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Abstract

This research study investigates whether the teachers of the Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth graders in two Public schools in Tyre encourage oral interaction, or not, and the importance of investigating such topic. Three hundred and seventy eight learners studying English as a Second language (ESL) and eight English teachers are observed in their classrooms. The students are of different age levels ranging between thirteen and seventeen in the three grade levels, but they have the same proficiency levels in the Second Language (L2). From every grade level, in its different sections, five students were interviewed. The ESL teachers of the third cycle in the two schools (eight teachers) filled questionnaires and each of them was interviewed for fifteen minutes. The collected data was analyzed qualitatively, and the results show that communicative second language teaching was completely absent in the classes of the third cycle in the two schools. The intertwined reasons behind the absence of interactive Second Language teaching in the observed classrooms are related to the students’ L2 level, the teachers’ degree and education, and the teachers’ misconception about Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Based on this, it is recommended that teachers in these schools read more about interactive teaching and pursue professional development by attending workshops and conferences focusing on oral interaction.
Chapter I

Introduction

Evolution is a shared aspect among humans and human-related matters. As part of these human-related affairs, education has evolved throughout history and is still progressing with the roles of its two poles, students and teachers, being reshaped and affected by the continuous emerging theories, perspectives, and approaches on language teaching and learning. New and most surviving methods of language teaching and learning are being characterized by an interactive, communicative, and student-centered nature. This determines the learners’ and the teacher’s role where the ultimate aim – on the learner’s behalf – is an independent, autonomous, and lifelong learning. On the other hand, as educators are part of the educational process they might be the prey of their beliefs, attitudes, experiences, philosophies, and school culture where they try to fit for all. Accordingly, their responsibilities and roles are crucial in this process, and they have to regularly update their educational levels and repertoires. They should make decisions regarding what is best for their students and their society.

Towards the end of the 1800s, a revolution in language teaching philosophy took place that is seen by many as the “dawn” of modern foreign language teaching. The Grammar Translation Method which was historically used for teaching Greek and Latin has many drawbacks (see for instance, Brown 2001; Harmer 2003; Nunan 1991). In addition, this method is characterized by extensive explanations of grammar, teaching vocabulary in isolated lists, and an emphasis on the inflections and forms of words (Brown, 2001; Harmer, 2003; Nunan, 1991). Consequently, teachers frustrated by the limits of the Grammar Translation Method in terms of its inability to create “communicative” competence in students began to experiment
with new ways of teaching language. New methods have been designed to address the areas that the Grammar Translation did not emphasize—namely oral communication. In other words, while more traditional approaches and models of teaching emphasized “linguistic competence” (grammatical rules), new approaches were investigated related to communication and interaction (Brown, 2001).

“Education is both made up of interactions and aims at the enhancement and spread of certain kinds of interactions” (Freebody, 2004, p. 90). The ability to use the target language effectively and appropriately is a must. This capability cannot be examined and demonstrated unless the students interact and communicate with one another, with their teacher, and with the world. This ultimate objective is attained when the students are given real chances and experiences to send messages, receive and interpret them in a context, negotiate meanings, and collaborate to accomplish certain purposes (Brown, 2001). Through their communication, “students learn not only about curricular content and not only about the communication patterns that characterize acceptable educational practice around that content, but also about the structure of society, the place and function of schooling, their place as students, and the nature, significance and consequences of their learning. They learn these things through their participation (Freebody, 2004, p. 92) or through interaction which is defined by Lantolf (2000) as “a dynamic construct shaped by participants’ expectations, experiences, and beliefs about the communication and their interlocutor” (p. 51-52). Accordingly, it is the teacher’s role as an overseer of learning, classroom manager, consultant, and co-communicator (Littlewood, 1981) to create conditions in which the learners engage in an effort to cope with communication (Prabhu, 1987). The best way to learn to interact is through interaction itself (Brown, 2001). Rivers (1987) puts interaction this way:
Through interaction, students can increase their language store as they listen to or read authentic linguistic material, or even the output of their fellow students in discussions, skits, joint problem-solving tasks, or dialogue journals. In interaction, students can use all they possess of the language—all they have learned or casually absorbed—in real-life exchanges. ...Even at an elementary stage, they learn in this way to exploit the elasticity of language (p.4-5).

Statement of research topic

The aim of this research is to explore whether English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers of public schools in Tyre encourage students’ oral interaction/communication or not and why? The classes are the seventh, eighth, and ninth grade (the third cycle of the official program).

Rationale and Significance

The Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) Approach with its strong and weak versions stresses “communication” and its vital role in language acquisition (Howatt, 1984). This project also derives from the different teaching and learning theories and Second Language Acquisition Theories (SLA theories) which emphasize the role of interaction with its numerous facets and manifestations (output/collaborative dialogue/instructional conversation) for language acquisition (Krashen 1981, 1982, 1985, 1990; Long, 1996; Swain 1985, 1998; Van Lier, 1996; Vygotsky 1978, 1987, among others). This expression (SLA) denotes the study of how second languages (English in this research) are learned and the elements which affect this process. SLA researchers investigate the way communicative competence
progresses in a second language (Savignon, 1997). Communicative competence was defined as the ability to analyze the meaning of a message, figure out cultural references, employ strategies to sustain communication, and apply grammatical rules (Savignon, 1997). These theories, along with their practical implications, will be discussed in the next section under the subheading: theoretical perspectives. In addition, the various features of interaction, as construed from different educational theories, will be examined.

Furthermore, choosing the context of the study to be a public school stems from the researcher’s belief that carrying out research in public educational settings paves a way for improving public schooling. This is added to the fact that many educational studies have been conducted exclusively at private schools located in different Lebanese cities, while little or no research has been done in public schools—namely in Tyre. Thus, together theories of L2 acquisition, cognitive, and sociocultural theories of language learning, teaching, and acquisition provide a theoretical framework and a firm ground for this research.
Chapter II

Literature Review

Theoretical perspectives: Interaction and language acquisition

This section sheds light on the different theories on language learning and acquisition. These range between extreme—cognitive notions and the sociocultural ones. Sociocultural theorists emphasize the importance of conceptualizing language learning as a development process, the center of which is interaction. This process is mediated by semiotic resources appropriated from the classroom (Wertsch, 1998). According to Ferdinand Sassure, semiotics is the theory and study of signs and symbols, especially as elements of language or other systems of communication, and comprising semantics, syntactics, and pragmatics. These semiotic resources include print materials, the physical environment, gestures, and most notably “classroom discourse” (Donato, 2000, p. 45). This theme contrasts sharply with the cognitive perspectives based merely on the acquisition metaphor of progression which speculates language learning as an attribute to various internal mental processes such as “the construction of interlanguage representations, encodings and decoding between individuals, input processing and attentional operations” by the learner, or the “biological unfolding of linguistic universals” (Donato, 2000, p. 45). Besides, within the cognitive approaches, the individual is seen as the only track through which language is gained (Donato, 2000). However, in the past twenty-five years, there has been much growth in research associated with more extensive views of language, consideration of its dynamic nature, and attention to many contexts of Second Language (L2) learning (Kaplan 2002). Consequently, these cognitive-oriented views have been continuously revised and modified to include an additional factor called “interaction”.
Cognitive Perspectives

Krashen (1981, 1982, 1985, and 1990) suggested theoretical perspectives, articulated in a set of interwoven hypothesis about L2 acquisition. According to Krashen (1981), adult L2 learners have two means for internalizing a target language. The first is acquisition, a subconscious and intuitive process. The second is conscious learning, in which a learner attends to form and is aware of his/her own learning process. Thus Krashen (1981) uses his claims of no interface between learning and acquisition as the main argument for recommending large doses of acquisition activities in the classroom. He asserts that speech would emerge after the acquirer had been exposed to enough comprehensible input (Krashen 1985, 1994). He further proposes the Affective Filter Hypothesis which suggests that learners should have a low “affective filter” to be emotionally disposed to the input. This means that best acquisition occurs in environments where anxiety is low, and defensiveness is absent. Thus, according to Krashen (1985) “speaking emerges as a result of a system of language competence having been established in the brain through exposure to comprehensible input over time” (p. 2). Consequently, “speaking is a result of acquisition and not its cause” (Krashen, 1985, p. 2).

However, Krashen’s hypotheses along with his Comprehensible Input Hypothesis (CIH) have been disputed both by linguistics and psychologists (see Gregg, 1984; McLaughlin, 1990; Brumfit, 1992). Brumfit (1992) reported that L2 learning in school context requires active participation of learners and teachers alike, and emphasizes the role of interaction, feedback, and intake in L2 learning.

McLaughlin’s (1990) findings in experiential psychology showed that acquisition requires interaction with, rather than, exposure to the target language. These findings contradict Krashen’s theory on acquisition and learning through
condensed qualitative exposure to spoken language in the early stages of L2 instruction.

Long’s (1996) update of the CIH (following Krashen, 1981) suggests that Second Language interaction can facilitate development by providing opportunities for learners. These opportunities are related to the students’ receiving of comprehensible input and negative feedback, as well as to modifying their own output, testing hypotheses, and noticing gaps in their interlanguage. Harley and Swain (1984) studies of immersion classes in Canada illustrate one of the biggest challenges to the CIH. In this research young students were exposed to large quantities of comprehensible input while little talking was required of them. However, they found that these children continued in committing enormous numbers of mistakes when speaking. The two researchers concluded that comprehensible input alone was insufficient for acquiring all language patterns. For a new language to be acquired, it is not enough just to highlight it while keeping silent. It’s completely the opposite. The targeted language must be used in oral production. This process provides three things for the learner. First, it sheds light on the new patterns as ‘Input’. Second, it forces the learner to construct the new item before and during ‘Output’. Third, it brings upon confirmation from the interlocutor (teacher) that the production is correct signaling more proofs for the learner’s hypothesis about the target language. This has been the derivative to what is termed, by Swain (1985), as the Comprehensible Output Hypothesis (COH) (Macaro, 2003).

Many research studies, based on Swain’s COH, emphasized the fact that oral interaction does not necessarily mean or automatically lead to acquisition. This is simply because there are other factors which act as catalysts in this complex equation. “Noticing” (Swain, 1985) is one of the most important elements. It depends
heavily on the quality of the teacher-student/student-teacher interaction and student-student interaction where meaning is negotiated. That is, students are allowed to “control their agenda” (Skehan, 1998, p. 17) and consequently, they are pushed into speaking more appropriately, coherently, and precisely (Macaro, 2003; Swain, 1985).

Furthermore, Swain (1985; 1998) attributed an important role to collaborative dialogue, i.e., dialogues in which learners are absorbed in negotiating meaning and language constructing. In a collaborative dialogue learners may engross in co-composing their second language and in establishing knowledge about it (Swain, 1985). Cooperative language production acts may therefore stimulate learners to expand their knowledge of linguistic rules (Swain, 1998). Swain also adds that this may elicit cognitive processes which may produce new linguistic comprehension and combine already existing knowledge” (Swain, 1998).

This notion of collaborative dialogue was lately revisited by the sociocultural theorists (e.g., Swain, 2000) according to whom, the two facets of an utterance, the cognitive activity and its product - appear in both output and collaborative dialogue. According to the socioculturalists, Collaborative Dialogue is “a dialogue in which speakers are engaged in problem solving and knowledge building. It heightens the potential for exploration of the product” (Swain, 2000, p.102). Based on this, collaborative dialogue is an intersection between interaction and the comprehension of a certain linguistic form or/and meaning. In other words, it is the result of interaction and negotiation of meaning and/or form which yields to noticing this form/meaning and hence acquiring it (Lantolf, 2000; Swain, 1998; Van Patten, 2000).

Later, a great line of research in the field of second language on whether noticing a particular linguistic form may promote that form has been conducted
(Doughty and Varela, 1997; Izumi, Bigelow, Fujiwara & Fearnlow, 1999; Noris & Ortega, 2000; VanPatten, 2000). Noticing a linguistic form in the output is thought to operate as an indispensable but not a adequate condition for processing (VanPatten, 2000; Schmidt, 1995). As stated by Robinson (1996), Schmidt (1995), and Skehan (1998), there appears to be a relationship between learners’ knowledge of linguistic structures in the input and successful learning. Skehan’s Information Processing Model (1998) is centered on the concept of noticing, which is a conscious attention to input Schmidt (1990). The Information Processing Model asserts information processing and the interaction of input features, through noticing, with the interlanguage system of the learner (Skehan, 1998). Thus, various influences affect noticing, such as the frequency and the salience of the input, classroom instruction, task demands on processing resources, individual differences between learners in processing ability, and readiness to pay attention to certain linguistic forms (Skehan, 1998).

Also derived from a cognitive perspective is the big line of research that asserts the role of interaction in L2 acquisition. This is based on the hypothesis that while learners interact with each other, their language skills progresses, in so far as their morphological, grammatical, lexical, and rhetorical skills are concerned (Robinson & Garcia, 2001). Based on this, the Interaction Hypothesis of Second Language Acquisition and associated work by Gass (1997), Long (1996), Pica (1994), and Swain (1995) suggest that negotiated interaction facilitates SLA.

Moreover, the studies represented in the work of Anderson (1985), O’Malley and Chamot (1993) affirmed that L2 acquisition occurs most effectively with high degrees of learner engagement. They suggested that strategic learning can stress on separate components of language, such as vocabulary, or on comprehending and
conversing meaningful ideas. Furthermore, O'Malley and Chamot (1993) confirmed that procedural knowledge, the ability to put known forms to communicative effect, is learned effectively through meaningful practices that achieve specific goals (Wu, 1994). Procedural Knowledge is learned either by observing and modeling series of goal-oriented professional performance, or by achieving fractional mastery over the constituents of a complete skill by practice with feedback either from the teacher or from more skilled peers. O’Malley & Chamot, (1993) also suggested that L2 learner could model “expert” performance, ask for feedback, or resort to rules if there is a necessity for modification in performance.

Sociocultural Perspective

Researchers adopting a sociocultural view tried to draw a new and more applicable interpretation for a special relation between cognition, social practices, and language. New notions, connections, explanations, and terminologies originated to replace and question the existing input/ output and intake.

Kramsch (1995), Van Lier (1996), and others pointed out the hindering effect of the “Conduit Metaphor” (Van Lier, 1996) on the development of a more extensive comprehension of second language learning. The old metaphor of learning “Acquisition Metaphor” has been substituted by a newer one “The Participation Metaphor”. Van Lier (1996) replaces the term “output” with such labels as “speaking”, “writing”, “utterances”, “verbalization”, and “collaborative dialogue” (Swain, 2000, p. 103). Van Lier defended his proposal for this “concept of dialogue”, instead of comprehensible “input” and/or “output”, by considering second language learning and teaching from a Vygotskian perspective.

Van Lier (1996) also referred to Cole (1996) and Vygotsky (1978 and 1987) who have expanded on a sociocultural theory of mind (Swain, 2000). The main
premise of this theory is that cognitive functions such as voluntary memory, reasoning or attention are interceded mental activities, the sources of which are activities exterior to the learner but in which he or she partakes (Swain, 2000). According to Arleevitch & Van der Veer (1995), external activities are converted into mental ones by a process of internalization. In other words, as Stetsenko and Arleevitch (1997) explain: “psychological processes emerge first in collective behavior, in co-operation with other people, and only subsequently become internalized as the individual’s own possessions” (p. 161). As Vygotsky (1981) argued, this process is mediated by semiotic tools. This claim stems from Vygotsky’s general genetic law of cultural development where he contends that “any function in the child’s cultural development appears twice, or on two planes”: the social plane (level) (among people: interpsychological category) and the psychological plane (intrapsychological category). He continues “social relations or relations among people genetically underlie all higher functions and their relationships” (p. 163). In other words, social processes allow the language to become a cognitive tool for the individual. These planes (levels) of functioning are dynamically interconnected, joined by language which intervenes social interaction on the interpsychological plane, and mediates thought on the intrapsychological plane (Swain, 2000). Based on this, language is one of the most important and powerful semiotic tools which mediate our interaction with the physical and social environment. “It mediates our physical and mental activities; as a cognitive tool, it regulates others and us; it can be considered as cognitive activity and its product” (Swain, 2000, p. 104). Hence, meaningful social interaction operates as a device through which the transformation of the L2 from interpsychological to intrapsychological functioning arises (Ohta, 2000).
Derived from a broad sociocultural theory proposed by Vygotsky (1962, 1978) many studies have emphasized building cognitive understanding in social contexts. The social course of language learning is essential to Vygotskian sociocultural theory. This theory necessitates apprehending the significance of interaction between people for the construction of intellectual activities (Vygotsky, 1978). Two central doctrines of Vygotskian sociocultural theory are mediation and activity theory (Wertsch, 1979) where the latter echoes the major idea that reasons for learning in a meticulous context are interwoven with “socially and institutionally defined beliefs” (Sullivan, 2000). The former notion is mediation, which suggests that human intellectual activity is “mediated by tools and signs, the foremost tool being language (Sullivan, 2000, p. 115). Wertsch, Del Río, and Álvarez (1995) describe the Neo-Vygotsky project as such: “the goal of sociocultural research is to understand the relationship between human mental functioning, on the one hand, and cultural, historical and institutionary setting, on the other hand” (p. 56). Wertsch adds that sociocultural research entails two principal premises, those of “human action and mediation”, which are the “defining moments of the sociocultural research” (p. 56).

The sociocultural theory also places a special emphasis on “Agency”. That is, learners carry to their communications in language classrooms their personal values, ideas, and postulations, etc. (Lantolf, 2000). Added to this is the fundamental role of instruction to sociolinguistic development in classroom. The theory also focuses on a key concept which is the instruction within the Zone of Proximal Development beyond the learner’s actual development level.

The Zone of Proximal Development and Scaffolding (ZPD)

Van Lier (1996) illustrates this concept as follows: “at a given point in time, there are things a person can do confidently on his or her own” (p. 190). This area is
called the "Self-Regulated" action. Beyond that there is "a range of knowledge and skills" (p. 190) which the person can only attain with someone's assistance. In the case of a performance of some complex action, then the person can accomplish the action if someone more capable is available to help. In the case of "some piece of knowledge, this becomes available because it can be linked to existing knowledge or experiences, again, perhaps with someone else's guidance" (p. 191-199). This material, which one might say is within reach, constitutes the "ZPD". Newman, Griffin, and Cole (1989), who call the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) the "Construction Zone", present another definition for this notion. It is the "changes that take place in socially mediated interaction" (p. 2). However, simply to give students a problem and some guidance presented in peer interaction or expert assistant, does not mean that one is working in the ZPD, and it is no guarantee at all that any progress will be achieved (Van Lier, 1996). For this, the work of the developmental psychologist Bruner (1983) provides interesting guidelines through his notion of "scaffolding", or as described through another metaphor 'Assisted Performance' (Poole & Patthey-Chavez, 1994; Tharp & Gallimore, 1991).

Scaffolding is defined as "a process of setting up the situation to make the child's entry easy and successful and then gradually pulling back and handing the role to the child as he becomes skilled enough to manage it" (Bruner, 1983, p. 60). Therefore, the notion of scaffolding entails a number of features that ensure working within the ZPD. These features are proposed by a number of researchers including Bruner (1983, 1996), Wells (2001), and Van Lier (1996). The first is the 'Continuity' principle which is related to the repeated occurrences of a chain of actions over an extended period of time. The second principle is the 'Contextual Support' which implies a structured activity done in a safe environment where students are involved
and errors are expected and tolerated. The ‘Intersubjectivity’ principle means that throughout the activity, the focus is on mutual engagement and “Intersubjectivity of attention” (Wells, 2001). Moreover, all actions are contingent depending on the students’ reactions. This means that certain elements in the activity can be modified, deleted, or even repeated so that students are able to understand and invest this new knowledge practically and benefit from it socially and cognitively. By doing so, the Contingency principle will be met (Van Lier, 1996).

The last two principles are the ‘Handover’ and the ‘Flow’ principles. The fifth comprises the idea of the learner being observed closely while the teacher is looking for opportunities to “hand over” parts of the action as soon as the child is ready to handle them on his/her own. The ‘Flow’ principle denotes that “actions of participants are jointly orchestrated, or synchronized in rhythmic terms, so that the interaction flows in a natural way” (Van Lier, 1996, p. 195). Nevertheless, these principles of scaffolding, claim Van Lier (1996) and Lantolf (2000), are derived from and are mainly applied on one-on-one interactions and small group activities which are illustrated in Cazden’s (1988), Palinscar’s and Brown’s (1984) studies. Consequently, Van Lier recommends what is called ‘pedagogical scaffolding’ which is suitable for large group interactions (for example, thirty students). Pedagogical Scaffolding is a “multilayered (at least three-layered) teaching strategy consisting of episodes, sequences of actions, and interactions which are partly planned and partly improvised” (Van Lier, 1996, p. 189-99). At every stage the emphasis of the scaffolded activity is on an understanding of, a permanent scrutinizing of, what is difficult and what is easy for the students. “It allows the teacher to keep in mind, at all times, a long-term sense of direction and continuity, a local plan of action, and a
moment-to-moment interactional decision making; it is a focus on process rather than
product" (Van Lier, 1996, p. 199).

To sum up, researchers working from a socio-cultural perspective have
disputed that interaction itself is a place for learning. For instance, when a more
proficient interlocutor maintains, or scaffolds, a learner socially, cognitively, and
affectively. During interaction, the learner is offered the opportunity to expand not
only her/his linguistic abilities, but her/his cognitive and problem-solving skills as
well (Donato, 1994; Lantolf, 2000). A parallel agreement is made in the heart of the
processing model, which hypothesizes that interaction itself stimulates the sort of
intellectual activity needed for storing new data in long-term memory, thus founding
the situation through which learners can generate the links between the new material
in the input and their prior knowledge (Ellis, 1999). Interaction is also believed to
enable learners to elicit the kind of information they need at the precise time when
they need it, both developmentally and interactionally (Ellis, 1999).

Based on the above, the sociocultural theory accentuates that during
instruction, awareness of the constitution and function of language are evolved by
utilizing it socially (Donato, 2000). It also adjoins greater lucidity to the subject of
modified interaction and the negotiation of meaning in classroom settings. Rather
than entities who are inhibited by their need of understanding, teachers and learners
are given chances to mediate and help each other in the creation of the zone of
proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978) in which each individual learns and
progresses. Hence, a central concern in sociocultural theory is that learners actively
"transform their world and do not merely conform to it" (Donato, 2000, p. 46). Also
in this view is the conclusion that L2 learning is not an isolated act of cognition, but
a mediated social process, "a process gaining entry to a discourse of practitioners via apprenticeship assistance from peers and teachers" (Warschauer 1997, p. 88-89).

Modes of classroom practices for initiating and sustaining interaction

"Interaction is the collaborative exchange of thoughts, feelings, or ideas between two or more people, resulting reciprocal effect on each other" (Brown, 2001, p. 165). A study done by Green and Oxford (1995) revealed that the active use of the target language, with a strong emphasis on practice in naturalistic situations, was the most important factor in the development of acquisition and proficiency in a second language. Therefore, teachers are to adapt materials based on the requirements of a certain class. Students should feel safe, unthreatened, and non-defensive in their classroom; they are expected to interact with one another in small group and pair group tasks, which are most likely to facilitate acquisition (Larsen-Freeman 1986; 2000). In order to provide such interactions, teachers should avoid implementing a teacher centered authoritarian stance by, for example, seating students face-to-face (Savignon 1991; Taylor 1983). Besides, they should prepare activities and undertake ways that minimize tension such as games/fun activities, listening to music, and role-playing, promoting student initiative and creativity, and carrying out tasks that are motivating in themselves (Norman, Levihn, Hedenquist, 2002).

Drawing on his own research as well as synthesizing the research of others, Ellis (1988), argued that the following factors were apt to enhance Second Language acquisition in instructional context: First, the quantity of intake. Second, a need to communicate; here the teacher's role is very crucial where he/she creates questions that are of students' interests and experience. Third, a choice on the part of the learners over what is said should be made. This means that the students initiate the
learning process and do all the work. An example of this is illustrated in Barnes’s (1976) classic book *From Communication to Curriculum*, which shows the potential benefits of engineering classroom interactions so that the focus is mainly on the learners rather than the teacher. While the episode took place in a content classroom, the results could apply to any classroom. The input data for the task was a poem entitled “the Bully Asleep”, in which the teacher fails to interfere when a group of children frighten a sleeping bully. Barnes (1976) arranged the students in small groups. He simply told them to talk about the poem in any way they like and let him know when they are done. He then recorded and analyzed the resulting small group discussions. From his analysis, Barnes concluded that the task succeeded because:

> The absence of a teacher has placed control of learning strategies in the pupils’ hands. In this case, since no task was set, the children control the questions they choose to ask.…. 
> The teacher’s absence removes from their work the usual authority…. Their in their discussion the children, not only formulate hypothesis, but compelled to evaluate it for themselves…. (p. 25)

The fourth factor is uninhibited practice, where the students build on their own learning experiences, express their own opinions, ideas, and feelings, guided by the teacher. Students decide what language to use in different situations that their teacher presents in the classroom. Role-plays and simulations help to make the classroom a lively and rich-in-communicative language environment, for learners of different abilities (Nunan 1995). Fifth, is the existence of performance of a variety of speech acts. Finally, an input rich in “extending” utterances; these are teacher’s
utterances that rise, intricate, or in other ways expand the learner’s contribution or participation (Ellis, 1988).

These same principles were also presented more recently, though under different subheadings, and are considered the foundation stone of the Interaction Theory. They guide the teacher how to initiate interaction. As presented by Brown (2001), the principles are: Automacity, intrinsic motivation, risk-taking, the language-culture connection, interlanguage, communicative competence, and strategic investment. According to the automacity principle, interaction is accomplished when attention is mainly on meaning where learners are liberated from language in a controlled mode and can more easily “proceed to automatic modes of processing” (p.166). Intrinsic motivation denotes that as students become engaged with each other in speech acts “of fulfillment and self-actualization, their deepest drives are satisfied” (p. 166). The third principle is risk-taking which means that students are vulnerable to failing to produce and/or interpret intended meaning. In addition, they might be laughed at or shunned. However, the risk is worth taking because the rewards are great. The fourth factor is language-culture connection where interactive speech requires that interlocutors be “thoroughly versed in the cultural nuances of language” (Brown, 2001, p. 166). Interlanguage suggests that the complexity of interaction entails a long developmental process of acquisition.

Numerous errors of production and comprehension will be a part of this development. The sixth notion is communicative competence which includes all of its elements: grammatical, sociolinguistic, pragmatic, and strategic. The final factor is strategic investment which requires judicious use of numerous strategies for production and comprehension (Brown, 2001, p. 165-66).
One of the best ways for creating interactive learning is the teacher's development of a range of questioning strategies (Brown, 2001). That is, the teacher should think of a variety of questions beginning with display questions that try to elude information already known by the teacher, all the way to highly referential questions that demand information; sometimes answers to the latter entail opinion about facts that are not clear or a assertion of values (Kinsella, 1991) - following Kinsella's (1991) and Bloom's (1956) typical categories of question words. However, Kinsella (1991) asserts, that teachers should be very careful about a continual attachment to certain kinds of questions that may actually suppress interactive learning. These questions are display questions, so obvious questions, vague questions, complex-language/too wordy questions, rhetorical questions, and random questions (that don't fall into logical or well-planned sequence). The TALK project (Myhill, Jones, & Hopper, 2006), as the name suggests, investigated students talk versus teachers talk in the classroom. It identified certain kinds of questions which promote interaction and are used in interactive settings. Such questions include: 'Speculative' questions which invite a response with no predetermined answer, often opinions, hypothesis, and imagining ideas. These encourage "Building on Thinking" making children think about the ideas and concepts; this moves ideas forward, unlike checking understanding questions which look back at ideas already covered (Myhill et al., 2006; p. 142). Examples of 'Speculative' questions are: Do you have any idea what that could mean? What is your opinion about "X"? If "X" changes, what do you think might happen then? The TALK project also sheds light on expert teachers who are found to encourage participation by selecting his/her comments, responses, and questions. For example, she must draw as much as possible on students' own experience. Besides, an expert teacher should also be a
good listener for children. This is manifested by inviting the students to extend, elaborate, and justify their answers.

Kinsella (1991) also affirmed that there are other strategies which promote interaction. The first group includes pair and group work which are featured in games, role-play and simulations, projects, interviews, jigsaw, opinion exchange, problem solving, hypothesis testing, and decision making. The second group of strategies is summarized by giving direction, organizational language, and reacting to students (praise, recognition). The third group is considered as an excellent means of inspiring the learner to develop tools of interaction (Brown, 2001; Kinsella, 1991). It is related to responding genuinely to student-initiated questions, and encouraging students to develop their own strategies.

However, most importantly is that all of the above activities and strategies are being employed in naturalistic situations (Green & Oxford, 1995). This is added to the six factors which Ellis (1988), supporting Kinsella’s (1991) suggestions, affirms as essential for enhancing L2 Acquisition within instructional context. These recommendations confirm Hargreaves et al’s (2002) definition of interactivity as “the relationship between the number of statements and questions”, which depends on “the ratio of questions to statements- the higher the ratio of questions to statements, the more interactive the teaching” (Hargreaves, Hislam, & English, 2002; p. 9)

Empirical studies on interaction (in general) and acquisition

Ellis (1984) published a study reporting his investigations. Ellis set out to investigate the effects of approximately three hours of teaching on the ability of thirteen children between the ages of eleven and thirteen to ask wh-questions. At the beginning and again at the end of the three-hour instructional period, the children were given cue cards for what, who, where, and when, and were asked to make up
questions based on a picture of a classroom scene. Ellis found that there was no considerable increase for the thirteen children as a whole in their ability to use wh-questions, although different children did show a noticeable improvement. When reverting to the lesson transcripts, he found out that the quality rather than the quantity of interactions counted. When the teaching sequences included communicatively rich conversations, in which the learners were expected to participate in relatively natural interactions, rather than direct drills, they showed more development.

In addition, while investigating the immersion programs in Canada Harley and Swain (1984) found that children's second language development was not as advanced as it should be. They concluded that this was due to the basic instructional pattern. Teachers talked a great deal and students very little. This kind of one side interaction or domination (from the teacher's side or only on few students' part), Karp and Yoels (1987) warns against. Interaction should be mutual, because interaction is seen as a social process that involves frequent student-to-student and teacher-to-student interaction in a caring environment (Perkins 1992). A caring environment is a structured one where the teacher's job is to help students construct, transform, and extend knowledge. It's also where the teacher helps students keep an open mind, be willing to listen and to learn, discuss and argue, etc. Besides, students are given the chance to construct their own knowledge and understandings through active social interaction with peers and teacher (Johnson, Johnson, Smith, 1991).

Still the crucial role that interaction plays in L2 acquisition and learning facilitation, is shown in the works of many researchers such as Shopov and Fedotof (2000), High (1993), and Johnson and Johnson (1989), where the latter asserted that teachers should encourage students to develop effective group communication skills
(interactive social skills), by recognizing, explicating and rewarding students for taking part in effective social interaction activities. Skills such as turn taking, offering constructive and encouraging criticism, and actively participating in-group discussions are but a few important skills that students must learn in order to maximize communication in the target language.

Montgomery and Eisenstein (1985) carried out a study in Canada which also supported the idea that opportunities to practice the language in communicative situations were important for language acquisition. They carried out an experiment in which a controlled group received grammar instruction only. An experimental group got instruction plus chances to use their language communicatively outside the classroom. At the end of the experiment, they tested both groups and found out that the experimental group surpassed the control group in the tests of communicative interaction and those of grammar, even though they had received moderately less grammatical instruction. This same conclusion has been reached by Schmidt and Forta (1986), who carried out a case study on his own experience (Schmidt’s experience) learning Portuguese in Brazil. He found that formal instruction and opportunities to communicate out of class were both necessary for acquisition.

Extensive research was undertaken in the nineties to investigate the importance of opportunities to interact in the target language to acquisition. Spada (1990) reviewed much of the research carried out by herself and others in Canada. Spada summarized studies that investigated three types of curricular organizations. According to Spada (1990), the first is Traditional curricula (grammar-translation) which focused on grammar teaching and drills. The second type was immersion courses in which content is presented in target language, but there’s no formal instruction in grammar. The last one was “communicative” classes, in which learners
were given opportunities to deploy their language in communication. Spada (1990) concluded that classrooms that were “communicative” in orientation, but that contained opportunities for explicit grammatical instruction were supreme to both other curricula.

Lim’s (1992) 2-year period longitudinal study discussed the relationship between the extent to which the learners use the target language and both qualitative and quantitative aspects of acquisition. She found that the frequency (quantity) and the quality of the learner participation (talk), such as the sort of speech acts and the control of conversational management skills directly influenced acquisition. Furthermore, learner participation in class related drastically to advances in language proficiency. In other words, those who used language more progressed more rapidly. Wu (1994) found that in addition to formal instruction, opportunities to trigger knowledge through output activities (e.g. conversations), was a significant feature in acquisition.

It is clear, from the studies reviewed in this section that interaction in the target language makes a difference for language acquisition. It seems that, in order to maximize the effects of instruction, learners need opportunities to use the structures they are learning in communicative interaction.

Forms and kinds of mediation

In order to improve their knowledge of the target language, learners must constantly match or compare their learned language with the target. Noticing differences between the two is the primary step towards filling the gap. The significance of first recognizing a structure in order to acquire it is articulated in the “noticing hypothesis” (Schmidt, 1990) as well. However, noticing novel structures while focusing on the target language input for meaning, or linking input and output
while trying to conveying the message, frequently outstrips the learner’s capability. Corrective feedback offers support in handing with the matching problem. Comparing the learner’s utterance and its corresponding version in the target language brings the learner’s attention to structures that have not been learned, thus inaugurating a learning process (Schmidt, 1990). This is added to the claims proposed by Swain (1985; 1998) that output may affect noticing and endorse L2 acquisition. It acts as oral training, assists fluency and supplies learners with the occasion to examine hypotheses about the rules they have developed for the target language (Swain, 1995).

Corrective feedback

Since various but generally compatible theoretical notions drive assertions about the advantages of interaction, it can be difficult to separate the different aspects of interaction that have been assumed to be developmentally useful. An enormous number of studies have noted down positive outcomes for interaction in general (Mackey, 1999; Silver, 2000), since it supplies learners with opportunities to make modified output (Swain, 1995), as well as in relation to specific interactional variables such as feedback (recasts and prompts) (Leeman, 2003; Philip, 2003). Moreover, researchers have maintained that developmentally helpful interactional chances for learners incorporate getting comprehensible input, attaining feedback, being compelled to make target-like changes in output, and having opportunities to examine linguistic hypotheses (Ayoun, 2001; Leeman, 2003; Mackey, 2003; Nabei & Swain, 2002; and others). “Corrective Feedback” provides a response to an ill-formed utterance (Oliver, 2000) and, consequently, different types of errors (syntactic/lexical) evoke different kinds of negative feedback (Explicit /recasts/negotiation). According to the Interaction Hypothesis, feedback obtained
during interaction can contain explicit correction and metalinguistic explanations, in addition to more clarification requests, confirmation checks, repetitions, and recasts (Long, 1996; Gass, 1997; Pica, 1994). Other researchers have stressed on interactional profits with respect to scaffolding, depth of processing, and input control (Donato, 1994; Ellis, 1999; Lantolf, 2000).

Negotiation

A considerable number of researches demonstrated the beneficial role of interaction in general (Mackey, 1999; Silver, 2000) as well as in relation to specific interactional variables—namely different kinds of “Corrective Feedback”. Scholars such as Leeman (2003), Long (1996), and Philip (2003) have studied the effectiveness of “Recasts” or “Negotiation-of-Form”. On the other hand, some researchers focused on the “Negotiation-of-Meaning” or “Prompts” benefits while emphasizing the comprehensibility of meaning in student-student and teacher-student interactions (Lyster, 2002; Havranek, 2002). However, all studies that investigated the different forms and features of corrective feedback emphasized that teachers should be very careful about correcting students’ mistakes, how, and when the correction is done (Ehrlich & Zoltek, 2006; Norman et al, 2002). Students should not be disgraced by ironic remarks, tone of voice, or facial expression (Ehrlich & Zoltek, 2006).

An important feature in the teacher-student, student-teacher, and student-student interaction is “Negotiation”. Negotiation, by definition, “focuses on the comprehensibility of message meaning and on the message’s form only on so far as that can contribute to its comprehensibility. Learners and their interlocutors find ways to communicate messages through negotiation, but necessarily with target-like form” (Pica, 1994, p. 498). However, many researchers differentiated between the
different kinds of negotiation (Lyster, 2002), and the effectiveness of each kind. The first is negotiation of meaning or meaning-focused negotiation, and the second is negotiation of form or form-focused negotiation. Lyster warns that, form-focused negotiation is totally different from and superior to explicit corrections. In the first the teacher withholds correct forms and instead prompts, or incorporates ways of “pushing” students to retrieve correct forms from what they have already said (Lyster, 2002; Pica, 1994; Swain, 1985; 1998), while in the other she supplies the correct form and directly indicates that what the student has said is incorrect.

Also based on research findings, is the conclusion that corrective feedback has a facilitating effect on second language acquisition (Long, 1996). Several experiments involving adult learners demonstrate the superiority of corrective feedback over mere input (Ayoun, 2001; Carroll, Swain, Roberge, 1992). The findings of classroom studies are similar. Learners in content-based and communicative language classes show considerable gain in accuracy if communication tasks are complemented by feedback and other types of focus on form (Doughty & Varela, 1997; Lyster, 2002). In addition, the success of feedback is strongly shaped by situational and linguistic elements the most significant of which is the learner’s own involvement in the correction sequence (Lyster, 2002). It is most likely to be successful if the learner is able to provide a correct form when he/she is informed about the error. Moreover, if the correction is provided by a peer or by the teacher, the success rate is likely to increase if the learner repeats the correct version. Mere recasts without learner contribution - negotiation, are least effective for all learners (auditor and participator) (Ayoun, 2001; Havranek, 2002; Lyster, 2002; Mackey, Oliver, and Leeman, 2003; Oliver, 2002).
Meaning-Focused Negotiation/Negotiation of Meaning (Prompts)

According to Long (1996), negotiation of meaning entails different types of interactional features. These are: input modifications (stress on key words, decomposition, partial self-repetition), semantically contingent responses (recasts, repetition, expansion), and conversational modifications (confirmations, confirmation checks, comprehension checks, and clarification requests) (Long, 1996).

There is a major premise, which ensued from the theories of L2 interaction dissatisfaction with Krashen’s (1985) CIH, that L2 input does not spontaneously or necessarily lead to acquisition. Hatch (1978) was one of the first researchers to deliberate the negotiation of meaning issue (Pica, 1994). She suggested that interaction should be researched as connected with language learning development, not as pertinent to the syntax of language. Consequently, she hypothesized that the learners’ progress is the outcome of real-life interaction rather than communicative competence resulting from the repeated practice of structures. Long (1981) adopted this view to be further investigated and elaborated upon. Based on his direct observation, Long noticed that L1 (First Language) speakers were trying to elicit a better quality from the L2 learners by giving them verbal feedback which was not understood by the learners-hearers. However, following Krashen’s (1985) earlier model, the speakers’ input has been ‘finely tuned’ to the immediate needs of the L2 learner, and thus, being made more understandable for the learners. Hence, the input was made ‘comprehensible’ as a result of interaction. This comprehensible-finely tuned input is termed by Long (1981) “Modified Interaction”. Long suggested that this modified interaction was the result of a set of practices performed on both sides (learner/hearer and speaker). These were: confirmation checks, comprehension
checks, and clarification requests. Pica, Young, and Doughty (1987) took this a step further when they proposed that this “Modified Interaction” was not the result of one-route procedure of feedback from L1 speaker to L2 learner. It was rather the outcome of a course of “Negotiation of Meaning” between the interlocutor (L1 speaker and/or teacher-Macaro, 2003) and L2 learner in order to reach a comprehensible conversation for both parties. Pica and her associates’ conclusion resulted from studying the interaction patterns of sixteen low-intermediate learners of L2 (English). The subjects were divided into two groups and were asked to follow two different directions needed to perform the same thirty-minutes listening task of assembling a portrait. For the first group, the directions were pre-modified by the L1 speakers (simpler syntactic structures). As for the second, L2 learners were pushed to ask for clarification. This means that in the second group the input was not pre-modified and, consequently, meaning was being negotiated. The researchers discovered that negotiation helped students in comprehending the directions of the task and, consequently, better performed the assigned task. Besides, the negotiation process led to an increase (quantity) in suitable input, and a more appropriate quality of input (for the learners). Moreover, those who were only listeners assured that they benefited more from negotiation of meaning than from listening to pre-modified input. Accordingly, Pica, Young, and Doughty (1987) concluded that negotiation of meaning is a powerful instrument for comprehension.

After that, numerous studies were carried out on the same issue and same results were attained. For instance, Penate Cabrera and Bazo Martinez (2001) investigated how under two different conditions (directions) a sample of sixty Spanish primary-school children studying English as a foreign language performed differently. The children were able to follow the storyline (they have been listening
to the story) better when they were given chances to negotiate the meaning, as compared to pre-modified/simplified text.

Recent work presented by Lyster (2002) identified four interactional moves (prompts) to improve the accuracy of students’ non-target output. The first move is clarification requests where the teacher indicates to the student, by using “pardon me” and “I don’t understand”, that the utterance is ill-formed in some way, and that a repetition or a reformulation is required. Repetition, where the teacher repeats the student’s errors, regulating the intonation to draw attention to the false utterance, is the second move. The third one is metalinguistic clues. The teacher presents comments, information, or questions related to the ill-formedness of a student’s expression, without plainly giving the correct form. For instance, is it masculine or feminine? Fourth, elicitations which are used to obtain correct forms from the students by asking questions such as “how do we say that in English?” or by pausing to allow the learner to complete the interlocutor’s utterance (it is a...?); or by asking students to reframe their speeches (try again) (Lyster, 2002; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Morris, 2005).

Negotiation of meaning has been found effective not only in listening comprehension, but in acquiring new vocabulary as well. According to Macaro (2003) “not all vocabulary acquisition occurs in receptive learning tasks” (p. 75). Interactive Listening (in both directions/learner-speaker and speaker-learner), by negotiating meaning, clearly leads to enhanced comprehension as compared to solely listening to L1 speaker.

Although a big number of researches emphasized that learners can select new vocabulary while they are listening or being read to a text, however, in order to notice the difficult-to-be-comprehended new word, learners must be given enough
processing time. Consequently, the processing time is solely gained if the learner tries to negotiate meaning (Macaro, 2003). Ellis (1995) and Ellis and He (1999) investigated the effect of the various types of input during oral task on vocabulary learning. The learners in Ellis (1995) obtained either modified input, pre-modified input, and interactionally modified input. The results were that more word meanings were learnt from interactionally modified input as compared to modified input. Nevertheless, modified input produced a faster rate of acquisition. However, Nation (2001) claimed that the success of these three forms of modified input is contingent to the quality of the input in the first place.

On the other hand, Ellis and He (1999) studied fifty students learning English as L2. These were divided into three groups depending on the kind of input they were receiving. The first group was the pre-modified input group, the second was the interactionally modified input group, and the third was the modified output group. In the last group interaction took place between two students. Contrasting other studies, the three groups obtained the same quantity of time for the dispensation of the new vocabulary to take place. The researchers found that the third group surpassed the other two groups on three aspects. These were comprehension (understanding the meaning), vocabulary recognition, and vocabulary production. The scholars also concluded that negotiation for producing new words helps the students in processing these words more deeply more than mere listening tasks can do (Ellis and He, 1999).

*Form-Focused Negotiation/Negotiation of Form (Recasts)*

One type of semantically contingent feedback that figures in the Long (1996) taxonomy of negotiation of form strategies is the “Recast”. A “Recast”, as defined by Long (1996), is “a well-formed reformulation of a learner’s utterance with the
original meaning intact” (p. 416), or it is an “implicit target-like reformulation of a learner’s utterance” (Lyster, 2002, p. 385).

Recasts and Negotiation of Form: Research Findings

Recasts (Macaro, 2003) are utterances by the teacher that “repeat the student’s incorrect utterance but make the minimal changes needed to reproduce a correct utterance, not change the meaning in anyway” (p. 51). A recast may also emphasize different aspects varying from stress on the “corrected language element, to an immediate pose before it, or a louder voice during it, to body language and so on” (Macaro, 2003, p. 51).

One of the most important questions about recasts, which are very highly persisting in communicative classrooms, is whether they lead to ‘Uptake’ by the learner. In other words, whether learners notice the recast as a feedback, consider it carefully, and consequently modify the targeted language form, or not. Sure these questions are raised by researchers following Schmidt’s ‘Noticing’ hypothesis which emphasizes that noticing a particular feedback is necessary for uptake (Schmidt, 1990). For instance, in a study published in (1994), Doughty noticed that recasts represented sixty percent of teacher feedback. Though these aimed at correcting single and small errors in the students’ utterances, she found no evidence that the students noticed the corrective feedback. Supporting these findings, Lochtman’s research (2000) in German foreign classes in Belgium showed that recasts provided very low uptake by the learners.

On the other hand, Havranek (1999) investigated, along with other research questions, whether the teacher’s recorded 1700 recasts led to improved performance in the tests. She found out that half of the errors were made again either differently or in the same way. Havranek (2002) studied some situational factors which might
influence the success of corrective feedback and found that the learner, who committed the error and his/her peers, would use the corrected form successfully “if the learner is invited to self-correct and is able to do so” (p. 261). Doughty and Varela (1997) conducted a research in middle school ESL (learning English as a Second Language) in Science classes. The researchers questioned whether focusing on form may interrupt the communicative direction of the lesson. They deduced that some kinds of focus on form are unremarkable and highly effective if they are cautiously planned and employed on a narrow focus. Nevertheless, all the above researchers stressed on the fact that recasts should be salient. This point was disputed by Nicholas, Lightbown, and Spada (2001) who claimed, after extensive observations, that when teachers get familiar with their students recurring mistakes, “they will be able to understand the learners’ meaning in spite of the errors and will offer a recast as a natural, almost conversational type of feedback” (p. 741). Consequently, “the recast lacks salience and disappears in the background of the discourse” (Macaro, 2003, p. 53).

After an in-depth metanalysis of a group of studies, Lyster and Renta (1997) identified six main kinds of corrective feedback in L2 classroom interactions. These were: explicit corrections, recasts, elicitation, metalinguistic clues, clarification requests, and repetition. Although recasts were the most used corrective feedback-to-error technique, yet they produced the lowest quantity of repair. On the contrary, the five other forms of corrective feedback not only caused a higher rate of uptake (noticing the feedback), but also highest rates of self and peer repair as well. Also researching the effectiveness of recasts, Ellis, Basturkmen, and Loewen (2001) undertook a study in three adult classes studying English in New Zealand. Contrary to all the above studies, Ellis, Basturkmen, and Loewen (2001) reported that there
were high levels of uptake even in response to recasts. They also noticed that the recasts didn’t affect negatively the communicative orientation of the lesson. Besides, they found that recasts were no problem for adult learners but may be so with younger learners Ellis, Basturkmen, and Loewen (2001). Hence, as Macaro (2003) sees it, it is the “saliency of the correct form that leads to acquisition not merely the provision of implicit negative evidence” (p. 56).

Meaning-Focused negotiation or Form-Focused negotiation?

The argument against corrective feedback which has often been exposed as a paradox should be mentioned. Chaudron (1988) summarized it as follows: teachers can either disrupt communication by their formal correction or overlook errors so that interaction proceeds. Nevertheless, many researchers such as Doughty (2001), Spada and Lightbown (1993), and van Lier (1996) claimed that this might be a false paradox. Therefore, they warned that teachers do not have to choose between communication on the one hand and corrective feedback on the other, because they can integrate both during teacher-student interaction. Besides, to be a useful notion in SLA (Second Language Acquisition) research and classroom pedagogy, negotiation needs to account for corrective feedback and include both focus on form and meaning (Lyster, 2002).

Group work in interactive classroom

Other scholars such as Pica (1994) who criticized the “Meaning-Negotiation” interactive model of L2 acquisition by claiming that it’s not adequately comprehensive to illustrate acquisition. She reviewed the limitations of meaning negotiation as a way for learning and concluded that negotiation can only tackle all aspects of L2 learning. That is, negotiation rarely focuses on morphology. Besides, Macaro (2003) confirmed that “there is more evidence of acquisition of lexis as a
result of modified interaction than there is on acquisition of grammatical patterns of the target language" (p. 187).

Moreover, Wu (1998) asserted that this kind of interaction can not cover most verbal exchanges in L2 classroom since there is inconsiderable amount of meaning negotiation in practice. This means that some learners do not take part in interaction unless the input is understood. This is added to the fact that interaction is parallel to acquisition and not the consequence of a linear process (Wu, 1998). Consequently, Wu (1998) introduced a more dynamic and complex model of interaction which is beyond the scope of this research. In addition, Macaro (2003) argues that negotiation "is not often pedagogically possible in classrooms with large numbers of students" (p. 188). Based on this, many researchers such as Brooks, Donato, and McGlone (1997), Ellis and He (1999), Iwashita (2001), stressed on the effectiveness of pair and group interaction for indulging the greatest number of students in class talk and for obtaining modified input. They also emphasized that oral pair-work tasks should not be judged as successful based on the correctness of the used language (Brooks, Donato, McGlone, 1997). At the same time, Anton and DiCamilla (1998) and Knight (1996) found that negotiating meaning among pairs in L1 for the meanings of unknown words resulted in learning new words as much as negotiation in L2 did.

Additionally, while the majority of the students reacted favorably to pair and group work, teachers avoided using pair and group work (Macaro, 2003; 1997) because they thought that students might go "off task, off topic and off target Language" (p. 190) and they counted the students using of L1 during interaction is off task (Macaro, 2003; 1997).

Brown (2001) discussed the advantages of group work. According to him, as well as to others such as Norman et al (2002), one of these advantages is giving
students more opportunities to speak and, hence, fostering the variety and the quality of the interactive language (output). Small group work provides chances for learner's initiation, for mutual discussions, for exercises in meaning-focused discussions, for conversational exchanges, and for individual students' roles that would be otherwise unfeasible (Brown, 2001). However, group work does not mean simply putting students into group and leaving them doing what they could have done individually. Many factors should be accounted for when assigning group work. First, the objective of the task/activity should be considered carefully. Different objectives entail different group size and techniques. For instance, pair practice is especially suited to most types of text work, grammar exercises, and vocabulary work. On the other hand, working in small groups is particularly convenient for activities directed towards discussion, freer conversation, role-play, problem-solving, projects, interviews, information gap, jigsaw, opinion exchange, and drama (Brown, 2001; Norman et al, 2002). Second, the activities must feel meaningful and realistic to the students (Norman et al, 2002). Third, the teacher must be the monitor of the task and he/she should always be there for establishing affective supports (Brown, 2001; Norman et al, 2002).

The impact of teachers' beliefs on their practice (promoting interaction) in language teaching.

Many factors intervene in and constitute the education equation. However, Sanders (1988) claimed that among many factors which might affect students' performance is the classroom teacher.

Richards and Lockhart (1996) state that "teachers' belief systems are founded on the goals, values, and beliefs teachers hold in relation to the content and process of teaching, and their understanding of the systems in which they work and their
roles within it” (p. 30). These beliefs and values function as the background to much of the teachers’ decision making and action, and hence constitute what has been termed the “culture of teaching”. Richards and Lockhart (1996) summarizes that teachers’ belief systems are derived from a number of different sources (Kindsvatter, Willen, and Isher, 1988). These are: their own experience as language learners, their experience of what operates best, established practice, personality factors, educational based or research-based principles based on an approach or method (p. 30-31). Borg’s (1998) one-teacher study conveys that the teacher’s pedagogical system was sculpted by educational and professional experiences in his/her life. The teacher in this study was strongly affected by his/her initial training. The teacher’s experience familiarized him with communicative methodology and cultivated his beliefs in student-centeredness, which had a direct and permanent influence on his practice teaching.

Elbaz (1983) conceptualized the sort of knowledge that teachers embrace and exploit as practical knowledge. She identified the content of practical knowledge as “knowledge of self, the milieu of teaching, subject matter, curriculum development, and instruction” (p. 45). Research in language classrooms shows that the teachers’ beliefs, feelings and needs, combined with experience and theoretical knowledge, usually guide their language instructional practices. Teacher perceptions regarding how languages are learned also play a crucial role in that they determine a teacher’s willingness to experiment with new approaches (Li, 1998). For example, Pennington and Richards (1997) study five English teachers in Hong Kong, who failed to implement Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) principles and practices in their classrooms. They suggest that the reason for their failure was the teachers’ preexisting ideas for teaching founded on their learning experiences as students in
Hong Kong. Other researchers such as Fenstermacher (1994) discussing the same issue, argued that teachers rely to a large extent on their practical knowledge. Practical Knowledge is the knowledge which students create as a result of their experiences as teachers and their contemplations on these experiences. In addition, Meijer, Verloop, and Beijaard (1999) concluded that practical knowledge has the following characteristics: It's personal and unique for each teacher, based on reflection on experience-indicating that it derives from and advances through experiences in teaching, is chiefly implicit, directs teachers' practice, and is associated with the subject that is taught.

Examples from empirical studies on the teachers' beliefs and practice of CLT

Li's (1998) study, surveying eighteen South Korean secondary EFL teachers in 1995 and interviewing ten teachers, shows that the difficulties of applying CLT from those teachers are divided into four categories: difficulties from the teachers are incompetence in English, lack in strategic and sociolinguistic competence, deficiency of training in CLT, fallacies about CLT, and the little time for upgrading materials for communicative classes. The second category is related to those difficulties originated from the students' low English proficiency, lack of motivation for developing communicative competence, and resistance to class participation. A third category summarizes difficulties coming from the educational system such as large classes, grammar based examinations, and lack of support. The last category is related to insufficient account of EFL teaching, and lack of effective assessment instruments. Wang (2000) investigates English teachers at tertiary level in China to know to what extent English teachers have utilized the strategic novel practices associated with CLT. The findings show that it might not be the training the
respondents received, but the type of students they taught that determined the extent to which they applied innovative practices in their teaching.

Teachers' use of L1 in L2 classrooms

Based on the information collected from surveys and questionnaires, filled by teachers and students, on whether L1 should be banned from the L2 classroom, (Macaro, 2002) found clear evidence that it shouldn't. Additionally, codeswitching in L2 classroom should be considered a valuable communication strategy and "forbidding learners to code switch will result in them not being able to learn how to use it sparingly and in a principled way" (Macaro, 2003, p. 41-42). Teacher codeswitching may also be a way of modeling substantial learning strategies for learners to consider- "strategies which learners can deploy to lighten their cognitive load" (p. 42). Crystal (1987) suggested that code, or language, switching takes place when a person who is bilingual shifts between two languages during his/her conversation with another bilingual individual. A bilingual person may be considered to be the one who can communicate, to certain extents, in a second language. Berthold, Mangubhai and Bartorowicz (1997) considered that code switching exists where "speakers change from one language to another in the midst of their conversations" (p. 213). However, there's no evidence that teacher codeswitching correlates with increased learner use of L1 in oral interaction.

Conversely, there is no proof yet that excluding the L1 from the classroom results in better L2 learning (Macaro, 2001; Macaro & Mutton 2002). Moreover, eliminating codeswitching from classrooms, especially beginner and lower intermediate classrooms, may lead to a number of undesirable pedagogical practices, for example "teacher domination of discourse or obstacles to learner-centered oral interaction"(p. 42). Evidence on this is found in Macaro (1997) about novice teachers and in
Macaro and Mutton (2002) about experienced teachers. Nevertheless, more research should be conducted about teachers' codeswitching and acquisition Macaro (2003). Learners' experience with L2

There are other factors involved in complicating the relationship between interaction, noticing and acquisition (Kuiken and Vedder, 2002). These are L2 proficiency and group dynamics. As stated by Long (1996), interactions seem to take place particularly in case of an information difference, when learners with different levels of L2 proficiency interrogate each other's linguistic propositions. For less proficient learners, this knowledge gap is definitely a benefit; they are able to benefit from the right solutions offered by more advanced learners. The opposite, however, may not always be the case: an incorrect structure suggested by a less expert learner may be recognized by other learners simply because he/she has a more assertive personality and more social esteem (Storch, 2002). Accordingly, the course of the classroom teacher talk (instruction explanations etc...) should be pointed towards the average levels of proficiency in the classroom where group work tasks present chances for the teacher to handle several proficiency issues (Brown, 2001).

Interaction is believed to assist the necessary links between input, output, feedback, scaffolding, processing, and control that can aid the understanding and acquisition process for a range of features of the target language (Mackey, 2003). In order to be effective in group/pair work and/or whole class discussions, interactive learning entails a set of practices, on both teachers' and students' behalves, such as corrective feedback (for example, recasts) and negotiation etc. However, most importantly is the quality of interaction on both sides and in both directions (teacher-student or learner-speaker or vice versa, and student-student or learner-learner) where the 'input' and 'output' must be salient and 'comprehensive'; however, all taking
place in naturalistic settings. These points have always been focused on in theoretical and in research work presented by researchers such as, Ellis (1995), Macaro (2003), Nation (2001), Swain (1985), and many others.

This chapter presented the different and numerous cognitivists and socioculturalists scholars with their different views on interaction. It also discussed how interaction is a crucial requirement for language acquisition. It was clear that learning is a mediated process, in and outside the classroom, the goal of which is its progression and not its product. This process should be continuously scaffolded. In school settings interactive teaching entails a number of features the heart of which is the students: being given time to express themselves when right and when asked for corrections and reformulations. However, corrections should neither be direct nor humiliating to the student. In addition, language should be practiced in authentic tasks. It should also be presented to the students working in naturalistic settings.

In the next chapter, interactive teaching and learning as presented in the above literature review will be compared to the teaching process in the three class levels (grades six, seven, and eight) in the two public schools in Tyre.
Chapter III

Methodology

The aim of this research was to explore whether the teachers of the seventh, eighth, and ninth graders in the public schools of Tyre encourage oral interaction or not, how and why they do it. The term interaction is used in diverse contexts such as “theories of linguistic descriptions, modes of second language acquisition, and instructional exchanges between teachers and learners and learners and learners” (Brown and Rodgers, 2002, p. 79). In this research paper, the word interaction refers to the instructional exchanges between the tutor (teacher) and the student and between the pupils. In this sense, these interactions between the teacher and the student are associated with teacher questions, teacher error corrections, quantity of teachers’ talk, teacher explanations, and teacher “wait time” for student responses (Brown and Rodgers, 2002). Hence, encouraging oral interaction necessitates a set of inevitable practices such as the general classroom’s physical environment, interaction initiation techniques (e.g., questioning) sustaining interaction techniques, and error corrections. Out of four public schools in Tyre, only two were chosen for the study. The study is limited to these two because one of the other two schools does not have an English section for the third cycle. Moreover, entering the fourth one was not feasible because of the principal’s objection.

Why choosing qualitative research?

Many researchers such as Brown and Rodgers (2002), Scott and Usher (1999), and Thomas (1998), emphasized that the research question and type determine the research approach (qualitative or quantitative). That is, the subject and event suitability along with the context appropriateness ascertain the type of research method. Accordingly, there were many reasons which necessitated the usage of a
qualitative approach as a framework for this study. Based on Brown’s and Rodgers’ (2002) assertion that “classroom research is considered a qualitative research approach,” and on the aim of this research which is to explore the general reality (Brown & Rodgers, 2002; Scott & Usher, 1999; Thomas, 1998) of interaction between teachers and students in the classroom and not to test hypotheses (quantitative research), the qualitative research methodology was most pertinent for this project.

Why using questionnaires, interviews, and direct observation?

The three direct-data gathering techniques— the direct observation, teachers and students interviews, and the questionnaires—were used at the same time with the same sample of teachers and students for various reasons. According to Brown and Rodgers (2002), Scott and Usher (1999) and Thomas (1998), each of these techniques has its advantages and disadvantages. Hence, when one technique leaves some uncovered gaps, one of the other two or both of them will rectify this weakness.

Interviews allow the researcher to gather different kinds of data such as the interviewee’s interests, values, plans, etc (Brown & Rodgers, 2002; Scott & Usher, 1999; and Thomas, 1998). It also enables the investigator in education to restate or simplify questions (for example, translating into the interviewee’s mother tongue—the case in this research) which the informant does not understand. It can even give the respondent more space to elaborate on his/her opinions (Brown & Rodgers, 2002; Scott & Usher, 1999; and Thomas, 1998). Besides, as compared to questionnaires, interviews are more suitable for collecting information about opinions of “people whose reading and writing skills are limited” (Thomas, 1998, p. 69). This was the case when conducting this research where some teachers left certain questions in the questionnaire unanswered or with vague responses. Answers for these questions were
clarified through direct observation and interviews. On the other hand, though transcribing interviews is time consuming, this disadvantage was overcome since the interview time (ten minutes) and the number of the interviewees was relatively small.

Questionnaires are used as a means for exploring people’s answers about “their life conditions, beliefs, or attitudes” (Thomas, 1998, p. 162). Thomas (1998) asserted that life condition is related to people’s gender, age, job, education, etc. Beliefs refer to informants “convictions about a topic” (p.162). Attitudes are “underlying tendencies for people to act in certain ways” (Thomas, 1998, p. 162) and questionnaires are designed to unveil these attitudes through the informants’ opinions. These same purposes for using questionnaires along with their advantages for being used with large samples were emphasized by Brown and Rodgers (2002) and Scott and Usher (1999). Consequently, in this paper the teachers’ education, beliefs, age, sex, philosophies in teachings, etc, were investigated in the different questions presented in the questionnaire. This technique comprised a variety of questions starting from the warm up ones to the preliminary and then the more complicated ones. These were presented in this order following Burns’ (2000) recommendations on the arrangement of questions in a questionnaire.

Observations are typically used in conducting classroom research where the observer can audio tape, video tape, or directly note down events on a checklist, rating scale, etc, (Brown & Rodgers, 2002; Burns, 2000; Scott & Usher, 1999; and Thomas, 1998). Also, the information about people who are afraid to express their attitudes and beliefs in an interview or questionnaire are better collected from direct observation. In addition, investigators resort to direct observation in order to test whether the respondents’/s’ answers about their beliefs and practices match their actual behaviors in a certain context (Brown & Rodgers, 2002; Burns, 2000; Scott &
Usher, 1999; and Thomas, 1998). This was actually the situation when implementing this study in the two schools. As will be shown in the discussion section, many of the teachers’ answers (in both the interview and the questionnaire) contradicted the students’ answers and the observation.

Consequently, triangulation- the implementation of three different techniques in a research study (Burns, 2000) – is demonstrated in this paper. Triangulation consolidates the findings are given more reliable and valid results. Brown and Rodgers (2002) defined validity as “the degree to which the results of a study can be accurately interpreted and effectively generalized”. On the other hand, reliability was defined by the two scholars as “the degree to which the results of a measure or a study are consistent” (Brown & Rodgers, 2002, p. 292-294). However, it should be emphasized that the aim of the study was to explore whether the English teachers in the two public schools encourage interaction. By this triangulation the researcher did not aim at generalizing the findings, but intended to shed light on this aspect (interaction) of the teaching learning process in these two schools in Tyre. Thus, triangulation was employed in order to increase and assure the precision of the collected data. This is simply because many critics – as claimed by Brown & Rodgers (2002), Burns (2000), and Scott & Usher (1999), and Thomas (1998) - describe qualitative research as one lacking in precision.

Interaction and interactive/communicative teaching are related to a set of behaviors, strategies, techniques, and features displayed by both teachers and students. Consequently, the three instruments which were used for carrying out this research sustained gathering information related to the way interaction took place in the observed classes. Manifestations of interactive teaching such as questioning strategies, feedback, scaffolding, group work, etc, are presented in the
questionnaires, interviews, and observations. Same aspects such as feedback, corrections, interaction - initiation, group work, etc. were clearly stressed in the questions of the three direct-data gathering techniques in order to test and compare the teachers' answers at different times.

**Implementing the research**

I contacted the principal of the aforementioned school, and the purpose of the study was clarified. After meeting him at his office and explaining the aim and the nature of the study, he in turn contacted the principal of the second school and arranged for a meeting. They both introduced me to the English coordinators and English teachers at their schools and said openly “You can enter any classroom, take notes on whatever you wish, and interview students and teachers, without any objection. You can even audio tape the conversations in the classroom”. However, they advised me that it is better if the students don’t recognize the recorder. I followed their directions, and I affirmed to every teacher and to the coordinators that their true names will be omitted and replaced by pseudonyms. Nevertheless, both principals mentioned that they do not object mentioning the names of their schools. At the same time, it was surprising to see the name of every teacher written on the questionnaire which he/she filled.

The teachers of the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades (there were eight teachers in the two schools) were interviewed (each for ten minutes) during the recesses over a period of two weeks. Others were interviewed during their free periods. Some of the questionnaires were given to the English language coordinators in both schools. Other teachers were given the questionnaires personally and the researcher translated many questions for them. Filled questionnaires were picked up from the principal’s office (in the two schools) later on (see appendices A and B).
Both the questionnaire and the interview concentrated on whether Second Language (L2) teachers promoted oral interaction or not, and how, and why they did this.

Three techniques were deployed for the implementation of this study. These were the questionnaires, the interviews, and direct observation. Students were interviewed for ten minutes in groups of five from each section of the various grade levels. Each group included students who are high achievers, low achievers, and middle achiever students in English (in L2 classrooms) of both boys and girls. The English teachers provided the researcher with a copy of the students’ mid year grades. Students from each group (high achievers, low achievers, and average students) were chosen randomly. In some classes the highest grade was fourteen over twenty, the average grades were between eight and eleven, and the lowest grades were below seven (most of them were below five). In other sections (for example grade seven- section B in school I) the highest grade was nine over twenty, and there were students who got a zero. In sections like this one, high achievers were students who got from seven to nine, average pupils were those who had marks between four thirty and six thirty, and low achievers were the students who got less than four thirty. The bulk of the questions are related to L2 use by the students, group work, and corrections.

Direct observation was carried out in the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades. In school I there were six sections of grade seven (A, B, C, D, E, and F), four sections of grade eight (A, B, C, and D) and four sections of grade nine (A, B, C, and D). Each grade level, with its different sections, is observed for one hour. In school II, there was one section for each grade level. Consequently, the total number of observation hours was fourteen in the first school and three in the second one. However, it should be mentioned that the researcher visited some sections more than
once since students were having exams and the class observation were not possible.

The observation focused mainly on the teachers' questioning strategies as related to initiating interaction and sustaining it, and to feedback. The researcher used her own rubric which was divided into two columns (two headings). The first was titled "teachers' talk" and the other "students' talk" (see TABLE 1). Classroom talk was audio taped, and at the same time notes were filled in the rubric. In case some important information was missed, the researcher resorted to the audio tapes to check for the missing parts.

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher talk</th>
<th>Student talk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiating interaction questions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Students' answers/reaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. look about the pictures for two minutes</td>
<td>1. Students looking at the pictures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What do you expect to learn?</td>
<td>2. No answer................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ................</td>
<td>3. ...............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>During interaction questions.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Students' answers/reaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Why is Valentine’s Day special?</td>
<td>2. One day in the year, and is associated with flowers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your opinion why-without referring to the book?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback</strong></td>
<td><strong>Student's reaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. T: No, because it is associated</td>
<td>1. students laugh at this students and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with flowers and...?</td>
<td>he never shares for the rest of the session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group work (directions)</td>
<td>Group work application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not found)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of teacher's talk</td>
<td>Amount of students' talk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the contents of this table will be analyzed, and the findings will be interpreted in extract 2 (page 63).

Sample Description

The sample description section reports the teachers' teaching experience and educational background. It also provides general information about the students' socio-economic status along with their distribution in each grade level and section. This information is submitted by the school's principal. The names used in this study are pseudonyms.

Teachers' educational and teaching background

In the first school there were six teachers; two males and four females.

Bassima has a Lebanese Baccalaureate degree, has seven years experience in teaching grade nine, and has lived one year in the United States. She teaches grade nine section D and grade eight sections A. Lama is the coordinator. She teaches grade nine, sections A, B, and C. She has a Teaching Diploma in English Language issued from the Lebanese University and two years experience. She is also a Teacher Training College graduate specialized in Intermediate level teaching. Iman is a teacher for grade eight, sections C and D. She has a Bachelor Degree in Social Sciences from the Lebanese University and twenty years experience in teaching.
grade eight. Kinda teaches grade seven, sections A and B. She has a Teaching Diploma from the Lebanese University, and she has no experience in teaching (first year). Nadim joined the Teacher Training College and graduated from it after he had finished the Intermediate Official Exams (Brevet). He has 28-years teaching experience, and he teaches grade seven (sections C and D) and grade eight (section B). Nasser has a Teaching Diploma in English Language and fifteen years of teaching experience. He teaches grade seven, sections F and E.

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER PROFILE</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher's name/gender</strong></td>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>Teaching Experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassima (f)</td>
<td>Lebanese Baccalaureate degree</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lama (f)</td>
<td>T.D. in Language Training graduate English Teacher College</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iman (f)</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree in Social Sciences</td>
<td>20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHOOL 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinda (f)</td>
<td>T.D.</td>
<td>First year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadime</td>
<td>Teacher Training College graduate</td>
<td>28 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasser</td>
<td>T.D.</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(f) = female/ (m) = male/ T.D. = Teaching Diploma
In the second school, there were two female teachers who teach in the third cycle. Amanda teaches grades seven, eight, and secondary classes (grade eleven). She has a Teaching Diploma issued from the Lebanese University in 1982. She stopped teaching for ten years (from 1994 to 2004) then returned two years ago after completing the educational sessions offered in the Teacher’s Training College. The other teacher, Melissa, is a Lebanese University graduate having a Teaching Diploma since 1994. She teaches grade nine and secondary classes in the same school. She also teaches English in a private school located in Tyre suburbs. She has twelve year teaching experience.

**TABLE 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL II</th>
<th>Teacher’s name/gender</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amanda (f)</td>
<td>T.D.</td>
<td>Fourteen years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melissa (f)</td>
<td>T.D.</td>
<td>Twelve years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Students' Background**

The three hundred and seventy eight students in the two schools belong to the low socio-economic class. The number of the seventh, eighth, and ninth graders in the first school is three hundred and eight students. They are distributed as follows: one hundred and ten seventh graders (twenty students in section F, twenty two in section E, twenty three in D, twenty three in C, twenty one students in section B -ten boys and eleven girls). All the students in section B are repeaters (some are third year repeaters) and consequently, their age average is fifteen. In section A there are twenty one students (six boys and fifteen girls). Many seventh graders in sections A
and B are living in an orphanage. There are ninety nine eighth graders (twenty five in section A, twenty six in B, twenty four in C, and twenty four in D). There are also ninety nine ninth graders distributed in four sections- twenty five students in each one (A, B, and C) and twenty four in section D. The number of girls as compared to the boys’ in each section of the different grade levels is approximately the same, except for grade seven section-A.

In the second school there are seventy students in cycle three. Twenty four of them are seventh graders, twenty nine students are in grade eight, and seventeen are ninth graders.

**TABLE 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Student Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Twenty one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Twenty one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Twenty three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Twenty three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Twenty two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Twenty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Twenty five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Twenty six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Twenty four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Twenty five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Twenty five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Twenty four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Twenty four</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Student Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Data Analysis procedures

The data analysis system employed in this research is inspired by the main questioning categories in the Foreign Language Interaction Analysis system (FLINT) (adopted from Brown, 2001; and originally from Flanders, 1970) which is used to study interactive language teaching. More precisely, the part related to the teacher’s talk versus student’s talk is selected from this analysis system. Interaction mediators categories, such as the form and kind of feedback (e.g., recasts, and prompts-interactional moves in negotiating meaning/form and in scaffolding), will be appended to the entries in (FLINT) system. Using this system has many advantages such as determining the rate of the students’ control over talk in interaction as compared to their teacher’s. It also provides a framework for the teacher for evaluating and improving his/her own teaching. Besides, the FLINT model aids to set a learning environment for interactive teaching.

The collected data (from interviews, questionnaires, and observation) will be distributed among three entries (Entry I, Entry II, Entry III, and Entry IV). “Entry I”: Initiating-Interaction Questions (Questions related to students culture, questions are of students interest, etc.). Entry II: Interactive Activities (Group work, Jigsaw, group size, kind of objectives for doing a group work, etc.- as presented by Brown, 2001; Norman et. al 2002). Entry III-Part T: During-Interaction teacher’s reactions to students’ right answers and/or errors/kinds of questions and sustaining interaction
(using different kinds of feedback, scaffolding and negotiation), (praising, complementing, confirming that the answers are correct, questions being rhetorical, too difficult, vague, etc.-questioning strategies presented by Brown 2001; Ellis, 1988; Kinsella, 1991; Green & Oxford, 1995). Entry III-Part S: During—Interaction Students’ acts (their questions, answers, use of L2, etc.). Entry IV is related to the teacher’s accurate and correct use of L2.
Chapter IV

Data Collection

This chapter comprises a detailed description of the data collected from the different direct data-gathering techniques. The information is presented the way it was submitted by the informants and it is then discussed and analyzed.

Data collected from questionnaires

Eight teachers filled the questionnaires. They were given enough time (some teachers returned them after one week) and many teachers asked for translations into Arabic while they were taking the questionnaires from the researcher. The answers of the participants in the questionnaires came as follows: five teachers (out of the eight teachers) claimed that they implement the CLT as their teaching method (one of the other three teachers gave no answer and two wrote Direct and Direct and Audio methods respectively). They used group work/pair work and discussions as a technique reflecting this approach. Five teachers also chose speaking as the most emphasized language skill in their teaching method and all the teachers labeled interaction as being very important for language acquisition. Yet, only three teachers saw that communicative language teaching should replace other methods- two teachers chose the “undecided” answer and two ticked the “No” answer (question 24). According to the answers of the teachers, interaction is initiated by photos, oral discussions, and pair work. In addition, all the informants considered projects, group work, oral presentations and games as the interactive activities that their students do in class on daily basis. Group activities aim at peer correction, oral communication, exchanging ideas, and practicing language structures- claimed the respondents. 30 % of the teachers saw that the effectiveness of oral interaction in L2 fluency is adequate while 25 % considered it as less than adequate (25 % gave no answer and 20 %
ranked it as more than adequate). On the other hand, six teachers 75% (six participants) rated students’ speaking ability improvement after oral interaction activities as positive (the 20% did not answer). There were various answers concerning communicative/interactive mediators that these teachers employ in order to push learners to use correct language during oral interactive tasks. 50% of the teachers claimed that they either ask for peer correction or for repetition in order to get the right answer. The other 50% said that they explain the rule, use extra sheets and eloze questions. The types of the feedback used by the teachers when students made meaning-related mistakes during their interaction, were prompts (30%), recasts (50%), and 20% gave no answer. As for assessing oral interaction, 40% of the teachers assessed it based on fluency, 40% evaluated the accuracy, fluency, and form of the students’ utterance (at the same time), and 20% looked for accuracy. Finally, the teachers’ educational degree was considered the factor which affected their practices most (80% rated it as most and 20% rated the student’s personality as the first factor). At the same time, the teachers’ teaching techniques and practices were the factors which affected the students’ oral interaction (80% ranked it as first factor). Still, 90% of the informants stated that the physical environment had the least effect among other factors on the students’ oral interaction. As for the other factors, there were different answers regarding the ranking (question 25).

Data collected from teachers’ interviews

This part presents the information presented from the teachers’ interviews and the students’ interviews respectively.

All the teachers saw their roles today as “helpers and motivators”. The word motivator meant giving students the information and the help when needed. None of the interviewees was able to identify his/her philosophy and its source except for
one teacher who said that her methodology and way of teaching stems from her experience as a student. She explained that she knows what used to attract her attention in a teacher’s way of teaching. She tried to see “what and how students want to learn by using different ways at different times to see which one is the best seeing the results”. As for the methods they use, the answer was almost the same by all the teachers. They use different methods with different students taking into consideration their needs, age, and L2 level in each class. When they were asked what they mean by a method, the answer was group work, projects, and individual work. The aspects which they emphasized most in their teaching method were oral interaction, speaking, and group work because these were good for the students’ personalities. The techniques that these teachers used to initiate and optimize students’ interaction were Jigsaw and group work. In addition, 80% of the informants corroborated that they respond to mistakes (form and meaning- in student-student and student-teacher oral interactions) by waiting till the student has finished and then they submit the correct answer. The other 20% affirmed that they say the correct form when mistakes are committed, and they ask students to repeat these forms after them.

Regarding the teachers’ opinions about group work, 50% of them asserted that they avoid group work because the class becomes so noisy, and students will not benefit from it since they use the Arabic language. The other 50% claimed that they follow the teacher’s guide and work with groups when recommended in that book. Finally, all of the interviewees ascribed their students’ very weak English level to the curriculum (they said it in Arabic). They explained that the Lebanese curriculum does not oblige using English in math and science sessions. Accordingly, the teachers can explain all other material in Arabic. However, two of the teachers added
that there are other factors such as the gaps between one cycle and another in the curriculum, and the excessive usage of Arabic in English classes. Data collected from students’ interviews

While interviewing the students, all the questions were translated and explained in Arabic (and so were the answers), though the interviewees were of different L2 levels. From every -and each section of the different grade levels in the two schools, a group of five students were interviewed. Since there were seventeen sections, the number of the interviewees was eighty five students (seventeen times five).

Regarding their interest in the English language and its usage inside and outside school, 80 % of the students responded that they like it. 90 % of them said that the English language usage was restricted to writing and reading during English language sessions, and they rarely used it in communication. 10 % said that they used English letters while chatting on the internet. Besides, all the interviewees asserted that their English level is very weak, and the lessons they were taking at school were not enough for mastering this language. This was simply because teachers spoke too much Arabic in class. However, the reasons for their weakness in English were different among the members of the same group. 80 % said that it’s the school level, their parents’ educational level (no one can help them), and the fact that they never used English outside the school. The 20 % said that they didn’t understand a single word when the teacher spoke in English.

Moreover, the students were asked about the quantity of the group work, and the reasons that encourage them to interact in class. Their answers came as follows “sometimes we work in groups, and the teacher say work together- two or three of us, but we use Arabic most of the time unless we know the words very good.
Sometimes, there are students who don’t understand English, so, we talk only in Arabic”. They also added: “If we know the subject from outside the school or if the teacher talked about it before” “And if the teacher gives us time to understand the subject from our discussions”. As for bringing their personal experience into the classroom, the students gave same answers: “Yes, sometimes, But if we share we have to talk in English. If we talk in Arabic, the teacher doesn’t listen”. The word “sometimes” was vague for the researcher, so she asked the students about the number of times they do the group work and refer to their experience. The students responded that this meant once per week and sometimes, once every two weeks.

Concerning the way teachers correct the mistakes (during student-student and student-teacher interactions), the students answered as follows: 90 % said that it depends. “Sometimes the teacher says: “it’s wrong, sit down”. “Sometimes, she doesn’t listen when my answer is wrong. Sometimes, the teacher chooses another student to give the answer when I give the wrong answer”. 10 % (these were better in English than others) said that, especially in grammar, the teacher “stops me when I say it wrong and says the correct answer or tries to remind me of the rule”. As for whether the students benefit from these corrections, 90 % of the interviewees said that most of the time “I don’t know why it is wrong. But some structures are always repeated so, I memorize them. For example, with “he/she/it” the verb takes an “s” in the simple present”. The other 10 % said “I don’t share and if I do, it’s always wrong”. Finally, students were asked whether these corrections inhibit their interaction. 10 % said: “no, but sometimes I lose certain ideas that I was keeping in my mind”. 90 % said that when the teacher frustrated them, they decided not to answer questions during the session.
Data collected from observation

Interactive language teaching was not present in the three grade levels of the two public schools. What was really absent in the observed classrooms' discourse was the student–student interaction. If interaction was to be found, it was actually between the student and the teacher; however, it was not the kind of negotiation (neither form nor meaning). For example the meaning focused negotiation and the different practices that reflect it (those presented by Long, 1996), such as repetitions and conversational modifications were completely absent (zero percent during teacher-student interaction–since student-student interaction was not found). It was rather the sort of teacher's questions and students' answers; traditional student-teacher relation in the classroom (this is clear in all the following extracts which show a one-way-interaction, that is, teacher-student interaction-question answer). Hence what was recommended by Ellis (1995), Macaro (2003), and Nation (2001) was not found in the classroom. Namely, the qualitative interaction taking place in naturalistic settings and in both directions (student-teacher and teacher-student) did not exist in the observed classrooms.

Feedback was either in the form of direct correction (most of the time), or recasts (rarely). Scaffolding, it seems that teachers don't have any clue about what this word might mean practically. Only few teachers were trying to help the students. However, not all assistance can be counted as a form of scaffolding. In addition, there was a huge number of lexical and phonological mistakes in the teachers' "Spoken" and "Written" language.

The next section presents detailed instances on the kinds of teacher-student interaction (initiating interaction, and during interaction), student-student interaction-group work (if any is depicted), scaffolding, feedback, the questioning strategies, the
use of L1, and some of the teachers' obvious linguistic faults. Later on, these classroom examples will be compared and contrasted to some of the teachers' answers in both the questionnaires and the interviews and the students' replies. (Note: T = teacher, S = student, S1, S2, S3 etc., are different students)

Discussion

The four entries are summarized in "Initiating-Interaction Questions", "Interactive Activities", (as presented by Brown, 2001; Kinsella, 1991; Norman et. al 2002). During -Interaction teacher's reactions to students' right answers and/or errors/kinds of questions and sustaining interaction (questioning strategies presented by Brown 2001; Ellis, 1988; Kinsella, 1991; Green & Oxford, 1995), "During - Interaction Students' acts". The fourth entry is related to the teacher's accurate and correct use of L2.

In order to initiate interaction and insure the implementation of interactive teaching, the teacher should display certain practices and deploy certain strategies and techniques. For instance, the seven principles presented by Brown (2001) along with those of the TALK Project (Myhill et al, 2006) can be good guidelines framing the teachers' practices- concerning their questioning strategies in an interactive classroom. The following four extracts were taken from grades eight, seven, and nine respectively. These will be scrutinized where every part will be dissected and compared to the different aspects of interactive teaching and learning.

(Note: The grammatical mistakes in this extract were made by the teacher and not by the researcher. This reveals the teacher's L2 deficiency).

Extract 1

The subject of the new lesson was advertising. The teacher wrote the title of the lesson and the date on the board.
T: Look about the pictures for two minutes. Do you know what is advertising? (She
directly stated the definition even before the students took a look at the ads).
T: How did you get the information about this subject?
No one answers.
T: What do you expect to learn after reading the text?
No one answers.
T: (She chooses a student and asks him) what product have you bought it?
T: Give an example about a product you show on TV and you bought it? What about
its quality?
Ali: Aaa...... (No answer)
T: Thank you. Ok Omar, go on, say it.
Omar: No answer.
T: Weasel Words. (She pronounces it wizal words). She explains the word weasel
by referring to the dictionary.
T: Weasel is an animal suck the egg and it broken or empty. Read paragraph one and
two and pick up weasel words......

According to Kinsella’s (1991), Brown’s (2001), and Myhill’s, Jones’, and
Hopper’s (2006) initiating interaction strategies, the teacher’s initiating-interaction
questions must be related to students’ prior knowledge or information. This
information can relate to their culture and/or their own experience. If one takes a
close look at Barnes’ (1976) classroom example on how he initiated interaction in his
classroom, he/she will recognize how students were given the time and chance to
interpret the material their own way. However, the students in grade eight were asked
a question where a direct and rapid answer was expected, though this was a new
lesson (no time was given between the answer and the preceding/following
question). In case those students had no clue about the subject, the teacher should have “scaffolded” their learning process. That is to say, the teacher had to resort to pedagogical scaffolding where she sets up the situation in order “to make the child’s entry easy and successful and then gradually pulling back and handing the role to the child as he becomes skilled enough to manage it” (Bruner, 1983, p. 60). For instance, a magazine, a picture, a question about any kind of ads that any/ or some of the students like, etc, could have helped in attaining the objective. In addition, the order of the questions and the free time among them portray the teacher reciting a set of memorized information (the first five consecutive questions). Hence, instead of implementing what is called ‘pedagogical scaffolding’ (Van Lier, 1996) which is appropriate for large group interactions (for example, thirty students), the teacher continued her questions without paying any attention to her failure in motivating students to interact and exchange the conversation with her. Of course, the students’ refusal to answer any of these questions proves that the questions were either misunderstood/ vague or were unfamiliar for the pupils. Instead of focusing on the product, which is mutual interaction with students, the teacher insisted on using her prepared questions. Accordingly, the teacher failed to create or apply pedagogical scaffolding- whose focus is on the product- which allows her “to keep in mind, at all times, a long-term sense of direction and continuity, a local plan of action, and a moment-to-moment interactional decision making”(Van Lier, 1996, p. 199). This means that she should have been prepared to change the questions by restating them differently or replace them by others which might have been the key for mutual interaction.

Hence, students were not given time to express themselves or refer to their own experience, though they are familiar with subjects such as ads on TV and
different mass media. The teacher was asking and answering at the same time and the students were not invited to extend, elaborate, and/or justify their answers. More important than that “in-court-like”, questioning strategies were not done in naturalistic settings (contradicting Myhill et al 2006). Students were not given any chance to discuss the subject which in turn led them to work collaboratively and, hence, use and notice different forms of language. Therefore, since conversational interaction was banned from this episode, the new knowledge (given by the teacher) was not embedded in the familiar (knowledge of the students) (Swain, 1998). This means that students were not able to connect utterance to utterance, text to context, and the new knowledge to the world. Thus, all the social and cognitive merits and outcomes of interaction were not accomplished.

*Extract 2*

T: Why is Valentine’s Day special? In your opinion why? (Don’t refer to the book).

S1: (She says it in Arabic) It comes once every year.

T: In English.

S1: One day in the year, and is associated with flowers.

Ss (students): Laugh.

T: No, because it is associated with flowers and...?

T: It is associated with love and romance. So, it is special because?

S2: Associated with flowers.

T: With love and romance.

T: What does it represent?

T: Love. What is a valentine?

S2: Love.
T: What do people send in this day? S3: (She repeats her answer three times)
"Presents".

Teacher didn’t recognize her, and he said directly: Candies, flowers, and messages.
Then he wrote his answer on the board and asked the students to copy it.

In “Extract 2” the focus of the discussion will be on “During – Interaction”
teacher’s reactions to students’ right answers and/or errors//kinds of questions and
sustaining interaction (using different kinds of feedback, scaffolding and
negotiation)/ (praising, complementing, confirming that the answers are correct,
questions being rhetorical, too difficult, vague, etc.-questioning strategies presented
by Brown 2001; Ellis, 1988; Kinsella, 1991; Green & Oxford, 1995). In addition,
“During – Interaction” Students’ acts (their questions, answers, use of L2, etc.) in the
above extract will be compared and contrasted against those presented in the
literature review.

Certainly, it would be difficult to overlook the teacher’s words at the very
beginning of the lesson “In your opinion why? -Don’t refer to the book” (this
question was stated in the book in the warm up questions). Here, the listener or/ and
the reader expects the student to give her/ his opinion in any way he wishes- the way
at Barnes’ (1976) classroom. The students at Barnes’ class were given chances and
freedom to interpret the material the way they wanted and to express themselves
freely. In this classroom the students had to be given the chance to talk about
valentine the way they understood it from their own experience. However, what took
place was exactly the opposite. In the above literature review, it was emphasized by
different researchers how the teacher/s should adopt certain practices in order to
sustain interaction. One of these is Ellis’s (1988) recommendations about an input
rich in “extending” utterances; these are teacher’s utterances that pick up, elaborate,
or in other ways extend the learner’s contribution or participation (Ellis, 1988). These utterances could be one of Lyster’s (2002) four interactional moves (prompts) to improve the accuracy of students’ talk. The first move is clarification requests where the teacher indicates to the student, by using “pardon me” and “I don’t understand”, which the pupil has to restate what he/she said in a different way. Repetition, where the teacher repeats the student’s errors, adjusting the intonation to highlight the erroneous utterance, is the second move. The third one is metalinguistic clues. The teacher presents comments, information, or questions related to the ill-formedness of a learner’s utterance, without explicitly giving the correct form. For instance, is it masculine or feminine? Fourth, elicitations were used to obtain correct forms from the students by posing questions such as “how do we say that in English?” or by pausing to allow the learner to complete the interlocutor’s utterance (it is a…?); or by asking students to reformulate their utterances (try again) (Lyster, 2002; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Morris, 2005). Comparing these moves to the teacher’s reaction to and feedback on the student’s answer in extract 2, one notices that the teacher could have used the fourth move above “how do we say that in English” as an answer for the student’s “B Yeege marra bi cene”. Or, the teacher had other choices such as “do you mean it comes once in a year”? / “take your time and try again to find a better answer”. In addition, the teacher committed a mistake which many researchers warned against. Ehrlich and Zoltek (2006) and Norman et. al (2002) emphasized that teachers should be very careful about correcting students’ mistakes, how, and when the correction is done. They also emphasized that students should not be humiliated by sarcastic remarks, tone of voice, or facial expression. They admonished direct and explicit corrections too. However, the tutor resorted to explicit corrections “No” -though the student’s response was not wrong (it sounded
logical). He answered the student in a way which made the whole class laugh at their classmate. At other instances, he neglected the students' answer (the last two sentences in the extract). More important than that is the fact that the teacher didn't either expand or confirm when the students' answers were right and logical (Long, 1996).

Extract 3

T: Try to work together, these are English proverbs, I don't expect you to know the meaning". Take five minutes.

T: (she chose a girl to answer) what does it mean once in a blue moon?

S1: In the night.

T: Visits me rarely. What does it mean blue collar workers? No one answers.

T: (She gives the meaning of this proverb and all the other proverbs without giving examples or checking for understanding). Then the teacher moves to another lesson.

This extract will focus on group work and on vocabulary teaching. This is a grade nine section. The students were supposed to work on an exercise about proverbs- a word they were encountering for the first time.

In many of the observed classrooms some students were working individually while others were working in pairs or groups without the teacher's request and guidance for that. Brown (2001), Norman et al (2002), and many others underlined the benefits of group and pair work. Nevertheless, these researchers asserted that group work does not mean simply putting students into group and leaving them doing what they could have done individually. Many factors should be accounted for when assigning group work. These factors are the objective of the task/activity (where different objectives entail different group size and techniques), the meaningfulness and authenticity of the activity to the students, and the teacher's
monitoring role. Monitoring is not only restricted to giving directions about the way students should deal with the activity but is related to establishing affective supports as well (Brown, 2001; Norman et al. 2002). By collating these recommendations with the teacher’s practices in grade nine, a big gap is identified. In this class the teacher left the students to work on their own. She neither clarified the objective behind studying and finding the meanings of these proverbs, nor stated the tools needed for this. More importantly, the teacher didn’t provide the students with any affective support. From the very beginning she told them that they won’t know the meaning. Besides, interaction is a process mediated by semiotic resources appropriated from the classroom (Wertsch, 1998) such as print materials, the physical environment, gestures, and most notably “classroom discourse” (Lantolf, 2000). Hence, the teacher was expected to assure that all the students had dictionaries (or at least one for each group, pair or student— since students were working the way they wanted) or any kind of print material (aid) which might have helped them in suggesting possible meanings— if not finding exact ones. Learning was unguided, unseafolded, and receptive. Students were only waiting for the right answers from the teacher.

Anton and DiCamilla (1998) and Knight (1996) found that negotiating meaning among pairs in L1 for the meanings of unknown words resulted in learning new words as much as negotiation in L2 did. By giving the students the meanings instead of giving them some clues or asking for dictionary use, the teacher deprived the students of the chance to negotiate and suggest possible meanings.

Extract 4

T: Do you still remember this lesson? What is its form or structure?
Ss: subject, has or have, past participle, and the complements.
T: Who can give an example?

S1: Leila has cleaned the room.

T: Very good, can you change it into a question? A number of students raise their hands.

T: Ok, he chooses a student.

S2: Does Leila....

T: Who knows the right answer?

S3: Do Leila.....

T: Who can guess?

S4: Did Leila...?

T: Who knows?

S5: Has Leila cleaned the room?

T: That is right, very good. Read paragraphs one and two and pick up the present perfect tense. (The students pick up the verbs and fill the answers in their workbooks).

T: Now that you have finished, can you clean your desks?

T: What have you done few seconds ago?

Ss: we have cleaned the desks.

T: Ok, so, you have completed the action now. So, the past tense is an action completed in the past, yesterday, last night, for example while the present perfect tense is completed now or has just finished. Each and every one of you must give me an example now.

S1: I have written my homework at five o'clock.

T: We should not specify the time with the present perfect tense. Take your time to prepare another example.
S2: Our teacher has asked us to give examples.

T: Very good.

S3: The student has played football.

T: Very good.

S1: The pupils understand the lesson.

T. What? The students...?

S2: the student has understands the lesson.

T: Pick up your verb list and check it with the other two students (Then the teacher listens for the examples given by every -and each, student).

The fourth extract was taken from a seventh grade with a twenty four years experience teacher teaching the simple present perfect tense. He was trying to guide the students and to help them practice the present perfect tense. At the same time, the teacher was encouraging students to engage in lively practice of the targeted grammatical form and not a dry application of recitation. Besides, it was clear how talk was- some how, equally distributed among the teacher and the students during interaction. It is worthy to cite that this teacher did not answer the questions in the questionnaire which related to his teaching method, effectiveness of oral interaction in enhancing fluency, and practices for initiating interaction. Also, he did not answer questions eighteen, nineteen, twenty one, and twenty two (check appendices). He stated that speaking does not improve students' fluency and ticked the "undecided" option for CLT replacing other method too. According to him, listening was the most emphasized aspect. The aim behind this reference is to show how observing this teacher's practices in the classroom revealed that he supported interaction more than many others who claimed to be applying interactive language teaching method. Moreover, it was cited in order to show how observations give a clearer picture about
certain practices when other data-collecting techniques fail to do that (Brown & Rodgers, 2002; Burns, 2000; Scott & Usher, 1999; and Thomas, 1998).

Compared to all the other observed classes, interactive language teaching was applied in this section only. The way interaction was taking place (a very dynamic class) could be attributed to various factors. First, the teacher started the conversation by a display question whose answer was known for both the teacher and the students (prior knowledge) (Brown, 2001). The question was about the form of the present perfect, and the students were going to learn about “when to use this tense”. Second, the teacher gave students the time and the chance to express themselves (take your time and give another example). Third, the teacher stimulated the students’ need to communicate by the questions that were of students’ interests and experience (What have you done few seconds ago?). Fourth, the teacher gave a choice for the learners to give any examples they want (he didn’t restrict the choice to a specific subject). The fifth factor is uninhibited practice, where the students were allowed to build on their own learning experiences by expressing their ideas. They cleaned their desks and experienced that present perfect tense is an action related to the very near past. Finally, an input rich in “extending” utterances; these are teacher’s utterances that pick up, expand, or in other ways broaden the learner’s contribution or participation. These utterances were: ”very good, who knows, that’s right”. Sure, it is clear how these factors are the ones which Brown (2001), Ellis (1988), Kinsella (1991), and Myhill et al (2006) recommended for enhancing interaction.

Comparing the collected data/ Results

This part highlights the differences and similarities among the teachers’ answers in the questionnaires and interviews, the students’ responses in the interviews, and the classroom observations. Particularly, the teachers’ answers
regarding interaction (in general), initiating and sustaining interaction, corrective feedback, group work, and their conception about CLT will be compared to observations and students' answers.

In order to investigate the teachers' conceptions and understanding of "interaction", the researcher started exploring philosophy underlying the teachers' education. According to Larsen-Freeman (2000) an educator's practices and techniques reflect his/her method of teaching which, in turn, is the manifestation of his/her philosophy. Accordingly, the teachers' philosophy/philosophies should reflect their methodology which might—or might not—encourage interaction. Based on the data collected through the teachers' interviews and questionnaires, the researcher got valuable information about interaction, feedback, and group work. Regarding interaction, all the teachers emphasized that it is very crucial to language acquisition and consequently, speaking is the most emphasized aspect in their teaching method. At the same time, none of the teachers identified his/her philosophy in the interview. On the contrary, it was misunderstood and mingled with the method and the techniques. CLT was the teaching method (for five teachers) which emphasizes speaking exposed in group/pair work/games/presentations and discussions. All the teachers affirmed that these are employed on daily basis. Moreover, all the teachers (in the interviews and questionnaires) considered work group as very important and beneficial since it enables students to communicate, exchange ideas, and practice new linguistic structures. 75% of them indicated that students' speaking improved after oral interaction (through group work and the other above-mentioned activities) and 50% claimed that the effect of oral interaction on L2 fluency is adequate and more than adequate. Nevertheless, 50% of them said that they avoid group work because the class becomes very noisy and the students
wouldn’t benefit as long as they interact in Arabic. Comparing these statements and responses to the students’ answers and the findings from observations, the results were contradictory. The students and the observations clarified two things. First, group work was not used on daily basis. Besides, there existed no practices which resembled any games, presentations, or discussions. Second, Arabic was the language that was used during student-teacher (and vice-versa) and student-student interaction very frequently. Hence, how would the students’ communicative abilities progress when the targeted language (English) is not used? Third, explicit corrections were used very frequently and learning was not scaffolded. This was also stated in the teachers’ answers (interview) about error corrections and interaction-mediation techniques.

Concerning interaction-initiation techniques, the teachers pointed out in the interviews and the questionnaires that they use oral discussions and photos in group and pair work for this purpose. Adversely, the students expressed that what really encouraged them to interact or start an interaction is their prior knowledge about the discussed subject- on one condition that the teacher gives them “enough time” to talk. Besides, they were not given chances to refer to their personal experiences and beliefs which are emphasized- by Lantolf (2000) - due to their benefits in initiating and sustaining interaction. The data collected from observations, also showed that the teachers did not deploy any of the techniques they claimed using for initiating interaction and did not encourage the students to share their experiences and express their beliefs and attitudes towards an issue or subject (see extracts 1 and 2). If one takes a look at the extracts above (except extract 4), it was clear how the students were not given any time to think about possible answers.
As for feedback, 80% of the teachers indicated (in the interview) that they wait till the student has finished and they (themselves) correct (explicitly) both meaning and form related mistakes. However, in the questionnaire, 50% of the respondents (of the same 80%) wrote that they either asked for peer correction or for repetition when grammatical mistakes were committed (the other 50% gave no answer). At the same time, 30% resorted to prompts and 50% relied on recasts for correcting meaning-related mistakes. This seems very contradictory when the same respondent-interviewee expressed different answers for the same question. As stated above in the literature review and the observation analysis section, explicit corrections are completely different from recasts and prompts. On the contrary, 90% of the students said that their teachers asked them either to sit down (stop talking) or requested a peer correction. At other instances, the teacher did not listen/pay attention when the pupils did not give the expected and desired answer. This was clearly shown in most of the observed classrooms. The first three extracts above showed how the three teachers neither listened, nor gave chances to the pupils’ suggestions which were different from the one true answer they (teachers) had been waiting for.

As to the students’ level in English Language, both the teachers and the students themselves affirmed that it is very weak. The teachers corroborated that this resulted from authorizing (the official curriculum) the usage of Arabic for explaining math and science (physics and chemistry) while English was only used during English language sessions. At the same time, there was a surplus usage of L1 (Arabic) in the L2 classes—said the teachers. The students also saw the reasons for their weak L2 level in the excessive utilization of Arabic during the English lessons, in the absence of educational aid outside the school (uneduicated parents), and in the restricted deployment of L2 to school settings.
Interpreting contradiction among collected data

The findings in the classroom observations and the contradiction among these and the data collected from the students’ interviews and the teachers’ questionnaires raise a big question about the teachers’ acquaintance with the practical and pedagogical implementations of interactive/communicative language teaching in today’s language classrooms. In addition, the terms method, technique, and philosophy were analogous for the teachers. Furthermore, the teachers’ answers regarding the same aspect were contradictory. For instance, five teachers adopted a communicative language teaching approach but they didn’t recommend it for replacing other methods. Another example is detected when the teachers said that interaction enhance L2 acquisition although some (three) of these teachers saw that the effectiveness of interaction on the students’ fluency is less than adequate. In the questionnaire, 80% of the teachers ranked their teaching techniques and practices as having the greatest effect on students’ oral interaction while 20% considered the students’ personality as the most important factor (question 23). At the same time, 90% of the informants stated that the physical environment had the least effect among other factors on the students’ oral interaction. Still, the teachers’ educational degree was counted as the first concept which affected their teaching practices. On the other hand, all the teachers claimed that group and pair work is a manifestation for their teaching method, but three of them said that they avoid it because they lose control over the class. Besides, the common vocabulary used by the teachers in the interviews and the questionnaires, to describe the kind of feedback used for correcting the students’ mistakes, did not include technical words (such as prompts, recasts, scaffolding, etc.) used by educators. For these reasons, it is suitable to say that teachers in the two public schools had different understanding and interpretation
for "interaction" from the definitions presented in the literature review. Or, they did not have enough practical information and idea about interaction, interactive teaching and the educational requirements it entails.

Conclusion

Since many factors undertake every single aspect of the educational equation, the absence of interaction in the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades has many reasons. According to the teachers, it is their educational degree, the gaps in the curriculum between one cycle and another and the students’ L2 level. From the students’ perspective, it is their L2 level, which they relate to the insufficiency of the L2 vocabulary that they have and to the confined usage of L2 to L2 classes merely.

From the researcher’s point of view, based on both the theoretical perspectives and this practical research, there was no interactive teaching in the observed classes. Relying on the collected data, the students had a very weak L2 level, there was an abundant use of L1 (Arabic) in the classroom, and group/ pair work was not encouraged. Additionally, students were not motivated to share in interactions since they were not allowed to bring their experiences and share their beliefs in classroom discussions. Half of the teachers claimed that they avoided group work because students were not using the targeted language, and they were very noisy. This claim supported Macaro’s (2003; 1997) records about teachers’ banning of group work from their classes.

Based on the literature review, feedback- both positive and negative- plays a crucial role in classroom interaction. It is motivating when applied in the right time and when confirmation checks (exemplifying prompts) and recasts are employed (Long, 1996; Pica, 1996). However, in the observed classrooms, and in the students’ and teachers’ answers on feedback, it was clear that explicit corrections were made
most of the time, and positive feedback (correct, Bravo, good answer, etc.) was not used. Though the students' language weaknesses are the sediments of a cumulative process whose origins go back to the teachers' methods and ways of teaching in previous years, the teachers in the third cycle still bear a big part of the responsibility. Comparing the situation in the schools presented in this study to those in Li's (1998) and Wang' (2000), the two have many sharing aspects. On the teachers' behalf, the difficulties in applying communicative language teaching (which encourages interaction) are teachers' deficiency in English, deficiency in strategic and sociolinguistic competence, lack of training in CLT, misconceptions about CLT, and the absence of developed materials/tools for communicative classes. These are the semiotic tools which Wertsch (1998) and Lantolf (2000) summarized in the print materials, the physical environment, gestures, and most notably “classroom discourse”. They also described these tools as the basic constituents of interaction which is at the heart of acquisition. For instance, none of the students had a dictionary to use in the class. In addition, the teacher (as shown in their answers and classroom observation) was mediating the students' learning process neither by scaffolding, nor by the suggested techniques of corrective feedback. Concerning the teachers' deficiency in English, it was shown in the recurring mistakes while teachers were explaining in class (See extract 1- for example). Also, answering many questions (in the interview) in Arabic and asking for translations in the questionnaire support this postulation.

On the students' behalf, their L2 level was responsible for limiting interaction among themselves and the teacher. This point supported what was presented by Li (1998) and Wang (2000) that the students' L2 level stood as an obstacle in implementing innovative teaching techniques in the researched schools in Korea and
China respectively. As for the third and fourth categories which Li (1998) presented in the difficulties coming from the educational system and the assessment instruments, this paper did not investigate these aspects and consequently, this facet in the equation needs to be researched.

Since interaction is "the collaborative exchange of thoughts, feelings, or ideas between two or more people, resulting reciprocal effect on each other" (Brown, 2001, p. 165), what was analyzed in the above extracts and in the teachers' and students' answers is not related to any "Exchange". Exchange was experienced neither in collaborative dialogues, nor in negotiations. Consequently, interaction was absent in the observed classroom.

To sum up, interactive teaching was absent in the researched grade levels because of the students' L2 weak level and the teachers' practices. These were practices which not only contradicted interactive teaching, but hindered it as well.

The teachers of the seventh, eighth, and ninth graders in the two public schools:

- Always wait for One-Right Answer, and consequently do not encourage creativity in language by prompting students and by scaffolding their learning process (contrasting Brown's principles (2001)).

- Do not implement effective ways for teaching vocabulary.

- Do not support weak students—this enlarges the gap between high achievers and low ones.

- Stick to the guidelines (time allocated for each part in the lesson and the way students should work on it—individually, in groups, etc.). This restrains taking into consideration the students' needs and adopting the materials accordingly. Hence, they never add or omit anything from the lesson (opposing Van Lier's recommendations (1996)).
➢ Do not encourage cooperative learning by guiding students how to work in
groups and by showing them the effectiveness, the mechanism, and the vast
pedagogical outcomes of group work when well-mentored. This strongly
conflicts with the principles and the essence of interactive and
communicative language teachings defined throughout this paper by different
researchers.

➢ Resort to explicit corrections so many times. This was noticed during
classroom observations (above) and was stated in the students’ answer of
question nine in the students’ interview.

➢ Are using the same preparation books which they had been using in previous
years. Again, this vehemently opposes the fact that education is a vital and
ever changing process where different needs impose different teaching
methods and techniques.

➢ Do not create vital situations where students can apply and use language.
Hence, the Vygotskian notion about language being a cognitive activity and
the product of this same activity. What were observed were rather situations
where the students are being pushed into “memorizing” language and not
living and using it.
Chapter V

Conclusion

This research aimed at investigating whether interactive teaching is applied in two public schools in Tyre. From one side, both the questionnaire and the teachers' interviews did not give clear-cut answers about the implementation of communicative language teaching in the third cycle. However, the students' interviews and the classroom observation proved that the teachers' practices in this cycle did not comply with practical implications of communicative teaching. The teachers' failure to adhere to the pragmatic translations of the CLT and SLA theories was ascribable to many factors. It stemmed from the teachers' and the students' L2 weaknesses, absence of essential CLT classroom materials, and the teachers misinterpretation of CLT. These facts were demonstrated in the teachers' anti-interactive practices in their classrooms. Teachers' behaviors such as explicit corrections, scarcity of group work, resistance to students' expression for their experiences and ideas, are considered as opposing interactive teaching.

Based on the above (findings and literature review) the researcher has recommendations which are mainly, though not exclusively, directed to the L2 teachers in Public Schools. Accordingly, teachers should realize that:

- Interaction is not what they claimed to apply in their classrooms. An interactive episode is not one where the teacher is controlling the whole communication process with his/ her questions and students' standard answers. As stated in the literature review, it is related to a set of practices the main outcome of which is socially and cognitively beneficial for the learner. Through their communication, “Students learn not only about curricular content and not only about the communication patterns that characterize
acceptable educational practice around that content, but also about the
structure of society, the place and function of schooling, their place as
students, and the nature, significance and consequences of their learning.
They learn these things through their participation (Freebody, 2004, p. 92) I

➢ As an evolving aspect of the ever changing society, education is continuously
broadening to cater for various emerging needs of the students and –
consequently is constantly imposing more qualifications, competencies, and
responsibilities upon the teacher’s behalf. Accordingly, it’s the teacher’s
perpetual duty to update her/ his education. This could be attained by
regularly attending conferences and workshops, by reading new books about
teaching and learning, and by visiting hundreds of websites which include all
the educational theories and their practical implications presented in the
research studies from all over the world. Besides, at the classroom application
level, teachers have to present the same material differently for different
students. That is, for one group of students one technique and/ or strategy
could be effective while at the same time it is not for another group. For
instance, teachers should not use the same preparation book every year using
the same strategies and techniques, with the standard and one accepted
answer, with different students of different needs and L2 level.

➢ Language is vital and alive and it is the tool and product of communication
(Lantolf, 2000). Therefore, it should be lived and experienced in order to be
learned. This means that students have to use it in social contexts at both
levels inside the classroom and in the bigger society. This could be achieved
when students are given the chance to refer to their own life experiences as a
way to examine the ignorance and knowledge about all the vocabulary,
grammatical structures, and their competencies needed to express themselves at one point or another in a definite subject. In other words, teachers should encourage students to exchange ideas and words because teaching communication comprises many constituents that influence understanding in everyday life as well as in academic performance (Small, 2003). In addition, a wide variety of authentic materials such as TV shows, songs, radio broadcasts, recordings and so forth, should be introduced into the classroom.

➢ Education is a mutual teaching and learning process. In other words, teaching the students and being exposed to new kinds of learners every year and day makes the teacher continuously introspecting their qualifications and bringing up to date their education and learning. By doing so, teachers can meet the needs of these students and can overcome common and possible pitfalls that teaching holds, especially, for inexperienced and novice teachers. Due to this, students are to be given the space (time) to act, interact, exchange information, and negotiate meaning among each other because this is the only way through which teachers can depict their students' language weaknesses and strengths. In brief, teachers have to be good listeners before being listened to and monitors for every single move of their students in the classroom.

➢ The implementation of the CLT, the main part of which is interaction, needs preliminary steps. That is, the teacher has to facilitate learners’ needs, ease their anxiety, and make the students feel comfortable in the learning environment. This means that it should be made clear for students that committing mistakes is tolerated and is very natural. For instance, this idea can be emphasized by changing it into an always attached-to-board slogan
“There are no stupid questions. Only stupid students don’t ask”. By doing so, the teacher can surpass his/her struggle with the students' resistance to CLT.

- Concerning vocabulary, teachers should not spare a single chance for teaching vocabulary in new ways other than memorizing word meanings. This would enrich the students’ vocabulary repertoire which would in turn encourage them to interact and show what they have and know. This neither means banning L1 from classroom nor contradicts Macaro’s (2001) and Macaro’s and Mutton’s (2002) about codeswitching. It’s rather that teachers should recognize that “not all vocabulary acquisition occurs in receptive learning tasks” (Macaro, 2003, p. 75). In other words, “Interactive Listening” (in both directions/learner-speaker and speaker-learner), by negotiating meaning, clearly leads to enhanced comprehension as compared to solely listening to L1 speaker.

- Teachers should oblige every single student to have and bring his/her own English-English dictionary into the classroom to look out new words introduced to them every English session.

- Teachers should know that learners “would need at least 95% coverage of the running words in order to gain reasonable comprehension and to have reasonable success at guessing from context” (Nation, 2001, p. 114). Hence, they have to find new ways for teaching vocabulary so that students can interact using the targeted language.

The limitations of the study

Limitations of the study are depicted in the small sample and the methodology. The four Public schools in Tyre should have been included in the sample. However, while one of these schools does not teach English as a Second
Language in the Upper Middle Classes (Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth grades), the principal of the other school did not show any cooperation. As for the methodology, questionnaires should have been distributed in all the schools, and the classroom observations should have been extended for longer periods distributed during different thematic units. This is simply because teachers as much as students might find themselves more engaged, interested, and knowledgeable about one subject than the other.

Moreover, parts the literature review on which the bulk of the research is built on, especially findings related to the effectiveness of certain interactional features are derived from different interactional contexts (content-based classrooms and/or one-to-one interactions). Consequently- as claimed by Braidi (2002), Breen (2001), Leeman (2003), Morris (2005), and others, if we perceive interaction and interactional features such as feedback/recasts/other implicit forms of corrective feedback as catalysts or as potentially beneficial acts for language development and acquisition, we must pay more attention to classroom contexts. This is added to the fact that the researcher’s presence at the class might have affected the interaction and talk’s control and orientation between the teacher and the students.

Moreover, the research failed to clarify certain aspects such as the effect of the teachers’ believes on their practices. Also the teachers’ refrain from answering certain questions in the questionnaires left caused imprecision. This was mainly related to their true conceptions about interaction, philosophy, methods, and technique.

Additionally, the principals’ prior knowledge about the nature of the research might have also led them to bring the teachers’ attention to some of the aspects that this study tackles. For instance, the principal might have asked the teachers to leave
more space for the students to interact and use their English language and so on. One of the limitations is that if the sample of teachers in the public schools (who were all Lebanese University graduates) were compared to some teachers who are teaching in the Public and/or Private Schooling sections and who are other university’s graduates, this would help in clarifying the role of university education in teaching.

Achievements

The achievements of this research paper are divided into two groups personal and general benefit. As a student and a teacher, the research was a true chance to test my ability to implement all the research methods that I learned at the university. It also alerted me to certain mistakes for which teachers might become a pry. Consequently, these might prevent the educator from introspecting his/ her teaching practices. Teachers’ misconception of an educational issue and their reliance on experience and not on their every day research in the classroom for dealing with the increasing demands of their students, might be one of these problems.

As a novice researcher, this experience unveiled many issues that should be deeply researched in the future. First, the reasons behind the general plight in these schools where teaching is still having an anti-interactive posture should be investigated. Codeswitching and the effect of the teachers’ degree and its resource on their teaching practices should be explored too. Besides, The reasons behind the numerous mistakes (lexical, syntactic, phonological mistakes- such as the p & b) floating in the teachers’ English language should be answered.

In addition, this research can be considered as a preliminary step for comparing the levels and the types of gaps between the private and the public schooling. It inspired me for researching the way vocabulary should be taught in
these schools in order to ameliorate one of students’ skills needed for interaction in the target language.

Moreover, two findings intersected with those in literature review. The first was the reasons for not encouraging group work (presented by Macaro, 2003, 1997) and the second was the obstacles preventing teachers from applying CLT (Li, 1998; Wang, 2000). This gave me confidence in my work.

Finally, the principals and some teachers in the two schools affirmed that they will wait till this project is done so that they can benefit from the findings and recommendations for bettering teaching. Many of them called me recently asking for a copy. I hope that this will bring a benefit for those who will read it.
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Appendices

Appendix A

Questionnaire

Please answer the following by filling the boxes (☐) next to the answer that best reflects your response.

1. What is your gender?
   ☐ Male
   ☐ Female

2. What is your age?
   ☐ 23-30
   ☐ 31-38
   ☐ 39-46
   ☐ 46 or older

3. Which university did you graduate from?
   ☐ Lebanese University
   ☐ L.A.U.
   ☐ A.U.B.
   ☐ N.D.U.
   ☐ Others (specify) .....................

4. What university degree do you possess?
   ☐ BA
- BS
- MA in Education
- MA in (specify)..................

- BA in (specify) Five have BA in Literature, I has BA in History, and 1 has a BA in Psychology.

5. Do you have a Teaching Diploma in English?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Working on it

6. What levels do you teach (other than the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades)?
   - Elementary
   - Middle
   - Secondary
   - Others (specify).

7. What other subjects do you teach?
   One answered general psychology.

8. What is your teaching load?
   - Full time
   - Part time
   - Other (specify)..............................................................

9. In how many schools do you teach?

..............................................................

10. What teaching method (s) do you implement?
    - Silent way
11. What are the most emphasized language skills in your Teaching Method? (Number them starting from 1 being the most emphasized and 4 being the least emphasized)

- Reading
- Writing
- Speaking
- Listening

12. State three techniques that best reflect your teaching method (s)?

13. To what extent is "Interaction" important for language acquisition?

- Fundamental
- Marginal
- Not important

14. Name three of your students’ favorite interactive activities that you engage them in.

15. How often do your students do oral activities in class?
16. State two reasons for indulging students in group work?

........................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................

17. How does students' speaking improve after oral interaction activities?
   □ Positively
   □ Negatively
   □ No effect

18. How would you rate the effectiveness of oral interaction in enhancing L2 fluency in ESL classrooms?
   □ Very poor
   □ Less than adequate
   □ Adequate
   □ More than adequate
   □ Sufficient
   □ Insufficient

19. Give two instances of your practices that aim at initiating interaction?

........................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................

20. On what basis do you assess your students' oral interaction?
   □ Pronunciation
21. Name three communicative/interactive mediators you employ in order to push learners to improve their grammatically-ill utterances during oral interactive tasks?

.................................................................

.................................................................

.................................................................

22. What kind of feedback do you use when students make meaning-related mistakes during their interaction?

□ Prompts

□ Recasts

□ Others (specify)

23. Which of the following factors have the greatest effect on students’/a student’s oral interaction? (Number them starting from 1 having the highest effect and 4 having the least effect).

□ Classroom physical environment (secure and well equipped)

□ Student’s/s’ experience with the language

□ Student’s/s’ personality (assertiveness)

□ Teacher’s teaching techniques and practices- six ranked it as most important.

24. Do you believe that teaching language communicatively should
replace other methods of language teaching?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Undecided

25. Please rank how each of the following concepts affected your teaching practices? (With 1 being the most and 5 being the least)

☐ School culture

☐ Your learning experience

☐ Your teaching experience

☐ Your attitudes towards teaching career

☐ Your educational degree

☐ Others (specify) .................................................................

26. On which aspects of language teaching, do you think, the official curriculum stresses more?

☐ Language form

☐ Language use

☐ Both (use and form)

☐ Other (specify) .................................................................

27. To what extent were the educational theories, you read about, applicable in your classroom practices?

Two gave no answer, three said that some are applicable, two said that they are hard to be applied, and one said that it depends on students’ needs.

28. In your opinion, in what ways can students’ oral interaction enhance Second Language Acquisition?
Teacher 1: “Interaction enhances vocabulary, ideas, spelling, pronunciation, and writing skills”.

Teacher 2: “It improves the speaking-articulating skills of the students and they learn best since they are actively involved”.

Teacher 3: “To me, I think that oral interaction can enhance the students’ acquisition because it can help them communicate”.

Teacher 4: “By watching and listening to English movies, or translated.”

Teacher 5: “It can help them in building their self-confidence and which in its turn can enhance the students to give. Involve the students can help a lot”.

Teacher 6: “Oral interaction is the best method to improve SLA because it gives the students the chance and ability to express oneself in the class at the beginning and in society later in the future. So, when students acquire self-confidence to interact freely, they discover a greater tendency to learn a Second Language; the more the learners communicate in the classroom the better they learn”.

Teacher 7: “The book which depends on life language and concentrates on listening and speaking by native ‘British/American’.

Teacher 8: “They can communicate”.

Thank you
Appendix B

Teachers’ interview questions

The following questions are used to interview the seventh, eighth, and ninth graders’ ESL teachers in the Public High School for boys and Public Second Elementary School in Tyre.

1. In your opinion, what is the role of the teacher in today’s language classroom?
2. What is your own philosophy on language teaching and learning?
3. What method/s do you adhere in teaching English as a second language?
4. Which aspects do you emphasize most in your teaching?
5. In your opinion, what is the importance of students’ oral interaction?
6. What techniques do you use to initiate and optimize students’ interaction?
7. How do you respond to mistakes (form and meaning) in student-student and student-teacher oral interactions?
8. Do you indulge students in group work? How often and why?
9. What is your students’ L2 level?
10. In your opinion, what factors might have created this level?
Appendix C

Students' interview questions

These questions are used to interview students in groups of five.

1. Do you like English?
2. What do you use it for inside and outside school?
3. Are the English lessons that you are taking in school enough for mastering this language?
4. What do you think about your level in English?
5. What factors do you think make your L2 level?
6. How often do you work in groups?
7. What encourage you to interact in class?
8. Are you allowed to bring your life experiences into classroom discussions?
9. How does your teacher correct the mistakes that you make while interacting with your friends and/ or with her/him?
10. Do you benefit from these corrections? Give an example on one of your recurring mistakes which are not repeated after the teacher's correction.
11. Do you think that these corrections inhibit interaction?
Instructions:

Create a new PowerPoint file named: FirstName_LastName.

Choose one of the following (ONLY) as a topic for your presentation:
- History of computers
- Computer Hardware
- Computer Software
- Operating Systems
- Computer viruses
- Cell phones and computers
- Video games and computers
- Computer networks and the wireless revolution
- Multimedia and computers
- The Internet revolution

Follow the steps outlined below to create an animated presentation about the topic chosen. Your file should contain a maximum of 15 slides. You should use animation and graphics when there’s the need.

Remember, the more creative you are in your presentation, the higher the grade you will receive.

Note that cheating is not tolerated. Any attempt for cheating will result in an immediate zero.

The deadline for submitting your assignment is Monday June 11, at 10:00 AM. Any assignments received after that date will NOT be graded, so be punctual.

Good Luck!
1- Create a new PowerPoint presentation having a maximum of 15 slides (including the title slide).

2- The title page should have the Name of your topic in the title textbox and your name and ID in the subtitle textbox.

3- Apply a slide design to the slides. You can choose one of the built-in designs (already available in PowerPoint), or you can use one of the online templates. These can be downloaded from the following website: http://office.microsoft.com/en-us/templates/CT101172621033.aspx. Either way, make sure the design and color scheme you choose is appropriate for the topic chosen.

4- Open the Slide Master. Make sure that the title’s format is as follows:
   a. Size = 36, Alignment = centered, Font Name = Verdana, Bold.
   b. The color depends on the slide design and color scheme you chose, so don’t change it.

5- The text in the Slide Master should have the following format:
   a. First Level bullets: Size = 14, Font = Arial, Bold. Bullet shape = ●
   b. Second Level bullets: Size = 12, Font = Arial. Bullet shape = ○
   c. Third Level bullets: Size = 10, Font = Arial, Italic. Bullet shape = —

6- Add a header having: the name of the course (Computer Literacy), your ID and the date of your submission. Also, add in the footer the Current slide number (Slide X of Y) and a link to the Last slide (call that link: Final comments). Close the Slide Master.

7- In the rest of the slides, you should apply at least 3 different Slide Layouts, two of which should contain images, pictures or objects as well as text.

8- Add images or pictures where you deem it necessary. You can also add objects such as tables, charts and diagrams to add more value to your presentation.

9- Animate your presentation by choosing an appropriate Slide Transition. Also add custom animation on the bullets in each slide (choose different animations to add more effect) and the pictures that you add. Use a combination of Entrance, Emphasis and Exit animations as appropriate.

10- You can add sound or videos to make your presentation even more interesting. Make sure however that you do not loop the sounds indefinitely!

11- On the last slide, write your comments about the course and any suggestions you would like to make. What new things did you learn and how would you improve the course are examples of what you could write.

Have a nice end of semester!
Instructions:

Create a new PowerPoint file named: FirstName_LastName.
Choose one of the following (ONLY) as a topic for your presentation:
- History of computers
- Computer Hardware
- Computer Software
- Operating Systems
- Computer viruses
- Cell phones and computers
- Video games and computers
- Computer networks and the wireless revolution
- Multimedia and computers
- The Internet revolution

Follow the steps outlined below to create an animated presentation about the topic chosen. Your file should contain a maximum of 15 slides. You should use animation and graphics when there’s the need.

Remember, the more creative you are in your presentation, the higher the grade you will receive.

Note that cheating is not tolerated. Any attempt for cheating will result in an immediate zero.

The deadline for submitting your assignment is Monday June 11, at 10:00 AM. Any assignments received after that date will NOT be graded, so be punctual.

Good Luck!
1- Create a new PowerPoint presentation having a maximum of 15 slides (including the title slide).

2- The title page should have the Name of your topic in the title textbox and your name and ID in the subtitle textbox.

3- Apply a slide design to the slides. You can choose one of the built-in designs (already available in PowerPoint), or you can use one of the online templates. These can be downloaded from the following website: http://office.microsoft.com/en-us/templates/CT101172621033.aspx. Either way, make sure the design and color scheme you choose is appropriate for the topic chosen.

4- Open the Slide Master. Make sure that the title's format is as follows:
   a. Size = 36, Alignment = centered, Font Name = Verdana, Bold.
   b. The color depends on the slide design and color scheme you chose, so don’t change it.

5- The text in the Slide Master should have the following format:
   a. First Level bullets: Size = 14, Font = Arial, Bold. Bullet shape = ●
   b. Second Level bullets: Size = 12, Font = Arial. Bullet shape = ○
   c. Third Level bullets: Size = 10, Font = Arial, Italic. Bullet shape = —

6- Add a header having: the name of the course (Computer Literacy), your ID and the date of your submission. Also, add in the footer the Current slide number (Slide X of Y) and a link to the Last slide (call that link: Final comments). Close the Slide Master.

7- In the rest of the slides, you should apply at least 3 different Slide Layouts, two of which should contain images, pictures or objects as well as text.

8- Add images or pictures where you deem it necessary. You can also add objects such as tables, charts and diagrams to add more value to your presentation.

9- Animate your presentation by choosing an appropriate Slide Transition. Also add custom animation on the bullets in each slide (choose different animations to add more effect) and the pictures that you add. Use a combination of Entrance, Emphasis and Exit animations as appropriate.

10- You can add sound or videos to make your presentation even more interesting. Make sure however that you do not loop the sounds indefinitely!

11- On the last slide, write your comments about the course and any suggestions you would like to make. What new things did you learn and how would you improve the course are examples of what you could write.

Have a nice end of semester!