of classroom interaction.

The Hong Kong English syllabus (Forms I-V) was revised in 1983 to reflect a "more communicative and purposive type of approach than in the past (Lai, 1994, p.100). In her study, Lai investigated whether this syllabus had actually been manifested in the classrooms. The objectives of this study were three fold: to find out whether the English classrooms provide opportunities for meaningful communication as advocated by the syllabus; to find out the learner's level of confidence in using English in classroom communication; and to identify the factors that account for different confidence levels in classroom communication. The study was based on the analysis of a questionnaire administered to 487 Form four students at eleven local schools.

The student responses claimed that most teachers used a mixed code in the English class, that teachers tended to take a traditional teacher centred role; that there was little attention to interactional communication; and that group work often seemed to be limited in terms of the language functions which they were supposed to promote. The majority of the students were not confident in using English as a means of communication in English lessons. The findings of this study identified three constraints which lowered students' confidence levels – self esteem, language anxiety and non favourable patterns and opportunities for classroom communication.

Lai (1994) concludes that although the Hong Kong English syllabus advocates the importance of meaningful and communicative use of the target language, in reality this has not been practical. The role of the English teacher was found to be very significant, especially in building students' confidence and self-perception of their English standard.
However, this study was based only on students’ perspectives of the learning process. Although the teacher’s role was found to be very significant, their views were not solicited. As a result, it was not possible to find out why the teachers failed to implement what was recommended. Nor were there opportunities to observe and confirm what the students claimed was happening in their classes. Future research based on teachers’ perspectives and what actually happens in the classroom through observations is necessary to understand the reasons for the teachers’ inability to achieve the objectives of the communicative syllabus.

While Lai (1994) examined the students’ perspectives of the dynamics in the classroom, Tsui (1996) looked at the teachers’ perspectives of second language learning and the factors that contribute to students’ reticence in some Hong Kong secondary classes. This study was based on a classroom action research project which involved thirty eight ESL teachers, the majority of whom were teaching in secondary schools in Hong Kong where the average class size was thirty five to forty students.

Tsui (1996) used the teachers’ lesson transcripts and reports written during their action research project as data for her study. The teachers who were enrolled in a Postgraduate Program videotaped or audio-recorded their own lessons to identify one specific problem they encountered in their teaching. They then designed strategies to overcome the problems and implemented them over a four week period. During this period they maintained a diary of the proceedings of the lessons and their own reflections. At the end of the remedial period, another lesson was recorded, evaluated and reported on for its effectiveness.

Tsui (1996) reports five main reasons identified by the teachers as contributing to the lack of student participation: the students’ low English proficiency; their fear of making mistakes and being ridiculed by peers; teachers’ intolerance of silence, which allows the students only a very short time to produce an answer; unequal speaking opportunities provided to the students by the teacher; and teacher language input being incomprehensible to the students. All these features were found to be contributing to language classroom anxiety and inhibited student participation in classroom interactions.

Some possible reasons for the teachers’ behaviours were also identified by Tsui. These include their need to cover the syllabus in a specified period of time, as one teacher said "time is precious, too precious": the misconception that an effective teacher should be able to solicit immediate responses from the students which makes them
question the better students more often; and the students not questioning the teachers even when they do not understand what the teacher says. Some of the techniques that seemed to improve student participation as reported by the teachers were peer support and group work in which the students could check their answers with their peers before offering them to the whole class; activities which focused on content rather than form and the introduction of an element of competition in the activities.

The action research provided the teachers opportunities to identify the problems, and test the remedial measures in the classroom. However, the remedial strategies, which were claimed to be successful, were based only on analysis of one lesson per teacher. Observations over a longer period would provide better opportunities to explore their strengths and weaknesses in different classroom contexts.

The effects of class size on language learning opportunities in the classroom were examined by Kumar (1992). This study was based on the observations of two small and two large ESL secondary classes in India. The initial emphasis of the study was on the amount of teacher talk in relation to student talk. For this purpose, audio recordings of the classroom interactions of a small class with less than 25 students and a large class with 45 students were analysed, measured in terms of the number of teacher and student turns.

Based on the findings, it was claimed that there was more teacher talk in the small class than in the large class. This finding seemed to indicate that the larger class provided greater opportunities for student interactions than the smaller class, which seemed to contradict the general assumption that there are less opportunities for interaction in the larger classes. However, observation data seemed to offer a possible explanation for this unexpected finding. It was found that in the larger class, the students were involved in a role-play while in the smaller class they were doing a grammar lesson. This led to further observations, which seemed to indicate the importance of the activities done in the class.

Contradictory evidence was found depending on the type of activity. In a large class where grammar was taught and a small class in which more communicative activities were observed, it was found that there was less pupil talk in the large class. Thus, Kumar concludes that class size alone may not be responsible for the amount of opportunities available for learners to interact in the classroom. Kumar's (1994) findings also suggest that it is the nature of the teaching/learning activities and the teacher's role which influence the nature of student interaction.
This study was based on four different classroom observations. Thus even though the class size and the activities were similar the type of students, the teachers and the classroom contexts were different. As a result, the difference in interaction patterns could be not only due to the activities and class size but also due to other variables such as the type of students in the class. Thus this study points to the need for more research in similar contexts to find out the possible effects of other variables in providing opportunities for learning.

While Kumar (1992) appears to suggest that class size per se does not affect opportunities for interaction, Shamim (1996) claims that it does. The main objective of Shamim's study was to examine the direct consequences of large classes for language learning. This study was conducted over a period of six months in six state schools in Pakistan. Two hundred and thirty two classes with students ranging from 45-100 or more were observed. In addition to this, 20 teachers and 21 groups of learners were interviewed by Shamim.

Classroom space was perceived by both teachers and students as divided into two distinct zones - the front and back of the classrooms. The teachers had definite opinions about the kinds of students who sat in the front as opposed to those who sat at the back of the room. They considered those who sat in the front as "industrious" and "hard working", having strong personality types and participating actively in the lesson. In contrast, those at the back were "dull" and "lazy", with weaker personalities and generally not interested in their work. While the students who sat in the front also had similar negative opinions of those who sat at the back, the ones at the back were contemptuous of the "tricks" played by those in the front to get the teacher's attention.

During interviews, the teachers did not acknowledge any difference in their interaction with students in different locations in the classrooms. However, observations indicated that the majority of the teachers created a smaller class within the larger class, being made up of students who sat in the front of the class. Difficult questions were asked from those who sat in the front while those at the back were expected mostly to repeat the answers. Those at the back were addressed mostly for punitive purposes.

The environment in the front zone of the class seemed to be more conducive to learning and more opportunities were provided for these students to participate in activities. In contrast, the atmosphere at the back zone seemed to be distracting and non-conducive to work with even minimal conditions for learning unavailable. As
Shamim (1996, P.142) described, "the back zone seems to have its own culture". Thus, even though the students in the front zone did not necessarily have a higher ability level, the availability of better conditions for learning motivated them to work harder and become "good" students.

The findings of this study appear to suggest that the general pattern of teacher-student interaction and the opportunities for language learning in the larger classes are linked to the location of the students in the classroom and the cultures associated with them. Students seemed to work better when they are under the direct "surveillance" of the teacher (1996, p.125). Yet, in large classes, close monitoring by the teacher is difficult due to inadequate space and lack of time. However, Shamim reports a few instances of the teacher trying to bring the students at the back of the class into the "action zone" by using various strategies such as asking questions, moving the students from the back to the front, the teacher moving around occasionally and keeping monitors at the back while the teacher still continued to teach from the front of the classroom. There were also a few students who were "highly motivated" for whom sitting at the back did not seem to have an adverse effect. However, they also tried to move to the "action zone".

Through its multiple data gathering techniques this study brings out the complexity of the classroom dynamics in large classes. While it suggests the need for close monitoring by teachers of the quality and quantity of their interactions with students in different locations in the classroom, and it also brings out the diversity of the student population in such classrooms. Thus, this study also highlights the need for future studies that examine classroom interaction in different sociocultural backgrounds.

The studies discussed in this section seem to indicate that taking a teaching methodology that is devised in one culture and importing it to another poses challenges for teachers and students. As Bailey and Nunan (1996, p.120) argue, "given the particularities of individual cultural contexts, any pedagogical proposal, of what ever complexion, needs to be contested against the local reality". Thus, the findings of these studies emphasis the need for more studies in local classroom contexts.
Chapter 3

THEORIES OF SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING

3.1 Introduction

An examination of SLA literature, for the purpose of this study is important for three main reasons. First, to trace any convergence between the implications of SLA literature at the time the learning materials were written and the recommended teaching methodology. Second, to identify ways Second Language Acquisition Research (henceforth SLAR) might inform interrogation of data and the recommendations for practice in Sri Lanka in the future. As Lightbown (1985) argues, SLAR at that time may not have progressed far enough in providing guidelines in either "what" or the "how" of second language teaching. However, since then SLA research has progressed as Lightbown (2000) argues "dramatically". It is "no longer correct to say that changes in language teaching have not been influenced by SLA research" (p.438). Third, the categories in COLT (Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching), the observational scheme which is used as one of the tools for the analysis of data in this study is "derived from theories of communicative language teaching and from related research in first and second language acquisition" (Spada & Frölich, 1995, p.2).

This review will begin with a discussion of the literature prior to the period the learning materials were prepared. It will illustrate the major shifts in the SLAR field, a field of research in a "continuous process of change" (Crookes, 1997, p.96), while building on and retaining some features of the earlier periods. As a result, each shift not only signals a change but also a "reinvention" (Crookes, 1997, p.96). This historical mapping of the SLAR field also shows that its development was contextualised in the changes that were taking place outside the second language pedagogy such as psychology and first language acquisition research. By the early 1980s, the SLAR field had become complex due to these outside influences as well as the combined focus of inquiry on the environment and learner internal capacities.
3.2 SLA studies and theories relating to input and interaction – prior to 1980s

3.2.1 The influence of behaviourism and structuralism

The first influences on SLA can be traced back to the 1950s. During this period the general learning theory dominant in psychology, behaviourism, and the dominant linguistic theory, structuralism, the linguistic theory mentioned in Chapter 2, had an impact on SLA. The behaviourists (for example Skinner, 1957) considered language learning, like any other learning as the formation of habits. The correct response of a learner to a stimulus in the environment, reinforced repeatedly, becomes a habit. Learning a first language was considered similar to learning a set of habits. Learning a second language, however, was more complex as the learner had already acquired a set of habits. In order to learn the second language the old habits had to be replaced with a new set of habits. This process was complicated as the old habits interfered with the new, both positively and negatively. The behaviourist psychologists argued that errors that might occur as a result of the interference of LI must be avoided as they might lead to wrong habit formation. Since learning was assumed to take place through imitation the language input that students were exposed to was considered important as it provided the model. It was believed that learning materials and teaching methodology could help learners overcome the conditioned habits of their LI in order to acquire L2.

This view expressed by the psychologists was also endorsed by the linguists of that time such as Fries (1945, cited in Mitchell & Myles 1998) and Lado (1964). They believed that the development of the second language was strongly influenced by the first language. Further, they adhered to a structuralist approach to language learning as discussed in Chapter 2. According to this approach language is a system of finite sets of 'patterns' or 'structures'. As a result, the linguists argued that the learning materials should be based on a scientific description of language to be learned and compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner. This combined influence of psychology and linguists resulted in the method of "contrastive analysis", to compare first and second languages in order to identify the areas of difficulty for the second language learners.

Even though most of the SLA theories of the 1950s were descriptive rather than based on empirical evidence, they had strong influence on pedagogy. The Audio Lingual Method, as discussed in Chapter 2, was based on behaviourist principles, the structural
view of language, and the findings of contrastive analysis. A teacher's role was to provide the correct model and to eliminate errors while the students imitated the teacher and learnt the structures through drilling and reinforcement. Therefore, SLA literature in the 1950s laid more importance on the language learning environment in the form of correct models than on learners' internal learning mechanisms, and proposed a direct relationship between input and output.

3.2.2 The influence of cognitive psychology and the LAD

A major shift in thinking in psychology and linguistics, which began in the later part of the 1950s and continued to 1960s, challenged the existing view of SLA. The behaviourists' emphasis on the role of environment in learning fell into disfavour with the psychologists' interest shifting from observable behaviour to cognitive processes such as perception, memory and, thought processes. As a result, they were interested in problems which involved the mind and language.

In the field of linguistics, a similar shift in focus resulted with a focus on the role of learner internal capacities as opposed to the environment. This emphasis resulted, as some writers (for example, Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Rivers, 1968) claim, in a 'mentalist' view of L1 acquisition. The mentalists maintained that learners' brains are especially equipped with a Language Acquisition Device (LAD), which contained a 'Universal Grammar' (UG) which specified the essential form any language could take. What is necessary for acquisition to take place is minimal exposure to input which acts only as a trigger for the acquisition process. Mentalist views were triggered by the publications of prominent linguists, Chomsky (1965) and Corder (1967). Chomsky, as discussed in Chapter 2, argued that the structuralists' views on language as comprising of patterns were narrow as they were based on the description of 'surface structures'. He maintained that language consists of both surface and deep structures and the learning of patterns alone is not sufficient to account for the creativity of language.

Further, Chomsky (1965) challenged the behaviouristic view of language acquisition, with his critique of Skinner's (1957) *Verbal Behaviour*. He argued that the language acquisition process was one of rule formation rather than habit formation. He claimed that humans possess an innate ability to induce the rules of the target language from the input to which they are exposed. Once the rules are acquired learners can create and understand novel utterances. Citing errors such as overgeneralisation found in first language acquirers' speech, he claimed that such errors suggested that learners have internalised the rules but not mastered their limitations. He therefore, argued that errors
are developmental, as with time learners will learn the limitations and overcome the errors.

The idea that the learner can act on the input contrasted with the behaviourist view that the learner is a passive recipient of input. While the behaviourists considered errors as detrimental to L2 acquisition, for the mentalists errors were a positive sign. Further, for the mentalists, the learner internal capacity was more important than the learning environment in the form of input, as input acts only as a trigger in the acquisition process. As a result of these developments in the fields of psychology, linguistics, first language acquisition and "error analysis", researchers and teachers were more interested in learners' language output or "performance" in order to understand the acquisition process than in the language learning environment.

In contrast to the SLAR in 1950s, there was no teaching methods directly related to SLAR in the 1960s. Yet, as described in Chapter 2, the influence of Chomsky's views and the learning theories can be seen in the cognitive code learning method. This method assigns a central role to the learner. The teacher's role is to recognise the importance of the student's mental assets and mental activity in learning. Thus, a parallel can be drawn with this method and the interest in SLAR at that time on learner's internal capacity in language acquisition.

3.2.3 The influence of developmental psychology, error analysis and interlanguage

Chomsky's views, which related to L1 learning, led many SLA researchers (for example, Dulay and Burt, 1974) to examine whether these views could be applied to L2 acquisition. L2 learners were found to commit similar developmental errors, which were not the result of L1 interference. Further, as Rivers (1968) states, the credibility of "contrastive analysis" also began to be questioned by some of the practising teachers, as they found some of the differences between pairs of languages did not create difficulties for the learners. As a result, it became necessary to study learner errors, and "error analysis" developed as the systematic investigation of second language learners' errors. Corder (1967) in The significance of learners' errors focused attention on the importance of studying learner errors, as all errors could not be attributed to L1.

Researchers who analysed second language errors and compared them with the errors of first language learners revealed that some second language learner errors were
neither target like nor the results of the influence of L1. This resulted in the view of a separate linguistic system which Selinker (1972) terms as "interlanguage". This focus on second language learning as a separate system from L1 learning is considered the beginning of SLAR as a field of its own.

According to Selinker (1972) the learner's development of the target language grammar was a separate linguistic system in its own right and was not governed by the rules of either L1 or L2. In order to develop the "interlanguage" learners need to relate the input they receive to their existing knowledge. One view of explaining this process was proposed by cognitive psychologists. According to them learners' achieve this by using the general cognitive strategies they use in L1 learning. An alternative view was expressed by the mentalists, that is that LAD is used to identify the rules in the input. Selinker's concept of interlanguage was also aligned with Piaget's views on cognitive development, according to which inner forces drive the child to interact with the environment. The concept of "interlanguage", therefore, combined the views of both the linguists as well as psychologists. Furthermore, the concept of "interlanguage" signalled a further shift of focus in the SLA field. This combined influence of both the input and the learner internal capacities made SLA more complex.

While error analysis continued as a mode of data analysis, some writers (for example, Celce-Murcia, 1991) felt it was inadequate to account for the now increasingly complex nature of theories of SLA. Error analysis focused only on errors and neglected the study of what the learners did correctly so that researchers did not get the whole picture of how learners learn a second language. The focus of inquiry, therefore, had to shift to learners' performance, that is, both errors as well as well-formed utterances (Larsen-Freeman, 1991). Studies from this point in time indicated that learners from widely divergent L1 backgrounds, who were learning English as a second language, appeared to acquire grammatical morphemes in almost the same order (Dulay & Burt, 1974). On the basis of this evidence the SLA process was conceptualised as a "creative construction", in which the language learners organise the language they hear according to the rules they construct to understand and generate sentences. According to Dulay et al (1982), this was a subconscious process. The analysis of learner performance and the morpheme studies also supported Selinker's concept of "interlanguage" and that second language acquisition was a process of interaction between the language environment and a learner's internal mechanism.

The focus of inquiry in SLA studies in the early 1970s was on learner performance. However, there was a shift in focus from errors in 1960s to both errors and well
formed utterances in the 1970s. Thus, the focus of SLA studies in the 1970s was the result of both the behaviourist and mentalist views.

SLA studies up to this point looked at learner performance in order to find out how learners acquire language forms. The assumption was that in order to speak a person must first learn the grammatical structures either through the environment or with the help of an internal mechanism. However, Wagner-Gough (1975) claimed that certain utterances were uninterpretable by only looking at the learners' performance. For example, "I don't like meat" could be a statement, a complaint or a request for some other food, depending on the context in which it was said. In order to understand it was necessary to look at the input that resulted in the utterance. On the other hand. Hatch (1978) challenged the assumption that a person first learns to manipulate the structures then learns to speak by putting the structures together. Instead she argued that learning to converse, to interact verbally leads to the development of syntax. This view emphasises the social aspect of interaction. However, Hatch did not deny the importance of rule formation in interlanguage development.

3.2.4 Discourse analysis and the concept of scaffolding in SLA

Discourse analysis studies (for example, Wagner-Gough & Hatch, 1975) illustrate how learners' participation in conversational interaction provides them with opportunities to hear and produce the L2 in ways that go beyond its role as simply a means for practice. This view was further extended when Hatch (1978) argued that it is not enough to look only at input and the frequency of the forms in it, as this alone will not explain how a child learns.

Language learning, according to Hatch (1978) evolves out of learning how to carry on conversations. She emphasises the collaborative endeavours of the learners and their interlocutors in constructing discourse and suggests that syntactic structures could grow out of the process of building discourse. One way in which this can occur is through "scaffolding". Learners use the discourse to help them produce utterances that they would not be able to produce on their own.

Hatch (1978) citing both L1 and L2 acquisition data argues that discourse evolves not entirely due to an acquisition device, which is triggered by the input, but as a result of the conscious desire of the child to talk. According to Hatch (1978) the order of acquisition is a reflection of conversation growth. The type of questions the adult asks is controlled by the topic nominated by the child. Therefore, the adult does not
consciously simplify the input but the frequency of what is contained in the input is controlled by the child's topic of conversation. As a result what the child acquires first are the same syntactic forms as those in the input. Second language learners who know the rules for conversation from their first language but do not know anything about the second language find it difficult to nominate topics in early acquisition. As a result, the conversational partner has often to take control of the interaction by asking questions.

Hatch (1978) like some of the other SLA researchers, such as, Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) and Lightbown (1985) was hesitant in advocating implications for pedagogy. However, she suggests that the study of discourse analysis "might have tremendous implications for teaching, particularly teaching adults a second language" (1978, p.433).

In spite of Hatch's caution, her contribution to SLA is valuable for two main reasons. First, she encourages an alternative view on the nature of the learning process by asking researchers to turn their attention away from learners acquiring structures to examine how the learning of structures evolves out of communication. Second, she views interaction as an incorporation of linguistic, cognitive as well as social processes. However, as Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) point out, Hatch's (1978) views have not been empirically tested. Further, most of the studies she cites in support of her argument were conducted with language learners learning the L2 in environments where native speakers interacted with non native speakers. It is necessary therefore, to examine its applicability in other contexts. However, as Pica (1994, p.494) notes, with the publication of Hatch's (1978) work the importance of interaction, in language learning "once overlooked or at best taken for granted in SLA theory became a major focus and debate". Hatch's ideas, therefore, have led other SLA researchers to develop theoretical models to examine the connections between the properties of social discourse and the process of L2 learning.

An examination of studies related to input and interaction prior to 1980 indicates that there had been a shift in focus on the factors that influence SLA. This shift in focus reflects the views on language and language learning prevalent at that time in linguistics and general psychology. A major issue throughout has been whether the input shapes and controls learning or whether it is just a trigger, while the learner controls the learning. However, by the end of the 1970s SLA researchers were arguing that it is not only input to the learner but also the interaction between the input and the learner that is important in SLA. This change in perspective was paralleled by a shift in focus in language pedagogy towards a communicative approach. A further
development during this period was the move to an understanding of second language learning as largely independent of the LI of the learner. However, from this later point of view while there are differences between L1 and L2 acquisition, there are also similarities. Therefore, while the controversies regarding issues such as, the role of the linguistic environment, the learner, learner errors and the L1 continue, other areas such as the study of UG and discourse analysis have developed into sub fields in SLAR.

3.3 Theories relating to input and interaction after 1980.

The discussion of the theories prior to the 1980s pointed to a somewhat confused picture of debatable issues making SLAR an increasingly complex field. The discussion of the theories and writings in the 1980s shows that attempts have been made to address some of these issues, however, the major issues such as the role of input, interaction output and the role of the learner continue to draw the attention of some of the key figures in SLAR field (for example, Krashen, 1981, 1982, 1985; Long, 1983, 1985, 1996; Swain, 1985, Swain and Lapkin, 1995).

Krashen's (1981; 1982; 1985) "input hypothesis" argues the importance of making the input meaningful to the learner to acquire the L2. Long (1983, 1985) draws on the "input hypothesis" as support for his "interaction hypothesis". Long, while maintaining that input is necessary for acquisition, argues that input alone is not sufficient, as it is the interactional modifications that promote language acquisition. Swain's (1985) "output hypothesis" emphasises the importance of output. The significance of these three theoreticians is that they use each other's hypotheses as a basis for their arguments. However, all three models can be traced back to SLA studies prior to the 1980s, especially to the work of Hatch (1978) and Wagner-Gough (1975).

3.3.1 Input Hypothesis

Krashen's "input hypothesis" (1982; 1985) supports Hatch's views on the role of input simplifications such as foreigner talk on SLA. On the other hand, Krashen believes that language production does not have a direct influence on SLA. Therefore, his views are not in keeping with Hatch's arguments concerning interaction. In contrast to Hatch (1978), Krashen (1982) argues that his theory has implications for pedagogy. Further, the Natural Approach (Krashen & Terrell, 1983) is based on his theory and some writers (for example, Lightbown, 1985; Richards & Rodgers, 1986) associate it with CLT.
However, Krashen's theory is not without its own problems and has been criticised for a number of reasons (see for example, Ellis, 1994; Gregg, 1984; Long, 1983; McLaughlin, 1987; White, 1987). The criticisms centre mainly on his distinction between acquisition and learning, his claim that they are two separate processes and that input alone is sufficient for language acquisition to take place, and the lack of empirical evidence to support the hypothesis. As mentioned earlier in Chapter 2, Krashen (1982) makes the controversial distinction between acquisition and learning. Acquisition for him means to "pick up" a language and is similar to learning a first language. On the other hand, learning is conscious knowledge about language or grammar. Fluency in a second language is due to acquisition, and learning is useful only as a monitor or editor. For Krashen, acquisition and learning are two different processes and the language knowledge acquired/learned cannot be integrated. However, other researchers (for example, Gregg, 1984; McLaughlin, 1987) disagree with Krashen, and this debate regarding the distinction between acquisition and learning continues up to the present (for example, Zobl, 1995).

However, for the purpose of this study, Krashen's hypothesis is valuable in the possibilities it claims to offer in providing a theoretical base for CLT. In addition, it also describes one possible role for input in second language learning.

The "input hypothesis" is that if input is made comprehensible to the learner acquisition will take place. According to Krashen input is "what we read and hear" and output is "what we speak and write" (Krashen, 1982, p.57). He believes that in order for language acquisition to occur the acquirer must understand input that contains structures "a bit beyond" his or her current level of competence (Krashen, 1982, p.21). For instance, if the current level of competence is 'i', the input he or she understands should contain i+1. By understanding, Krashen means the understanding of meaning and not form. It is presumed that structures are acquired if the learner is ready, as a result of understanding meaning. Further, while the input needs to contain i+1, it is not necessary to deliberately focus on providing i+1. His argument is that, if comprehensible input is provided, i+1 will be available automatically. Krashen's claim is that comprehensible input that is relevant or interesting to the acquirer, but not necessarily grammatically sequenced, if supplied in sufficient quantity, will promote acquisition.

Another view regarding language input has been provided by Corder (1967). He pointed out that while second language learners, particularly those who live in the target language culture, are exposed to a large amount of comprehensible input, they
are unable to make use of all of it. Corder argued that all input would not become "intake". Elaborating on Corder's concept that input has to be converted into "intake" for acquisition to take place Krashen (1983 cited in Mitchell and Myles, 1998) proposed that the learner should "notice a gap" between his/her current level of competence and the i+1 form in order for acquisition to take place. However, in his later version of the input hypothesis (Krashen, 1985) has not mentioned this condition. According to this version of the input hypothesis exposure to comprehensible input is both "necessary and sufficient" for second language acquisition to take place (p. 2).

Krashen accepts that at the beginner stage "the second language classroom is potentially very useful for second language acquisition" (Krashen, 1981, p. 103). However, he claims that the outside world can supply more comprehensible input (Krashen, 1982, p. 58). The classroom is of benefit only when "it is the major source of comprehensible input. The role of the teacher, according to Krashen is "not only to provide grammar instruction" but also to provide "the simpler 'teacher talk', the comprehensible input" (Krashen, 1982, p. 22). Teachers are advised to aid comprehension in two ways. First, through linguistic means by simplifying language. Second, through non-linguistic means such as by providing extra linguistic support in the form of realia and pictures, teachers can also aid comprehension by discussing topics that are familiar to the students and taking advantage of the student's knowledge of the world. However, though Krashen claims that comprehensible input is "necessary", he argues that all comprehensible input will not automatically lead to acquisition (P. 66). He maintains that affective factors such as negative attitudes towards the language will not let the input reach the learner's LAD (Krashen, 1982). Therefore, teachers must not only provide comprehensible input but also provide an environment, which lets the learners' "affective filter" down. Thus, Krashen acknowledges the mentalist's view of a language acquisition device, yet, since language acquisition is not understood as a conscious process, the language learning environment is more important than the learner's internal mechanism.

Krashen is also critical of error correction for its potential to make students defensive and adversely affect the affective filter. Krashen maintains that error correction is "not of direct benefit to language acquisition" and "a safe procedure is simply to eliminate error correction in communicative type of activities" (1982, p. 76).

The implications of Krashen's "input hypothesis" for the role of the teacher as provider of meaningful input, the role of grammar teaching and error correction is similar to the characteristics of the "strong form" of CLT mentioned earlier. According to Howatt
(1984), in the strong form of CLT the emphasis is on meaningful input without attention to language form or error correction. However, while CLT advocates interaction, Krashen's hypothesis does not propose that interaction has an important role in language acquisition. According to the input hypothesis, speech "emerges" after the learner has built up sufficient competence via input. Therefore, it is not necessary to teach speaking. Generally, acquirers talk when they are "ready", and there is some individual variations as to when this 'silent period' ends (1985, p.2). On the other hand, however, Krashen (1982) argues that output has an indirect contribution to make to language acquisition. The more a person speaks the more people will talk in return. This will result in more input, thus increasing the quantity of input. He also admits that output also affects the quality of input directed at the acquirer, and that "engaging in conversation is probably much more effective" for language acquisition than "eavesdropping" (Krashen, 1982, P.61). He illustrates the indirect connection between conversation and language acquisition as follows.

\[
\text{Input} \rightarrow \text{Language acquisition} \rightarrow \text{Output} \rightarrow \text{Conversation}
\]

(Krashen, 1982, p.61)

However, Krashen's views on output are contradictory. As this diagram illustrates input results in acquisition, and acquisition is assumed to lead to output. According to this argument acquisition takes place irrespective of output. If so, it is not necessary to increase the quality of input through output and conversation, to promote acquisition. Krashen's input hypothesis emphasises the importance of language input rather than interaction or output in promoting language acquisition. As a result, he claims that language teaching methods such as The Natural Approach which advocates that students should be exposed to comprehensible language before production are more successful than teaching methodology which promotes language production. Although, Krashen's claims that "the input hypothesis, may be the single most important concept in second language acquisition theory today because it attempts to answer the crucial theoretical question of how we acquire language" (Krashen, 1982, p.9) has to be viewed with caution his theory has appealed to teachers who were looking for "something simple and concrete on which to base their methodology" (Brown, 1994, p.280). As Lightbown (2000) argues Krashen's views had become so integrated in their teaching the teachers were "confident that any attention to language form would cause students to feel stressed or anxious" that they rejected teaching
language form (p. 433). Thus, Krashen's views may have influenced CLT and ESL teaching in Sri Lanka as well. Further, this hypothesis led many other researchers to investigate Krashen's claims and propose alternative theoretical perspectives.

3.3.2 Interaction Hypothesis

Long (1983, 1985), while arguing that comprehensible input is important, emphasises that it alone is not sufficient for acquisition to take place. He maintains that comprehensible input will be more effective in language acquisition when modified through interactional modifications. In his early version of the "interaction hypothesis", Long (1983) proposes that the more adjustments speakers make in their attempts to communicate, the greater the opportunities for second language acquisition, as they create comprehensible input. As some writers such as Mitchell and Myles (1998), Mackey and Philp (1998) and Long (1983) himself have pointed out the "interaction hypothesis" is an extension of Krashen's input hypothesis. It has also been traced to Hatch's (1978) work (for example, by Long, 1983; Mackey, 1999; Perrett, 1990). Long's hypothesis has changed over the years.

Based on a study of Native Speaker (NS) to Non Native Speaker (NNS) conversation, Long (1983), argues that there is a relationship between conversational interaction and acquisition. He suggests an indirect method based on three steps to investigate this relationship.

Step1 Show that (a) linguistic/conversational adjustments promote (b) comprehension.
Step2 Show that (b) comprehensible input promotes (c) acquisition.
Step3 Deduce that (a) linguistic/conversational adjustments promote (c) acquisition. (Long, 1985, p.378)

The first part of this "interaction hypothesis" Long claims, is supported by the 'evidence' Krashen cites for his input hypothesis. However, Long maintains that such evidence though "consistent" with Krashen's claim "is not very strong" (p.340). As "strong" evidence, Long (1983), points out that access to comprehensible input is a characteristic of all cases of successful first and second language acquisition. Second, he suggests that the results of the comparative methods studies, seem to indicate that greater quantities of comprehensible input result in better or faster acquisition. Finally, citing Swain (1974) and Tucker (1980) he argues that the superiority of the immersion programs over other SL/FL programs also supports this view. He maintains that those
programs are superior due to the availability of comprehensible input. In addition, he cites findings of research (for example, Bard & Sachs, 1977; Sachs & Johnson, 1976 cited in Long, 1983) as evidence that the delay in language acquisition of hearing children of deaf parents, indicates that lack of access to comprehensible input results in little or no acquisition. Considering these evidence as well as the evidence provided by Krashen. Long (1983, p.341) maintains that "it seems that all the available evidence is consistent with the idea that a beginning learner, must have comprehensible input if he or she is to acquire either a first or second language".

The second part of Long's argument is that conversational modifications lead to better comprehension. While Krashen (1982) argues that it is the modifications to the language input such as "foreigner talk" which aid comprehensible input, and which result in comprehensible input. Long (1983) argues against this for two reasons. First, that input modifications often claimed to characterise foreigner talk did not have empirical basis, nor is there evidence that such modifications facilitate comprehension. Second, he questions the efficacy of removing from the input structures that make comprehensibility difficult for the learners, as this might retard the learner advancing to the next stage of development. On the other hand, Long does agree with Hatch (1978) and Krashen (1981) that the use of linguistic and extra linguistic context and directing the conversation to the "here and now" help in making input comprehensible (p.342). However, he argues that "the most important and most widely used" way of making input comprehensible is the modifications to the "interactional structure of conversation through such devices as self and other-repetition, confirmation and comprehension checks and clarification requests" (Long, 1983, p.342). He claims that these are specially facilitative of acquisition as they help to make "unfamiliar linguistic input comprehensible (Long, 1983, p.343). He cites findings of his study (Long, 1980 and those of Gaies, 1981 and Sperry, 1981 cited in Long, 1983) as support for his argument.

Long (1983) claims that as there is evidence to support step 1 and 2 of his argument the third step, that is that conversational modifications promote acquisition can be deduced. In contrast to the general lack of consensus that prevailed in the early 1980s in SLAR field and the hesitancy of theoreticians and researchers to advocate implications of their findings to pedagogy, Long's claim that his research findings "permit some initial generalisations to be made concerning the success of SL instruction in providing classroom learners with comprehensible input" (1983, p.346) is significant.
Long's claim regarding pedagogy is important as some of his implications were based on classroom studies, even though their generalisability is questionable. Long and Sato (1983) compared the classroom conversation of six ESL teachers with their elementary level students, mostly young adults, from different L1 backgrounds, with 36 informal NS-NNS conversation outside classroom. They claimed that the classroom data comprised mostly of "display" or what Mehan (1979) refers to as "known information" questions, and relatively few "referential" or unknown information questions, compared with the NS-NNS conversation outside the class. Based on this study they concluded that the second language classrooms, at least at the elementary level, did not offer much opportunity to the learner to communicate in the target language and that ESL classroom conversation in that study "reflected something approaching a pure transmission model of education" (Long, 1983, p.349).

Instruction in the second language, according to Long (1983) takes place at the expense of communication and comprehensible input. He argues that, since the students were able to respond appropriately to the teachers, the input they received was comprehensible. On the other hand, he argues that the input was "impoverished" both quantitatively and qualitatively. Qualitatively, the input, that is the teacher's use of language, consisted of structurally and lexically controlled sentences, which were repeated several times. According to Long (1983), like many others (for example, White and Lightbown, 1984; Pica and Long, 1986) classroom data follows a common pattern consisting of a teacher question, a student response and a teacher reaction/evaluation. The same pattern is repeated as sentence patterns are often drilled. Therefore, Long (1983) claims that quantitatively too, the input is lacking, as an exchange comprising of three sentences becomes the total input for the class. The implication is that the classrooms do not provide the type of interaction that leads to comprehensible input which in turn results in acquisition.

The findings of Long and Sato (1983) regarding teacher input are significant as their findings in second language classrooms support the general view (for example, Mehan, 1979) that, "teacher talk" alone is not sufficient for any learning to take place. However, Long and Sato's study has led other researchers to examine classroom communication in second language classrooms, some of which have questioned their findings (for example, Banbrook & Skehan, 1989) while others support the "interaction hypothesis" (for example, Pica et al, 1987; Varonis & Gass, 1985). Thus, Long and Sato's (1983) study has contributed to classroom interaction research, which has become a sub field of its own as discussed in works such as Allwright and Bailey (1991) Bailey and Nunan (1996) Chaudron (1988) Tsui (1995) and van Lier (1988). As
a result Long's pedagogic implications of the "interaction hypothesis" are significant for the purpose of this study, which also examines teacher/pupil interaction in classrooms which claims to be communicative.

Based on the Long and Sato (1983) study and the "interaction hypothesis", Long makes recommendations for second language pedagogy. He believes that the relative emphasis laid on accuracy over communication in the teaching of grammar has to change with more attention given to communication. In order to achieve this he proposes that teaching materials should contain tasks in which students engage as "informational equals" (Long, 1983, p.351). In order to increase the quantity of the input he suggests using a wider variety of "two way" tasks and also to carry out tasks in smaller groups. These changes, he argues, while enabling a focus on formal accuracy in some phases of teaching, will also approximate classroom conversation to that of NS-NNS conversation outside classroom, thereby facilitating SLA in a classroom setting (Long, 1983).

There have been several studies on group work and interaction based on Long's "interaction hypothesis". Most of these studies (for example, Doughty & Pica, 1986; Gass & Varonis, 1994; Mackey, 1999; Mackey & Philp, 1998; Pica, 1987 and Polio & Gass, 1998) support Long's views that small group work increase the quality of language input and provides more opportunities for language learning through interaction. Although most of these studies have involved adult learners there are a few studies (for example, Heimback, 1994 and Oliver, 1998) which claim that even young children are successful in interacting to obtain comprehensible input. The implications are that given the right task the students can engage in negotiation of meaning and the more opportunities they are provided with, the better for language acquisition.

The claim that two way information tasks provide more opportunities for interaction has also been questioned. For instance, a study by Foster (1998) in a natural classroom setting reports that while there was a trend for pairs involved in two-way tasks to produce more negotiated interaction, there was no clear overall effect for task type or grouping. However, many students in the small groups did not talk at all, while many more did not initiate negotiated interaction. The difference in the results of Foster's study and the earlier studies indicate the importance of the setting in which the interactions take place. Further, in Foster's study there were wide individual variations in performance, which indicate the importance of learner characteristics.
Revised Interaction Hypothesis
In his updated version of the so called Interaction Hypothesis”, Long (1996, p.414) states that neither the environment nor innate knowledge is sufficient for language acquisition to take place. He proposes that "environmental contributions to acquisition are mediated by selective attention and the learner's developing L2 processing capacity, and that these resources are brought together most usefully, although not exclusively, during negotiation for meaning" (Long, 1996, p.414). Long admits that the linguistic environment for SLA may be considered in different ways. However, in this version of the hypothesis, it is the "positive or negative evidence speakers or writers provide learners about the target language" (p.413) which is assumed to provide the linguistic environment. Therefore, input for Long (1996) is more specific than Krashen's (1982, p. 57) definition of "what people hear and read".

Interaction, for Long in this version of the hypothesis, is one way in which negative feedback in the form of recasts is elicited. He defines recasts as "utterances which rephrase a child's utterance by changing one or more sentence components (subject, verb or object) while still referring to its central meaning" (p.434). The concept of recasts can be considered as one form of error correction, which continues to draw attention in SLAR. The recasts according to Long are facilitative, at least in some part of L2 development such as vocabulary, morphology and language-specific syntax. In a later experimental study Long, (Long et al, 1998) claims that learners benefit more from intensive recasts than from interactive recasts.

The findings of several studies (for example, Gass, 1988, 1997; Mackey & Philp, 1998) claim that recasts are beneficial for second language development. However, an analysis of interaction in four primary immersion classes (Lyster & Ranta, 1997), which had been earlier identified, using COLT (Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching) observational scheme, as communicatively oriented, did not confirm Long's view. Lyster and Ranta, claim that recasts did not lead to student incorporation of repair as recasts already provide correct forms to learners. Thus, they argue that it is more profitable to the students when "there is negotiation of form, that is, when the correct form is not provided to the students – as it is in recasts and explicit correction and when signals are provided to the learner that assist in the reformulation of the erroneous utterance" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p.58). Further, Lyster (1998) claims that recasts do not allow for much negotiation to occur between teachers and learners (p.76)
Input plays a lesser role in this version of the interaction hypothesis than in the earlier versions or in Krashen's input hypothesis. Citing the immersion students' inability to achieve native-like grammatical competence, Long (1996) argues, supporting Swain's (1985) claim, that comprehensible input alone is insufficient for language acquisition to take place. He argues instead that, paradoxically, comprehensible input may actually inhibit learning on occasion, because it is often possible to understand a message without understanding all the structures and lexical items in the language encoding it, and without being aware of not understanding them all. Thus, he accepts White's (1987) argument for a need for negative evidence— that is, that in cases where learner hypotheses or the structure of the L1 leads to L2 overgeneralisation, it is difficult for the learners to correct their mistakes only by being exposed to positive evidence. Negative evidence is judged to be essential only in such instances.

How input becomes 'intake', the distinction made by Corder (1967) is another issue discussed in the later version of the interaction hypothesis. According to Long (1996) learner's processing capacities and the attention to form may mediate the extent to which L2 input becomes incorporated into the learner's interlanguage as intake. This argument is based on Schmidt (1990) and Long (1988). While Schmidt claims that "noticing" or "conscious perception" is necessary for converting input into output, Long suggests that focus on form is "probably a key feature in instructed learning because of the saliency it brings to target features of classroom input" (1988, p.136). However, for Long (1996) "focus on form" differs from "focus on forms". The latter, he argues is similar to a structured syllabus, which presents grammatical items in isolation. On the other hand, focus on form presents language as object during meaning-oriented activities where the focus is on both form and meaning.

Spoken production Long considers "probably" useful, as it elicits negative input and encourages learners to analyse input grammatically and thereby improve accuracy. Further, it helps acquisition by pushing learners, as suggested by Nobuyoshi and Ellis (1993), to increase control over forms they have already internalised.

The revised "interaction hypothesis", therefore, "connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention and output in productive ways" (Long, 1996, p.452). As a result, the later version of the "interaction hypothesis" attempts to explain SLA from a broader perspective than in the earlier version. SLA is not assumed to be the result of individual efforts of either input, interaction, output or learner mediation, but the combined effort of all these factors. In addition, in the later version there is a
more focus on teaching language "form" than in the earlier version which focused more on meaning oriented activities.

3.3.3 Comprehensible Output Hypothesis

In contrast to Krashen, who claims that "comprehensible input" is sufficient for language acquisition to take place and output does not directly help acquisition, Swain (1985) claims that language acquisition is promoted not only by receiving comprehensible input, but also through the opportunities provided to learners to produce the language.

Based on the studies of Canadian French immersion programs (Harley & Swain, 1978, cited in Swain, 1985) Swain shows that although the immersion students achieve fluency in the second language, they fail to acquire native like grammatical competence. Swain (1985) argues that since the immersion classrooms are rich in comprehensible input, the failure to be grammatically correct cannot be due to lack of input.

The inability of the students to gain full grammatical competence, Swain speculates, might be because they did not have enough opportunity to talk or were not "pushed" in the output they produced. Swain describes learners as being "pushed" into developing their linguistic abilities when they participate in meaningful interaction. Further, for learners to actually produce the language, they must attend to both the meaning of what they say and the form of how to say it. This she claims forces learners to move from semantic to syntactic processing. This view is similar to Hatch's (1978) argument that learners develop syntax through conversation. Swain maintains that simply being able to access comprehensible input alone will not help the learners to achieve full grammatical competence. She emphasises the importance of language production in social interaction, because it gives the learners opportunities to try out their knowledge of the language. She argues that language production in isolation, for instance, in a language laboratory, will not provide this opportunity.

Revised Output Hypothesis

The "output hypothesis" (Swain, 1985), has been extended by Swain and Lapkin (1995). They argue that problems that arise while producing the second language can trigger cognitive processes that are involved in second language learning. This argument is an elaboration of Schmidt & Frota's (1986, p.311) view that a second language learner will begin to acquire the target like form if and only if it is present in
comprehended input and "noticed" consciously. Swain and Lapkin (1995) suggest that output is one of the triggers for noticing the target language forms. Based on a study of young adolescent learners of French, thinking aloud while writing in their L2, Swain and Lapkin (1995) claim that learners become aware of gaps in their linguistic knowledge as they produce their L2. The learners in this study who were encountering problems in producing L2, even when external feedback was unavailable engaged in thought processes which could play a role in second language learning. Swain and Lapkin (1995), therefore concluded that the communicative need which arose as a result of attempting the task forced the learners into thinking about the linguistic forms necessary for the output, which meant the learners moved from semantic to grammatical processing. They also claimed to find important differences in the grammatical analysis of higher and lower proficiency learners, which they believed might have implications for pedagogy.

On the basis of their studies, they also suggest that collaborative dialogue is useful for understanding L2 learning. In a later study, Swain & Lapkin (1998) analysed the dialogue between two learners in which they talk about the language they were producing or writing, as they attempted to solve a linguistic problem. Based on their analysis Swain and Lapkin claimed that language is both the means of communication and a tool for thinking. They argue that collaborative dialogue provides both the occasion for language learning and the evidence for it. For instance, while negotiation occurs when there is a breakdown in communication, collaboration provides support through scaffolding for language production. Swain and Lapkin (1998), also found that students in this study approached the same task differently and profited differently from the same task. This supports Foster's (1998) view that all students do not negotiate for meaning in the same way while engaged in the same task.

There have also been studies which examined whether the output produced by the learners as a result of negotiation for meaning can benefit L2 development. Nobuyoshi and Ellis (1993) claimed that output that is pushed might help the learners in two ways. First, it will improve their immediate performance. Second, it increases the learners' control over the structures they have already acquired at least in the short term. This study seems to support Swain's (1985) claim that pushed output promotes grammatical accuracy. It has also been suggested by Izumi et al. (1999) that if output is to help draw the learners' attention to particular grammatical forms, the tasks they engage in could be able to control their focus of attention, while not overloading their processing capacity.
Swain suggests three ways in which output can help second language acquisition. First, it can serve a consciousness-raising function by helping learners to notice gaps in their interlanguages. Second, output helps learners to test hypotheses; it enables them to try out rules. Third, it provides learners with opportunities to identify their problems and discuss ways of solving them. The comprehensible output hypothesis is important as it stresses the importance of production while not denying the importance of input.

The revised versions of both the "interaction" and the "output hypotheses" focus more on the learner. They place a greater emphasis on the learner in "noticing" mismatches between their output and the input they receive than in the earlier versions of the hypotheses. The later version of the interaction hypothesis also draws attention to "focus on form", as facilitating second language development.

3.4 Focus on Form

"Form-focused instruction", which SLA researchers refer to as "the attempt to focus learners' attention on specific forms and the meaning they realise" (Ellis, 1997, p.41) has been a controversial issue.

In the early versions of the "input" and "interaction" hypothesis (for example, Krashen, 1982 and Long, 1983) there was little attention to teaching language form. However, in the later version of the "interaction hypothesis" (Long, 1996) there is more emphasis on the role of grammar or focus on form. It is increasingly acknowledged in recent SLA literature as discussed earlier in this Chapter that learners must not only attend to the meaning and comprehensibility of input, but to the forms that shape the language input. There have also been a number of empirical studies (cited in Larsen-Freeman & Long 1991 and Ellis, 1994) which indicate that learners who received grammar focused instruction did better than those who did not, both with regard to rate of acquisition and level of achievement. There are also claims that a focus on form within an overall communicative context contributes to a higher level of accuracy and language development (Lightbown and Spada, 1993; Spada, 1997; Lyster, 1994; White, Spada, Lichtbown and Ranta 1991). On the other hand, there have also been studies which suggest that grammar instruction does not seem to make a marked difference to acquisition (for example, Pica, 1983).

The lack of emphasis on the teaching of grammar in early SLA theories seems to have been mirrored in language teaching practices. As Tonkyn (1994, p.2) points out that "until fairly recently the idea of singling out grammar for special attention in relation
to foreign language teaching would have seemed odd". Whereas in the Grammar Translation Method, as discussed in Chapter 2, the teaching of language meant primarily the teaching of grammar, the communicative approaches to language teaching tried to replicate in the classroom features of real communication outside the classroom. As a consequence of the emphasis on "real" communication there was less emphasis on the teaching of grammar. However, according to many writers (for example, Ellis, 1997 and Tonkyn, 1994) grammar seems to be back in language teaching.

In many second language classrooms which claimed to be communicative, like in Prabhu's Bangalore Project (1987) grammar teaching was visible, though not acknowledged. On the other hand, recent ESL literature (for example, Bygate, 1994; James, 1994; Mitchell, 1994) seems to provide support for some attention to teaching grammar. For instance, James (1994) argues that the teachers in their role of "explainer" need to provide the learner both positive and negative evidence about the language being learned. He suggests a grammar teaching strategy taking the learner's L1 as its starting point. Through this strategy learners can be made more aware of the rules of L2 through a heightened awareness of his/her L1 rules. Mitchell (1994) while supporting James's views emphasises the need to help the learners build an explicit model of the target language. This she believes will be useful in identifying problematic features of the L2, providing contrastive evidence with the learners' L1 as well as negative evidence on how the L2 system does not work. While James and Mitchell highlight the importance of providing grammatical knowledge to the learner, Bygate (1994) emphasises the need for manipulating task based or process approaches to language teaching to include the teaching of grammar. He explains how different tasks can be used to teach different aspects of language.

There is a shift in the 1990s in second language learning theories regarding form focused instruction. As Lightbown (2000, p.446) argues although the debate about the extent to which an explicit focus on grammar in a "genuinely communicative situation" affects learners' "linguistic competence" or "performance" continues, there is more research evidence at present for a relationship between explicit knowledge of grammar and language performance than in the 1980s. Rather than arguing for or against a focus on form researchers seem more interested in investigating the different ways in which such a focus can benefit language learning. Although such studies have not provided clear answers, they provide, as Mitchell (2000) points out some suggestions to teachers and course planners based on research findings such as:
grammar teaching should be planned and systematic, driven by a strategic vision of eventual desired outcomes;

it should nevertheless be 'rough tuned', offering learners at slightly different stages a range of opportunities to add increments to their grammar understanding;

grammar teaching could involve acceptance of classroom codeswitching and mother tongue use, at least with beginners;

it should be 'little and often', with much redundancy and revisiting of issues;

text-based problem solving grammar activities may be needed to develop learners' active, articulated knowledge about grammar;

active corrective feedback and elicitation will promote learners' active control of grammar; and

grammar teaching needs to be supported and embedded in meaning oriented activities and tasks, which give immediate opportunities for practice and use. (p.297)

As Mitchell (2000) points out these suggestions may not suit all contexts of second language teaching. Thus, research to examine the feasibility of implementing these suggestions in contexts such as Sri Lanka could support the development of effective practice in grammar teaching. Further, this knowledge needs to be made available to the teachers in order for them, as argued by Derewianka (2001) to evaluate their usefulness for various teaching contexts.

3.5 Communicative Language Teaching and SLAR.

Most proponents of CLT (for example, Breen & Candlin, 1980; Brumfit & Johnson, 1979) claim that CLT developed independently of SLA theories. The discussion in Chapter 2 indicated that some of the main issues addressed in CLT have been whether to focus on the teaching of form, meaning or both; the role of error correction; the role of LI, whether to emphasis accuracy or fluency; the role of the teacher and learner and the types of tasks that learners should engage. The SLA literature discussed in this Chapter showed that some of these concerns have continued to draw the attention of the researchers and writers in SLA field as well. Therefore, as Lightbown (1985, p.181) claims the "convergence of language acquisition research findings and proposals for communicative language teaching practice" can at the least be considered a "happy coincidence". Further as Lightbown (2000, p.452) acknowledges "there is
now a rich literature of SLA research which can help shape teachers' expectations for themselves and their students, and provide valuable clues to effective pedagogical practice". Since SLAR has brought some "explanatory support" to CLT, even though, it may not have directly answered questions about teaching, it can help to understand the classroom language learning process.

Two areas in which CLT and SLA have come together in the last decade are task-based language teaching (TBLT) and discourse-based language teaching (DBL)

3.5.1 Task-based language teaching (TBLT)

Task-based syllabus design has interested curriculum developers and second language researchers even in the mid 1980s (Breen, 1987; Long, 1985; Nunan, 1987; Prabhu, 1987). As claimed by the proponents of TBLT (for example, Skehan, 1996, 1998; Willis, 1996) the last decade has seen a resurgent of interest in the use of tasks in second language learning which has led to the development of TBLT. A task-based approach takes task as the unit of analysis (Long & Crookes, 1992). Some writers (for example, Markee, 1997) consider TBLT as an umbrella term that subsumes the process syllabus, the procedural syllabus and pedagogical applications of some of the more recent theoretical and empirical work in SLA studies, and classroom research. According Long and Crooke’s definition pf TBLT it encompasses the use of the Procedural syllabus as in the Bangalore project (Prabhu, 1987) and the process syllabus (Breen, 1984) discussed in Chapter 2. Thus, as has been pointed out by some writers (for example, Burton, 1998) TBLT has led to various interpretations.

Long and Crookes (1992) however, make a distinction between the two syllabus types procedural and process and TBLT. According to them, the inclusion of both procedural and process syllabuses is problematic for several reasons. The tasks in these syllabuses are not based on any prior needs identifications which leads to problems for selection, grading and sequencing of tasks. Further, in these syllabuses, there is no explicit focus on language form and no clear indication of an underlying SLA theory or research. On the other hand, Markee, 1997 considers the use of procedural and process syllabuses as instances of TBLT. For example, the Bangalore Project is considered by Markee’s a successful instance of developing a teacher centred version of a task-based language learning project. However, as discussed in Chapter 2, an evaluation of the project (Beretta, 1992) demonstrated that 40% of the teachers who participated in this project were not well informed of the task-based methodology and did not understand how to use it.
TBLT is considered to be compatible with research findings on language learning, has a systematic approach to content selection and incorporates classroom centred research findings in making decisions regarding the designing of materials and methodology (Long & Crookes, 1992). Focus on form as discussed before which is a central focus in SLA literature is also a main issue in TBLT. In TBLT a focus on linguistic form is not scheduled in advance, but the teachers are expected to exploit opportunities that arise naturally from the interaction of learners and tasks to make the students notice linguistic forms. Further, as suggested by some writers (Long, 1983; 1985; Pica, 1987; Pica et al. 1989; Swain, 1995). the interactions produce negotiated comprehensible input and output leading to preconditions for second language development. In TBLT approach “target tasks” are identified through a needs analysis. “Pedagogical tasks” are derived from the “target tasks” to form the task-based syllabus. Pedagogical tasks are designed with no specific linguistic focus and the learners are expected to face successively more complex approximation of the “target tasks” (Long & Robinson, 1998, p.23).

Much research (for example, Bygate, 1996; Foster, 1998; Pica et al; 1993 Skehan, 1996, 2000; Willis, 1996) has been conducted to investigate the various characteristics of tasks. Nunan’s (1993, p.114) summary of this work shows that it centres on task difficulty, selective task effects, discourse features, participants in tasks and processing based outcomes such as fluency, accuracy and complexity of the language produced. While some of these studies (for example, Brown et al, 1984; Bygate, 1996. Foster & Skehan, 1996 and Pica et al, 1993) show positive effects of TBLT as mentioned earlier in this chapter others such as Foster’s (1998) findings indicate that all learners do not actively participate in TBLT and that they participate according to their cognitive and personality styles. Thus it could be said that though there is an extensive body of literature on TBLT it is still an emerging field.

As acknowledged by some writers (for example, Markee, 1997; Nunan, 1993 and Skehan, 1996) TBLT is not without its own problems with regards to implementation. These problems centre around issues such as conducting small group work in large classes, development of entire courses on TBLT and the feasibility of adopting such approaches in contexts where student assessment continues to be product oriented. Although TBLT may lead to greater fluency it is argued that it does not encourage a focus on form and as a result does not lead the students to long term language development (Skehan, 1996). However, Skehan (2000, p.25) citing research evidence accepts that “a meaning orientation need not prevent a concern for form.”
As claimed by some writers (for example, Long & Crookes, 1992; Markee, 1997 and Skehan, 2000) TBLT is still an emerging technology and much research is needed to judge how feasible it is in practice. Such studies can reveal generalizations about aspects of language use which can be viewed within the framework of task-based instruction, and that attention can be channelled towards meaning or towards form. As has been pointed out further research is needed to find out more about the effects of such factors as age, gender and ethnic background on the nature of interaction in tasks (Skehan, 1998).

While TBLT can be considered as one attempt at a learner centred curriculum model, discourse-based language teaching is another.

3.5.2 Discourse based language Teaching (DBLT)

Most communicative approaches to language teaching developed as a result of Hymes (1972) critique of Chomsky’s (1965) views on linguistic competence and the introduction of the concept of “communicative competence” (see Chapter 2). As a result a distinction between the “rules of use” and the “rules of grammar” arose with the priority of the former over the later. This differentiation in theory could be discerned in classroom practice as well. However as discussed by proponents of DBLT (Burton, 1998; McCarthy & Carter, 1994) linguistic analysis and discourse analysis is inseparable. Thus DBL could be considered as one way of exploring the relationship between linguistic competence and communicative competence.

Parallel however to the development of Hyme’s views, Chomsky’s ideas continued to influence the work on learner errors (Corder, 1967) and “interlanguage studies” (Selinker, 1971) which has in turn led to a central focus on language as an aspect of individual cognition and mental processes in SLA studies. These developments it is claimed have led to a tension between these two perspectives – mental orientation and social and contextual orientation - to language “resulting in distorted descriptions of views on discourse, communication, and interpersonal meaning – the quintessential elements of language” (Firth & Wagner, 1997, p.288)

Discourse Based Approaches help both the teachers and students. They are based on the premise that in order to understand the relationship between the linguistic patterns
and the social context in which they function teachers need to collect, transcribe and analyse short stretches of classroom discourse from their own teaching (McCarthy & Carter, 1994) When teachers analyse classroom discourse, it provides them with an opportunity to evaluate their own teaching strategies (Burton, 2000). The learners, it is believed can learn to take more responsibility for their own learning, stimulate collaborative analysis and be able to use language more successfully inside and outside the classroom (Burton, 1998; Freeman, 1992).

DBLT could also be considered as one way of redressing the imbalance between the focus in SLA on mental processes and the need to attend to the social context of language learning. For example, Clennell (1996) argues that identifying and classifying some of the features of strategic competence, such as interlanguage communication strategies, from a pragmatic, discourse based perspective which preserves the interactive quality of the negotiation process may provide insights into the role of negotiation and interaction in second language acquisition itself.

Further, such an approach reduces the reliance on textbooks. Texts produced by the students can be used as input for further discussion (Freeman, 1992). DBA can thus be considered as incorporating “communicative aspects of language use, the notion of task as course or syllabus organizer, and the principles of the learner-centred curriculum” (Burton, 1998, p.296).

DBLT has been used in countries such as Australia and Thailand to help teachers and students develop discourse strategies (Burton, 1998). Further, teachers have also examined the potential of using different teaching approaches they have developed based on analysis of their own classroom interactions (Burton, 1998; Freeman, 1992, Lynch, 2001). However, such approaches have been rarely tried much in developing countries such as Sri Lanka. Whereas in Maggie’s largest class in Freeman’s (1992) study there were only 25 students in some large classes in countries such as Sri Lanka, Pakistan and India there are between 50 and 120 students Further, in order for such approaches to be successful both the teachers and learners need to develop discourse analysis skills. Thus, in implementing DBA in countries such as Sri Lanka problems similar to those discussed in relation to CLT in China, India and Pakistan (Anderson.
1993; Kumar, 1992; Shamim, 1996) may be encountered. As discussed in Chapter 2, these problems include: large numbers in classes, product based examinations and the lack of resources. As argued by some writers (for example, Tudor, 1996) the success of any learner centred approach will also vary depending on both the human and organizational context within which teaching and learning is expected to take place. Factors such as the learners’ learning styles, their learning goals and the characteristics of the context in which they learn may affect the success of new innovations. On the other hand, DBA could be very helpful in contexts where teachers have to cater to groups of students with varying second language abilities using common textbooks. Therefore, more research into the use of DBLT in such situations is necessary as DBLT could be a useful approach in teacher development and to find out the possibility of using it as an effective approach for language learning.

3.6 Current thinking in SLA

Current research on the role of interaction in the L2 development continues to contribute to our understanding of the relationship between input, interaction and SLA. The theoretical framework for this study considered SLA literature relating to interaction from the perspective of an input-output model of L2 learning. However, it is noted (Mitchell & Myles, 1998) that there are less studies in classroom settings where more and less proficient non native speakers interact with each other. Long (1996) points out that most studies have been undertaken in culturally homogeneous settings in western education institutions. There is a need to investigate the type of interaction and its effect in classroom settings, like Sri Lanka, where it is expected that the cultural background inhibits interaction with the teacher and many other factors such as the limited exposure to the L2, the diversity of the socio economic backgrounds of the students, and large numbers in the class effect second language learning. The present study examines whether “interaction is facilitative of SLA” in such a setting in order to help the practising teachers improve their teaching practice.

As pointed out by some writers (for example, Lightbown, 2000) SLAR findings are not the only source to guide the ESL teachers in their practice. More recently, several writers (for example, Ellis, 1999; Firth & Wagner, 1997) argue for the need to supplement the input-output model of L2 learning with other theoretical perspectives. On the other hand, there are those who view interaction as a socio-cultural phenomenon which explains the necessary conditions for learning (Ellis, 1999;
Lantolf, 2000 and Lantolf & Appel, 1994 and Swain, 2000b). They advocate the introduction of Vygotsky's theory to SLAR. However, this is not a new concept as discussed before Hatch (1978) expressed a similar view in the context of second language development. As a result of this new interest in interaction from a socio-cultural perspective some researchers have examined classroom interaction using a combination of theoretical perspectives such as SLA theories and systemic functional grammar and SLA and socio-cultural theory (for example, Gibbons, 1998; Perrett, 1990 and Swain, 2000).

The observations in this study indicate that there is not much negotiation of meaning between students and teachers in the Sri Lankan classrooms in ways which are immediately evident. The socio-cultural norms of the classrooms seemed to mitigate against the students engaging in negotiation for meaning. In a socio-cultural approach to second language acquisition the starting point is that classroom practices are situated in particular cultural contexts and within these contexts, teaching is socially constructed (Holliday, 1994 and Sullivan, 2000). As argued by several writers (for example, Brown, 2000; Holliday, 1994, 1997 and Sullivan 2000) to assume that what works well in one setting works well in another is to ignore the interrelatedness of history, culture and pedagogy. Thus, it may be useful to examine teacher pupil interactions from a socio-cultural perspective in order to understand second language development in the classrooms.

According to the socio-cultural model of learning (Vygotsky, 1986), learning and cognitive development are interrelated. Cognition develops as a result of social interaction in which the child learns how to complete a task by sharing responsibility for that task with a more competent peer or adult. Vygotsky distinguishes two levels of development in a child – the "actual" and the "potential". While the actual development determines what a child is capable of understanding and doing alone, the potential development relates to what children are able to accomplish with the help of a more competent adult or peer. The difference between the actual and the potential, Vygotsky refers to as "the zone of proximal development" (p.85). Learning is expected to take place when children are helped by the experts through interaction. Such interactions occur through "verbal scaffolds" referred to by Bruner (1978) and similar to those found in caregiver-infant conversations. As discussed earlier in this Chapter, Hatch (1978) citing evidence from children learning a second language argues that a similar pattern is followed in learning a second language.
As suggested by some writers (for example, Gibbons, 1998, p.103) the socio-cultural model of language learning implies the notion of "apprenticeship into a culture" and is relevant in the ESL context as students are to be initiated into the culture of the second language. Such a model is relevant to the Sri Lankan context as the students are beginner learners and they need the support of an expert. According to this model the teachers can gradually reduce their support as students learn to take more responsibility and gain confidence.

Both the input-output model of language acquisition as well as Vygotsky's socio-cultural models of language learning describe language learning in terms of interaction. The "interaction hypothesis" suggests that the second language is acquired through negotiation of meaning in situations where breakdown in communication occurs. On the other hand, socio-cultural models view language learning through teacher pupil-interactions through collaborative tasks which may not always necessitate negotiation of meaning. The revised "output hypothesis" considers collaborative dialogue as a means of providing opportunities for focusing on language forms and thereby language production through scaffolding and thus complements Vygotsky's views. Thus a combined theoretical focus provides opportunities to look at classroom interaction from "multiple perspectives" (Pica, 1996, p.17) and help in better understanding second language acquisition in contexts like Sri Lanka.
Chapter 4

METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

The overall purpose of this study is to examine the role of classroom interaction in second language acquisition in Sri Lanka. The study aimed to achieve this purpose through the analysis of classroom interactions in four selected schools in Sri Lanka. The research design and methodology used in conducting the present study is discussed in this chapter.

4.2 Research methodology

The approach used in this project could be best be described as naturalistic research – that is the collection of data in the natural setting of the classroom – framed around four specific classes as cases. According to Punch (1998, p.150) "the case study aims to understand the case in depth, and in its natural setting, recognizing its complexity and its context". For this study multiple cases are studied to provide an understanding of how oral interactions in these Sri Lankan classrooms contributed to the learning of English as a second language.

A multiple case study approach is expected to provide a better understanding of each case, provide insights into an issue as well as extend the examination of this issue to other cases (Stake, 1995). As discussed in Chapter 1, the phenomenon of teaching English in the Sri Lankan schools is complex due to the diversity of the classes and the wider social cultural context which led to the development of ESL in Sri Lanka. The context of each class differs according to a range of variables such as the socio-economic background of the students, their prior English language learning experiences, the teacher’s experience and preparation for teaching English and the opportunities provided in the school for learning English. As a result, each class is a unique case. However, in each class the same learning materials which advocate oral
interactions are used to teach English. The case study approach it was believed, would enable me to examine the oral interactions in each classroom in the immediate context of the relationship between the teacher, the learner and the learning materials as well as against the wider ESL context in Sri Lanka. The selection of four schools from diverse backgrounds permitted comparison across cases. In keeping with the methodology of 'grounded theory' (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, p.158), the analysis of the data systematically gathered from the four case studies will contribute to theory regarding classroom interaction and second language learning in the ESL classrooms in Sri Lanka. The use of the multiple cases enabled me to focus both within and across cases (Punch, 1998).

In each school, a wide array of data collection sources was used. The main data gathering technique was non-participatory observation with audio recordings of oral interactions. Field notes, open ended interviews with teachers and documentation such as student learning materials, lesson notes, and student and teacher record books were also used as supplementary data. These multiple sources of evidence provided triangulation of data.

As a supplementary tool to gather information about the oral interactions in the different cases an observational scheme - COLT (Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching) was used. The use of an observational schedule has been criticised by some writers (for example, Allwright and Bailey, 1991; van Lier, 1988) as predetermining what is to be observed. However, some of these writers, such as van Lier (1988), while criticising the use of a single observation scheme, argue that such schemes could be valuable if they are one of a number of tools which might include lesson plans, field notes and interviews. Punch (1998) also acknowledges that although case studies are predominantly qualitative, a case study need not necessarily be a qualitative technique and may also use numerical data. Thus, as the observational scheme is used in this study as one of several other tools it will be of added value in understanding the oral interactions in each case.

It has also been argued by writers such as Nunan (1989) that there is no such thing as theory free observation. According to Nunan (1989, p.89), even without formal and predetermined observation schedules, "we bring with us our own interior 'observation schedule' which will be framed in terms of our own beliefs, attitudes and ideologies about language, learning and teaching".

Originally, my intention was to use COLT as the primary analytic tool. Thus, all five
lessons observed for analysis were coded using both COLT A and B. However, this exercise made me realise that it narrows the focus of the study and I would not be able to bring out the diversity in the different classrooms that was observed and indicated when reading the transcripts and the field notes. Therefore, I decided to describe, analyse and interpret the lessons observed using the transcripts, field notes and interview data and to use COLT analysis to provide only a global view of each lesson. This analysis allowed me to identify the different interaction patterns and possibilities for language learning in each lesson.

4.3 Selection of the schools and participants

All state schools in Sri Lanka are categorised into four types. The school "type" is decided upon by the variety of "course combinations" that are available to the pupils in the school (The First Report of the National Education Commission, 1992, p.43). At present, the school structure is of thirteen years duration, at the end of which students can sit the General Certificate of Education, Advanced Level (GCE A.L.) examination which is considered as the university entrance qualification.

The school census for 1991, cited in the First Report of the National Education Commission (1992, p.43), classifies schools in Sri Lanka as follows:
Type 1AB: with classes up to GCE A.L. that offer subject combinations in arts, commerce and science.
Type 1C : with classes up to GCE A.L. and offer subject combinations in arts and commerce only.
Type 2 : with classes up to Year 11
Type 3 : with classes up to Year 5 or 8.

The administration of the school system is normally the responsibility of the provincial government. The provincial council is expected to provide resources to the schools in each district from a budget financed by the central government. However, among the 1AB type schools, there is a group of large schools managed directly by the Ministry of Education of the central government. These are the "National Schools" and are located in or near urban areas. These are "among the most sought after schools in the country" (The First Report of the National Education Commission, 1992, p.43).

For this study four schools were selected from the same district of Colombo but from four different categories, 1AB, 1C, type 2 and type 3. The 1AB school is a National School. The selection of the schools from the same district was one of the limitations
of this study as the findings of this study may not be generalised to Sri Lanka as a whole. As I was studying in Australia and was expected to collect data over a six month period in Sri Lanka it was difficult to gather data in more than one district. The time constraint was further exacerbated by the political situation in the country which made it difficult to travel to some parts of the country.

It is claimed that there are differences in resources in the different provinces and districts (The First Report of the National Education Commission, 1992, p.31). Thus, the four sites selected from Colombo may not also be representative of Sri Lankan schools as a whole with respect to teaching ESL. The students living in Colombo may be more exposed to English than in the rural areas and there is likely to be more human and physical resources for English language learning in the Colombo schools than in the rural schools.

However, some studies, for example Rupasingha (1990), claim that certain measures have been taken to compensate for the disparities which exist between education regions. On the other hand, according to these same studies intra-regional disparities have not been sufficiently addressed. In addition, Karunaratna (1990) in her study of ESL classrooms in two different districts, Colombo and Puttalam, found some similarities with respect to the provision of resources in the two regions in "large" and "small" schools. According to her, in both districts, the large schools had more human and physical resources while the smaller schools had less resources.

As claimed by some writers such as Stake (1995), Punch (1998) 'cases' are similar in many ways while also being unique in many ways. Thus, it was decided that selecting schools from the same district but from the different categories would help me to identify the similarities among the cases as well as their uniqueness. This would also allow me to recognise some of the intra-regional disparities within the district with respect to the opportunities provided for learning ESL. Further, as discussed by some advocates of case study approach (for example, Punch 1998, p.154) even though the findings of this study may not have proven generalizability "it can certainly suggest such generalizability, putting forward concepts or propositions for testing in further research".

All four schools selected were from the capital city, Colombo. Three of the schools were within a radius of five kilometres and close to busy commercial centres. Since there was no IC type boys' school available closer to the other schools, the boys school selected was about 8 kilometres away and in a more urban area. Most of the
children in all the schools were from the majority ethnic group the Sinhalese. In the National School the student population was 100 percent Sinhalese while the other schools had a few Muslim and Tamil students. However, they were all studying in the Sinhala language medium. The gender and socio-economic background of the students, the nature of the school and the class size were variables that differentiated the four schools. While the 1AB school was a large girls' school drawing its students mostly from upper-middle class families, the 1C boys' school was fairly big but not as big as the 1AB school with the majority of students coming from lower-middle class families. The other two schools were both small co-educational schools catering to students' from working class families or the most disadvantaged sector of society.

Since book 1 of EED materials was introduced in Year 7, it was decided to select four Year 7 classes from each school for the purpose of this study. However, in case there was a drop out from the study, it was decided to select two classes from the 1AB and 1C schools. As there was only a single Year 7 class in the other two schools, it was not possible to have a back up. However, for the final analysis only one class from each school was selected. From the 1AB school, the most experienced teacher was selected and in the 1C school the teacher who had completed a more recent professional development program was selected. In all the selected schools all teachers of English were female. Thus, the participant teachers were all female.

4.4 Ethical considerations

This study has the approval of the Human Research Ethics Committee, University of Wollongong and the National Authority on Teacher Education (NATE) in Sri Lanka.

The participant teachers gave their written consent to both have their lessons recorded on audio tapes and to be interviewed (for copies of Consent forms see Appendix XV). Prior to consenting to be participants, the teachers were informed that the 10 lessons would be observed over a period of 5-6 months and the observations would be without prior notice. The purpose of the research and the importance of observing their normal lessons in the EED materials were also explained to the teachers. They were also informed that the anonymity of the school, teachers and students would be preserved by giving pseudonyms.
4.5 Data Collection

The main data collection methods used in this study were classroom observations with audio recording of teacher-pupil interactions, interviews with teachers and principals of the schools and examination of relevant documents.

4.5.1 Observation

Observation was the principal data gathering technique used in this study in keeping with the characteristics of observational case studies discussed in literature (for example, Bogdan and Biklen, 1998). The original plan was to observe ten lessons of approximately 40 minutes duration per teacher over a period of four to five months. The observations were conducted in three stages. In the first stage, two lessons were observed and field notes taken. The first two observations were trials and I sat through the lessons but they were not recorded. These observations were for the teacher and students to get used to my presence in the class.

The next three lessons were observed, field notes were taken and audio recorded and transcribed by me. However, these lessons were not used for the analysis. There were several reasons for this. The observations began in the second week of January, which was the second week of the school year. The students and teachers needed time to get familiar with each other and to get used to the lessons being audio recorded. At the same time it provided me with the opportunity to be familiar with the context of the class and the school and also to identify areas to be focused in later observations and interviews. It was expected that the first five observations in all schools would be completed by the end of March.

In the final stage, five lessons were observed for analysis. These observations were to commence in late April or May, after the three week school vacation. Although this schedule could be adhered to in three schools, the observations in the National School had to continue until early July. This was due to the large number of co-curricular activities in the first term, some of which continued in to the second term as well, disrupting the normal school work. In addition, in this school I could do only four out of the five preliminary observations.

As a result of the disruption to the normal classroom teaching in some schools, when the five observations for analysis commenced, some teachers had moved further along the lesson units than the others. Since my visits to the schools would rotate and the day I visited each school would differ, the observed lessons were not in sequence and the
type of lessons observed in the different schools varied. As a result, it was not possible to compare lessons across schools. This did not affect the study as the purpose was to compare the interaction patterns across the schools and not the lessons per se. However, on a few occasions, the same lessons were observed in different schools and comparisons of interactions in the classrooms in relation to the activity types across the schools were made.

By the time the real observations began, I knew all the students in the classes of the two small schools and most of the students in the IC type school by their names. During observations, I had a seating plan of each of the classes with me and each student was identified by two letters. When interactions took place it was indicated on the plan. Furthermore, by then I was able to identify each student by his/her voice on the tape. However, in the National School it was difficult to identify the students. Often students responded in chorus and unless the teacher nominated students, it was difficult to identify who was speaking. Further, in this school students' seating arrangements changed every week and it was difficult to draw a new plan each day. Thus, each day individual responses were identified by a number.

I thought that having a long time in which to observe the classrooms would help me to become "part of the scene" (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998, p.88) and the lessons would be as natural as possible. Although the teachers knew that their lessons would be observed and recorded, they did not know the exact days on which lessons would be observed. Thus, it was expected that teachers would not do special lessons but follow their normal classroom practice as far as possible. As expected, during the preliminary observations, as expected the teachers were very conscious of my presence and often referred to the TG during lessons and sometimes even made excuses at the end of the lesson for their inability to do certain things which they thought they should have done. By the time the five observations for analysis commenced, they were more relaxed and seemed more concerned about 'covering the syllabus' than my presence in the classroom.

The students in all the schools were excited about the lessons being recorded and taken to Australia. Some of them were keen to get their voices recorded on tape and wanted to listen to the tapes at the end of the lesson. At the beginning, in the type 3 school the recordings even became a problem as the teacher found it difficult to control the class as some students would shout out anything, in order to be recorded. However, by the second term the novelty had worn off and the recordings became part of the lesson.
4.5.2 Interviews

The observational data was supplemented with interview data. At the outset of the research I met the principals of the four schools to explain the purpose of the research and to obtain their permission. The Principal of the National School I met by prior appointment and the 30 minutes discussion helped me to gather information such as the objectives of teaching English in the school and the opportunities provided for the improvement of learning English outside the classroom. In the other three schools the Principals were quite willing to have informal discussions with me on many of my visits to their schools. These discussions provided valuable information. They were not audio recorded but notes were taken.

I had an informal discussion with each of the four teachers prior to the commencement of observations. This helped me to gather some background information about them as well as to make them feel comfortable during observations. When the final observations were completed, I had formal interviews with all four participant teachers based on an open ended interview schedule (Appendix I). In addition, I had several informal discussions with the teachers either before or after a lesson if the teachers had a free period, or during the interval. In the 1C type school and type 3 schools in particular there were many such opportunities. On such occasions relevant information was recorded through field notes.

On the days I had observations, I used to spend at least half a day and sometimes the whole school day in each of the schools. During the six months of observations, I became almost a member of each of the schools. I was invited to some of the co-curricular activities and also became acquainted with some of the other members of the staff. In addition, I also had the permission of the Principals to access documents such as school annual reports, student records, attendance registers, and class record books. The interactions with the other members of the staff, the participation in the school events and the access to documents in the schools enabled me to understand the school context and form a profile of each school.

4.5.3 Audio recordings and transcribing

During classroom observations, two recorders were used to record the classroom interactions. One was kept in the front of the class and the other at the back. The one at the back was kept close to where I sat so that I could monitor the recordings. All group activities could not be recorded as a recorder could not be provided for each group.
However, during a few lessons when the teachers interacted with the students, interactions were recorded by moving the tape recorders from group to group. The formal interviews with the teachers were also audio recorded with the teachers' prior consent.

Transcribing of the interview data and the lessons was done as soon as possible and the seating plan of the students and the field notes were used to identify the students on the transcripts. The transcripts of the first lesson used for analysis from each class were given to the respective teachers for their comments. However, it was not successful as they found it difficult to spare the time for this task.

### 4.5.4 Documents

Originally, my research plan was only to analyse the teacher-pupil interactions in the four schools using field notes, transcripts of teacher-pupil interactions and interviews with teachers. However, the preliminary observations in the classrooms indicated that the EED materials play a significant role in what happens in the classrooms. As a result, the focus of the study was broadened to include the analysis of the EED materials.

Documents were used in this study both as primary source of data and as auxiliary data to supplement information gathered as part of the case study. As Bogdan and Biklen, (1998), state, qualitative researchers are increasingly using documents as primary sources of data. In this study, EED materials formed one of the primary sources of data, as they were the main teaching learning materials used in the classrooms observed. These materials were analysed to examine how they conform to the theoretical underpinnings of CLT on which they are claimed to be based and to identify the teaching methodology to be adopted in the classrooms.

In addition, official documents such as annual reports, and student and teacher record books served as auxiliary data supplementing the primary data. This data, while enabling me to cross check some of the claims of teachers and principals, also provided additional data regarding such things as students backgrounds, teachers classroom practices and the activities and historical backgrounds of the schools.

The use of multiple sources of data led to a fuller understanding of the issues being discussed and also provided opportunities to verify facts. The analysis of documents, especially those pertaining to the EED materials as well as the interviews with the
teachers regarding their preparation to use the learning materials, for example resulted in a better understanding of what happened in the classrooms. In addition, it enabled me to cross-check facts, such as whether the teachers' views on teaching grammar is reflected in their practice in class.

4.6 Research questions and data analysis

This study was guided by two main research questions.

1. How does the relationship between the teacher, the learner and the learning materials in the classroom provide opportunities for second language learning?
2. How does the teacher-pupil oral interaction in the classroom promote possibilities for second language development?

In an attempt to answer these questions, the data gathered through various sources were analysed.

4.6.1 Analysis of the learning materials

The analysis of the English Every Day learning materials was necessary as they were the primary teaching and learning resource used in the classrooms. An understanding of the learning materials was important for several reasons: firstly, one of the main purposes of this study was to investigate the relationship between the learning materials, the teacher and students in providing opportunities for learning ESL; secondly, to understand what happens in the classroom; thirdly, to explain why certain things happened in the classroom the way they did; and finally, to identify directions for future curriculum changes.

In order to interpret the EED materials, I had to first understand the perspective of the course writers. An article written by the consultant for the EED materials writing project and other literature provided the context in which the materials were prepared. In addition, it also enabled me to identify the purpose for which the learning materials were prepared and how they were expected to be different from the previous learning materials that were used in schools, as well as details on the writing project, and the theoretical framework – CLT on which the materials are based.

The learning materials were next examined in relation to the course teams' perspective, in order to understand how they were designed to fulfil the purpose for which they
were prepared, that is to promote oral interaction. This examination related to the learning content and the methodology proposed in the learning materials and how they exemplify CLT principles and provide opportunities for oral communication. Through this interpretation certain issues relating to the implementation of the learning material were identified as potential areas of difficulty for teachers in promoting second language development in the classroom.

4.6.2 Analysis of the case studies

The analysis of each case was centred on five observed lessons. Each lesson was examined based on field notes and transcripts of audio recordings of teacher-pupil interactions. Each lesson was described in relation to the activities and episodes in the lesson, highlighting the oral interactions between the teachers and students through illustrative sections of the transcripts. Each description was preceded by information regarding the type of the lesson and its objective as stated in the TG. Finally, the procedures followed by the teacher were summarised and compared with the instructions in the Teacher's Guide, if such information was available.

This analysis, which is descriptive, is supplemented by a quantitative analysis of recorded data using Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT) observation scheme. This scheme will be described in section 4.7. The COLT analysis quantifies the teacher-pupil interactions in relation to the type of activities done in the classroom, that is, the amount of class time spent on teacher fronted activities, group work and individual work. In addition it indicates the modalities in which the students were engaged in each lesson, that is, either reading, writing, listening and speaking, as well as the type of learning materials and the way L1 and L2 were used in the class.

The descriptive and quantitative data synthesises the teacher-pupil interaction patterns and possible opportunities for second language learning in each lesson are identified in relation to the objective of the lesson.

Finally, the analysis of the five lessons and the interview data are synthesised and interaction patterns and possibilities for second language development in each school in relation to the realisation of what is proposed in the EED materials are identified. The analysis in each school is also a comparison between schools to identify the similarities as well as what is unique to each classroom context.
4.7 COLT observation scheme

The development of observation schedules which can be traced back to mainstream classroom research was first associated with teacher training (Chaudron, 1988). Observation schedules were mostly used to categorise teacher behaviour. These observation schedules had to be modified by researchers to use in the context of language teaching and to identify learner behaviours. Various observation schedules have been developed since Flanders’ pioneering work on "Interaction Analysis" (1970) for general educational purposes. Chaudron (1988) cites 25 such instruments developed specially to analyse interaction in second language classrooms. One such scheme designed to identify communicative orientation of second language classrooms is COLT (Spada and Fröhlich, 1995).

COLT was developed in the early 1980s within the context of a large scale research project examining the nature of second language proficiency and its development in classrooms. This project, the Development of Bilingual Proficiency (DBP) was carried out in Toronto, Canada. Since one of the main research questions examined under this project was whether the type of communication orientation of the instruction contributed differentially to particular aspects of L2 development, an observation scheme was needed to describe the instructional practices and procedures in different L2 classrooms. According to the developers of COLT, the categories included in COLT are theoretically driven as they were derived from a comprehensive review of theories of CLT, theories of communication and theories of first and second language research (Spada and Fröhlich, 1995).

COLT was later used (Spada & Fröhlich, 1995) in four different second language programs, that is, regular second language programs for children, intensive ESL programs for adults and children, and French immersion programs for children and adolescents, to test the validity and reliability of the categories. According to Spada and Fröhlich (1995, p.7), COLT is capable of differentiating between a "more or less communicatively oriented instruction".

As discussed in Chapter three, there have been changes in L2 theory, research and practice in the years since COLT was originally developed. Taking these shifts in theoretical perspective as well as problems the developers of COLT faced in using it over the years into consideration, COLT was revised. The revised version of COLT and comprehensive guidelines in its use is provided by Spada and Fröhlich (1995). In this version, some categories have been deleted while others have been added.
Additional information and explanation, specifically in the definitions of some of the categories and the rationale for the inclusion of each category in the scheme is provided. The revised version consists of two parts with 40 categories. Part A, describes "classroom events" and categorises the events that take place in the classroom at the level of episode and activity. Part B, categorises "communicative features" and looks at the interactions within the activities.

However, researchers are encouraged to adapt the scheme to suit the research questions addressed in their studies. Several examples of studies conducted in different second and foreign language classrooms using adapted versions of COLT in both process-product as well as process-oriented studies are also provided by Spada and Fröhlich (1995). Some researchers have used only one part of the scheme while others have used both.

As some writers, such as Cook (1991), state, COLT has the advantage over other observation schemes, as it is deliberately oriented towards a teaching approach – that is, CLT. It also looks at relevant aspects of the teaching process. Since the purpose of the present study is to examine instructional practices claimed to be communicative and to identify the role of verbal interaction in these practices, COLT was considered to be a useful tool in the analysis of classroom activities and verbal interactions. However, it was adapted to suit my research design. In this study, as in similar studies (for example, Yohay and Suwa, 1995; Zotou and Mitchell, 1995 cited in Spada and Fröhlich, 1995), Part A of COLT was used to obtain a macro level analysis of the classroom behaviours in each lesson and to provide a global view of each lesson. It enabled me to identify classroom events, which varied across lessons as well as across classes. This analysis supplemented the more comprehensive qualitative analysis of communicative features in the classes. This type of research, referred to as "hybrid research" (Ellis, 1997), provides opportunities for combining objective and subjective elements in the study. Such combined approaches to data analysis have also been advocated by some second language classroom researchers (for example, Allwright and Bailey, 1991; Chaudron, 1988; van Lier, 1988).

In the original version, coding for all categories in Part A of the scheme is done in "real time". In this study, during observations, I noted the various activities and episodes in the lesson and the time each activity/episode commenced. Other than this, the observation scheme was not used during observations and no real time coding was done. This enabled me to observe and take field notes without being distracted by coding. The audio recorded teacher-pupil interactions were later transcribed and coded.
using the observation scheme (Appendix ii). Later, a percentage of the class time spent on different activities and episodes was calculated in relation to the time noted during observations.

In addition to the categories in Part A of the scheme (Spada and Fröhlich, 1995), I included another category from COLT B that is the use of the target language. This category was included as the initial observations in the classrooms indicated that while the amount of target language used by the teachers varied, some teachers also used L1 to varying degrees in the class. As suggested in CLT and SLA literature, this is an issue for researchers and for teachers.

COLT A addresses the following questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part A: Classroom events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. What type of activity occurs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How do the teachers and students participate in the activity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. What content is talked about in the activity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Which skills or combination of skills are being used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. What materials are being used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Which language is used, L1 or L2?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Cook, 1991, p.47).

The categories in COLT as defined by Spada and Fröhlich (1995, p.14-26) are described below. Where adaptations were made for the purpose of this study, they are acknowledged and explained.

4.7.1 COLT categories

These categories describe classroom events at the level of activities and episodes. The following eight main features are differentiated in this section.

- Time
- Activities and episodes
- Participant organisation
- Content
- Content control
- Student modality
- Materials
- Use of the target language
These main features are sub-divided into categories. A definition and rationale for each category is provided below. They are presented in the order in which they appear on the scheme, starting with column 1. The complete schedule of COLT A is provided in Appendix ii.

**Time**

The starting time of each episode/activity was noted during observations.

**Activities and episodes**

According to the definition given in the coding conventions “activities and episodes are separate units which constitute the instructional segments of a classroom. They are marked by changes in the categories of the main features of COLT” (Spada and Frölich, 1995, p.14). In this study, if a lesson in the Pupil's Book contained different tasks, they were considered as activities. The steps to be followed in one task or activity were considered as episodes. For example, a listening task in the Pupil's Book is an activity. The steps the teacher follows in getting the students to do the activity, such as studying the pictures, answering pre-listening questions, listening to a description and responding to post-listening questions are four episodes in the same activity. Doing a related task in the Work Book was coded as a different activity.

**Participant organisation**

Group work is considered as more likely to focus on negotiation of meaning and verbal interaction among the learners. As discussed in chapters two and three classrooms which provide for group work are considered to be more communicative. According to the designers of COLT, this feature was developed to "describe distinctions between teacher-centred and group-work interactions in L2 classrooms" (Spada & Fröligh, 1995,p.15).

Participant organisation in COLT refers to the way in which students are organised. Three main patterns of organisation are coded under this category: class, group and individual.

**Class**

*Teacher to student or class*

One central activity takes place where the teacher interacts with the whole class or individual students.
Student to student, or student to class
One central activity led by a student or students occurs. (For example, a group of students acts out a play while the rest of the class is the audience.)

Choral work by students
The whole class or individual groups participate in choral work. (For example, repeating a dialogue in the textbook or repeating after the teacher.)

Group
Same task
Groups/pairs of students work on the same task.

Different tasks
Groups/pairs of students work on different tasks.

Individual
Same task
Students work on the same task individually.

Different tasks
Students work on their own, but on different tasks.

Content
Content refers to the subject matter or theme of activities that the teacher and students are involved in. As discussed in chapter two and three, one of the main issues in CLT and SLAR literature is whether the focus of instruction should be on meaning, form or both. It was discussed in chapter four that the EED materials are based on "a structural ladder around which a snake of themes are looped". Thus it was expected that the focus of instruction in the class would be on both form and meaning. This category was included to examine the focus of instruction. Three major areas are differentiated under this section as management, language and other topics. These areas are further categorised as follows:

Management
Procedure
Procedural directives such as "open the book and turn to page seven".
Discipline
Disciplinary statements such as "stop talking", "I can't hear you, speak louder"

Language
Form
Reference to grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation etc.

Function
Reference to functions/communicative acts such as requesting, apologising and explaining.

Discourse
Reference to the way in which sentences (spoken or written) combine into cohesive and coherent sequences (such as describing a process).

Sociolinguistics
Reference to forms or styles (spoken or written) appropriate to particular contexts (for example, the way to address a formal occasion and an informal occasion).

Other topics
Different topics which arise in classroom discourse are categorised as either narrow or broad.

Narrow
According to COLT categories, topics which refer to the classroom and the students' immediate environment and experiences are coded as narrow. For the purpose of this study, if the content is strictly limited to what is in the Pupil's textbook or Work Book it was coded as narrow.

Broad
If the discussion topics are outside what is given in the text, they were coded as broad.

Content control
The categories in content control refer to the selection of a topic or task in the lesson as well as the control over the content of an activity/episode. This feature has been developed to describe the extent to which classrooms encourage learners to be involved in their learning and are differentiated into the three following categories.
Teacher/ Text
The teacher based on the text decide upon the topic or task.

Teacher/text/student
The topic is jointly decided upon by teacher, students and/or the text.

Student
The topic is determined by the student/s.

Student Modality
As discussed in chapter two, CLT literature encourages the integration of the four language skills listening, speaking, reading and writing in the language class. This section identifies the various skills involved in the activities and indicates whether these skills occur in combination. In addition to the four categories indicating the four skills, COLT also contains an additional category to include activities such as drawing. Thus this section is divided into five categories

Listening
Speaking
Reading
Writing
Other

Materials
The final column in Part A of COLT describes classroom materials in terms of text type (for example, minimal/extended, audio and visual) and source (L2-NNS, L2-NS, L2-NSA, student-made). Since my preliminary observations showed that in all the four schools the teachers relied heavily on the EED materials, coding for materials was adopted from test type and source to Pupils book, Work Book and other materials. Thus, this section is divided into three categories instead of the eight in the original scheme.

Pupil’s Book
Work Book
Other

Use of target language
This category has been included based on the view that use of the target language facilitates L2 development. It also provides opportunities to investigate whether, in classrooms where the students have a common L1, more communicative
interactions tend to take place in the L1 rather than the L2. In COLT B, under 'target language', the original scheme has a binary division; L1 or L2. Since, in some classes, I noticed the teachers' code switching from L1 to L2 or vice versa, another category called mixed mode (L1-L2/L2-L1) was included. Inclusion of this category I expected, would enable me to examine the reasons for the code switching.

The analysis of data using COLT in this study differed from the way suggested by Spada and Fröhlich (1995) in the original version. Where, real time coding was done and the researchers were expected to indicate whether the focus of the activity was exclusively on one category or whether there was a primary focus and a secondary focus. During data analysis the percentage of time spent on each category was calculated.

In this study, as COLT analysis was used only to provide a global view of the activity, only the primary focus of each of the activities was calculated. For example, during an episode when the teacher worked with the whole class most of the time, there could have been individual responses. In such an instance, the percentage of class time spent during that episode was considered as time the teacher interacted with the whole class. However, the field notes enabled me to acknowledge in the descriptive analysis that even during whole class interactions there were a few individual teacher-student interactions and I was able to identify the students who interacted.

Similar difficulties were encountered in identifying the primary modalities in which the students were involved and the amount of L1 and L2 the students used during an episode. In some episodes of the lessons while a few students were speaking such as acting out the characters in a role play the rest of the class would be listening. In such instances since the majority of the students appeared to be listening the primary modality was considered as listening. Similarly, according to the COLT analysis reading meant both loud reading and silent reading. It was the field notes that enabled me to identify the type of reading involved. If COLT was used as it was originally designed and real time coding was done it may have helped me to identify the modalities that took place simultaneously. However, that would have narrowed the focus of observation and I would not have been able to record some of the rich interactions that took place. The purpose of using COLT was to provide a global profile of each lesson and the field notes a more in depth analysis of the interactions. The use of COLT and field notes supplemented each other and provided a better understanding of each issue.
Chapter 5

ENGLISH EVERY DAY

5.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the English Every Day learning materials which are used in Year 7 (Grade 7) classes in all schools in Sri Lanka. As discussed in Chapter one, one way of attempting to make English 'available to all' in Sri Lanka has been through curriculum revision and changing the teaching methods. The English Every Day (EED) materials are the result of one such curriculum change that took place in the early 1980s. The introduction of these learning materials was necessitated by the political, economic and social changes that took place in Sri Lanka and in other parts of the world at that time. Due to these changes there was a demand for people who could communicate in English. In keeping with this demand, the learning materials are claimed to be based on CLT.

From the perspective of this study, the learning materials are important for two main reasons: first, because of their role in the relationship between the teacher, learner and learning materials; second, because of their role in promoting the verbal interaction between teacher and learners which is expected to promote language development. As discussed in chapters two and three, both CLT and SLA theories advocate verbal interaction as facilitating second language acquisition. Taking into consideration the discussion in Chapters 2 and 3, the learning materials are examined to identify their potential role in providing opportunities for second language development.

This chapter begins with overviews of the English Every Day materials as well as the textbooks used immediately prior to them - An English Course for grade six to ten. A significant difference in the two materials is that while the English Every Day materials are comprised of a set of learning materials, that is a Pupil's Book, a Work Book, a Teacher's Guide and audiocassettes, the previous materials consisted only of the Pupil's Book and a syllabus for the teachers. In this chapter, one aspect that is looked into is the significance of the innovations in the learning materials, in achieving
the expected objective of teaching English for communication. An examination of the content of the Pupil's Book and the implied methodology in the Teacher's Guide indicates that they have the potential to contribute to facilitating verbal interaction. However, some of the socio-economic and political issues in the Sri Lankan education system, which had impacted on curriculum reforms in the past, still remains.

5.2 An English course for Grade Six

*An English Course* was the first set of locally prepared learning materials in Sri Lanka. As discussed in Chapter one, a shift in national policy after Independence as discussed in chapter one, away from education based on the English language towards an emphasis on the national languages resulted in a change in the medium of instruction from English to the L1. Although there was a change in the medium of instruction, more time was needed to translate all reference books into L1. Thus, English became one of the subjects in the curriculum with the objective of teaching it to develop the students' reading ability, so that they could read books in English (De Lanerolle Commission Report, 1973). To cater to this need, a new course for teaching English - *An English Course for Grade 6 -10* was developed.

In keeping with the objective of developing students' reading ability, the course was largely made up of 150 - 400 word reading passages with multiple-choice or true-false comprehension questions. The textbooks followed a regular format - language practice of the structures involved, followed by two passages for reading. One passage was of a slightly higher linguistic level and both were followed by comprehension exercises. Each passage was preceded by a vocabulary list with L1 equivalents. Usually, the lists contained new vocabulary that would appear in the passage. In addition to the Pupil's Book, teachers were provided with a syllabus which also specified the learning outcomes, which were mostly related to linguistic ability.

Although the objective of the ESL program was to develop reading comprehension skills, the reading passages were contrived to teach structures. In addition, each unit contained a language practice section through which students were introduced to a new language structure. According to Mosback (1984), "the grammar sections were based principally on Hornby (1961)" and students had to practice structures through repetitive drills. Later, the structures were used in written sentences. These textbooks have been criticised (for example, Cumaranatunga, 1989; Karunarathne, 1990) for not being sufficiently challenging for learners from an English speaking background and for being too difficult for others.
Socio-economic and political changes in the country after 1970 necessitated a curriculum revision in the 1980s. The liberalisation of trade and industry, the opening up of the Middle East job market and a boom in tourism gave rise to a need for English among potential job seekers at all levels. On the other hand, the ethnic crisis in the country resulted in a renewed demand for English as a link language. These factors together with the methodological changes that took place in other parts of the world in the teaching of English as a second language necessitated that English be taught not as a library language but as a language for communication. Therefore, the *English Every Day* materials were developed with the aim of teaching English for communication.

5.3 English Every Day

As discussed in Chapter one, the decision to prepare a new set of learning materials was made in 1982 at a seminar held in Sri Lanka, on "Teaching English to meet communicative needs" (Karunaratne, 1990). Subsequently, a writing team comprised initially of a British consultant and twelve Sri Lankan writers drawn from experienced teachers were appointed to prepare the learning materials. The preparation of the materials took place over two years and according to the British consultant for the project:

For the first two years, our emerging materials (and even more importantly the implied methodology) were being trialled in the most thorough way possible through the interchange between the entire teaching force in the schools, the pupils, and the members of the materials team (Mosback, 1990, pp.18-19).

As a result of this "sampling" period, the "course package" was prepared and it was comprised of
- a Pupil's Book
- a Work Book
- a Teacher's Guide
- an audiocassette.

However, the Work Books were produced only in 1990. This could be because of the financial and time constraints the writing team had to face. In fact the Government was "politically pledged only to provide a free textbook (ie a Pupil's Book) for each pupil" (Mosback, 1990,p.19). According to Mosback (1990), they could only plan for two books for each year: a Pupil's Book and a Teacher's Book.
5.3.1 The Pupil's Book

The *English Every Day Book 1* is the first in the series of English Language textbooks for the secondary schools in Sri Lanka. It is introduced in Year 7 (age group 12-13) and contains eight units. These units were arrived at in conjunction with the teacher expectations observed during the trialling period. Each unit, which is generally built around a theme, follows roughly the same pattern and contains the following sections:

- Role Play
- Finding Out
- Word Study
- Listening.
- Grammar in Action.
- Writing.
- Learning Together.
- Useful Dialogues.

These sections are followed by three appendices.

- Appendix 1 — Grammar Notes
- Appendix 2 — Irregular Verbs
- Appendix 3 — Vocabulary Guide.

The next section briefly introduces each of the above components.

**Role Play dialogues**

Each unit starts with a "Role Play" dialogue and contains a story line. The story centres on Ravi, Padmini and Anne. Ravi and Padmini are a brother and sister living in Sri Lanka. Anne, who studied nursing with Padmini in London, is on holiday and visits Padmini. The presence of Anne, a foreigner, gives everyone a reason to speak in English.

The purpose of the "Role Play" dialogues appears to be to develop the students' oral skills. Through the dialogues, the students are exposed to language in a natural setting. The objective of the dialogue is found in the statement "we don't use the same language with a friend as we do when talking to a stranger or a superior" (Teacher's Guide, 1985, p.8). The objective seems to be to develop "sociolinguistic competence" and "grammatical competence" or "rules of use" as well as "rules of grammar" discussed in Chapter two.

**Finding Out**
Each unit contains either one or two short texts of either prose or poetry. The objective of including this section is to improve the students' reading skills. However, the purpose of the "Finding Out" sections differs from the reading comprehension passages in the former textbook, *An English Course*. In the later reading passages were preceded by a list of new vocabulary items with L1 equivalents. The passages were meant to be read aloud with the teacher helping the students to answer the question given at the end of the passages, often translating the passages into L1. On the other hand, in the "Finding Out" sections, the students are expected to find out for themselves by getting "the meaning of the passages by processing them as far as possible in English and not by translating every single word into their first language" (Teacher's Guide, 1985, p.15). However, "glosses of explanations in L1" to interest the students in the reading materials and reading aloud in the early stages of reading comprehension is recommended in the Teacher's Guide (p.15).

**Word Study**

This section is mainly to introduce the students to some common vocabulary in context. It is similar to a page from a 'picture dictionary' book and usually contains about 15-20 items grouped around the general theme of the unit. The pictures provide the context. Pair work is suggested to practise the vocabulary learnt and to provide interaction. Sometimes, the illustrations are also used to give the pupils the opportunity to discuss, for example, the position of the objects, or if it's people, more about their profession.

**Listening**

The Listening section contains activities for the pupils which usually ask students to perform some task by listening to a passage read by the teacher. The tasks are generally expected to be useful or enjoyable for the students (for example, tracing a route on a town map, or constructing a 'magic square'). The listening passage is in the Teacher's Guide and a pre-listening task is usually given before the teacher reads the text. Teaching listening as a skill was quite new to Sri Lankan teachers. Perhaps, due to this, the Teacher's Guide provides an extensive description of its purpose and procedure to follow.

**Grammar in Action**

This section is at the end of each unit and usually contains one or more grammar points to which the students have been introduced in the other sections of the unit. The "Grammar in Action" section differs from the grammar practice in the earlier textbooks in the way it is presented. In the previous textbooks, students were first
introduced to the grammar point, drilled in it and then made to practise it by writing isolated sentences. In the present textbook, the students encounter the grammar in natural contexts before they practice it in "communicative activities". However, in this section, the grammatical items that the students encountered earlier in the unit are explicitly taught. Although most activities are to be done in pairs and groups, they are mostly substitution drills. This seems to be based on the assumption that "many of the basic structures of English are hard to master and need a lot of attention" (Swan, 1981, p.41). In addition, isolating specific difficult structural points and providing practice as discussed in Chapter two in "pre-communicative activities" is in keeping with CLT principles.

Writing
Even though students engage in writing activities in other sections of the Pupil's Book, this section is specifically meant to develop writing skills. Comprehensive guidelines regarding teaching this skill are given in the Teacher's Guide. The writing tasks involve students writing for a purpose, such as a letter to a friend, a letter of complaint or a poster. However, according to some writers, (for example, Nunan, 1989) learning to write fluently and expressively is the most difficult macro skill for language learners. Thus, a structural activity before a communicative task seems designed to help the students to be more accurate and gain confidence. Some writing tasks in the Pupil's Book appear to provide for this opportunity while at the same time making the task flexible so that the more proficient students can be encouraged to be creative. The written tasks are often linked to other sections in the Pupil's Book such as "Role Play," "Listening," and "Useful Dialogues". The linking of these tasks has the potential to reinforce and help the students to master this difficult skill.

Learning Together
This section of each unit contains communication games or activities for students to involve themselves in pairs or groups. The activities are based on the structural and thematic points examined in that unit. However, these activities are not always highly structured, that is, the students have the freedom to choose the language. The purpose of this section is to improve oral skills. Some of the activities under this section (for example, "Draw and describe" on p.8) are "information gap" activities as discussed in Chapter three.

Useful Dialogues
These dialogues focus on everyday situations such as at school, at home, or on the street. They are mostly structured but allow the students the choice of selecting words.
often from a given list. These dialogues are also centred on the thematic and structural focus of the unit and provide the students with the opportunity to practise the language learnt. Thus, they are designed to provide opportunities for the development of accuracy.

The content and setting of the Pupil's Book are based on Sri Lankan culture and background. However, the students are introduced to other cultures as well. For example, Anne coming from England and the "Finding Out" passage on Venice. This is in contrast to the former textbook (An English Course for Grade Seven), in which the setting was mostly Sri Lankan. However, there are some criticisms, (for example, Wijesingha, 1994) levelled against the EED materials due to its "foreignness" mainly in relation to the presence of Anne's character in the "Role Play". On the other hand, there are others, such as Nagasundaram (1996), who see this as a positive feature whereby the students are exposed to the culture of the target language.

It can be concluded then that the English Every Day Pupil's Book differs from the previous textbook in structure, content and setting. Further, while An English Course focused on the development of reading and grammar, the EED materials appear to be designed to promote the development of reading, writing, listening, speaking and grammar in keeping with CLT principles.

5.3.2 Teacher's Guide

The Teacher's Guide (referred to as the TG) was expected to be an important part of the EED course. At the beginning of the TG, it is stated that "this guide forms an indispensable part of English Every Day Book 1, and the Year 7 course cannot be properly followed without it" (Teacher's Guide, 1985, p.i).

The teaching methodology which was to be used in the classroom seemed to be suggested in the TG which consists of eleven chapters. The first chapter is an introduction and general guidance to the teacher. The need to develop the student's ability to "use" the language in addition to learning "facts about" the language is emphasised (Teacher's Guide, 1985, p.1). General instructions on classroom dynamics, arranging pair and group work, and how to integrate the different skills are also given. The rest of the chapters correspond to the different activity types in the Pupil's Book such as "Role Play" and "Finding Out". In each section, general guidelines are given as how to handle these activities. This is followed by specific instructions for each unit.
On the other hand, there is no indication in the TG of the language content to be taught. As the discussion in chapter two indicated, the EED materials are supposed to be based on a "structural ladder" around which a "snake" of themes and communicative activities are looped (Mosback, 1990, p.23). The TG discusses some of the activities that are in the Pupil's Book. However, there is no explicit reference to the structures and themes or functions to be taught.

The TG seems to prescribe the teaching methodology more than to specify the learning content. Thus, the syllabus is more implicit whereas the methodology is explicit. This aspect will be examined in more detail in section 5.4

5.3.3 Recorded materials

Additional material is provided in the form of audiocassettes, which contained the "Role Play" dialogues and also the "Listening" passages. These were originally prepared to assist the teachers in handling the "Role Play" activities given in the Pupil's Book. It was hoped the cassettes could be used as a substitute for the teacher's voice during dialogue presentation (Cumaranatunga, 1989). It was felt that this would reduce the burden on the teachers who were facing problems with their own pronunciation.

However, these cassettes were not available in any of the schools I visited nor were they available at the National Institute of Education from where the teachers were supposed to obtain them. I was unable to determine why they were not available.

5.3.4 The Work Book

Although the Pupil's textbooks were published in 1985, there was no accompanying Work Book till 1991. The Work Book was prepared by the Department of English of the National Institute of Education in Sri Lanka with the help of a group of local writers.

According to the stated objectives, the aim of the Work Book was to provide the learner with better guidance to understand the EED series. It was also intended to provide "extra support materials" to both teachers and students. However, "the main purpose of the Work Book is to provide the child with material to work on his own, at his own pace" (Work Book 1, 1991, p.i). Thus, the preparation of the Work Book can be considered as another way of shifting towards more 'learner centred' learning. However, a perusal of the Work Book makes one doubt the possibility of achieving this purpose. There are a few activities in the Work Book for which solutions are
provided at the end of the book. However, simply providing the solutions does not make the book "learner centred" or provide opportunities for the student to "work on his own, at his own pace". Further, most of the "tasks" given are "exercises" such as 'filling the blanks' and writing sentences using a Table. This aspect will be further discussed when analysing the classroom interactions.

5.4 The syllabus

As the discussion in section 5.3 indicated, one of the differences between the previous textbook *An English Course* and the EED materials was that while the former consisted only of a Pupil's textbook and a syllabus for the teachers, the later comprised of a learning package. Another difference is that at the time when *An English Course* was used, the teachers were provided with a syllabus which specified the learning content as well as the outcomes which were expected to be achieved at the end of the lesson. However, with the EED materials, there was no syllabus, only the Teacher's Guide.

The British concept of a syllabus as discussed in Chapter two refers to both the content to be taught, that is, the "syllabus inventory" and the guiding principle of selecting and arranging the content – the "pedagogical syllabus". However, the traditional pedagogical syllabuses, such as *An English Course*, consisted of a list of structures, a communicative syllabus was expected to consist of several lists such as lists of structures, functions, notions and topics. Such lists are available in *Threshold level* and *Waystage* (Van Ek and Alexander, 1980) on which the EED materials are based and is expected to be provided in the EED materials as well.

As discussed in Chapter two, *Threshold level* syllabus specifications were developed by the Council of Europe on the basis of an analysis of the linguistic needs of adults in forty four occupational categories. Originally, *Threshold level* was considered the minimal level of communicative competence a foreign language learner needed (van Ek, 1973). However, a further level *Waystage* was later developed (van Ek & Alexander, 1980).

According to the British consultant for the EED materials project, the writing team had decided that the expected objectives of the EED syllabus could be a level between the Council of Europe objectives as outlined in *Threshold level English* and *Waystage English* (van Ek and Alexander 1980a,b). In particular *Threshold level* had been considered as the "ideal" at the exit from secondary school to university in Sri Lanka.
(Mosback, 1990). The rationale behind this choice was that its objectives were "to teach students to cope in everyday situations, as visitors to the foreign country, or with visitors to their own country, and establish and maintain social contacts" (Mosback, 1990, p.22). However, these objectives, on which the EED materials are presumed to be based on, are not stated in the TG.

Considering the content specifications the writing team had felt that some specifications were not relevant to the Sri Lankan context (Mosback, 1990). Therefore, it was agreed that as far as content specification and language functions were concerned, the most relevant specifications for the Sri Lankan students from both Threshold level and Waystage should form the syllabus. However, such a syllabus is also not explicitly stated in the TG. At the time of data collection, the teachers were not provided with such a document. When I inquired about the syllabus from the officials responsible for curriculum development, I was told that the syllabus is implicit in the Pupil's Book and the Teacher's Guide provides adequate guidance for the teachers to "handle" the Pupil's Book. A lack of a syllabus may cause problems to teachers who were used to being guided by a document which specified what to teach.

When considering the suitability to the Sri Lankan situation of the Threshold level and Waystage specifications on which the EED materials are claimed to be based, several factors have to be taken into consideration. Although, Threshold level has "international acceptance" its appropriateness as a "benchmark" (Mosback, 1990, p.22) for all contexts was questionable even when it was first introduced. Some writers, such as White (1983), have questioned the transferability of a syllabus specification developed to meet specific needs in the European context, to other contexts. Even van Ek, who prepared these specifications himself, questions the feasibility of defining one single foreign language objective for all countries in Europe. "Would it be equally relevant to countries as far apart as Norway and Italy, England and Austria?" (van Ek, 1976, p.4). If so, the question is: how relevant is it to Sri Lanka?

The general objective of teaching English in the secondary schools in Sri Lanka in 1984, when the learning materials were prepared was for "oral communication". Yet, for most of the students, English is just another subject in the curriculum. The majority of these students can accomplish their day-to-day activities without English. As Morrow (1981) points out, the basis of the selection of the items which occur in the Threshold level is the "instrumental" needs of the students. This might be a suitable basis of syllabus design for adults learning the language in order to visit the foreign country on business or for students who are in the target language country and who can
relate their language learning to these instrumental needs. However, it is doubtful whether a thirteen year old student in Sri Lanka has such instrumental needs. Thus, as mentioned by some writers (for example, Widdowson, 1990), the relevance of these syllabus specifications in situations outside of which they were designed, where the aims of the original syllabus do not relate to the learning objectives of the context in which they are used, has to be considered with caution.

Further, by 1990, the original versions of both Threshold level and Waystage were revised. According to van Ek and Trim (1991), for many beginner learners, the feasibility of mastering the learning load represented by Threshold level may seem to be very doubtful. Therefore, they decided to reduce the learning load represented in Threshold level and Waystage (1991) to almost half of the original version. However, the EED materials which were based on the original versions were not revised.

**Pupil's Book and the learning outcomes**

The TG for the EED materials does not provide an explicit syllabus, and neither does the Pupil's Book provide the learning objectives for the activities exemplified in it. According to Mosback (1990), the writing team had decided:

> that for consumer acceptability a certain grammatical ladder, or syllabus, would have to be seen to underlie the thematic and functional unity of each unit and book (p.23).

The units in the Pupil's Book seem to follow the pattern Mosback (1990, p.23) described as a "structural ladder" around which a "snake" of themes and communicative activities would be "generally but not always contingently looped". Each unit contains a section on grammar. The grammatical points introduced in each unit generally progress from simple to more advanced (for example, the present with "ing" in unit 2 and the passive voice in unit 8) and normally not more than two to three new structures are introduced in one unit. However, unit one introduces more grammatical structures than in the other units.

Each unit also contains communicative activities such as games and semi structured dialogues and "Role Plays" which can be considered as communicative activities (for example, 'picture bluff', 'draw and describe'). The units appear to be based on a theme as well (for example, people, places, and transport). However, the themes are not always explicit.
The expected learning outcomes of the EED materials for each grade are not specified the way they are in *An English Course* syllabus. According to Mosback (1990), in addition to the specific functions and content items identified, the materials writing team had also drawn up a "generalised list of performance objectives, or desired exit behaviours for each of the five years of the course" (Mosback, 1990, p.22). Yet, neither the Pupil's Book nor the TG explicitly spells out the objectives of each of the sections in the Pupil's Book. Brumfit (1981, p.48) when referring to CLT syllabuses for secondary schools, stresses that they must have "explicitly" or "implicitly" what the language is being learnt for. At the outset of the TG it is stated that:

> Learning a language requires more than the imparting of knowledge by the teacher to a passive class. In addition to facts ABOUT the language (vocabulary meanings, word order and structural changes) the pupils need constantly to be able to develop their ability to USE the language" (Teacher's Guide, 1985, p.1)

Thus, it cautions the teachers that this course is different to the previous course. However, since the expected learning outcomes are not specified, the teachers may find it difficult to understand what is expected of them. For example, the "Role Play" dialogues are something new in the present course. In the general introduction to the "Role Play", the importance of the dialogues is mentioned:

> This is very valuable, since traditional, classroom language in the past, following the structural selections of example, A.S.Hornby, has given children access only to a rather stiff and formal register of English with little scope for the expression of any emotion, friendliness or opinion (Teacher's Guide, 1985, P.7).

The implication, then, is that what happened before the introduction of the new materials was "traditional" and the EED materials are "more communicative". Yet, the teachers might not be able to differentiate between the "traditional" and the "communicative" due to inadequate assistance in the TG.

Without clear objectives, the teachers might find it difficult to understand what they should aim for and why they should change. For instance, the rationale for including "Role Play" dialogues in the Pupil's Book is specifically to improve oral interaction. It is stated in the TG that with dialogues, the pupils learn to ask questions as well as to answer them. Since the recommended procedure is to repeat the dialogue in groups or pairs, changing the roles alternatively, teachers could misinterpret this as getting students to repeat the dialogue or merely to act the dialogue. However, the implicit aim of "Role Play" according to the TG seems to be to equip the students with the ability to
fulfil the role played in the dialogue. For example, the first "Role Play", which is situated at the airport is based on language functions such as, asking and giving information, introductions and showing gratitude and pleasure. Thus, at the end of the lesson, the students are expected to extend the dialogue to similar situations and be able to perform language functions such as introduce themselves, greet formally and informally and show pleasure. The teachers are expected to provide such opportunities to the students, yet these expectations are not explicitly stated in the TG.

The "Grammar in Action" is another section that is likely to cause problems for teachers. Teachers who have been used to teaching the traditional syllabuses might think that the objective of "Grammar in Action" is only to teach about the language. This idea could be further supported by the grammar notes provided at the end of the Pupil's Book. For example, an exercise indicated in Figure 5.1 could quite easily become a mechanical language drill and neither the Pupil's Book nor the TG gives more guidelines to the teacher as to what is expected of this exercise.

**Fig. 5.1**

[1] Make questions from this Table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does</th>
<th>(Pupil's name)</th>
<th>speak English?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>usually</td>
<td>read newspapers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our teacher</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>eat biscuits?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>come to school early?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>always</td>
<td>work hard?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>X and Y</td>
<td>write neatly?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pupils' names)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(English Every Day Book 1, p.14)*

Explicitness of the syllabus might not be a problem to the teachers if they were well prepared in the use of the learning materials. However, the teachers' lack of proficiency in the English Language and their inadequate professional training has been a recurrent problem in the ESL field in Sri Lanka. As the course writers themselves point out, "with a more communicative approach to fostering the pupil's English language ability, the line between language used for a purpose and simple 'structure practice' are more difficult to draw than with some more traditional approaches" (Teacher's Guide. 1985, p.60).
Evaluation

Although students are expected to learn about language and be able to use language, they are often tested only on their knowledge 'about language'. Students in all secondary schools in Sri Lanka are tested twice a year by the Department of Education in each district. The papers are set by teachers selected by the department and the test items are expected to cover a certain number of units in the Pupil's Book. The same test paper is given to all the schools in the district. In the junior secondary classes ten percent of the marks are allocated for a "speech test" which the teacher of English is expected to conduct for his/ her pupils. In the higher grades the students are tested only on their written ability.

The type of assessment is another factor that affects the implementation of the syllabus. Alexander (1976) identified testing as one of the problems with implementing a functional/notional syllabus. Mosback (1990) referred to the problems the materials writing team encountered when the "testing experts" questioned them as to how they could "test a course with so many varied inputs". The experts asked "where is your real grammar syllabus?" (Mosabck, 1990, p.23). At that time, it was hoped that in the future, the testing of communicative abilities would develop to suit communicative oriented courses. However, there still seems to be a mismatch between assessment and what is taught. The following comment in the findings of the report on the implementation of the Year 11 syllabus and public examination are also applicable to the Year 7.

The textbook series is intended to teach pupils communication abilities, with considerable emphasis on oral skills. However, the O-level examination contains tests of reading (reading comprehension), writing and grammar only (Alderson, 1992, p.22).

As a consequence of this emphasis teachers devoted less time to develop students' oral and listening skills. Further, even where reading, writing and grammar were concerned, it was the traditional text and task types that were used for testing. Thus, teachers were likely to use these test items to formulate their teaching objectives, and this resulted in their teaching only "about the language".

Student heterogeneity

The heterogeneity of the student population in the Sri Lankan classrooms discussed in Chapter one, is likely to cause problems for students in understanding the subject matter of the lessons. For example, the listening activity, the "Magic Square" is an interesting activity for students who know the vocabulary involved in the task such as
'square', 'column', 'row' and 'diagonal'. However, in a mixed proficiency class, unless the teacher first teaches the vocabulary involved, some students could be at a disadvantage. Similar problems could also arise with the subject matter in some of the "Finding Out" passages.

In the TG, it is also acknowledged that all the content in the Pupil's Book cannot be covered in all classes. It is stated that:

any teacher or school fortunate enough to have scope for wider reading and a more extensive command of the language among their pupils should feel free to go ahead, but this should never be at the expense of providing even the weaker pupil with a useful set of abilities across the four skills at each grade (Teacher's Guide, 1985, p.60).

However, when teachers are expected to complete a certain number of units per term and all students are tested on those items, teachers do not have much choice other than continuing teaching, irrespective of whether all students have understood what has already been covered. The problem is further aggravated with large numbers of students with differing language proficiency levels being in the same class. The TG does not provide much assistance to the teachers regarding this problem.

5.5 Methodology

There is no clear demarcation between 'what' is to be taught and 'how' to teach in the Teacher's Guide. Although Mosback (1990) discusses the syllabus model on which the EED materials were based, there is no reference to methodological implications. It has been mentioned by writers such as Nunan (1991) that with the development of CLT, the traditional distinction between syllabus and methodology was difficult to sustain. Teaching methodology, according to van Ek and Alexander (1976), depends on the characteristics of the teaching/learning process and there is no one specified methodology. This could be one reason for not demarcating the syllabus and the methodology in the TG for the EED materials.

Two broad views regarding CLT methodology were discussed in Chapter two. One view (for example, Breen, 1984) considers that language learning is a process and as a result more emphasis should be on teaching procedures such as tasks. The other view, (for instance, Brumfit, 1981; Johnson, 1979), advocates a more "flexible methodology". While emphasising the importance of activities, advocates of this latter
view also argue that these procedures should enable the students not only to gain knowledge about the language but also to use the language.

The EED materials seem to advocate a methodology based on the second view, the "flexible methodology". Alexander (1976, p.161) refers to the methodology in the Threshold level specifications on which the EED materials are claimed to be based as "flexible to allow for the development of many parallel and radically different frameworks and methods". As discussed in Chapter two, the proponents of the "flexible methodology" argue that the teaching content should be derived through the methodology and needs to provide input as well as opportunities for the learners to interact through activities, such as group work and role play. In addition, they were of the opinion that traditional exercises such as drilling can be adapted for communicative practice.

The need for the pupils to learn "about" the language and the "ability to use" the language, is stated in the TG. It further states that language is a set of skills, which the learners must be able to acquire. As a result, it recommends that a large proportion of learning time in the language class should utilise productive pair and small group work, with the pupils practising the language skills together. This view is also similar to van Ek and Alexander (1976), who expected language practice to take place in "simulated real life situations" (p.20), and to the communicative activities mentioned by Littlewood (1981).

However, the TG also cautions teachers that all aspects of language learning cannot be covered in pair and group work. They will need to "spend a proportion of class time in explanation, drilling of structure examples, choral repetition by class and by sections, demonstration of dialogues and other techniques for the introduction of new material" (p.2). Yet, it is emphasised that such activities "should always lead to some more active participatory" work in pairs or small groups (p.2). Thus, the EED materials seem to subscribe to the view that the syllabus is derived through the methodology and that teachers should provide the input as well as the opportunities for learners to interact through activities. This view is also compatible with the SLA literature of the early 1980s as discussed in chapter three.

Both "communicative" as well as "traditional" tasks are included in the Pupil's Book and the Work Book. There are some activities which can be considered as communicative or as providing 'simulated real life experience'. For example, 'writing a letter to a children's newspaper'. In addition, there are several traditional activities.
which have been adapted as communicative tasks. For example, to teach the simple present tense negative form, an adapted drill, as indicated in Figure 5.2, is provided.

Fig. 5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Pupil's name)</th>
<th>walk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our teacher</td>
<td>doesn't cycle to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X and Y</td>
<td>don't</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(English Every Day Book 1, 1986, p.14)

These may be considered as pre communicative tasks. The Table given could help the students to practise the negative form of the simple present tense. At the same time that they could be "talking and writing" about their class, they would be using language in a meaningful situation. Thus, the activity would be different to a traditional drill where language structures are practised mechanically.

Yet, there are still a number of traditional grammar exercises, such as the following:
Make sentences like the following example using the stems given below.
Eg: I eat fish but I do not eat meat.
1. He plays cricket
2. I like

(Work Book, 1991, p.30)

Exercises such as the above, have the potential to give the students a knowledge 'about the language' that is an explicit explanation of "form". Giving practice through structural drills and insisting on accuracy at this level would help the learners master these difficult structures. A communicative course may provide for formal presentation and practice of structural and lexical items before they are incorporated into authentic language in context. As discussed in Chapter 2, it may also provide for formal revision of such items after they have occurred in several separate contexts as have been argued by some writers (for example, Hawkes, 1983; Wilkins, 1976). However, whether the teacher can keep a balance between the different types of activities, especially without clear objectives, depends on the teaching procedures to be adopted.
Teaching procedures
The TG gives comprehensive guidelines for teaching some of the sections in the Pupil's Book. However, "Grammar in Action" is one section that has been left open for teachers to decide how to handle. For example, "Grammar in Action" section states that "it is up to you to use whichever means may be most appropriate in the circumstances to ensure the pupils can use the items indicated" (Teacher's Guide, p.60). However, in the light of the type of assessment discussed above and the competence of the teachers in ESL teaching, it is likely that they may have difficulty in deciding what are the most suitable procedures to be used in the classroom.

On the other hand, the other sections, which provide comprehensive guidelines, also advise the teachers that the procedures recommended "are not suggested as a hard and fast system" (p.18). At the outset of the TG, it is stated that the Teacher's Guide "forms an indispensable part of" the Pupil's Book and the "Year seven course cannot be properly followed without it" (p.i) Thus, it is left to the teacher to decide whether to be totally dictated by the TG, to totally abandon it or to take a mid-position.

Teachers' and students' roles
Teacher dominated classrooms have been cited both as a common feature in second language classrooms and in classrooms in general, both in Sri Lanka and in other parts of the world (see Chapter two). The TG also acknowledges this as a problem and suggests that "more tactful and skilful assistance from the teacher" will help the "problem of over-directed 'teaching' as opposed to teacher-assisted LEARNING" (Teacher's Guide, p.3). There is one section in the TG on the teacher-pupil relationship and the psychological aspects of the learning environment. Teachers are warned that "impersonal, authoritative teaching" is unlikely to promote confidence in the learner to use language (p.5). Thus, teachers are advised to build rapport with their pupils. Teachers are warned that if they become too strict, the students may develop "subconscious negative attitudes" towards the target language and be "aversive" and "unmotivated" (p.5). These ideas seem to be in keeping with Krashen's (1982) views regarding the affective filter, and the role of the teacher in CLT as discussed in Chapters two and three. As will be demonstrated in later chapters, this advice takes very little account of the reality of Sri Lankan classrooms.

The TG does not explicitly describe the role of the student. Although students are supposed to be "active" and use language "productively", they are also expected to have "more practice of a less formal kind" (p.3). On the other hand, practising
language skills similar to practising dancing skills are emphasised. This might encourage teachers to go back to the drilling common in the audio lingual method. The suggestion in the TG regarding skill practice could mean "to learn it, do it" (Morrow, 1981). However, even though Morrow meant involving the learner in the learning process he also expected the learners to take the responsibility of learning and giving them more freedom in selecting "what" and "how" to say. Yet, the TG does not convey this idea nor does the Pupil's Book nor the Work Book provide for many such opportunities.

The traditional expectation of the teacher and pupil roles discussed in Chapter one, may be in conflict with the role advocated in the TG. The TG claims that objections are often raised by teachers against doing pair and group work, citing large numbers in classes resulting in too much noise and the physical limitations in the classroom as drawbacks. The TG argues against these objectives and provides a few instructions on how to handle such activities in large classes. For example, "pairs are formed by from row 'neighbours'. Groups are formed by rows turning inward" (Teacher's Guide, 1985, p.62). Yet, whether these suggestions can be applied to all classrooms is doubtful.

**Error correction and feedback**

The TG does not give specific instructions regarding error correction. It is mentioned that "correction should be patiently and lightly handled, especially in front of the whole class" (p.5). Teachers are also warned of the ill effects of "too much directed repetition, over prompting and disapproving and harsh correction" (p.3). However, it does not explicitly state how and what to correct, when to look for accuracy and when for fluency. As a result, whether there are sufficient guidelines for teachers to deal with error correction in a useful way is doubtful.

As discussed in Chapter three, error correction is an important and recurrent issue that has been addressed in second language acquisition literature. The controversy over accuracy versus fluency and when and what to correct has been discussed in CLT also and was examined in Chapter two. One area of interest in this study is the way the teachers treated errors and whether they promoted interaction in the class and opportunities for learning.

**Use of L1**

The TG does not give any guidelines in its general instructions as to the use of L1. With reference to the "Role Play", the teachers are advised to "set the scene" for the
dialogue "as much as necessary" in the first language (p.9). On the other hand, in teaching reading, the instruction is to use English "as far as possible with short glosses or explanations in the first language" (p.18). In Sri Lanka, where the teachers and pupils share a common first language, and English being their second language there may be a tendency to use a lot of L1 in the classroom.

The use of L1 in the second language classroom is another controversial issue in CLT. Whether L1 is a hindrance or a help has also been a debatable issue in SLAR. As discussed in Chapter two, writers such as Cummins and Swain (1986) and Howatt (1988) argue that the target language should be taught in the L2 and not in the L1. On the other hand, there is the view (for example, Atkinson, 1987; Finochiaro and Brumfit, 1983; Swan, 1985; Pica, 1997) that the L1 can be helpful in learning L2.

In this study, the different teachers used L1 in varying degrees depending on their understanding of ESL they also used it to communicate with their students. However, there was some confusion among the teachers over their use of L1 in the classroom.

5.6 Research related to EED materials and classroom interaction

The EED materials have been discussed in relation to their content and methodology. In this section, the two available research studies in Sri Lanka will be examined. One is related to the implementation of the EED materials and the other is related to classroom interaction. Both these studies have been conducted in secondary classes in different contexts.

The first study, which is related to the EED materials, was conducted by Karunaratne (1990), who investigated the English teacher effectiveness in relation to their use of the communicative approach. The sample for this study comprised 50 teachers selected from different categories of schools, belonging to two districts in Sri Lanka - Puttlam and Colombo. According to the researcher, the rationale for the selection of these two districts was that Colombo "is well served with English teachers and facilities" (Karunaratne, 1990, p.18) whereas Puttlam is poorly served. The data was obtained through the observation of lessons (one lesson per teacher) using a researcher designed observational schedule. This schedule was used to judge the teachers' effectiveness pertaining to ten aspects of their teaching methodology, such as the achievement of lesson objectives, lesson planning and classroom management. The teachers were
awarded a maximum of ten points for each aspect observed. This data was supplemented by the information obtained through structured interviews with teachers and parents, and questionnaires administered to students in one school.

According to Karunaratne's findings, 56 percent of the teachers were "generally successful" in using the Communicative Approach and were able to exploit the use of the Pupil's Book to its advantage. About 16 percent of the teachers "were complete failures" and 28 percent had a "vague notion of the approach" (1990, p.75). Unsatisfactory teacher training programs, teachers' poor command of the language and uneven distribution of facilities to learn English are some reasons that she cites as causes for this failure. She found similarities in the two districts with respect to distribution of resources and teacher effectiveness. The smaller schools in both districts had fewer resources and fewer competent teachers.

Karunaratne's study also found that there was greater pupil participation and enthusiasm to learn English after the introduction of the English Every Day teaching materials. Karunaratne (1990) considered this as one of the positive features of the introduction of the Communicative Approach. However, it is not certain on what basis this comparison was made. There was no reference to a previous study regarding pupil participation in classrooms before the introduction of CLT. She also claims that although teacher talk continued to dominate in the lessons, in many lessons the pupils "predominate in conversation and activity" (p.77). This claim challenges the findings of the National Education Commission (1992, p.66) that in the Sri Lankan classrooms there is very little student involvement in the activities. These contradictory claims suggest that there are different patterns of teacher-pupil interaction depending on the context of each classroom.

Referring to the students' background knowledge of English, Karunaratne (1990) stated that the majority of the students in the small schools were unable to comprehend the EED materials. She attributed this inability to their lack of background knowledge of English and lack of facilities in the schools. Karunaratne categorised the pupils into three groups in relation to their knowledge of English.

(a) Those who have a background knowledge of English and are fluent in English.
(b) Those who are not very fluent in English but make an effort to improve.
(c) Those who are very weak in English.

Karunaratne believed that some students in the second category were able to use the Communicative Approach but those in the third category could not do so.
The learning materials, according to Karunaratne (1990) were found "interesting" by the teachers, officials and parents. Yet, she felt that some content in the materials was "beyond the comprehension of the majority of the students in small schools" (p.81). Thus the teachers found it difficult to use the teaching materials and the Communicative Approach in these schools. However, the majority of the teachers preferred these textbooks to the former textbooks, although few teachers preferred the former textbooks An English Course "as they felt that these books paid more attention to structure and grammar" (p.79).

Regarding professional development, Karunaratne claims that though number of seminars had been held on the use of the textbooks they had been inadequate and the "full implementation of the approach has not been conveyed" (p.76). She also claims that some teacher educators have not been retrained and as a result some of them were not aware of the implications of the Communicative Approach and this was one reason for unsatisfactory professional development programs.

Based on her findings, Karunaratne (1990, p.104) claims that the communicative approach, after its introduction in Sri Lanka has shown "favourable results in certain instances" (p.104). However, she is sceptical about the consequences of "haphazard imposition of policies" (p.104). She suggests that there should be greater understanding of the problems the teachers face in using the same curriculum in all parts of the country. She recommends that English should be taught at three levels and at the GCE (O) Level Examination knowledge should be tested at these three respective levels.

As the first classroom-based study after the introduction of the EED materials, Karunaratne (1990) identified some of the strengths and weaknesses of the learning materials. She had selected her sample of schools from two districts and from prestigious as well as disadvantaged schools. This enabled her to compare her findings at an inter-districts as well as intra-district. She also solicited the views of parents, teachers and students regarding the EED materials. Thus, her findings could help future curriculum revisions.

However, this study was based only on the observation of a single lesson per teacher. As a result, it is doubtful whether the teacher pupil behaviour observed during the lesson could be generalised to the general classroom behaviour of teachers and students. Therefore, more research based on an increased number of lessons observed
is necessary to understand teacher-pupil interaction and opportunities to learn in the classroom.

While Karunaratne (1990) investigated the teacher effectiveness with reference to the use of CLT and the EED materials, Silva (1993) examined classroom interaction patterns in a few varied ESL teaching contexts with a view to improving teacher effectiveness.

The participant teachers of her study were ten ESL teachers who were undertaking a Postgraduate Diploma in TESL and were on their teaching practice component. Her study was based on the assumption that teachers could be trained to improve their classroom practices by recording and analysing the verbal interactions in the classroom. Silva claimed her analysis of the recorded interactions, enabled her to identify broad interaction patterns common to most classrooms observed though there were diversions as well.

Silva, observed three lessons per teacher and analysed ten minute segments of two lessons per teacher using an observational instrument - FOCUS (Foci for Observing Communicative Use in Settings). She also interviewed the teachers and students.

Based on her data, Silva (1993) claimed that the majority of the participant teachers induced interaction "whenever conducive" through activities such as pair and group work, language games and information gap activities (p. 305). However, she also stated that "excessive teacher concern for learner's grammatical accuracy, clarity of pronunciation and scrupulous conformity to expected linguistic norms" inhibited interaction (p.306). Thus, she suggested that teacher awareness should be raised to focus more on "linguistic performance" than on "linguistic competence" (p.307) of students.

Silva's observations regarding the students appeared to be contradictory. According to her, the data indicated "more instances of learners being ordered about" than instances of learners' being "consulted" (p.308). She attributed such teacher behaviour to teachers' assumption that "learners are passive recipients of learning" (p.307). According to her, this assumption is reinforced by learners' acceptance of such a role and a sense of respect for the teacher. Thus, she suggested that both teachers and learners need to be convinced of the advantages of active participation in classroom interaction. Silva also cited teachers' lack of fluency in the target language, not allowing adequate 'wait time' for students to respond, insistence of grammatical
accuracy and "overt and instant" recasts as inhibitive of interaction. However, Silva, claimed that most teacher behaviour "varied depending on the different classroom contexts" (p.326). Thus she believed that analysing the behaviour patterns may help to promote learning in the classroom.

As the pioneering study on interaction in ESL classrooms this study provides important insights for the promotion of classroom interaction, such as the cultural implications of teacher and pupil perception of their role in classroom interaction. However, some of the claims of this study have to be viewed with caution. The participant teachers in this study were on their teaching practice and were being evaluated by the researcher who was their lecturer. Thus, the teacher behaviour during this study may not be the general behaviour of teachers. Further, depending on which segment of the lesson was analysed, the interactions in the class could vary (Banbrook and Skehan, 1989). Although, the EED materials were used in these classrooms how they affected the interactions was not considered. It was claimed that the interactions varied depending on the context of the different classrooms. However, the contexts of the different schools were not discussed. Thus, further research in naturalistic classroom settings, selected from different contexts is needed to confirm the interaction patterns claimed by Silva (1993) as facilitating learning English.

While Karunaratne (1990) examined classroom practices from the perspective of the learning materials and teaching methodology, Silva (1993) examined classroom processes. However, these two studies were conducted independently of each other. Further studies based on them will help to complement their findings as well as to help to better understand language learning in the Sri Lankan ESL classrooms.

In the meantime, another curriculum revision is under way. The syllabus on which the new textbooks, The World through English are to be based is referred to as "an integrated syllabus of grammar, communicative functions and language skills – listening, speaking, reading and writing" (Teacher's Guide, 1998, p.1). Further, The grammar syllabus is carefully graded, taking the learner through a revision of the structures learnt in previous grades. The functional syllabus recycles some of the functions taught in earlier grades and introduces a number of new functions. (Teacher's Guide, 1998, p.1)

In other words, this syllabus is also eclectic and is not markedly different to the "multi syllabus" (Mosback, 1990) on which the English Every Day materials were based. Therefore, the assumption appears to be that if CLT had failed, then it was not due to
the syllabus but as a result of the implementation of the syllabus. Although Mosback (1990, p. 22) argues that a new syllabus "occasionally might seem to make demands greater than the system was currently able to meet", this could be one such occasion that the syllabus has made demands that the system was unable to meet.

5.7 Conclusion

The examination of the EED learning materials for Year seven indicates that they are based on a "grammatical ladder" around which themes and communicative activities are generally looped. The prescribed methodology mostly conforms to the principles of CLT and some findings of SLAR discussed in Chapters two and three which seems to facilitate verbal interaction. Thus, the learning materials advocate "a more communicative approach".

As discussed in Chapter two, some advocates of CLT attribute a primary role to instructional material as a way of influencing the quality of classroom interaction. The Sri Lankan government clearly agrees with this provision as it has provided the learning materials free of charge to all students since 1984. In the majority of the instances, the learning materials are the most readily available resource for the teachers as well. As a result, the learning materials are an important component in the classroom pedagogy and integral to an understanding of verbal interactions in the classroom. However, as discussed above, there are limitations inherent in the EED materials which are likely to be important in a context where teachers are often ill prepared to teach ESL, the student population is extremely diverse in terms of its experience of the English language and support within and without the school is inadequate. The next four chapters examine how the relationships between the learning materials, teacher and students work in practice in the context of verbal interaction in the classrooms of four schools.
6.1 Introduction

The next four chapters describe, analyse and interpret the data gathered in the four schools that were the focus of this study. The context of each of these schools is provided at the outset of each of the chapters through information gathered from my observations in the schools, interviews with the four teachers who were the principal participants in this study, informal discussions with the Principals, some teachers in the schools, the Principals, and from documents providing information about the schools.

The description of each case is followed by the analysis of the five lessons that were audio recorded and transcribed for the purpose of data analysis. The analysis of each lesson commences with a description of the lessons. The lessons are then analysed using the field notes and interview data supplemented by the COLT analysis. This is followed by a critical review of the observed lessons in each of the classrooms. This review examines the relationship between the teacher, learner and the learning materials as well as the oral interaction between the teachers and students which is expected to facilitate second language development.

6.2 The School: Vanitha

Vanitha is a National school, selected from the 1 AB category of schools discussed in Chapter four. It is the largest school out of the four schools selected for this study. The analysis of the lessons suggests that while certain features of the school setting, such as exposure to English outside the class and positive attitudes towards the teaching of English by the school administration are designed to promote the learning of English, other features (for example, the size of the school and the number of students in the class) seem to adversely affect the relationship between teacher and students. This, in turn, restricts opportunities for verbal interaction in the class.
Vanitha was first established by a philanthropist as a private school for the education of Buddhist girls during the time of the British rule in Sri Lanka. Although it is a government school today, it still tries to maintain the traditions and aims of its founder. About 95 percent of the students are Sinhala Buddhists representing the majority ethnic and religious communities in Sri Lanka. One of the main objectives of the school, as stated in the student record books, is to mould the students to be well disciplined women and to have the characteristics of the typical traditional women as exemplified in Buddhism. As a result students are expected to acquire qualities such as obedience to elders, calmness, kindness and patience.

Vanitha is one of the biggest girls' schools in Sri Lanka. At present the school has a student population of 4090. There are classes from Grade one to Grade twelve and these classes are not streamed. The staff comprises of 135 teachers, all of whom are female. There are eight parallel classes for each Grade and in each class there are at least 45 students, that is approximately 350 students in each Year. Due to the large number of students, each Grade is like a small school. Each Grade has a coordinator who is like the 'principal' of this 'small school'. In addition to the Grade coordinators, there are subject coordinators, including one for English. As a result of their additional responsibilities, the coordinators are given a reduced teaching load.

According to the school Principal, the school environment is designed to promote the teaching of English. In her discussion with me the Principal of Vanitha emphasised the need to improve the standard of English in the schools in Sri Lanka and her desire to do everything possible to promote the teaching of English in her own school. She was happy that I selected Vanitha for my study as she thought that the school might benefit from it. English is taught in most state schools from Grade three. However, in this school, English is taught from Grade one.

There are 20 teachers of English, all of whom are professionally qualified in the teaching of English. There are two teachers with postgraduate qualifications and most of the teachers are well experienced in teaching English. In addition, there are many co-curricular activities through which the students are exposed to English outside the English language class. Announcements are relayed both in the mother tongue and in English at the morning assembly. Inter-house debates and drama competitions organised by the English Literary association and "An English Day" are annual events in the school. Further, the students also take part in inter-school competitions, including the Shakespeare Drama competition. Most of these events took place during the duration of my observations. However, only five students from the class I observed
took part in the "English Day" events. According to the teacher in charge of drama and debating, it is often the students who follow private speech and drama courses that take part in these programs.

The school has three libraries catering to the primary, junior and senior secondary students. The main library has a comprehensive collection of English books and the students are taken to the library once a fortnight during an English period. They are allowed to borrow an English book and keep it for two weeks. According to the teacher in charge of the class I observed, the objective of the library period is to improve the students reading skills in English.

The school structure has changed over the years and this appears to have had an impact on the teaching of English. As a government school, Vanitha was originally meant to be a secondary school to accommodate fifth standard scholarship recipients (discussed in Chapter one) coming from the less privileged primary schools. The classrooms were built to cater for thirty students. However, due to the pressure from past pupils and parents, the primary section was reintroduced in 1985. As a result, in the secondary school there are students who have had their primary education in the school, as well as students who have come from schools from different parts of the island. Some of these schools may have had less facilities to promote the teaching of English.

Vanitha is considered one of the best girls’ schools in the country. There are several reasons for this belief. Although Vanitha is a school funded by the state, it is also heavily supported financially by the School Development Society (SDS) which is comprised of teachers and parents, most of whom are relatively affluent. The SDS provides funds to buy some equipment as well as for the salaries of some casual teachers. As a result, this school has better facilities than most of the other schools in Sri Lanka. The state has also provided it with better human and physical resources than in some of the other schools. Vanitha is one of the schools that the students who obtain high marks at the fifth standard scholarship examination have the choice of selecting. Due to these reasons, admission to Vanitha is competitive and highly sought after. As a consequence, the classrooms that were meant to cater to 30 students are now crowded with 45-50 students.

6.3 "Latha"

Latha is one of the senior teachers at Vanitha. She has been there for the last 12 years. She has more than 20 years experience as a teacher of English. After her secondary
education, which was in Sinhalese, she obtained a teaching appointment as a non-certificated teacher. After teaching in a remote area school for three years, she followed a two year residential English teacher training program in a Teachers' College and taught once again in the same district. After her marriage in 1985 she obtained a transfer to a school closer to Colombo. Three years later she joined the staff of Vanitha. Latha is the class teacher of one of the classes I selected for my study and she is also the teacher of English in that class.

Latha is entrusted with many responsibilities in the school. In addition to being the class teacher, Latha is also the English Coordinator for Grade 8-10. As one of the senior teachers in the school, as well as one of the parents, she is very much involved in the extra curricular activities of the school. In spite of this, she teaches 25 periods of 40 minutes duration per week in the secondary classes from Grade 7 to Grade 11.

Latha's different responsibilities sometimes impinge on her role as the teacher of English. She was involved in most of the co curricular activities that took place in the school during my period of observation. On several occasions, when she was due in class, she could not be there because of her other duties. Further, being the class teacher, when she came to class she also had to attend to "off task" activities, such as marking the register and reprimanding students for complaints received. Further, she often had to come to this class from the top floor of a three storeyed building which is in another part of the school. As a consequence, even though 40 minutes was generally allocated to each period, the amount of time available for teaching was on average 20-25 minutes.

Latha's professional training had taken place prior to the introduction of the English Every Day course. When Latha first started teaching, An English Course had been the textbook used in schools, so that she was originally trained in the use of the structural approach. However, she has attended seminars in the teaching of the EED materials. In response to questions about her confidence to follow the teaching approach currently advocated, she claimed that the seminars and the Teacher's Guide gave her adequate guidance to some extent — "yes ..some what". She felt quite confident in teaching English and she claimed that after fifteen years of using the TG that she no longer needs its guidance: "No I don t (laughs). Fifteen years experience in using it!"

The EED materials, she felt, are better than the previous course and different from it. She found the difference was mainly in the teaching of grammar and the inclusion of "Finding Out" passages, "Word Study" and — "especially dialogues...they (earlier books) did not have dialogues". These "new features" she believed made the text
interesting. However, she was of the opinion that there was not adequate grammar teaching in the EED materials whereas the earlier materials provided for the teaching of grammar even though they contained "structures, drilling and...then comprehension". In response to questions about the teaching of grammar under the new approach, she agreed that "there is grammar but we don't teach it as grammar. We go on doing the activities and students....they don't know what it is....we don't explain...we are not supposed to explain".

6.4 The class: "Class 8"

Latha's English classroom was on the top floor of a three storey building. There were 45 students in the class. They were seated in groups and each group was comprised of 6-7 students. The groups were formed by putting 6-8 desks together. The seating arrangements in the class looked as follows.

![Diagram of Class 8 seating arrangement]

There was very little space in between the groups. The teacher had access to each group with difficulty. The black board was fixed on the wall behind the teachers desk. The class had obviously been built for a teacher-fronted class with rows of desks facing the teacher and the blackboard. According to Latha, the new seating arrangement was in keeping with the instructions given by the Ministry of Education to make the class "more learner centred". As a result of this arrangement, some of the students had their backs to the blackboard and the teacher. Therefore, they found it
difficult to see what was on the board. However, each week the seating arrangements changed as the groups moved in a clockwise direction. The classroom walls were covered with charts some of which were in English.

The students in the class could be divided roughly into four groups as discussed in Chapter one. About 10% of the students in this class seemed to belong to the socio-economic group that Walatara (1979, p.18) referred to as children whose "home language is, if not fully, partially English". Observations of the class suggest that these students could converse in English and seemed to find some of the activities in the Pupil's Book quite easy. However, the majority of the students had joined the school by passing the fifth standard scholarship examination and did not come from English speaking home backgrounds. These students too were not homogeneous and fell into two groups based on their prior experiences in learning English. According to Latha, depending on the home background, whether they have learnt English in their previous schools, and the amount of extra help they receive, the majority of the students managed to gain good marks for English for the written paper at the end of the year and half yearly tests, but often found it difficult to converse in English. This comment made by the teacher was confirmed by some of the students I spoke to. For example, one of the students that I spoke to had obtained 96% for the end of the year test the previous year but claimed that she found it difficult to speak in English. The third group was made up of students who had not learnt English in the primary classes as they did not have teachers qualified to teach English and they were not exposed much to English outside the school. These students, according to the teacher, did well in other subjects but were unable to catch up in English. The fourth group was comprised of about 5% of students. Even in a prestigious school, there are students who are not literate even in their first language. Often, they come from low socio-economic backgrounds. The teacher admitted that she found it difficult to cater to these last two categories of students due to the heterogeneous nature of the student population, the pressure of covering the syllabus and the large numbers in the class. In addition, some of the students in the class went to after school tuition classes where the same learning materials were used and, as a result, these students were already familiar with some of the activities done in class.

6.5 The Lessons

This section analyses the interactions between teachers and students in five of the observed lessons. This analysis, based on transcripts of lessons, field notes and supplemented by the COLT analysis, enabled me to examine the communicative orientation of each lesson.
As discussed in Chapter four, in keeping with COLT categories the different tasks in the lesson were defined as activities, the steps that the teacher followed were the episodes. The teacher and student behaviour in each lesson is described and interpreted in relation to the activities and episodes in the lesson, based on the transcripts. Next, the activities and episodes in each lesson are examined in relation to the COLT categories of **Participant Organisation, Content, Materials Used** and **Content Control, Student Modality**, that is listening, speaking, reading and writing to supplement the interpretation of the lessons.

The Pupil’s Book, as discussed in Chapter five, consisted of eight units each containing eight sections. These follow a similar sequence: that is consisting of "Role Play", "Finding Out", "Word Study", "Listening", "Writing", "Learning Together", "Useful Dialogues" and "Grammar in Action" sections. When the five lessons observed for analysis commenced at Vanitha, the teacher was still doing unit one of the Pupil’s Book. Three of the lessons observed for analysis were from unit one. The other two were from units two and three.

The analysis of each lesson is preceded by a summary of the guidelines provided in the TG for the conduct of the lesson.

### 6.5.1 Lesson 1 — Useful Dialogue

This lesson was the first "Useful Dialogue" lesson in unit one of the EED materials. According to the general information on the "Useful Dialogues" (Appendix iii), "these are designed to give the children something they can actually say everyday for FUN as well as usefulness" (Teacher’s Guide, p.86). The theme of unit one of the EED materials as discussed in Chapter five, is describing, identifying and introducing people. The students in this class had already done the first "Role Play" lesson where Ravi and Anne met at the airport and introduced themselves to each other. The "Useful Dialogue" activity is based on this "Role Play" and the general theme of unit one.

The TG does not give specific guidelines as to the procedures to follow in conducting the "Useful Dialogue" lessons. With regards to the procedure in handling the dialogues, the teachers are referred to the introduction of the "Role Play" section. "The process is exactly the same for all dialogue work" (Teacher’s Guide, p.86).

The lesson was based on the dialogue given in Figure 6.
**USEFUL DIALOGUES**

Practise these dialogues in pairs with as many of your classmates as you can in ten minutes. Make the answers true ones. Your teacher will go through some possible answers with you first.

1. **Hello. What’s your name?**
   - My name’s.............
   - And MY name’s..........
   - How old are you?
   - I’m (eleven, twelve, nearly thirteen, eleven and three months etc.)...How old are you?
   - I’m..........

2. **Where do you live?**
   - I live (at, near, next to, in, behind)....
   - How do you get to school?
   - I (walk, cycle, come by bus, come by train, come by car, come on foot).

3. **Which subjects do you like?**
   - I like.......and......but I don’t like....
   - What do you do after school?
   - Sometimes I.....and sometimes I....

Practise the conversation in three parts first, and then put them together when you think you are ready.

*English Every Day Book 1, p.7*

Latha was delayed by ten minutes and started the activity as soon as she came to class. This is how she introduced the first episode of the lesson.

**Example 1**

01. T. Good Morning children.
02. SS. Good Morning teacher
03. T. Turn to page 7, useful dialogues.
     I ....................(pause).
04. T. Practise these dialogues in pairs with as many of your classmates as you can in ten minutes.
05. T. Right.
06. T. First have a look at the dialogues.
07. T. Just read them.
08. T. Hello, what’s your name?
09. T. My name is........
10. SS T. My name is....... 
11. T You have to get the partner to say the name.
     .........Then.....read.....read...the whole thing.
     ........
12. T And my name’s....
13. SS T And my name’s....
14. T How old are you?
15. T I am eleven years, twelve, nearly thirteen.

1 A dotted line indicates a pause in an utterance
After this introduction to episode 1 of the lesson, Latha asked the students to read the dialogue with her. However, after the students as a group started to follow her, Latha interrupted them, to explain the task. Finally, she read the dialogue while the students listened.

In the second episode, the teacher asked the students to practise the dialogue in pairs. While they did so, she walked around the class. However, during this episode, except for one child (the teacher referred to this student on an earlier occasion as "a problem student" disturbing lessons, harassing other students and cutting lessons) who sought Latha's help in translating a sentence, there was no interaction between the teacher and the students. Some of the students who were not involved in the lesson, seeing the teacher approaching, turned to their books. There were at least three students who did not have a Pupil's Book in front of them. The students had to complete the dialogue and read it to each other. From what I observed (I was seated close to the entrance to the class) the majority of the students appeared to be involved in the activity. After completing the dialogue and reading it to each other, their discussions centred around after school activities and the subjects they liked and disliked. The discussions among the students in the two groups that I could hear took place in L1.

After allowing the students to practise for seven minutes, Latha called for volunteers to come up and read the dialogue. She asked for a pair from each group to come forward. Since the students were hesitating, she named two students. They read the dialogue without difficulty and she commented by saying "good". This was followed by one pair from each group coming forward to read. Altogether seven pairs of students read the dialogue. There were no comments from the teacher on the students performance except to call for another pair to volunteer to read or to ask them "to speak louder". All the students who came up read the completed dialogue without difficulty.

After this episode in the lesson, Latha changed to a different activity. This was from the Work Book. Latha asked the students to do Activity 5 in the Work Book (Appendix iv) for homework. However, before moving on to the second activity, she asked the students to read Activity 5, which they did in chorus. The second activity, (Activity 6) involved writing a paragraph based on the information gathered in Activity 5. The students were told they could do this in the class the next day. The students were asked to read aloud Activity 7, which is given in Figure 3. They did so and were then asked to write the answers individually.
Within five minutes, about ten students had completed the activity and had taken their books up to the teacher to be marked. The lesson ended with the teacher marking a few books.

A summary of the lesson with the different activities (A), episodes (E), the time taken for each episode (T), the teacher and pupil behaviour is given in the table below.

Table 6.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>T(mts)</th>
<th>Teacher Behaviour</th>
<th>Pupil behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Read the dialogue.</td>
<td>Listened. Few choral responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>Walked around monitoring the work.</td>
<td>Completed the dialogue in pairs. Read to each other.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Listened and made a few comments. No error correction or feedback except once.</td>
<td>Seven pairs of students read the dialogue to the class. Others listened.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Read the activity in the Work Book. Told the students what they were supposed to do.</td>
<td>Listened. Choral reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>Marked a few books.</td>
<td>Individually did the writing task.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Activity  E = Episode  T = Time

Analysis of the Lesson using COLT

The lesson for the day was based on the "Useful Dialogue" in the Pupil’s Book which is comprised of a single activity. Latha incorporated an activity from the Work Book into the lesson. As a result, as Table 6.1 indicates, this lesson is comprised of two activities. While the first activity had three episodes, the second had two.
The COLT analysis category *Participant Organisation* provides opportunities to analyse the ways in which the students were organised within activities and episodes. Table 6.2 indicates the participant organisation of the lesson as a percentage of class time. The total duration of the lesson was 30 minutes.

As demonstrated in Table 6.2, the students were involved in whole class, group as well as in individual work in this lesson. The majority of the class time (60%) was spent on whole class participation, that is, the teacher led the central task while the students were the audience listening to the teacher.

**Table 6.2**

**Participant Organisation by class time.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Organisation</th>
<th>Time (mts)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patterns</td>
<td>Categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole class</td>
<td>2 T-&gt;S/C</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 S-&gt;S/C</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 choral</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Different task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same task</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Different task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same task</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, this analysis (Table 6.2) takes into account only the involvement of the majority of the participants during an episode. According to the observations, when the teacher led the activity, for the majority of the time the students were the audience listening to the teacher. However, there were also a few choral responses by the students.

Group work occupied 24% of the class time. However, during this time, some students were not involved in the activity and the teacher was unable to monitor this due to large numbers in class and lack of time. Neither did the teacher interact with the students in the groups.

---

2 T->S/C = The teacher addresses the whole class
3 S->S/C = One student or group of students address the class
4 Choral = Whole class or group of students repeat after a model provide by teacher/text book/students
The students worked individually for 5% of the class time. During this time there was no interaction with either the teacher nor other students.

Throughout the lesson, irrespective of whether it was whole class, group or individual work, all the students were expected to do the same task. When the teacher addressed the class, there were very few responses from the students. While the students were engaged in group or individual work, there was no interaction by the teacher with the students.

COLT category Student Modality, which is listening, speaking, reading and writing provides the opportunity to indicate which modality or modalities are involved for the majority of the students in different episodes of the lesson. Table 6.3 shows the predominant modality for the majority of the students as a percentage of class time.

Table 6.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Time (mts)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>23.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 6.3 indicates, for half of the class time (50%) most of the students had been involved in listening either to the teacher or to other students. However, this lesson also involved the students in speaking (24%), reading (10%) and writing (17%) of the class time.

This Table, however, does not indicate the involvement of a small number of students during each episode. Although the students were expected to speak in L2 during 24% of the class time, some of them used both L1 and L2. During the teacher fronted activity, while the class listened to the teacher, there were also a few choral responses. Similarly, while the majority of the students listened, seven pairs of students were involved in reading the completed dialogue to the class.

The Content category refers to the subject matter of the activities, that is, what the teacher and students were talking, reading, writing about or listening. As discussed in chapter four, COLT differentiates three content areas as "management", that is,
language used for classroom management, "language" that is whether the focus of the lesson is on language form, functions, discourse or sociolinguistics and "other topics". For the purpose of this study, the other topics were defined as "narrow", if the topic centred exclusively on the EED materials and "broad", if it related to a topic outside the learning materials.

The content of the lesson was a dialogue designed to find out personal information. There was no explicit reference to language form or function in the lesson. The teacher used language for "procedural directives" such as "open your books", "read the dialogue". She had to use language for disciplinary purposes only once. That was when the second pair of students were reading the dialogue to the class and the teacher could not hear what they were saying as the others were talking among themselves.

Content Control category in COLT refers to who selects the topic or task that is the focus of the instruction. The Materials used category refers in this study to whether the teacher used the Pupil’s text, the Work Book or any other materials. These two categories indicate the role of the teacher and the learning materials in the content control of the lesson.

The materials used in the lesson were the Pupil’s Book and the Work Book. Though the lesson was based on the activity in the Pupil’s Book, as can be seen from the instructions given, Latha did not adhere exactly to the procedures given in the text book. Instead of asking the students to practise the dialogue in three parts she introduced the whole dialogue at once. Further, she limited the practice of the dialogue to one pair rather than asking them to practice it "in pairs with as many of their classmates as they can in ten minutes" (English Every Day- Book 1, p.7). Instead of this activity, she incorporated the Work Book activity which provided the students with the opportunity of improving their written skills. Thus, the content of the lesson was controlled mostly by the teacher and the materials used.

Summary

The objective of the "Useful Dialogue" lesson appears to be for the students to be able to ask for and provide personal information using the model dialogue provided in the Pupil’s Book. According to the instruction provided in the Pupil’s Book, students were expected to practise the dialogue with as many other students as possible within ten minutes. Thus, this activity appeared to be designed as a "pre-communicative" task.
However, Latha adapted the activity and asked the students to practise only with their neighbours.

There was very little interaction between the teacher and the students during this lesson. At the beginning of the lesson, as instructed in Pupil’s Book, the teacher tried to explain the activity before students practised it in pairs. However, during this episode of the lesson, except for a few choral responses, for the majority of the time the students were listening to the teacher and there was no verbal interaction between the teacher and students. Likewise, during the pair activity, the students and teacher did not interact. Only one student asked for clarifications.

The teacher did not provide feedback at all during this lesson. She did not listen to the students practising during pair work. My observations suggest that there were a few students who were not involved in the activities. There was no feedback when a few pairs of students read their completed dialogues to the class, nor during pair work. Thus, as I could not record the interactions within groups, it was not possible for me to judge whether the students understood what they were supposed to do or whether what they were practising was correct.

The teacher used only L2 during the lesson. As a result, for the majority of the class time the students were listening to L2. However, during pair work the students spoke to each other in L1. As the students did not ask for clarification or responded to the teacher, it was difficult to know whether use of L2 alone was sufficient for comprehension and facilitation of language development.

Latha’s incorporation of the Work Book activity provided diversity to the lesson as well as providing the students with a writing task. However, like the "Role Play" activities, the objective of the "Useful Dialogues" seemed to be to provide opportunities to practise communicating in English. It is doubtful whether the manner in which Latha adapted the activity helped in achieving this objective. On the other hand, it may have been difficult for students to practise with more than one student due to lack of space to move around.

6.5.2 Lesson 2 - Listening - "Who’s Who?"

The second lesson in the sequence of those observed was a listening activity. As stated in chapter five, listening activities are an innovation in the EED materials and this is the first listening activity in the Year seven Pupil’s Book. The TG gives comprehensive
guidelines as to the procedure the teacher could follow in this lesson. The steps as stated in the TG are summarised in Table 6.4.

Table 6.4

Summary of lesson 2 and instructions in the TG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Teacher Behaviour</th>
<th>Pupil Behaviour</th>
<th>Instructions in the TG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Marked the register</td>
<td>Studied the picture. S-M</td>
<td>1. Pre-Questions Pupils study the picture for 3 or 4 minutes. Ask them to guess-what the people are like? How old might they be? What are they doing? What countries might they be from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Questioned the ss. about the picture (T-C).</td>
<td>Choral responses (C-T).</td>
<td>2. Write the names of the 8 people on the blackboard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wrote a list of names on the black board. Read the list (T-C).</td>
<td>Copied the list.</td>
<td>3. Read the sentences with speed and clarity as you think suitable for your pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Started to read the descriptions. Told the SS what they have to do. Continued with reading. A message brought in. Stopped reading. Continued to read. (T-C).</td>
<td>Supposed to have listened and done the task. Some did. Some listened.</td>
<td>4. Ask the pupils to write down the eight names in their exercise books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Read each description again and orally checked the answers.</td>
<td>Listened. One S. responded to T. questions (S-T). Few choral responses (C-T).</td>
<td>5. Read the sentences again at conversational speed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Read the activity in the Work Book. (T-C)</td>
<td>Listened.</td>
<td>6. Give 5 mts to make up their minds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asked the ss. to do the Work Book activity. Left the class to attend to some other work.</td>
<td>Some ss. started on the Work Book activity.</td>
<td>7. Exchange books and mark books by looking at the answers on the board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Returned to class and did the activity orally (T-C). SS were asked to write the correct number in the Work Book.</td>
<td>Choral responses and few individual responses (C-T). Some wrote the answers while listening.</td>
<td>8. If there is time for a brighter class give a list of jobs and ask the students in pairs to fit them to suitable people in the pictures. This should lead to an interesting discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this lesson, the task was to identify eight people by listening to the descriptions read by the teacher. This activity (Appendix V) given in the Pupil’s Book has eight pictures with one or two people in each. Against each picture there is a number. Above the picture, the following instructions are given.
Fig. 6.4

Your teacher will tell you about these people from the information in the teacher’s book. Listen carefully and try to guess their names from the list your teacher will write on the blackboard.

*English Every Day, Book 1, P.5*

The pictures were not quite clear in some of the books. As a consequence, some students may have found it difficult to identify the people. However, none of the students informed the teacher about the unclear pictures. Latha started the lesson at 10.30 am, (scheduled to begin at 10.20). When she came to class, some of the students were ready for the lesson. However, there were a few in each group that did not seem to be ready. The lesson began as follows.

**Example 3**

01 T. Turn to page number five in your textbook and study those pictures.

02 How many pictures are there?

03 SS. Eight.

04 T. Eight. Now study them.

While the students were studying the pictures the teacher marked the attendance register.

In the second episode, Latha tried to involve the students in a discussion. She commenced the episode by following the TG instructions and asking the students some pre-questions. She asked at least one question about each picture focusing the students’ attention on the picture. There was no response from the students for the first question. As can be seen from Example 4, the teacher provided the answer yet tried to get the students involved by converting the statement into a tag question by adding "no" at the end of the statement. Such conversions are part of the syntax of "Sri Lankan English".

**Example 4**

06. T. Now look at the pictures.

07. T. The first one.....the lady, is she a young woman or an old one?

08. T. ......Middled age no?

09. T. She has a fish in her hand.

10. T. Second one.....number two?

11. T. The man with....

12. S1 Ear phones

13. T. Ear phones. Right

14. T. Number three?

15. SS (not clear)
As Example 4 indicates, Latha helped the students by cuing the response to the next question. This encouraged S1 to reply. Latha then reacted by repeating the correct response and commenting "right". Thereafter, the students responded as a group by giving one word answers. The teacher reacted repeating and expanding the student responses. She also asked new questions to help the students to elaborate their one word responses. This pattern continued through out this episode and resulted in another individual response as can be seen from Example 5.

Example 5

29. T How many people?  
30 SS Two  
31 T What are they doing?  
32 SS Listening.  
33 T Yes. They are also listening.  
34 T Number 7?  
35 S Smiling  
36 T She is smiling and looks very pleasant.

In the third episode, the teacher wrote the list of names of the people the students were expected to identify and asked the students to copy it. While the students were writing, the teacher asked them to read the list as well. The students were busy copying and did not respond to the teachers command and finally it was only the teacher who read.

After giving the students time to copy the names and checking whether they had finished, the teacher started reading the descriptions. However, after reading one description she stopped to tell the students what they had to do. The following section of the transcript illustrates this situation.

Example 6

43. T Finished?  
44. T Right. I will read the description now.  
45. T Number one...Mr. Said's a Libyan. He's from Libya. He likes learning English.  
Now look at the picture and...write...the number ..in front of the correct name. Right?  
46. T Mr. Said's a Libyan. He's from Libya. He likes learning English.

Some of the students appeared to be confused. Yet, no one asked the teacher for clarification. A few students started to do the activity. Others were looking at what their peers were doing. The reading was further disrupted when a message was
brought in for the teacher. The teacher read each description twice, in the way indicated by Example 6.

At the end of the reading, Latha checked the answers orally by reading each description again and by asking the students who each person was. Only one student responded. The teacher noticed the lack of participation by the other students and commented.

Example 7
T. Mr. Johnes is a Londoner. He's from London. He likes helping tourists.
S1. Number eight.
T. Number?
S1. Eight.
T. Only one girl is giving the answers. What about the others?

However, the same pattern continued. The only difference was that the other students repeated S1's response as can be seen from the following excerpt.

Example 8
70. T. He wears glasses and he has a nice smile.
71. S1. Number seven.
72. T. Number?
73. SS. Seven.

At the end of checking the answers and when the teacher asked for the scores, almost all students raised their hands claiming they had all correct responses. The teacher then moved on to an activity in the Work Book.

As can be seen from table 6.4, this move to the Work Book activity, is a departure from the procedure given in the TG. The activity is as follows:
Look at page 5 of your EED book. What can you say about the picture there?

Say in which picture you can see the following:

i) two people playing golf.
ii) someone talking to a child.
iii) a man wearing glasses.
iv) a woman holding a fish.
v) a girl holding a pen in her hand and thinking.
vi) a man talking to tourists - two people listening.

Ask your teacher for their names. Write them in your books.
Your teacher will tell you something about them. Now can you say who is who?

*English Every Day Work Book 1, p.33.*

This episode is significant as one student asked the teacher for clarification. The teacher had to leave the class to speak to another teacher and the students were asked to write the answers on the book itself. Yet, as can be seen in Figure 6.5, there is no place to write the answers. One student then questioned the teacher as indicated in Example 9.

**Example 9**

T: Right. You can write the picture number there with the name.
S: In the Work Book itself?
T: Yes. In the Work Book.

During this episode, while some students were observed doing the activity other students were not. Although the teacher did not refer to the fact that the answers were provided on the next page of the Work Book some students were looking at that page.

The teacher returned to class and checked the answers orally. The students mostly gave choral responses. However, as the following example indicates, there was one instance when the students gave the wrong answer.

**Example 10**

115 T: Next one...a man wearing glasses.
116 T: Yes?
117 S1: Number four
Even though both students gave the wrong answer, the teacher did not indicate why the answer was incorrect, but reacted by providing the correct response herself. The lesson ended with this episode.

**Analysis of the lesson using COLT**

This lesson was comprised of a listening activity from the Pupil’s Book and a writing activity from the Work Book. As Table 6.6 indicates, activity 1 is comprised of five episodes while activity two is comprised of three episodes.

The **Participant Organisation** of the lesson indicated whole class as well as individual work and is indicated as a percentage of class time in Table 6.5. The duration of the lesson was 30 minutes.

**Table 6.5**

**Participant Organisation by class time.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Organisation</th>
<th>Time(mts)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patterns</td>
<td>Categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole class</td>
<td>T-S/C</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-S/C</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choral</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Different task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same Task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Different Task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same task</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>09</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 6.5, for the majority of the class time (70%) the teacher led the tasks. This period included the time the teacher led the tasks (54%) as well as the time the students responded chorally (17%). There were no student led activities during whole class participation.

As Table 6.5 demonstrates, there were no group activities during this lesson. The students were involved in individual work for 30% of the class time and they all did the same task.

5 | = An overlapping utterance.
According to the observations, during whole class participation in some episodes of the lesson, the teacher addressed the whole class and majority of the students were the audience listening to the teacher. There were a few instances of individual and choral responses to teacher questions. In other episodes while the teacher led the activity, students were expected to listen to the teacher and do an activity. However, while the students were engaged in individual work, there was no interaction with the teacher.

**Student Modality** as a percentage of class time is indicated in Table 6.6.

### Table 6.6

**Student Modality as a percentage of class time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>26.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 6.6 indicates for the majority of the class time (44%) most of the students were involved in listening which was the main objective of this lesson. They were engaged in reading and writing for 14% and 27% of class time respectively. There was no reading aloud by the students.

Speaking involved 17% of the class time. According to observations both teacher and students used L2 during this lesson. However, all the students were not involved in the discussion.

The content of the lesson was designed to improve listening skills. The students were expected to listen to the descriptions and identify people. The content was meaning oriented and there was no explicit focus on grammar or teaching language functions.

While the teacher used language for classroom management, she used language only once for disciplinary purposes. That was as indicated in Example 6 when the teacher found only one student answering the questions.

The *Materials Used* in this lesson were the Pupil’s Book and the Work Book. However, the teacher did not follow all the steps suggested in the TG. As shown in Table 6.4, instead of doing the activity recommended in the TG for a brighter class, the
teacher opted to do the Work Book activity. Whereas the activity suggested in the TG is designed to broaden the topic, the Work Book activity is for self study with the answers provided. The Work Book activity did not lead to any discussion among the students or with the teacher. The topic was narrow as it did not extend beyond what was given in the Pupil’s book and Work Book.

The content of the lesson was mostly controlled by the teacher and the text book as the materials used were the Pupil’s Book and the Work Book.

Summary

The objective of this lesson seemed to be for the students to be able to listen to descriptions of eight people and identify them by their pictures given in the Pupil’s Book. Observations in the class indicated that most students appeared unable to follow the teacher’s instructions during the listening activity.

There was no interaction between the teacher and students during the listening activity. Even though the students looked confused, none of them asked for clarification. All students claimed that all their answers were correct, yet, when the teacher was checking students’ answers, only one student responded and the others chorused after her. Thus, it is doubtful whether the students were able to listen and identify the people as intended in the lesson.

According to the instruction in the TG, it was suggested that the listening task could be extended to another activity which it was hoped would then lead to a discussion. The Work Book activity which the class completed instead of this task did not lead to a discussion.

The way the teacher provided feedback resulted in different opportunities for interaction. The COLT analysis indicated that during this lesson, the majority of the time was spent on teacher directed activities with little interaction between the teacher and the majority of the students. However, observations indicated that there were variations in the interaction patterns within episodes of the lesson. In the second episode when Latha reacted to student responses by repeating and expanding student utterances as well as asking for clarification through further questioning, there were more students responding.
The way the teacher handled student errors did not seem to result in more opportunities for interaction. There were two instances when the students provided incorrect answers. Yet, the teacher merely provided the correct response without explaining why the answers were wrong or involving other students in error correction.

6.5.3 Lesson 3 - Grammar in Action - The Simple Present Negative

"Grammar in Action", as discussed in Chapter five is another section in the TG for which no specific guidelines are given. In the general information section, it is stated that the "structural focus sections are principally a guide to the teachers" and not designed for "extensive choral repetition and drilling" (Teacher's Guide, P.60).

This lesson is one of the "Grammar in Action" lessons in unit 1. The students were expected to have learnt to write sentences using simple present tense verbs in the previous lesson. As can be seen from Figure 6.6, the lesson provides little guidance to the teacher as to its objective.

Fig. 6.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT ONE</th>
<th>THE SIMPLE PRESENT NEGATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeta does not (doesn’t) like coffee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother doesn’t buy expensive toffees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravi doesn’t work in an office.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say and write some statements about your class:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pupil's name) walk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our teacher doesn’t cycle to school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X and Y (names don’t take the bus) run</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*English Every Day Book 1, p.13*

The lesson began with the teacher reminding the students what they learnt in the previous lesson.

Example 12

01. T. Good Morning children.
02. SS. Good Morning Teacher.
03. T. We learnt the present tense that day.
04. Can you tell me a sentence in the simple present tense?
05. .......................for example..(writes ) Mala reads....what?
06. S. English newspapers.
07. T. English newspapers.

Next the new structure was introduced.
Today you are going to learn...the negative form of the simple present tense.

Right, now how do you turn this into the negative form? (The students did not respond)

This was followed by the teacher explaining in English how the present tense negative is formed. Next, the students were asked to open their books and read the example given.

Right ....now open your books and just look at the examples given here.

Read them.

In the absence of guidelines in doing this activity Latha focused mainly on teaching language form. This is illustrated in the following example.

Example 13

Then say and write some statements about your class.

You can make sentences from the table given here. I’ll give you five minutes. No, I’ll give you ten minutes. You just look at this and make some sentences.

Pupil’s name you can make any pupil’s name. Our teacher, then X and Y, that is names of two children.

Now if it is two children, the verb is what?

How do you use the verb....and what do you use....don’t or doesn’t?

Don’t. It’s plural, so it has to be plural.

Now make sentences...get into groups and you can read out the sentence in the negative form.

Next, the students were asked to discuss in their groups and write three sentences using the Table given in the book. One student was asked to write while the others helped her. The teacher went round monitoring. She noticed that the classroom was not clean and had to reprimand in L2, the students who were supposed to clean the class that day. Other than this, there was no interaction between the teacher and the students during the group activity while only one student in each group wrote, a few students were involved in the writing. However, in each group there were some students who seemed to be not involved in the activity at all. The teacher noticed this and commented.

Example 14

Now only one child is writing. What about the others?

Tell her what to write.

Discuss and write.

After checking whether the students had finished writing, the teacher asked one student from each group to read out the sentences to the class. In each group, the one
who wrote the sentences read them. The sentences the students constructed contained only the verbs in the Table and the names of children used were the common names of the characters in the book. Only one group had related the sentences to the class and the student who read the sentence was giggling when she read "our teacher doesn’t cycle to school".

The teacher listened and sometimes repeated the sentences. Only one group had made a mistake in the use of the verb form and the teacher corrected it. The way she corrected the error is demonstrated in the following Example.

Example 15
47 S2 Ravi and Mala doesn’t take.
48 T Ravi and Mala?
47 S2 take the bus
48 T Once again
49 S2 Ravi and Mala don’t take the bus to school.
50 S2 Madara doesn’t walk to school.
51 T Your group?
53 S3 Mala and Kamala doesn’t.
54 T Mala and Kamala...it’s plural
55 T Now look at this children. If it is two people it has to be...
57 T Yes?
58 T Mala and Kamala...what?
59 T doesn’t or don’t?
60 SS don’t
61 T Do not walk to school
   Do not take the bus to school. Right?
62 T Now take out your Work Books and turn to page 32.

As Example 15 demonstrates in the first instance when the student made the mistake, the teacher indicated this by partially repeating the previous utterance. However, the student did not understand what the teacher was implying. Thus, Latha reacted through a request for clarification to indicate that the student should reformulate the previous utterance. This time the student corrected the mistake. When the next group too made a similar mistake, the teacher reacted by correcting the mistake and giving a grammatical explanation. In the other groups the students did not make mistakes and there was no comment by the teacher except to ask the next group to read. The teachers reaction was form based and there was no reaction to the meaning of the student utterances.

Next, the students were asked to do the Work Book activity given below in groups.

Fig.6.7

12. Make sentences like the following example using the stems given below
   Eg: I eat fish but I do not eat meat.
1. He plays cricket.  
2. I like  
3. She sings  
4. They grow  
5. Boys wear

*English Every Day*. Work Book 1, p.32.

The teacher emphasised that all the children must both discuss and do the activity. However, it was still only a few students who were involved in the discussion. Later, each group was called upon to read a sentence. Since there were only five sentences and eight groups, Latha had to nominate five groups. In some groups it was the same student who read the sentences in both activities.

After all five sentences were read out, the students were asked to write them in their exercise books. A summary of the lesson is provided in Table 6.7

### Table 6.7

**Summary of lesson 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Teacher Behaviour</th>
<th>Pupil Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Recapitulation.</td>
<td>Listening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Explained the formation of the Simple present negative form.</td>
<td>Listening &amp; a few choral responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Explained the exercise.</td>
<td>Read the exercise. Listened to the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Monitored student work. (Spoke to me. Scolded the students for the class not been clean)</td>
<td>Discussed and wrote sentences in groups. (But only few students were really involved in the lesson).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Listened and provided feedback. (few occasions).</td>
<td>One child from each of the five groups read what had been written.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Walked around.</td>
<td>Wrote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Listened. Commented once.</td>
<td>One student from each group read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Checked the attendance. Marked the written work.</td>
<td>Students copied the sentences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of the lesson using COLT**

As Table 6.7 indicates, there were three activities in this lesson. While activity one had only one episode, the other two activities were comprised of four episodes each.
**Participant Organisation** within activities and episodes as a percentage of class time is indicated in Table 6.8. The duration of the lesson was 33 minutes.

### Table 6.8
**Participant Organisation by class time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Organisation</th>
<th>Time(mts)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patterns</td>
<td>Categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole class</td>
<td>T-S/C</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-S/C</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choral</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Different task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same Task</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Different Task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same task</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 6.8 indicates, the students were involved in whole class, group and individual work. The majority of the class time (58%) was spent on whole class participation. During this period the teacher led the activities for 25% of the class time while a student/s led the task for a similar period (25%). Students were also involved in choral work for 9% of the class time. When the teacher or a student led the activities, the rest of the class was the audience listening to the teacher or the student.

Group work occupied 30% of the class time. However, as observed, all the students were not involved in the tasks. Individual work occupied only 12% of the class time and all the students did the same task. When students were involved in group and individual work there was no interaction with the teacher.

**Student Modality** as a percentage of class time is indicated in Table 6.9.

### Table 6.9
**Student Modality as a percentage of class time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>12.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 6.9 indicates, the modality that the students were involved in for the majority of the class time was listening (49%). That is, listening either to the teacher or to another student speaking in L2. Students were expected to be involved in speaking for 30% of the class time. However, according to what was observed during this time, most students were speaking in L1. Reading involved (9%) choral reading of the activity in the Pupil’s Book and the Work Book and writing (12%) was copying the sentences written by a few students in the group.

The Content of the lesson was teaching language forms that is, the simple present negative form. There were no explicit focus on the functions of the language form taught.

The Materials used were the Pupil’s Book and the Work Book. The student utterances were form restricted due to the expectation imposed by the task and the teacher. The students not only had to use the simple present negative form but also were restricted to the structure of the sentences as they had to use the Table in the book. Thus, the content of the lesson was controlled by the teacher and the learning materials.

Summary

The objective of the lesson was not explicitly stated either in the TG or the Pupil’s Book. Latha’s objective in doing this lesson seemed to be teach language forms, that is the negative form of the simple present tense.

There was very little interaction between the teacher and the majority of the students in this lesson. According to the COLT analysis, the majority of the class time was spent on whole class activities. As the TG suggests, the teacher spent some time in teacher fronted episodes to explain the grammar point. During such episodes, the students did not ask for clarifications or initiate discourse. There were very few responses to teacher questions and they too were mostly choral.

Such episodes also led to group work. However, observations indicated that most students were not involved in the group activity. The same students who were involved in the task were also the only ones who responded to teacher questions. Nor was there interaction between the teacher and students during group work.

The teacher used only L2 in her explanations of the grammar. Further she also used metalanguage. However, as there was very little student involvement in such episodes, it is difficult to make any claims about whether students learnt the language structure
taught. On the contrary, the use of the metalanguage seemed to confuse the students. Two groups had made errors in the use of the verb form taught. The teacher focused on language form during error correction and it may have helped the students to better understand what was taught.

6.5.4. Lesson 4 - Grammar in Action - "Comparing Things"

This lesson was also a "Grammar in Action" lesson, but it is in unit two. There is no reference to this lesson in the TG. However, the Pupil's Book gives the procedure to be followed in this activity. The activity done in class taken from the Pupil's Book is given in Figure 6.6

Fig.6.6

(1) Group work. Work in groups of three. You are shopkeepers. Decide on a list of ten things you are going to sell in your shops. Make up suitable prices for the things on your list. Don’t let anyone else see your list. When you all finish, compare your lists so that you can make ten statements about the prices in your group, five using 'cheap' 'cheaper', 'cheapest' and five using 'expensive', 'more expensive', 'most expensive'. Your ten items might be - an umbrella, a clock, a watch, a pen, a school bag, a radio, a saucepan kettle, an exercise book and a bag of toffees. YOUR statements might be something like:

Rohan's clock is cheaper than mine.
Seeta's clock is cheaper than Rohan's.
Seeta's got the cheapest clock.
My umbrella's more expensive than Seeta's.
Rohan's umbrella's more expensive than mine.
Rohan's got the most expensive umbrella.

Now try the sentences again using 'dear, dearer, dearest' and 'LESS expensive' and 'the LEAST expensive.'

*English Every Day, Book 1, p.25*

The theme in unit 2 seems to be describing places and actions. The "Word Study" and the "Listening" lessons in this unit are connected with shopping. The grammar lesson is also connected with shopping and is designed to help in comparing the prices of things using degrees of comparison.

When the teacher came to class, some of the students were not present. She inquired where they were and was informed that those students were held up as a result of the Home Science practicals which they were unable to finish the previous period. Latha started the lesson and those students walked in five minutes later.

Latha followed the procedure given in the Pupil's Book and asked the students in groups of three to write a price list. Most of the students discussed the items to be included in L1 and wrote the list in English.
Next, the teacher wrote a short list of prices on the board and explained, using English only, how to compare the prices using the adjectives 'cheap' and 'expensive'. The following example illustrates how she did it.

Example 16
05 T Now look at the blackboard.
06 T School bag. Now there are three girls....Mala, Shila...and ...
Madara no?
07 S Sama
08 T Sama. Mala, Shila and Sama.
09 T Mala, what's the price of your school bag?
10 S Three hundred and fifty rupees.
11 T Shila, your one?
12 S One hundred and fifty rupees.
13 T Sama?
14 S One hundred and forty.
15 T One hundred and forty...right.
16 T Now there are three prices.
17 T Now you can first tell....Mala can say my school bag is three hundred and fifty rupees. Then Sheila can say my school bag is one hundred and fifty rupees and Sama can say my school bag is one hundred and forty rupees. Sheila and Sama can say my school bag is cheaper than Mala's and Shila's school bag. Then Sama can say I have got the cheapest school bag.
18 T Do you understand?

(No response from the students).

In this episode, the teacher involved a few of the students in her interaction with the class and an explanation was provided through a concrete example. As the discussion of the context of the class indicated, there may have been students who understood the teacher’s explanation. Yet, there was no response from the students to indicate whether they understood or not. The teacher continued with a linguistic explanation of degrees of comparison, using metalanguage such as "superlative", "comparative" as can be seen from the following example.

Example 17
19 T You are comparing the prices....comparing things....the prices there...the words we used (writes) cheap...cheaper...and cheapest.
20 T You can use another word......what do you call this word?
21 T ................Yes...cheap?
22 T It's a cheap school bag...what is it?
23 T We learnt this.
24 T ........It's an adjective.....and when you used an adjective to compare.....this is called the comparative.....and this word is the superlative........my school bag is the cheapest.
25 T In the same way for this you can use the word...the adjective expensive.
26 T Now who can tell me how to use it?
27 T ........How do you compare it?
Most expensive... how are you going to use these and talk about your bags?

Now you are talking about the prices in the shop... school bags.

How do you use these words... who can use these words out of three... the most expensive.

Mala has the most expensive school bag.

As Example 17 demonstrates, there was no response from the students to the teacher's questions. Finally she answered her own question. She checked again whether the students understood what was explained, but once again there was no response from the students.

The students in groups of three were then asked to practise comparing the things on their lists. From what was observed, in the group interactions, students were constructing sentences using the degrees of comparison even though they sometimes made mistakes. Thus, they were using L2 most of the time. However when they encountered a problem, as in the following example, they resorted to L1.

**Example 18**

S1 My hand bag is 375 rupees.

S2 My bag is 500 rupees.

S3 (Hand bag, school bag... which bag are you referring?)

S2 Bindu... (say)... my hand bag is most expensive hand bag.

S3 My pencil box is cheap.

As this example indicates, often students were forming sentences using the adjective and an item from their lists, rather than comparing each others' prices. Although the teacher did not refer to the textbook some of the students were looking at the activity in the book (Fig. 6.6) and were using the sentences in the book as a guide.

The teacher went round checking what the students were doing. She listened to the students in each group. Except for one group, the teacher found that none of the students in the other groups had understood what she expected them to do, though some of them were using the adjectives correctly. This can be seen from the following example of part of an interaction in one group.

**Example 19**

S4 My exercise book is cheaper than Bindu's.

S5 My exercise book is more expensive than Sumana's.

T Why... do you... now she is talking about cheap, cheaper and you are talking about expensive. Now tell the prices again.

S4 My exercise book is eight.

S5 My exercise book is ten rupees.

S6 My exercise book is seven fifty.

T So you can say my exercise book is cheaper than Dammil's book.
Understand...because when you compare your one...your one is cheaper than her one. But Bindu’s is the cheapest. Now carry on.

Thus, she had to explain to each group again using examples from their price lists. As a result, the entire period was devoted to practising comparisons using the two adjectives cheap and expensive. There was no time to do the other activities in the lesson.

The summary of the lesson is given in Table 6.10:

**Table 6.10**

**Summary of lesson 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher behaviour</th>
<th>Pupil behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 Explained the activity. Wrote a list of prices in groups of three.</td>
<td>Wrote a list of prices in groups of three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wrote a list of prices on the board.</td>
<td>Continued with their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Explained comparison of adjectives using an example from the list.</td>
<td>Listened. Few responses to T. nominations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Explained the activity</td>
<td>Listened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Went round monitoring the activity. Listened to groups of students and provided feedback.</td>
<td>In groups of three compared the prices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis based on COLT**

This lesson was comprised of a single activity. Table 6.10 indicates that there were five episodes in the activity.

The participant organisation of the lesson as a percentage of class time is indicated in Table 6.11. The duration of the lesson was 30 minutes.

**Table 6.11**

**Participant Organisation by class time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Organisation</th>
<th>Time (mts.)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patterns</td>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole class</td>
<td>T &gt;S/C</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S &gt;S/C</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choral</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>23.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Different task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same task</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.11 indicates that in this lesson the students participated as a whole class as well as a group. According to this Table, for the majority of the class time (76.67%), most of the students were involved in group work. In the group work all the students were engaged in the same task. During whole class participation, which was 24% of the class time, the teacher addressed the whole class and there was no choral work nor a student or students leading the rest of the class in the tasks.

According to the observations, in three out of the five episodes, the students were working in groups. In the first episode before the students started working in groups, the teacher addressed the whole class for a short period of time to explain the activity. In the final episode while the students were working in groups, the teacher also interacted with the students in the small groups. Most of the students were involved in the group activity. They were using L2 most of the time. However, as discussed before, when they encountered a problem, the students resorted to L1.

The two episodes in which the teacher addressed the whole class most of the students were the audience, listening to the teacher. There were only three student responses and these were the result of teacher nominations.

**Student modality** as a percentage of class time is indicated in the following Table.

### Table 6.12

**Student Modality as a percentage of class time.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Time(mts.)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>23.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 6.12 indicates for the majority of the class time (60%) most of the students in the class had been involved in speaking. They were engaged in listening and writing tasks for 24% and 17% respectively. There was no reading aloud or choral reading involved in this lesson. However, students had to read their price lists and what the teacher wrote on the black board in order to do the activity.
According to the observations the 17% of class time in which the students were involved in listening indicates the time they were listening to the teacher. In addition they were also listening to each other while they were speaking. The time spent on speaking involved both L1 and L2. However, there was more opportunities to use L2.

The content of the lesson was teaching language forms and meaning. The language item taught was comparison of adjectives and it was introduced through meaningful situations of comparing prices in shops. The topic of content was narrow as the activity was confined to what is in the Pupil’s Book. The teacher did not have to use language for disciplinary purposes but did use procedural directives.

The content of the lesson was controlled mainly by the teacher and the text. The Materials used were the Pupil’s Book only. However, the students wrote their own price lists.

Summary

This lesson seemed to be designed for the students to practise the comparison of adjectives. The practice was to be provided through a meaning focused, small group activity. This was one of the lessons in which some of the procedure to be followed in conducting group work is provided. Latha followed most of the instructions.

However, the haziness regarding the objective of teaching grammar discussed in the earlier chapters seemed to be apparent in this lesson. Latha explained using an example how to compare the prices of three things. Although, the Pupil’s Book does not refer to metalanguage in comparing the adjectives she did so. This seems to lead to confusion. Although, there was no indication by the students of incomprehension, neither did they respond to the teacher. Yet, group activity indicated that most of the students had not understood the objective of the task.

During group work the students had the opportunity to interact both with the teacher and each other. The student-teacher interactions in the small groups provided feedback to the students and enabled the teacher to realise that the students had not understood the task. This seems to suggest the need for the teacher to act as the facilitator in group work. However, in this lesson the teacher could do only one activity which appears to question the feasibility of conducting group work in large classes where the pressure for covering the syllabus is an issue.
The teacher used L2 throughout the lesson, while the students used both L1 and L2. The students interactions in L1 seemed to indicate that teacher's use of L2 alone may not have helped in facilitating interaction.

6.5.5 Lesson 5 - Role play - "Anne makes a mistake"

This is the first lesson in unit 3. In the "Role Play" in unit 2, Ravi realises that he has left his bag at the air port. Thus, he and Anne decide to go back to the airport to look for it. This is rehearsed in this lesson "Anne makes a mistake".

The objective of the "Role Play" lessons are not explicitly stated. However it is implied that they are designed for the students to use language in meaningful situations by "acting out roles." Grammatical structures are to be "encountered in a natural setting" before they are "explained or drilled" if necessary later in the unit (Teacher's Guide, 1985. p.7). In this "Role Play" students are expected to use language for functions such as asking for information and making suggestions.

As stated before, "Role play" is one section of the book for which the TG provides comprehensive guidelines regarding the procedure to be followed. In addition to the general information, there is specific instructions regarding further practice in each "Role Play". The general and the specific guidelines provided in the TG are summarised in Table 6.13. This Table also indicates the teacher and pupil behaviour in the lesson.

Table 6.13

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Teacher behaviour</td>
<td>Student behaviour</td>
<td>Instructions in the TG</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>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Read the dialogue</td>
<td>Listened.</td>
<td>1. Set the scene. (5 mts) Introduce the characters and describe the situation briefly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Recapulated the previous role play and set the scene for the present role play.</td>
<td>Listened. Choral responses to T. questions. Very few individual responses.</td>
<td>2. Deal with any special difficulties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Listened.</td>
<td>Choral reading of the dialogue in groups of three.</td>
<td>3. Read the dialogue 2-3 times without the ss looking at the text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Checked the understanding of a few words.</td>
<td>Two individual and one choral response to T. questioning.</td>
<td>4. Pupils repeat the dialogue in groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. The. T. play the role of one of the characters - pupils as a group or groups the other characters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Focused on language structures—adjectives and prepositions.</td>
<td>Listened.</td>
<td>6. Ask few simple questions to check general understanding.</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>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Walked around the groups. Made a comment—some ss doing other work.</td>
<td>In groups read the dialogue to find prepositions. Discussion among the students.</td>
<td>7. Ask the pupils which sections of the dialogue the illustration describes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Checked ss work (orally)</td>
<td>One st. from each group called out the “prepositions” they found.</td>
<td>8. Practise the dialogue in pairs/groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Referred to a possessive pronoun in the role play and asked for more examples.</td>
<td>two ss. responded.</td>
<td>9. Act the dialogue in pairs/groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>T. attended to some work.</td>
<td>Wrote sentences in the group. One st. wrote after discussing with some of the others in the group. (S-S)</td>
<td>Further practice 1. Get the pupils to think of situations where they would say—‘sorry to trouble you’ ‘oh, dear,’ ‘that’s all right’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Listened and provided feedback. SS were asked to copy the sentences they listened to.</td>
<td>One st. from the group read. (S-T/C) Copied the sentences that were read out</td>
<td>2. When and where they might use these statements. (a) Perhaps they can help you. (b) Why not go to the police station. (c) Why not go to your teacher. Perhaps she can help you. 3. Pupils say or write what they think the man might be saying to Anne in the second picture. 4. Draw and illustrate the man’s description.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lesson commenced with the teacher asking the students to "turn to page 27" and then proceeding to read the "Role Play" dialogue (Appendix VI).

Next, she reminded the students of what happened in the previous "Role Play" by asking questions about it. These questions were directed at the class and two students responded as can be seen from the following Example.

**Example 20**

| 08 | T | Now what happened in the earlier lesson? |
| 09 | S1 | Ravi lost his bag. |
| 10 | T | Yes, Ravi’s bag was not there. |
| 11 | T | So what did they do? |
| 12 | S1 | They went back to the airport. |
| 13 | T | Now they are at the airport. |
| 14 | T | So what are they doing? |
| 15 | S2 | They are looking for the bag. |
| 16 | T | Looking for Ravi’s bag |
| 17 | T | So did they find Ravi’s bag there? |
| 18 | S2 | No |
| 19 | T | Not yet. |
This Example illustrates how Latha reacted to student utterances in ways which seemed to stimulate more student participation. First, she indicated that the response was correct through a comment, that is "yes". Next, she paraphrased the student utterance which was followed by a request for elaboration. Throughout this interaction the teacher continued to react through paraphrase and elaboration requests. In turn 19 she also expanded the student utterance.

The class was then divided into three groups and each group was assigned a character. The dialogue was then read in groups. The teacher listened while the students read. There were a few students who did not read at all while the majority seem to read without difficulty. Latha did not make any comments on the reading. The "Role Play" was read thrice, the groups changing roles each time.

The next episode of the lesson involved checking comprehension. This episode of the lesson was another instance where the teacher incorporated student utterances and is demonstrated in the following example.

Example 21

T Right, Now do you have any difficult words that you don t understand?
.................
T Now what is arrival?
T You know this word because we learnt this word in the first lesson.
T ........arrivals?
T ........Yes...arrivals?
T ...A simple word for arrivals?
S1 Coming.
T Coming....right.
T Now what is the opposite of this?
SS Departure.
T Right.(Writes the word on the board).
T Exit..exit means.
S2 Going out
T Going out.

Here the students did not respond to the teacher's question at first. However, the teacher continued to encourage the students through paraphrase and repetition of her question until a student responded. Once the student responded, the teacher incorporated the students' response through repetition, commenting and requesting for elaboration. This resulted in other students also responding.

Thereafter, the focus of the lesson shifted to teaching grammar. The teacher referred to the phrase "brown leather bag" and mentioned that brown is an adjective. Then she indicated that there were some prepositions in the dialogue and reminded the students that they had learnt them in the first lesson.
"We learnt prepositions in the first lesson. So you know what they are".

She asked the students in groups to find the prepositions and that she would go to each group to check. She was walking around the class and noticing some students were not doing what they were supposed to do, made the following comment.

"Are you looking for the prepositions or doing something else"?

The group of students who were next to where I sat did not seem to know what prepositions were. One student was overheard asking from the other in L1, whether prepositions are adjectives. One girl claimed she did not know, while another said "yes". Thus, the group started to look for adjectives thinking they were prepositions.

A little while later when the teacher asked for prepositions, the first group had not found any. The second group, that was the group whose conversation I overheard, mentioned brown. The teacher was surprised.

**Example 22**

T. Right...your group...did you find?
   (No response from the group)
T. No?.....Not a single!
   Yes...Hiro your group?
S1. Brown
T. Prepositions!
T. Yes?
S2. On
T. On

Only one group had identified the prepositions. The teacher picked out a few more prepositions from the dialogue and wrote them on the board. She reminded the students that they had learnt prepositions in an earlier lesson. Latha also gave a few examples of sentences with prepositions.

The next episode of the lesson focused on possessive pronouns though neither the Pupil’s Book nor the TG suggest a focus on grammar in a "Role Play" lesson.

**Example 23**

T. Now what are these words....see...your bag.
   Can you find similar words like this....your bag...your bag.
   Somebody owns the bag...your bag.
   Then any other words like that?
S2. Friend’s bag
T. Friend’s bag.
S3. His bag.
T. His bag.
S1. My bag
T. My bag.
T. That’s all
   These are called...who knows...
S2. Possessive pronouns.
However, in the next episode the focus shifted once again to prepositions and possessive pronouns were not referred to again. Students were asked to write a sentence each for the seven prepositions that were on the board. Students were instructed to do this in groups. In each of the groups one student wrote the sentences, after talking with a few others. Later the teacher asked each group to read out one sentence. After each sentence was read, the teacher repeated the utterance. The following instance was the only difference to this pattern.

Example 24

S  The cat is standing behind the chair.
T  The cat is standing behind...the cat is behind the chair.
    Don t say cat is standing behind...the cat is behind.

The teacher corrected the student utterance but no reason was given as to why it was wrong. Further, she reacted to the form of the student utterances rather than the meaning. Latha used only English in her interactions with the students.

After listening to all seven sentences, the students were asked to write them in their exercise books.

As can be seen from Table 6.13 Latha, while following some of the guidelines given in the TG also diverged from it. For instance, while there was not enough time to do "further practice", her focus on teaching language structures was a diversion from the guidelines.

Analysis of the lesson using COLT

As Table 6.13 indicates there were two activities in this lesson. While activity 1 is comprised of four episodes, activity 2 contained six episodes.

Participant Organisation within the activities and episodes indicated whole class as well as Group work.

Table 6.14 indicates the participant organisation as a percentage of class time. The duration of the lesson was 30 minutes
Table 6.14

Participant Organisation by class time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Organisation</th>
<th>Time (mts)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T &gt;S/C</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S &gt;S/C</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>21.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>12.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different task</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same task</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different task</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same task</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As this Table indicates the majority of the class time, (73%) was spent on whole class participation. During this time, the teacher led the activities for 40% of the time while a student led the activities for 21% of the class time. The whole class participated in choral reading for 12% of the class time. When the teacher or a student led the tasks the majority of the students were the audience listening to the teacher and other students speaking in L2. There were few individual responses to teacher questions directed at the whole class.

The group work occupied 27% of the class time. All groups were expected to do the same task. However, most students were not involved in the task and some students were speaking in L1. The teacher did not interact with the students while they were doing the group work.

There was no individual work by the students.

The predominant Modalities the students were involved in this lesson is indicated in Table 6.15.

Table 6.15

Student Modality as a percentage of class time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>24.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>12.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 6.15 indicates for the majority of the class time most of the students were involved in listening to the teacher or other students speaking in English. The time the students were participating in reading involved both choral reading of the dialogue as well as silent reading to look for prepositions. Although 17% of the class time, the students were expected to discuss in English most students were observed speaking in L1. Writing involved copying sentences that a few students produced.

The content of the lesson was a "Role Play" dialogue. As Table 6.15 indicates in this "Role play", the guidelines given suggest that the focus should be on language functions. However, the analysis of the lesson indicates that the majority of the class time was spent on teaching language forms such as prepositions, possessive pronouns, adjectives and teaching of vocabulary. In the other episodes in the lesson, the focus of the topics was limited to either choral reading of the dialogue or to a few questions about the previous "Role Play" or grammar. There was no reference to language functions, discourse or sociolinguistic aspects.

Language was also used for classroom management such as for drawing the attention of a student whom the teacher noticed not attending to the task and for procedural directives. The lesson content was controlled by the teacher and the textbook.

The Materials used in this lesson was only the Pupil’s Book. As discussed before the teacher did not follow all the instructions in the TG. The main activity in the lesson, the "Role Play" dialogue was done as choral work. This restricted language production. However, in the final episode though students were expected to use prepositions in the sentences, language production was not totally restricted.

The content of the lesson was controlled mainly by the teacher and the Pupil’s Book.

Summary
This lesson was expected to help the students practice using English to fulfil functions such as making suggestions, asking for information and giving directions. However, the analysis of the lesson indicated that the majority of the class time was spent on teaching language forms such as prepositions and possessive pronouns. As a result, there was not enough time to use language in different situations as suggested in the TG. Nor did the students "act out roles", though they read the dialogues in groups.

The COLT analysis of the lesson also indicated that in this lesson the majority of the class time was spent on teacher fronted, whole class activities. However, there were
some episodes in the lesson where there were more teacher-pupil interactions than in others. In these episodes the teacher used different feedback techniques and it resulted in more student participation in the lessons.

Although there was group work in this lesson it did not result in more teacher-pupil interactions. The teacher did not interact with the students during the group work.

While the teacher used only L2 in the lesson, the students' interactions in the group work were mostly in L1. Some of these interactions seemed to indicate that the students had not understood what the teacher expected them to do. The teacher's use of L2 alone and metalanguage language in discussing about language forms appears to confuse some students.

The lesson which was expected to facilitate speaking did not appear to do so.

6.6 Discussion

This section discusses the five lessons in relation to the analysis of the learning materials in Chapter 5. The purpose of this discussion is to examine how theory is implemented in practice in the classroom and to identify difficulties that the teachers encountered in its implementation.

Latha was doing unit one of the Pupil's Book when observations commenced in the second term. This was due to the large number of co-curricular activities in the school and the teacher's various responsibilities which restricted the amount of time available for teaching. All schools are expected to complete teaching at least four units by the end of the second term and the students would be evaluated on this work at the half yearly tests. Thus, it was difficult for the teacher to spend too much time on each lesson. This restricted the time she could interact with individual students, especially as there were 45 students with differing proficiency levels coming from different linguistic backgrounds. Thus, the structure of the school and the context of the class discussed at the outset of this chapter seem to have affected substantially the interactions that took place in the class.

The school environment at Vanitha did not seem to facilitate interaction. The school was large and the number of students in one grade alone was larger than the two smaller schools in this study. In addition, Latha being the class teacher was expected to maintain discipline in the class and due to her other responsibilities did not have much time to interact with the students other than while teaching. Except when Latha reprimanded the students regarding the cleanliness of the class, or marked the register
what happened in the class was directly relevant to the lesson. There was no social "chit chat" in these lessons.

During most of the observations the teacher addressed the whole class with very few responses from the students. Sometimes the students did not respond to teacher questions at all nor did the teacher always react to student responses. However, when Latha provided feedback there were more student involvement resulting in different interaction patterns even within the same lesson. Even during teacher fronted activities in some episodes of the lessons there were more teacher-pupil interaction than in others. At times when the students responded as in some episodes in the Listening and Role Play lessons Latha not only repeated their answers but also commented, expanded or asked for clarification. Such feedback moves though few seemed to result in more student participation in the lesson than when there was no reaction from the teacher.

There were very few instances observed of the students reacting verbally to teacher utterances. Sometimes even after the teacher had repeated the question there was no response. There were instances observed of the students appearing to look confused and looking at others to find out what they were supposed to do. Yet, except on two occasions the students did not ask the teacher for clarification and on one of these occasions clarification was sought by a student who was considered as a "problem" student. The students in Latha's class seemed unable or unprepared to negotiate with their teacher.

The students did not initiate turns in any of the lessons observed. Even when the teacher asked a question they seemed to wait to be nominated to respond. The students not initiating turns and not asking for clarification could be due to the cultural expectations of the teacher pupil relationship mentioned in chapter one, the specific culture of Vanitha, they were conforming to the expected behaviour of girls or was likely a combination of all three which effectively silenced the students in this class in their interactions with the teacher. This aspect of the impact of culture and gender in the classroom interactions will be discussed in Chapter 10.

There were group and pair work in most of the lessons observed. However, most of these activities did not seem to result in more teacher-pupil interaction. The TG claims that pair and group activity "is central to the process" of language learning and "it is the point where authoritative teaching from the front of the class become active learning within the class" (Teacher's Guide, 1985, p.2). However, in most of the group work at Vanitha did not result in all students being actively involved in learning.
Neither did the teacher interact with the students and facilitate the interaction. In addition most of the activities done as group work were not structured to necessitate active participation of all students.

However, some small group or pair work did result in the students talking to each other using both L2 and L1. In the "Grammar in Action" lesson on comparisons, Latha followed the instructions in the Pupil’s Book and the students worked in small groups while the teacher interacted with all the groups. All the students were involved in this lesson. It also enabled the teacher to provide feedback and correct student errors. The difference in the way Latha conducted group work could be due to the lack of assistance in the TG regarding their implementation.

The majority of the students not being involved in the group activities was a recurrent feature observed in most of the lessons. Latha during the interviews commented that all the students did not involve themselves in the activities. According to her "they start chatting (laughs).....and do other things". She claimed that to involve the students in the lessons, they have to be made "interesting" and she has to go round "checking". However, she did not elaborate how the lessons could be made interesting. The analysis of the lessons indicated that in all the lessons, all students did the same task. Due to the heterogeneity of the students in this class, it could be possible that it is the students who come from English speaking backgrounds that do the tasks and respond to the teacher. Thus, providing the same task for all the students may restrict interaction and language acquisition and enhancing of those whose English is already good.

In all the lessons observed students were involved in the four modalities of listening, speaking, reading and writing. Yet, all the students were not involved in all activities. The majority of the students seemed to be listening and writing. Some of the lessons in the Pupil’s Book, such as the "Listening" and the "Useful Dialogue" are designed to involve the students in one modality more than in others. However, the TG does not provide guidelines as to how to encourage students to be involved in these modalities.

Very few instances of error correction were observed in the lessons. This could be because only a few students responded and most of their responses were correct. On the other hand, when errors were observed teacher often provided the correct response without explaining why the response was wrong. However, when the same mistake was repeated Latha indicated that the responses were wrong and provided the students with opportunities to correct the mistake. She also explained why the answer was wrong. Most of the error correction was observed during grammar lessons and was
focused on language forms. The TG does not provide much instruction regarding error correction. However, the teachers are warned against the ill effects of "harsh correction" (Teacher's Guide, p.3). There were no opportunities to observe whether the way Latha corrected student errors resulted in their using the language form correctly on other occasions.

Latha used L2 whenever she addressed the students. In the whole class student participation, students either listened to the teacher or other students using English. Thus, it could be argued that for the majority of the class time students were exposed to L2. On the other hand, in the group work most students spoke in L1 and there were instances where the students looked confused not knowing what they were expected to do. Thus, it is doubtful whether all students understood the teacher's language. Latha in the interviews admitted that in the schools she taught before Vanitha she had to use much more L1. In this school too she said that sometimes in Year 6 and 7 teachers have to use L1. Yet, Latha maintained that she normally does not use L1. The TG does not provide specific instructions regarding the use of L1. From what was observed at Vanitha it is doubtful whether using L2 alone facilitated language acquisition.

The content of all the lessons observed was based mainly on the EED learning materials. It was expected as discussed in the previous chapters, that the text book will play a major role in the classroom due to it being the most readily available resource for both teachers and students. The teacher used both the Pupil's Book and the Work Book in the class. The main objective of the Work Book activities is for the students to work on their own. In the observed lessons the Work Book activities were mostly used to provide written work and often students were first asked to do the activity as a group. Thus, it is not certain whether the use of the Work Book activities in class fulfilled the purpose for which it was supposed to have been prepared. The teacher selected the activities from the learning materials and the students seemed to comply.

The lack of specification of syllabus outcomes was reflected in Latha's teaching. This could be seen in the "Useful dialogue" lesson. Although it was designed as a communicative activity focusing on meaning there was no explicit focus on either form or meaning. Lesson three, which was a "Grammar in Action" does not give any instructions to the teacher either in the Pupil's Book or the TG. On the other hand, lesson four which was also a grammar lesson provides the instructions. Latha focused both on form and meaning in this lesson with teacher fronted activities leading to small group work which involved most of the students. Lesson three which did not have instructions was exclusively form focused even though the activity seemed to be designed as the kind of "pre communicative" task advocated by Littlewood (1984).
The lessons observed showed that while Latha followed some steps given in the TG she also diverted from it. The Role Play lesson and the "Listening" lesson were examples where she did not follow all the steps given in the TG. The TG was expected to play a main role in the successful implementation of the EED materials. After fifteen years of using the EED materials Latha felt that she didn’t need the guidance of the TG any longer. The guide claims that "the Year 7 course can not be properly followed without it" (Teacher’s Guide, p.ii). However, teachers are advised to adapt the procedure to suit their classes. Thus, Latha seems to follow the instructions in the TG. Yet, some of the steps that Latha did not follow such as the post listening activity (Table 6.4 ) in the "Listening" lesson and the further practice in the "Role Play" (Table 6.13) lesson may have provided opportunity for the students to use language in meaningful ways.

Large numbers in the class hinders the implementation of some of the communicative activities given in the Pupil’s Book. In the Useful Dialogue lesson Latha did not follow all the steps in the Pupil’s Book. It would not have been possible for all the students to move around talking to as many students as they could during 10 minutes. If it was done it may have provided the students more opportunities to practise the dialogue through a meaningful situation. During interviews Latha claimed that "noise" was one of the problems she faced in doing group work. She said that "sometimes the other teachers complain because of the noise". Thus, some of the activities in the book, though designed to facilitate interaction are difficult to implement due to context specific problems.

An explicit focus on grammar was observed in some lessons with the teacher using metalanguage in the explanations. During these episodes there was less student involvement in the interactions. According to Latha, the EED materials were different to the former text books An English Course with regards to the teaching of grammar. She claimed that although there is grammar in the EED materials teachers are not supposed to teach it as grammar and "not supposed to explain". However, as was seen in the "Role Play" lesson and the two "Grammar in Action" lessons she did teach grammar explicitly. The "Grammar in Action" lessons were designed to teach grammar through meaningful situations while in the "Role Play" lesson the TG emphasises that grammatical structures are to be "encountered in a natural setting BEFORE they are explained or drilled" (Teacher’s Guide, p.9). The way Latha interpreted the teaching of grammar in the EED materials and the way she taught could
be due to several reasons such as inadequate guidelines in the TG, and/or her prior experience in teaching and learning grammar.

Latha addressed the students from the front of the class during whole class participation. During group work she walked around the class monitoring the work of the students. However, except in the fourth lesson she was detached and was not interacting with the students. The TG advocates that the teacher should adopt a "supportive, monitoring role in the body of the class, close to the pupils and away from the detached, front-centre, lecturing position" (Teacher's Guide, p. 2). Although, at Vanitha the classroom arrangements have been changed in keeping with a "learner centred class" it seemed difficult for the teacher or student roles to be changed.

The emphasis on teaching English at Vanitha was to gain good grades at the Public examinations. The school, the parents and the majority of the students expected good examination results in English as a subject. Thus, even though the time available to teach was limited, the pressure to cover the syllabus was high at Vanitha. Consequently, the teacher had to give priority to teaching language items that are tested at the examination. Since listening and speaking skills are not tested, the tendency in the lesson was for the teacher to include writing and reading tasks in the majority of the lessons.

Most students in this class were silent participants during lessons. Listening to the teacher did not suggest that they comprehended what the teacher said as often they looked confused. Yet, in spite of this situation according to Latha most students do the writing tasks correctly as answers are provided in the tuition classes they go to outside school. Due to the product based evaluation and high value placed on gaining good grades parents who can afford, send their children to these classes with the hope of gaining better results at the examinations. Thus, as Latha pointed out gaining good grades does not reflect that the students can communicate in the second Language. Sometimes it is not interaction but rote learning that helps the students to gain good marks.

6.7 Conclusion

This chapter examined the first "case" in this study. This examination was based on the argument that the relationship between the teacher, the learner and the learning materials provide opportunities for learning. In this context the interaction between the teacher and the learners in the classroom at Vanitha was examined to find out the possible opportunities for second language development.
The lessons observed indicated that the learners involvement in the lessons appeared to be limited. There was very little interaction between the teacher and the students and not much language production by the majority of the students. On the other hand, those who produced language and participated in the activities seemed to use language without difficulty. However, the available data is insufficient to hypothesise that the students who did not interact did not acquire the second language. Nor can it be said that the students who were involved in the lessons communicated because they interacted in the class. It could be because they interacted in English outside the class.

However, the classroom data at Vanitha indicates that although CLT and SLA literature advocates interaction and the learning materials are based on this premise, the teacher is unable to exploit them to help learners to interact and facilitate language development due to context specific problems. Some of these problems such as large numbers in class, students of mixed proficiency levels being in the same class and school structure may be specific to Vanitha. On the other hand, other problems for example, insufficient professional development, problems related to the syllabus and the learning materials may be common to all schools and can be traced back to the historical development of ESL in Sri Lanka discussed in Chapter one. This aspect will be discussed in Chapter 10.
Chapter 7

"Mahasen"

7.1 The School: Mahasen.

Mahasen belongs to Type C schools, that is, schools which have classes up to GCE (A/L) but do not have the science stream.

This school was first established by the Catholic missionaries as a private school for boys during the time of the British rule in Ceylon. It had been an English medium school until it was taken over by the state in 1964 when the medium of instruction changed to Sinhala. Most of the students in this school are Sinhala Buddhists yet compared to Vanitha there are more students belonging to other religious and ethnic groups.

Mahasen, although situated in Colombo is about 8 kilo metres away from the other three schools and in a more suburban area. It is in the middle of a congested urban centre by the side of the main road. However, according to the Principal of the school, at the time the school was built its environment had been more quiet and a good residential area. The majority of the students who come to this school according to the Principal, are from working class family backgrounds.

Mahasen is a single sex school for boys. At the time the observations commenced the school had a student population of 813. The staff was comprised of 36 teachers. While the majority of the teachers were female there were 12 male teachers including the principal of the school and a Buddhist priest who was also on the staff. There were two parallel classes for each Grade up to Year seven but only one class from Year eight. The number of students per class varied, yet no class exceeded more than 35 students.
At the time of the study there were seven teachers of English and except for one all were professionally qualified in the teaching of English. All the teachers had at least five years of teaching experience. The school Principal had positive attitudes towards the teaching of English. He was quite willing for me to conduct observations in the school. When, initially I wanted to observe two classes he suggested that I also observe the class of the teacher who was not professionally trained. He thought it might help the teacher and the students. The Principal had also prepared the time tables as far as possible to have English in the morning periods so that more time could be spent on teaching English. Although English is taught in most schools from Year three in this school it is taught from Year one.

Exposure to English outside the class is limited in this school. The annual "English Day" which is held in the third term is the only event in the school calendar that provides for activities in English. According to the teacher, students look forward to this event and they try to encourage as many students as possible to take part. In fact on the first day of my observations the students were quite eager to perform the action song they did for the "English Day". Those students who do well in school level competitions such as reading, writing, recitation are sent in for the district level competitions conducted by the Department of Education.

The school structure has changed over the years. According to the Principal of the school, during the time it was an English medium private school it was reputed to be a "good" boys' school. However, with the development of two National schools for boys within a radius of five kilometres from this school Mahasen’s reputation declined. The school has less resources compared to the National schools. The entire school is comprised of five buildings which are very close to each other. There is no playground and students have to go to a nearby park to practise for the annual sports meet which is held in the second term. There is no library or laboratory. Students who pass the fifth standard scholarship examination leave this school to join a better school. At the end of year 11 those students who want to take up science subjects at the GCE (A'L) leave school and join one of the 1 AB category schools.

In general parents prefer to send their children to schools where they can complete their entire education in one school. As a result, admission to this school is less competitive than at Vanitha.
7.2 “Rasa”

Rasa was the teacher of English as well as the teacher in charge of one of the classes I observed at Mahasen. The class teachers were expected to be with their class during the morning assembly, and since on most days the first subject for the day was English, Rasa could start the lesson as soon as the period commenced.

Rasa was one of the senior teachers at Mahasen. At the time of the study, she had been teaching in the school for 13 years. She had more than 25 years experience as a teacher of English. Rasa, being a Muslim had her secondary education in English. After completing her secondary education she obtained a teaching appointment as a non-certificated teacher. Her first appointment was to a school in Colombo where she taught English to Muslim students studying in the English medium. After her marriage, for seven years she taught in a different part of Sri Lanka. During this time the English Medium in the few schools in which it was available was abolished. Thus she had to teach English to students who were studying in the mother tongue. At that time Rasa taught from *An English Course* - the course of study prior to EED. In 1983 Rasa obtained a transfer to a school in Colombo. She was awarded her first degree, the Bachelor of Arts, in the English medium as an external student in 1987. Since then she has been teaching in this school. At the time of the observations Rasa was considering retiring from Government teaching and joining one of the private English medium schools.

Although Rasa was quite experienced in teaching, her professional training was quite recent. Rasa had completed a one year full time professional development program and obtained the Postgraduate Diploma in the teaching of English in 1997. This recent training was reflected in some of her classroom practices. When observations began in 1999 she claimed that my presence in class did not disturb her as she was used to the lecturer sitting at the back of the class during her teaching practice. When the first transcript of the teacher-pupil interactions was given to her she took it home and returned it to me the next time I visited the school. She had counted the number of teacher utterances and was quite happy that she had spoken less than the total amount of student talk. She also made it a point, if possible to discuss with me about the lesson and the class after an observation.

According to Rasa, the EED materials were better than *An English Course*. From her point of view the earlier course focused more on writing whereas in the EED materials there was more emphasis on communication. While *An English Course* taught
grammatical structures students did not "get a chance to speak". When the EED materials were first introduced, she said she attended two seminars that were offered. However, at the seminars "they did a few lessons here and there— but we later managed with the TG". In response to the question whether she heard about CLT at the seminars Rasa replied "no..no.during the Diploma course". Thus though Rasa was familiar with CLT, it was because of the Diploma course rather than the seminars. She further said that the 10 weeks of teaching practice for the Diploma course was very helpful in understanding the teaching approach.

According to Rasa, the problems she faced in teaching the EED materials, were due to the students' lack of exposure to English and inadequate time for further practise. She felt that especially in grammar lessons students needed more opportunity for "further practise". As they have to finish a number of lessons per term she finds it difficult to devote as much time as she would like for this. Group work Rasa felt was helpful as the leaders could help the weaker students, though she also said they often simply copied what the leaders had written and even during tests they expected to copy from the leader.

7.3 The Class: "Class 2"

Class 2 was one of the classes in which Rasa taught English and she was also the teacher in charge.

This classroom was in a single storey building close to the entrance to the school. The school office and the staff room were quite close to this classroom. The space between the building that housed the class and the office was the only place available for students to play.

There were 26 students in the class when observations began. Yet the average attendance was about 20. Towards the end of the observations two students left the school for other schools. One of them was the 'best' student in the class. The seating arrangement in the class is illustrated in Figure 7.1.
The students always sat in the same place. According to Rasa she has divided the class into five mixed ability groups. Rasa appointed a leader in each group on the basis of the student's marks the previous year for English. For some group work the students moved around and sat in a circle by turning their chairs.

Most of the students in this class, according to the teacher, had been in the same school from Grade one. Rasa had taught most of the students when they were in Grade three. She knew the students quite well and according to her the majority of them belonged to low economic backgrounds and were not exposed much to English at home or in the community. Rasa claimed that with regards to English proficiency the students in her class could be categorised into two groups. Those students she had identified as the leaders were the 'better students'. All the others were generally of the same level, obtaining below 40 percent for the written paper.

7.4 Lessons

When the observation of the sequence of lessons to be analysed commenced at Mahasen, Rasa was doing the third unit in the Pupil's Book. Two of the lessons observed were from unit three and the other three were from unit four.

7.4.1 Lesson 1- Word Study - "Vehicles"

This lesson was the "Word Study" lesson in unit 3. The theme of this unit seems to be connected with transport and this lesson appears to be in keeping with this general theme and was about vehicles.
According to the TG the "Word Study" section "introduces sets of words for the things which are part of the world the pupils see around them every day" (Teachers Guide, p.32). In this lesson the students are expected to learn vocabulary connected with vehicles.

The Pupil's Book contains 16 words, their illustrations and two activities for the students to do in pairs (Appendix viii). The words as they appear in the Pupil's Book are given in Figure 7.2.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. carriage</td>
<td>5. driver</td>
<td>9. wheel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. cyclist</td>
<td>6. handlebars</td>
<td>10. engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. bus</td>
<td>7. lorry(truck)</td>
<td>11. headlamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. coach</td>
<td>8. seat</td>
<td>12. motorbike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. tyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14. motor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15. mudguard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16. van</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The TG gives the general instructions to be followed in the "Word Study" lessons as well as specific instructions for each lesson. The summary of the instructions and the teacher pupil behaviour in the lesson is provided in Table 7.1.
### Table 7.1
Summary of lesson 1 and instructions in the TG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Teacher Behaviour</th>
<th>Pupil Behaviour</th>
<th>Instructions in the TG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nominated SS to name vehicles.</td>
<td>Named vehicles.</td>
<td>1. T. reads the words. SS look at the pictures and identify them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drew a grid on the board. Asked the students to categorise the vehicles under air, sea and land. Fill the grid using SS responses.</td>
<td>Called out answers. Both group as well as individual responses.</td>
<td>2. T. reads out the words again. SS repeat after her. (5 mts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Explained why vehicles are important. Referred to an earlier lesson.</td>
<td>Individual and group responses.</td>
<td>3. SS. Cover the words. T name and object. SS identify by number (5 mts).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Asked the students to look at the lesson in the Pupil's Book. Called out numbers SS expected to indicate whether they knew the word by raising their hands.</td>
<td>Responded to teacher nominations.</td>
<td>4. T call out numbers. SS identify by word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>SS were asked to study the words. Wrote 5 questions on the board.</td>
<td>Some looking at their books. Others were talking with the neighbour.</td>
<td>5. SS do the pair work in the Pupil's Book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Read out numbers.</td>
<td>Expected to write the words. Some did.</td>
<td>Specific Instructions Referred to the two pair activities in the Pupil's Book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Checked the answers orally.</td>
<td>Exchanged books and marked.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Questioned SS about the position of the vehicles.</td>
<td>Answered in response to T. nominations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asked the SS to do a pair activity. Went round helping.</td>
<td>Pair work. Most SS involved in the activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring the group work.</td>
<td>One S called out numbers. Individual answers from the two groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher began episode one of the lesson with the following exchanges.

**Example 1**

01 T
02 SS
03 T
04 SS
05 T
06 SS
07 T
08 S Ro

Good Morning children.
Good Morning teacher.
Are you all ready?
Yes, teacher.
Ok. Today we are going to do a very interesting lesson on vehicles.
Vehicles.
What are vehicles... Rob?
Car... van
The teacher named three more students and they answered correctly.

In the second episode the teacher asked questions to help the students categorise the vehicles as those that travel on land, sea and air. She asked,

"Right. Now tell me car travels on land, sea or air?"

The students did not answer. The teacher then helped the students by prompting the answer

"Car goes on..." Akish completed the sentence by providing the correct response.

"Land"

The teacher repeated this response and it was immediately repeated by other students although the teacher did not ask them to do so. This was followed by a few students calling out the names of other vehicles that travel on land. While the students were responding the teacher drew a grid and as the students responded she filled it while repeating each response.

The teacher followed the same procedure and got the students to name the vehicles that travel on sea and air. Several students shouted the answers at once and it was difficult to identify who was giving the answers. Rasa also introduced the word "submarine" which the students did not know and explained its meaning using both L1 and L2. In the third episode the teacher explained that vehicles are used for travelling. As indicated in Example 2, in this episode a student responded to the teacher in L1 and Rasa incorporated the response by translating it.

Example 2

Next, the teacher connected this lesson with the previous lesson which was also on travelling. Rasa also made use of this opportunity to introduce some vocabulary that was to come in the next activity. This is illustrated in Example 3.
Example 3
59  T  Right, then Rukmal what is the thing that helped the cart to move?
60  SRu Ah... Wheel (Wheel)
61  T  What do you call that in English?
62  SRu ............. Wheels.
63  T  Wheels. Very Good.
64  SS  Wheels.
65  T  Wheels...w..h..double e...l..s. (Writes on the board).
66  SS  Wheels
67  T  Now in the car. ...what are these things?
68  SAk  Tyre
69  SS  Tyre
70  T  Tyre. Ok

This example also illustrates how the teacher encouraged Rukmal who responded in L1 to remember the English equivalent. She rewarded him by commenting "Very Good".

In the next activity the teacher asked the students to turn to the lesson in the Pupil's Book. The way she started the first episode is demonstrated in the following example.

Example 4
71  T  Right. Now turn to your lesson in your book.
      You can see on page 31, Word Study.
72  T  There are number of vehicles there.
73  T  Now I will call the number and if you know what it is you must put up your hand. Right.
74  T  Number Two...Yes Mustapa.
75  SMu  Cycle
76  T  Cyclist. Right. Cyclist.

As can be seen from this example, although the lesson was titled "vehicles" number 2 was "cyclist". This may have confused the student. The illustration in the book is a boy on a cycle and it is not certain whether number two refers to the cyclist or the cycle. Thus, the illustration could have added to the confusion.

The teacher continued to call out numbers and nominate students to answer. Some students were clamouring to answer. Rasa tried to involve all students in the lesson. As indicated in the following example she tried to encourage the students who could not respond.

Example 5
110  T  Number seven...Azan
111  T  Number seven...others don't tell.
112  SS  Miss..miss
113  T  All right Marius.
114  SS  Miss...Miss
115  T  Give him a chance.
116  T  ബിനാൻല്‍ ( right tell)
In episode 2 of activity 2, Rasa asked the students to study the words for three minutes. "Now study the number and the word. Now if I say number one you must be able to say.....I'll give you three minutes".

While the students were studying the teacher wrote five questions on the board. All the students had their books open. Some students were studying. Others were talking to each other.

In the next episode the teacher asked the students to close their Pupil's Books and to take out their writing books. She checked whether all had their textbooks closed and started to call out numbers. Rasa wanted the students to write the number and the word in front of the number. Most students appeared unable to do the task. She noticed that the students were not writing and said "if you don't know try to guess that ...right". Rasa called out five numbers.

Students were asked to exchange their books. Some students had not written anything, This is indicated in what the teachers said.
Ok. Have you exchanged your books?

©SaS a>cS §a»0  ro©a$ ®CCBC. (It's all right if you have not written)

Rasa next checked the answers orally. Akish asked the teacher in L1 if the spellings were wrong what to do. The teacher replied in L1 to mark it as correct. Next, she checked how many students had got all five correct. Only two students Akish and Gamini had answered all five correctly.

Students were next asked to open the Pupil's Book again and answer the questions the teacher asked. The questions she asked were on the board. These questions related to the second pair work given in the Pupil's Book and seemed to revise the use of prepositions as well as give the students more opportunities to use the vocabulary taught. The teacher nominated who should answer the questions. As can be seen from the following example the student misunderstood the first question asked and the teacher had to resort to L1.
Example 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sga</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Van</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where is the van?
Yes Gamini?
Sixteen
Not the number. I am asking a question.
Look at the picture and tell me.
Van
Where is it?
Yes Akish
Behind the car.
The van is...
Behind the car.
Is he correct children?
Correct.

The students answered the other questions correctly and the teacher used only L2 during the rest of this episode. Rasa noticed some students talking and indicated to them that she was aware that they were not attentive. She did so by saying ".....are you listening".

The next episode was pair work. The task Rasa wanted to do was in the Pupil's Book and is given below.

**Fig 7.3**

| Pair Work [1] Take turns to cover the list and ask your partner the names of five of the numbered things.
| Keep changing turns for five minutes to see who gets the most right. |

Rasa did not refer to the textbook and instead gave her own instructions. However, as the following example demonstrates the teacher's instructions were not clear.

Example 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sru</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Right. Now get in to your pairs and ask each other...how many...five numbers.
Five numbers.
Not to write. Like the teacher asked you...you play a game and tell me the marks.
Miss අපයක් මෙයි? (Miss do we have to write).
ඉතිහාසීය අපයක් මෙයි? (No don't write).

The teacher had to go round the class explaining to the students what she expected them to do. In some pairs both partners had their Pupil's Book opened. In other pairs, those who were supposed to respond had their books closed and as a result had to recollect both the number and the word.
In the final episode the teacher divided the class into two groups and asked one student to come up and call out numbers and the students in the two groups had to answer. The teacher asked the students to close the books. Thus, once again they had to recollect both the numbers and the words. The questions were directed at individual students in the groups. If they answered correctly a mark was awarded. There were some complaints that others in the groups were helping the ones who were supposed to answer. There was time only to ask for five numbers from each group. The lesson ended with the teacher checking the scores.

The summary of the lesson and the guidelines given in the TG are given in Table 7.1.

**Analysis of the lesson using COLT**

As Table 7.1 indicates this lesson was comprised of two *activities*. The first activity was teacher made and set the context for the second activity which was based on the lesson in the Pupil's Book. While the first activity was comprised of three *episodes*, there were seven episodes in the second activity.

*Participant Organisation* in this lesson indicates whole class, group as well as individual student involvement. Table 7.2 demonstrates the participant organisation by class time. Duration of the lesson was 40 minutes.

**Table 7.2**

**Participant Organisation by class time.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Organisation</th>
<th>Time (mts)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patterns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-S/C</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S- S/C</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different task</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different task</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 7.2 for the majority of the class time (70%) the teacher led the tasks. A student led the tasks for 10% of the class time and there was no choral work. Group work occupied 13% of the class time and all students were involved in the same
task. Students were involved in individual work for 18% of the class time. During this time they all did the same task.

Observations in the class showed that while the teacher led the activities, she interacted with the students. She questioned the students and nominated who should respond. There were individual student responses as well as students responding as a group. Two instances of students asking for clarifications from the teacher regarding instructions were observed. The students used L1 in both instances and the teacher also responded in L1.

During group participation students worked in pairs and the teacher went round the class trying to help the students. In the interactions the teacher used both L2 and L1. There were two episodes in which students worked individually. During one episode the teacher was occupied writing on the board and students were expected to study the words in the lesson. In the other episodes students had to listen to the teacher and write the words.

_Student Modality_ as a percentage of class time is indicated in the following Table.

**Table 7.3**

**Student Modality as a percentage of class time.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Time (mts)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 7.3 indicates the students had been involved in all four modalities during this lesson. For the majority of the class time (58%) most students were involved in listening to the teacher or other students speaking in English and using the vocabulary they were to learn in the lesson. During this time some students spoke in response to teacher nominations or as a group. Reading which occupied 23% of the class time involved the students in silent reading of the word list. Speech occupied 13% of the class time. According to observations during this time students used both L1 and L2. They were expected to practise the words they had heard and read. Writing involved 8% of the class time and students were asked to write some of the words they were expected to have acquired during the lesson.
The *Content* of the lesson was vocabulary connected to vehicles. These items were not taught using the illustrations in the Pupil's Book. However, the teacher did not limit the lesson to the items in the book. The lesson focused on teaching vocabulary. However, it was not only limited to teaching the 16 words the teacher also used the words in a few meaningful situations such as the mode of travelling for which they are used. Thus, the lesson focused both on form and meaning.

Rasa also used language for classroom management and for disciplinary purposes such as to draw the students attention to the lesson, when she thought they were inattentive.

The teacher used both L1 and L2. However, for the majority of the time she used L2 and L1 was used only when she failed to get the students to respond to L2. Students were mostly exposed to L2. Most of the students were provided with the opportunity to say the words they were taught at least once during the lesson.

The lesson was based on the EED materials. However, the *Content* of the lesson was not entirely *Controlled* by the learning materials. The teacher incorporated at the beginning of the lesson a task which she had devised. This enabled her to build the lesson on what the students already knew and proceed from the known to the unknown. The content of the lesson was controlled by the teacher and the materials used.

**Summary**

The purpose of this lesson seemed to be to introduce some words connected with vehicles.

The majority of the interactions in this lesson were teacher led. However, the teacher tried to involve all the students in the lesson during the teacher led episodes by questioning and nominating students to respond. A few students tended to respond more than the others and the other students would often repeat their responses. This pattern was visible in most episodes of the lesson.

Observations during pair work indicated that some students had not understood the teacher's instructions and some others found it difficult to do the tasks. However, as the teacher interacted with the students during group work she was able to explain the tasks again and to assist those who needed help. While two instances of asking for clarification during the teacher fronted activities were observed students seemed to be
more ready to ask for clarification during pair work. However, L1 was used in all these instances.

Teacher mostly used L2 during the lesson. However, when using L2 alone led to misunderstanding she used L1. When students responded in L1 some times she incorporated their answers by translating. When they asked for clarification in L1 she also responded in L1.

Rasa encouraged the students by providing feedback through repeating their correct responses and commenting often by saying "good". She also encouraged the less proficient students telling them not to be frightened to respond and that it doesn't matter if they make a mistake. Such feedback seemed to lead to more student involvement in the lesson.

The majority of the students appeared to be interested in the lesson and willing to respond at the beginning of the lesson. Several opportunities were provided for the students to practise reading and saying the words. However, the majority of the students found it difficult to write the words. Most of the students seemed to be able to say the majority of the words at the end of the lesson yet, they still found some words such as "cyclist" and "carriage" difficult to remember.

7.4.2 Lesson 2- Learning Together - "Calendar"

The TG describes the "Learning Together" tasks as "oral communicative activities" with the main purpose to involve students in meaningful conversation in pairs or small groups (Teacher's Guide, 1985, p.60). This is the second "Learning Together" lesson in unit three. This lesson was preceded by another "Learning Together" lesson in which students were expected to learn the days, months and order numbers up to the twentieth. Rasa had done this lesson the previous week.

This lesson was based on the "Learning Together" activity in the Pupil's Book and is provided in Figure 7.4
For this activity you will need to know how to talk about the past and future with the verb "am, is"

This is very easy.

Today IS Wednesday.    Yesterday WAS......?    Tomorrow WILL BE......?
Now I AM twelve.       Last year I WAS....?     Next year I'LL BE............?

Each pupil draws a calendar for a week either side of the day of the class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mark the current date [here February 1st]. Your teacher will ask you some questions with time expressions, like this: 'Today is Thursday the first of February. 'Yesterday........? Three days ago......? The day after tomorrow.....? The day before yesterday...? After some practice with your teacher, you and your pair partner give each other five time expressions like those above. Write down the answers. Check them together after each turn.

*English Every Day Book 1*, p.35

The "Learning Together" is one section in the TG that provides comprehensive guidelines in conducting these activities. In addition to the general instructions, the TG also provides specific instructions for each "Learning Together" lesson. A summary of both the general and specific instructions and the summary of teacher-pupil behaviour in the lesson is provided in Table 7.4.
Table 7.4

Summary of lesson 2 and guidelines given in the TG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Teacher Behaviour</th>
<th>Pupil Behaviour</th>
<th>Instructions in the TG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Copied the calendar. Asked the students to bring the class calendar.</td>
<td>Looked at what the teacher was doing.</td>
<td>General Presentation. A sample of the language to be used in the activity must be displayed clearly and explained as necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduced the time expressions using the class calendar.</td>
<td>Responded to teacher questions. Mostly choral.</td>
<td>Practice stage. Any technique the teacher and class find choral, repetition, group or individual repetition, direct method or mother tongue explanation may be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduced the tenses.</td>
<td>Listened. Choral responses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Focused on the grid written on the board.</td>
<td>Responded to T nominations.</td>
<td>Production. Climax of the activity. Pupils get into their pairs or groups and the teacher takes on the counselling and monitoring role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised the order numbers. Introduced up to 31.</td>
<td>Choral reading.</td>
<td>Specific. Write up the necessary language on the board. For example, &quot;was...will be.&quot; You can put up the complete range, or go one step at a time according to the ability of your class. If necessary come back to the activity two or three times over a week or so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Explained how to use &quot;day after&quot; &amp; &quot;day before&quot;. Questioned the SS</td>
<td>Listened. Responded to T nominations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Explained how to talk about age using time expressions.</td>
<td>Listened, Responded to T nominations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Explained the pair work. Went round the class checking students work.</td>
<td>Expected to question each other.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Explained the task using one pair to model.</td>
<td>Listened.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lesson began with the teacher inquiring whether there was a calendar in the classroom.

While a student at the back of the class took the calendar off the wall and brought it up to the teacher, she started copying on the black board the calendar provided in the Pupil's Book for the activity. While the teacher was writing one student commented it was a time table. The teacher heard this, and said, "not the time table. What is it?" No one answered.

After completing the calendar on the board Rasa moved on to the second episode of the lesson by focusing students' attention to the class calendar. This is how she introduced some of the language the students needed to know in this lesson.
Example 8
20 T Right. what is the date today?
21 S Ruk May
22 SS May
23 T May? What is the date today?
24 S Ruk Sixteenth
25 SS Sixteenth
26 T Today is the sixteenth.
27 T What is the day today?
28 T What's the day today?
29 S Ruk Tuesday.
30 SS Tuesday.
31 T Right. Today is Tuesday, May sixteenth.
(T wrote the sentence and underlined "is").

The teacher followed the same procedure to introduce "yesterday was...." and tomorrow will be....". Rukmal continued to respond to the teacher's questions. His responses were immediately repeated by the other students.

In the third episode attention was focused on the tenses and how Rasa explained the tenses is demonstrated in Example 9.

Example 9
48 T Now if you say is...right ....today is Tuesday the 16th, what is the tense here?
50 T Is (points to the sentence on the board) today is Tuesday. ....what is the tense?

51 T Is it past tense, present tense or future?
52 S Ru Past
53 S Ga Future.
54 T Yes? today?
55 S Ruk Past
56 S Ak Present tense
57 T Present tense. Yes Good.
58 T Today is
59 S Ak Present tense[
60 T Yes. Now today when teacher is marking the register I ask you whether absent or present no? You say present. It's because you are here today.

The teacher next checked whether the students knew the past and future tenses by using the examples written on the board. Akish provided most of the answers to teacher questions and these were repeated by the other students in chorus. Rasa used mostly L2 in this episode. However, she asked in L1 the term for "future tense". Once again Akish responded.

In the next episode the teacher asked the students to look at the calendar drawn on the board and did the task advocated in the textbook. In this episode the teacher made a
mistake in referring to the month and Akish corrected her. The way Rasa conducted
the task in the Pupil's Book is demonstrated in Example 10.

Example 10
85  T Imagine .......that today is the....Tuesday.....the thirtieth of February..
86  SAk January
87  SS January
88  T Sorry.....January
(Some students entered the class)
89  T Hurry up and sit down.....late comers.
90  T Right. Others look at the black board.
91  T Champika look at the blackboard.
92  T Right.....you have seen this.
93  T Now....imagine that today is Tuesday....30th of January. Right.
94  T Don't think of May...think of January ...30 th.
95  T Now answer my questions.
96  T What will be the date tomorrow?
97  SAk What will be the date tomorrow?
98  SRu Thirty first
99  SAk Thirty first.
100 T Thirty first. What is the day?
101 S Ru Wednesday
102 T Wednesday. Date will be the 31st. Day will be Wednesday.

The teacher next gave the L1 equivalents of "date" and "day". This was followed by
Rasa mentioning a date and questioning the students in L2 of the day, the previous and
following dates and days. Most of the time the same two students responded and the
answers were repeated by the others. As the students were responding the teacher
realised that they were making mistakes in the use of the order numbers. The
following example illustrates how she drew the students attention to the mistakes and
tried to revise what they had learnt in the previous lesson.

Example 11
132  SS Six
    Seventh
    Fourth
133  T Fourth of February,
134  T Don't say four...fourth of February.
135  T Now we have done order numbers. Can you'll remember?
136  T First...
137  SS Second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eight, nine,ten eleven, twelve,
thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, nineteen, twenty,
twenty one, twenty two..
138  T Twentieth
139  SS Twentieth

As Example 11 illustrates the students were responding in a group and they were still
making mistakes. They had learnt to count up to the twentieth in the previous lesson.
In this lesson they were taught up to the thirty first. The teacher called out the number
and the students repeated.
In the next episode students were introduced to "day before" and "day after" as can be seen in Example 12.

**Example 12**

170 T  Now I am going to ask you....all these days I was asking you about one
day earlier or one day forward right, future and past. Now I am going to
ask you......a ..little more difficult....right..about one or two days earlier and
in the future right.

171 T  Imagine that today is 7th of February.
172 T  Right...did all of your follow?
173 T  Right..7th of February....what will ......the day after tomorrow will be?
174 SRuk Eighth.
175 T  Now think carefully.
176 T  The day after tomorrow.?
177 T  Some of you may not have heard this. But we'll learn now.
178 T  The day after tomorrow?
179 T  What is tomorrow?
180 SRuk Eighth
181 T  So one day more......after tomorrow.
182 SS  Nineth
183 T  Yes. That is called ...day after tomorrow.
     (Writes on the board)
185 T  Did you follow children?
186 T  මතප (You understood didn't you?)
187 SS  Yes teacher.

Using the calendar drawn on the board the teacher got the class to practise the use of
"day after". Two examples were done with the whole class responding and this was
followed by the teacher nominating students to respond. Rasa provided feedback
either repeating the correct response and or commenting with "good" "very good".
Sometimes she tried to incorporate the rest of the class in evaluating student responses
as can be seen from the following example.

**Example 14**

211 T  Yes Mustapa?
213 SMu  ............Thirty one
214 T  Thirty first..... (We don't say thirty one ) order
     numbers.
215 T  Right. මතප (Is that correct children?)
216 SAk  Yes.
217 T  Because tomorrow is 30th. the day after tomorrow is 31st. Ok. Now did
     you follow?

Rasa sometimes focussed not only on the structure that was being taught but also
introduced new vocabulary and went beyond what was in the Pupil's Book as can be
seen from the following example.
Example 15

244 T What happens on February 4th?
245 S Ga Sunday.
246 T No. What happens in Sri Lanka?
247 T Is it a school day?
248 S Ro Independence Day
249 T Yes. Anybody tell in English. Independence Day.
250 T In English what is it?
251 T It's a long word.
252 T Yes...February 4th...Independence Day.
253 SS Independence day
254 T Independence...celebrations day...February 4th we don't come to school.

At the end of episode 6, as can be seen from what the teacher said Rasa wanted to give a pair activity next. Yet, later she changed her mind and did more whole class work.

Example 16

280 T Now listen carefully. I'll give you pair work. You have to ask each other questions and do it.
281 T I'll give you another two minutes later.
283 T Right....now I am going to ask you. Look at your textbooks. It's written there...about your age. There also we can tell present, past and future. Right. Ok.

In order to do this activity the teacher first wrote the necessary language structures on the board. Next, she tried to remind the students of the three tenses. Yet, as can be seen from Example 17 it confused some students.

Example 17

282 T Now I am...the word now...is what tense?
283 T Now I am 12 or 11 or 10
284 S (not clear)
285 T No. Is it past, present or future?
286 S Ak Present tense.
287 T Right. Now Akish only told the answer earlier also.
288 T Now means අවසාසික (Now isn't it?).
289 T Right. Gamini...tell me...how old are you?
290 S Ga Present tense.
291 T I am asking how old are you?
292 S Ga Twelve
293 T Twelve. Now I am twelve.
294 T Say...tell the sentence.
295 S Ga Past tense.
296 T No! I am asking...tell your age.
297 T Now I am twelve....tell about yourself.
298 S Ak ආවසාසික... ආවසාසික ආවසාසික (Tell...Tell the sentence).
299 S Ga Now I am twelve.
300 T Right.
As the Example 17 illustrates Gamini who the teacher had identified as one of the "good" students was confused in this instance. Until one of his peers explained in L1 he could not understand what he was expected to do.

Rasa asked three students for their age. Next she got them to say "now I am...." and "last year I was...". The teacher asked some more students for their age now and the previous year. Most of the students found it difficult to answer correctly in a complete sentence and the teacher had to prompt almost every word. Example 18 was one such instance.

Example 18
368  T  Last year what was your age?
369  T  Now I am eleven years.
370  T  Last year...
371  SLa  Last year...
372  T  I was
373  SLa  I was seven
374  T  Is he.....wait is he correct children?
375  SS  No
376  T  No why?
377  S Ak  Miss
378  T  What was his age last year?
379  T  He said now I am eleven.
380  S Ak  Ten...ten
381  T  Yes. Last year I was ten.

This was followed by the teacher questioning another student. He too found it difficult and the teacher had to help. Next, Rasa started to talk about the future. Example 19 illustrates how she explained the formation of the future tense.

Example 19
401  T  Now we are coming to another one...future. Next year I...how do we say that?
402  S Ru  Thirteen
403  T  What is the word we use here....future.
404  T  Next year I was ढोढी गोढी (can we say)?
405  SS  No.
406  T  Or I am?
407  SS  No
408  S Ak  I will be.
409  T  Will be ....right.
410  T  I will be (Writes on the board).

This was followed by the teacher naming students and asking for their age the following year. She questioned all the students in the class. Most of them found it difficult to answer. Some of the students were saying "your" for "year". The teacher explained the difference by writing the two words on the board.
Example 20

454 T Right. How do you pronounce these words?
455 T How do you say this (writes)
456 S Ak Year
457 SS Year, Year
458 T What's this word?
459 S Ak Your
460 Ss Your
461 T Ok. Your...this word is year and not your.

The next episode was a pair work. This is how the teacher explained what the students were supposed to do.

Example 21

487 T Now most of you had a chance I want you to practise in pairs.
488 T Right. Ask each other...these are the...its in your textbook.
489 T Right. You can say....now teacher asked you....Today it is Wednesday.
Yesterday was.....Today it is the 5th of February.
What will be yesterday?....Like that I want you to ask questions and the age. What was...last year I was.....Will you practise?
490 T I'll give you 5 minutes. You can look at your books. The questions are there.

The teacher went round the class checking what the students were doing. She found that most of them could not do the task. Next, she called Gamini and Rukmal to come to the front of the class. Then the bell rang signalling the end of the period. Yet, the teacher continued the lesson and asked the two students to demonstrate asking questions using the time expressions they had learnt. As illustrated in Example 22 the teacher had to help the students to do the task.

Example 22

500 T Right. Rukmal and Gamini come. Use is, was, will be.
501 T Mustapa. Sit down.
502 T Today is what?
503 S Ga Today is what?
504 T No, no. Tell the date?
505 S Ga Today is...
506 T Yes. Tell any day.
507 S Ru Today is.... today is a Wednesday.
508 T Today is Wednesday.
509 T Now you ask him the question.
510 S Ru What was yesterday?
511 S Ga Yesterday was....... 15th....eh...May...Monday.
512 T Monday. All right
513 T Then ask about...tomorrow.
514 S Ru Tomorrow will be seventeenth. March...Wednesday.
515 T All right. Others will do tomorrow.
Analysis of the lessons using COLT

This lesson was comprised of two activities based on the Pupil's Book. While the first activity contained five episodes the second had four.

The Participant Organisation of the lesson involved students in whole class as well as group participation. The duration of the lesson was 40 minutes. The participant organisation as a percentage of class time is indicated in Table 7.5

Table 7.5
Participant Organisation by class time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Organisation</th>
<th>Time (mts)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patterns</td>
<td>Categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Class</td>
<td>T-S/C</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-S/C</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choral</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Different task</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Different task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 7.5 the majority of the class time (82.5%) the students were involved in whole class participation. This period included the time the teacher led the tasks (70%), student/s leading the tasks (7.5%) as well as choral work (5%). There had also been group work but no tasks in which the students worked individually.

According to the observations during the time the teacher led the activities, she involved the students in the lesson by asking questions from the class. For the majority of the time the same students responded to the teacher and their responses were repeated by the rest of the class. However, in some episodes of the lesson such as episode four and six of activity one and episode one of activity two students responded to teacher nominations. Each student was called upon to respond at least once during the lesson.

The episode in which the teacher called upon two students to demonstrate to the rest of the class, the teacher interacted with them, monitoring and guiding them.

During group work students worked in pairs the teacher went up to each pair and monitored what they were doing. All the students were expected to do the same task
Student Modality as a percentage of class time is indicated in Table 7.6

Table 7.6
Student Modality as a percentage of class time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Time (mts)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 7.6 indicates for the majority of the class time (77.5%) most of the students in the class had been involved in listening. Choral reading involved the students for 5% of the class time. The majority of the students were expected to be involved in speaking for 17.5% of the class time.

As the observations revealed while the majority of the students were listening to the teacher there were a few students who responded to teacher nominations. Thus, these students were speaking while the rest of the class was listening. Both the teacher and the students used mostly L2 during this time. On the other hand, during oral work when students were expected to speak in L2, some students did not do the activity and they were talking in L1. This lesson did not involve the students in writing.

The Content of the lesson was to talk about the past and future with the verb "to be". Thus, the content was based on language forms. Yet, the lesson had not been designed with an explicit focus on language form but to use language through a meaning focused activity. The students were expected to talk about the past and present with the help of a calendar. According to the observations the teacher focused both on form and meaning in the lesson.

Rasa involved the students in using the calendar to talk about the past and the future. However, she also focused explicitly on form by referring to the tenses.

The teacher used English for classroom management that is for both disciplinary purposes as well as for procedural directives. L1 was used on few occasions to check students' comprehension or after several attempts at using L2 alone failed to evoke student responses.

The Materials used in the lesson was the Pupil's Book and a calendar. Though the lesson was based on the activity in the Pupil's Book the teacher did not follow all the
instructions given in the TG or the Pupil's Book. According to the TG instructions, it is
not necessary to introduce all the language structures given in the activity in one
lesson. However, Rasa introduced all the structures in this lesson. According to the
Pupil's Book students were expected to write the answers to the questions the pair
partner asks. Instead of the writing task Rasa asked the students only to speak. More
time was spent on "presentation" and "practice" than on "production" (Teacher's

The content of the lesson was based on the activity in the Pupil's Book. However, the
teacher modified the procedure suggested in the Teacher's Guide in response to student
behaviour.

Summary
This lesson was expected to promote oral interaction in small groups or in pairs. Yet,
the majority of the class time was spent in teacher fronted activities.

However, according to the instructions given in the TG before doing pair work or
"production" where the teacher is expected to switch to the "monitoring role",
language necessary for the activity has to be "presented" and "practised" (Teacher's
Guide, p 61). Although, teachers are warned not to spend too long on presentation they
are advised to use any technique they think is effective even "drilling", "choral
repetition" and "use of L1". Thus, though Rasa spent more time on teacher fronted
activities she was following the TG instructions in providing the students opportunities
to "practise" the language structures needed for the activity. However, this resulted in
reduced time available for "language production".

In this lesson also the interaction pattern observed in the previous lesson where the
students repeated the responses of the 'better' students was observed. However, the
teacher tried to involve all students in the lesson by nominating all students in the
class.

The teacher tried to teach several language structures in this lesson. She also used
metalanguage in questioning the students even though the technical terms were not
used in the Pupil's Book. Trying to teach several structures at once and the use of
metalanguage seemed to confuse the students and reduce interaction in the class. On
the other hand, the way the teacher handled errors, provided feedback and used L1
seemed to facilitate interaction.
At the end of the lesson it was only the few students who always responded in class who were able to use the structures without much difficulty and even they needed the teacher's help.

7.4.3 Lesson 3- Role Play - "Ravi is lucky"

In the "Role Play" dialogue in unit three Anne and Ravi asked for directions to go to the enquiry desk to look for Ravi's lost bag. In this "Role Play", Ravi and Anne are at the enquiry desk enquiring about his bag. Ravi had to describe the belongings in his bag for identification (Appendix ix).

The objective of this "Role Play" seems to be for the students to use language to ask for and give information. Although the TG does not specify the learning objective in this activity it provides general as well as some specific instructions that the teachers can follow in this lesson.

The instructions in the TG and the summary of the teacher pupil behaviour in the lesson are provided in Table 7.7.
### Summary of lesson 3 and the instructions in the TG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Teacher Behaviour</th>
<th>Student Behaviour</th>
<th>Instructions in the TG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Questioned the SS about the previous role play.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Set the scene (5 mts) Introduce the characters and describe the situation briefly. Explain that the words in brackets are not part of the spoken dialogue. 2. Deal with any special difficulties. Explain why &quot;IS&quot; is in capital letters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Read the dialogue.</td>
<td>Listened.</td>
<td>3. Read the dialogue 2-3 times without the ss looking at the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Questioned students.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Pupil's repeat the dialogue in groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Read the dialogue.</td>
<td>Choral reading.</td>
<td>5. T plays the role of one character- pupils as a group or groups the other characters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Questioned the students.</td>
<td>One S responded. Others listening.</td>
<td>6. Ask the SS which sections of the dialogue the illustrations describes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Read one character speech.</td>
<td>Read the dialogue in groups.</td>
<td>7. Practise the dialogue in pairs/groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nominated three students to read. Listened.</td>
<td>Three students read the dialogue. Others expected to listen.</td>
<td>8. Act the dialogue in pairs/groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Questioned the students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Went round the class monitoring the work.</td>
<td>SS expected to practise the dialogue in groups of three.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Listened. Commented.</td>
<td>Six students read the dialogue. Others expected to listen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Further practice. 1. Write a list of the things in Ravi's bag without looking back at the book. 2. What other things MIGHT Ravi carry in his bag? Remember he is a University student. Also, he couldn't pay for the bus tickets. 3. Look at the pictures and say how you can tell it is the Enquiry Desk. 4. Why did Ravi say to Anne, &quot;You mustn't tell Padmini I lost my bag.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lesson commenced with episode one in which the teacher recapitulated the previous "Role Play". As Example 23 illustrates the teacher had to repeat her question and finally resorted to L1 before a student responded.

#### Example 23

01 T Today we are going to do a Role Play......4th lesson.
02 T Now we have met Ravi and Anne earlier.
Where are Anne and Ravi?

Where are they?

Ravi and Anne, do you remember?

Where are they?

Arojeeo (where?)

Sak Airport.

SS Airport.

At the airport.

After this the teacher did not use L1 but continued to question the students, prompting them and elaborating their one word responses. This is demonstrated in Example 24.

Example 24

What did the man tell them...man what did he tell?

.....to go to the...yes?

airport.

Yes,...look at the lesson and tell me where did the man ask them to go?

Remember?...what is the place?

Between the book shop and the exit...to find the bag he asked them to go somewhere no?

Where did he ask them to go?

Yes Gamini?

Rukmal...can you remember?

Enquir

Enquiry desk.

Enquiry desk. That is the office ...to go and find out information.

After helping the students to recall what happened in the previous "Role Play" Rasa moved on to the second episode of the lesson. After explaining to the students that they need not look at the lesson but should listen to her, the teacher read the "Role Play" given in the Pupil's Book (Appendix ix ).

In the third episode the teacher questioned the students to check their comprehension. The students were expected to look at the "Role Play" in their textbooks and answer. In this episode as demonstrated in Example 25, Rasa sometimes used both L1 and L2.

Example 25

Who found the bag?

Brown leather.

No. Who found the bag?

Security.

(You heard when the teacher read. Didn't you?)

Who found the bag?

(Who found the bag?)

Anne...Anne

No.

Security

Security...security.

Security guard. Right.

security security (Don't say only security).
Rasa did not hear Akish’s second response and she continued to elaborate her responses using L1. As Akish was seated at the back of the class sometimes the teacher did not hear his responses. The students could respond to most of the questions the teacher asked by looking at the "Role Play". These questions were asked in L2 and the students also responded in L2. Sometimes the questions were directed at the class and some times the teacher nominated who should answer. Rasa also asked two questions for which the answers were not found in the book. As demonstrated in Example 26, on these occasions the teacher used both L1 and L2 and the students also used L1.

Example 26

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Now when we find something in the school whom do we give it to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>The where do we give if we find some money or pen or umbrella.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>(not clear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Ah yes. She is the watcher or to the...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>SAk</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>To the office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Right. Now this is a difficult question why did the clerk ask Ravi what is in the bag?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>?(Why did he ask like that?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>SGa</td>
<td>Miss (To know whether it is his)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>To check whether it is Ravi’s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth episode of the lesson involved the teacher reading the "Role Play" dialogue and the students as a group repeating this after her, followed by the teacher asking one question given in the TG. As Example 27 illustrates, the students did not understand the question and the teacher had to translate it to L1.

Example 27

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Why does Ravi tell Anne not to tell Padmini?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAk</td>
<td>(He says not to tell Padmini)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>No. Why does he tell her?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>?(Why does he tell?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAk</td>
<td>(He lost his bag.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Yes, because Padmini will scold him. because he has lost the bag. He has been very careless not careful. No?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In episode 6, the dialogue was read in groups. The teacher read the character of Anne and the class was divided into three groups and read the other character utterances. The teacher read with the correct intonation but some students found it difficult to read.

The teacher next nominated Akish and Gamini to come up to read the dialogue and Rukmal volunteered to be the third character. These students read the dialogue without
much difficulty. However, they did not adhere to correct intonation or stress. This was followed by three other students offering to read the dialogue. They found it difficult to read and Rukmal and Gamini helped them by prompting some of the words. Most of the students mispronounced the words "sure", "sir" and "security". Some of the other students also wanted to read. However, the teacher said that they could do so later after some practice and went on to the next episode.

In episode eight the teacher questioned the students' comprehension once again. However, the questions she asked were different. In Example 28 the teacher corrected the students when they said "security" instead of "security guard". As demonstrated in Example 28 Akish had remembered the teacher's instruction (see Example 25) although he misused it. This episode is another example where the teacher helped the students' comprehension through her elaboration of their responses. The teacher did not use L1.

Example 28

| T | Did Ravi find his bag? |
| T | Did Ravi find his bag? |
| T | This is the sentence...did Ravi find his bag? |
| T | Found?....yes or no? |
| SS | Yes. |
| T | Yes, Ravi found the bag.. |
| T | Where was the bag? |
| S Ak | Air port |
| SS | Air port. |
| T | Air port...where? |
| S Ak | Security Guard |
| T | Security Guard? |
| S Ru | ...in...security desk |
| T | Security desk |

The teacher also utilised this time to correct pronunciation mistakes students made while they were reading the dialogue. While the students were reading she had identified common errors which could cause miscommunication, and without disturbing them while reading she waited till the end of the episode to do so. As seen in Example 29 the way Rasa handled error correction involved the better students as well as the others.

Example 29

| T | All right. How do you pronounce this word? |
| T | How do you pronounce this? |
| S Ga | Sir |
| S Ak | Sure |
| T | Sure |
In the next episode the teacher asked the students to practise the dialogue in threes. Rasa asked two students to move to form groups of three. The students were told they could take only 10 minutes to practise and after that they could "act the dialogue". The teacher went round checking what the students were doing. She found some students not doing the task as they were unable to read it. She used L1 to speak to them. She asked one group to repeat after her and during most of this episode Rasa helped that group of students.

In the final episode the teacher called on volunteers to come up and read the dialogue. The first group that read, included Gamini and Rukmal who had read before. Their reading was better the second time with less hesitations. The second group that came up found it difficult to read. Although some of the other students wanted to read, there was no time for them to do so.

As the summary of the lesson in Table 7.7 indicates while Rasa followed some of the guidelines in the TG, she did not follow all the instructions, especially in further practise.

**Analysis of the lesson using COLT**

The lesson was based on the "Role Play" lesson in the Pupil's Book. As Table 7.7 indicates this lesson contained a single activity with 10 episodes.

The Participant Organisation of the lesson as a percentage of class time is indicated in Table 7.8. The duration of the lesson was 40 minutes.
Table 7.8
Participant Organisation by class time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Organisation</th>
<th>Time (mts)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patterns</strong></td>
<td><strong>Categories</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Class</td>
<td>T-S/C</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-S/C</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>choral</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Different task</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 7.8 for the majority of the class time (80%) the students were involved in whole class work. This time involved the teacher addressing the class (30%), students leading the task (25%) while the other students were listening, and the students involved in choral work (25%).

The students were involved in group work for 20% of the class time during which all the students were involved in the same task.

In this lesson the students were not involved in any individual work as part of the formal structure of the lesson.

According to the observations, during whole class participation the teacher directed the questions at the whole class most of the time. However, in a few instances she nominated students. In both instances often it was the same students as in previous lessons who responded. Sometimes the other students repeated the responses of the "good students". During episodes where students led the activities it was once again the same students who participated. As a result, for most of the class time the majority of the students were listening to the teacher or other students speaking.

During group work the teacher went round the class and interacted with the students. She helped some of the students who could not read the dialogue and got others who were not doing the task involved in it.

*Student Modality* as percentage of class time is indicated in Table 7.9.
Table 7.9

Student Modality as a percentage of class time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Time (mts)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 7.9 indicates in this lesson for the majority of the class time most students were involved in listening (62.5%), and reading (37.5%). Writing and speaking were modalities in which most of the students were involved in.

According to observations in episodes 1, 3 and 8 while the majority of the students were listening some students responded to teacher questions. Thus, they were speaking. During the group work, although the students spoke to each other they were using L1. In no episode in the lesson were any students involved in writing.

The Content of the lesson was a "Role Play" dialogue designed to improve speaking skills. However, as Table 7.8 indicated the majority of the students were not involved in speaking. The content of the lesson was meaning oriented and there was no explicit focus on teaching form or functions.

The teacher also used language for classroom management and disciplinary purposes such as trying to draw the attention of students who were inattentive. She used L2 for these purposes. However, during some episodes when she found that the students were not responding to L2 alone she used L1. Some students also responded in L1 occasionally and the teacher translated such responses into English.

The Materials used in the lesson was only the Pupil's Book. The teacher followed some of the guidelines in the TG. Yet she did not adhere to all the instructions such as doing the writing task or use the illustrations in the book for the discussion. On the other hand, Rasa followed the instructions in the TG in the choral reading of the dialogue. The entire lesson was based on the "Role Play" dialogue.

Thus the content of the lesson was based on the Pupil's Book and the procedures were adapted by the teacher sometimes in response to students' behaviour.
Summary
The purpose of the "Role Play" dialogues seemed to be to promote verbal interaction. Yet, the majority of the class time in this lesson was also spent on whole class participation with teacher fronted as well as choral work. In fact, the time spent on whole class participation in this lesson was even greater than in the preceding lessons observed.

However, the TG instructions do suggest choral reading of the dialogue and practising it in groups. The teacher followed these instructions which resulted in devoting more time for teacher fronted activities.

During pair work teacher interacted with the students. This enabled her to identify some students who had difficulties in reading the dialogue and help them. Practising in the small groups provided opportunities in some groups for the 'better' students to help the others. The students' performance after the practice seemed to be better than before and several groups wanted to read the dialogue though time did not permit it.

There was not enough time to do "further practice" as suggested in the TG. However, there were two discussions during the teacher fronted episodes. The teacher questioned the students to find out whether they have understood the situation in which the dialogue was taking place. Thus, the practice was not done in isolation.

During discussions Rasa used a mix of L1 and L2. At the beginning she used L1 which seemed to encourage students to participate in the interactions. Once the students were responding she reduced the use of L1 and limited it only to instances when L2 alone failed to draw a response.

The way Rasa provided feedback by elaborating students' responses and prompting them led to more interactions as well as reduced the amount of L1 use.

This lesson focused on verbal skills and there was no written work done in class. The teacher corrected students' pronunciation mistakes which could have resulted in miscommunication. The error correction was at the end of the episodes focusing on practice and involved the whole class.
7.4.4 Lesson - Finding Out - “Lost in the countryside”

According to the TG the objective of the "Finding Out" lessons is to enable the students to "get the meaning of the passages by processing them as far as possible in English" (Teacher's Guide, 1985, p.15). Since this "Finding Out" passage is about getting lost in the countryside the purpose of this lesson appears to be for the students to be able to learn some instructions they could follow if they get lost.

The passage as given in the Pupil's Book is given in Figure 7.5

Fig 7.5

| Groups of friends often like to go out for the day walking in open country areas, or mountainsides covered with thick trees. Sometimes they get lost. What should you do if this happens to you one day? |
| First you must keep calm. You must try not to be afraid. After some time, somebody will know you are missing and they will search for you. Keep your friends happy, especially the younger ones. |
| Secondly, make as much noise as you can for as long as you can. If you all shout loudly together, your voices will soon get tired. Singing is easier. Make a plan to have some noise for many hours if possible. |
| Thirdly, make it easy for people to see where you are. Light a fire. Find an open space away from trees or bushes. If it is daytime, put plenty of green leaves on the fire to make a lot of smoke. At night, make the fire burn brightly with plenty of dry leaves and sticks. One of the group should climb to the top of the tallest tree near you and tie something white to the top - also a piece of something shiny to flash in the sunlight in the day time. |
| If one or two of you go to find help, you must mark your way with small piles of stones, branches, or marks on trees. You don't want to get lost twice. |

*English Every Day, Pupil's Book 1*, p.41

The TG gives both general and specific instructions that teachers can follow in doing the "Finding Out" passages. A summary of the instructions and the teacher pupil behaviour in the lesson is given in Table 7.10
Table 7.10
Summary of lesson 4 and instructions in the TG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Teacher Behaviour</th>
<th>Pupil Behaviour</th>
<th>Instructions in the TG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Introduced the topic showing a picture and asking questions.</td>
<td>Responds to teacher questions. Individual as well as choral responses.</td>
<td>1 Interest the pupils in the materials. 2 Deal with any special difficulty. 3 Read out the passage while pupils listen. 4 Pupils skim through the passage. 5 Read the passage while the pupils follow it in their books. 6 Practise in reading aloud. 7 Questions on the passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Read the passage.</td>
<td>Listened.</td>
<td>Specific Instructions First para can be read as an introduction with any additions or explanations in L1. Introduction should be brief-let the pupils find out for themselves. Pre questions - try to count the number of things you should do if you get lost in the countryside. Post questions - In the Pupil’s Book may be too difficult. If so prepare simpler ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Checked comprehension by asking questions.</td>
<td>Two students responded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Read the passage.</td>
<td>Repeated after the teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Helped the students to read the questions in the book.</td>
<td>Three students read the questions. Two T nominations. One volunteered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Read the question.</td>
<td>Choral responses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Involved in official work.</td>
<td>Writes the answers in groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided feedback.</td>
<td>Group leaders read the answers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher commenced the lesson as demonstrated in Example 30 by introducing the topic countryside

Example 30

01 T Today we are going to do the lesson lost in the countryside.
02 T Now tell me where are we living today?
03 S Ak Colombo
04 T What is it country side or what?
05 S Ru ꕑ Greenland (Town)
06 T It’s a town. ꕑ/ is town.
07 T But if we go to the countryside......what is countryside?
08 T ......FirstOrDefault? (countryside isn’t it ?)
09 T ......villages.....that is called countryside.
10 T Now look at these pictures.
11 T Can you see?
After this introduction the teacher showed two pictures to the students. She introduced vocabulary connected with the countryside by using questions based on the pictures. Most of the questions were directed at the whole class. There were individual responses which were often repeated by the whole class.

Most of the questions Rasa asked were display or questions for which the answer was known. Yet, as can be seen from Example 31, she also asked referential questions.

**Example 31**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Is this a town or countryside?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SAk</td>
<td>Countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Countryside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Countryside...yes because.....how do you know that this is a countryside?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>What do you find here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SNi</td>
<td>Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Mountain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Example 31 illustrated when Rasa asked the referential question "how do you know.." the students did not respond. Then she asked a display question which the students were able to answer.

Rasa mostly used L2 in this episode. Yet, when she found that the students were not responding she used LI to clarify her questions as well as to check student comprehension. This is demonstrated in Example 32

**Example 32**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Then when you have lots of trees what happens?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>..... (When there are lots of trees)......what do we call?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>SAk</td>
<td>Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Forest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Forest...jungle....(&quot;forest isn't it&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Right. Forest. What else?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>SNi</td>
<td>Waterfall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Waterfall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Yes in up country places...in hill country like Badulla....you have waterfalls. You have done that lesson.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Example 32 illustrates, the teacher used a mixed code, both LI and L2 in line 25. Rasa also referred to an earlier lesson where the students came across the word waterfall.

At the end of this episode a student offered a picture post card to the teacher. Rasa told the student in LI that she would take it later.
In the second episode of the lesson Rasa read the passage to the class. Students were asked to close their books and listen to the teacher. After her initial request Rasa found that several students had their books opened. She repeated her request three times in L2 and made sure that all the students had their books closed before starting to read. While the teacher read, although most students appeared to be listening, a few were not attentive, as they seemed more interested in what was happening outside the class.

In episode three the teacher checked students understanding of the passage. She questioned the students and the questions were mostly directed at the whole class. The students were told that they could "look at the book and answer". Most of the responses were provided by three students. No one answered some questions. At such instances, the teacher repeated the question, some times reformulating it or translating it. If the students did not still respond Rasa provided the answer. The way Rasa questioned the students and provided feedback during this episode is demonstrated in Example 33.

Example 33

100 SAk Light a fire.
101 T Light a fire. Again Akish. Very good.
102 T Why do we light a fire.
103 T  (Yes?) ...Why do we light a fire in the jungle?
104 T ......Then people will see. Somebody will search for you.
105 T Who will search for you?
106 T Who will search for you, if you are lost?
107 T  (Yes?) ...Who will look for you?
108 T  (It doesn't matter if you make a mistake, say)
109 T  (people)
110 SRu  (people)
111 T  (Yes. which people?)
112 SRu Friends
113 T Yes. You have gone with friends. But some other friends can come. Who else will search for you?

Episode four of the lesson was practising loud reading. The teacher read phrases from the passage and the students repeated these after her. The teacher went through the entire passage. In between reading the teacher sometimes made a comment or asked a question as illustrated in the following example.

Example 34

T and sticks
SS and sticks..
T Day time what must we put?
SS Day time...we must have lot of smoke.. (smoke isn't it?) so we must put lot of green leaves.
T dry leaves and day time green leaves. Why is that?
After these discussions the teacher and the students continued with the reading aloud. At the end of the reading the teacher referred to the story of "Hansel and Gretel" and as can be seen from the following example, was surprised when Akish claimed to have had read it.

Example 35

SS: You don't want to get lost twice.

T: Yes. (Did you understand that children?)

SS: Yes.

T: Yes? What is it?

SAk: Mark... (If someone goes in search of help) and how do you come back?

T: Where do you mark?

SRo: Mark on trees.

SRu: Marks[...

T: Marks on the trees. You have read...some stories...Hansel and Gretel (have you heard?) stories. mark...

SAk: Yes miss.

T: Ah you have read! Ok

T: Like that you must mark it and go then you can come back to the same place. Otherwise you will get lost again.

In the fifth episode the teacher asked the students to look at the questions given in the book which is provided in Figure 7.

Fig 7.6
She called upon Akish to read the first question and asked the others to follow in their books. He was slow in reading and Rukmal prompted. The teacher asked Rukmal to read the second question. Two other students volunteered to read the third and fourth questions. The teacher helped with the pronunciation of some words such as "especially," and "shiny".

The fifth question the teacher read and students were asked to say whether the statements were "right" or "wrong". As Example 39 demonstrates, the teacher sometimes questioned the students as to why a statement was right or wrong. When only one student was responding the teacher tried to get the whole class to respond.

Example 36

T  Climb a tree.
SAk  Yes
T  Yes. All of you say only Akish is answering.
T  Eat some berries.
SS  No
T  Right. Why?
T  ...You are not sure no whether it is poisonous or not.
T  Burn the forest
SRu  No
T  No
SS  No

.................
T  Bang a tin with a stick
SS  Yes
T  That you like to do in the class room.

In the next episode, the teacher asked the students to get into their groups and write the answers to the first four questions. She checked whether each group had their leaders. The students were told that the group leaders could write after discussing with the
LI. The leaders explained to the others what they had to do. The teacher could not interact with the students as another teacher came into the class to get some information from the teacher.

In the final episode of the lesson the teacher called upon one leader to read the answer to the first question. That group had misunderstood the question. Instead of the things they were supposed to do they had written the people who would go looking for the lost people. The teacher next called another leader to read the answers. The other students were told to listen. The answers to all the questions were discussed with leaders from different groups calling out answers and the teacher providing feedback. This is illustrated in Example 37. However, only Akish's group had found the answers to most of the questions.

**Example 37**

SRu  Branches or mark the trees  
T    Yes you can use the branches to mark the tree? (How?)  
T    (What do boys normally carry in their pockets?)  
T    Pen knife  
SRu  Torch  
SLa  diary  
T    Ah...diary?  
SRu  Chalk...chalk  
T    That's right. Very Good.  
SRu  Pencil...pen.  
T    Right.  
SAk  Miss  
T    Ah...charcoal...very good.

The lesson ended with the teacher asking all the students to write the answers for home work.

**Analysis of the lessons using COLT**

The lesson comprised of a single activity based on the lesson in the Pupil's Book. This activity was comprised of eight episodes.

The Participant Organisation of the lesson involved students in whole class as well as group participation. The duration of the lesson was approximately 40 minutes. The participant organisation as a percentage of class time is indicated in Table 7.11

**Table 7.11**
Table 7.11  

Participant Organisation by class time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Organisation</th>
<th>Time (mts)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patterns</strong></td>
<td>Categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Class</td>
<td>T-S/C</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S- S/C</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>choral</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Different task</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Different task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 7.11 for the majority of the class time (80%) the students had been involved in whole class participation. During this time the teacher led the tasks for 52.5%. While a student was leading the activities for 5% of the time and all the students were expected to be involved in choral work for 12% of the time. Group work involved 20% of the class time. The students were not involved in individual work during this lesson.

Observations in the class indicated that during the time the teacher led the tasks, she tried to involve the students by asking questions. However, most of the questions were directed at the whole class. Most of the time, the same students responded. In the episodes that students led the activities, the teacher interacted with the students by providing feedback. On a few instances other students also assisted the ones who were talking. During the episode in which the students were involved in choral reading, the teacher addressed the students intermittently. She questioned the students and a few students responded.

During group work the students were working in small groups and most of the students were involved in the discussion. However, there was no verbal interaction with the teacher.

*Student Modality* as a percentage of class time is indicated in Table 7.12
Table 7.12
Student Modality as a percentage of class time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Time (mts)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 7.12 indicates for the majority of the class time (65%) most of the students in the class had been listening either to the teacher or other students. The majority of the students were expected to be involved in speaking for 20% of the class time. Students read aloud for 15% of the class time. The majority of the students were not involved in writing during this lesson.

However observations indicated that there were variations among the students in their involvement in the four modalities which the above Table does not indicate. During the time most of the students were listening, some students responded to teacher questions. Thus, while the other students were listening these students were speaking.

During this time, both the teacher and the students mostly used L2, although they used L1 occasionally. On the other hand, during group work when most students were expected to use L2, they spoke mostly in L1.

Reading, as indicated in Table 7.9 involved reading aloud. Yet in episode 3 and 8, in order to respond to teacher questions the students had to read the passage. Thus, this resulted in some students involved in silent reading.

Although, the majority of the students did not write, during the group task the leaders were expected to write the answers and the other students were told to do so for homework.

The Content of the lesson was a reading passage to help the learners to find out what could be done if some one gets lost in the country side. The lesson is designed according to the TG to involve students in both loud reading as well as in silent reading. Students were expected to guess the meaning from context.
According to observations the lesson was meaning focused and there was no teaching of grammar involved. The students had practice in reading aloud and silent reading. However, for the majority of the students the practise involved mainly reading aloud. Language was also used for classroom management and disciplinary purposes. The teacher used L2 for these purposes but some time she used LI to question the students regarding the content and to provide feedback. Some students also responded in LI which the teacher translated in to English.

The *Materials* used in this lesson is the Pupil's Book and two pictures. The teacher used the pictures to introduce some vocabulary related to the lesson. The teacher followed some of the guidelines in the TG. Yet, as can be seen from Table 7.9 she did not follow all the instructions such as allowing the students to skim through the passage or read the passage while the students were following it in their books. Although the TG leaves the choice to the teachers to change the post reading questions given in the textbook, Rasa used the same questions.

The *content* of the lesson was based on the reading passage in the Pupil's Book. However, the teacher adapted some of the teaching procedure in this lesson also.

**Summary**

The "Finding Out" lessons are expected to help the students to find out the main idea in the passage without translating the text into L1.

Rasa followed most of the guidelines given in the TG. However, she also adapted some of the procedures. She used two pictures to introduce the topic which seemed to interest the students and may have helped to reduce the amount of L1 needed in the explanations.

The teacher followed the TG advice and provided the students with opportunities to practise reading aloud. However, in between reading she questioned the students which may have helped the students understand the passage. Thus, reading was done in context.

Although the TG recommends that the post questions be modified to suit the level of each class Rasa used the same questions. However, she converted this task to a group activity and utilised the help of the leaders. They helped the other students in doing the
task. During this lesson the teacher could not interact with the students during group work and some groups did not understand the task.

The same interaction patterns of a few students responding and other's repeating the answers were observed in this lesson. The better students trying to help others in reading was also observed. There were also instances of students volunteering to read. The teacher used similar feedback techniques as in the other lessons and used mostly L2, but where necessary L1 to facilitate interaction.

During the group activities students used L1 in their discussions. Group leaders explained the task to others in the group using L1. In two groups the students had not understood the task at all. Although the teacher did not use L1 very much in the lesson most of the students seemed to find the task difficult.

7.4.5 Lesson - Grammar in Action - "Negatives in the Future"

This lesson was based on the final "Grammar in Action" lesson in unit four of the Pupil's Book. As stated in the Pupil's Book the topic was "Questions and Negatives in the Future". There were three grammar lessons preceding this lesson. These lessons were "talking about the future", "four forms of the future" and "questions in the future". Thus, students were expected to have learnt to form statements and questions using the future tense.

This lesson was based on the second activity in the Pupil's Book. The activity is given below.

[2] Think of ten things you will NOT do tomorrow. Tell your pair partner what they are.

The Pupil's Book does not provide any more information regarding this lesson. Neither does the TG provide any guidelines regarding the teaching of the Grammar lessons in this unit.

The teacher was in class on time and started the lesson at the scheduled time. However, within ten minutes of the commencement of the lesson, a group of primary students started practising their drill display quite close to the class. The teacher continued the lesson with difficulty. However, she had to stop the lesson ten minutes
earlier than the scheduled time, as it became impossible to work with the noise outside. Further, the students in this class were also expected to go for sports practise.

The teacher started episode 1 of the lesson by revising the previous lesson as can be seen in Example 38.

**Example 38**

| 01 | T | Last time we did this lesson questions in the future. Can you remember? |
| 02 | SGa | Yes teacher. |
| 03 | T | Can you remember? |
| 04 | SS | Yes. |
| 05 | T | Tell me one of the question forms. |
| 06 | T | Yes? |
| 07 | S Ak | Will...will. |
| 08 | SS | Will...will |
| 09 | S Ru | Going to. |
| 10 | T | One by one. |
| 11 | S Ru | ing...going to |
| 12 | SS | is going to |
| 13 | T | If one person.....is....plural are |
| 14 | S Ga | ing form...ing form |
| 15 | SS | ing form |
| 16 | T | ing form. All right ing form. |
| 17 | T | Now we’ll take an example. |

Next, the teacher gave an example of a sentence using the "ing form" to convey the future. She asked Rukmal to give another example. He gave a sentence using the simple present tense to express the future. Example 39 demonstrates how the student responded, the way the teacher provided feedback and then introduced the new topic.

**Example 39**

| 19 | T | Rukmal.....tell me an example. |
| 20 | S Ru | Ah.....train leaves. |
| 21 | T | Yes? |
| 22 | T | Train leaves.....very good. |
| 23 | S Ru | at 9.30 pm. |
| 24 | T | Now you know the future forms. |
| 25 | T | How many are there? |
| 26 | S Ak | Four |
| 27 | S Ga | Four |
| 28 | T | There are four. Now we are not going to do questions, but we are going to do negative form in the future. |

In episode two, the teacher questioned the students to check whether they knew the meaning of negative. One student gave the correct response several times. Yet, as can be seen from example 40, the teacher did not hear because of the noise outside.
Example 40
28  T  Have you heard the word negative?
29  T  Yes can you remember?
30  SAK  ..........Not (T. did not hear)
31  T  What is the word we use for the negative?
32  SAK  Not (T did not hear).
33  T  Right. I'll tell you. Now look at his word.
34  SAK  Not
35  T  (T writes) What is this word?
36  SAK  Not...not
37  T  When we say....right...we are not doing something then it becomes....the negative....we won't do it....we are hoping to do something and we won't do it, it becomes the negative......right?
38  T  Now..we are not having practices ....sports practices today. That becomes the negative ....right?

Next, the teacher asked the students to give examples of sentences using the future tense negative. In this episode as Example 41 demonstrates, the teacher tried to elaborate on a student’s correct response. This appeared to make the student confused.

Example 41
45  T  Don't be frightened say.
46  T  Anything you won't do today...today or tomorrow right...in the future.
47  T  Nishan.
48  SNI  Rukmal. ...will not come to school tomorrow.
49  T  Rukmal. ...will not come to school tomorrow.
50  T  Will not...like the first example. Rukmal will not come to school ...tomorrow.
51  T  Today he is here no...so tomorrow
52  SNI  Rukmal...will not go to school today.
53  T  Today he has come no?
54  SNI  Come to school today.
55  T  No...no...today he has come. How can you correct it?
56  SNI  Rukmal. go to....
57  T  Will not go...
58  SNI  Rukmal. ....will not ...go to school....
59  T  When?
60  SNI  When?
61  SAK  Tomorrow.
62  T  Today ...is present tense. Use the word tomorrow. Now he has come to school no? right.

Another student then gave a correct sentence and the teacher wrote it on the board. She emphasised that the students should use “tomorrow”. As Example 42 indicates after this instruction Nishan formed a correct sentence.

Example 42
69  T  Rizan... (writes) will not go to the post office tomorrow.
70  T  Use the word tomorrow...right...because we have already come to school no? Rukmal also have come to school. So Rukmal will not go to school tomorrow.
This was followed by three students forming correct sentences. All the students used the verb "go". The teacher wanted the students to use other verbs. She gave one example, "I will not wear a red sari tomorrow". Still most of the students continued to use the verb "go". However, two students used other verbs. The responses were provided by four students. Example 46 illustrates, how the teacher provided feedback during this episode.

Example 43

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Sn</td>
<td>Akish. .....will not...will not go to....Kandy tomorrow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Akish will not go to Kandy tomorrow. Right.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Example 43 demonstrates when the teacher said "don't use go" the student gave the past tense. Yet, she did not say he was wrong. The student continued to use "go" and although it was not what the teacher expected, she accepted the student's response. When Rukmal made a mistake in the use of the article "the", Rasa provided the correct form in the next turn and also provided positive feedback as he used "eat", a new verb. After a few more examples, given by the students she moved on to the activity given in the Pupil's Book.

In episode one of this activity the teacher explained the task. The way Rasa wanted the students to do the activity was a little different to the instructions in the Pupil's Book. Instead of asking the students to tell each other ten things they were not going to do, the teacher asked each student to write five sentences and tell each other. Later they were expected to read these sentences to the class.

The students worked in pairs and the teacher went round checking what the students were doing. During this episode there was one instance when Nishan asked the teacher for clarification regarding the use of "today" and "tomorrow" to express the future. He used L1 to ask for clarification and the way the teacher responded is illustrated in Example 45.
All the sentences must have will not and tomorrow. Miss today  
(Can’t we say today?)
Today... you must... say the time... evening. You can’t say morning... then it is present. Better say... Even today is all right... if it is after this time.

Next, the students were called upon to read to the class the sentences they wrote. The teacher nominated who should read. Some students hesitated to read but the teacher encouraged them. Ten students read their sentences to the class. Most of the students who read had used the negative form of the future tense correctly. Some times they made slight mistakes and the teacher used different forms of error corrections as can be seen from Example 46. In turn 152 she asked for clarification which resulted in the student self correcting. On the other hand, when Gamini made a mistake she involved the class in correcting the error.

Example 46

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Sn</td>
<td>My brother will not bath tomorrow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>My brother will not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Sn</td>
<td>My brother will not bathe tomorrow. My teacher will not come by bus tomorrow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Right.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Sn</td>
<td>My mother will not make a cake tomorrow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Very Good. All correct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Right. Come here Gamini.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>My sister will not drink tea tomorrow. My brother will not picture tomorrow. Father will not go to Kandy tomorrow. Mother will not eat bread tomorrow. Ruwan will not play cricket tomorrow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Right. Good. What did you say about picture?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>My brother will not picture tomorrow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>My brother will not picture tomorrow. How can we correct that?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>My brother will not....</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>draw....draw.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Draw a picture tomorrow. Very Good. Or See a picture, film Right.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the disturbances outside and as the students were expected to go for sports practices the lesson was stopped before all students could read what they were supposed to have written.

The summary of the teacher pupil behaviour in relation to the activities and episodes in the lesson is given in Table 7.13

Table 7.13

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>Explains the formation of negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.13
Summary of lesson 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Teacher Behaviour</th>
<th>Pupil Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Recapitulated future tense question forms- by questioning the ss.</td>
<td>Individual as well as choral responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td>Explains the formation of negative form.</td>
<td>Listening. Two individual responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide feedback.</td>
<td>Form sentences using the negative form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Explain the activity in the book.</td>
<td>Listened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor the work and help the students.</td>
<td>Write sentences using the negative form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide feedback.</td>
<td>Individual students read out the answers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the lesson using COLT

This lesson was comprised of two activities. There were three episodes in each of the activities.

The Participant Organisation of the lesson involved students in whole class, and individual work. The duration of the lesson was 30 minutes. The participant organisation as a percentage of class time is indicated in Table 7.14

Table 7.14
Participant Organisation by class time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Organisation</th>
<th>Time (mts)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patterns</td>
<td>Categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Class</td>
<td>T-S/C</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S- S/C</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>choral</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group &amp; Pair work</td>
<td>Different task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same task</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 7.14 for the majority of the class time (74%) the students were involved in whole class participation. During this period the teacher had led the tasks for 50% of the class time, while a student/s led the activities for 24% of the class time.
There had not been any choral work. The students had worked in pairs and individually for 27% of the class time.

According to observations during the time the teacher led the episodes in the lesson for majority of the time she questioned the students and they responded. Most of the responses were individual. Often it was only four students who responded. However, in the final episode nine students out of the eighteen present that day responded to teacher nominations. During all the episodes where the students responded to teacher questions, the teacher provided feedback.

The activity based on the Pupil's Book was expected to be a pair work. However, the teacher asked the students to write the sentences individually first next to read it to each other. Thus, this episode was a combination of individual and pair work. During this time the teacher went round the class checking the students' work. While the teacher was monitoring the work one student asked the teacher for clarification.

**Student Modality** as a percentage of class time is indicated in Table 7.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Time (mts)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing &amp; Speaking</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>26.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 7.15 in this lesson for the majority of the class time (74%) most students were involved in listening either to the teacher or other students. This lesson also involved the students in writing and speaking for 27% of the class time.

The observations revealed that while the majority of the students were listening some students spoke in response to teacher questions. During the pair work while most students were writing a few students did not write. The speaking involved both L1 and L2. When the teacher led the activities for the majority of the time she used English. On a few occasions she used L1 for clarification and to check student comprehension.

The **Content** of the lesson was as the Pupil's Book states "negatives in the future". The teacher focussed explicitly on language form. However, the students constructed sentences using the language form that was taught. Thus language was used in context and the teacher's feedback focussed on both form and meaning.
The *Materials* used in the lesson was the Pupil's textbook. However, the task in the book was adapted by the teacher and was only part of the lesson.

**Summary**

In this lesson the students were also involved in whole class participation as well as in pair and individual work with the majority of the time spent in whole class participation. The teacher interacted with the students during whole class participation through questions and providing feedback to student responses.

In some episodes of the lesson the same interaction patterns as in the other lessons were observed. However, in the final episode the teacher tried to encourage all students to speak at least once. Adapting the task to allow the students opportunity to write the answers before reading them and the pair work which sometimes provided peer support seemed to increase students confidence.

The teacher and students mostly used L2. However, the students spoke to each other and on a few occasions responded to the teacher in L1. The teacher also used L1 sometimes to check students' comprehension and for clarification.

In this lesson the students were expected to use the future tense negative form. The teacher focused explicitly on language form. Yet, the students also had the opportunity to use the language form taught through a meaning focused activity. Most of the students who responded in the final activity used the language form correctly.

7.5 **Discussion**

This section discusses the five lessons in relation to the opportunities provided in this class for second language development. While this discussion centres on what happens at *Mahasen* it also compares and contrasts with the interactions at *Vanitha*. This comparison provides the means to identify the context specific characteristics that either facilitate or hinder teacher-pupil interaction and affect second language acquisition.

Rasa had already commenced teaching unit three of the EED materials when observations began in the second term. On the other hand, at *Vanitha*, Latha was still
doing unit 1 in the second term. At *Mahasen* there were no extra curricular activities in
the school during the first term and school work was rarely disrupted. Further, during
most periods the teacher could spend all 40 minutes for teaching. The number of
students in the class was also less. Thus, compared to *Vanitha* the time available to
interact with the students at *Mahasen* was greater. Though there were students of
different proficiency levels most of them came from similar linguistic backgrounds.
Consequently, the diversity of the student population was not as great as at *Vanitha*.
Thus, the structure of the school and the context of the class in the two schools had the
potential to affect the interactions in the class differently.

During the whole class participation sections of the lesson, the teacher was at the front
of the class addressing the students. During group work she went round the class
monitoring the students' work. Latha too followed a similar behaviour pattern.
However, whereas Latha rarely interacted with the students, Rasa often did so. While
both teachers were class teachers Rasa's relationship with the students was different
from Latha's. Rasa was firm with the students and saw to it that they are attentive and
involved in the lesson. Yet, she often encouraged students by telling them not to be
afraid to speak or make mistakes. While there were no informal talk between the
teacher and students at *Vanitha*, Rasa on a few occasions joked with the students.
During the "Word Study" lesson some students complained that others were cheating.
The teacher was tolerant of this kind of banter in the class. During group work when
the teacher went round the class the students often asked for clarifications. Thus, the
school ethos and the "power structure" in the two schools seemed to differ. This
difference affected the teacher-pupil relationship and in turn the interactions and
opportunities for language acquisition.

Although the lessons at *Mahasen* like those at *Vanitha* were teacher fronted, the
interaction patterns were different. Whereas at *Vanitha* the students often did not
respond to teacher questions at *Mahasen* at least a few students responded. Often these
responses were repeated by the other students. This resulted in more verbal interaction
at *Mahasen*.

The way Rasa provided feedback also promoted more verbal interaction patterns than
was at *Vanitha*. Rasa was more likely than Latha to elaborate and expand student
responses it resulted in more student responses. In addition, at *Mahasen* when the
students failed to respond the teacher would repeat, reformulate the question and
sometimes use L1 to help the students to respond. Such techniques seemed to increase
teacher-pupil verbal interaction and possibilities for L2 learning.
There were more instances of students reacting to teacher utterances in this class than at Vanitha. At Vanitha students appeared to be waiting to be nominated to respond. They never initiated discourse and rarely asked for clarification. At Mahasen in some episodes of some lessons students were clamouring to answer. Sometimes students would volunteer to respond as in the "Role Play" and "Finding Out" lessons. One explanation to the very different student behaviour in these two schools could be related to the gender of the students and culture of the schools. However, there were very few occasions of students asking for clarification also at Mahasen even though such instances were higher than at Vanitha. Thus, the teacher-pupil interactions seemed to relate to a culture where teachers are expected to command respect and where students are expected to listen rather than question.

There was more student participation in the group work at Mahasen than at Vanitha. In most of the group and pair activities, the teacher interacted with the group acting as a facilitator. Thus, she was able to involve more students in the activities by providing feedback and opportunities to ask for clarification. In addition in some group activities teacher assigned a 'better' student as a leader to each group. The students seemed more willing to talk with the peers both using L1 and L2. The group work in the observed lessons was either pair work or working in small groups. Most of the students were involved in the pair work in the "Word Study" lesson in which they had to share the information than in the Grammar lesson in which students wrote the answers individually and read to each other. Thus, the teacher's role during group work, the choice of leaders and the structuring of tasks seemed to lead to more interaction and better opportunities for language development at Mahasen than at Vanitha.

More instances of error correction that seemed to promote greater interaction were observed at Mahasen than at Vanitha. At Vanitha the teacher would often provide the correct response without an explanation or involving the students in error correction. On the other hand, at Mahasen the teacher first indicated to the students that there was a mistakes through a signal. This sometimes helped the student to correct the mistake himself. If he was unable the teacher asked the class to correct the mistake incorporating the other students in error correction and failing that she herself corrected the mistake explaining why the response was wrong.

At Vanitha, Latha never used L1 in any of the lessons observed. On the other hand Rasa while using L2 for the majority of the class time also used L1. Rasa used L1 when using English alone failed to elicit a response from the students. The use of L1
seemed to encourage more student participation. Rasa also used L1 to check comprehension. Students also used L1 for clarification and sometimes they also responded in L1 to teacher questions which were in English. This suggests that although the students could comprehend what the teacher said they did not have the necessary language to respond to the teacher. Often when the students responded in L1, the teacher translated it thereby exposing the students to new language.

The Content of the all the lessons observed was based on the EED materials, however at Mahasen only the Pupil's Book was used. In addition, Rasa used other material such as pictures in the "Finding Out" lesson, a calendar in the "Learning Together" lesson and a teacher made task in the "Word Study" lesson to introduce and "set the scene" for the lessons. Such materials seemed to encourage more student involvement in the lessons.

Rasa followed some of the steps given in the TG but she also diverted from it. In the "Finding Out" lesson she followed most of the instructions but introduced the lesson using pictures. This seemed to encourage students to join in the discussion. On the other hand, in the "Learning Together" lesson the teacher followed most of the instruction in the TG but there was not enough time for language production. In most of the lessons observed Rasa spent more time getting the students to practise with her than with their peers. As a result, she could not get the students to do some of the tasks in the Pupil's Book. At the interview Rasa said that one of the problems she faced is not having enough time for further practice.

The lack of a syllabus specifying the learning content and objectives of the lessons was also reflected in some of Rasa's classroom practice. The "Learning Together" lesson although based on the three tenses was expected to be conducted as a pair work to develop oral communication. Yet, Rasa referred to the tenses and used metalanguage which seemed to confuse the students and result in less interaction. In addition the lesson did not seem to provide much opportunity for oral communicative practice in small groups.

Most of the students in the class found it difficult to read the content in the Pupil's Book. This could be observed in the "Role Play" lesson when the teacher asked the students to practise the dialogue. Although the students had listened to the teacher reading the dialogue and read it in groups still most of them found it very difficult to read. Even the students who volunteered to read it to the class found it difficult. During the episodes when Rasa called upon each student to read out an answer she had to
prompt almost every word. Thus, though the number of students in the class was less
than at Vanitha the student's linguistic ability seemed to be lower than the majority of
students at Vanitha. Rasa said the lack of outside exposure to English makes it difficult
for the student to follow the content and she needs to spend lot of time to "practise" but
there is not enough time as they have to "cover a number of units" in the book and this
was confirmed by the observations in the class, especially during the "Role Play"
lesson.

There were few opportunities for the students to be involved in writing in most of the
lessons observed at Mahasen. If writing was done in class it was as a pair or group
work which provided opportunities for the students to assist each other. In the "Word
Study" lesson when students had to write the words on their own, they found it
difficult to do so. In contrast to Mahasen at Vanitha more class time was spent on
writing. At Vanitha the students seemed keen to write the answers in their exercise
books and get them marked by the teacher. Thus, where as the students at Vanitha
seemed to value learning to write in English, there were less interest in writing at
Mahasen. One explanation for this difference in the students orientation to writing
could be because at Vanitha the purpose of learning English is for examination success
where as at Mahasen the majority of the students are less interested in academic
success. Another explanation for less written work at Mahasen could be due to Rasa's
interpretation of the the EED materials. She maintained that the EED materials
emphasised oral communication whereas the previous textbooks focused more on
writing. This view seems to be reflected in her teaching which could also be a
reflection of her recent training in the use of the EED materials.

7.6 Conclusion

The observations at Mahasen indicated that like Vanitha the learner involvement in the
relationship between the teacher, the learner and the learning materials was limited.
However, during teacher-pupil interactions the teacher interacted more with the
students and there was more learner involvement than at Vanitha. In all the lessons
observed there were a few students who responded to the teacher more than the others.

The students who interacted more in the class produced more language. According to
the teacher they are the students who obtain high marks in English. Unlike Vanitha
most of the students in this school do not have outside exposure to English. Thus, it
could be the importance of classroom interaction that provided more opportunities to
acquire the language. On the other hand there were a very few students who generally did not respond to the teacher but when nominated would answer correctly.

Some of the problems observed at Vanitha did not affect Mahasen. On the other hand students lack of exposure to English outside the class and low proficiency level hindered the teacher exploiting the learning materials to facilitate interaction and thereby language acquisition.
Chapter 8

"Maya"

8.1 The School: Maya

Maya belongs to Type 2 schools that is schools, which have classes up to Year 11. This school was first established in 1928, by the Catholic Church, during the later part of the British rule in Sri Lanka. It is situated close to the Parish church and though taken over by the State in 1964, the school still has the patronage of the church community. The church provides all students with a free mid day meal once a week and the needy students are provided with stationery and clothing by the church. Until the early 1990s the Principals of this school were nuns. At present the Principal is a Catholic layman.

At its inception Maya was an English medium school. At that time a range of ethnic groups of students had attended this school. However, after the English medium was abolished, the medium of instruction at Maya became Sinhala and a separate Tamil medium school was established on the same premises. Compared to the other three schools in this study however, Maya had a more multi religious and multi ethnic student population.

Maya is a mixed gender school situated about a kilometre from Vanitha. The school has classes from Year 1 to Year 11 and there are no parallel classes. At the time the observations commenced the student population on roll at Maya was 305. The number of students per class varied, but did not exceed 25. According to the Principal most students were not regular in their attendance. The staff was comprised of twelve permanent teachers of whom all except for the Principal were female. There were three casual teachers, two of whom were male.

At the time of the study there were two teachers of English in the school. Only one was professionally qualified in the teaching of English. While the teacher who held a
trained teacher's certificate taught the secondary classes the other teacher worked with the primary students.

Exposure to English in this school was limited to classroom teaching. Some students took part in the district level "English Day" competitions and the teachers have to train them in class. Two students in the class I observed had won certificates in the previous year at the competitions held for schools belonging to the category of schools Maya belonged to, that is Type 2.

The school structure has changed over the years. According to the Principal of the school the number of students in the school is declining annually while the number of students in the Tamil medium school increases. There were only three applicants for grade one for the new academic year at the time of the study. The Principal of the school said that most people are not even aware that Maya is a separate school as they think it is part of the Tamil medium school. He attributed the reasons for the diminishing number of students enrolled in the school to the large number of "big" single sex schools in the vicinity of Maya. According to him the parents prefer to send their children to such schools rather than a small mixed school. The lack of facilities in the school is also another reason. The entire school was comprised of a single three storeyed building, which was built in 1987 replacing the original classrooms and a single room remaining from the original buildings. This room was used as the tearoom for the staff and the canteen for students. There was no library, science laboratory or playground. Due to these reasons only the students who were unable to gain admission to any of the other schools come to this school.

Regarding the teaching of English the Principal of the school was happy that at least a few students pass in English at the public examination at the end of year 11. He considered this a great achievement by the teacher as most students are not interested in their studies and generally the students came from non English speaking backgrounds. Although the Principal wanted to improve the standard of English in the school he claimed lack of resources, shortage of staff and parental support made it difficult. He thought that only a very few students if at all would continue with their higher studies. Thus he was keen to help the students to improve their talents in other fields such as sports and creative art in order to obtain employment. He thought if the students could communicate in English it would be an advantage and had asked the teachers to encourage the students to speak in English.
8.2 "Sama"

Sama was the teacher of English in the class I observed at Maya. At the time of the study she had been teaching in the school for nearly six years.

Sama was the most senior teacher of English at Maya. She had nearly ten years of experience as a teacher of English. She had taught English in a "difficult area" school in the first four years of her career as a non certificated teacher of English. She had completed a part time professional development program and obtained a Trained Teacher's Certificate in the teaching of English in 1992. Sama had requested a transfer to Colombo and had come to this school in 1993. She was keen to further her studies and towards the end of my period of observations she applied to follow a full time Bachelors Degree program in a local university.

In addition to being the senior teacher of English in the school, Sama was also a class teacher and the teacher in charge of Sports. In addition, she was often entrusted with many responsibilities. Some times she was asked to attend the meetings at the Education office to represent the school. Although the school did not hold a sports meet the students were sent for district level competitions. Thus in the second term Sama had to miss several days of class work in connection with the competitions. However, as most students in the class were also involved in these activities the students were not affected by it. According to the Principal, Sama was very dedicated and came to school early and sometimes stayed after school and had extra classes for the year 11 students.

Although Sama was not in charge of the class I observed she knew the students well. She had taught some of them in an earlier class. Further, as the school is small most senior teachers were aware of the family background of the students.

Sama had taught only the English Every Day materials as when she commenced teaching these books were already in use. However, as a student she had studied the previous textbook An English Course. Sama felt that the English Every Day materials were better than the previous books as they were "more interesting" and provided opportunities to speak. However, she said that it was difficult to teach from these books in a school like Maya especially "Grammar in Action" and "Finding Out." Sama thought that the EED materials did not focus enough on grammar. Her views seemed to support Latha's ideas that grammar was not consciously taught in the EED
materials. According to her some of the "Finding Out" passages were too difficult for the students.

Sama was not very satisfied with the professional training she received. She felt that she had not been able to obtain the maximum benefit out of it as it was a part time program conducted during weekends and as she had to spend a considerable amount of time on travelling to attend it. The TG she thought was helpful. However, she believed that she could not follow some of the instructions at Maya because in her class some of the students were not literate even in their LI. She said that although the students were keen to learn to speak they found it difficult to read and write. She found that students liked doing group work and it helped the less proficient students. Irregular attendance was also a problem as she was unable to do a lesson if most students were absent. Sama said sometimes she had to spend several days on the same lesson. In spite of her using some of the "relief periods" with the class to teach English she still found it difficult to complete the syllabus. However, according to her neither the majority of the students nor their parents were concerned about completing the syllabus or gaining good marks.

8.3 The Class: "Class 3"

Class three was the only Year seven class at Maya. The classroom was on the top floor of the three storey building. There were four other classes on that level. Quite often during observations there was no teacher in the next class and sometimes Sama could not hear her students' responses due to the noise.

When observations began at Maya, there were twelve students on roll in this class. During observations one student left the school. There was never a full complement of students present in class during any of the observations.

As the classroom was built to accommodate at least 30 students it was quite spacious for the twelve students. The seating arrangement in the class is illustrated in Figure 8.1
The boys and girls sat separately. There were six girls and they sat on the left side of the class while the boys sat on the right. The students had their permanent places. However, during group work if there were few students in class the teacher formed mixed gender groups. Often the students with mixed abilities were paired and then students were asked to change places.

The majority of the students in the class were Sinhalese. However, there were two Tamil girls, a Muslim and a Burgher boy studying in the Sinhala medium. The home language of the Burgher boy was English while all the others spoke Sinhala. According to the teacher although this boy could speak in English his writing was poor and he did not score very well at the tests. Compared to the rest of the class two of the girls were quite good at English. One of these girls works as a domestic aid to an English speaking family in a nearby house and they looked after her education. The other girl had joined the school that year as her family had moved to Colombo recently and was too late to apply for a better school. The teacher had identified three boys who could not read or write in English. The rest of the class were at about the same proficiency level with their term test marks usually being below 30%.

8.4 The Lessons

The observations of the lessons at Maya commenced soon after the first term vacation. Sama had completed teaching unit one and two lessons in unit two in the first school term. The lessons observed were from unit two and three.
8.4.1 Lesson 1 - Finding Out - "Badulla"

The first lesson observed for analysis at Maya was from unit two. Although the second school term had commenced three days prior to this observation most students had not returned to school after the vacation. As a result, this was the first lesson the students were doing in the second term and there were only six out of the twelve students present in class that day.

This lesson is based on a short article, which according to the TG appeared in the children's page of a Sri Lankan newspaper. It is a description of a town in Sri Lanka. The objective of the "Finding Out" lessons according to the TG is to enable the students "to get the meaning of the passage by processing them (sic) as far as possible in English" (Teacher's Guide, p.15). While the Pupil's Book provides only the reading passage the TG provides the pre and post questions (Appendix 10). The reading text as it appears in the Pupil's Book is given in Figure 8.2

Before the lesson commenced the teacher spent a few minutes talking to the students and asking them what they did for the Sri Lankan New Year celebrations during the vacation. Both the teacher and the students spoke in L1.

Next the teacher introduced the lesson and the way she did so is demonstrated in Example 1.
At the beginning of the lesson the teacher mentioned the page number of the lesson and students opened their books and turned to the lesson. However, as Example 1 illustrates she did not want the students to read the passage.

As Example 2 demonstrates Sama continued to repeat and reformulate the question and the same student, Denver continued to respond to the teacher’s questions. Yet the teacher did not react to his response but tried to get the other students also involved in the lesson by naming students and asking more questions.

Example 2

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SDe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SDe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next the teacher drew a map of Sri Lanka on the board and repeated the question. Denver responded again. Sama without reacting to his reply asked the other students to come up to the black board and mark Badulla on the map. As Example 3 indicates one student refused to mark saying that he did not know where the town was situated. The others in turn put a dot on the map where they thought Badulla is.

Example 3

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>SDe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>SAs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In episode two of this lesson the teacher read the text and the students were expected to follow in their books. All the students had their books opened and were looking at the book.

In the third episode the teacher checked the students understanding of some vocabulary items in the text. The same girl, Sasa responded twice by giving the L1 equivalent. Sama noticed that Denver was talking to his neighbour and named him to answer the
next question. He gave the meaning of "surrounded" in L1. The response was correct but as Example 4 illustrates Sama did not react to his response once again.

**Example 4**

38 T It is surrounded by mountains. What is surrounded......Denver?
40 SDe Surrounded විශේෂයෙක් පෙන්නෙන්
41 T Now Badulla is the capital of Sri....sorry Uva Province.

However, in some instances as in Example 5 when misunderstandings took place the teacher tried to clarify through expansion or using L1.

**Example 5**

42 T What is capital?
43 SDe Capital මුද්‍රණයෙක් පෙන්නෙන් මාශ..A ජාති නම් simple මුද්‍රණයෙක් (Opposite of capital...now if it is A...simple a).
44 T Now Sri Jayawardanapura is capital of Sri Lanka.
45 SDe Capital....මුද්‍රණයෙක් පෙන්නෙන් B (now if it is Badulla "B")
46 T No..no now listen.
47 T Now Sri Jayawardanapura Kotte...ah...think of Colombo is the capital of...what is capital.....capital?
48 SDe මුද්‍රණයෙක් පෙන්නෙන් (The other word for it)
49 T Capital?
50 T Now....in Sinhala මුද්‍රණයෙක් පෙන්නෙන් මුද්‍රණයෙක්? (What is the capital of Sri Lanka?)
51 SSa Sri Jayawardanapura.
52 T Now Sri Jayawardanapura Kotte is the capital of Sri Lanka.
53 T What can you say...capital?
54 STd මුද්‍රණයෙක් (capital)
55 T මුද්‍රණයෙක් capital.
56 T Badulla is the capital of Uva province.

In this episode Denver continued to explain "capital" as the upper case characters. Sama used different ways to correct his mistake. She first made a negative evaluation, "no" and asked another question. Yet, the student continued to maintain his meaning of the word. Sama then indicated to him that it was wrong by repeating the word with a rising intonation. Still Denver could not understand that he had made a mistake. Next, the teacher tried to clarify using an example, asking another question and finally asking for the L1 equivalent.

The teacher continued to read the text and questioned the students. Three out of the six students responded to the teacher. Sometimes, the teacher made use of the map. After going through the entire passage Sama moved on to the fourth episode of the lesson. In this episode she divided the class into two mixed ability groups. The teacher wrote five questions on the board and although she did not ask the students to copy them, they started to do so.
In episode five Sama asked the students to read the passage and write the answers. She gave the instructions in English and as Example 6 illustrates, some students were not sure of what to do and clarified using L1. The teacher continued to use English and Asan provided the information Sasa wanted in L1.

**Example 6**

115 T Now don’t write the answers..sorry don’t write the questions. You have to write only the answers.
116 T In groups of three read the passage and write the answers.
117 Ss Sa ******Miss යොමු ආන්තර් උසේදය? (Do we write only the answer?).
118 T Get in to groups and write the answers.
119 Ss As යොමු කියා කියා කියාද? (Yes, only the answer).

While the students wrote the teacher went round checking what the students were doing. In the group that was comprised of three boys Denver explained to the group the questions, and showed them where the answers were found in the text. In the other group the two girls worked individually while the other student who was a boy was looking at what they were doing.

In the next episode the teacher asked the students to read the questions and the answers. She asked one student to read the question and another to give the answer. Most students found it difficult to read and either the teacher or another student had to help. Except for one answer all the other student responses were correct. The way the teacher provided feedback when the student gave the wrong answer is demonstrated in Example 7.

**Example 7**

150 T Denver, now listen please.
151 T Find the name of a mountain near Badulla.
152 SDe Pidurutalagala
153 S Ud [ Na...Namunukula
154 T Namunukula.....Dunhinda is a waterfall.

Although teacher nominated all the students in the class to read two students could not read at all. However, as demonstrated in Example 8, there was one instance where a student volunteered to answer.

**Example 8**

173 T Sasa can you read?
174 Ss Asa What religions..are..there in Badulla?
175 T What is the answer?
176 T Udula. can you give the answer?
177 Ss As යොමු කියා කියා? (Shall I tell?).
178 T Ah..right
In the final episode the students were asked to write the answers to the questions in their writing books.

The summary of the lesson and the guidelines given in the TG are provided in Table 8.1.

**Table 8.1**

**Summary of lesson 1 and instructions in the TG**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Teacher Behaviour</th>
<th>Pupil Behaviour</th>
<th>Instructions in the TG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Talking to the ss about the holidays.</td>
<td>Responded to the teacher.</td>
<td>1. Interest the pupils in the materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduced the topic through questions.</td>
<td>Responded to T nominations.</td>
<td>2. Deal with any special difficulty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T read the passage.</td>
<td>SS expected to listen.</td>
<td>3. Read out the passage while the pupils listen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Explained the passage through questions.</td>
<td>Individual responses.</td>
<td>4. Pupils skim through the passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Divided the SS into two groups.</td>
<td>Copied the questions.</td>
<td>5. Read the passage while the SS follow it in their books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wrote the questions on the board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Walked around helping the SS.</td>
<td>Found the answers in groups.</td>
<td>6. Practise in reading aloud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Listened and provided feed back.</td>
<td>Read the questions and answers.</td>
<td>7. Questions on the passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual reading with the help of other SS in the group.</td>
<td>Specific instructions.</td>
<td>Pre and post questions provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copied the questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of the lesson using COLT**

As Table 8.1 indicates this lesson was comprised of a single activity based on a "Finding Out" text in the Pupil's Book. There were seven episodes included in the activity. Before the lesson commenced the teacher spent a few minutes talking to the students in L1 about their vacation.
Participant Organisation in this lesson indicates whole class, group as well as individual student involvement. Table 8.2 demonstrates the participant organisation by class time. The duration of the lesson was 35 minutes.

Table 8.2

Participant Organisation by class time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Organisation</th>
<th>Time(mts)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patterns</td>
<td>Categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole class</td>
<td>T-S/C</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-S/C</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choral</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Different task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same Task</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Different Task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same task</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 8.2 for the majority of the class time (54%) the teacher had led the tasks. There had not been student/s led tasks or choral work. Group work and individual work had each occupied 14% of the class time. During this time all students were involved in the same activity.

Observations indicated that during the time that the teacher led the activities she interacted with the students by questioning them. In most episodes three students responded to teacher questions. However, during the sixth episode the teacher questioned all students though two students did not respond at all.

During group work students worked in two small groups. The teacher went up to both groups and checked what they were doing. In one group there was more interaction among the students. However, in both groups the students spoke in L1. In the two episodes in which students were involved in individual work there was no interaction with the teacher. In one episode the students copied the questions written on the board and in the other copied the answers that were discussed in the previous episode.

Student Modality as a percentage of class time is indicated in Table 8.3.
Table 8.3

Student Modality as a percentage of class time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>77.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading &amp; speaking</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>11.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>11.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 8.3 shows the students were involved in Listening to the teacher or other students for the majority of the class time (77%). Reading and Speaking had involved the majority of the students in 11% of the class time. Writing too had occupied similar amount of time (11%).

According to observations during the time the majority of the students were listening to the teacher some students spoke in response to teacher questions. In the group activity the students were expected to read, discuss in the group and find the answers to the questions. However, the discussions took place mainly using L1. Although, the TG advocates reading aloud this lesson involved the students only in silent reading.

The time spent on writing involved the students in writing what had already been discussed in the previous episode.

The Content of the lesson was a letter written by a thirteen year old student to a Sri Lankan news paper and was reproduced in the Pupil's Book. It was a description of a Sri Lankan town. There was no explicit focus on language form and the content was meaning oriented.

Sama also used language for classroom management and for disciplinary purposes especially to draw the attention of one particular student. Although the teacher used both L1 and L2, she used L2 for classroom management and disciplinary purposes. In presenting the content of the lesson she used mainly L2. However, L1 was used to check students' comprehension and for clarification when L2 alone led to confusion.

The lesson was based on the EED materials. Although the teacher followed most of the guidelines given in the TG she did not use the post questions given there. The pre questions were given as the post questions. Sama also used a map to help the students' comprehension of the passage. Though the content of the lesson was based mainly on the EED materials the teacher adapted it depending on the level of the students.
Summary

The classroom events that took place in this lesson showed a whole class, group as well as individual participant organisation with the majority of the time spent on whole class participation. During the teacher led activities at least 50% of the students were involved in the lesson by responding to the teacher.

During interactions one student tended to respond more than the others. However, the teacher tried not to let him dominate interactions by nominating and questioning others. She also saw to it that he was not neglected and questioned him and provided feedback when necessary. Although there were two girls who seemed to know the answers to the questions the teacher asked, the boys seemed to interact more with the teacher. Two instances of a boy volunteering to respond and also refusing to respond were observed.

The teacher used mostly L2 but L1 was used to check students' comprehension and for clarification. Students also used L1 for clarifications. On one occasion when the teacher responded in L2 to a student response in L1 another student translated it.

The use of the map and working in mixed ability groups helped to involve the majority of the students in the lesson. Yet out of the six students two students seemed unable to read or write the answers on their own.

8.4.2 Lesson 2 - Useful Dialogues

This lesson was also from unit 2 of the Pupil's Book. There are two "Useful Dialogues" in this lesson and the students had done the first dialogue which was between a shopkeeper and a customer in the previous lesson.

The "Useful Dialogues" are designed according to the TG to provide practice for the students to be able to say something in English "useful" as well as for "fun" (Teacher's Guide, p. 68). This dialogue as illustrated in Figure 8.3 seemed designed to provide practice in using the "Present tense with the 'ing' form" which the students are expected to learn in one of the "Grammar in Action" lessons in this unit.
The TG does not give specific instructions to be followed in "Useful Dialogue" lessons and the teachers are advised to refer the instructions for handling the "Role Play" dialogues.

The lesson commenced with the teacher writing the dialogue on the board. While the teacher wrote some students were looking at their books. Two students were talking while one started to copy the dialogue.

After writing the dialogue the teacher wanted the students to look at the board. Denver started to tell the teacher in L1 what the class was expected to do in the task. However the teacher did not want him to do so. The way Sama reacted to the student's initiation is demonstrated in Example 9.

Example 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>SDe</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>SDe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Right. Now look at this.</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>(Miss select from here..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Dulip don't write.</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>(Miss select from here and..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Right. wait.</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>Right. Now look at this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher next gave the instructions in English and wanted the class to complete the dialogue orally. Two students responded. As Example 10 illustrates, Denver made a mistake at first. Sama indicated that there was a mistake but allowed him to correct it.

Example 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>SDe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Now..where's ....now think....now think where's the teacher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>She's school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 10 also demonstrates one instance when a student responded without using the words given in the Pupil's Book. When the teacher repeated the question "where's the teacher" Denver's second response was not selected from the list given in the Pupil's Book.

In the third episode the teacher asked the class to select from the lists and complete the dialogue. Once again Denver responded. Sama then nominated other students but no one responded. At this point she used L1 and explained the task again. After this two other students responded. However some students still found it difficult and the teacher and other students had to help them as shown in Example 12.

Example 12

70 T Tilan, What's he doing?
71 S_Ti ...(S_De prompting) working.
72 T Working.
73 T Dulip...can we take....where's the principal?
    Where's the principal?
74 S_Du He is...
75 T at the...
76 S_Du (S_De prompting) school.

In the fourth episode the teacher called upon two students, Denver and Priya to come up and read the completed dialogue to the class. As Example 13 demonstrates these two students were able to repeat the completed dialogue in their second attempt without looking at the book.

Example 13

85 S_De Where's your father?
86 S_Pr He's in...in the office.
87 S_De Working.
88 T No....you ask....you ask what's he doing.
89 S_De What's he doing?
90 S_Pr He's working.
91 T Can you say without looking at the book?
    (S_De nods his head showing agreement)
92 T Ah...right...try then.
93 S_De Where's your father?
94 S_Pr He's in the office.
Next the teacher called upon others to read. Since no one came the teacher named two students. Only one student was willing to do it, that too with reluctance. However, one of the girls volunteered. Teacher got all four pairs of students to read the dialogue using the different cues given in the task. Yet, as Example 14 illustrates the teacher had to help the students with cues and translations. Sometimes other students also helped the less proficient students.

Example 14

| 122 | T | Now take another one. She asked where's your father. |
| 123 | SJa | Where's Padmini? |
| 124 | T | Where's the doctor? |
| 125 | SJa | Where's the doctor? |
| 126 | T | ..........He is.... |
| 127 | SJa | He is |
| 128 | T | Doctor வேலைசெய்கிறார் என்கிறார்? (Where is the doctor?) |
| 129 | SJa | Hospital |
| 130 | T | Tell the full sentence. |
| 131 | T | He is in the.... |
| 132 | SJa | He is in the hospital. |
| 133 | SJa | What's he doing? |
| 134 | T | வேலைசெய்கிறார் என்கிறார்? |
| 135 | Spr | Seeing the patient. |
| 136 | SJa | Seeing the patient. |

After this episode Sama moved on to a new activity. She asked the students in two groups (boys and girls) to form their own dialogues using different words. Immediately Denver made up a dialogue and the teacher told the others also to make similar ones. Three of the girls, Priya, Udula and Sasa made two dialogues each without making mistakes. Denver made up five dialogues but as shown in Example 15 he did not always conform to the structure given in the book. In another dialogue he said "where are you going" and the teacher said "I want this type".

Example 15

| 206 | SDe | Where is the bag? |
| 207 | T | Can we say like that? |
| 208 | T | What's it doing.....the bag? |
| | | What's it doing ah...can we say like that..bag, paper can we say like |
| | | that...this type...you have to take a person. |
| 209 | SDe | Where is the engineer? |
| | | He is....making. |
| 210 | T | Where is he now? |
| 211 | SDe | He is in the... |
| 212 | T | He is in the... |
| 213 | SDe | ..mechanical place. |
Example 15 also shows how this student overcame a vocabulary problem. Sama encouraged all students to form at least one dialogue. There was a pair of students who had not formed a single dialogue and the way the teacher and Denver encouraged them is shown in Example 16.

Example 16

254 T Dulip and Tilan are you ready?
255 SDe අහි (Say) Where's the banker?
256 SDe බෙල් (Can't,...can't)
257 SDe ආෙළෙඛකුව මෙන් මෙන් (They said, so can you)

260 SDe Miss..miss
261 T Ah..wait....all right Denver.
262 SDe Miss these two are going to say.
263 T Ah..good..stand up
264 SDe Where's the bank?
265 T Where's the...?
266 SDe Where's the banker?
267 SDe Where's the banker?
268 SDe Where's the banker?
269 T Where is he?
270 S Ti He...
271 SDe He's at the අහි (say)

The two students read the dialogue with Denver and the teacher prompting almost every word. The summary of the lesson is given in Table 8.4

Table 8.4
Summary of lesson 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Teacher Behaviour</th>
<th>Pupil Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Wrote the dialogue on the board.</td>
<td>Talked to each other. One S wrote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Explained the task. Questioned the SS.</td>
<td>Listened. One S. initiated discourse. Two responded to T questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>Helped the SS to complete the dialogue.</td>
<td>Individual responses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>Provided feedback</td>
<td>In pairs read the completed dialogue to the class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>Went round checking and helping.</td>
<td>In two groups wrote their own dialogues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Provided feedback.</td>
<td>Read their own dialogues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of the lesson using COLT

As Table 8.4 indicates this lesson was comprised of two activities. The first activity was based on the "Useful Dialogue" given in the Pupil's Book. The second activity was an extension of the first and was initiated by the teacher. While there were four episodes in the first activity, the second had two.

Participant Organisation in this lesson indicates whole class and group involvement of students. Table 8.5 demonstrates the participant organisation by class time. Duration of this lesson was approximately 35 minutes.

Table 8.5
Participant Organisation by class time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Organisation</th>
<th>Time(mts)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-S/C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-S/C</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.86</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different task</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Task</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Task</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same task</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>00</strong></td>
<td><strong>00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 8.5 in this lesson the majority of the class time (57%) was spent on pair work where all the students did the same task. The students were involved in whole class participation for 43% of the class time. There were no tasks in which the students worked individually.

Observations in the class indicated that during the time when the teacher led the tasks she questioned the students and tried to involve all the students in the lesson. When the teacher did not nominate who should respond the same student tended to respond. However, in some episodes Sama called upon each student to respond although often a few students did not respond. There were three instances of students volunteering to speak and initiating discourse.
During pair work the teacher provided feedback to all the students. Further, the students interacted with each other and the 'better' students helped the less proficient students.

*Student Modality* as a percentage of class time is indicated in Table 8.6

**Table 8.6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 8.6 demonstrates for the majority of the class time (43%) most students in the class were speaking. They were also involved in listening to the teacher or other students speaking in English for 43% of the class time. They were involved in writing for 14% of the class time. The majority of the students were not involved in reading aloud or silent reading.

In episode one of the second activity, the teacher asked the students to write new dialogues. Yet, according to observations most students wrote only one dialogue and a few did not write at all. In the final episode all the students who spoke did so without a written script. In the episodes where the teacher addressed the class while most students were listening some students responded to the teacher questions.

The content of the lesson was a useful dialogue designed to practice the use of the simple present tense with the "ing" form. There was no explicit focus on form but students were able to use the language form through a meaning focused task.

The teacher also used English for classroom management and disciplinary purposes. However, when the student seemed unable to understand the instructions Sama used L1. In this lesson the students also mostly used L2. Sometimes L1 was used to speak to each other and help others.

The Materials used in the lesson were based on the Pupil's Book. However, without restricting to the activity in the book, the teacher followed the advice given in the "Role Play" section of the TG and asked the students to extend the dialogue to other
situations. Yet, she wanted to maintain the format of the dialogue given in the book. Thus the content of the lesson was mainly based on the Pupil's Book though the students had the choice to use different vocabulary.

**Summary**

The classroom events in this lesson indicated that the majority of the class time was spent on pair work. There was also whole class participation with the students also being involved by responding to the teacher questions. In the pair work, Sama let the better students help the others. This resulted in all the students being involved in the lesson. Co-operation among students in helping each other was observed even without the teacher asking them to do so.

Both L2 and L1 were used in the class. However, the teacher mostly used L2. The students also used L2 for the majority of the class time. There were few instances of students initiating discourse. On some occasions there was more student participation when the teacher repeated the instructions in L1

The content of the lesson focused implicitly on both form and meaning and was based on the activity given in the Pupil's Book. The teacher guided the students to extend the dialogue to other situations while conforming to the structure given in the book.

**8.4.3 Lesson 3 - Role Play - "Anne makes a mistake"

This is the same "Role Play" lesson observed at Vanitha. The objective of this "Role Play" as stated before seemed to be for the students to use language for functions such as asking for information and making suggestions.

The general and specific guidelines provided in the TG and the teacher pupil behaviour in this lesson is summarised in Table 8.7
Table 8.7
Summary of lesson 3 and instructions in the TG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Teacher behaviour</th>
<th>Student behaviour</th>
<th>Instructions in the TG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Revised the earlier Role play through questioning</td>
<td>Listened. Individual responses.</td>
<td>1 Set the scene. (5mts) Introduce the characters and describe the situation briefly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Read the dialogue.</td>
<td>Listened.</td>
<td>2. Deal with any special difficulties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Questioned the class regarding the illustrations in the book.</td>
<td>Choral reading of the dialogue in groups of three.</td>
<td>3. Read the dialogue 2-3 times without the ss looking at the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Checked the understanding of a few words.</td>
<td>Choral reading.</td>
<td>4. Pupils repeat the dialogue in groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Read the dialogue again.</td>
<td>Choral reading.</td>
<td>5. The T. play the role of one of the characters- pupils as a group or groups the other characters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Played the role of one character.</td>
<td>As a group read the role of the other character.</td>
<td>6. Ask few simple questions to check understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reversed the roles and read again.</td>
<td>Read as a group.</td>
<td>6. Ask the pupils which sections of the dialogue the illustration describes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reversed roles and read again.</td>
<td>Read as a group.</td>
<td>7. Practice the dialogue in pairs/groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Repeated the dialogue reading.</td>
<td>Read as a group.</td>
<td>8. Act the dialogue in pairs/groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>listened and provided feedback.</td>
<td>Read as a group.</td>
<td>Further Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Get the pupils to think of situations where they would say -&quot;sorry to trouble you&quot;,&quot;oh, dear&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Monitored the work.</td>
<td>Practised reading in pairs.</td>
<td>2. When and where they might use these statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Listened and provided feedback.</td>
<td>Read as a group.</td>
<td>a. Perhaps they can help you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Why not go to the police station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Why not go to your teacher. Perhaps she can help you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Pupils say or write what they think the man might be saying to Anne in the second picture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Draw and illustrate the man's description.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were eight students present in class. The lesson commenced with the teacher informing the students that they were going to do the "Role Play" - "Anne makes a mistake" (Appendix !X).
In the first episode of the lesson Sama revised what happened in the previous "Role Play" lesson by questioning the students. In this episode as demonstrated in Example 17, Denver challenged what the teacher said.

Example 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T</th>
<th>SDe</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>What happened in the last lesson?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>SDe</td>
<td>Anne came to the airport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>.......and after what happened?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>SDe</td>
<td>They got into the bus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>They got into the bus and then what happened?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>SDe</td>
<td>.......They...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>What happened to Ravi's bag?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SDe</td>
<td>Not Ravi's. Anne's.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Spr</td>
<td>Ravi's.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Turn to the page and see.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>.......Priya you are right.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Whose bag?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Ah.....whose bag?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SDe</td>
<td>Ravi's.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Ravi's bag.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Example 17 indicates the teacher did not deny Denver's statement but allowed him to realise his mistake.

Next the teacher asked the students "What happened to Ravi's bag?" As there was no response from the students she repeated the question. Then Denver responded. Yet the teacher continued to ask the question translating it to L1 and calling upon other students to respond. The way Sama tried to involve the rest of the class is demonstrated in Example 18.

Example 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T</th>
<th>SDe</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>What happened to Ravi's bag?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>SDe</td>
<td>It...it got lost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>What happened to Ravi's bag?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Can't remember?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>අංකිකම් ආදර්ශී? (What happened?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Gay ආකාරයි what happened?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>S Ga</td>
<td>Airport ගෝනි ආදර්ශී (Left at the airport)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Jaya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>SDe</td>
<td>They ran back to the airport to take it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>අංකිකම් ආදර්ශී ආදර්ශී ආදර්ශී? (What happened to the bag?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>S As</td>
<td>මිති ඵෙලෝ ආපර් කුළු කුළු කුළු (Forgotten and left at the airport)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Now Ravi and Anne are back at the arrivals exit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second episode of the lesson, the teacher read part of the dialogue and the students were expected to listen. Sama read the dialogue slowly and was looking at the students to see whether they were listening.
Next episode was a discussion based on the illustration and the dialogue the students heard. Most of the responses to the teacher's questions were provided by two students. In this episode also Denver disagreed with the students' statement. Teacher while accepting Denver's response as correct also justified her statement. The way the teacher reacted to the student's initiation is indicated in Example 19.

Example 19

37 T Now here how many people are there?
38 SS Three.
39 T Three people. Can you guess?
40 SDe No, not three people.
41 T ..............How many people are there?
42 SDe ..............seven people.
43 T Right, all together. But we are going to talk about these three people.
Now can you guess who are they?

As appendix ix indicates there were altogether seven people in the picture. However, only the three main characters are clearly visible. The teacher wanted to focus on these three people and Denver's reply was unexpected.

The teacher continued to question the students on what they could see in the picture and tried to explain what the mistake was, using English only. Although, the teacher did not ask for the L1 meaning as can be seen from Example 20 one student provided it.

Example 20

59 T Now the man....he is....what is he doing?
60 T What is he doing?
61 SDe He is reading a paper.
62 T He is reading a paper.
63 T No. That's not his bag. The man says that's my bag. Anne is telling
Ravi, my mistake.
64 SPr උංංං (mistake)
65 T Now that is the mistake.

In episode 4, the teacher read the dialogue and the students were expected to repeat after the teacher. While the teacher was reading she checked whether the students were reading and noticed two students not doing so. She asked them to repeat a sentence after her and also told them both in L1 and L2 to keep their finger on the line they were reading. Next, the teacher continued to read the dialogue and the students repeated after her.

From episode 5 to 9, the teacher played the role of one character and asked the students as a group to read the lines of another character. Next, the roles were reversed
and the students continued to practise reading the dialogue. At the beginning of episode 7, only two students were reading. The teacher noticed this and stopped reading to check whether the students had understood what they were expected to do. In this section of the lesson the teacher used L1 only.

Example 21

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Dumidu මුදමුදු මැදි මැදිමුදු මැදිමුදු මැදිමුදු? (Didn't you understand)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>මිළි? (Who am I?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Anne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>මෙට්ටුම්රීමුදු මෙට්ටුම්? (All of you?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>මෙට්ටුම්රීමුදු මෙට්ටුම් මෙට්ටුම් මෙට්ටුම් මෙට්ටුම්? (So after I read Ann's part what must you read?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDu</td>
<td>Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Right. Start again.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In episode 10 the teacher asked pairs of students to come forward and read the dialogue to the class. The first pair read it without difficulty. The second pair found it difficult and the teacher and another student had to prompt most of the words. One pair of boys did not read at all. Asan was reluctant to read and his partner, Denver encouraged and even offered to read Anne's role which he thought was difficult and give Asan the easier role. Finally Asan read and one of the girls, Priya helped him with the words he found difficult to read. At the end of the reading he was so relieved that the class laughed.

In episode 11 the teacher paired a better student with a less proficient student and asked the better student to assist the partner and practise the dialogue. The teacher went round checking their work. While going around the teacher asked Sasa whether she had recovered after her illness. The student who was reluctant to read the dialogue in the previous episode, Asan called on the teacher three times to ask for help. Each time he used L1. In the other pair Denver told the teacher he taught his partner only half of the section they were to practise as his friend needs more time. He said in L1 "he forgets. I have to remind him every word and the word 'that's' is the most difficult for him". The teacher assured him that it was all right.

In the final episode of the lesson one pair of girls read the dialogue to the class. The less proficient student's reading was better after the practise. The same boy who asked for the teacher's help wanted to know whether they could continue with the lesson the following day and the teacher agreed.
Analysis using COLT

This lesson was comprised of a single activity with twelve episodes.

Participant Organisation of the lesson involved whole class as well as group participation. Table 8.8 indicates the participant organisation by class time. The duration of the lesson was 36 minutes.

Table 8.8

Participant Organisation by class time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Organisation</th>
<th>Time(mts)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patterns</td>
<td>Categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole class</td>
<td>T-S/C</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-S/C</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choral</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair work</td>
<td>Different task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same Task</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Different Task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 8.8, in this lesson the majority of the class time (78%) was spent in whole class participation. During this time the teacher addressed the students for 44% of the class time. While student/s led the tasks for 19% of the time, choral work occupied the students for 14% of the class time.

Observations in the class indicated that during the time when the teacher addressed the class she questioned the students and tried to involve all the students in the lesson. Two instances of a student disagreeing with what the teacher said was also observed. Sama also provided the opportunity to all the students to read the dialogue to the class even though two students did not come forward. While a pair of students was reading, the teacher and other students were involved in the task by helping them to read. During choral work the teacher was monitoring students' understanding and questioned the students.

The pair activity resulted in all students being involved in the task. All students did the same task. However, there was collaboration among the students and the 'better' students helped the others.
Student *Modality* as a percentage of class time is indicated in Table 8.9.

### Table 8.9
**Student Modality as a percentage of class time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 8.9 demonstrates for the majority of the class time (61%) most of the students were involved in reading aloud. They were also involved in listening for 39% of the class time. However, most students were not involved in speaking in L2 or writing.

According to observations, in the teacher led activities while most of the students were listening a few students responded to the teacher in English. During the pair activity the students spoke to each other but it was in L1.

Although the teacher and students both used L1 and L2 for the majority of the time the students were listening to either the teacher or other students speaking or reading in English. L1 was used mostly by the teacher and students for clarification.

The *Content* of the lesson was a "Role Play" dialogue designed to practise conversation. In this lesson the teacher focused only on part of the "Role Play". There was no explicit focus on language forms. The majority of the class time was spent on practising reading the dialogue. However, the teacher tried to explain the context in which the dialogue took place before the students practised it.

The teacher used L2 for classroom management yet sometimes she had to use L1 as well when students found it difficult to understand the instructions.

The *Materials* used in the lesson were only the Pupil's Book. The teacher followed most of the guidelines given in the TG. As suggested in the TG (Teacher's Guide, p.9) to suit the level of her students she divided the "Role Play" in to two meaningful sections and did only the first part of the dialogue. The content of the lesson was based on the textbook. Yet, the teacher adapted the lesson to suit the level of the lesson.
Summary

The majority of the class time in this lesson was involved in teacher fronted activities with choral reading. However the teacher followed the instructions in the TG, which suggest such activities.

Although “Role Play” lessons are expected to improve speaking, during the majority of the class time the students were involved in reading and listening. However, most of the students in the class found it difficult even to read the dialogue without help.

Restricting the lesson to part of the dialogue given in the Pupil’s Book and requesting the better students to help the others seemed to encourage more interaction. The teacher’s interaction with the students during pair work and students being free to use L1 appeared to result in more student initiations and requests for clarifications. Some students translating the teachers’ L2 instructions to L1 for the benefit of their peers as observed in previous lessons were also seen in this lesson.

8.4.4 Lesson 4 - Word study "Vehicles"

This lesson was also from unit 3 and is the same "Word Study" lesson observed at Mahasen in which students were expected to learn vocabulary connected with vehicles. There were nine students present in class. Example 22 illustrates the way Sama commenced the lesson.

Example 22
01 T Turn to page 31.
02 T (Waits for the SS to open the books)Vehicles.
03 T Name some vehicles.
04 T ........Tell me some vehicles you know?
05 SDe Train ..car..lorry
   SAz   Bike
   STi   bus..bicycle[
06 T What?....tyre? (SS laugh)
07 T Name some vehicles.
08 SDe Car
09 T Car
10 SSa Bicycle
11 T Bicycle
12 SAz Van
13 SDu əʊjɪpə
14 T Ah?
15 SDu əʊjɪpə
16 T What’s the English word?
17 STi Plane
18 T Yes?Étrain
As Example 22 illustrates when Tilan said "plane" the teacher heard it as "train" due to the noise in the next class. After the students had named a few vehicles the teacher seemed satisfied and wanted to move on to the next episode. Yet Denver still continued to respond and the teacher had to stop him to gain control of the floor.

In episode 23 the students were asked to look at the illustrations in the Pupil's Book and name the objects. At the beginning of the episode the teacher called out the number and asked the students to name it. The students made mistakes in the first two responses. Example 23 demonstrates the way the teacher provided feedback.

Example 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>Right...now look at number one....number one?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAz</td>
<td>Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Number one...what is that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Number one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSa</td>
<td>Carriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Carriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Number two?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Now look at number two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPr</td>
<td>Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Cyclist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Who is cyclist?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>....He is cyclist (Pointing). This is the cyclist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSa</td>
<td>&quot;85© ©®C3) ©da»©ca ©ca&gt;©) ( A boy cycling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Cyclist .startTimeMacro (One who cycles.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Number three...bus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher continued to call the number and name the vehicle while the students listened. However, Tilan who usually did not respond in class was very interested in this lesson and was looking at the pictures and identifying them. He called out three words, which the teacher did not hear. The words he said, that is "handle", "tyre", "light" was not the ones given in the book (handlebars, wheel, headlamp). The words the student used are some L2 words that have become part of the LI vocabulary in Sri Lanka. The teacher continued to read the words. After reading the word mudguard Sama asked, "What is mudguard". Tilan explained in L1. The teacher did not comment but continued reading the next word.

In episode three the teacher asked the students to read the words after her. The students did so as a group and all the students seemed to be repeating. Once all the 16 words were read out the teacher asked the students to repeat after her once again.
This episode was followed by the teacher calling out the number and the students identifying the vehicles. The students responded as a group. All responses were correct and the teacher repeated each response as demonstrated in Example 24.

Example 24
140  T  Sixteen
141  SS Van
142  T  Van

In episode five the teacher called on individual students to identify the numbers she called. Each student in class got a turn. All the students answered correctly and the teacher either repeated the correct response or made a positive comment as indicated in Example 25.

Example 25
180  T  Number three...Dulip...number three.
181  SDu Bus
182  T  Right, bus.
183  T  Ah...number five Sasa.
184  SAs Driver
185  T  Driver

The students were next asked to cover the words and to respond to teacher questions. The teacher gave the instructions in English. These were immediately translated by Denver for the benefit of his neighbour. The teacher called out a number and the students identified the vehicle. Except for two individual responses the rest were group answers. Most of the responses were correct. However, as Example 26 illustrates the students still found it difficult to say "cyclist".

Example 26
236  T  Number two?
237  SS  cycle
cyc....list
cycle [ 238  T  Cyclist

In the final episode of the lesson students were asked to do the same activity in pairs. The teacher gave instructions in English. Some had not understood what they were expected to do. The teacher went round and explained the task to some students in L1. The students took turns to call out the numbers. When each pair finished going through the numbers they changed partners and continued the task till the end of the period. The teacher went up to each pair and helped the students. Some students asked for help in pronouncing words.
The summary of the lesson and the instructions given in the TG are indicated in Table 8.10.

Table 8.10

Summary of the lesson 4 and instructions in the TG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher Behaviour</th>
<th>Pupil Behaviour</th>
<th>Instructions in the TG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nominated SS to name vehicles.</td>
<td>Named vehicles.</td>
<td>1. T. reads the words. SS look at the pictures and identify them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Called out numbers. Read the numbers.</td>
<td>Called out answers.</td>
<td>2. T. reads out the words again. SS repeat after her (5 mts).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both group as well as individual responses.</td>
<td>3. SS. Cover the words. T name and object. SS identify by number (5 mts).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Read the words.</td>
<td>Choral reading</td>
<td>4. T calls out numbers. SS identify by word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Read the words.</td>
<td>Choral Reading.</td>
<td>5. SS do the pair work in the Pupil's Book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Called out numbers.</td>
<td>Identifies the vehicle.</td>
<td>Specific Instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whole class responses.</td>
<td>Referred to the two pair activities in the Pupil's Book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Individual students called upon to identify vehicles.</td>
<td>Responded to T nominations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SS asked to cover the words. T. questioned the class.</td>
<td>Whole class responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Checked SS work.</td>
<td>Pair work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the lesson using COLT

This lesson was comprised of a single activity with eight episodes.

Participant Organisation in this lesson indicates the students involved in whole class as well as group work. Table 8.11 demonstrates the participant organisation by class time. Duration of the lesson was 36 minutes.
Table 8.11

Participant organisation by class time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Organisation</th>
<th>Time (mts.)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Categories</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-S/C</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-S/C</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different task</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Task</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Task</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same task</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 8.11 the majority of the class time (58%), the students were involved in whole class participation. This time included teacher led tasks (42%) as well as students involved in choral work (17%). There were no student led activities.

The students participated in pair work for 42% of the class time and during this time they all did the same task. During this lesson the students were not working individually.

According to observations during teacher led episodes most of the students were involved in the lesson by responding to teacher questions. While in some episodes the questions were directed at the whole class in one episode Sama called upon each student to respond. During group work all students were involved in the task and the teacher addressed the students providing feedback. There were instances of students asking for assistance and the teacher responding.

*Student Modality* as a percentage of class time is indicated in Table 8.12

Table 8.12

Student Modality as a percentage of class time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 8.12 indicates in this lesson most students were involved in listening (25%), speaking (50%) and reading (25%). Students were not involved in writing.

According to observations during the time the students were involved in speaking during pair work they used both L1 and L2. Reading involved both reading aloud as well as silent reading. While the majority of the students were listening to the teacher some students responded to teacher questions.

The content of the lesson was 16 vocabulary items connected with vehicles. The content was limited to the teaching of form, that is vocabulary.

Sama also used language for classroom management. She used L2 for the majority of the class time. However, during group work she used L1 to help those students who had not understood the instructions. The students also used L2 to respond to the teacher. Yet, they used L1 to talk to each other and to seek assistance from the teacher.

The Materials used in the lesson were based on the Pupil's Book. As Table 8.10 indicates Sama followed most of the instructions given in the TG. Although there were two activities given in the Pupil's Book the teacher did only one activity. This activity was restricted to teaching only the 16 words. Thus, the episodes in the lesson though based on the textbook were adapted by the teacher to suit the level of the students in the class.

Summary

The majority of the class time in this lesson was spent in the students participating in whole class work. However, pair work also occupied a considerable percent of the class time. The pair work seemed to help the students to practise the words taught. Even some students who generally found it very difficult to be involved in the activities seemed to find this lesson interesting.

The better students assisting the others were seen in this lesson too. They helped the less proficient students by translating the teachers instructions and read difficult words. Teacher’s interaction in L1 with the students during pair work helped them to clarify instructions provided in L2.

At the end of the lesson some students continued to find some words difficult to use. The teacher was able to do only one of the activities given in the Pupil's Book.
8.4.5 Lesson 5 - Listening - "Magic Squares"

The lesson scheduled for the day was the listening lesson in unit 3 of the Pupil's Book. The task given in the Pupil's Book is provided in Figure 8.2.

Fig. 8.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT THREE</th>
<th>LISTENING</th>
<th>MAGIC SQUARES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draw as square 7.5 centimetres (3 inches by 3 inches). Then draw lines to divide it into NINE equal smaller squares (2.5cm. x 2.5 cm. or 1&quot; x1&quot;). Listen to your teacher's instructions and put numbers in the squares as you are told. Here is an example of the kind of instructions you will hear, though they will not always be the same.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write the number 4 in the top left-hand square.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write the number 2 in the top right-hand square.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put a 9 between the 4 and the 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the bottom ROW, write the number 8 in the first square.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the next square after the 8, write the number 6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the first COLUMN, write the number 3 between 4 and 8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put 7 between 2 and 6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put a 5 in the middle square.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow the instructions correctly and you will find that any column, row or diagonal always adds to the same total. What is it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Sama intended to do this task, as the analysis of the lesson indicates she could get the pupils to do only the first step.

The teacher commenced the lesson by asking the students whether they had done the homework she had given. Out of the nine students present that day only two girls had done the task. The teacher was disappointed and told the students in L1 "this is bad".

In the second episode of the lesson, Sama drew eight small squares adjacent to each other. Then she told the students once again in L1, "I gave like this (referring to the squares) and gave some questions". Next she wanted Denver to read the first question. He did so and the teacher repeated it twice. No one replied. Sama then called upon Asan and repeated the question, which was "how many boxes are there?" After Sama repeated the question for the fourth time the student gave the correct response. Denver was asked to read the next question and the teacher followed the same pattern of repeating the question and naming a student. This question was to "write the answer in the last box". Sashi who was asked to respond went up to the board and did the task correctly. The students
who were asked to respond to the next two questions made mistakes. The way the teacher reacted to the student responses is demonstrated in Example 27.

Example 27.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>SD&lt;ref&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>SD&lt;ref&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>SPr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>S&lt;ref&gt;Ud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three students who were nominated to respond to the other three questions did the task correctly. The teacher did not use L1, however she had to repeat the questions at least three times before the students responded.

In the next episode of the lesson the teacher asked the students to turn to the lesson in the textbook. Example 28 illustrates how Sama explained the task.

Example 28

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the teacher went round checking the students work she found that most of them had not understood the instructions. This could be seen from some of her comments. These comments were in L1.

"Are we to take any measurement we want?"

"What is the size of the square I asked you to draw?"
Sama tried to explain the measurement by drawing a square on the black board. She questioned the students but as Example 29 illustrates there was only one response.

**Example 29**

69  T  Now this line is 7.5 centimetres.
70  T  7.5?(How many centimetres?)
71  De  Seven (Seven).
72  T  7.5?  (Seven and..?)
73  T  seven point five? (what do we call this?)
74  T  seven point five  (seven point five)
75  T  Denver..how many centimeters here?
     (Showed on the ruler) Here seven.......seven point is here. Now here eight
     centimeters no?
76  T  Now here...how many centimetres....7.5 is here..
     Jaya.....centimetres.......

The teacher noticed that some of the students were looking at the inches. Then she asked in L1 whether they knew on which side of the ruler they could find centimetres.

There were no responses. The teacher then asked Jaya to show her the centimetres on her ruler. She could not indicate centimetres. Sama then explained using the ruler how to identify centimetres and inches. She then asked the students to draw the square using centimetres. Once the students had drawn the square Sama asked them to measure it in inches. Thilan measured and shouted "three". The way the teacher concluded this episode of the lesson is illustrated in Example 30. During this episode the teacher mostly used L1 and all student responses were in L1.

**Example 30**

83  T  7.5 meters or three inches.(T.checks what the ss have drawn)
84  STi  Three miss three
85  T  Good.
86  T  Inches.
87  T  Good.  (What is the English word?)
88  T  7.5 meters or three inches.(T.checks what the ss have drawn)
89  STi  Miss is it correct now?
90  T  Right.

In the next episode Sama asked the students to divide the square into nine equal squares. She repeated the instruction three times. Yet, the students did not do the task. The teacher then questioned the students as Example 31 illustrates to check whether they understood the meaning of "divide" and "equal".

**Example 31**

95  T  This is the square.....you have to draw lines to divide it.
96  STi  Miss do we have to draw like that?
97  T  Em..what should you do?
98  STi  Nine
99  T  You draw lines to divide this.
     Miss divide it?  (What is the meaning of divided?)
(Why do we divide?)
(to divide)
Now you have to draw lines to divide...you have to draw nine equal...equal squares.
(Similar)
(Similar)
(Equal)
Right. Now divide it into nine equal squares.

Even though some of the students knew that they had to draw nine equal squares and they had to divide the square they could not still do it. One student had divided the square but not equally. Thus as Example 31 demonstrates Sama had to give more instructions.

Example 32
If you divide like that can you get equal squares?
How do you draw...you have to divide 7.5 centimetres by three. Then how many centimetres?
One square should be 2.5 centimetres.
Can you understand?
Miss (shows the T)
Ah....right. Good.

The teacher went round and checked. Four students two girls and two boys had done it correctly. The teacher had to explain in L1 to the others.

In the final episode of the lesson Sama began to read the instructions to complete the magic squares. She read the first instruction and repeated it five times. The students seemed unable to do it. Finally the teacher indicated top right hand square on the figure she had drawn on the black board and asked the students to write four there. While she was reading the second instruction the bell rang indicating the end of the period. As demonstrated in Example 33, the students found it difficult to do the task as they had forgotten the language forms such as "prepositions" which they were expected to have learnt in the previous lessons.

Example 33
Top right hand (bell rings)
Next one...put nine between two and four.
Write number nine...write number nine....between..two and four.
(Nine?)
You have to write only nine.
What is between?)
Between (Can’t you remember?)
(We used that earlier in the task).
Right. We will continue tomorrow.
(Miss the others?)
(The other teacher is waiting).
The summary of the lesson and the specific instruction for this lesson given in the TG are indicated in Table 8.13

Table 8.13

Summary of lesson 5 and instructions in the TG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Teacher Behaviour</th>
<th>Pupil Behaviour</th>
<th>Instructions in the TG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Checked home work. Questioned individual students.</td>
<td>Responded to teacher questions.</td>
<td>Tell the pupils they are going to do something interesting with numbers. Then go on with the instructions as given in the Pupil's Book. It isn't necessary to use the exact sentences from the book. you may vary the expression as long as the main points are clear. You can vary this task as you like by adding any number you like. After a while, you can tell the pupils how to do it and have them make up squares with different numbers for each other in their groups. The MAIN POINT, though, is the LANGUAGE, not the mathematics so you should monitor the groups carefully to make sure the 'callers' are giving full and accurate instructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Called on individual SS to do the activity on the board.</td>
<td>Some ss did the activity. Others listened.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Explained the listening activity in the Pupil's Book.</td>
<td>Listened.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Checked SS work. Commented..</td>
<td>Drew a square.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Explained how to identify centimeters. Questioned some students.</td>
<td>Listened. Two SS responded to T nominations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asked the students to divide the square. Checked ss work. Explained.</td>
<td>Listened. Followed instructions. Drew the square.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Read the instructions.</td>
<td>Few started to do the task.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the lesson using COLT

There were two activities in this lesson. While the first activity was consisted of two episodes there were four episodes in the second.

Participant Organisation of this lesson indicates that the students participated only in whole class work. The participant organisation of the lesson as a percentage of class time is demonstrated in Table 8.14. The duration of the lesson was 38 minutes.
Table 8.14

Participant Organisation by class time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Organisation</th>
<th>Time(Mts.)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole class</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 8.14 indicates for the entire duration of the lesson the majority of the students was involved in whole class participation with the teacher addressing the class. There was no group work or students working on their own. However, as Table 8.13 indicates the TG suggests group work.

According to observations while the teacher addressed the class in most of the episodes the teacher questioned the students and when they responded the teacher reacted. There were also instances where the students responded by drawing or writing individually. During such activities the teacher provided feedback by going up to them.

The student Modality as a percentage of class time is indicated in Table 8.15

Table 8.15

Student Modality as a percentage of class time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (drawing)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 8.15 for most of the class time (67%) the majority of the students was involved in listening to the teacher or other students. They were also involved in drawing for 34% of the class time.
However, according to observations while the majority of the students was listening some students responded to teacher questions. In some episodes, for example in episode one of activity one, some students responded orally and also either wrote or drew in response to the questions. In episodes two and three of activity 2 the students were expected to listen and draw.

The *content* of the lesson was a listening passage designed to help the students to listen and follow instructions. The instructions related to marking positions such as top, bottom which the students were expected to have learnt in previous lessons.

In most instances the teacher used English for classroom management. However, often there was no response from the students and the teacher then used L1. Sometimes the teacher had to use L1 to explain the content of the lesson as well. However, the teacher tried as far as possible not to use L1.

The *Materials* used in this lesson were based on the Pupil’s text as well as an out side text. The students were supposed to have done at home, a task, which the teacher had taken from another book. Yet the majority of the students had not done it. Thus the teacher had to do it in class. Even though, the TG recommends an additional group activity varying the task given in the Pupil’s Book, the teacher was unable to get the students to complete even the task in the Pupil’s text as students found it difficult to follow the instructions. Thus, although the content of the lesson was based on a teacher selected task and a task based on the Pupil’s Book, what happened in the class was indirectly controlled by the students.

**Summary**

In this lesson all the tasks were teacher led and the students participated in whole class work. In some episodes such as episode two the teacher involved the students in the task by questioning them or asking them to follow her instructions. The students' responses in this lesson were less than in other lessons. However, students responded to the teacher's instructions by drawing. Yet, often the students misunderstood the teacher's instructions. The teacher engaged herself with the students and provided feedback. Although the teacher tried not to use L1, she was compelled to use L1, as otherwise students were unable to understand teacher's instructions.
This lesson which had been designed to improve the listening skill involved the students for the majority of the class time in listening. The students' involvement in reading and writing was minimal. Student talk was mainly in L1.

The content of the lesson had to be adapted according to the students' needs. Most of the students had not done the homework given. As a result Sama had to get the pupils to do the task in class. This resulted in reducing the time available for the activity in the Pupil's Book. However, this activity appeared to revise some of the language necessary for the activity.

Although the students spend more time in listening than in reading, writing and speaking the majority seemed to find it difficult to follow the English instructions. The difficulty seemed to be aggravated as the task involved not only linguistic skill but also mathematical knowledge as well. Most of the students seemed to find the mathematics involved difficult. Thus, it is not certain whether the students' difficulties were related to mathematics or L2 instructions.

8.5 Discussion

When observations commenced in this school, Sama was to teach the third lesson in unit two of the Pupil's Book. Thus, in relation to the number of lessons completed Sama was ahead of Latha while being behind Rasa. As was the case at Mahasen in this school there were no extra curricular activities. On the other hand like Latha, Sama had many responsibilities. Yet, Sama also had more opportunities to compensate for the time she might have lost due to her involvement in other work. Compared to the other two schools Maya had the least number of students. Thus, the time Sama had available to interact with the students was greater than either at Mahasen or Vanitha. Like in the other two schools in this school there were students of different proficiency levels. Yet, the diversity of the student population at Maya and the exposure to English outside the class was more similar to Mahasen than to Vanitha. However, there was one student at Maya whose L1 is English and his presence in the class was often a help to the other students, yet at times he tended to get more turns in the interactions in the class. Student absenteeism was another feature, which was more specific to Maya. The majority of the students being absent sometimes prevented Sama doing a new lesson or other times students may not have been able to be involved in the lesson as they had not been present for a previous lesson. As both parents and students were less keen on gaining good results at examinations there was less pressure on the teacher to complete
the syllabus. This allowed the teacher to repeat classes to attend to needs of less able students.

The interpersonal environment at Maya was more similar to Mahasen than to Vanitha. There was an overall friendly and co-operative relationship between the teacher and students and students and students. The teacher knew the students well and some times there were informal talk in the class, for example, discussing the vacation or inquiring after a sick child. There were few instances of students asking the teacher for help during group work. Although the teacher was friendly she was also firm as when she found that the majority of the students had not done the homework she scolded them. Yet students could also challenge the teacher as Denver did or inform the teacher that they do not know the answer as Asan did. Students were quite willing to help each other. There was also co-operation between the girls and boys and they often helped each other. Thus, the interpersonal environment at Maya appears to facilitate interaction and provide more opportunities for L2 development.

The teacher-pupil interactions at Maya had both similarities as well as differences to both Vanitha and Mahasen. In all three schools during the majority of the lessons the teacher dominated the interactions. The structure of the lessons was often based on question and answer dialogues. In contrast to Mahasen where a few students often responded to the teacher at Maya, more often one student tended to answer the teacher. While at Vanitha the teacher accepted the response of those who responded and continued with the lesson, at Maya the teacher questioned the other students and would not accept only one response. This resulted in more interactions at Maya.

Even though the amount of interactions was similar at Mahasen and Maya between the teacher and most of the students, there were other differences between Mahasen and Maya. At Maya the other students rarely chorused after the best student, where as at Mahasen they often did so. At Maya the students seem to expect to be called before answering. A few instances of students asking permission from the teacher to respond out of turn were observed. The teacher also seemed to expect this of the students as at times for example, when Denver answered out of turn she asked him to wait. However, at Vanitha very rarely did the teacher nominate students or the students initiate discourse.

Although most of the class time was spent in teacher led activities there were also group and pair work observed at Maya. There was more student participation in these activities at Maya than at the other schools. At Maya like Mahasen the teacher had
mixed ability groups. Yet, during group work the teacher did not appoint leaders. In the boys' groups Denver sometimes self appointed himself as the leader and helped the other two students. On the other hand in the other group in which the majority were girls, they tended to work alone. Thus, this observation seems to support the observations at Mahsen that the boys were more likely to initiate interaction.

During pair work when the teacher paired a better student with a less proficient student it resulted in more students being involved in the lesson. Thus, both Rasa and Sama's choice of leaders facilitated interaction. Both teachers also interacted with the students and were available when the students needed help. Students were also more ready to ask for clarification in the small groups than in the whole class interactions. However, as the number of students were less at Maya, Sama could be available to all the pairs. She also devoted more time for pair work than Rasa. Thus, the students involvement in group and pair work at Maya due to the teacher and leaders co-operation and commitment facilitated more interaction which provided more opportunities to second language learning.

The way Sama provided feedback seemed different depending on the lesson and the student who responded. In the "Word Study" lesson where the focus was on teaching vocabulary the teacher repeated the correct response whether it was choral or individual indicating that the response was correct. When the students made a mistake Sama corrected them. In other lessons often when better students gave the correct response there was no evaluation or repetition of response instead the teacher asked another question of a different student. However, when the students made mistakes she indicated that there was an error through a signal such as repeating the word or phrase. For example, when the student misunderstood the meaning of capital" Sama asked more questions to explain the meaning. This type of error correction provided opportunities for the students to correct their mistakes and better comprehension.

While using L2 for the majority of the class time, like Rasa, Sama used L1 where necessary. She also used L1 when L2 alone failed to elicit a response from the students and to check comprehension. Similar to Mahasen the students at Maya also used L1 to ask for clarification, talk to their peers and sometimes to respond to the teacher. Students sometimes translated the teacher's L2 instructions to L1 for the benefit of others. However, there were fewer instances of Sama translating students' L1 responses to L2 than at Mahasen. During interviews Sama said that she had to use L1 a lot as some of the students would not otherwise understand at all. She seemed to be conscious of the students' low proficiency and though she used English to give
instructions Sama often checked to see whether all the students were following the instructions. If she noticed that they were not following the instructions she would resort to L1. Thus, like at Mahasen at Maya also the use of L1 was more flexible and appears to encourage more student interactions.

In comparison with the other two schools at Maya the teacher adhered more to the instructions in the TG. Following the TG guidelines that teachers should decide how much of the tasks recommended in the Pupil's text can be done in their classes, Sama reduced the number of tasks done in the class when the tasks were too difficult. This provided more time for the students to practise. For example, in the "Role Play" lesson teaching only half of the dialogue enabled the students more time to practise in pairs. However, when the task was short and the students could do it without much difficulty like in the "Useful Dialogue" lesson Sama, as stated in the TG extended the dialogue to other situations. Like Rasa she too did not use the Work Book in the class during the observed lessons. The way Sama used the EED materials in the class appears to facilitate interaction.

Most students in this class like at Mahasen found some of the content in the textbook difficult. Several students could not read even the few lines in the "Role Play" dialogue after reading it with the help of others. Thus in this school also the lack of exposure to English outside the school seems to affect what happens in the class. On the other hand, in the "Listening" lesson even the students who had exposure to English could not do the task. This could be because it involved not only linguistic ability but also mathematical skills. In this lesson the teacher had to use L1 much more than in other lessons. During the entire duration of the lesson the teacher was leading the task and addressing the class. Sama found it very difficult to get the students to follow even the preliminary instructions. Thus, the students' behaviour at Maya seems to imply that the content of some of the EED materials is beyond the students' proficiency levels and it affects interaction in the class.

Sama like Rasa believed that the EED materials provide more opportunities to practise speaking. She was also aware that in her class some students found it very difficult to read and write. In the lessons observed except in one lesson the students were not involved in writing. On the other hand like Rasa, Sama too involved the students in choral drilling in the "Finding Out", "Word Study" and "Role Play" lessons. Yet, Rasa could only provide controlled practise and no opportunities for using the structures learnt in other situations. At Maya, at least in the "Useful Dialogue" lesson students
were able to extend the dialogue to other situations as advocated in the TG. This could be because at *Maya* the number of students was less than at *Mahasen*.

At the interviews like Latha, Sama also considered a lack of an explicit focus on grammar as a weakness in the EED materials. A "Grammar in Action" lesson was not included in the five analysed lessons at *Maya*. There was no explicit focus on grammar teaching in any of the lessons analysed. However, there was an explicit focus on grammar using metalanguage in the first "Grammar in Action" lesson observed. This was the same grammar lesson observed at *Vanitha* in which no guidelines are provided to the teacher. Thus, like the other two teachers Sama also seemed to find it difficult to interpret how to teach grammar due to insufficient guidelines.

Unlike the other two teachers Sama did not have experience in teaching any other textbooks. As the EED materials were in use when she first started teaching she would have had to depend on the TG for guidance until she received her professional training. Although the data is insufficient to generalise, it could be suggested that perhaps Sama not been involved in teaching other approaches may have helped her to interpret some of the guidelines in the TG better.

### 8.6 Conclusion

The observations at *Maya* indicated that like at the other two schools here also the teacher led most of the activities with the structure of the lesson often being based on question and answer dialogue. Yet, there was more teacher-pupil interaction and student involvement in the lessons. This could be due to several reasons such as, the lesser number of students in the class, structure of the school being less rigid with the teacher having more freedom to be flexible, less pressure to complete the syllabus, a more conducive interpersonal environment where the teacher was more a guide with the students helping each other and the teacher not being influenced by prior experience in other teaching approaches.

However, in this school also the students who had exposure to English outside the school seemed to interact more with the teacher. Yet, among the better students the boys tended to interact more while the girls seemed to wait to be nominated. However, the girls score better marks at the examinations. There were more student initiated clarifications than at the other two schools but such instances were more prominent during small group work and in L1. Thus, the data at Maya appears to support some of
the findings in the other two schools regarding interaction being related to gender and culture specific to the school as well as the broader Sri Lankan culture.

The final case study - *Raja* will be examined in Chapter 9.
Chapter 9

"Raja"

9.1 The School: Raja

*Raja* belongs to Type 3 schools, that is schools which have classes up to Year five or eight. This school was first established in 1898, by the Buddhist Theosophical Society. *Raja* was one of the few Sinhala medium schools established during the British period in Ceylon. At its inception *Raja* was a co-educational primary school with classes from Year one to Year five. This school was then considered as the feeder school for the prestigious secondary schools in the neighbourhood. In the past *Raja* was considered as one of the sought after primary schools and it was also in one of the good residential areas.

However, the status of *Raja*, when observations began was quite different. The residential area had developed into large commercial complexes and administrative centres. The area around the school was a congested slum land. The school was comprised of a single two storeyed building, which was not well maintained. The wall that was in front of the school was broken and there was no gate. Close to the broken wall was where local residents put their garbage.

The staff was comprised of eight teachers of whom five were female. Of the three males, one was a Buddhist priest who resided in the nearby temple and the other two were the Principal and the Deputy Principal. The Principal who had been at the school for twelve years resided in a small bed-sitter on the school premises. At the time the observations commenced the student population on roll was 100. The average attendance however, was around 50. According to the Principal of the school most students were not regular in their attendance and some rarely came to school. Most students who came to *Raja* were from nearby houses. There were also 'street children' some of whose education had been intermittently disrupted. The Principal said that he knew the family backgrounds of most of the children. According to him most fathers were either unemployed or involved in illegal business and they sometimes used the children in these activities. The Principal cited this as one reason for the low attendance in the school.
The school, which was originally a primary school, now has classes up to Year eight. Yet the number of students has declined. According to the Principal the decline began when the other neighbouring "big" schools started primary classes and Raja no longer became the feeder school. Although there were classes up to Year eight there were only four students in Year eight. According to the Principal after Year eight these students were eligible to enter two of the IC Type of single sex schools closest to Raja. However, the students often left school as they found it difficult to get adjusted to the different culture of these schools.

The school structure at Raja was quite flexible. The eight teachers were in charge of the eight classes. The Principal was also one of the class teachers. Often at least two or three teachers were absent every day and the teachers who were present combined classes and taught. At the time of the study there were two teachers of English. Both had obtained their professional training recently. Often these teachers had to teach other subjects in their classes besides English.

Admission to this school was not competitive and very flexible. According to the Principal he did not follow the normal procedure advocated by the Ministry of Education in insisting on relevant documents such as birth certificates and certificates from the former schools. He said this provided opportunities for students who had been dropped out of other schools to come back to school. The Principal believed that the students at Raja were not academically oriented and that they faced many socio-economic and psychological problems. According to him, the school is the place where they come to be away from the problems. He said he had asked the teachers to be very sympathetic and help the students to become socially acceptable adults.

One of the private schools close to Raja helped the students by providing them annually with their school needs such as stationary, clothes, and school bags. The Principal had also obtained the help of a few Non Governmental Organisations to provide the school with a lathe machine and a sewing machine. He wanted to help the students to develop skills which might help them to find employment. He was happy that the students were making use of this opportunity.

Opportunities for extra curricular activities were also provided in the school. Although there was very little space in the school compound, a sportsmeet was held in the second term. For two weeks the students were taken to a nearby park in the afternoons for practice. At the end of the fortnight the athletic events were held and certificates and prices were awarded. The Principal said he encouraged such events as it provides opportunities to select those who were good in sports to participate in District Level
The opportunities for the students to interact in English at the school outside the class were very limited. The principal believed that the students should be encouraged to speak in English. He said he had told the teachers to speak to the students in English. Although the students did not come from English speaking homes, the Principal thought being able to speak in English would help the students to find casual employment in the nearby commercial centres and hotels. He was very supportive of my going to the school for observations. I was told that I could come any time I wanted and need not follow the timetable. He thought that the research might encourage more student participation in the lessons. The students were also sent up for district level English day competitions and the Principal was happy that they had won certificates for one of the events they entered, "Action songs".

9.2 "Priya"

Priya was the teacher of English in Year seven. She was the teacher in charge of Year 4 and taught English in all the classes except in Year 6. Of the two teachers of English at *Raja*, Priya was the most senior teacher.

Priya had nearly 10 years of experience. She obtained her first teaching appointment in 1989. For the first five years Priya taught in a difficult area school. She obtained a transfer to *Raja* in 1995. Priya completed a two year full time professional development program and obtained the Trained Teacher's Certificate and returned to *Raja* in 1998. When observations commenced she had completed one year of teaching after training.

Priya had a good understanding of the students in the class I observed. She had taught most of these students the previous year as well. Priya knew their family backgrounds as well as their capabilities. This enabled her to adapt the learning materials to the students' needs and to be sympathetic and tolerant of their behaviour. None of the students in her class came from English speaking backgrounds. However, she said that the students were exposed to English in the wider community more than the students she had taught in other schools were. This is because English was used in the nearby commercial centre and some of the students were exposed to English as they were involved in part time employment in these centres. However, Priya said that compared to the former school where she taught, in this school classroom management was difficult and the students' literacy level was below that of other students she had taught.

The EED materials were already in use, when Priya commenced teaching. Since she
underwent professional training only in 1995, most of her teaching experience had been as a non trained teacher. She had not taught the previous textbooks, *An English Course*, however, as a student she had studied both this course and the *English Every Day Book 5* in the final years of her schooling.

Priya said she learnt the teaching methodology behind the EED materials, during her professional training. When asked whether the professional training helped her in her classroom teaching Priya said "of course I feel more comfortable after training". According to her she could not do everything the TG suggests. She cited the "Finding Out" sections as one such example. Priya said that she found it very difficult to get the students to answer the questions given in the TG. She felt that if she were to give the same questions she would have to ask the questions in the mother tongue or explain in the L1. The "Grammar in Action" sections were another difficulty. She said it was very difficult as the students did not know the basic grammar. As a result, before doing the lesson scheduled for the day, Priya had to revise the grammar the students were supposed to have learnt in the previous lessons. On the other hand, the "Role Play" lessons she said she could "manage".

From Priya's point of view, the EED materials were different to the former materials, *An English Course*. The difference she found was mainly regarding the teaching of grammar and reading comprehension. Priya said the previous course taught more grammar. According to her, in the EED materials "they have mentioned grammar, but it's "Grammar in Action". So I think it is very.....we are not learning rules....but grammar in action". The comprehension passages in the former textbooks, *An English Course* contained the meanings of the new vocabulary in the Mother Tongue. Priya thought that this does not encourage students from finding the meanings themselves. Thus she thought the EED materials were better and more interesting as it makes the students find out the meanings for themselves.

Priya used group work to encourage more student participation. Yet she said that in order to make group work a success, she had always to be with the students. Otherwise, they were unable to and would not do the task.

Use of L1 seemed to be one of Priya's main concerns. When I discussed with her the possibility of observing her lessons she did not mind being observed but voiced her concern that she had to use a lot of L1 in the class. Priya said that she tried to use only English, especially for classroom language such as giving instructions, it did not work as the students expected instructions in their mother tongue. Priya seemed to think that according to the prescribed teaching methodology she should use mostly L2. She said
that "they", (referring to the lecturers at the Teachers' College) "want us to use English, but in a school like this it is very difficult".

9.3 The Class: "Class 4"

Class four was the only Year seven class at Raja. The classroom was on the second floor of the school building. There were four other class rooms on the same level. The classrooms had half walls with a wire mesh going up to the roof. When it rained the school had to be closed as the classrooms got flooded. In addition, noise from the neighbouring houses and the road could be heard in the class.

When observations commenced at Raja, fourteen student names were on the class attendance register: five girls and nine boys. However, at no time during the observations were all students present in class.

The students had sufficient room in the class to move about, and the teacher had easy access to all students during group work. The seating arrangement in the class is illustrated in Figure 9.1

![Diagram of Classroom Layout](image)

The girls usually sat together in the first row on the right side of the class. While some boys sat on the second row behind the girls, the others sat on the left side. Some students had their permanent seats while the others would sit wherever they wanted. A few would even move about while the lesson was going on.

The majority of the students in the class were Sinhalese. However, there were three Tamil students, a girl and two boys, and two Muslim boys whose home language was also Sinhalese. Most of the students in the class came from the nearby slums. Two of
the students were 'street children' while another with his younger brother was living in a social service institution while their parents were on the street begging for their living. According to the Principal of the school one of the Non Governmental Organisations provided after school care for the 'Street Children', help with their studies and involved them in recreation activities. The literacy level of these students was very low.

The average age level of a Year seven student in Sri Lanka is twelve years. However, in this class there were students whose ages ranged from thirteen years to seventeen years. This was because students whose mainstream education had been disrupted were admitted to this school. There were two such students who travelled from a distance of about seven kilometres. There were also students who had to repeat their studies in the lower grades. The literacy level of most of these students was very low and their parents or guardians were generally not concerned with their education. I was told by the teacher not to have observations on Fridays as some parents "employ" their children to beg from people who come to the nearby Mosque and the Church. As a result, absenteeism was very high on Fridays.

The students were at times very supportive of each other. Yet, sometimes even for a slightest reason they were provoked. In most of the lessons observed, while the teacher was conducting the lesson some students would fight each other. Sometimes these fights and arguments would continue throughout the lesson. There were a few instances of students eating, playing, singing and even walking in and out of class while the lessons were going on. In spite of such behaviour the teacher-pupil relationship was very cordial. Although the teacher sometimes scolded the students she was friendly and encouraging to all the students. The students appeared not to be afraid to converse with the teacher and question her. There was a good rapport between the teacher and students.

9.4 The Lessons

When observations commenced at Raja the teacher had already taught unit one and four lessons of the second unit. Three of the lessons observed were from unit two and the other two lessons were from unit three. The two lessons observed in unit three were conducted mostly using L1. Therefore, in this school only the first three lessons will be analysed using both field data and COLT analysis. However, a descriptive analysis of the last two lessons will be provided to demonstrate how these two lessons differed from the other lessons.
9.4.1 Lesson 1 - Word Study - "Shopping"

The purpose of this lesson appears to be to introduce the English words for some common food items. As stated before the objective of the "Word Study" section in each unit is "to introduce sets of words for the things which are part of the world the pupils see around them every day" (Teacher's Guide, 1985, p.32).

This lesson is based on the illustration of a grocery store given in the Pupil's Book (Appendix ii). In this picture there are some shelves which contain food items which are labelled. The shopkeeper and Padmini who has a shopping list in her hand are also in the picture.

There were nine students, three girls and six boys present in class that day. Priya had asked the students to bring labels, wrappers, empty cartons and boxes of various food items for this lesson. One of the boys and one girl had these items on their desks. The lesson began with the teacher and students talking in L1. Priya wanted to know whether only one boy brought all the items. Azar who had brought the pictures acknowledged that one of the other boys had also given some pictures the previous day. This boy was absent that day. Asitha commented that no one had brought cardboard to prepare the chart. The teacher replied that in that case they would have to postpone making the chart. Yet, one of the girls, Lakmini who had brought some of the pictures insisted that they must make the chart.

In the next episode the teacher asked the students whether they went shopping during the New Year season. The conversation was in L1. While Yoga said he did not go shopping Azar said he did. As Example 1 illustrates, the teacher next questioned the students on what they bought. The teacher's question was in English and was addressed to a boy who was one of the 'better' students. Yet, one of the others immediately translated the question to L1.

Example 1

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>What did you buy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>(Toffees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>(Yes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Yoga (Do you go shopping?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>(Yes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>(What did you buy?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>(Vegetables)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>(Rice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Tell in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Vegetables...then what else?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teacher continued to nominate students, the students responded in L1 and the teacher translated their responses.

In the third episode of the lesson Priya drew the students' attention to the illustration in the book. As can be seen from Example 2, she used both L1 and L2.

**Example 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>SAz</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>SL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Rice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As demonstrated in turn 71, the teacher used L1 and immediately translated it to L2. Thus it is not certain whether Yoga listened to the L2 question. The word "list" is commonly used in L1. While this exchange was taking place Asitha crossed to the other side of the class and started talking with Sam.

The teacher next asked the students to read the list. She repeated her request in English twice. Yet, there was no response from the students. Priya next used L1. Still there was no reaction from the students. She then noticed that some students did not have the Pupil's Book with them. Priya pulled up Asitha for not having a book. As can be seen from Example 3, this resulted in an argument between the teacher and student as well as between a girl and a boy.

**Example 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>SAz</th>
<th>SL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>SAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>SAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open your books and turn to page 18.

(Only that book for the three of you?)

(That's not your book it's mine)

(Asitha and Lakmini started fighting over the book)

(You leave your books at home. That's the problem.)

Right. Now stop fighting and read the list.

(Read the list in Padmini's hand)

After the teacher requested for the fifth time Lakmini started to read. She made a pronunciation error in the first word. She said "floor" for "flour". The teacher repeated the word with the correct pronunciation. Although the teacher expected the whole class to read the words as Example 4 illustrates, only Lakmini and Azar read the words.

Example 4

| 100 | SL | floor  |
| 101 | T  | flour  |
| 102 | SL | soya   |
| 103 | T  | soya   |
| 104 | SL | salmon |
| 105 | SL | cheese |
| 106 | SL | /shager/ |
| 107 | T  | Ah?    |
| 108 | SAz| sugar  |
| 109 | T  | sugar  |
| 110 | T  | ඉකුණු අකුණු sugar? (What is sugar?) |
| 111 | SS | මක් |
| 112 | T  | මක් මක් මකුණු කුණු කුණු (Did anyone bring a packet of sugar?) |

(No one had a packet of sugar)

Priya next checked whether the students had labels of the things on the list. Azar searched among his labels and gave some to the teacher who showed them to the class. The students were asked to read the list again and they did so as a group.

In the fifth episode, the teacher asked the students to read the names of the things on the counter. Two of the boys, Asitha and Sam were arguing and two girls Indra and Uditha were also not involved in the lesson. The others read the list.

In the sixth episode the teacher said in L1, "right let's find out the things in the shop". The teacher read one word and thereafter Lakmini started naming the things. Once again she pronounced "flour" incorrectly and the teacher repeated the correct pronunciation. Lakmini also found it difficult to say "soft drinks" and the teacher
helped her. Next, Priya asked from the class in L1, "what are soft drinks?" No one answered. Then the teacher showed some labels and indicated in L1 that they were soft drinks. Immediately Sisira called out a brand name and this was followed by Azar and Asitha naming two other brands. Lakmini picked a picture from her items and gave the teacher. Priya showed it to the class and said in English "these are soft drinks". Next she asked in L1 "what do you call them"? and the students chorused "soft drinks". This was followed by the teacher asking for the other goods in the shop.

The students responded individually. The teacher reacted to student responses sometimes by checking whether they knew the meaning by asking in L1. Other times she asked the students to look for a label or picture to illustrate the item. The way the teacher reacted to student responses is demonstrated in Example 5.

**Example 5**

176 T Coffee, පොහොම් යොම් යොම් යොම්?
177 SS තල් (coffee)
178 SAZ Tea
179 SSi මැති (tea)
180 T Ah....tea....tea යොම් යොම් යොම් යොම් යොම් යොම් යොම් යොම් යොම් label යොම් යොම් ...Lipton (searches for the label)
181 SLa පොහොම් යොම් (Here it is)
182 T Right. පොහොම් යොම් යොම් යොම් යොම් යොම් යොම්. (Those who brought will remember)

Different patterns could be observed in the way the students reacted to each other’s responses. Sometimes when a student gave the English word as in turn 178 in Example 5 another student would give the L1 equivalent. Other times as in Example 6, they would chorus after an individual response and the teacher also repeated it.

**Example 6**

209 T Right. Next one.
210 SYo Cheese
211 SS Cheese
212 T Cheese
213 SSi Chocolate
214 T Chocolate
215 SS Chocolate
216 T Right.
217 SS Sweets
218 T Sweets, පොහොම් යොම් යොම් යොම් යොම් යොම් යොම් යොම්?.
219 SŠi පොහොම් (fruits)
220 T No. පොහොම් යොම් යොම් යොම් යොම් toffee, chocolates

As this exchange demonstrates even though the students had the illustration in the book, they could not identify the things. Thus, if the teacher had not checked Sisira may have thought that "sweets" means "fruits". The teacher got the students to name
all the items in the shop and continued to check whether they knew the meanings of some of the not so common words.

In the seventh episode Priya told the students in L1 "lets read once more". Although, the students started to read all were not doing so. The teacher said that all must read and to start again. A few more joined in reading and the teacher repeated the words. She noticed that Asitha had moved to another seat and was talking to another boy and asked him to name a soft drink. Sisira whispered the answer and Asitha repeated. Priya heard this and said in L1 "ah..some one helped". As Example 7 illustrates, some words were read only by one student and the teacher had to go round and ask those who were not reading to do so.

Example 7
229 SLa Sweets.
230 T Sweets...chocolates..sweets
231 SS Eggs
232 SAz Dry fish
233 T (To Indra) පොලිය මගින් ආදරයෙන් මෙයි?(Why don't you read?)
234 SS Dry Fish
235 T Dried fish
236 T (To Kalum) ඔබට මෙකොමයි (You also read).

After the students had read the names of all the items in the shop, Priya then checked whether all the things on Padmini's list are in the shop. The teacher called out each item and the students as a group replied "Yes". This exchange took place in L1.

In the next episode the teacher asked the students some of the questions given in the Pupil's Book. Example 8 demonstrates the students could provide the correct responses only when the teacher prompted in L1. As line 246 suggests students have a great deal of difficulty with even simple phrasing in English.

Example 8
243 T Ah...කොළඹ අංගන් (What else will she buy?)
244 T Asitha?
245 SYo Chocolate
246 T Chocolate...yes Why?
247 SA Eggs
248 T Anne is staying with her remember? පොලිය චක්‍රණ දීග වේදිකාවේ මාරාදී (Can you remember where Anne is?)
249 SAz Colombo
250 T Colombo. She is living with Padmini and her family කොළඹ?(Isn't she?)
251 T මගින් නොළුව?(At Padmini's house isn't it?)
252 SS OV (Yes)
253 T අංගන් මොර්ටා මරු මමීම (What does she like to eat?)
254 SYo Sweets
255 SS Sweets
256 T Sweets. Very Good. Then Padmini will buy chocolates..some sweets.

In the next episode teacher divided the class into two groups. She asked the two boys, Asitha and Kalum to join the three girls. The other group was comprised of four boys.
Priya referred to the two groups as two shops and asked the students to separate the labels and pictures they had brought under the different categories of items in the shop given in the Pupil's Book such as "sweets", "milk products". She said that they could make a chart later. The teacher went to both groups and helped them to sort out the items. Three girls and three boys were involved in the activity. Kalum was very quiet and watched what the girls did. Asitha was moving from one group to the other and disturbing the others. Once the teacher noticed and asked in L1, "in which group are you". In the boys' group Sam was singing a jingle that was heard over the radio to advertise a brand of biscuits.

After both groups had finished categorising the teacher asked each student to read in L2 the names of the items they have. Except for Sam, the other three boys read without much difficulty. The teacher wanted Sam also to read and Azar tapped him on the shoulder thinking he didn't hear. This made Sam angry and shouted at Azar.

In the girls' group Lakmini did not find it difficult to read. However, the teacher had to help Udeni and Kalum while Lakmini helped Inoka. Asitha refused to read at first. However, when all the others had finished reading he asked the teacher whether he should read. Lakmini had to prompt most of the words for him to read. Twice he also asked the teacher to help by saying in L1 "What is this miss"? in L1. During the group work the entire conversation between the students and teacher and among students was in L1.

At the end of the lesson the teacher asked the students to prepare two charts using the pictures they had and also bringing some more. In the chart the students were expected to paste the pictures and label them in L2. It was decided that the students would collect more pictures during the weekend and prepare the chart on Monday. The three girls were very keen to do the chart and hang it in the class.

The summary of the lesson and the guidelines given in the TG are indicated in Table 9.1

Table 9.1
Summary of lesson 1 and instructions in the TG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Teacher Behaviour</th>
<th>Pupil Behaviour</th>
<th>Instructions in the TG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Checked whether the students had brought pictures.</td>
<td>Some SS. responded to the T. and to each other.</td>
<td>1. T reads the words. SS look at the pictures and identify them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Asked individual sts. why they go shopping.</td>
<td>SS responded to the teacher</td>
<td>2. T reads out the words again. SS repeat after her(5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Drew the ss attention to the illustration in the book. Asked the Ss. to read the list. Pulled up a ss for not bringing the book. Two SS. Responded to the teacher. Choral reading

Asked SS to find the things on the counter. T. provided feedback. Individual student responded. Few choral responses.

Asked for the things on the counter. T. provided feedback. Showed pictures as examples. Individual responses. Some students also involved in selecting relevant pictures.

T. interacted with the SS and offered help. In small groups SS. grouped the pictures into different categories of food.

Teacher moved around the group providing feedback. Each S(except for one) read the names of the items of food they had in their group. Others in the group helped.

Specific to this lesson

Do the questions given in the book

Some more questions.

What's Padmini doing?

What's the first item on the list?

Has she already bought the first item? How many items are on the list?

What things are packed in bottles? Jars? What are eggs kept in?

How many more things has Padmini got to buy? Give the names of three things in the shop we buy in Kilos.

Give the names of ten things to eat you cannot see in this. You may have to do some translating here, though many of the items your pupils will suggest will not have English names. It will be interesting.
| 3 | 4 | Discussed the group project. | Most students were involved and offered to bring pictures and suggestions. | for them to build up a list of such things. |
Analysis of the Lesson using COLT

As Table 9.1 indicates this lesson was comprised of two activities. The first activity which was based on the task given in the Pupil's Book contained eight episodes. The second activity was devised by the teacher and contained three episodes.

Participant Organisation in this lesson indicates whole class as well as group work. Table 9.2 demonstrates the participant organisation by class time. Duration of the lesson was 40 minutes.

Table 9.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Organisation</th>
<th>Time (mts)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patterns</td>
<td>Categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole class</td>
<td>T-S/C</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-S/C</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choral</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Different task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same Task</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Different Task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 9.2 the majority of the class time (63%) the teacher addressed the class. Choral work occupied 8% of the class time. There were no activities where a student led the activities. Group work occupied 38% of the class time but there were no tasks where students worked individually.

Observations indicated that during the time the teacher led the tasks, she questioned the students. In episode two, teacher named students and there was more student participation. Yet, in other episodes too, students responded to the teacher without waiting to be called. Thus during whole class participation the majority of the students were involved in the lesson responding to the teacher. However, two students tended to respond more than the others.

During group work students worked in two small groups. The teacher went up to both groups and helped the students. Except for two students the others were involved in the task. However, the students spoke with each other as well as with the teacher in L1. Student Modality as a percentage of class time is indicted in Table 9.3
Table 9.3
Student Modality as a percentage of class time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 9.3 indicates in this lesson the majority of the students were expected to be involved in reading for the majority of the class time (50%). However, observations revealed that except in episode 7 when most of the class read the words in other episodes it was not certain whether majority of the students were involved in reading as only a few students responded.

There were three episodes in the lesson in which students were expected to be involved in speaking. This amounts to 35% of the class time. Yet, most of this time the students were talking in L1.

In episode six while one student read the words in their groups others were expected to listen. During this time (15%) most students listened and helped the one who read.

The Content of this lesson was teaching some vocabulary connected with shopping. The teacher introduced the lesson by talking about shopping. The majority of the class time was spent on teaching the names of the food items in the picture. In the second activity students were introduced to more vocabulary connected with food through the pictures they had brought.

The lesson was based on the EED Materials. The format of this Word study lesson is different to other such lessons in the book. Usually the items in the illustration numbered and the corresponding words with numbers are given below the picture. This picture did not have numbered items or a list of words. As a result, Priya could not follow the general guidelines given in the TG as indicated in Table 9.1. She asked the questions given in the Pupil's Book. Instead of doing the additional questions suggested in the TG she devised an activity which provided more opportunities for the students to practise the words they learnt. Thus though the content of the lesson was based mainly on the EED materials the teacher adapted it depending on the level and interest of the students.
Priya used both L1 and L2 in the class. Instructions were given in English yet they would be often followed by the translation. Sometimes the same pattern could be seen in the teacher questioning related to the content of the lesson. The teacher-pupil interactions in the group work were also mostly in L1.

**Summary**

The objective of Word study lessons according to the TG is for the students to learn some vocabulary they would come across in their day to day life. The purpose of this lesson would have been to teach vocabulary connected with shopping. Some of the vocabulary taught in this lesson such as chocolates, cheese, biscuits the students already knew as these words are also used when speaking in L1. On the other hand words such as sugar, flour, sweets, dried fish were new words.

The activities done during the lesson facilitated teacher-pupil interaction in the class. Although teacher led activities occupied most of the class time the students were also involved in the lesson during this time by responding to the teacher. The group activity provided the opportunity for the majority of students to participate and for the students to practise using some of the words in the lesson. Thus, the procedure adopted by the teacher was in keeping with the general instructions provided in the TG. On the other hand, she did not limit the lesson to the activity in the Pupil's Book but adapted it to suit the level and interest of the students in the class. The use of labels and wrappers and the group work may have encouraged more student participation especially as most students did not bring their books to the class and some of the illustrations in the book were not quite clear.

The social environment in the class encouraged the students to initiate an exchange and at times even disagree with the teacher. The way Priya provided feedback and corrected student errors during the lesson also led to more student involvement and interaction with the teacher. However, most of this was in L1.

The use of L1 during the lessons while facilitating interaction also reduced the amount of L2 to which the students were exposed. In the episodes where the students spoke to each other or responded to the teacher, they used L1 most of the time. Although L2 was used both by the teacher and the students the amount of L1 used to maintain discipline and for classroom procedure was greater than L2.

The evidence of the interactions during the lesson alone is not sufficient to claim whether these students acquired the language items taught. There was no individual
work or written work done in the lesson. However, in the final activity, the students who interacted more during the lesson were able to use the new words to identify the items better than the other students.

9.4.2 Lesson 2 - Learning Together - "Who's doing what?"

According to the TG the aim of "Learning Together" lessons are to involve students in "meaningful conversation" in pairs or small groups (Teacher's Guide, p.60). This lesson was also from unit two. Priya had taught the "Useful Dialogue" lesson based on the present continuous tense observed at Maya. The "Learning Together" lesson (Appendix xii) is also based on present continuous tense and the use of pronouns. Thus, the objective of this lesson would be for the students to be able to converse in pairs or small groups using the present continuous tense and pronouns.

Detailed general instructions to handle the activities are given in the TG and are summarised in Table 9.4

Table 9.4

Summary of lesson 2 and instructions in the TG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Teacher Behaviour</th>
<th>Pupil Behaviour</th>
<th>Instructions in the TG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Revised Pronouns. Wrote on the board.</td>
<td>Listened. Two SS responded. Few choral responses.</td>
<td>Presentation A sample of the language to be used in the activity must be displayed and explained as necessary. It is not necessary for the SS to be fluent before the activity begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Asked the SS to describe the pictures. Questioned the class.</td>
<td>Three SS responded individually. Others choral.</td>
<td>Practice Any technique the T and SS find effective may be used in this stage - choral repetition, group or individual repetition, direct method or mother tongue explanation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Showed the pronoun cards and questioned the class.</td>
<td>Whole class responded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Showed the action cards and questioned the SS.</td>
<td>Individual responses to T nominations. Few choral responses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Explained how to form sentences.</td>
<td>Listened. Three students responded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Helped SS to form sentences.</td>
<td>Individual responses to T nominations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Explained the group work</td>
<td>Listened. One S asked for clarification</td>
<td>Production Pair or group work and the teacher switches to the low profile Counselling and Monitoring role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moved among the groups helping the SS</td>
<td>SS formed sentences in groups using the cards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provided feedback

In addition to the general instruction, specific instructions for each activity are also provided in the TG. For this lesson the instructions for the pair activity are also provided in the Pupil's Book.

In the Pupil's Book there are 10 phrases as shown in Figure 9.1

Fig. 9.1

He (She) is... We, You, They are....
1. writing a letter 6. catching a bus.
2. drinking tea. 7. posting a letter
3. making tea 8. buying vegetables
4. mending a bicycle 9. playing volleyball
5. repairing a chair 10. reading a book.

The students are asked to make ten "action" cards for the verbs above and two copies each of the pronoun indicator cards to illustrate the pronouns "he", "she", "we", "you", "they". Examples of the cards are illustrated in the Pupil's Book and example of each is shown in Figure 9.2

Fig. 9.2

Priya had asked four students the previous day to prepare the sets of cards at home. There were 11 students present in class that day. The lesson began with Priya checking whether they had brought the cards. All four students had done the task and brought the cards to class.

In the first episode of the lesson, the teacher revised 'pronouns'. Priya said that she had taught them pronouns in an earlier lesson but would remind them again. In this episode as demonstrated in Example 9, the teacher used both L1 and L2.

Example 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the teacher was explaining most of the students were talking among themselves. Next, the teacher asked the students to read the list of pronouns and some students did so. Priya then read each pronoun and asked for the L1 equivalent. Only Lakmini and Azar replied and their responses were correct. After each response the teacher repeated it.

Priya next checked whether the students knew the difference between singular and plural. Lakmini gave the L1 equivalents for singular and plural and the teacher said “very good”. Most of the other students were not involved in the lesson at this stage. The teacher wrote the following table on the board and pointing to it explained that singular pronouns take a singular and the plural pronouns a plural verb. All the explanation was in L1.

He
She is
You are
They

In episode 2 of the lesson Priya drew the students attention to the pictures in the textbook. In this episode the teacher used both L1 and L2. She wanted the students to describe the pictures. As Example 10 illustrates the students also used both languages.

Example 10
44 T Now.....take out your reading books and turn to page 22.
45 T සනසන සනසන් නාමයන් දිග මඟ ගැනීමේ (There are some pictures)
46 SSi මාධ්‍යයම් (There are ten)
47 T Now we will find out what the pictures are.
48 T මාධ්‍යයම් දිග (first one)
49 SSi ඉලඟිය (pen)
50 T Writing a letter
51 SAz Cup of tea.
52 SLa Cup of tea
53 T Ah..cup of tea..
54 SAz Take
55 T මකුණුම් මකුණුම්? (making isn't it?) making a cup of tea.

Priya helped the students by telling them they can select from the list of phrases on the next page. At first only two students were responding. Gradually the others also joined. There was better student involvement in this episode. Example 11 demonstrates how the teacher provided feedback. She helped the students to expand their one word answers by questioning them using L1.
Example 11

In the third episode the teacher showed each pronoun card to the class and the students were expected to identify them. Asitha was talking to Kalum and the teacher asked him to name a card. He gave the wrong answer. Asitha said "he" for "we". The teacher indicated that there was a mistake by repeating the answer with a rising intonation. The other students gave the correct response and the teacher explained in L1 that it is plural as there are two people.

Example 11 also indicates the way the teacher and students reacted to each other's responses. The teacher sometimes evaluated students' correct responses saying "very good" and other times repeated the correct response and the class repeated the correct response.

Priya showed a few action cards to the class in the next episode. She wanted the students to identify them. At first the teacher nominated students but after two turns the questions were directed at the class. Five students responded.

In the fifth episode the teacher explained how to form sentences. She showed a pronoun card and asked the class to identify it. Next, she asked for the verb that should follow. Both responses given by the students were correct. Next, she showed an action card and Lakmini identified it. Priya wrote the sentence on the board and read the sentence thrice. Next, she wanted the students to form sentences by using the action cards she showed. In this episode L1 was used sparingly. Yet, as demonstrated in Example 12 most students were involved in the lesson.

Example 12

Example 11

77  SSc Volleyball
78  T Volleyball /asalaacak sadak? (What do you do with the volleyball?)
79  SLa Playing the volleyball
80  T Playing volleyball. Very good.
81  SS Playing volleyball.

Example 11 also indicates the way the teacher and students reacted to each other's responses. The teacher sometimes evaluated students' correct responses saying "very good" and other times repeated the correct response and the class repeated the correct response.

Priya showed a few action cards to the class in the next episode. She wanted the students to identify them. At first the teacher nominated students but after two turns the questions were directed at the class. Five students responded.

In the fifth episode the teacher explained how to form sentences. She showed a pronoun card and asked the class to identify it. Next, she asked for the verb that should follow. Both responses given by the students were correct. Next, she showed an action card and Lakmini identified it. Priya wrote the sentence on the board and read the sentence thrice. Next, she wanted the students to form sentences by using the action cards she showed. In this episode L1 was used sparingly. Yet, as demonstrated in Example 12 most students were involved in the lesson.

Example 12

Example 12

160  T If you know the answer raise your hand.
161  SLa Making tea
    Svi Making tea[
162  T I want the full answer.
163  Sv He...he
164  Saz is making
165  SLa making a tea
166  T Yes Vijitha?
167  Svi He is making a tea.
168  T  He is making tea. Correct.
       Spr  We [  
169  T  We පුකුණු ලෙඩි. පොකෙරුණින් අපු? (Not we son. What is this?)
170  SS He..he
171  T  He..he (Shows another pronoun card) එම එම (This is we.)

The teacher showed two more sets of cards and named two students to answer. She asked from those who normally do not respond in class. One student could not respond and the teacher helped him.

In the sixth episode Priya questioned each student by showing a set of cards. When the first student could not answer, the teacher helped him to form the sentence and asked him in L1 "What was the difficulty?" Then she explained in L1 again how to formulate the sentence. She questioned all the students in the class. Except for Sam all the other students responded to the teacher. Sometimes students made mistakes in the use of the verb. The teacher would then indicate that there was a mistake and allowed the student to correct. For some students the teacher or another student had to help.

Some students did not wait to be nominated to respond and even sometimes as indicated in Example 13, would steal others turns. Yet, Priya tried not to let these students dominate the interactions.

Example 13
222  T  Kalu ....what...say this sentence
223  Svi  She is posting a letter.
224  T  No.. no....not you. I am asking Kalu

The teacher moved on to the activity in the Pupil's Book next. Priya formed four groups with three groups of boys and one with the two girls. The teacher then explained the group work in L1. The task in the Pupil's Book is a pair activity. The instructions given in the TG are indicated in Fig. 9.3
Who's doing what?
Pairs start off with their piles of cards face down - one partner with the five pronoun cards and one with the ten 'action' cards. They each turn a card over and the 'pronoun card' partner asks, "what are they (is he, is she, are you etc.) doing?" The 'action' partner replies suitably. Remind them that the, "what are you doing?" question needs, 'I'm.....' as an answer. The pronoun cards need 'shuffling' after 5 turns. You may ask each pair to bring 15 squares of cardboard or stiff paper in advance (the day before you are planning to have this activity). There are no "points" in this one. The aim is to find pairs who can go through the 'pack' with speed and accuracy. Two or three really proficient pairs may be asked to show their skill to the rest of the class.

Teacher's Guide, 1985, p.64

Priya made this activity a group work. In each group there was a "better" student. Each group had two sets of cards. The teacher asked each group to keep the piles of cards face down. She asked each student to turn over an 'action' card and a 'pronoun' card and make a sentence. Each student who formed the sentence correctly would get a mark. They were told to have their own score cards. After explaining the activity in L1, the teacher said "Right now you can start". Vijitha said in L1 "wait miss, where do we put the marks?". Before the teacher could reply, Azar complained that Praba had taken the cards and would not give. Asitha was walking towards the front of the class saying in L1 "there is a 'tape' there too" (meaning another cassette recorder). The teacher went to Azar's group, got the two sets of cards and helped Praba to do the first round explaining using only L2. She asked Asitha to go back to his place and said she would come to his group next.

In the final episode all groups did the activity. At first, there was many complaints of cheating, that some had their books opened and shouting at each other. The teacher went round to each group and listened to all the students at least once. She helped the weaker students. Later she said to give half marks if half of the sentence was correct. Most of the students who were normally not interested in the lesson participated in this activity. The teacher encouraged them by saying "very good" when they gave the correct responses. She helped the weaker students. Example 14, illustrates how the teacher provided feedback in one group to two students who normally did not participate in the activities in class.

Example 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Su</th>
<th>(Shall I say?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>(Right give him)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su</td>
<td>You is making tea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>You are making tea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vi</td>
<td>He..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>He is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>He is (Right say the rest of it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>He is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>(What's the word for drinking?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>Drinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Drinking tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>He is drinking tea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the end of the lesson the teacher said that all the students were very good that day.

*Analysis of the lesson using COLT*

This lesson was comprised of two activities. The first activity which contained six episodes was used by the teacher to explain and practise the language necessary for the second activity. The second activity was based on the task given in the Pupil's Book and was comprised of two episodes.

*Participant Organisation* in this lesson indicates whole class as well as group work. Table 9.5 demonstrates the participant organisation by class time. Duration of the lesson was 40 minutes.

**Table 9.5**

**Participant Organisation by class time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Organisation</th>
<th>Time (mts)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patterns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole class</td>
<td>T-S/C</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-S/C</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choral</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Different task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same Task</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Different Task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same Task</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 9.5 the majority of the class time (63%) the students were involved in whole class participation. During this time the teacher led the activities. Group work occupied 38% of the class time. The students were not involved in tasks where they worked individually.

Observations in the class indicated that most of the episodes in which the teacher led the activities were based on the teacher questioning the students and them responding. In most episodes, three or four students tended to respond more yet the teacher tried to involve the other students by nominating them. In episode six Priya questioned each student in the class. Thus, even though most of the class time was spent in whole class
participation the students were not only the audience listening to the teacher but also responded to the teacher.

During group work students worked in four small groups. The teacher interacted with all the groups and helped the students. All the students were involved in the task and formed sentences using the pictures. They spoke to each other and to the teacher in L1.

**Student Modality** as a percentage of class time is indicated in Table 9.6.

### Table 9.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 9.6 indicates in this lesson for the majority of the class time (48%) most of the students were expected to listen to the teacher or other students speaking or reading. According to observations during this time some students responded to teacher questions.

Table 9.6 also indicates that most of the students were involved in speech for 35% of the class time. During this time it was observed that students also used L1 to speak to each other and to the teacher.

In this lesson most of the students were not involved in reading though some students read the phrases given in the Pupil's Book in episode 2. None of the students were involved in writing during the lesson.

The **Content** of this lesson was describing pictures using the pronouns and the present continuous tense. In the first part of the lesson the teacher focused on teaching the necessary language. In the final episodes the emphasis was more on meaning. Thus the lesson was focused both on form and meaning.

The lesson was based on the EED *Materials*. The teacher followed the TG instructions and explained and displayed the language needed for the activity to be followed. She also provided the necessary practise in using this language. The activity given in the Pupil's Book, Priya adapted to suit the level and interest of the students.

Priya used both L1 and L2 in this lesson. L1 was mostly used for the explanation of language form, for instructions and for maintaining discipline. According to the TG instructions given in Table 9.4 the teachers are advised to use the mother tongue explanations if it is effective with their class.
Summary

In this lesson the students were expected to form sentences using the personal pronouns and the present continuous tense. Thus, the objective of the lesson was to teach language form but through a meaning oriented activity using action cards.

The teacher-pupil interaction in the lesson was influenced by the way the teacher questioned the students and directed the activities. Although the teacher led activities occupied the majority of the class time, during some of these episodes the teacher addressed the class and only two or three students responded to the teacher or initiated exchanges. These episodes related mostly to explanation of language structure. On the other hand there were other episodes in which the teacher tried to involve more students in the lesson by naming them. During these episodes the teacher also used the "Action cards" and the "Pronoun cards". This resulted in more student participation and more opportunities for the teacher to provide feedback and error correction. Such opportunities were also available during the group activity as the teacher interacted with all the groups.

Use of LI in the lesson differed according to the purpose of each episode. The episodes which involved explanation of language structure was conducted using mostly LI. On the other hand in the episodes in which the teacher used the pictures the amount of LI used was less. Thus, in this lesson the use of the "action cards" helped to reduce the reliance on LI. There were also instances of the teacher using LI to help students to expand their utterances and to encourage students to respond.

While Priya followed the general guidelines given in the TG she also adapted the task given in the Pupil's Book. The TG recommends not to give "points" to the students and the "aim is to find the pair who can go through the 'pack' with speed and accuracy". Priya gave points and converted the task to a small group activity. Awarding of points motivated the students to participate in the task and provided more opportunities for the students to practise the structures and for the teacher to correct errors. This activity also helped to a certain extent to reduce the incidence of disciplinary problems in the class.

At the end of the lesson some students were able to form sentences using the structures learnt, with the help of the "action cards". The students who did the task correctly were the ones who interacted most in the class. There was no individual work or written work by the students. Thus, it was not certain whether the students could apply the structures learnt in another situation.

9.4.3 Lesson 3 - Grammar in Action - "Can, Cannot, Can't"

This was the third "Grammar in Action" lesson in unit 2 of the Pupil's Book. The grammar points on which the other two lessons were based were the present tense with 'ing' and the comparison of adjectives. The lesson as given in the Pupil's Book is provided in Figure 9.4

Fig.9.4
Can you tell me the time, please?
No. I'm afraid I can't. I haven't got a watch.
Well, can you show me the post office, please?
Yes I can. It's over there on the right.

Pair work. Practise this dialogue with your partner. Give true answers to each other if you can.

A: Can you lend me a pen please?
   a sheet of paper
   an eraser
   a ruler
   a pencil
   a piece of chalk.

B: No, I'm afraid I can't. I need it
   I'm using it.
   OR
   I haven't got one.

   B: Yes, certainly. Here you are.
   A: Thank You.

*English Every Day Book 1, p. 26*

There are no guidelines given in the TG for the conduct of this lesson. There were eleven students, three girls and eight boys present in class that day. The lesson was in the period after the tea break and the teacher found it difficult to maintain discipline in the class.

Priya introduced the lesson by questioning a student using 'can'. Then she explained in L1 that in that lesson the students were going to learn how to say whether they can or cannot do something. In this episode the teacher tried to involve all students in the lesson by nominating them. Yet, as demonstrated in Example 1, one boy, Hashi responded to questions directed at others. The students who were expected to reply, repeated his responses.

**Example 15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Kalum, can you write your name in English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>S_Ha</td>
<td>Yes, I can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>S_Ka</td>
<td>Yes...I...can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Yes, I can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Ah...Udeni ..can you jump?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>S_Ha</td>
<td>Yes, I can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>S_Ud</td>
<td>Yes, I can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Lakmini can you draw?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>S_La</td>
<td>Yes, I can.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yes, I can. Can you read your English book Sam?

No. I cannot.

(cp8 ©ceoe So@)..JWe say can"t..)

The teacher tried to explain the meaning of cannot using Sam's response. While this episode was proceeding, Praba and Asitha were fighting with a plastic bottle. Thus, Priya had to intervene to stop the fight. After this interruption the teacher explained the purpose of the lesson again in L1. She gave the meanings of 'can' and 'cannot' in L1. Next, she gave four sentences using can. This was followed by Priya nominating students and each student forming a sentence using can. Five students were involved in responding to the questions.

As can be seen in Example 16, the way the teacher provided feedback differed. When Yoga, who is considered a better student responded, the teacher repeated his response. When Praba who did not often participate in the activities responded the teacher repeated his response and also commended him perhaps to encourage him.

Example 16

38 T Yoga?
39 SYo I can...play...volleyball.
40 T I can play volleyball.
41 T Praba?
42 SPr I can play...cricket.
43 T I can play cricket. Good.
44 T Asitha?
45 SAs I can play...cricket
46 T Good.

Priya explained that 'can't' is the abbreviated form of 'can not'. She also gave five examples using can't.

In the third episode the teacher introduced the students to the Table given in the Pupil's Book. The way she did so is demonstrated in Example 17.

Example 17

49 T (Let's see how we ask something from someone.)
50 T Vijitha, can you lend me your pen?
51 T Can you lend me your pen? නේ ගැනීම අවසන්න?
52 T Can you lend me?
53 SVi Here
54 T නේ ගැනීම අවසන්න? (You can't you?)
55 T Yes, certainly.
56 T Yes, certainly. නේ ගැනීම අවසන්න
57 T Page 26
diversion as Praba had hit Asitha with the bottle and he was crying. The teacher took the bottle and kept it on her table and scolded them in L1. Udeni asked the teacher to continue, commenting that they (the three boys) did not want to learn.

The teacher started her demonstration of how to show your inability to lend something. Although Priya said page 26, she did not check whether the students had the books or were looking at the relevant page. She asked for an eraser from Yoga. He said "yes" and gave the book. Next, the teacher asked Udeni for the English book. She gave the book but did not reply. Priya then explained how to reply by writing on the board,

"Can you lend me your pen?"
"Yes, certainly"

The teacher asked the students to look at the board. While she was writing the three boys started their fight again and Priya had to reprimand them again.

The teacher next explained in L1, the importance of learning these structures. She cited the example of needing a pen to fill in a form at the bank and also wanting a piece of paper to note down a telephone number. She read the request and the response twice. During this episode there was only one student response and expect for the three students who were fighting and complaining, the rest of the class was the audience while the teacher addressed the class.

In the fifth episode Priya asked the students in L1, how they would express their inability to lend something to someone. There was no response from the students. She tried to demonstrate how to do so by asking, "can you lend me an envelope". She asked Indra to repeat this request. She did it with the teacher prompting almost each word. Before the teacher could demonstrate the reply there was another. She introduced the phrases "No, I am sorry I can't.

I need it.
I am using it.
I haven't got.
"No, I am afraid I can't".

This explanation was also in L1. In this episode too, there were hardly any student responses or initiations and the teacher addressed the class for the greatest part of this episode.

In this sixth episode Priya checked whether the students had brought the pictures they were supposed to bring. She had told the students to bring either the pictures or illustrations of common objects. Most students had not brought them. Some started to draw then. Both Asitha and Praba had not done the task while Sam had drawn one. The teacher seemed disappointed because the students had not responded to her request. She said "I can't get you even to do a small thing". Asitha said he did not come to school the previous day. This resulted in an argument between Asitha and Udeni. According to Udeni, Asitha was lying.

Finally, the teacher asked the students to use the pictures or any object they had. She wanted the students to request from a friend some item they need. She wanted Yoga to ask Udeni to lend a ruler. Yet it was Hashi who responded to the teacher's request. The way the teacher introduced the phrases is demonstrated in Example 18.

Example 18

125 T Yoga ค้าผ้าผืนผ้าผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผื่นผื่น per Udeni ค้าผ้าผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่น per Udeni ค้าผ้าผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผืนผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่น per Udeni ค้าผ้าผืนผืนผืนผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่น per Udeni ค้าผ้าผืนผืนผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่น per Udeni ค้าผ้าผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่น per Udeni ค้าผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่น per Udeni ค้าผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่น per Udeni ค้าผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่น per Udeni ค้าผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่น per Udeni ค้าผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่น per Udeni ค้าผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่น per Udeni ค้าผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่น per Udeni ค้าผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่น per Udeni ค้าผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่น per Udeni ค้าผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่น per Udeni ค้าผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่น per Udeni ค้าผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่น per Udeni ค้าผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่น per Udeni ค้าผื่นผื่นผื่นผื่น per Udeni ค้าผื่น per Udeni ค้า per Udeni

(Let's imagine that we need a ruler. How do you ask Udeni for a ruler?)
126  SHs  Can you lend me a....
127  T    ruler
128  SHs  ruler please.
129  T    Very Good. Can you lend me a ruler please.
131  T    (Now imagine that Udeni can give) then Yes, certainly here you are.
          Yes, certainly here you are.
130  T    Lakmini ගැනුමේ මහනු මහනු  
          (Lakmini, ask for something else)
131  SLa  Can you lend me an umbrella please?
132  T    Can you lend me an umbrella please? Very Good.
132  T    (Now I can't give because I don't have)
133  T    No, I'm afraid I can't...why?
134  SLa  I need it
135  T    (Now I don't have. I can say I need it only if I have it.)
          I haven't got one.
136  SLa  මී පැමිණි (I don't have.)
137  T    (If I have and need it how do you say?)
138  SLa  Ah....I need it.

The teacher again demonstrated to the class by asking Vijith for the ruler and getting him to say "No I am afraid I can't, I need it". He found it difficult to say "I am afraid" and the teacher had to help. Next, the teacher asked Vijith to request something from her. He did so correctly.

The students were told to practise borrowing and lending things. The teacher went round and checked whether all the students were doing the task. She asked those who did not have pictures to use any object they had with them. She found that some students were making mistakes in pronouncing "lend". One student said "led" and another "learn". They also found it difficult to say "I am afraid I can't". The teacher asked twice whether it was too long and they found it difficult. Hashi said in L1 that it was easy. However, Priya said if it was too difficult to use "No, I'm sorry I can't" instead.

During this episode the teacher encouraged those who were usually not attentive in class to be involved in the task. Praba wanted Lakmini's scissors to cut a piece of paper to draw his picture. Lakmini refused. This conversation took place in L1 and was not part of the lesson. The teacher overheard and told Praba "ask in English and she will give". She helped him by prompting each word. Next, she asked him to repeat. Instead of "scissor" he said "sisira" which is a name of a boy. Lakmini laughed and the teacher said "don't laugh, at least even making mistakes he is trying".

In the final episode the teacher asked pairs of students to stand up and to borrow something from each other. Harshi, Vijith, Lakmini and Udeni asked from each other. Although the teacher called upon other students they found it difficult to respond. During this episode the teacher explained in L1 the difference between lending and buying.
Due to the noise in the class it was very difficult to hear what the students were saying. As Example 19 indicates even at the end of the lesson even the better students were making pronunciation errors.

Example 19
348 StLa Can you...can I please ..radio....Miss ..can you let me..the radio please?
349 T oV uWwry (Yes the answer?)
350 StLa Ah..
351 StUd Radio? ( Lakmini was referring to the cassette recorder).
352 StLa Yes. I can.
353 ShA Thank you very much.
354 T දෙම මම පුළුත්වේ, පරිදි මේකුට මොදීය. (You can't give this. Then you have to buy from a shop).

During this episode the teacher's instructions and interaction with the students were mostly in L1. At the end of the lesson she asked the students to practise at home with a sibling using the pictures.

The summary of the lesson is provided in Table 9.7

Table 9.7
Summary of lesson 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>T(mts)</th>
<th>Teacher Behaviour</th>
<th>Pupil Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Introduced the lesson by questioning the students. Intervened to stop a fight.</td>
<td>Four individual responses. Two students fighting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Repeated the correct sentences and provided feedback.</td>
<td>Formed sentences using 'can'. Individual responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Explained the function of 'can' to ask for something.</td>
<td>Some listened to the teacher. Two SS responded to T nominations. Three boys fighting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Explained in L1 the instances the SS might use 'can' to ask for something. Scolded the SS</td>
<td>Listened. One S responded to T nominations. One S initiation. The boys fight continued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Explained how to refuse. Scolded a boy.</td>
<td>Listened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Checked whether the ss had brought the pictures they were supposed to bring. Demonstrated how to request for an object using the pictures.</td>
<td>Individual responses to T questions a few student initiations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SS asked to practise in pairs. T. helped.</td>
<td>SS practise in pairs. The fight continued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Helped the SS. Provided feedback</td>
<td>Pairs demonstrated to the class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis using COLT
As Table 9.7 indicates this lesson was comprised of one activity with eight episodes.

Participant Organisation in this lesson indicates whole class as well as pair work. Table 9.8 demonstrates the participant organisation by class time. The duration of the lesson was 40 minutes.

Table 9.8

Participant Organisation by class time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Organisation</th>
<th>Time(mts)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patterns Categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole class T-S/C</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole class S-S/C</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole class Choral</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair Work Different task</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair Work Same task</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Different Task</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Same task</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 9.8 the majority of the class time (75%) the students were involved in whole class participation. This included the time (45%), the teacher directed the tasks as well as the time (30%), pairs of students demonstrated the dialogue to the class. Pair work involved 25% of class time. There were no individual work in this lesson.

Observations in the class indicated that while in some of the teacher led episodes in the lesson the teacher addressed the class for most of the time with only a few student involvement, in others the teacher questioned the other students by nominating them. Yet, in most of the episodes the teacher was talking for the majority of the time while some students listened the others were not involved in the lesson.

During pair work and when pairs of students demonstrated to the class the teacher interacted with the students providing feedback. However, most of the teacher-pupil and pupil-pupil interactions in this lesson and the teachers explanations and instructions were in L1.

Student Modality as a percentage of class time is indicated in Table 9.9.

Table 9.9

Student Modality as a percentage of class time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 9.9 demonstrates in this lesson for the majority of the class time most of the students were expected to speak (55%) and listen (45%). The majority of the students were not involved in reading and writing for most of the class time. During the time the students were involved in speaking though they used L2 for most of the time L1 was also used. The listening involved both L1 and L2.

The **Content** of this lesson was the use of "can", "cannot" and "can't" to ask for and refuse something. The structures were taught through meaningful situations.

The lesson was based on the EED *Materials*. There were no guidelines given in the TG regarding this lesson. Priya tried to get the students to practise the structures given in the Pupil's Book without adaptations. However, she realised that it was too difficult for the students and gave them the choice of using an easier structure later in the lesson.

Both L1 and L2 was used in the lesson. L1 was used for explanations, classroom instruction and for disciplinary purposes. In this lesson there were fewer instances of the teacher first using L2 and resorting to L1 when L2 alone failed.

**Summary**

The objective of this lesson was to teach the students to learn to request and refuse using "can" and "cannot". The teacher introduced the structures and provided the students with opportunities to practise through meaningful situations.

At the end of the lesson the students who had more opportunities to practise were able to request using the structure learnt. Most students could understand others' requests, yet they found it difficult to respond appropriately using the language form given in the Pupil's Book. "I am afraid" and "lend" were difficult for all the students.

The teacher used more L1 than L2 in some episodes of the lesson. This may be because she was explaining the meanings and functions of the language structures taught. However, the use of L1 in these episodes did not result in more student participation. Most students were not listening and were doing other work. On the other hand, there were more participation when the students were involved in the pair activity using the language learnt. Use of pictures and objects also resulted in more student involvement in the lesson.

**9.4.4 Lesson 4 - Finding Out - "How soap cleans our clothes"**
The objective of a "Finding Out" lesson according to the TG is "for the students to get the meaning of the passages as far as possible in English and not by translating every single word to their first language" (Teacher's Guide, 1985, p.18).

In this lesson (Appendix xiii) there are seven pictures illustrating the seven paragraphs given in Figure 9. 4

Figure 9.4

| 1. Soap has many tiny parts. We call them molecules. They are much too small to see. |
| 2. Each molecule has a head which likes water, and a tail which hates water. |
| 3. When you put dirty clothes into soapy water, the 'tails' stick to the dirt to get away from the water. |
| 4. The tails pull the dirt away from the cloth. This makes the clothes clean and the dirt goes into the water. |
| 5. The molecules push the water away. |
| 6. Water without soap stays in clear drops. |
| 7. The soapy water is broken up. It spreads out. |

English Every Day, Book 1, p.28

The TG provides some pre and post reading questions.

There were 11 students present in class that day. Those who were not regular in their attendance normally were present that day as they were to be taken to see the Museum.

The lesson began with the teacher asking whether the students did the homework which she gave the previous day. This was to write five sentences each using "is" and "isn't". None of the students had done it. Hashi said in English, "I not coming". Immediately some of the others said in LI that they too were absent. Some wanted to know when the homework was given. Priya asked Vijith to form a sentence. He said "It is behind the table". The teacher repeated this. The other students were not listening as they were still arguing who was present or not and what was done and when.

In the next episode the teacher asked the students to turn to the lesson in the Pupil's Book. The way the teacher commenced the lesson is demonstrated in Example 20

Example 20

| 15 T | Ok. Now take out your Reading Books and turn to page 28. |
| 16 T | Page 28 |
| 17 T | Now tell me the topic. |
| 18 T | What is the topic of this lesson? |
| 19 SHa | Miss...our soap cleans our clothes. |
| 20 SLa | How soap cleans our clothes. |
| 21 T | How soap cleans our clothes. |
| 22 T | ചുണ്ണം ചെയ്യുന്നത് (cloth മാത്രമെടുക്കാം? (What's the meaning of cloth?) |
| 23 SLa | cloth...cloth |
| 24 SHa | ചുണ്ണം (cloth) |
| 25 T | ചുണ്ണം പാട് (for clothes) |

Priya next asked the students for the meaning of "soap" and in LI said that they were going to learn "how soap cleans our clothes". Next she asked in English how many
pictures there were. Lakmini said seven while Praba said one in L2. The teacher asked the students to count the pictures in L2.

In the next episode the students were asked to look at the first picture and read the sentence. The way the students read is demonstrated in Example 21.

**Example 21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>55</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Read the sentence.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>SAz</td>
<td>Soap has many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Soap has many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>many tiny parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>many tiny parts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>SAz</td>
<td>We call them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>molecules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>SAz</td>
<td>We call them [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Ok. Tiny...what is the meaning of tiny?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No one responded. The teacher gave the L1 meaning. Thereafter she asked for the meanings of "parts" and "molecules". Azar gave the meaning of "parts" but the teacher explained the meaning of "molecules" referring to science lessons.

When the teacher said to read the second sentence Azar did so without difficulty and the teacher commended him by saying "very good". The same procedure was followed in reading through the seven sections. Azar read some of the sentences with difficulty. Teacher asked the students for the meaning of words and continued to explain in L1. Azar, Hashi and Vijith gave the L1 meaning of some of the words such as "like", "hate", "dirty", "stick". Some students were not involved in the lesson but were arguing and fighting as usual. Teacher tried to involve them once or twice by asking a question in L1. Yet their attention shifted to other things very quickly. Priya next explained the experiment given in the book and provided in Figure 9.5

**Figure 9.5**

| Dip a pencil into some clean water. Shake the drops onto a plate. Dip the pencil into soapy water. Shake the drops onto another plate. Tip the plates a little and you see the clean water in drops. The soapy water spreads out. |

*English Every Day, Book 1, p.28*

After explaining in L1, the teacher asked the students to do it at home. Manoj wanted to do it in class and the teacher agreed to do so once they did it at home.
In the next episode, Priya asked the students to read the lesson while she wrote some questions on the board. These questions were different to the ones given in the TG as shown in Figure 9.6

Fig. 9.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions given by the teacher</th>
<th>Questions in the TG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What has soap got? (para 1)</td>
<td>Pre-questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What has each molecule got?</td>
<td>1. What is a molecule?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Why do tails stick to the dirt?</td>
<td>2. Is it possible to see molecules with our eyes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Where does the dirt go?</td>
<td>3. Which part of the molecule pulls the dirt away from our clothes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What stays in clear drops?</td>
<td>4. If 2 hydrogen atoms join with 1 oxygen atom, what molecule is formed?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Say True or False
1. Molecules are too small to see.
2. Each molecule has a head, tail and body.
3. The tail does not like water.
4. The head pulls the dirt away from the clothes.

Priya tried to check the students’ comprehension of the passage through these questions. She read the first question translated it and told the students the relevant paragraph in which the answer could be located. Yet, as Example 22 illustrates, though Hashi said he knew the answer none of the students could give the correct response.

Example 22

245  T  First one.
246  SHa  මම මම (I know)
247  T  Wait
248  T  උයන් උයන්... උයන් උයන් උයන් (Read then you will find the answer)
249  T  Soap මම මම මමේ මමේ? (What has soap got?)
250  T  Yes Lakmini?
251  T  Vijieth.....Haza?
252  SHa  They are much too...
253  T  No.....Soap මම ...what has soap got...soap has....
254  T  ...many tiny parts.

The teacher followed the same pattern of reading the question, translating it and helping the students by referring to the paragraph in which the answer is located. Some times when the teacher explained the question in L1 the students would give the response in L1. Yet, they found it difficult to locate the answer in the passage. Although the teacher had explained all the paragraphs using L1, and given the meanings of new vocabulary, when she used the word molecule, Lakmini asked for the meaning again. Hashi, Dinali, Azar and Vijith made an attempt to find the answers.
However, except for Azar who found the answer to the last question, the answers to the other questions were found mostly with the teacher's help and the use of L1.

Even after the correct response was found it was not certain whether the students understood the relevant section. Example 23 illustrates one such instance. This dialogue follows the teacher's explanation of "What has each molecule got". She had already said in L1 that there are two parts and that the answer was in paragraph 2.

**Example 23**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>Yes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHa</td>
<td>Likes water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>(I said there are two parts).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDi</td>
<td>Head, tail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Head likes water...tail which hates water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHa</td>
<td>Miss mm I said was correct wasn't it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Miss what I said was correct wasn't it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>You said like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Why do tails stick to the dirt?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Example 23 demonstrated Hashi thought his answer was correct because the phrase that the teacher read out contained the word he said. The teacher's explanation as to why his answer was wrong was interrupted as she had to control the class as some of the other students were disturbing the lesson.

Priya gave the L1 meanings of "true" and "false" before reading out the five statements in the next question. When the first statement was read, some said "true" while the others said "false". Finally she explained in L1 and the students responded mostly as a group.

The lesson ended with the teacher asking the students to do an activity in the Work Book for homework. This activity (Appendix XIV) was to answer 12 questions based on the "Finding Out" lesson. The five questions the students did in class were among them. Priya gave the instructions in L1 and the students were asked to write the answers in the Work Book itself. The Work Book provides the answers for self checking. The teacher did not mention this to the students.

The summary of the teacher pupil behaviour and the instructions given in the TG is provided in Table 9.10

**Table 9.10**

**Summary of lesson 4 and instructions in the TG**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Teacher Behaviour</th>
<th>Pupil Behaviour</th>
<th>Instructions in the TG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Asked about homework.</td>
<td>Discussion in L1. One S responded to teacher nominations in L2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Questioned one student.</td>
<td>Two responses in L1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Directed the SS attention to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When the teacher came to class most of the students were not ready for the lesson. There were eight students in class, two girls and six boys. She asked them to take a sheet of paper and Azar wanted to know whether it was a test. Priya said it was not and they can even do it in their writing books.

This is how she began the activity.

Example 24

T | Right. Now draw a big square. கருட் பத்திரக் காருட் - big square
   | (T draws on the board.)
T | Draw a big square.
T | ..................
T | Right?
T | ................
T | Yogaraja.......now show me your left hand.
T | Left Hand
SYo | எதை என்ன? (Is it correct?)
T | Udeni.....Yoga's left hand.
SUd | எதை என்ன? (gigling) (right)
T | Show me your left hand.
T | Show me your left hand
T | எதை என்ன? left, right (Have you forgotten left, right)

In episode 2, the teacher asked several students to show their left or right hand and also gave the L1 equivalent.

This was the same "Listening" lesson observed at Maya. Before doing the activity in the Pupil's Book, Priya checked whether the students knew the language needed for the task. She first checked whether they knew "left" and "right". She did this by asking a few students to show their "left" or "right' hands. Some could not do so correctly. She said to remember that we use the "right hand" to eat rice.

Next, she drew a big square and asked the students also to do so. The students looked at the board and drew a similar square. This was followed by her asking the students to divide the square into three columns while she also did so on the board. She pointed to the columns and introduced the word and the students repeated after her. As some
students had not divided their square the teacher repeated the instructions. Udeni asked in L1 what she has to do and the teacher explained in L1 and gave the L1 word for "divide".

Priya next divided the columns into rows and told the students not to confuse columns and rows. Using the square the teacher also introduced the L2 words 'top', 'bottom', 'first', and 'middle'. She wrote these words on the board and drew arrows to indicate top and bottom. The left and right of the square was also marked. To check whether the students had understood the directions, Priya called out each word and the students as a group, gave the L1 equivalent.

The teacher numbered the small squares one to nine. Later she read out instructions such as "draw a flower in the top left hand square" and asked the students in which square the flower should be. Some students were still making mistakes with left and right. Priya once again explained the directions using L1. She asked for the meaning of between and no one responded. So she explained using L1. Priya spent nearly 30 minutes of the class time to explain and practise the language necessary to do the listening activity.

In the final episode of the lesson Priya helped the students to do the activity in the Pupil's Book. She read the first instruction and did it on the board. Next, the teacher asked in L1 whether all the students understood what they were expected to do. She went round checking and found that some students had numbered all the squares, as they had copied the numbers which she had earlier used to explain the directions. This was in spite of the teacher telling them earlier not to do so. The teacher made certain that all the numbers were erased before reading the instructions again. While the teacher was reading a student wanted her to repeat the instructions. She said to go on doing the task and she would repeat all the instructions at the end of the task. Priya read the instructions three times. She did not translate the instructions or give L1 meanings while giving the instructions. However, she used L1 to explain to the students that she would be reading three times, to check whether students had followed one instruction before reading another and to maintain order in the class. The students also used L1 for their interactions with the teacher. Only four students followed the instructions. Two students copied from others while the other two students merely wrote numbers in the squares before handing over the paper to the teacher. Only one student had followed all the instructions correctly.

The summary of the lesson and the instructions given in the TG are provided in Table 9.11

Table 9.11

Summary of lesson 5 and instructions in the TG
### 9.5 Discussion

The school structure at Raja appeared to be more similar to Maya than the other two schools. Both Sama and Priya were doing unit two in the Pupil's Book when observations commenced. As was the case at Mahasen and Maya, the extra curricular activities at Raja did not disturb the classroom work very much. The number of students in the class and the class time the teacher could devote for each period was also similar to Maya. As a result, both Priya and Sama had more time available to interact with individual students. Student absenteeism, was also a problem at Raja. Compared to the other three schools, the disciplinary problems however, were the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>E</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher Behaviour</th>
<th>Pupil Behaviour</th>
<th>Instructions in the TG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Asked the SS to take a piece of paper and draw a square. T drew a square on the board.</td>
<td>Two SS asked for clarification (L1).</td>
<td>Tell the pupils they are going to do something with numbers. Then go on with the instructions as given in the Pupil's Book. It isn't necessary to use the each sentences from the book. You may vary the expression as long as the main points are clear. You can vary this task as you like by adding any number you like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Checked whether the SS knew left and right.</td>
<td>Some listened. Two responded to T nominations. Some not involved in the lesson.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructed again to draw the square. Introduced columns and rows by using the square on the BBC.</td>
<td>Choral responses. Some copied the figure on the board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summarised on the board what was taught. Wrote on the board. Drew arrows. Questioned the SS. Responded to SS.</td>
<td>Listened. Praba asked permission to go out to bring a pen. Another offered a pen. Praba went out.</td>
<td>After a while you can tell the pupils how to do it and have them make up squares with different numbers for each other in their groups. The MAIN POINT. though, is the LANGUAGE. not the mathematics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduced Top bottom. Numbered the squares on the board.</td>
<td>Choral as well as a few individual responses.</td>
<td>So you should monitor the groups carefully to make sure the 'callers' are giving full and accurate instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduced first, middle, bottom using the square on the BB. Questioned the SS.</td>
<td>Responded to T questions. Mostly individual and in L1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Read the instructions. Asked the SS to give the relevant number of the square in which the picture should be drawn</td>
<td>Responded to T questions. Mostly individual and in L1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Read the first two instructions and did it on the board. Read the instructions thrice.</td>
<td>SS did the task. Some SS copied from others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.5 Discussion

The school structure at Raja appeared to be more similar to Maya than the other two schools. Both Sama and Priya were doing unit two in the Pupil's Book when observations commenced. As was the case at Mahasen and Maya, the extra curricular activities at Raja did not disturb the classroom work very much. The number of students in the class and the class time the teacher could devote for each period was also similar to Maya. As a result, both Priya and Sama had more time available to interact with individual students. Student absenteeism, was also a problem at Raja. Compared to the other three schools, the disciplinary problems however, were the
greatest at Raja. Even though both Sama and Priya had more time available to interact with the students, Priya had to spend some of the class time in maintaining discipline.

Most of the students at Raja seemed to belong to the same ability group and also similar to Maya in respect to both L1 and L2 literacy. In contrast to Maya where there were at least two students who came from English speaking backgrounds, at Raja there were none. However, there were at least four students, three boys and one girl who appeared to be more interested in the lessons than the others. These students were more involved in the classroom interactions, responded more to the teacher, initiated conversation and at times even responded to other students' turns. On the other hand there were at least two students who could not read or write in L1 or L2.

There was no emphasis on gaining good results in examinations at Raja. As the school had classes only up to Year 8, the teachers did not have to prepare students for Public examinations. Academic success was not a priority for most of the parents and students at Raja. The Principal of the school wanted the teachers to teach English for utilitarian purposes. There was not much pressure therefore on the teacher to teach everything in the Pupil's Book and this allowed more freedom to adapt the tasks to suit the level of the students. This seemed to provide more opportunities for language learning as observed in the "Word Study" and "Learning Together" lessons.

The teacher-pupil interactions at Raja had both similarities as well as differences to the other three schools. As was the case in the other schools, at Raja during the majority of the lessons the teacher dominated the interactions. The structure of the lessons was often based on question and answer dialogues. At Raja, like Mahasen three or four students tended to answer the teacher more often than the other students. Priya like Sama and Rasa tried to involve the other students in the lesson by nominating them.

The interaction patterns that emerged in some of the other schools appeared to be present at Raja also. However, at Raja the patterns seemed to differ across the lessons. As was the case at Mahasen, at Raja the other students chorused after a student who provided the correct response. This pattern could be observed during the “Word study” lesson but not in the other lessons observed. Most students at Raja did not wait to be nominated or asked permission to respond. Some students even responded to other's turns. However, as was the case at Maya and Mahasen, there were a few students who did not respond when called upon to do so.

The students' behaviour and the teacher-pupil interactions at Raja was very different from Vanitha where students hardly ever initiated interaction with the teacher. Both
boys and girls initiated teacher-pupil interactions at Raja. On the other hand, as was pointed out, in the other mixed schools, boys seemed to initiate more interactions. Thus, the observations in the four schools appeared to suggest that interaction is related not only to gender but also to the school culture.

As was the case in the other schools, at Raja although more class time was spent in teacher led activities there was also group and pair work. There was also more student participation in the group work than during teacher fronted activities. A noticeable feature in the group work at Raja was that in the three lessons observed where there was group work they involved the students using either pictures or objects to help them to practise what was taught. The teacher also awarded points for correct responses. These features appeared to motivate the students whose attention the teacher found usually very difficult to retain. Although the teacher did not appoint leaders in forming groups she assigned those students who were more responsive in class and interested in class work into different groups. Thus, in each group there was a 'better' student. These students helped the others by prompting words they did not know. As was the case at Maya, at Raja the teacher interacted with each group and provided feedback.

Pair work was observed at Raja only during one lesson. As was the case at Maya, at Raja the purpose of the pair work was to practise the structure taught. However, unlike Maya, at Raja the teacher did not pair a better student with a less proficient student. The students were expected to practise with their neighbour. All pairs did not do the task as expected even though the teacher went round and tried to involve all students. At Raja, Priya had the additional problem of classroom management. She said it was difficult to do group and pair work as she "always had to be with them".

The interpersonal environment at Raja was more like that of Mahasen and Maya but different from Vanitha. The teacher was quite friendly and encouraging to the students. She sometimes addressed the boys as "son". She knew the students well and sometimes when they were misbehaving she would ignore it. At other times when the students' behaviour disrupted the lesson and disturbed the others she would scold them. On the other hand, she tried to encourage even students like Asitha, Sam and Praba who often disrupted lessons with their fights and sometimes argued with the teacher. The students were quite friendly with the teacher and did not hesitate to ask for clarification and initiate interaction. Sometimes the activities to be done in class were decided after consultation between the teacher and students. The discussion regarding the making of charts after the "Word Study" lesson and the teacher compromising with the students on the "soap experiment" were two such instances. Although most of the
students did not do homework or bring their textbooks to class, all the students who were entrusted with preparing the cards for the "Learning together" lesson had done so. In the "Grammar in Action" lesson some of the students had not drawn the pictures. Yet, when the teacher expressed her disappointment they started to do so. The students, both girls and boys, would often fight and argue with each other, yet they would also help each other when faced with difficulties, for example, Lakmini argued with Asitha over the textbook, but later helped him to read the words. Thus, the interpersonal environment at Raja encouraged "collaborative" interaction between teacher and students and between students and students which appeared to have potential for language development.

Priya used different feedback techniques which even within the teacher fronted activities sometimes resulted in more student responses. In the "Words Study" lesson as was the case in Maya and Mahasen, Priya repeated the correct responses, both individual and choral which indicated to the students that their responses were correct. Priya sometimes, especially with uncommon words, asked for the L1 meaning to check whether the students knew the meaning of the word and were not mechanically repeating the words. When students attempted to answer but could not give the complete response she helped them by asking a question in L1 to enable them to expand the utterance. This type of feedback seemed to assist and encourage the learners to comprehend and produce more language.

Priya used different strategies of error correction on different occasions. During the word study lesson when the students made pronunciation mistakes the teacher repeated the word with the correct pronunciation. Once she indicated that there was a mistake by asking "Ah?". Then it was corrected by another student. Yet, she did not ask the student who made the mistake to repeat the correct pronunciation. Often the pronunciation mistakes such as "floor" for "flour" and "learnt" or "led" for "lend" could have resulted in a difference in meaning. When students made such mistakes at Mahasen, Rasa wrote the words on the board, explained the difference in meaning and asked the students to repeat the words. Priya on the other hand did not do so and sometimes the students continued to make the same mistake. However, not correcting errors seemed to encourage more student responses. At other times, for example, when a student used the wrong pronoun, the teacher would correct the mistake. She sometimes indicated that there was a mistake and other students gave the correct answer and the teacher repeated it. On other occasions, such as when the wrong reason was given for the inability to lend what was requested Priya would explain why the answer was wrong and gave the correct response. Priya's inconsistency in correcting errors could
be because of the students' low proficiency she did not want to discourage students by always providing negative feedback.

At Raja L1 was used for a greater range of purposes than at Mahasen and Maya. Sometimes even within the same episode of a lesson different patterns of L1 use could be seen. As was the case in the other two schools, at Raja, L1 was used by the teacher when L2 alone failed to elicit a response from the students and also to check comprehension. However, there were also instances where Priya would ask a question in English and immediately translate to L1. Sometimes the teacher would commence an utterance in L2 and complete it in L1 or vice versa. The students like those at Maya and Mahasen used L1 to ask for clarification, to talk to their peers and the teacher and sometimes to respond to the teacher. A few instances of students translating the teacher's L2 utterances were also observed. The teacher's use of L1 was related to the structure of each episode and the content of the lesson. In the episodes where the teacher explained language form, such as in the "Grammar in Action" lesson the amount of L1 used by the teacher was greater. In these episodes for the majority of the time the teacher spoke and the students were expected to listen. Thus, the use of L1 at Raja, while facilitating interaction between the teacher and students and between students also restricted the amount of L2 used by the students and to which the students were exposed.

Use of visual aids was a feature that was more specific to Priya's teaching than to the other three teachers. It was observed that in the lessons that Priya used visuals, there were more student involvement than when such aids were not used. Further in some episodes of these lessons, such as in the "Learning Together" lesson where Priya showed the "action cards" and "pronoun cards" and asked the class to form sentences there was less use of L1. This pattern appeared to suggest that more use of visuals reduced the reliance on L1 and also increased student participation.

As was the case at Maya, Priya followed the guidelines given in the TG that teachers should decide what tasks given in the Pupil's Book could be done in their classes. Her adaptation of the "Word Study" and "Learning Together" lessons appeared to facilitate more student participation in the lesson and more interaction among students and between students and teacher. On the other hand, in the "Grammar in Action" lesson Priya tried to teach all the structures given in the Pupil's Book and the students found it difficult to use the structures at the end of the lesson. As one of the boys told me in L1 the next time I visited the school "it was too difficult". According to him he could say "give me a pen" but difficult to say "could you lend me a pen please".
Priya like the other three teachers believed that the EED materials did not teach as much grammar as in An English Course. As was noted in the other case studies, the lack of guidelines in the TG regarding the teaching of grammar appeared to affect Priya also. She did not seem quite certain of the role of grammar. Although Priya did not explicitly teach grammar rules or use metalanguage in the "Grammar in Action lesson" analysed, in a previous lesson observed she did so.

Priya, like Rasa and Latha, thought that the EED materials differed from An English Course with regard to grammar and reading comprehension. The two sections in the EED materials relating to these areas, "Grammar in Action" and "Finding Out" were also the sections she considered students found most difficult. She said that in the "Finding Out" lessons if she were to ask the same questions given in the TG she had to use L1 or explain in L1. In the "Finding Out" lesson observed, Priya had to translate most of the questions given as well as the content of the passages. The "Listening" lesson, as was the case at Maya, was another instant where the teacher had to often use L1. These lessons relied on the students' understanding of mathematical and scientific concepts in addition to the L2 difficulties. Thus, as was the case in other schools, at Raja the content of some of the EED materials was beyond the students' proficiency levels and this affected interaction in the class and the possibilities for L2 learning.

Like Sama, Priya did not have any prior experience in teaching any other course other than the English Every Day. Her professional training was more recent than the other three teachers. Throughout her career she had taught disadvantaged students. Perhaps these experiences helped her to interpret the TG guidelines to suit the needs of her students.

Priya believed that most of her students were interested in learning to speak rather than read or write in English. The Principal of the school also had advised the teachers to speak to the students in English. The students were not involved in writing at all during the observed lessons. None of the students had done the written work that had been given as homework. About four students in the class responded more to teacher questions than the other students in class and according to their test scores which were based mostly on written work, they were better in English than the rest of the class. However, rarely did these students initiate speaking in English in class, except one student who seemed to speak a few phrases in English. It is not certain whether he had picked up these phrases outside the classroom or in the classroom as he was not
regular in his attendance in school. Thus, it is not certain whether their speaking skills had improved as a result of the interactions in the class.

9.6 Conclusion

Observations at Raja indicate that in comparison to the other three schools there were more teacher-pupil as well as pupil-pupil interaction in the class. However, there were not much evidence of the students using L2 in class. None of the students in this class came from English speaking backgrounds and their exposure to English outside the class was limited. In addition, the students faced many socio-economic and psychological problems. Thus, at Raja the teacher faced more difficulties in class room management than in the other schools. Yet, there was overall a friendly and co-operative relationship between the teacher and the students. This interpersonal atmosphere in the classroom facilitated interaction.

While using the EED material in the class, the teacher was able for the majority of the time to adapt the content to suit the level and interest of the students. There were instances in the lesson where she acted against the instructions given in the TG such as awarding points for the activity using the cards. Such instances where the teacher differed from the typical activity structure seemed to promote more student involvement and opportunities for the students to understand the content of the lesson. On the other hand, as was the case in the other schools at Raja the students found the content of some of the lessons very difficult.

As was the case at Maya, the smaller number of students in the class, the less rigid structure of the school with the teacher having more freedom to be flexible, less pressure to complete the syllabus and less emphasis on examination success may have helped to promote classroom interaction at Raja. In addition the teachers experience in teaching the type of students in the class, her more recent professional training and lack of experience in the other teaching approaches as well as the homogeneity of the majority of the student population may also have contributed to the more positive classroom interactions. The data at Raja also support the findings in the other schools that interaction is related to the culture specific to the school. However, even though there were more interactions at Raja which seemed to provide better opportunities for learning most interactions were in L1 and there were not much evidence of the students understanding or using L2 in class.
Chapter 10

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

10.1 Introduction

This study was based on two main assumptions: First, that language learning in the classroom takes place as a result of the relationship between the teacher, learner and the teaching materials. Second, as the objective of teaching English in Sri Lanka is expected to be for oral communication, the verbal interactions between the teacher and students in the classroom are important.

Looking from these assumptions, this study examined two main research questions in relation to second language learning in Sri Lanka.

1. How does the relationship between the teacher, the learner and the learning materials in the classroom provide opportunities for learning the second language?
2. How does the teacher-pupil oral interaction in the classroom promote possibilities for second language development?

These questions were examined in relation to four schools selected for their social and cultural differences. The study used a predominantly ethnographic approach based on observational case studies. However, as the learning materials used in the classrooms were based on Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), a more focused approach drawing on CLT and Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theories specific to oral interaction was used to understand second language learning in the classrooms. As a result, COLT (Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching) observation scheme was originally used as the main tool to analyse the classroom interactions. However, the observations in the classrooms indicated that second language learning in the classrooms was strongly influenced by the socio-cultural context of each school and the richness of the interactions could not be captured through only using COLT. Therefore, the analysis of the data was based primarily on the transcripts of the lessons, field notes and interview data supplemented by the COLT analysis.
10.2 The learning materials, the teacher and the learner

In this section, first, the main findings of the study pertaining to the learning materials, the teachers and students are revisited. Next, the implications of the relationship between these three elements are discussed and conclusions are drawn in terms of opportunities for language learning in the classroom.

10.2.1 The learning materials

Ever since English was made a second language in Sri Lanka in 1951, different textbooks based on various teaching Methods have been used with the hope of finding 'the best Method' to teach English as a second language. The *English Every Day* (EED) materials were prepared by a team of Sri Lankan writers headed by a British consultant during 1982–1984 and were introduced to the secondary schools in 1985. These materials were claimed to be based on CLT (Mosback, 1990) which was considered at that time by most people in the English Language Teaching (ELT) field world wide as 'the Method' (for example, Karunaratna, 1990 and Kumaravadivelu, 1993) to promote communication in a second language.

Since 1951, the overall objective of teaching English as a second language in Sri Lanka has been to make it available to all. It has been assumed that the use of the same learning materials in all schools was one way of providing such equal opportunities (Rupasingha, 1990). This assumption led the UNP Government, that came to power in 1977, to take a policy decision to provide learning materials free of charge to all students beginning in 1981 (Little, 1999). The EED materials were expected to provide the standardised learning content across the different social classes. The intention was to help to overcome some of the problems identified in the ESL field in Sri Lanka (Karunaratna, 1990) and provide equal opportunities to learn English.

In 1982 a decision was taken by a group of ELT specialists to change the objective of teaching English in the Sri Lankan secondary schools from reading comprehension to oral communication (Karunaratna, 1990). This change was in response to an increasing demand for people who could speak English for the new jobs created by the open market policy adopted by the UNP government in 1977. This policy led to the establishment of businesses by many foreign investors in the "Free Trade Zone" and a need arose for people who could communicate in English to fill middle level positions in these enterprises. Thus, it was decided that the communicative approach would be the 'best Method' suitable to achieve this purpose and a decision was taken to prepare a new
set of learning materials (Mosback, 1990).

The EED materials that were introduced in 1985 replaced the textbook, *An English Course*, which was based on the structural approach and aimed at teaching English for reading comprehension. The EED materials were considered an innovation in the Sri Lankan context as they were based on CLT and also because they consisted of a learning package, which was expected to be the learning/teaching resource in the classroom.

The EED "learning package" replaced the previous learning material which was limited to a Pupil's textbook. The new learning package which was distributed to schools in the period 1985-1999 included a Pupil's Book, a Work Book, a Teacher's Guide and an audiocassette. While the Pupil's Book was used in most of the lessons observed for the study, the Work Book activities were rarely used. One reason the teachers did not make much use of the Work Book in the classrooms could be because the objectives of the Work Book were not clear. The stated aim of the Work Book was to provide "the learner with guidance to understand the EED series better" and to provide support material "by way of teacher guidance" (Work Book 1, 1991, p.i). On the other hand, according to the "Forward" to the Work Book its purpose was to "promote self learning". Thus, the teachers not using the Work Book in class could partly be because they may have thought that the activities in the Work Book were for students to do in their own time. The audiocassettes were designed to support oral activities such as the "Role Play" dialogues and "Listening" tasks. However, these audiocassettes were not available in any of the schools, at the time of this study. These particular innovative aspects of the package were therefore rarely used; what was used in the classrooms was the Pupil's Book.

Inadequate teacher training was highlighted as one of the reasons for the 'failure' of teaching English in Sri Lanka (De Lanerolle Commission Report, 1973; S.F. de Silva Commission Report, 1960; de Souza, 1977; Walatara, 1977). Prior to the introduction of the EED materials it was claimed that all the teachers in the system had been trained in the use of the learning materials (Mosback, 1990). However, according to Karunaratna, (1990) each year new recruits to the profession were appointed without professional training. These teachers like Sama and Priya had no training in the use of the learning material until they completed a professional development course, which could be in some instances several years after their first appointment as a teacher. Thus, the TG was the only source of guidance for most new teachers (Karunaratna, 1990). However, the TG does not provide a novice teacher with the information about 'what' and 'how' to
What is clear however from the analysis of EED materials in Chapter five and from observations of the lessons is that neither the TG nor the Pupil's Book provide adequate specifications of 'what' to teach for new or experienced teachers. This is despite the expectation that, following the example of the Council of Europe syllabus specifications (van Ek and Alexander, 1980), the content would be explicitly documented. In addition, the majority of the teachers in Sri Lanka, as was the case with Rasa and Latha was used to being guided by a syllabus which specified the learning content. Since the content was not specified the teachers had to be guided by the activities in the Pupil's Book in drawing up a syllabus. In two of the four schools there were schemes of work prepared by the teachers for the year. These schemes consisted a list of lessons from the Pupil's Book and the number of periods expected to teach each unit rather than a structural organisation of the language to be taught. In the other two schools the teachers merely followed the activities in the book. Thus, the lack of specification of the learning content resulted in the teachers selecting the activities as the organising principle of their schemes of work, rather than any notion of progression based on language.

The TG also provides little guidance on 'how' to teach. For instance, there is no specification of the teaching methodology or the principles of language learning from which the methodology to be used in the classroom is to be derived by the teachers. Since there were no principles on which the teachers could draw, it was difficult for them to formulate their own teaching procedures. Controversial issues in CLT such as the use of L1, teaching of grammar and how to conduct group and pair work in different classroom contexts are not discussed. For some of the activities in the Pupil's Book the TG provides some general as well as specific guidelines. For instance, it provides the general guidelines as how to conduct a "Role Play". In addition, it also provides a few specific guidelines to be followed during each "Role Play" lesson, however, as the principles underpinning the "Role Play" dialogues are not provided, the teachers seemed uncertain of the objective of the activity. This was evidenced in the frequency with which the "communicative" activities such as the "Role Play" became choral drills. On the other hand, for other sections such as "Grammar in Action" there are no general or specific guidelines.

The lack of specification of learning content and objectives, inadequate guidance regarding the principles on which the learning activities were based could explain why the teachers often followed the activities, rather than focusing on the language 'forms' or 'functions' to be taught through the different activities.
Another problem identified in the ESL literature in Sri Lanka is the heterogeneity of the student population (De Lanerolle Commission Report, 1973; Jayasuriya, 1969; Karunaratne, 1990; Walatara, 1979). Despite this concern, there is little attention focused in the EED materials on how to cater to the different ability levels of the students. The TG, in some of the guidelines given, such as those for conducting "Word Study" lessons, mentions that the teachers have the freedom to adapt the suggested procedures to suit their students' ability levels. It is also stated that all students need not be taught all the content in the learning materials, for instance in the teaching of grammar. However, very little explicit guidance is given. For example, no indication is given as to what constitutes the "core" structures or "basic" structures that could be taught to all students and what items could cater to the 'better' students. Nor are there any guidelines as to how to adapt the teaching procedures to cater for the different ability groups of students identified in Sri Lankan classrooms with regards to their English language proficiency (Karunaratne, 1990; Walatara, 1979).

Moreover, the observations in class and the analysis of the transcripts suggests that some of the content in the Pupil's Book was too difficult for even the 'better' students in all the schools. These students were more motivated to learn the second language in order to gain good grades at examinations and were therefore more interested in doing the written activities than the oral tasks. On the other hand, the majority of the students in the smaller schools were not interested in the written work and some activities had little relevance to students like Vijith who was not interested in learning such nuanced usage as "can you lend me your pen, please" when he could say, "give me your pen please".

While the students in the observed classrooms varied in their L2 experiences most of them were beginner ESL learners. The EED materials however, do not cater to beginner ESL learners. Rather they are based on the Council of Europe syllabus specifications which were designed to cater for adults from different linguistic backgrounds working in a European context who needed to learn to speak English as a common language. This could partially explain why the content was so difficult for the secondary level students in the study.

Based on the analysis of the EED materials, my argument is that though they were introduced as an innovation and provide some implicit guidelines in the TG regarding 'what' to teach and 'how' to teach, they were not designed to address the problems that have been identified in the ESL field in Sri Lanka such as the heterogeneity of the student population and inadequate teacher training.
10.2.2 The teachers

The four teachers in this study were from different backgrounds in terms of the training they received in the use of the learning materials, their experiences of learning and teaching English, the context in which they were teaching at the time of the study and their teaching styles. Their varied experiences influenced the way they interpreted and used the learning materials to provide opportunities for their students to learn English.

The quality and amount of teacher preparation each teacher received in the use of the learning materials varied considerably. Both Latha and Rasa had been teaching in the system when the EED materials were introduced. Latha's professional training occurred prior to the introduction of the EED materials and as a result it did not prepare her to use them. On the other hand, Rasa had been teaching for more than a decade by the time the EED materials were introduced and had received no professional training at all until her recently completed one year full time Postgraduate Diploma in TESL course. At the time the EED materials were introduced both teachers had attended two one day seminars each, to prepare them for the use of the learning materials. During interviews Latha said that the two seminars she attended were sufficient "to a certain extent" to teach the EED materials at Vanitha. She mentioned group and pair work as one area in which she faced difficulties. Rasa too had "managed" with the guidance and training provided regarding the use of the EED materials. However, it was during her more recent Postgraduate Diploma in TESL course that she heard about CLT. It was during the ten weeks teaching practice in schools, which was one component of the course that she "really understood the approach".

Latha who was quite experienced as an ESL teacher had spent the majority of her career at Vanitha. She had prior experience of teaching the former textbook and also studied during the time when more traditional teaching approaches were used. Latha's teaching behaviour in the class seemed to be more in conformity with the role of the traditional Sri Lankan teacher discussed in chapter one. She did not interact much with the students during lessons. Most of the activities in class were teacher directed and her relationship with the students was aloof. Her role was more of a disciplinarian rather than of a friend and facilitator.

Observations in the class seemed to suggest that Latha was quite confident of her practice in class. She not only asked the students to do the activities in the Pupil's Book in class but also asked them to do the Work Book activities. Despite the short time available for teaching she was confident of 'covering the syllabus'. However, some of
Latha's interpretations of the learning materials did not seem to facilitate learning for many of the students in her class. For example, though she seemed to think that using L2 alone in the class was what was recommended, doing so led to some students not being involved in the lesson because of their low entry levels of L2.

On the other hand, in the classroom context in which Latha was teaching and given her prior experience of teaching and learning it seemed difficult to expect a different role. From the observations and the interviews with the teacher and principal of the school, success in the examinations was of primary importance for both parents and the school. Such expectations necessitated the teacher focusing more on what was tested at the examinations such as writing and grammar. The many extra curricular activities in the school also left less time to 'cover the syllabus'. Her prior experiences in learning and teaching and, the lack of adequate guidelines in the TG also seemed to make her follow the more traditional model of the teacher. On the other hand, Latha may have found it difficult to conduct a more interactive classroom given the large size of the class and the range of English language proficiency. In addition as well behaved and docile girls, the students conformed to the traditional role of the students and did not necessitate a change in the teacher's behaviour. The school culture also expected the teacher to prepare the students to behave in such a manner. Thus, Latha seemed quite confident of the way she taught and perhaps the guidance she received was adequate to follow the role she fulfilled.

Rasa was an even more experienced teacher than Latha. She was the only participant in this study who had studied in the English medium and also taught students who had studied in the English medium. Like Latha most of Rasa's experience was in the use of traditional teaching methods. However there was considerably more oral interaction between the teacher and students in her classroom than was the case in Latha's. During group work Rasa interacted more with the students, used more feedback techniques and used L1 to facilitate interaction. She also asked the better students to help the less proficient students. The TG recommends that teachers "adopt a supportive, monitoring role in the body of the class, close to the pupils and away from the detached, front-centre lecturing position" (Teacher's Guide, 1985, p.2). According to what was observed in the classrooms, Rasa's teaching approach was more in keeping with this advice.

Observations in Rasa's class indicated that compared to Latha, she was more responsive to her students' needs. She knew that they were not exposed to English outside the class and needed to "practise" in class. She was concerned that practise did not leave her with much time for communicative activities. She also used L1 in different ways to facilitate
interaction. Thus, it seemed that Rasa's recent training in the use of the learning materials seemed to help her to understand the teaching approach on which they were based.

On the other hand, it could be argued that the differences between Latha and Rasa's teaching approaches could be due to the very different contexts of the two schools. Vanitha was a girls school where the students were expected to conform to a role model of a traditional Sri Lankan woman, that is to listen rather than question. At Mahasen there were no such expectations; the male students were allowed to be more active and questioning. In addition there was less emphasis on examination success, more time available for teaching and a more relaxed classroom environment which helped Rasa to interact more with the students.

Sama and Priya had less teaching experience compared to the other two teachers. Their only experience was in teaching using the EED materials. As a student Sama had studied the former learning materials while Priya had studied the EED materials. The context in which they were teaching was also more similar to each other than the other schools. Their entire teaching experience was based on teaching in 'small' coeducational schools. However, Priya had spent a larger part of her teaching career in her present school, which was located in the very poor area of the city and arguably drew on a very disadvantaged section of the population.

Both Priya and Sama had taught the EED materials for a few years without any training in their use. Thus, their teaching was informed almost solely by the Teacher's Guide. However, prior to the study they had both undergone professional education where they had training in the use of the EED materials. Priya whose training was more recent and was part of a two year full time in-service course claimed that the training she received was very helpful for her use of the EED materials in class. On the other hand, Sama was not very happy with her part time in-service training course because she could not devote as much time as she would have liked on her studies due to the large amount of travelling involved. However, they both agreed that they were more confident in using the learning materials after the training they received than before.

Observations in the two classrooms revealed that there were similarities in the teaching approaches of the two teachers. They were both aware of the students' limited exposure to English outside the class and less interest in academic work. They tried to adapt the learning materials to cater to student needs and used LI when it seemed necessary to help students understand some instructions and difficult language constructions. Their
use of L1 engaged students who would have otherwise been excluded from even the most basic interactions because of their very limited understanding and ability to use English.

As Sama was familiar with each of her students' levels of English proficiency and their L2 experiences outside the school, she was able to use the assistance of the better students to help the others. In most of the lessons observed Sama limited the lessons to only part of the activities given in the Pupil's Book. She was kind and friendly and one boy would even disagree with her on a few occasions. However, all decisions regarding the activities to be done in class were taken by Sama. She seemed to expect the students to wait to be nominated to speak though she tried to involve all students in the lesson.

Compared to the other teachers, Priya's teaching approach was more "learner centred" and in keeping with the TG instructions than the other teachers. She adapted the learning materials more to suit the students' needs. She consulted the students' regarding classroom decisions, solicited their co-operation in preparing learning materials and used more L1 in the class. Even the way she addressed the students by calling them "son", a term of endearment in L1, resulted in a more homely environment. Compared to other schools classroom management was most difficult at Raja. Yet, Priya was also able to solicit the student's co-operation.

In considering the classroom practices of the four teachers there were differences between the teachers who were recently trained in the use of the learning materials and the way they interacted with the students. Those who had recent training adapted the materials and interacted more with the students. Though the consultant for the textbook writing project (Mosback, 1990, p.18) claimed that there was "a nation-wide teacher and pupil orientation program to introduce the schools to the principles on which the course would be based" Rasa had heard of CLT only during her professional training. Neither Rasa nor Latha had attended the workshops which were claimed to have been held "to devise materials and activities of their own (many of which were to be recognisably incorporated into the final course books)" (Mosback, 1990, p.18). Similar findings were reported by Karunaratne (1990, p.76) in her study of the effectiveness of the Sri Lankan English teachers after the introduction of the communicative approach. She claimed that there was inadequate training and "the full implication of the approach has not been conveyed". Although, this data alone is not sufficient to generalise, it appears to be that teachers who had recent training seemed better able to use the learning materials to provide opportunities for learning English.
Training in the use of learning materials alone is not sufficient to use them in different teaching contexts. While the teachers who were recently trained in the use of the learning materials seemed to provide better opportunities for learning in some respects they were also more likely to express some anxiety about their own practices. Priya used L1 for a range of purposes, which facilitated classroom interaction. Yet she felt guilty for using L1, as the instructions at her training course had been to use L1 sparingly. Similarly, Rasa thought that according to CLT, that there should be less teacher talk. Even though she thought that her students needed more "practise" she was concerned that getting them to practise involved her talking. Thus, it seems that the teacher preparation for the EED replaced one set of imperatives for teaching English with another, what seemed to be needed is an approach that addresses the complexities of teaching English and encourages teacher flexibility and initiative.

The way the teachers in the different schools used the learning materials varied as the teachers themselves differed. As a result of this diversity the opportunities provided to learn in each school also differed. The way the learning opportunities were provided was also influenced by the way the learners responded to the teachers and the leaning materials.

10.2.3 The learners

The students were a heterogeneous group with intra-school as well as inter-school variations. The intra-school variations pertained to several characteristics such as the students' socio-economic backgrounds, exposure to English outside the class and the purpose of learning English promoted in the school. In addition to these, the schools also differed, due to the number of students in the class and whether they were single sexed or coeducational/mixed sex schools. As a result of this heterogeneity the needs of the students differed.

Student heterogeneity is a problem teachers face in most classrooms. However, in the Sri Lankan ESL classrooms this problem is compounded due to the students' prior experience or inexperience in L2. In the classrooms in the study students' prior and current experience of L2 beyond the school was extremely diverse. Some of the students came from English speaking background homes and could easily converse in English. Some had no experience of English other than at school. These groups were further differentiated by their access to English teaching in the primary school. Some of these students would have been taught English in the primary schools while the others would not have been taught. In addition, there were some students who may be already
familiar with the EED materials because they attend after school tuition classes where the same materials are taught. Students who belong to this group may be among any of the other groups.

The class at Vanitha was much larger than those in the other schools. It consisted of 45 girls mostly coming from upper middle class families. The majority of the students were scholarship holders who have entered this school by passing the fifth standard scholarship examination. Thus, it was most likely that students at Vanitha represented all the combinations of L2 experience described above. This was indeed the case as confirmed by the observations in the class and the information provided by Latha at the interviews.

Most of the students at Vanitha were very quiet during the lessons observed. Except for one student, Latha referred to as a "problem student" the teacher did not have disciplinary problems in class. The students mostly responded to teacher questions in chorus. There were very few individual responses and they tended to be by the same students who, judging from their English proficiency came from English language speaking backgrounds. The students never initiated discourse and waited to be nominated to speak. They would rather ask for clarification from each other than from the teacher. Most of the students did the written work in class and seemed very keen to get their work marked by the teacher.

The behaviour of the students at Vanitha can largely be explained by the fact that they were girls from middle class families who were conforming to a school culture which expected they be well mannered and respectful to the teachers. In addition, the majority of the students were learning English to gain good marks for which speaking in English was not essential. This could be one reason that they were more keen to do the written tasks than the oral activities.

At Maya and Mahasen, the student population was more homogeneous than at the other two schools. Most of the students in both schools were not exposed to English outside the class and came from lower middle class families. It was also less likely that these students had outside tuition. In both schools there were a few students whose English ability was better than their peers. These students often lead pair and group activities and assisted the less proficient students. However, while at Mahasen there were only boys, at Maya there were both boys and girls. The number of students in the class at Mahasen was greater than at Maya which seemed to allow for more interaction at Maya.
Just as the gender of the students seemed to influence their behaviour at Vanitha, the male students at Mahasen and Maya also behaved in ways more culturally acceptable for males than female students. As pointed out above, the classroom interactions at both of these schools were much livelier than those at Vanitha. While no similar comparisons could be made at the boys' school, Mahasen, at Maya the boys were more likely to be involved in interactions than were the female students. Despite the higher levels of English language proficiency of some of the female students' when compared to that of the boys, it was the boys who initiated more turns and asked for clarifications from the teacher. The differences in the behaviour of the boys as compared to the girls could be explained by the greater freedom boys have in Sri Lanka to deviate from the role of the quiet well-behaved students. This seems not only to be the case in Sri Lanka but in many western countries where the lower level of teachers interaction with female students is well-documented (Dart & Clarke, 1998; Spender & Sarah, 1980).

The majority of the students in both schools seemed to find most of the learning content in the EED materials difficult. When the content was difficult there were very few responses from the students. On the other hand, when they found the lessons interesting like the "Word Study" lesson on vehicles in both schools the students showed great enthusiasm in responding. Unless it was done as a group task most students found written work difficult. According to their teachers only a very few students in both schools were interested in gaining good results at examinations. Perhaps this was the case, because what is tested is so far beyond their ability that the examinations seemed irrelevant to most of the students even though the schools' administrators seemed to value academic success.

Raja, was the most disadvantaged school of the four schools observed. According to their teacher, the majority of the students lived in the nearby slums and a few lived on the streets. Raja was a coeducational school and the students in the class also ranged in age from 13 years to 17 years. This class was a marked contrast to the class at Vanitha. There was a very relaxed atmosphere in Priya's class and students sometimes disagreed and argued with her. The students would also fight and argue with each other for the slightest reason yet, when necessary they would help each other. Although the students would at times even argue with the teacher when called upon to do so they would cooperate with her in preparing visual aids such as cards and would bring pictures from home to make charts. There were also instances of the students expressing their opinion regarding the activities to be done in class.
homogeneous than the students in the other three schools. None of the students came from English speaking backgrounds and were unlikely to attend after school tuition classes. Observations and conversations with the teacher and students indicated that even the students who got the highest marks in this class found most of the content in the learning materials difficult. Although, no written work was done in class, and these students did no homework, at least some of the students in the class wanted to learn to speak in English. According to the Principal of the school their interest in learning to speak in English was related to interest in finding casual employment in tourism related services.

The behaviour of both boys and girls at Raja seemed to be less in keeping with the traditional role of the "passive" student discussed in Chapter one. These students were more willing to participate in decision making in class, initiate exchanges and ask for clarifications from the teacher. Unlike the students at the other schools, at Raja if the students found the learning content difficult or uninteresting they refused to do the activities, which led to disruptive behaviour. This could be partly explained by the fact that these students came from disadvantaged family backgrounds where even in Sri Lanka less conformity to the typical passive student role is expected.

The student behaviour in the four schools can be considered on a continuum with Raja at one end with students interacting most with the teacher and with each other, and Vanitha at the other with very little interaction. The other two schools ranged in between Raja and Vanitha. The different behaviours seemed to be related to characteristics identified earlier in this chapter such as gender, school culture, the students' family backgrounds, the purposes for which they seemed to be learning English and the number of students in the class.

10.2.4 The relationship between the learning materials, teachers and students

The relationship observed in the classrooms between the teachers, students and the learning materials was complex. The teachers who themselves had a range of experience and preparation for teaching with the EED, used the same learning materials to teach a heterogeneous group of students. As a result, the relationship observed in the classrooms between the teacher, students and the learning materials was complex.

The findings of this study suggest that using the same learning materials in all the schools, with all the students did not seem to provide equal opportunities to learn English. This study also seemed to contradict the claims (Karunaratne, 1990; Silva,
that the bigger schools in Sri Lanka with more resources provide more opportunities for learning English. In fact, the learning opportunities, though not necessarily the outcomes of such opportunities seemed to be inversely related to the size of the class. The findings suggest that the smaller schools with a smaller number of students in class allowed the teacher to adapt the materials to suit the level of the students. This appeared to provide better opportunities for learning to speak English. On the other hand, in the larger schools the focus of teaching English was related to what is valued at the examinations. Since what is tested is only written work based on the content in the learning materials, there was less adaptation of learning material and more emphasis on developing writing than speaking in L2. Therefore, the findings of this study suggest that teachers and students receive mixed messages regarding what is valued about the L2 and this is reflected in the opportunities provided for learning the second language.

10.3 Teacher-pupil oral interactions in the classrooms

The discussion in section 10.2 suggests that the relationship between the teacher, students and the learning materials in the classrooms observed was complex. In this context, this section examines how the teacher-pupil interactions in the different schools provided possible opportunities for second language development. The EED materials used in the classrooms observed for the study were prepared in the early 1980s and was informed by principles of learning which arose out of the CLT and SLA theories of that time. As a starting point, then, this study looked to these theories and more recent SLA research to understand second language learning in the classrooms. In particular it drew on an input-output model of L2 learning informed mainly by the "input hypothesis" (Krashen, 1982;1985), "interaction hypothesis" (Long, 1983, 1985, 1996) and the "comprehensible output hypothesis" (Swain, 1985 and Swain & Lapkin, 1995).

However, these theories were not based on classroom research in complex socio-cultural settings like Sri Lanka and are limited in the insights they can provide to understand the interactions observed and recorded in the classrooms. Therefore, in this section while examining how useful CLT and SLA principles are to interpret the data collected in the classrooms in the study it has also been necessary to look to more recent theories to explain the relationship between the socio-cultural and situational context of the classrooms, the interactions happening in them and the opportunities for students to learn English.
10.3.1 Input hypothesis

According to the "input hypothesis" (Krashen, 1982; 1985) in order for language acquisition to take place the language input, that is the language the learners read and hear, must be made comprehensible. By comprehensible input he meant language that contains structures "a bit beyond" the learners' current level of L2 competence (1981, p.100) so that learners can understand most of the input but still be challenged enough to make progress. In other words input that is not too simple or too complex. Krashen claimed that if comprehensible input is provided in sufficient amounts through meaning-focused activities in the classroom, second language acquisition will take place. When considering the language input provided in the four classrooms most of it seemed incomprehensible to the majority of the students. At Vanitha the frequency with which students asked for assistance from their peers, suggested that some students did not comprehend the language they heard and read. At Mahasen and Maya even the better students found some of the simple language constructions difficult to comprehend even after the teachers had repeated and simplified the input. On a few occasions at Raja when the teacher used realia or visuals it seemed to aid comprehension. However, the teacher frequently used LI to make the input comprehensible to the students. Therefore, if providing comprehensible input is an essential requirement for second language acquisition there were not much possibilities for second language learning in the observed classrooms.

10.3.2 Interaction hypothesis

According to the "interaction hypothesis" (Long, 1983; 1985: 1996) in order to obtain comprehensible input there has to be interactional modifications, that is the input needs to be modified in response to learner's signalling their lack of comprehension. Comprehensible input according to Pica (1994; 1996) will be provided when speakers and listeners "negotiate for meaning", that is try to be understood by using devices such as self and other repetition, comprehension, confirmation and clarification checks. Long (1983) claims that the more interactional modifications a learner uses in communication the greater will be the opportunities for second language development.

At Vanitha even though many of the students often did not seem to comprehend the teacher's input there was very little modification to the interaction structure. On the other hand, in the other schools when the students did not respond, the teachers repeated the questions and sometimes modified the questions until the students responded. Thus, there seemed to be better opportunities provided for obtaining "comprehensible input"
in the smaller schools than at the large girls' school. At Vanitha even though the students sometimes looked confused they did not ask for clarification and did not initiate discourse. The behaviour of these students is similar to such behaviour of students discussed in studies in China, Hong Kong and Japan (Anderson, 1993; Tsui, 1996; LoCastro, 1996). This suggests that the lack of student interaction with the teachers may be due to the cultural expectations of the traditional teacher-pupil relationship. On the other hand, in the other schools there were always a few students who would react to the teachers' utterances, initiate discourse and ask for clarification. The highest proportion of student-initiated interactions was observed at Raja with fewer interactions in the other two schools but more than at Vanitha. Thus, it might be assumed that there were better opportunities for obtaining "comprehensible input" and language development in these schools compared to Vanitha.

However, most of the clarifications by the students were in L1. The students lack of interactions with the teacher at Vanitha might be partly due to cultural expectations of the behaviour patterns of middle class, elite girls school. On the other hand, it could also have been because at Vanitha the teacher did not use L1 at all in the class nor were there many adaptations to the learning materials. Considering the range of English competency in the class it is likely that for many of the students using L2 would have been difficult and this prevented them from negotiating for meaning.

The "interaction hypothesis" was based on NS-NNS conversations in non-western settings. As a result it does not hypothesise how negotiations in L1 can assist L2 development. Long (1996) suggests that more research is needed in non western settings to understand how interaction facilitates language development. Classroom observations in this study indicate that the socio-cultural settings of the classrooms affected the way the negotiations for meaning took place. Negotiation of meaning depends on the learner signalling non comprehension. In the Sri Lankan context as in other countries such as Hong Kong, China and Japan as discussed before there is less instances of such happenings. On the other hand, in some classrooms when the teachers noticed the students lack of response and helped them to jointly construct meaning there seemed to be better opportunities for language development as was the case in other studies such as Gibbons (1998) Lantolf and Appel (1994) van Lier (1991). Therefore, there is more potential to understand second language learning in the Sri Lankan classrooms by exploring interaction from a broader perspective as argued by many writers (for example, Ellis, 1999; Gibbons, 1998 and Pica, 1996).
10.3.3 Comprehensible output hypothesis

The "output hypothesis" (Swain, 1985; 1995) states that learners should not only have comprehensible input but also have opportunities to produce the language if they are to be fluent nativelike speakers. Swain claims that learners are "pushed" into focusing on both language form and meaning in their language output when they have the opportunity to produce language.

In most of the lessons observed only a few students were observed producing the second language. At Vanitha often such responses were correct. However, the available data during group work suggests that students were struggling to produce language and discussions in the groups, even though in L1, helped to clarify issues and seemed to result in more L2 production in some instances. In the other schools during pair and group work, when students were working in collaboration with each other it enabled them to produce a few words and phrases which they did not do on their own.

The concept of the "output hypothesis" has been extended by Swain and Lapkin (1998) and Swain (2000a) based on Vygotsky's socio-cultural theory. These writers now suggest that "collaborative dialogue" provides opportunities for using language both as means of communication and a tool for thinking. "Collaborative dialogue" is defined as "dialogue in which speakers engage in problem solving and knowledge building" (Swain, 2000b, p.102). In the studies that Swain (2000ab) refers to, the learners used their L1 to discussing and reflecting on their L2 production. Although, interaction in groups were not recorded what was observed suggest that students' discussions in L1 seemed to help them to produce L2. Therefore, there is potential to examine "collaborative learning" as a way of promoting second language learning in the Sri Lankan classrooms.

10.3.4 Use of L1

There is some disagreement over the use of L1 amongst SLA researchers and CLT proponents. On one hand use of L1 in the communicative classroom is contradictory to the views of some writers such as Larsen – Freeman, (1986) Cummins and Swain (1986) and Howatt (1988). On the other, some of these writers (for example, Swain 2000) now acknowledge the importance of L1 in collaborative dialogue designed to develop L2 learning. Other writers (for example, Atkinson, 1989; Bolitho, 1983; Finochiaro and Brumfit, 1983; James, 1994; Pica, 1997 and Swan, 1985) also suggest that L1 can be helpful in learning the second language. The TG does not provide
general guidelines regarding the use of L1. However, the use of L1 is advised in the "Role Play" and "Finding Out" lessons to "set the scene" and also, if necessary, to provide explanations during the practice stage of the communicative activities.

At Vanitha, the teacher used only L2. However, observations at Vanitha suggest that listening to L2 does not equate with comprehension. For example, there were instances when students looked confused, clearly not understanding what they were expected to do. During group work students spoke to each other and clarified using L1. Thus, using L2 alone did not seem to help some students in the class at Vanitha to learn the second language primarily because they could understand so little of what was happening in the lesson. In addition, students may have been afraid to join in the interactions because of their uncertainty about their own capacity to be understood in L2. As Lai (1994) claims language anxiety is one of the constraints in promoting opportunities for meaningful communication.

The other teachers used LI for a variety of purposes. Rasa and Sama used L1 to check comprehension, and when the use of L2 failed to elicit a response. This seemed to promote more student interactions with the teacher and with each other. The teachers also translated when the students responded in L1. The use of L1 by Rasa and Sama is in keeping with Bolitho's (1983) suggestion that learners can use L1 to communicate their experiences when they do not have the competency to do so in English and the teachers can help them by translating. Priya and Sama also used more L1 when they did not adapt the content in the EED materials and when the students found it difficult to follow the content of the learning materials. The L1 was used by these teachers as a "scaffold" to help the learners to jointly construct meaning (Vygotsky, 1986). There were also a few instances of students translating teacher utterances for the benefit of other students. Thus, the use of L1 in the classrooms seemed to facilitate interaction and provide more possibilities for potential L2 learning.

On the other hand, too much L1 can restrict the opportunity to communicate in L2 and the amount of L2 to which the students are exposed. Thus, the L2 input as well as the output will be limited and according to the "interaction hypothesis" and the "output" hypothesis opportunities for language development may be restricted. Further, as was observed at Raja, the students sometimes seemed to wait for the L1 translation without making an attempt to understand the L2. In such instances rather than being a "scaffold", the L1 seemed to become a crutch.

Atkinson (1987) suggests that the uneasiness many teachers feel about using L1 in the
classroom could be due to inadequate literature on the role of the native language. The uncertainty regarding the role of the native language in ESL seems to make some of the teachers in this study uneasy about their use of LI in the classroom. Both Priya and Latha were anxious about the amount of LI they used, assuming it was contrary to the CLT approach. Thus, one of the problems seems to be that teachers are uncertain as to when and how to use LI and whether it is appropriate to use at all in their teaching of English. As a result they do not use LI at all or feel guilty about using it.

More recent research (Pica, 1997 and Swain, 2000 ab) provides further guidance on this issue. According Pica (1997) the use of LI in the classroom can be "a helpful dimension of learner and teacher communicative competence" (Pica, 1997, p.20). According to Pica, use of LI can be helpful in the areas of classroom management, guidance, clarification, preparation, rapport building and anxiety reduction. The way some of the teachers in this study used LI in these areas indicates that such a use can act as a "scaffold" and help in second language development. This is an issue that needs to be dealt with explicitly in teacher training and professional development. Teachers need to be sufficiently confident in their understanding of CLT principles to be flexible in the use of LI in the classroom.

10.3.5 Group and pair work

Both CLT and SLA literature recommend group work as facilitating communication through interaction. Some proponents of CLT (for example, Johnson, 1979; Larsen-Freeman, 1986; Morrow, 1981 and Richards and Rodgers, 1986) recommend that in keeping with the claim that CLT should provide opportunities for authentic language use, activities in the classroom should be based on building an information gap, give students the freedom to choose what to say, and to provide feedback. This view has also been supplemented by SLA theorists, such as Long (1983) and Swain and Lapkin (1998). Group and pair work is supposed to facilitate interactions thereby providing more opportunities to obtain comprehensible input (Long, 1983), to practise the target language, and to produce more language through collaboration with each other (Swain and Lapkin, 1998). Although the teachers in some of the activities provided feedback the students did not have much choice in what to say as the language to be used was restricted by the script in the textbook. Thus, most of the group and pair work did not conform to tasks recognised as "communicative" in the literature. However, when pair and small group work was done with teachers acting as facilitators, they provided more opportunities for students to practise what was taught. Thus, the group and pair work seems to be in keeping with the TG instructions that they provide "more practise of a
less formal kind with fellow-pupils in class" (p.3). They did not however seem to lead to a "communicative" use of the L2.

The observations in this study indicated that simply doing group work did not lead to interaction in L2. If learning is to occur, group and pair work should be monitored and managed. The way the teachers managed group work in the study influenced the way the students participated in group work. At Vanitha most students were not actively involved in the group work and the teacher found it difficult to monitor the work due to the large number of students in the class. At Maya and Mahasen the teachers asked the better students to assist the less proficient students and this resulted in more student participation. At Raja though most students were of the same proficiency level, the teacher's use of realia and visuals and sometimes an element of competition among the students helped to involve more students in the tasks. When the teachers interacted with the students in small groups some students asked for clarifications. Such clarifications were very rare in teacher fronted activities. Thus, although these tasks did not conform to the "two way" tasks as discussed by Long (1983), the pair and small group activities provided the context for the students to initiate and ask for clarification in a more non threatening environment than in the large class.

The techniques that Rasa, Sama and Priya used in their schools during group work led to more pupil interaction than at Vanitha. Previous research studies in Sri Lanka (Silva, 1993) claimed that the majority of the participant teachers in her study induced interaction through activities such as pair and group work. Tsui (1996) reports of teachers being successful in inducing interaction even in large classes in Hong Kong using techniques similar to those of Rasa, Sama and Priya. Thus, it is possible that in large classes in Sri Lanka more teacher-pupil interactions may be possible if teachers are encouraged to use strategies such as peer support through mixed ability groups, use of visual aids, and an element of competition.

Even though the small group work led to more interaction in the other schools, whether the interactions resulted in the ability to communicate in L2 is questionable. Most of the negotiations for meaning that took place through the interactions were in L1. Therefore in terms of the "interaction hypothesis" it did not result in "comprehensible input" nor did the majority of the students involve themselves in language production. However as discussed before in terms of "collaborative dialogue" there seemed to be better opportunities for language development when the students worked in groups and pairs with a better student paired with a less able student and when the teacher helped the students in the small groups.
10.3.6 Teaching language skills

CLT methodology expects to develop the students' four language skills, that is listening, speaking, reading and writing. One of the differences claimed for CLT in comparison to the more traditional methods of teaching English is that CLT focuses on the development of all four skills, with the use of one skill leading naturally to the use of another (Morrow, 1981). In contrast, according to Morrow, the more traditional teaching methods focuses on the development of language skills separately or reinforced one skill taught through the use of another. According to Cunningsworth (1995) the "skill dimension complements the dimension of grammatical/lexical/phonological knowledge and focuses on the ability of the learners actually to operate in the language" (p.64).

The EED materials are divided into different sections each focusing on one skill, yet also providing opportunities to use other skills. For example, the listening lessons were expected to develop listening skills but they also necessitated the students writing. Yet the students' involvement in these activities varied in the different schools. Rather than facilitating the development of all four language skills, each school appeared to focus more on some skills over others.

Although the EED materials were expected to facilitate the development of all four language skills this did not happen in most of the classrooms observed. The opportunities for the development of the different language skills appeared to be linked to the purpose for which English was taught in each school. In addition, the content of some of the activities was so difficult for the students, that there was no opportunity to develop the skills the activities were designed for.

At Vanitha the emphasis was on the skills of reading and writing. According to the TG, written work "provides variety in classroom activity, serves as a break from oral work, and increases the amount of language contact through work that can be set out of class" (1995, p.50). It also states that writing is often needed for formal and informal testing. The later purpose seems to be the main objective of doing written work at Vanitha. It is likely that this is because the students are assessed at examinations based only on these skills. On the other hand, at Raja writing activities were very rare in the observed lessons. In the other two schools, less time was spent on writing activities than at Vanitha but more than at Raja. When written work was done in class often it was done as a group activity, which resulted in verbal interaction, mainly in L1.
The "Finding Out" sections were specially designed to develop reading skills. The students were expected to read and find out the main idea of the passage for themselves without translating to L1. The majority of the students in all schools found it difficult to read and understand the content of some of the passages. Only the 'better' students at Vanitha were able to write the answers to the given questions on their own.

Inclusion of listening activities in the Pupil's Book is an innovation as the former learning materials contained only reading and writing tasks. In most of the lessons observed the majority of the students appeared to be listening to either the teacher or other students speaking. However, it is doubtful whether this type of listening where the students were not involved in any activity resulted in developing listening skills. The majority of the students seemed to find it difficult to follow most of the listening lessons. As was observed at Maya, sometimes the teacher had to translate most of the instructions in the listening activity. According to the TG this type of "help" is not part of the natural listening process outside the class. When the teacher did not offer help, as was the case at Vanitha the students seemed unable to do the task.

While all the activities in the Pupil's Book were expected to promote oral skills, certain activities such as "Role Play", "Useful Dialogues", and "Learning Together" were specifically designed to develop the speaking skills. However, in most of the classrooms observed these lessons gave the students practise in reading. Except at Vanitha, the majority of the students found it difficult to even read the dialogues. As a result the teachers had to spend most of the class time helping the students to read and could not proceed with the more communicative tasks. At Maya and Raja the teachers were able to involve the students in more oral activities by adapting the tasks. At Vanitha instead of extending the "Role Play" activities to pair or group work the teacher often used that time for written work focussing on grammar.

The observations in the four classrooms indicate that skill development as discussed in CLT literature rarely took place in these classes. However, as Cunningsworth (1995) notes an "in-depth and balanced treatment of all four skills is not necessary for all teaching situations" (p.64). If students are to develop language skills the teachers need to consider the level of the students and the objective of learning English. As most of the students in the Sri Lankan classrooms are beginners they need to develop the simple skills of listening and reading such as, comprehension before attempting advanced skills.
10.3.7 Feedback and error correction

The notion of feedback and error correction as an important feature in second language pedagogy has been acknowledged in both CLT and SLA literature. According to Chaudron (1988, p.132) "the aspect of interaction in classrooms with the widest scope is probably that generally referred to as feedback, which includes the notion of error correction". Morrow (1981) discusses feedback as an important feature of the principles of CLT. Long (1983) claims that most elementary level classrooms are not communicative as they follow a common pattern of a teacher question, a student response and a teacher evaluation. In such instances the teacher feedback is often a repetition of the students correct utterance or an indication that the response is correct or not. According to him, such a pattern controls the structure of the lesson. As a result, it would be assumed that both the language input and output would be limited. Most of the lessons observed in this study were teacher fronted and followed the IRE pattern described by Long (1983) as common in the second language classrooms and by other writers (for example, Barnes, 1976 and Mehan, 1979). However, sometimes the teachers reacted to student responses by elaborating and expanding their responses and sometimes their own questions.

While in the past second language classrooms that displayed the IRE patterns were considered as not communicative, recent studies (Gibbons, 1998; Johnson, 1995) claim that within the IRE interactional pattern there are options for altering the sequence through the way teachers provide feedback. Johnson (1995), applying Bruner's (1978) notion of "scaffolds" and Vygotsky's concept of "Zone of Proximal Development", discusses how teachers help students to expand their utterances and provide opportunities for language learning. Gibbons (1998) identifies similar options in her study, where within the traditional IRE pattern the teachers "recasted" and extended student utterances, which resulted in more student participation. The interaction patterns in this study suggest that even within lockstep lessons there were some opportunities for interaction and these lessons need not be considered as totally uncommunicative. It is the way the "options" were used that makes a lesson more or less communicative.

At Vanitha there were very few instances of the teacher using such options. On the other hand, in other schools there were more instances of such options being used. Thus, examining this data using the concept of "scaffolding" there seemed to be better opportunities for language development in the classrooms where teachers helped the students to expand their language use through different feedback techniques.
Error correction is one of the main areas of teacher feedback as it evaluates students' performance. However, as was discussed in Chapter 3, this is one area that has been interpreted in different ways by SLA theorists. The TG does not provide specific instructions regarding the handling of errors. Some CLT proponents, (for example, Brumfit, 1984) suggest that student errors be corrected in form focused activities in order to gain accuracy. SLA theorists such as Krashen (1982) do not attribute a major role to error correction, although the mentalists such as Chomsky (1965) consider errors as developmental. However, Long 1996 advocates interaction as a way of providing negative evidence to the students when focusing on language form. Some research studies (Gass, 1988; 1997; Long et al, 1998; Lyster & Ranta, 1997 and Mackey & Philip, 1998) claim that error correction in the form of recasts, that is rephrasing of a learner's non-target-like utterance, and reformulations help in focusing on form. However, they suggest that such corrections should be done in the context of tasks focusing on meaning.

In all the schools most error corrections were focused on language form. At Vanitha error correction was observed only on a very few occasions, as most student responses were correct. On those occasions Latha first signalled that there was a mistake and this helped the student to reformulate the utterance correcting the mistake. If the students failed to correct, the teacher provided the correct response. In the other schools in addition to such techniques the teachers also involved the other students in error correction by asking them whether a student response was correct and if not to correct it. At Mahasen when several students made the same mistake the teacher explained why it was wrong and practised the correct response in groups and individually. At Raja the teacher did not correct all errors, especially pronunciation errors.

In the classrooms observed error correction was seen mainly during form focused activities. However, as Allwright and Bailey (1991) argue it is not possible to expect error free language from low language proficiency students. At Raja the way the teacher handled errors seemed to encourage students to produce language, whereas when the teacher expected accuracy as was the case at Vanitha only a few students responded. Thus, the observations in the classrooms indicate the need for teachers to be more flexible in error treatment.

10.3.8 Teaching of grammar and use of language

There seems to be general agreement among contemporary writers that CLT is about teaching "communicative competence" (for example, Johnson, 1996; Spada & Fröhlich,
1995 and Thompson, 1996) where "communicative competence" is about gaining linguistic knowledge as well as the ability to use language.

As was discussed in Chapter 5, the EED materials were assumed to be based on a "grammatical ladder" (Mosback, 1990) and the "Grammar in Action" sections were designed to provide the grammatical ladder through meaning focused "pre-communicative" activities. While the "Grammar in Action" lessons were expected to provide the students with the knowledge "about language," the more communicative activities such as "Role Play" dialogues, "Learning Together" and "Useful Dialogues" were designed to assist the students develop the ability to "use" the language.

The teachers seemed confused regarding the role of grammar in the EED materials. During interviews all four teachers claimed that the EED materials did not focus adequately on grammar. Like the teachers Thompson (1996) refers to, these teachers were also under the "misconception" that CLT means not teaching grammar. However, most of the grammar lessons observed seemed to focus explicitly on teaching language structures, although there were variations among the teachers. In some lessons the teachers used linguistic terms to explain the facts about the language structures. This seemed to confuse the students and lead to a breakdown in communication (for example, using terms such as comparative and superlative adjectives at Vanitha and the four forms of the future at Mahasen). The use of such metalanguage resulted in miscommunication as the teachers and students were not "sharing and negotiating ways of talking and doing" (Lemke, 1985, p.5).

Differences observed in the teaching of grammar indicate the complexity of teaching grammar in Sri Lankan classrooms where teachers have prior experiences of teaching and learning grammar explicitly. This situation is further complicated by the confusion in CLT and SLA regarding the teaching of grammar and the lack of explicit guidelines and principles regarding the teaching of grammar in the TG. The "Role Play" dialogues which were expected to promote the learning of language functions through group and pair work, often became teacher directed activities with choral responses. No opportunities were provided in any of the lessons for students to use the language functions implicit in the dialogue through meaning focused activities in similar situations as suggested in the TG.

The reasons for this are not simply or primarily to do with the teachers' lack of competence to do so. In the context in which English is taught in some of the Sri Lankan classrooms it is very difficult for the teacher to focus both on providing
knowledge about language and promoting the ability to use language in the same lesson. For instance at Mahasen, when the teacher tried to involve all the students in the lesson and wanted to be certain that the language structure was learnt first, there was no time to do the more communicative tasks. On the other hand, on other occasions the communicative tasks could not be done as the students had forgotten the structures taught during the previous lesson. At Vanitha often the "communicative" tasks were replaced by written work to cater to students' needs and due to the pressure to cover the syllabus. Thus, even if the teachers wanted to do "communicative activities" the context of the classroom may have prevented it.

On the other hand, at Raja and Maya, even though the teacher led most of the activities, the students had more opportunities to "practise" through more meaning focused activities. During the "Learning Together" lesson at Raja the teacher provided the students with the opportunity to practise the present progressive tense. Action cards were used to describe an ongoing action. Although the students still depended on the script provided in the textbook, the use of action cards and realia made the practice more meaningful to the students. At Maya a few students were able to adapt the "Useful Dialogue" given in the Pupil's Book using words from outside the textbook. In these lessons there was no explicit focus on the linguistic structure nor did the teachers use linguistic terminology. However, the students still found it difficult to use language on their own.

Some early SLA theorists such as Krashen (1982) Long (1983) did not encourage explicit grammar teaching. However, recent interpretations of SLA theory (for example, Bygate, 1994; James, 1994; Long, 1996; Mitchell, 1994, 2000) advocate that a "focus on form", that is, focusing on form and meaning through meaning oriented activities, helps in converting language input into "intake." There are also suggestions that the learner's L1 is a useful starting point for grammar teaching (for example, James, 1994; Mitchell, 1994; 2000) and that the use of text-based problem solving grammar activities (Mitchell, 2000) can facilitate grammar teaching in ESL classrooms. Thus, the feasibility of using such strategies in the Sri Lankan classrooms needs to be explored. As argued by Derewianka (2001), one single grammatical model may not meet "all needs equally well in all contexts at all times" (p.267). Therefore, teachers need to be aware of what different approaches to grammar and grammar teaching can offer, to decide the best way to meet the needs of their students.
10.3.9 Teacher–pupil oral interaction and possible opportunities for second language development

The relationship between teacher-pupil interactions in the observed classrooms and the opportunities for second language learning was complex.

Due to this complexity, it is difficult to make specific claims regarding the opportunities for second language learning in the classrooms based only on the available evidence in the observed classrooms. According to what was observed in the large girls' school, Vanitha very little verbal interaction took place between the teacher and the students. Thus, in terms of SLA theories there was hardly any "negotiation for meaning", which is expected to result in "comprehensible input". Nor was there much oral language production. However, some students completed the written activities accurately and also gained good marks at the written examinations. However, both observations and teacher reports suggest that due to the heterogeneity of the student population at Vanitha it is not certain whether these students were able to do the activities because of the language learning in the class or because of the knowledge they bring into the class through outside exposure to English and their prior familiarity with the learning materials by attending after school tuition classes.

On the other hand, in the other three schools there were considerably more verbal interactions between teacher and students and students and students. However these interactions did not necessarily seem to lead to more L2 language production. In fact, in the small mixed gender school, Raja there were more interactions than any of the other schools. However students rarely spoke in English and did not write in English at all. The teacher's use of L1 was greater in this school than any other. Thus, in terms of second language learning, although the teachers in these schools were trying hard to provide the opportunities for language learning the available evidence seemed to suggest that very little second language learning was taking place in the classrooms. Clearly 'interaction' is not a sufficiently robust variable on its own to predict L2 learning. Other contextual factors affect language learning in the classroom.

As was the case in other countries such as Japan, China, Pakistan, India and Hong Kong where English is taught in similar conditions to Sri Lanka, cultural and context specific factors profoundly affected the implementation of CLT methodology. However, the findings of this study suggests that even within the culturally accepted teacher student behaviour patterns and context specific constraints there are still possibilities for using some current practices as argued by some writers such as Brown (2000). It also supports
Holliday (1997) view that what is considered as not "communicative" by the "western specialists" can be communicative in contexts such as Sri Lanka.

This study looked at SLA literature, mainly from an input-output model perspective to understand the oral interactions in the classrooms observed. The "interaction hypothesis" was based on NS-NNS conversation and as pointed out by Long (1996) most studies have been undertaken in western education settings. Thus, he noted that more studies in diverse cultural settings are needed to examine the role of interaction. This study was in response to that need and the findings indicate that some of the conditions that Long claimed as necessary for language development cannot be met in classroom settings like Sri Lanka. However, the study also provides some insights into how these conditions can be adapted to suit such contexts. These findings also suggest that teacher-pupil interactions could lead to second language development through "collaborative dialogue" (Swain and Lapkin, 1998) and "collaborative learning" (Vygotsky, 1986).

10.4 Implications of the study

10.4.1 Theoretical implications

The findings of this study demonstrate the complex nature of teaching English as a second language in Sri Lanka, which is deeply embedded in the sociocultural and political context of the country as well as in the particular cultures of each school. As a result of this complexity this study is unable to suggest simple solutions to the problems identified. However, these findings clearly indicate that in order to promote second language learning, there must be classroom based ethnographic research with the researchers entering into dialogue with classroom teachers. It is only through such research, taking a socio-cultural perspective of the interactions in the classrooms that classroom practices relevant to different classroom settings can be identified.

The significance of this study is that it demonstrates that the realities of second language classrooms differ not only across cultures but also within the same culture. On the one hand, while there were certain similarities between the ESL situation in Sri Lanka and in countries such as Hong Kong, India, Pakistan, China and Japan there were also differences. On the other hand, while there were similarities among the schools in Sri Lanka, there were marked differences as well. Therefore, these findings reinforce the danger of making generalisations regarding teaching English as a second language and prescribing teaching practices across cultures and within cultures.
10.4.2 Classroom implications

The heterogeneity of the student population in the ESL classrooms clearly indicates that using the same learning materials in all the classrooms is a problem. As was discussed in this thesis, student heterogeneity has been a problem throughout the history of ESL in Sri Lanka and as has been argued before (for example, De Lanerolle Commission Report, 1973; De Silva, 1979; Karunaratne, 1990) a stratified syllabus to cater for at least three ability levels of students needs to be developed.

One response to this issue has been the current education reforms (Reforms in General Education, 1997) which have proposed that at senior secondary stage - GCE (O.L) there will be two syllabuses providing the students with the option of selecting the level at which they want to study.

Every one will sit English 1, which is a general syllabus suited to the vast majority of students. The more capable students if they wish can study English 2 which is of a higher standard (Reforms in General Education, 1997, p.15).

However, this proposal had not been taken up in the development of the new learning materials, *The World through English*, which were introduced in 1999. These learning materials are also based on a common syllabus. Although an evaluation of these materials was beyond the scope of this study, a perusal of the content of the Year 7, Pupil's Book indicates that some of the prose and poetry texts in this book appear to be more difficult than in the EED materials.

There is clearly a need to address student heterogeneity in the classrooms, and the evidence from this study also supports the argument for a stratified syllabus. However doing so should not lead to inequality in learning opportunities in learning English, as has been the case in the past. Thus, it would be more feasible to increase the flexibility of the curriculum so that teachers can adapt the learning materials to suit the varying abilities, experiences and needs of students. There are no simple answers as to how this could be done and the findings of this study alone are not sufficient to suggest solutions. However, this study clearly indicates that it is only through similar classroom based studies that possible solutions can be found.

**Assessment**

The domination of examinations on what happens in the classrooms suggests that
assessment is clearly an issue in providing opportunities to learn the second language. The mismatch between the product based assessment of reading, writing and grammar and the intentions of the EED materials to teach pupils communicative abilities with considerable emphasis on oral skills has been highlighted in the literature (Alderson, 1992). In the proposed reforms (Reforms in General Education, 1997), school based assessment has been suggested and teachers will be expected to design their own tests and to assess students' ability to use all four language skills. However, the test papers administered by the Education Department at the end of the school term continue to be in place. Thus, if what happens in the classrooms is to be more flexible, the assessment procedures also need to change giving the schools more freedom to design their own tests to meet the needs of their students.

Teacher training
The four case studies suggest that despite the fixed syllabus some teachers were better able to adapt the learning materials to suit the needs of their students. The teachers who were better able to adapt the materials were the ones who had recent professional development. These teachers were able to use more "options" for second language learning even within the frame work of a teacher fronted class. This could be because they had more opportunities during their training to use the learning materials and were informed of the theoretical underpinnings of the teaching approach that was used in the classrooms.

This study also indicates that teachers need regular retraining in the use of the learning materials and the need for better monitoring of teacher preparation programs. In this study, the teachers who had recent teacher training in the use of the learning materials were better able to facilitate opportunities to learn in the class. At the same time they were anxious about the appropriateness of some of their practices. This implies the value of regular retraining. Further, the available data suggests that with the introduction of the learning materials there had not been adequate teacher preparation. Thus, during future curriculum reforms, programs for the training of teachers in the use of the learning materials needs to be more widespread and better monitored.

Teacher training is another issue that has been raised in the ESL context in Sri Lanka. With the introduction of the EED materials, an attempt was made to change the traditional teaching practices and provide the teachers with some guidelines regarding their classroom practices. However, it also made some teachers anxious about their practices as they are unable to follow some of the guidelines in the contexts in which they teach. Therefore, rather than prescribing general guidelines it seemed to be
important that teacher education should address the complexities of teaching English in the different contexts and encourage teacher flexibility and initiative. The teacher education programmes should equip the teachers with the confidence to be open minded and try out new ideas so that they can decide for themselves 'what' to teach and 'how' to teach to best suit their students.

As stated in the proposed Reforms in General Education the Ministry of Education has accepted as a matter of policy that all teachers should undergo periodical in service education programs. For this purpose it is proposed that 84 Teachers' Centres be established throughout the country. Training modules are also expected to be developed to be used in these training programs (Reforms in General Education, 1997, p.22). These Teacher Centres can be used to assist teachers try out new ideas and share their experiences in using the learning materials with their colleagues.

**Use of L1**

While the use of L1 seemed to facilitate interaction, and provide a starting point for second language learning for some of the students in the classroom, it also appeared to be a major concern of the teachers. As was discussed before, one reason for this is the teachers have no access to recent literature and thinking regarding the use of L1 in the teaching of the second language. Thus, teachers need to be informed of latest information regarding the use of L1. Further research in Sri Lankan classrooms needs to be conducted to examine how L1 can be more profitably used in the teaching of L2 and such research should be encouraged.

**Additional learning materials**

The use of additional learning materials helped to motivate the students and result in better student participation. Thus, the use of learner made materials and realia and also the possibility of doing projects, preparation of charts, and introduction of songs and drama may result in better student involvement and make learning English more pleasurable. The observations at *Raja* indicated that students were more responsive to language learning when an element of competition through activities such as games was introduced into the lesson. Unfortunately the audiocassettes which were a part of the EED materials were not available in the classrooms to find out how the students would have responded to them. However, the students' enthusiasm to be audio recorded, evidenced in all schools during data collection, suggests that the use of audio materials even occasionally may facilitate interaction in the class and help in language development.
10.5 Future research

The use of L1 played a major role in the classroom interactions. Yet how L1 can be used to facilitate L2 development is not certain. Thus, research in the use of L1 in the second language classroom is priority need in the ESL field in Sri Lanka.

The new learning materials that were being prepared at the time of this study are now being used in the schools. Some of the features of the EED materials that were identified as shortcomings, such as the lack of a syllabus specification seemed to be addressed in the new learning materials. Thus, further case studies in the same schools or similar schools would be helpful to find out the role of the syllabus in the classroom practices.

The present study focused more on teacher-pupil interaction than on pupil-pupil interactions. Further studies on pupil-pupil interactions with recordings of group interactions and interviews of students would be useful to identify the students' role in the classroom interactions and the possibilities of collaborative learning and dialogue.

This study concentrated on four schools selected from four different contexts within one district in Sri Lanka. The district selected, that is Colombo, is claimed to have better educational facilities than some of the other districts. Thus, a similar study in another district would help to find out inter as well as intra district disparities regarding the teaching of English in Sri Lanka.
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APPENDIX I

The Interview Schedule

The interview schedule was intended to be flexible and varied depending on the background and experience of the teachers. The teachers had been already described to me about themselves and their English language teaching and learning background.

Objectives.

At the end of the interviews the teachers would have indicated:

i. their views regarding the EED materials in relation to the previous learning materials.
ii. The type and quality of the preparation they received in using the EED materials.
iii. The difficulties they face in implementing the EED materials.
iv. Their students’ family backgrounds, interest in learning English and English language proficiency.
v. Their views in using L1 in class.

1. What differences do you find between An English Course and EED materials?
2. Which materials do you prefer and why?
3. What preparation did you receive in the use of the EED materials?
4. Do you think the preparation you received adequate to use the EED materials?
5. Do you face any difficulties in using the EED materials or following the guidelines given in the Teacher’s Guide. If so what are they?
6. Do you use L1 in the class? If so, for what purpose do you use it? If not why?
7. What are your views on group and pair work?
8. Can you tell me something about the family backgrounds if the students in your class.
9. Are they generally interested in learning English?
10. What sections in the book do the majority of the students find difficult.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES &amp; EpisodeS</th>
<th>MATES</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>PARTICIPANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES &amp; EpisodeS</th>
<th>MATES</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>PARTICIPANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade(s)</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Appendix II

Part A

Coll
Appendix iv

As you ask the questions, write the answers in this grid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Town/Village</th>
<th>Work Place</th>
<th>Hobbies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. eg: Miss Manel Perera</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Na-Ula</td>
<td>Elagamuva MV</td>
<td>Cooking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. 

3. 

6. Using the information above, write a paragraph about any one of them. Ask your parents/teacher to help you.

_________ ___________ is a ___________. He/she is ___ years old. She lives at ___________. She works in ___________. Her hobbies are ___________ and ___________.

ANSWERS

Activity 1

a - The Great Red Indian Chief
d - Arrow
b - Tent
e - Bow
c - Flute
Your teacher will tell you about these people from the information in the teacher's book. Listen carefully and try to guess their names from the list your teacher will write on the blackboard.
GROUP WORK. Work in groups of three. You are shopkeepers. Decide on a list of ten things you are all going to sell in your shops. Make up suitable prices for the things on your list. Don't let anyone else see your list. When you all finish, compare your lists so that you can make ten statements about the prices in your group, five using 'cheap' 'cheaper', 'cheapest' and five using 'expensive', 'more expensive', 'most expensive'. Your ten items might be – an umbrella, a clock, a watch, a pen, a schoolbag, a radio, a saucepan, a kettle, an exercise book and a bag of toffees. YOUR statements might be something like:

- Rohan's clock is cheaper than mine.
- Seeta's clock is cheaper than Rohan's.
- Seeta's got the cheapest clock.
- My umbrella's more expensive than Seeta's.
- Rohan's umbrella's more expensive than mine.
- Rohan's got the most expensive umbrella.

Now try the sentences again using 'dear, dearer, dearest' and 'LESS expensive' and 'the LEAST expensive.'

In groups of three, make statements comparing members of your group. Here are some adjectives that might help you:

- younger, youngest
- shorter, shortest
- taller, tallest
- bigger, biggest
- cleverer, cleverest
- kinder, kindest

(a) better – the best (runner, dancer, cricket/games player, etc.)
(a) worse – the worst (see above)
more hardworking – the most hardworking
more cheerful – the most cheerful
more serious – the most serious

better – the best
worse – the worst
as good as
as bad as

(a) In your group of three, make comparisons among yourselves about your different abilities. You must each try to find an activity you are best at. The other two may not agree with you, but don't take it too seriously. Here are some activities you might include.
Ravi and Anne are back at the 'Arrivals' exit.

ANNE: There it is. That's your bag. It's on that chair.

MAN: (He is sitting on another chair, reading a paper. He looks up.) No. That's not his bag. That's my bag.

ANNE: I'm very sorry. My friend's bag is brown leather, too. My mistake, I'm afraid.

MAN: Oh, that's all right. Let's look for your friend's bag.

RAVI: (He is worried.) No. It isn't here. It isn't near the door. It isn't under the chairs.

ANNE: And it isn't behind the chairs. Oh, dear.

MAN: Why not go to the enquiry desk? Perhaps they can help you.

RAVI: Where? Where's the enquiry desk?

MAN: It's over there, between the main exit door and the bookshop. See. The bookshop is on the left and the exit door is on the right.

RAVI: Thank you. Thank you very much.

ANNE: Sorry to trouble you.

MAN: That's all right. Good luck. I hope you find it.
UNIT THREE

WORD STUDY

VEHICLES

Learn the names of all the things with numbers. Can you find five things without numbers?

PAIR WORK [1] Take turns to cover the list and ask your partner the names of five of the numbered things. Keep changing turns for five minutes to see who gets the most right.

PAIR WORK [2] In turn, you and your partner ask each other five questions about where things are – in front of, behind, to the right of, to the left of, above, near, in, on. Use ‘What...’ ‘Where...’ ‘Who...’ and ‘Is the...’.

1. carriage
2. cyclist
3. bus
4. coach
5. driver
6. handlebars
7. lorry (truck)
8. seat
9. wheel
10. engine
11. headlamp
12. motorbike
13. tyre
14. motor
15. mudguard
16. van
UNIT FOUR  ROLE PLAY  RAVI IS LUCKY

ANNE : Excuse me.

CLERK : Yes ? Can I help you ?

ANNE : Yes. My friend lost his bag. It’s a brown leather bag.

CLERK : A brown leather bag. Let me see. (He reaches under the counter.) Is this your bag ?

RAVI : Yes. That’s it. Thank you.

CLERK : Just a moment. You must tell me what’s in it. I must be sure it’s yours. (He opens it.)

RAVI : Oh . . . Let me see. There’s a photo of a girl. My sister.

CLERK : That’s right. There IS a photo in the bag. I’ll take it out.

RAVI : And there’s a book. It’s a big blue notebook.

CLERK : That’s right. Here’s the book.

RAVI : And a small green comb.

CLERK : Correct. Here you are. You’re lucky. A security guard found it. You must be more careful in future.

RAVI : I will. Thank you very much. And thank the security guard too, please.

CLERK : I will. Good-bye.

RAVI : Good-bye. Anne, you mustn’t tell Padmini I lost my bag. I’m looking after YOU, remember.
POST-QUESTIONS

1. Why aren't there any cars or buses in Venice?
2. What is a Gondola?
3. Which sentence is right?
   (a) Batticaloa and Negombo are sinking like Venice.
   (b) Batticaloa and Negombo are built round lagoons like Venice.

4. Complete this paragraph, using suitable words from the passage:

   Venice is a ...... city in ...... . There are no ...... or ...... in
   the city, because there aren't ...... roads there. There are many ....
   and people travel in ...... . These ...... are called 'Gondolas'.

A LETTER TO A NEWSPAPER

This letter was written to a newspaper by a child of about the same
standard as your pupils. It was published in the children's section. It is
a description of a town in Sri Lanka.

PRE-QUESTIONS

1. Which province is Badulla in?
2. How far is it from Colombo?
3. Find the name of a mountain near Badulla.
4. How far is the Dunhinda waterfall from Badulla?
5. Apart from Buddhists, what other communities are there in Badulla?

POST-QUESTIONS

1. Fill in the blanks with three different words or phrases:

   ...... is one hundred and thirty miles from Colombo. ......
   is surrounded by mountains. Many visitors from Sri Lanka and
   other countries come to visit ...... .

2. How far is YOUR town, village or area from Colombo Fort?
3. Is your home area surrounded by mountains?
4. Is there a place near your school that many tourists visit from
   Sri Lanka or abroad?
5. What types of plantation are there near your home or school?
6. What is the majority community in your area? What other communities
   live around you?
7. Using your own answers to questions 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, write a letter
   to a newspaper about your town. Add any other information you like.
Padmini is shopping. She’s doing her shopping. How many of the things on her list are on the counter? What other things must the shopkeeper put on the counter? Can you think of any other things Padmini might ask for? Remember Anne is staying with her. Do you remember what Anne likes to eat?
Make ten ‘action’ cards for the verbs above and two copies each of the five pronoun indicator cards shown below. The ‘action’ cards:

The pronoun cards will be like this:

Work in pairs. One partner turns the ‘action’ cards one by one. For each ‘action’ card, the other partner turns a pronoun card. The first partner must then say correctly the complete sentence shown by the two cards together. After five minutes, partners change packs so that the second partner can practise making the sentences. See which pair in the class can get through the cards correctly in the shortest time.

Each pupil makes five cue cards or paper squares showing any actions your teacher thinks are useful or interesting. Examples might be,

Q. What’s he doing?
A. He’s .............. at a picture.

Q. What’s she doing?
A. She’s .............. for a bus.

Q. What are they doing?
A. They’re .............. volleyball.

These are situations where the ‘-ing’ form of the present is used very often. The person who asks, ‘What are you doing?’ cannot see what actions are going on at the time the question is asked.
UNIT THREE FINDING OUT HOW SOAP CLEANES OUR CLOTHES

1. Soap has many tiny parts. We call them molecules. They are much too small to see.

2. Each molecule has a head which likes water, and a tail which hates water.

3. When you put dirty clothes into soapy water, the ‘tails’ stick to the dirt to get away from the water.

4. The tails pull the dirt away from the cloth. This makes the clothes clean and the dirt goes into the water.

5. The molecules push the water away.

6. Water without soap stays in clear drops.

7. The soapy water is broken up. It spreads out.

TRY THIS EXPERIMENT

Dip a pencil into some clean water. Shake the drops onto a plate. Dip the pencil into soapy water. Shake the drops onto another plate. Tip the plates a little and you see the clean water in drops. The soapy water spreads out.
2. Read the Finding Out on page 28 'How soap cleans our clothes' and answer the following questions.

1) What has soap got? .................................................. (para 1)
2) What do we call them? ................................................. (para 1)
3) Can we see them? ...................................................... (para 1)
4) What has each molecule got? ....................................... (para 2)
5) What likes water? ..................................................... (para 2)
6) What hates water? .................................................... (para 2)
7) Why do tails stick to dirt? .......................................... (para 3)
8) What do the tails do? ................................................ (para 4)
9) What happens then? ................................................... (para 4)
10) Where does the dirt go? .............................................. (para 4)
11) What do the molecules do? ......................................... (para 5)
12) What stays in clear drops? .......................................... (para 6)

Turn to page 54 if you want to check your answers.

3. Look at the story 'Bullock Cart'. Try to find all the (i) nouns, (ii) verbs, (iii) adjectives and write them in your book under the different headings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Compare this with your partner's, and see who has got the longer list. Check your lists with the teacher.

Answers on page 55.