Reading the Discourse of Reading: a window on the meaning construction processes of third year learners of French
Vol. 2

By Philip Hood, B.A.

Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, May 2000

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
NOTTINGHAM

Chapter Six

The Part Two Programme - Summary of Data Analysis: Group talk, Discourse analysis of transcripts and the Follow-up questionnaire

6.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the data as analysed according to the methodology outlined in Chapter Four for group talk, discourse analysis procedures and the follow-up questionnaire. It presents results in various formats and summarises each element as it presents it. A more general discussion of the findings is located in Chapter Seven, which attempts to draw together the conclusions which can be made from individual data analysis sets.

The chapter consists of the following sections:

- 6.2 The nature of group talk
- 6.3 Discourse analysis of the transcripts
- 6.4 The follow up questionnaire

6.2 The nature of group talk

6.2.1 **Introduction**

As shown in Chapter Three (Section 3.4) important distinctions have been made by, amongst others, Barnes (1976, 1992), Mercer (1995) Almasi (1995) and Brewster (1999) regarding the nature of talk in small-group contexts. Especially relevant to the analysis of the group data are the concepts of presentational and exploratory talk (Barnes, 1992), of

disputational, cumulative and exploratory talk (Mercer, 1995, Brewster 1999) and of the three types of sociocognitive conflict (Almasi 1995): ie conflicts within self, conflicts with others and conflicts with text. Barnes' distinction implies for presentational talk the notion of correct and expected performance rather than any kind of exploration of ideas. In this study, this context was strongly removed from the group tasks by allowing them to work as independently as they wished. It might possibly have been felt more by subjects completing the think-aloud tasks, but here too the nature of the tasks and the working context kept the 'teacher' figure strongly in the background. There is a strong link between the ideas of Mercer and Almasi in that conflict here is seen as a potentially positive occurrence, which allows learning. But although this will happen if an individual is successful in gaining new understanding after discussion, it may fail, on the other hand, if the tone and context of that discussion is negative. In other words if the conflict is too disputational the outcome may not be one of new learning. Therefore, it is helpful to consider whether the nature of a conflict is closer to exploratory than to disputational talk, and to focus on the nature of the outcome for individuals. The distinction between these two categories might sometimes be less obvious than the definitions imply and further clarification might be helpful. For this reason we will keep in mind Brewster's (op cit) notion of persuasive and collaborative forms of exploratory talk. Almasi's (op cit) discussion of socio-cognitive conflict is also helpful, but as the categories were assigned to the discourse arising from L1 discussions on literature, in terms of the investigation reported in this thesis, we could redefine these conflict-types as follows. Conflicts within self is constituted by individually stated uncertainty around textual or TFI statement meaning or of the relevant T, F or I response. Conflicts with others occur where two or

more individuals have definite but conflicting readings in any of the above three categories, which then need to be resolved. Conflicts with text result where a subject advances a reading which is subsequently shown (and recognised) to be incorrect. Cumulative talk is unlikely to involve any conflict at all, and can therefore be analysed in terms of its contribution to meaning-construction and task completion.

It is helpful to use a concrete framework in a protocol analysis. The three categories of talk advanced by Mercer and the three categories of socio-cognitive conflict offered by Almasi will therefore be used in the transcript analysis which follows. This is done not to ensure any perfect fit, but to compare the differing evidence from four groups to a constant source, and thereby to draw out comparisons and contrasts with each other and where appropriate with the theoretical models themselves. It opens the possibility of a refinement of the models for this particular context.

6.2.2 Comparison of four transcripts

The four group TFI transcripts (A1, A4, B1, B3) were chosen for this analysis because they can immediately be seen to differ significantly. They are contrasting in their length, their approach to the text and task, their success in the task, and their overall structure and ethos. The initial intention here is to draw out the major differences. The second section will then take examples of text to illustrate how each might match to aspects of Mercer's and Almasi's categories. In Section 6.3 we shall plot both similarities and differences between the transcripts at a further discourse level, which involves concordancing and evaluating turn-taking and the decision-making roles within the groups.

An initial comparison of the four groups can be gained from the table below.

Table 6a: Four group transcripts compared

	Group A1	Group A4	Group B1	Group B3
Length - reading text Length - completing task	210 lines 66 lines =276	126 lines 117 lines =243	Lines 1-19 text started Lines 20 - 163 task-driven =163	183 lines 104 lines = 287
Approach to text and task	Read / translate text, then turn to task	Read / translate text, then turn to task, then repeat task responses	Start by reading / translating text, but very soon become task driven	Read / translate text, then turn to task
Success in the task*	1-3 / 8	3-6 # / 8	5-7 / 8	7-8$ / 8
Structure / Ethos	Two subjects (f) work extensively together or individually (seated together) with two other subjects (m) (seated opposite each other) contributing far fewer turns. Tone co-operative.	Two of three (all f) subjects working closely together, (due to seating pattern chosen) but all three co-operating throughout	Two (m) subjects seated opposite each other 'lose battle' with 2 (f) subjects seated side by side over text / task approach. Little overt co-operation	All three subjects (2f, 1m) seated close together. On balance the two (f) subjs worked more closely together than either with the (m) subject. (F) subject in centre acted very much as facilitator. Tone co-operative
Number of turns per Subject (including turns taken together)	28 - 103 26 - 100 19 - 48 17 - 11 R - 22	10 - 109 14 - 91 11 - 47 R - 6	2 - 56 3 - 52 15 - 33 16 - 16 R - 8	9 - 102 7 - 92 8 - 90 R - 9
Mean score on TA individual TFI task	3.33 / 8	4 / 8	2.25 / 8	4 / 8

* Two items were intended to be answered as 'impossible to say', but were interpreted as false by all three groups (Statement 8) and by two of the three (Statement 5) This response was perhaps not completely incorrect (as would a True response have been). The answers are therefore noted as part of the range of correct responses given. In each case the argument utilised demonstrated that the *thought processes* were not erroneous.

\# Group A4 gave their answers twice. On the first occasion their answer to statement 2 was correct, on the second it was incorrect

$ Subject 8 gave the correct answer to Statement 6, but it is unclear whether this was accepted by the other two subjects

One difference between the four groups which might need to be considered is that Groups B1 and B3 had already completed the parallel individual think-aloud tasks and were therefore perhaps better oriented to the quality of text and task-type than were Groups A1 and A4 who completed the group task first.

Table 6a demonstrates that success in the task does not depend on the time taken over it or on the use of the researcher as 'dictionary'. The success rate in the individual think-aloud TFI task is also not an influencing factor in the groups. The second most successful group here (B1) was the least successful individually if mean scores are calculated. Furthermore, the best achiever on the individual TFI task did not have the most moves in any of the four groups. There may be many reasons for this, arising from personality (shyness or modesty), a particular group context (unfamiliarity with one or more co-participants), motivation (a lack of desire to perform in that context or on that occasion) or other personal issues. It is interesting that it affected all four groups, but it is likely that in each case it was for a different reason. The next four sections may shed some light as we examine the dynamic of each group. As we saw in Chapter Three, (section 3.4) some researchers have pointed to the lack of efficacy of group tasks, but many more have demonstrated that they enhance learning. It is important of course that the learning of the most able is enhanced as well as that of the average and less able learners.

Although in three of the groups there is a pattern of two of the three or four participants having a majority of the moves, and indeed sharing that majority quite equitably, there is still variety in how much the remaining subjects have. The most successful group (B3) had a very even split between all three participants while group B1 had significantly more involvement by the 'minority pair' (31.2% of moves compared with 22.5%) than the least

successful group (A1). Group B3 sat closely together and had co-operation between all three members. The two A groups both had two female subjects co-operating closely (at least as regards positioning), whereas Group B1 had two separately seated male subjects taking a majority of the moves but with the two female subjects (seated adjacently and in the centre) still taking nearly a third.

The researcher was used most by the least successful group - further evidence that asking for vocabulary does not automatically lead to meaning construction even in a group context where there is more scope for discussion of how individual items make up coherent units of meaning.

6.2.2.1 Group B1

There is a very strong qualitative difference in ethos or atmosphere between the two A groups and Group B3 on the one hand and Group B1 on the other. The intention is not to use Mercer's categorisation on the basis of one group, one category, but rather to look for instances of the three categories in all three transcripts. However, it is immediately noticeable on a cursory reading of the B1 transcript (see Appendix O) that in some respects this group exemplifies the descriptor of disputational talk very well. We will investigate this thread first, and try to account for it where possible, before looking more broadly at the transcript. As the second most successful group in task performance terms it is important to establish whether the successful items emerged more through disputational talk or through exploratory aspects of sociocognitive conflict. In turn we can evaluate whether persuasive or collaborative talk predominated within the

exploratory talk category. The types of conflict will also be logged as part of this discussion.

The group worked on the TFI task first, as did all of the participants in the study. There is no doubt that the process involved in completing this task set the pattern and indeed the atmosphere for the FP task which followed. As a result, and because the task-type gives more concrete opportunities for focus and discussion, this analysis will concentrate on the TFI task.

There is aggression in tone and even profound disagreement between Subjects 3 and 15 on several occasions in the TFI task (lines 20, 31, 34 on the part of Subject 15, and 92, 94, 99,102 on the part of Subject 3). Additionally, there is a more playful disagreement between Subjects 16 and 2 at line 37, and some disagreement towards the end (line 154) between Subjects 2 and 3. The social dynamic of the group seemed unsuccessful, although the subjects had been chosen as four of a minority of just six from one particular tutor group within the class (the remainder being from just one other tutor group). The two male and two female subjects usually sat together as pairs, but as a group of four they were apparently not accustomed to co-operative problem solving. In addition, in the normal French classroom, the two female subjects sat outside a curtailed double horseshoe structure as the only pair in the class who were separate from the rest. If we look at the transcript we will see that disagreements do not centre principally on textual interpretation or even on the responses to the TFI task, but as much on organisational matters. (See extracts A and C)

The first hint of such talk occurs after the first 16 lines where Subjects 2 and 3 have alternated in a translation of the first paragraph of the text. At line 17 Subject 2 rather unsuccessfully (and perhaps ineptly) tries to draw in Subjects 15 and 16. At this point Subject 15 suggests in quite a strong tone that they alter the strategy to one which is task-led. (Of these 4 students only Subject 2 had used a task-led approach to his individual TFI task.)

Extract A

17.	2	((to 16/15)) Are you going to speak ?
18	16	* (1)
19	2	My, em, he's, I have [fourteen
20	15	Why don't you] just look at the first question and see whether it's true or not. What's the first thing mean ?
21.	3	All right, then

The suggestion is accepted, and it is quite crucial in that the remainder of the transcript shows a concern for understanding the task statements and drawing relevant information from the text, rather than for a more generalised meaning construction of the text, as was preferred by the other three groups.

The notion that disputational talk can stress rather resolve differences is exemplified by the next clash. Subject 3 is attempting to conduct a quite subtle discussion about whether step-brothers and sisters count as brothers and sisters in terms of statement 1, which asks if Guy is an only child. In fact he does have a 'full' sister, (as Subject 2 attempts to point out at line 36) so the distinction is not actually important. But Subject 3 is working

through this idea (lines 28 and 30) by 'thinking aloud' (Barnes, 1976, p28) but is stopped by Subject 15's aggressive outburst at line 31. In fact she is correct, but not because she has seen what Subject 2 proposes a little later. This is a good example of a conflict with others which is not resolved because the participants (and particularly Subject 15 here) are stating ideas rather than listening to them. It is also an example of the conflict with text which does not convince the speaker who has advanced an erroneous reading because it is not rationally supported.

Extract B

26.	2	Only child
27	15	It's wrong because does that mean he's an only child and he's not, is he?
28	3	Well he is in a way because they're step-brothers and sisters
29	15	They're not going to * are they
30	3	Well he's got step-brothers and sisters
31	15	((pointing at text)) Yeah it says that he's an only child. It's saying that he's an only child there and it's false because he's not obviously because he's got (-) sisters and brothers
32	16	Step-brothers
33	3	Well he was originally an only child but he's got step-brothers
34	15	Well he's not now is he ?
35	16	He's not now
36	2	No he wasn't because [he's had one sister
37	16	Shut up !] Shut up !

We also see here that Subject 16 is quite inclined to support Subject 15's assertions (at lines 32 and 35), and stifles further discussion at 37 (although the tone is in fact not aggressive)

In Extract C we can look at a series of statements made by Subject 15 (without their surrounding context) to gain a view of her role within the group. The selection runs from line 54 to line 122. Subject 15 speaks 18 times during that section, and we see that these moves can be classified into the four categories of

- attempting to move the discussion on to a new question (lines 54, 77, 86, 90, 95, 122)
- questioning meaning (lines 64, 93, 111)
- supplying meaning (lines 74, 88)
- asserting an opinion (lines 59, 84, 86, 95, 97, 103, 105, 107)

Extract C (line numbers on left)

54	15	What's the, what's the next question ? (1)
59	15	No, it's
64	15	What does that mean ?
74	15	Did Maria and Guy have the same mum]
77	15	Come on, let's go on to the next one, Four
84	15	Yeah he does, look
86	15	Yeah, that one's true - next one
88	15	Chantal's baby is called Philip or Philippe [or whatever
90	15	Question Five
93	15	So, I'm saying, is Chantal's baby called
95	15	Yeah we have, we've just done it, yeah we have
97	15	We've just said that he lives with her, him
100	15	Well. We're trying to find

103	15	No, I said, (-) I just read the thing out, Chantal's baby is called [what it says
105	15	So it's false then isn't it - number five is false
107	15	Yes it is because it says down there
111	15	What does Question Six mean then ?
122	15	We'll leave that one and go on to the next one (3)

In these 19 moves (one line contained two different categories) she asserts an opinion or attempts to move the group on to another section fourteen times. In her opinion giving, on just two occasions (lines 97 and 103) she offers a partial rationale for her assertion, but in general she does not. She is also more liable to try to organise the group than any other single member. It is here perhaps that the reasons for the disagreements arise. We can also identify these interjections as clear examples of coercive rather than persuasive talk (Brewster 1999). Her desire to lead, but not through the use of ideas evidently irritates Subject 3. Interestingly, in the follow-up questionnaire Subject 3 stated that he enjoyed the individual mode of working more and felt he did better in that mode too. In fact he only obtained one correct answer in the individual TFI task, but contributed actively towards three of the correct answers in the group task. In his questionnaire response he was the only subject present for both modes of working who enjoyed the individual mode more (as against 23 who preferred the group mode), and one of only five who felt they worked better in that mode.

We can see from the initial extract that Subjects 15 and 16 were not happy with the beginning of the task, when the two males were happy to dominate. (But in the questionnaire Subject 15 preferred the group mode under both questions, while Subject 16 felt she worked better in the individual mode because: 'I concentrated more by myself.

I didn't get distracted.'.) No member of the group is to be blamed for the disputational discourse (because as we have seen its origins could lie in many factors), but its nature raises important questions. The section, (lines 89-103) given in full as Extract D, shows the essence of disputational talk, ie that the exchanges are short and consist of assertions and challenges and counter assertions (Mercer, 1995). Most importantly, we see here the outcome of such discourse, as the answer to Statement Five is not really explained adequately by any member of the group because the nature of the talk does not allow resolution. Only at line 98 do we see evidence of a conflict within self, while the remainder of the moves constitute similarly unanswered or unsupported conflicts with others or with text.

Extract D

89.	3	Where, where are you going ?
90.	15	Question Five
91	2	We're looking at the [questions
92	3	You haven't] even read any of it
93	15	So, I'm saying, is Chantal's baby called
94	3	We haven't done Four yet
95	15	Yeah we have, we've just done it, yeah we have
96	16	Yeah we have
97	15	We've just said that he lives with her, him
98	2	Yeah, but who's the new baby called ?
99	3	We haven't even read it , how do we know ?
100	15	Well. We're trying to find
101	2	It doesn't say anything
102	3	You didn't give a reason, you just said straight away
103	15	No, I said, (-) I just read the thing out, Chantal's baby is called [what it says

But the discourse of this whole transcript is not just disputational and we do need to account for the group's overall success in the task. Therefore we should look beyond the more immediately noticeable qualities of the transcript to find out whether there are also examples of exploratory talk. Before the 'difficult' section above there is a contrasting sequence, which has a more even and discursive tone. It begins badly but then becomes more exploratory with the result that three of the four subjects contribute to the correct answer to Statement Two, giving a rationale as they do.

Extract E

40. 2 Are we still reading the question first ?

41. 15 No ?

42. 3 No because the next answer is in the next paragraph

43. 15 How do you know ?

44. 3 Because it says [Chantal there and Chantal in the question

45. 2 Yeah well they're]

46. 15 Well it might say Chantal somewhere else as well

47. 3 Is it how much, how old is Chantal ? Plus âgé

48. 2 Older than

49. 15 Does it mean Guy is older than Chantal, is that what it means ?

50. 3 Or Chantal's older than Guy

51. 15 Well is, no, the question is he older than [Chantal

52. 2 Yeah] which is false because it says that he's fourteen and she's, er, twenty [yeah, two

53. 3 Twenty two] So that's false, and then, then it says, she's got a baby I think (2) so it's definitely

From line 47 Subjects 15 and 3 co-operate. Subject 15 makes an assertion (a correct translation) but posed as a question, ie a conflict within self. She then clarifies and re-states that question, as a legitimate solution to a conflict with text. This allows Subjects 2 and 3 to answer it, using initially the 'primary evidence for that statement in the text (the ages). Subject 3 also uses a further fact from the text, which acts as a more inference-based piece of information for the statement response (that the sister has a baby, and is therefore older). The overlapping from line 51 to line 53 demonstrates the momentum of the ideas combining, and the uninterrupted pause near the end of the last line shows perhaps a level of satisfaction with that piece of collaboration.

Even in examples of less successful task resolution, the exploratory mode can still be seen (Extract F). The group finds the decision on Statement Three initially very difficult and this is further obscured by a misunderstanding in a request for a word. Nevertheless the three main speakers again accumulate facts through translation and interpretation, until one makes a decision which all seem to accept (and which is in fact right, although as stated earlier we are not absolutely clear that the rationale was correct.)

Extract F

54. 15 What's the, what's the next question ? (1)

55. 3 Who's Maria ? (3) My brother

56. 2 Is called Luke

57. 3 And he's (-) two

58. 2 What's, it says it says that his dad is called

59. 15 No, it's

60. 2 No that's his mother

61. 3 That's his brother Luke (-), mon frère (4)

62. 2 Maria is [his dad's new partner (2)

63. 3 He is] he is (2)

64. 15 What does that mean ?

65. 2 What's même ?

66. R Er, where it says elle-même, that means she herself (4)

67. 3 What's nouvelle ?

68. R It means new

69. 3 I think that says she's got a new, a new baby called Maria, because it says Maria et Guy

70. R Ah, when you asked for même, did you mean même in Question Three or même in the text where it says elle-même ?

71. 2 Même in Question Three

72. R Right, même in Question Three, sorry, that means the same. That word's a bit strange because it has more than one meaning, but in item three, Maria et Guy ont la même mère, même there means the same

73. 3 I think it means, did Maria [and Guy have the same mum

74. 15 Did Maria and Guy have the same mum]

75. 3 Which is false because it says he is his dad, I think

76. 2 Yeah, that's his new sister, Maria

77. 15 Come on, let's go on to the next one, Four

We should not rule out that subjects may have a problem not just with their group colleagues but also with the presence of a researcher, recording equipment and thus an unfamiliar working context. Although she had requested or clarified sixteen words in the two think-aloud tasks, Subject 15 was reluctant to ask the researcher for vocabulary as we see at line 64, where Subject 2 asks for the word immediately afterwards. This was the first intervention by the researcher and so the procedure was not yet 'in use' as regards this group. Once confusion is settled over which version of *même* is being requested, the

task statement is clarified by Subjects 3 and 15 speaking in harmony, and resolved immediately by Subject 3.

In contrast to Extracts B and D where the disputational discourse includes no time for breath, the comparatively large number and length of pauses in this section demonstrates that the group were willing here to take time and consider evidence. We cannot know for sure that they were always listening to each other but lines 55-60 and possibly to 63 are certainly interlinked as dialogue. There we find markers such as the continuation of the same sentence between speakers, the use of '*and*' to extend information, and the use of '*no*' to contradict what has just been said. There is clear evidence (lines 54, 58, 64, 65, 67) that the three subjects speaking at this point articulate uncertainties and then follow through to a resolution. Where there is conflict with others or with text there is evidence (as shown above) of participants listening to each other and supporting statements with evidence. Finally, Subject 3's use of *I think* at line 75 exemplifies Barnes and Todd's (1995) notion of tentative talk which encourages agreement by its collaborative rather than declarative mood.

In Extract G we see a section which mixes Mercer's three categories. Interestingly, after moving the group on to this statement, Subject 15 takes no part in this whole exchange, which is split by another section (lines 141-151) where they consider a different statement.

Extract G

122	15	We'll leave that one and go on to the next one (3)
123.	3	Says something about dinner. Nathalie fait, is that does ? (1) une salade (2)

124. 2 Says [something about the parents,

125. 3 have dinner in the garage]

126. 2 his parents prepare the dinner (1)

127. 3 Where does it say that ? (-) Oh yeah

128. 16 Seven

129. 2 Question Seven, [* has dinner

130. 3 Par exemple] tout le monde aide le soir quand on fait le dîner (1)
What does that mean ? (1)

131. 2 I think it's talking, the next passage it says about, er (2) er, [the baby
Maria

132. 3 I think it says] Maria

133. 2 sits somewhere

134. 3 has a place at the table (4)

135. 2 Who's Nathalie again ?

136. 3 I think Number [Seven's false

137. 2 His sister]

138. 16 Mm

139. 2 Says Nathalie makes the salad

140. 16 Nathalie's the sister

152. 3 What about the dinner one ?

153. 2 * We've done it. It's false because the sister makes the salad

154. 3 Yeah but they don't just have salad for dinner, do they ?

155. 2 I know but

156. 3 Well then (3)

157. 16 Yeah but that's all it says

To begin with the talk is relatively exploratory. Subjects 2 and 3 try to establish the primary meaning of the text through selective translation. This could be more construed as cumulative talk but in this they do complement each other and ask each other a

question for clarification (lines 127, 130, 135) and suggest readings (lines 131, 132, 136). Thus this is an example of Brewster's category of collaborative exploratory talk. The issue is unresolved before the break in discussion, although Subject 3 has given an unsubstantiated opinion that it's false. Perhaps this happens because lines 135-140 are much more cumulative with less connection between speakers. While Subject 3 gives the opinion on the statement, Subject 2 asks a question and then answers it himself. During this time the conflicts which occur are within self, but are of course positive where they are resolved on an individual basis. It is interesting to consider that the group may sometimes be the overarching structure for purely individual thought development which does not depend on the utterances of others at that point but which can lead back into dialogic interaction when the time is right for that. In this sense the conflict within self can have a particular role within groupwork. When they return to the statement twelve lines later, it is Subject 2 who has taken up the suggestion that it is false and Subject 3 who stated this originally is now disputing the decision. In other words both have pursued their conflict within self to a different conclusion before they are forced to open it up again to discussion. At this point (lines 153-7) we return to a more disputational mode between Subjects 2,3 and 16, so the benefits of that conflict are not realised for all subjects.

Clearly, in terms of either meaning construction or task completion the members of Group B1 are most successful when they are in Mercer's exploratory mode and least successful when in the disputational mode. Their exploratory talk tends to be collaborative perhaps because none of the participants is sufficiently confident with the

texts linguistically to be more persuasive. Where they are declarative it spills over into coercive or disputational talk because the knowledge is not there for rational persuasion. Almasi's three categories of sociocognitive conflict, (conflicts within self, conflicts with others and conflicts with text) have also proved relevant to this. Where the conflict is directly with others and over organisational rather than textual matters, we see little resolution. Where there is conflict with text we may not see the evidence given to prove the truth of the opposing statement, which the second speaker advances. Additionally we may also not see either a defence of the original statement (from the first speaker) where s/he might have evidence to advance or a demand by the first speaker for supporting evidence from the second speaker. In other words resolution still does not occur because it is personalities rather than ideas which conflict. Where there are articulated conflicts within self, there is more likelihood of a collegiate attempt towards resolution, because such co-operation is being welcomed. It is, then, the overt struggle for meaning construction that can make the talk more exploratory and the outcome more rationalised.

6.2.2.2 Group A4

Group A4 consisted of three female subjects (Subjects 10,11 and 14). Subject 14 was to go on to produce the best individual task performance (with all TFI statements judged correctly and with five items noted in the FP task). It is therefore a matter for consideration that the group did not perform better than either B3 or B1, despite having an equal mean score (of 4) with B3 and a distinctly better one than B1 (2.25) on the individual TFI task. One factor may be that for B1/B3 this was the second experience of

the task types, having already completed individual tasks, whereas one might argue that the group experience enabled the members of A4 and A1 to go on to their individual tasks with better preparation. Within groups of course it is the influence of powerful personality rather than powerful intellect which can be crucial as we saw to a certain extent in the pilot group for the Part One study. Bennett and Cass (1988) found that able students do well in whichever grouping they are placed, and Webb (1985) recommended placing introverted students in groups where they are more able than other members. So the role played by Subject 14 in this group (as an able and slightly introverted subject) is interesting to monitor.

The group divided physically into a pair and an individual. Subjects 10 and 14 sat closer together (NE and E on a compass scale, with Subject 11 placed at point W) and often compared task sheets. Subject 11 interacted regularly and with both of the others but not as frequently as did 10 and 14 together. Subject 11 had just 19% of the turns, while 10 had the most (44%), but with 14 not greatly behind (37%). Yet if we look at the turns in the sections where the group is making decisions about the task statements there is only one to which Subject 11 makes no contribution. So superficially we have an evenness about involvement between the three participants. In this transcript there is nothing that could be called disputational discourse and our selected extracts will centre on the distinction between cumulative and exploratory talk, especially with a view to establishing which element might be more crucial in leading to the construction of meaning and the completion of task. Within this the respective roles of the three participants will also be analysed.

This group worked through the entire text initially before turning to the TFI task statements. They then dealt with the statements in turn before recapping on their decisions at the end. Therefore we will examine the transcript in two sections.

At the beginning there is no obvious leader and no definite strategy as extract A demonstrates.

Extract A

1. All ((read silently - (6)))
2. 14 Should we be reading this out loud ?
3. R It's up to you to do it how you want. You decide
4. All ((read silently - (36)))
5. 14/10 ((look at each other, check sheets, whisper))
6. 10/11 ((look at each other))
7. 10 OK, so, um

Subject 14 begins as the spokesperson in terms of interaction with the researcher on matters of procedural and lexical clarification and continues with that role throughout, (see for example lines 44-48) even though she is by no means the leader within the group. The next extract demonstrates the co-operative mode of working they subsequently adopt

Extract B

8. 14 My family is very interesting
9. 10 My parents are divorced (2)
10. 14 and =
11. 10 and they're both married to different partners (3)
12. 14 and * What's that ? ((points to sheet))
13. 11 Got brothers and [sisters

14. 10 Um], half sister and half broth- (1) yeah [he's got
15. 11 He's got] [one sister
16. 10 He's got a] sister, two half brothers and a sister
17. 14 And one sister Natalie
18. 10 Yeah. Three sisters *
19. 11 Two half sisters
20. 10 Three, three half sisters and two half brothers, stepbrothers
21. 14 Yeah
22. 10 Yeah

The talk here is cumulative in that they are building a translation and there is a certain amount of repetition and reinforcement (lines 13-20). But even within this thread of development there is also exploration of ideas and cognitive conflict through a reviewing of evidence. The text here states: '*Donc j'ai beaucoup de frères et soeurs. J'ai une soeur, (Nathalie) trois demi-soeurs et deux demi-frères.*' At line 12 Subject 14 asks a question, 'What's that ?', probably pointing ahead to the '*demi*' part of the *demi-soeurs / demi-frères* phrase. At the same point (line 13) Subject 11 continues with the translation, but Subject 10 who is looking at Subject 14's text offers a version of the words she has queried (line 14). Subject 11 then summarises the information about the one sister, while 10 continues to decode the information on the step-siblings (lines 15-16). Subject 14 develops 11's point by naming the sister and in the next three lines (18-20) they refine the information - three sisters becomes two half sisters, then three half-sisters and two half-brothers (the correct version). All three participants are involved in this sequence and this is reflected by their very equal participation later (lines 127-134) when they come to decide on the first TFI statement, which relates to this section.

In contrast however there are times when although the group is in exploratory mode individually, they do not sufficiently resolve the questions they are asking to make sense of the text.

Extract C

47	14	What does nouveau mean ?
48	R	Nouveau means new
49		(8)
50	10	I think they've just married or something
51	14	My dad (3) [has got
52	10	Is forty] he's forty isn't he ?
53	11	Who, his dad ?
54	10	The dad
55	14	Fille, is that ?
56	11	Yeah, it's four
57	14	What's that ?
58	10	His dad and (5)
59	11	Is that his wife, or his new girlfriend ?
60	10	I don't know

At line 50 Subject 10 seems to be following a productive line of reasoning but then makes an error two lines later, which confuses the development. Subject 14's role here is interesting because by starting a correct translation at line 51 and then asking two questions which remain unanswered she shows she might be able to draw more from this section. Subject 11 corrects Subject 10's number error, and asks for clarification over the last part of the sentence, but does not pursue her question either. When Subject 10 says (line 60) that she doesn't know, this seems to stop the explorative thread.

It also begins another very cumulative section (lines 66-94, see Extract D for an example of this) where Subject 11 stops contributing for 26 lines, and 10 and 14 gradually build up the meaning of the next two lines of text. Since the longer of the two sentences here is a relatively straightforward 'listing' sentence, this does give an indication of the degree to which the subjects appear to be text- rather than meaning-centred. Additionally, there is considerable overlapping in this section, which perhaps demonstrates that they are working more individually and occasionally echoing words that each is saying. The alternative reading strategy of summing up what kind of information the sentence is giving - this is telling us who lives at Guy's house - would have been very appropriate, but it is not clear whether the two participants realise this.

Extract D

74 14 What's belle-mère mean ?
75 R Belle-mère means er like step-mum
76 14 Right so it's like
77 10 Oh so it's like her dad's
78 14 [Like her dad's
79 10 his dad's wife], her dad's wife
80 14 Dad
81 10 With their sister, [sister Natalie, small Maria
82 14 Sister Natalie, small Maria]
83 10 small Maria
84 10 and my half brother Mar- =
85 10 Martin [and me
86 14 and me] .....

On balance then Group A4 is far less disputative than Group B1 but probably also less exploratory in their meaning construction. When they come to making decisions about the TFI statements we can see better whether their work on the text has been successful and whether they explore the options as fully as is needed.

Here it is interesting to look at the statement which gains most of their attention, because they discuss it twice. A comparison of the two extracts will allow us to unpick the thread of the discussion and to shed light on the social dynamic of the group.

Extract E

135	14	Guy is
136	10	The same, I think that's the same age as Chantal
137	11	No it's older than Chantal isn't it ?
138	14	((reads from text))
139	10	Yeah might be
140	11	Well does it say how old he is ?
141	14	((reads from text))
142	10	Yeah he's 14 and Chantal's 22
143	11	So that's false
144	10	Yeah
145	14	Yeah false (2)
200	10	The second one's (2) false I think. (2) It's either Chantal's older than Guy or Guy's older than Chantal, (1) depends which way, could be true one way [or false the other
201	11	Is that Question 2 ?]
202	10	Yeah
203	14	I don't know about that one

204	10	I think it's faux
205	11	Where does it say about ?
206	14	It says up [here une soeur
207	11	Where does it say] Guy's age ?
208	10	There look ((points)) j'ai 14 ans
209	11	[Oh yeah
210	14	It says there] 14 ans so
211	11	That's 14
212	10	Yeah, so I think that might be
213	11	False
214	10	true, no
215	14	Might be true
216	10	Look cause it says that look moi j'ai 14 ans
217	11	Yeah that's 14
218	10	Ma soeur la plus [âgée
219	11	Ch- Chantal is] 22
220	10	Yeah but it's got that la plus âgée ((points)) He's actually saying that so the second one must be true
221	14	*

In the first selection the role of Subject 11 is crucial. She corrects Subject 10's mistranslation of the statement, asks a relevant question and then offers a decision (which is correct). Both Subjects 10 and 14 have also played a part in recreating the meaning of the relevant sentence under the guidance of 11 so seem happy to accept her logic and agree. When the group reviews its answers 55 lines later they have all apparently forgotten that process. Here Subject 11 asks twice where the information is, but once she has seen it again gives her same judgement, that the statement is false. At first Subject 10 also considers that it is false. But this time Subject 14 is unsure and subsequently Subject

10 changes her view. Crucial here are probably Subject 14's two statements at line 203 ('I don't know about that one') and especially at line 215 ('Might be true') because this fuels Subject 10 to continue with her line of reasoning. Subject 11 has just said the statement is false and almost simultaneously Subject 10 says 'true' (lines 212-215). Subject 11 then repeats the two ages, but doesn't repeat her translation of the task statement, which the others have not understood. Her conflict within self seems probably to have been resolved (as it had been earlier). But the conflict with others and with text seems more of a deterrent on this occasion and this prevents her from using persuasive style or simply from framing the right questions as she had done in the first extract. Ultimately we see here the common TFI task practice (very well known to teachers) of matching phrases in the statement with phrases in the text as a means of deciding a response. If there is a match then the statement is true, if there is not, then it is false. Subject 10 bases her rationale on this (line 220) believing that *la plus âgée* in the text and *plus âgé* in the statement somehow 'agree' and make the statement true. It may be that Subject 14 has second thoughts but her utterance at line 221 is indecipherable and is preceded by nodding, presumably concurring with Subject 10's decision.

This extract demonstrates that even when there is exploratory talk we cannot guarantee a correct answer. This is partly because the exploration might be in a false direction, but also because at times we need persuasion rather than collaboration and we cannot guarantee how far individuals will go to assert and defend their beliefs about meaning. This aspect is discussed further in Section 6.3.3.

6.2.2.3 Group A1

Group A1 are characterised very notably by the under-utilisation of two of their members. The group includes the subject who made the joint lowest input to the two combined tasks (Subject 17 who, like Subject 27 in Group A2 contributed only fourteen times in all.) More significant however is perhaps the role of Subject 19 who had a very high GAP reading score, and ought perhaps to have had more input. Unfortunately, he was the only subject who was absent from the individual session and so we have no direct comparison of his performance. He did make some key contributions to both tasks here and there is a contrast between the outcomes of his moves compared with much of the interaction between the two more active group members. Subjects 26 and 28 (both female) were seated together in the centre and did collaborate well during the tasks. However, if we wish to gain an image of this group, it is a comparison of the nature (cumulative or exploratory) of Subject 19's input with that of their combined talk which is the most pertinent to consider.

Initially the three subjects combine quite effectively to create a translation of the first section of the text. Extract A demonstrates even progress and fairly even contributions.

Extract A:

1	28/26	My family is very interesting. My parents are divorced (3) and *
2	28/26	What's maries ?
3	R	Sorry ?
4	28/26	What's maries ?
5	R	Mariés means married
6	26	[married
7	28	oh right]

8	28	They=
9	26	They have different partners
10	19	[Yeah, they're divorced and they've got
11	26	They're divorced and they've got] different partners
12	28	Yeah, they're married, yeah. Em (2)
13	19	got (2)
14	28	they've got (1) a brother and (2) sister
15	19	yeah, brother and sister
16	28	my sister is called Natalie and she's (2)
17	19	three half sisters
18	26	oh right
19	28	three half sisters and two
20	19	half brothers (2)
21	28	my (1)
22	19	fourteen
23	28	fourteen
24	19	years or something
25	26	[ma soeur
26	28	my sister] is er (1) [Chantal
27	26	Chantal]
28	19	twenty-two years old

We can observe here a mixture of cumulative talk (through repetitions), eg lines 6, 11, 12 15, 23 and more exploratory discussion, eg the majority of lines14-20. Subject 19 is a crucial player in this process as he supplies the new information at lines 17 and 20 (and then again at lines 22, 24, 28). In the Four Penfriends transcript he proves very strong on numbers, while the other subjects are less secure with this vocabulary set, and this can be seen to be in action even here with comparatively low numbers. Up to this point, owing

to an apparently good listening process (eg the several instances of phrases '*yeah*' and '*oh right*'), they are managing collaboratively to produce a reasonably accurate translation. But other sections are less successful. Extract B shows a lengthy piece of interaction which is very cumulative in style where one fairly short section of text causes a lot of difficulty.

Extract B(i)

126	19	My little [sister
127	26	Maria] Yeah my little sister Maria aime mettre
128	28	aime mettre
129	26	what's aime mettre ?
130	28	aime
131	26	what's [aime mettre ?
132	19	oh that's likes]
133	R	mettre means put
134	26	put (3)
135	28	Maria
136	19	she likes to
137	26	the little Maria
138	19	she likes to put
139	26	verres on the table
140	28	Na- Natalie
141	26	Sorry, can I ask what's verres ?
142	R	Verres is glasses
143	28	right
144	19	what's that ?
145	28	((shows sheet)) after mettre
146	19	oh yeah
147	26	puts glasses

148 17 on the table

149 28 and les couteaux, what's couteaux ?

150 17 puts glasses and =

151 28 crayons etc

152 26/28 on the table

The first twenty two lines of dialogue concern the phrase '*La petite Maria aime mettre les verres* ... ', and it appears that none of the group are really listening and building the meaning together, but echoing without moving forwards with a translation. Subject 19 recognises *aime* as a familiar word (which had probably been initially learned up to 18 months earlier) and the researcher gives both *mettre* and *verres* after a request. The proof of the cumulative nature of the talk comes if we look from within that section at the accumulation of individual contributions, most notable those of Subject 26, as extracted below:

Extract B (ii)

127 26 Maria] Yeah my little sister Maria aime mettre

129 26 what's aime mettre ?

131 26 what's [aime mettre ?

134 26 put (3)

137 26 the little Maria

139 26 verres on the table

141 26 Sorry, can I ask what's verres ?

147 26 puts glasses

152 26/28 on the table

It is not that she does not hear the contributions of the others in the group, but that she does not really interact with them, but continues with a more personal meaning construction. Eventually all three who are contributing have sorted out the phrase, but we would then ask how much they will retain of the meaning, given that the process was tortuous and drawn out. When they come to discuss Statement Seven, over a hundred lines later, they make no mention of this sentence even though it is a part of the evidence. Extract C demonstrates this and also the 'disappearing' role of Subject 19, who makes very few contributions to the decision making process.

Extract C

257	26	les parents préparent toujours le dîner le soir
258	28	vrai
259	26	that's vrai
260	28	parents prepare the dinner
261	26/17	yeah, vrai
262	19	didn't it say, didn't it say he likes to choose and that ?
263	28	pardon ?
264	19	he says he likes to choose what he has * (2)
265	28	yeah
266	26	does that mean prepare ?
267	28	yeah but the parents [prepare the dinner at night time
268	26	prepare the dinner]
269	19	right
270	28	*
271	26	vrai
272	28	Is that alright with everybody ?

Subject 19 does remind the others (lines 262, 264) of the sentence where Guy speaks about choosing the bottle of wine, but no-one remembers the section on Maria laying the table, nor crucially the line about Natalie making the salad (which they had earlier mistranslated as liking salad). Subject 19 feels that the statement is not true, but does not argue his case. Subject 28 feels the need to be democratic and check agreement, and indeed she and Subject 26 have advanced a rationale for their choice of *true* as a response.

It is perhaps this notion of translating but not integrating and thereby building an overall grasp of more global meaning which is lacking and which also characterises the talk as cumulative rather than exploratory. Again it is Subject 19 who tends to do this more than the others. When they look at Statement 6 they fail to get a very accurate translation of the statement itself, but claim not to find any evidence in the text. (Although they did ask for a translation of *heureuse* - happy, and paraphrased that vital sentence over eight lines). But Subject 19 suggests as evidence that ' *they get on quite well*' (line 255), which indicates a more global awareness of the text, possible stemming from his generally good qualities as a reader.

During the section when they are making decisions about the TFI statements (compared with the 'translation' section), Subject 19's contributions fall from 18.5% to 13.6% of turns. But more crucially he has no input into the final decision about any of the statements.

In the FP task the group spend over a hundred lines looking at the (admittedly quite challenging) first paragraph. As a result of their difficulties in making sense of the text,

Subject 19 suggests (correctly) that the author might be Sasha Four: '*Is it anything to do with the one that writes puzzles ?*' (line 104). But later he advances a rationale for any of three of the authors and is cajoled into remaining with his original choice, which has now been adopted by all of the other three group members. Extract D shows the pattern of non-exploratory talk very well. We can perhaps not even call this cumulative, as each individual is pursuing a more fragmented line of thought.

Extract D:

126.28 Right, grand , big (1) [bookshop

127.26 Bookshop]

128.28 With (-) books

129.26 CD ROMs

130.28 CDs. Is it buy discs which go in CD ROMs or you put discs

131.R Disques means records here

132.26 What's that ?

133.28 Aujour- aujour- aujourd'hui. Oh yeah, that was in that other one

Aujour- aujour- aujourd'hui. Oh gosh

134.R It means today

135.28 Yeah

136.26 Today

137.28 Today (2)

Here there is no sense of moving from the word-level to the sentence-level and certainly no indication of a more global meaning emerging. Over the course of the entire FP transcript seven phrase or sentence units are articulated in detail (not all completely accurately) and from what the participants *say* at least, we cannot assume that they have formed any complete understanding of the major points of the letter.

Subject 19 does not take any part in the Extract D discussion, but facilitates the next section by interpreting the numbers mentioned as prices of the three records Sasha wants to buy. He also suggests that she is stating that she couldn't decide which to buy. Although technically inaccurate, this is moving towards the correct interpretation that the reader can work out which two she bought because she has outlined her preferences earlier and given her total cash sum available. In this way his interjections do seem to move thinking on in a way that is often not achieved when he is silent.

The crucial factor for both transcripts is that at decision-making points, there is never substantial and sometimes no evidence offered. This also supports the contention that here the group process has not created any greater understanding of the text or strategic reading capability than each subject managed in the individual session. Perhaps they did manage their individual tasks better because of this experience, and in this way the group context does still have an impact. But we cannot demonstrate this in the way that we can show the improvement of some of the B group members whose individual task work seemed to have primed them to make the most of the group context.

6.2.2.4 Group B3

Group B3 were constituted as the most able group and proved to be the most successful group in the TFI task, responding correctly to 7 or 8 of the statements (depending on an ambiguity over general acceptance of one answer). They were entirely co-operative, shared the turns much more equally than any of the other groups (with the exception of the dyad, group A3), and were also more able to make the global meanings overt than the other 3 groups under discussion in this section. Although Subjects 8 and 9 (two females)

worked together a little more than did Subjects 7 (a male) and 8 there was communication throughout. This is demonstrated more strongly by the fact that in the FP task Subject 7 was eager to make an early decision and as a result the meaning construction of the text was far less complete, and the wrong conclusion was drawn. Extract A (from the TFI transcript) shows that from the beginning of the task the overall nature of the talk in this group was collaborative and often exploratory:

Extract A:

1.	8	Shall we read through it in English ?
2.	9	Yeah, just like try and work out what everything says
3.	8	OK, my family is [very interesting
4.	9	very interesting]
5.	all	My parents are divorced
6.	9	And
7.	7	I've been, they were married for [two years
8.	9	two years] yeah, that looks about right
9.	8	Yeah
10.	7	Er, beaucoup, what's that mean ?
11.	8	Er, I'm not sure
12.	9	We know but we *
13.	8	Yeah I was just going to say that
14.	7	Deux frères=
15.	9	I have=
16.	7	et soeurs=
17.	9	I have=
18.	7	something about brothers and sisters
19.	9	I have
20.	8	Er yeah, deux, um some brothers and sisters
21.	7	Two, some brothers and sisters

22.	9	Yeah.
23.	8/9	I have a sister, Natalie
24.	9	She's (1) three
25.	8	half sisters and two half brothers (1)
26.	9	Yeah

There are several distinctive features in this extract. The discussion at the outset about how they should proceed makes the process overt from the start. The summarising comments (eg line 8), and the manner in which subjects 8 and 9 particularly use '*yeah*' and '*OK*' to show they are drawing information together in their minds maintains this more metacognitive approach. The tendency to ask each other about meanings before asking the researcher (the first item request comes on line 58) also demonstrates a more exploratory style. We still also see more individual trawls for information, particularly from Subjects 7 and 9, who were seated either side of Subject 8, but these often do come back to commonly shared perceptions. In this extract Subject 9 is attempting to translate the first clause of the fourth sentence (J'ai une soeur (Nathalie), trois demi-soeurs et deux demi-frères) over the course of lines 15, 17 and 19 and finally articulates it together with Subject 8 at line 23. Meanwhile Subject 7 has started looking at the second section of that sentence and tries to build this up over lines 14, 16, 18. But the difference with this group over Group A1 is that Subject 8 acts as anchor to the proceedings. Here she responds to Subject 7 at line 20 and restates his translation and then joins with Subject 9 at line 23 to articulate her section, before supplying the more accurate version, her own translation, at line 25. Subject 9 concurs with this before Subject 7 moves on again.

Each of the three can supply these more precise readings at various points through the task, so for example in Extract B Subject 9 at line 77 re-summarises previously stated information as a way of making sense of a section they were finding difficult:

Extract B:

76. 8 And (3) No not sure about

77. 9 Well she said she had two half brothers so it's (-) probably something to do with a step-dad or something like that [*

78. 8 OK,] alright

Similarly in Extract C Subject 8 draws together two linked strands at line 98, and Subject 7 adds a further recap to make the meaning even clearer:

Extract C:

96.	8	She's (1) with (2)
97.	7	Avec with sa nouvelle femme, a woman. (2) He is with another woman
98.	8	Oh yeah, and that was with a son with my mum and another man
		((shows sheet to 7))
99.	7	Yeah
100.	8	OK
101.	7	Yeah, they're split up, they're split up
102.	8	OK

Again here too in Extract D we see Subject 8's organising role in action. Her calm use of the summariser '*OK*', twice here both draws together a section and then shows that they can now move on.

Finally Subject 7 draws together information at lines 156 and 161, with Subject 8 again taking the centre role to move things forward:

Extract D:

156.7 The little Maria, no it's not something like helps lay the table
157.9 *
158.8 OK
159.7 Natalie, Natalie helps make the salad, the green salad.
160.9 But where's ?
161.7 Is it something going on about how they make the dinner all together ?
162.8 Yeah, yeah OK. We'll do, we'll say that then and go on to the next paragraph

These three short extracts demonstrate a qualitative difference between this group's interaction and all three of the other groups considered. This is perhaps finally additionally well demonstrated by a longer extract which addresses the TFI statement that they find more difficult than most of the others (see section 5.3.3). Statement 3 reads '*Maria et Guy ont la même mère*', and the key word *même* here proves difficult. It may also be that the third person plural form is far less familiar than any other form of the verb, particularly as here with an irregular like *avoir*. But the way they attack this problem and the way they resolve it again makes the group stand out from others.

Extract E:

198.8 Maria and Guy
199.7 [Are both
200.8 Are] the
201.7 Live with their mum, no

202.9 No

203.8 Are the same thing

204.7 It's got something, no their dad, no their mum, it's got something to do with their mum, mère

205.8 OK

206.9 [Where was that bit, we saw même earlier,

207.7 Ont la même mère] What does même mean ?

208.9 We saw it before but I can't remember where it was, was it with, where was it ((shows sheet to 8))

209.8 Maybe it's like they've both

210.9 [It's there it's there look ((points))

211.8 the same mum.] Oh yeah

212.7 Guy and Maria both have the same mum

213.8 Was that ?

214.R Yeah, um, même can actually mean more than one thing. In Number 3 that you're looking at même does mean the same. When you saw it up in the text it means something different there

215.7 Yeah so Maria and Guy have the [same mum

216.9/8 OK OK]

217.7 Is that true or false ?

218.9 Well was it his sister or his half sister, (1) cause then * was it

219.8 Um

220.9 Well he says that my dad has a s- a daughter [who is so

221.8 Oh with another] ((shows sheet to 7))

222.9 Well so they don't have the same mum do they ?

223.7 So that's faux

224.8 Yeah [that's false

The consideration of emerging meaning by linking with words known and words already encountered, the strategy of looking back in the text to find another appearance of the

same item, and finally the consideration of global evidence to make the decision are all key strategies. Here they are used as a group in a dialogic manner with all three participants separately taking the initiative in translation, evaluating each other's evidence, drawing in relevant detail from the contextual background and coming to a conclusion which all three can see is entirely justified. They also use questions frequently which encourages collaboration, but leads, through the framing of the answers, and through their tendency to *listen* to each other, to the talk being much more persuasive, but without losing its air of collaboration. This, then, is an extremely useful example of exploratory talk being used to create a greater understanding than might have been the case for one, two or perhaps even all three of the subjects if working alone. The conflicts which occur are all within self, and these are articulated through the questions expressed to one another within the group. The completely coherent linking of 26 lines of dialogue involving all of the participants in a group is very rare in these transcripts.

6.3 Analysis of discourse

6.3.1 Introduction

Two further examples of transcript analysis techniques are used in this section. The first is concordancing, the second selected discourse analysis procedures.

The purpose of concordancing is to gain a view of the lexis contained in the transcripts and to use the quantitative data generated by the software to investigate the correlation of certain key words in talking about the texts and tasks with success in these tasks. Clearly this is applicable to both individual and group transcripts. The items which would

indicate either a positive grasp on meaning construction or task responses, or an exploration of ideas towards either of these goals will include terminology for thinking, discussion, argument (ie rational support for one's opinions) and decision-making.

The purpose of using discourse analysis on the transcripts is here to shed further light on the activity occurring in the groups, from the point of view of the roles of the participants and the part played by individuals in decision-making within the groups. As shown in Chapters Three (section 3.4.4) and Four (section 4.3.3.) there are several relevant criteria for this, stemming from contexts such as discourse or conversation analysis.

6.3.2 Using the MonoConc concordancing software

The concordancing software was used to track key words used by individuals in their own sessions and in the four focus groups. This section will revisit the comparison of subjects 14 and 27 made in Chapter 5, Section 5.3.5.3, and will also compare Subject 14's individual and group input. It will look again at Subject 18's performance on the individual tasks (see Chapter 5, section 5.3.5.5). It will also compare the best and worst performing groups (B3 and A1).

The list of 44 key words for expressing thought processes about text and tasks are available in Appendix K. The use of modal verbs and adverbs of possibility (eg perhaps, possibly, probably, maybe etc) was not great either in either the individual or group transcripts. This perhaps reveals that extensive exploration of variants of text meaning or task response did not take place across the majority of the transcripts. Given the nature of

the tasks, it appears that items such as 'because', 'so', 'but', (it) 'says' (that), 'or' and 'something' were naturally going to be used to state, explore, or question. In addition to these the group tasks often produced examples of 'well', 'no' and 'we ('re)' as part of the debate / discussion process. Concordancing on 'I think' is also expected to be useful as its use can indicate the speakers' perceptions of their own role (ie as a strongly declarative statement which asserts control, or as a more conciliatory, qualifying statement which invites other opinion). Significantly however, I think was little used by any of the participants.

6.3.2.1 Subjects 14 and 27 compared

Subjects 14 and 27 were the best and worst performers respectively on the individual tasks. For this analysis the frequencies of all of the items appearing in the TFI transcripts were measured through the MonoConc program and the most frequently used items were compared. This revealed that Subject 14 used 63 different words three times or more, while the comparable figure for Subject 27 was 42. We know already that Subject 27 spoke less and was silent for longer periods than 14 so this disparity is not surprising. Given Subject 14's performance we should expect to find she used the 'reasoning' words much more frequently. The result of a simple count of how many of the 44 appear is however unexpected, as 27 uses 14 of the words to Subject 14's 11. However when we consider which of the 39 words were used, the number of times each appeared and the way in which they were used, the findings follow a more predictable pattern.

The comparison below of the respective uses of *because* and *so* are the two most contrasting examples, and are chosen because they illustrate the differences between

these two subjects and also demonstrate how concordancing can add an extra dimension to the transcript analysis process.

Eight of Subject 14's ten uses of *because* (nos 3-10) are to justify a decision about the TFI statements, with one (no. 1) associated with meaning construction and one (no. 2) simply a translation of *parce que*. The task responses demonstrate a global understanding of a piece of text, which she summarises succinctly in each case. The word *because* is thus a key indicator of a successful reader in this task. The first use performs a different function. It is not a means for Subject 14 to account for something but is rather embedded in a sentence which is in fact more important for its use of *might*, than for the word *because*. Here the word itself has significance as a conjunction, insofar as it demonstrates more complex sentence construction, again more typical of Subject 14 than of many others. It also indicates the pattern of quite regular review of information, which characterised Subject 14's approach to the tasks and which was discussed earlier.

Subject 14 - Use of '*because*' in TFI task:

1. 43) 14 It might be I don't smoke 44) 14 [[because]] it smells really bad, or
2. 14 Sunday I play rugby, em 67) 14 It's fun [[because]] two 68) 14 of my friends
3. 94) 14 False. 95) R Mhm. Why? 96) 14 [[Because]] it says that she works on the
4. 103) 14 That's false. 104) 14 [[Because]] she, her favourite's Robbie Williams and
5. 118) 14 and she said no 119) 14 [[because]] she plays rugby 120) 14 and the cigarettes
6. 14 Is the fourth one false as well? 125) 14 [[Because]] is semaine alone like seule ?
7. 146) 14 That's false as well isn't it? [[Because]] She works at the boulangerie.
8. 154) 14 That's false as well [[because]] she plays it.
9. 161) 14 Em. 162) R Why is it false? 163) 14 [[Because]] it says that it's the best in the region.
10.173) 14 that's false as well 174) 14 [[because]] it says um 175) (3) 176) 14 em 177) 14 Saturday

Subject 27 - Use of 'because' in TFI task:

1. second one's false. 49) R Can you say why? 50) 27 [[Because]] if 51) 27 if 52) 27 Robbie Williams if she 53) 27 actually
2. 102) R Can you say why you think it's true? 103) 27 [[Because]] em 104) 27 she likes to 105) 27 she 106) 27 says she likes to 107) 27 play rugby

Subject 27's two uses of *because* are both attempts to explain choices of TFI response, neither of which in the end are successful, and which are made only after a prompt from the researcher. As Subject 27 does not elaborate on her reading at any point unless pressed she will inevitably not reveal her thinking as much as does Subject 14. In passing we might also point out that her lack of confidence is also revealed if we consider her use of the auxilliary *does*. She uses it fourteen times during the TFI task, but of these only one makes her thinking processes explicit: '*Does the first question mean ... does she go ... ?*' The remaining thirteen examples are simply part of a request for vocabulary.

The use of *so* is also revealing in the same way. Subject 27 uses it just once compared with the ten times it appears in Subject 14's transcript. Here we see a good example of Subject 27 thinking though a statement, using evidence from the text, which she has unfortunately partially misunderstood. But it is the only such example. Subject 14's thinking processes are revealed through a broader range of usage of the conjunction. It is seen as an self-organiser in examples 1 and 5, as a means of signalling a conclusion drawn from preceding evidence in examples 2, 9 and 10. In examples 3, 4 and 6-8 it acts as a means to note a half-way stage in evidence gathering and to point on towards the next piece which is needed for the complete picture. Clearly where it acts as a pause, this is evidence of thinking and reflection. This is not to say that Subject 27 does not also engage in such activity, but we do not see the evidence for it if she does.

Subject 14 - Use of 'so' in TFI task:

1. 4) 14 ((Reads silently (46))) 5) 14 Right. [[So]] this first paragraph. 6) 14 Em. At the weekend...
2. Lundi Mardi Mercredi Jeudi Vendredi Samedi 8) 14 [[so]] that's on Saturday. 9) 14 Em
3. 40) R Mauvais means bad. 41) 14 [[So]] 42) 14 is it 43) 14 It might be I don't smoke
4. or something, wasn't it? 73) R Mhm. 74) 14 [[So]] the team is 75) 14 Meilleure. 76) R Er. The best
5. 127) 14 Right. [[So]]. 128) 14 What does dernière mean? 129) R Mea...
6. something about year? 136) R It is. 137) 14 [[So]] is that like 138) 14 that she started
7. 140) 14 The year before or something. 141) 14 [[So]] is that the year before? 142) 14 So is that before
8. 141) 14 So is that the year before? 142) 14 [[So]] is that before? 143) 14 Em. 144) 14 She works...
9. 159) 14 doesn't play very well. 160) 14 [[So]] that's false. Yeah. 161) 14 Em. 162) R Why...
10.178) 14 she goes to the 179) 14 disco. [[So]] they're all false. ((laughs))

Subject 27 - Use of 'so' in TFI task:

1. I think it's play 109) 27 play rugby 110) 27 [[so]] she might not er 111) 27 watch it as well.

6.3.2.2 Subject 14 in individual and group transcripts

Although, as we have just seen, Subject 14 used *because* quite frequently in the individual tasks, she used it only twice in the group TFI task. If we look in more detail at these uses we will see that *because* almost always forms part of a complete sentence, and so signals her confidence in a decision when she uses it. On the other hand, her use of *so*, which appears equally in the individual and group modes, shows a marked tendency (in at least 5 of the 10 instances in each context) to feature in incomplete statements. In her individual tasks of course she has time to reflect and consider, and the reasoning process then continues (on two occasions constituting a major piece of review and exploration). But in the group mode on such occasions she generally fails to finish the line of thought;

hence, this may be both a sign of her lack of confidence in the group mode and at the same time a factor in her failure to make an impact appropriate to her ability there.

By looking at her use of say* (ie say/s/ing) and does* (ie does/n't) we can also monitor examples of how she organised her thinking around decision making about meaning. In the individual session she used a form of *say* seven times during the FTI task. Three of these are part of her rationale for a TFI decision and as such follow on from *because*, but the other four all demonstrate her thinking aloud process. Three of these are attempts to work though a location of the material for a response (one of these forms part of a request to the researcher, but two are examples of her own reasoning and form a dialogue with herself.) The final instance is part of a realisation that she does not understand a section of text. In the group context she uses the word in similar ways, four times to articulate her interpretation of what constitutes important detail, twice to ask other members to justify their readings and twice as part of a decision about a TFI statement.

Subject 14 - **say*** in individual session

TFI

1. ...4 Okay. 14 Em. (17) 14 It doesn't [[say]] the first one does it? R Em.
2. ...the supermarket. (7) 14 Oh yeah. It [[says]] it there, doesn't it ? 14 Yeah. I see...
3. ...False. R Mhm. Why? 14 Because it [[says]] that she works on the 14 samedi...
4. 14 No. 14 I think there it [[says]] 14 em friends 14 kind of like ask her...
5. ...Em. R Why is it false? 14 Because it [[says]] that it's the best in the region.
6. ...14 that's false as well 14 because it [[says]] um (3) 14 em 14 Saturday evening
7. ...I've no idea what that first sentence [[says]]. R Are there any particular words

FP

8. ... Two. R Mhm. 14 Because 14 she [[says]] that 14 well it might be true but
9. ... sings, is it? Em (10) 14 Does that [[say]] something about she's popular in Europe...

Subject 14 - say* in Group TFI session

1 14 Where's it [[say]] that ?
2 14 So where does it [[say]] that ? (3)
3 14 it doesn't [[say[[whether it's called Philippe.
4 14 I would [[say]] that's false *
5 14 Ah it [[says]] here that the family's happy
6 14 So it might be that you can't [[say]]
7 14 It [[says]] up [here une soeur
8 14 It [[says]] there] 14 ans so

Her use of does* is not dissimilar, as she partly uses it to argue through her thoughts (sometimes in conjunction with the word *say* so we have the same examples). In the examples below all incidences of *does** being used simply to request vocabulary from the researcher have been removed. In the group session she challenges the other two participants to say where they have found information and again makes tentative suggestions herself. As with *say* she also uses it as part of a structure admitting that she does not know.

Thus this piece of analysis has to an extent drawn parallels rather than contrasts between her behaviour in the two contexts. We can see that where there is time she is exploring meaning in the group context as well. She also does challenge the other group members to explain their decisions, but more rarely asserts her own position using *says* or *does* in a declarative way. More often it is qualified in some way, through the use of a question or with an expression such as *I would* or *like*. This holds true for both contexts, but of course has no effect in the individual tasks, where she can pause and then pick up again a line of reasoning whenever she wishes and without conceding a turn. Thus we can demonstrate that reading and reasoning behaviour may be exactly the same in both of the contexts but that the outcomes will be different.

Subject 14 - **does*** in individual session

TFI

1. ...Oh what, she works at the supermarket, [[does]] she? 14 Em.
2. 14 Okay. 14 Em. (17) 14 It [[doesn't]] say the first one does it? R Em.
3. . 14 Oh yeah. It says it there, [[doesn't]] it ? 14 Yeah. I see.
4. 4. 14 em on Saturday. 14 But she [[does]] sport on Sunday. R Okay.
5. 14 The rugby team plays 14 like 14 [[doesn't]] play very well. 14 So that's false.

FP

6. 14 [[Does]] je je vais mean 14 like go? R Mm....
7. Em (10) 14 [[Does]] that say something about she's popular...

Subject 14 - does* in group TFI session

1 14 [[Does]] that mean in the garage ?
2 14 Where[['s]] it say that ?
3 14 So where [[does]] it say that ? (3)
4 14 [[Doesn't]] it ?
5 14 it [[doesn't]] say whether it's called Philippe. I would say that's false *
6 14 I [[don't]] know about that one

6.3.2.3 Subject 18 and key word concordances

Subject 18 was the participant who achieved more highly than might have been predicted from reading scores and who asked for the second greatest number of vocabulary items during the tasks. As a result the items *what/s* and *mean/s* are used very frequently in both the TFI and FP tasks. His most used 'reasoning' word in both the TFI and in the FP task is *so*, with 21 occurrences in the TFI task and 12 in the FP task. As we pointed out earlier Subject 18 does not succeed in the tasks because he demands a very high number of words from the 'live' dictionary, but because he uses that information to try to make sense of the text.

TFI task

1. ... 18 Is samedi Saturday? R Mhm. 18 [[So]] the first one's 18 does Chantal go to the...
2. .. 18 her liking classical music 18 [[so]] we'll say that 18 the second one's false...
3. ...hat beaucoup mean? R Er. A lot. 18 [[So]] is the third one does she like going to the disco...
4. ...someone to do something. 18 (6) 18 [[So]] 62) 18 I reckon that's false. 63) 18 third...
5. Erm. Semaine dernière means last week. 18 [[So]] 18 What's commencé? R Erm. Started.
6 18 [[So]] she started going to the supermarket 18 go...
7. working in the supermarket last week. 18 [[So]] I reckon that one 18 that one's impossible...
8. butcher's department. R That's it. 18 [[So]] 18 (10) 18 Is that maintenant. Is it
9.. 18 Oh right. She works in 18 oh [[so]] this one's false. It says she works in the
10. ...and is that pâtisserie the pas- pastry. 18 [[So]] she cooks gateaux. 18 Yeah.
11. ...So she cooks gateaux. 18 Yeah 18 [[So]] no.) 18 The fifth one's false
12. ...what does dimanche mean? R Sunday. 18 [[So]] she likes 18 she likes watching rugby
13 ... R Fatiguée means tired. 18 [[So]] she likes rugby doesn't she? 18 Go with that
14. ...what does l'équipe mean? R Team. 18 [[So]] her favourite rugby team.
15. .... R Means plays. 18 (5) 18 [[So]] her favourite team in 18 (9)
16. ...and and R joue means plays. 18 [[So]] her favourite team plays
17 ... R Good or well. 206) 18 Oh [[so]] her favourite rugby team plays well.
18. ... 18 Doesn't play well. 18 [[So]] her favourite rugby team *doesn't* play well.
19.. ...'s that meilleure mean? R Best. 18 [[So]]. 18 Her team is best.
20. ...18 Her team is the best in the region 18 [[So]] it says that they didn't play that well.
21. on a Saturday, she goes to the disco. 18 [[So]] 18 Sunday. 18 Is that 18 Is...

FP task

1. ..words together mean something. 18 (5) 18 [[So]] is the first line like 18 she's
2 ...she says is very? R Mm. Yeah. 18 [[So]] 18 this 18 her sister is
3. ...plusieurs means sort of several or many. 18 [[So]] that 18 and then that disques is discs?
4 ...enregistrè? R Er. Means recorded. 18 [[So]] she has seven 18 no...
5. film's really popular? R Mhm. 18 [[So]] she has many discs recorded from popular films....
6 ...he travels in television. R Mm. 18 [[So]]. 18 Er. 18 * I reckon it's
7. ... you asked about travaille then. 18 Oh [[so]] that means 18 that's work.
8 18 He works in television. 18 [[So]]. 18 He's a celebrity and works in television
9 a celebrity and works in television. 18 [[So]] from what I've read so far * I'd say it was Sacha...
11 oublié means I forgot or I've forgotten. 18 [[So]]. 18 What's that? Dire les noms.
12 What's that alors? R Em. So. 18 [[So]] he is 18 mm pretty sure it's got to be Sacha 2

These examples of the use of *so* divide into several different categories. Firstly there are those where he makes a decision about a TFI statement (eg *so we'll say that the second one's false*), and then those where he paraphrases (and possibly recaps) meaning (eg *so she started going to the supermarket*). As an extension of this category, there are examples where he appears to cast back and realign meaning after some further information has been processed (eg *So her favourite team* doesn't *play well.*). In other cases *so* is a holding device, often before he asks for a meaning (eg *So. What's commencé ?*) But all of these examples in both tasks demonstrate very fully that he is thinking about new text, constantly reviewing previously read text (even if only just the last few words for the most part) and most importantly trying to integrate meaning. He does not express this in his use of *because* or his equivalent of *I think* (the word *reckon*) which are both used almost entirely to rationalise TFI or FP choices, ie not to qualify his thoughts about emerging meaning but about task completion. But apart from his use of *so* we also see the process through his use of the exclamation / interjection *oh.* This appears fifteen times in all across the two tasks as he notes the emerging meaning of individual sentences and makes connections.

We can see therefore more detailed evidence of the same quality of Subject 18 as was shown by the strategy coding, his ability to read in a more sophisticated way than many other participants, and certainly above the level we might have predicted from his L1 reading scores.

6.3.2.4 Group A1 and Group B3

An initial frequency count of the 44 key terms used for the concordancing analysis demonstrates immediately the expected contrast between the most and least successful groups. If we begin by concordancing on the word *something*, which was used approximately the same number of times (14 by A1 and 11 by B3), we may at first not discern much difference between the groups. Certainly there are parallels in the functions it performs, but there are also differences if only in respective proportions between different patterns.

A1 TFI - something

1. ... 19 fourteen 28 fourteen 19 years or [[something]] 26 [ma soeur 28 my sister] is
2. ...means new 26 new 28 new married (4) 26 [[something]] (2) my dad - he's 28 one (1) daughter
3. ...my dad - he's 28 one (1) daughter (2) 19 [[something]] four = 26 four (1) four ? 28 who's, like,.
4. ... I said that = 19 it's not easy 28 [[something]] like living's not easy, something like that .
5. ...not easy 28 something like living's not easy, [[something]] like that 19 next bit's I live with my dad
6. ...28 it's 26/19* 26 it's [[something]] family 19 it's a family very (1) what's that...
7. ...for example 26/28 ((read aloud)) * 26 [[something]] about dinner, I think 28 For example (1) is
8. ...28 I like, me (2) and choisir (2) 26 [[something]] in the garage 28 What's that word choisir ?...
9. ...26 choose 19 I like to choose 26 choose [[something]]. (2) Eats, is that ? 28 me, I like to choose...
10. ... 19 that's wine in the garage innit ? 26 [[something]] like that 17 yeah 26 wine in the garage
11. ...garage 17 I like to choose the wine 26 [[something]] regarde la télévision 17 watch television
12. ...soaps 26 Oh they like soaps, er 28 is it [[something]] like my family like to watch television programme...
13. ...26/28 my family are complicated (1) 26 No [[something]] mine. Is the last word mine ? R ((murmurs assent))
14. ...yeah, we have arguments when we live together or [[something]] like that. we often chez Guy (2) we often have...

B3 TFI - something

1. ...9 I have= 7 et soeurs= 9 I have= 7 [[something]] about brothers and sisters 9 I have
2. ... she had two half brothers so it's (-) probably [[something]] to do with a step-dad or something like that
3. ...(-) probably something to do with a step-dad or [[something]] like that [*. 8 OK,] alright
4. ...9 It isn't 7 Je n'ai pas. It's not easy or [[something]] 8 [Yeah to understand or whatever
5. ... all Yeah. For example 7 Um (2) Is it [[something]] like on Monday they take, they took us out to dinner
6. 7 No it's not 8 I don't know, it's [[something]] [* 7 Monde] What does that mean ?
7. .... 9 Table] 7 The little Maria, no it's not [[something]] like helps lay the table 9 *
8. ...green salad. 9 But where's ? 7 Is it [[something]] going on about how they make the dinner all together
9. ...9 No 8 Are the same thing 7 It's got [[something]], no their dad, no their mum, it's got something
10. ... something, no their dad, no their mum, it's got [[something]] to do with their mum, mère 8 OK
11. ...the same. When you saw it up in the text it means [[something]] different

The word is used most often by Group A1 as a direct substitute for an unfamiliar word. Inserting it allows them to read on and try to make sense of the rest of the sentence. The most extreme example of this is line 2 in the box above (*..means new 26: new 28: new married (4) 26: [[something]] (2) my dad - he's 28: one (1) daughter*) The researcher gives the meaning of *nouveau* at the beginning of the extract and there follows four very brief turns as Subjects 26 and 28 try to make sense of that section of text. The word *something* is presumably being used for *mari* by Subject 26 who has not heard Subject 28's wrong translation as 'married'. There are other such examples at lines 3, 6, 9, 11, 13 above. In contrast to this Group B3 only use the word in this way twice (at lines 4 and 6 of their extract above). The remainder of the time the word appears as part of an attempt to create meaning, often by paraphrasing and making inferences. An example of this from Group B3 is from line 7: (*9: Table] 7: The little Maria, no it's not [[something]] like helps lay the table 9:* *). Here we see how the attempt to integrate the meaning of a problem section of text leads to a more positive gap fill, a marker of possibility rather than unfamiliarity. Less than half of the instances of A1's use of the word *something* fit this category while only 2 examples of B3's usage fail to fit it.

If we now take an already established reliable predictor of reasoning power for this cohort of subjects, the word *so*, we find the following contrast between the two groups. Firstly there is a clear quantitative difference. Secondly the three uses by Group A1 are each divergent - one is again part of an unsuccessful attempt at meaning construction, a second is a part of a piece of successful textual integration, while the third is part of a justification of a TFI response, although with a technically unacceptable rationale. On the other hand the 16 of the 17 incidences of *so* from Group B3 are part of an ongoing

dialogue which links what at least two of the three group members are saying. In addition each time the word occurs it provides a clear integration of text or a clear rationale for an interpretation of text and TFI statement. Only example 2 from the box below is an incomplete rationale, which does not appear to have a dialogic role in the developing discourse.

Group A1 TFI - so

1. ...le monde 17 dinner 26 sorry, everybody. [[So]] everybody 28* night 26 everybody [has...
2. ...R it means together 28 together all [[so]] we watch television together 26 and you know...
3. ...musique jazz 28 didn't say that 26 no, [[so]] [faux 28 faux]

Group B3 TFI - so

1. ... Chantal (-) a vingt-deux ans (1) 9 [[So]] 8 She's um 7 Twenty= 9 Twenty two=...
2. .... Twenty= 9 Twenty two=. 8 Twenty two. [[So]] that's * , and um 9 And my
3. ... R It means young 9 Oh 8 Oh right, [[so]] 9 So that means younger 7 A young
   9 Younger...
4 ... 9 Well she said she had two half brothers [[so]] it's (-) probably something to do with a step-dad.
5. 9 It's son isn't it 8 Yeah 9 Son. [[So]]. My dad's, my dad's son has yeah 8 Isn't fille
6 ... 8 Yeah, chez is our house 9 Yeah our, [[so]] our 8 And then nous is our[[so]] it's like
7 9 Yeah 7 Guy 9 OK 8 OK [[so]] we've got Guy is an [only child
8 you ((shows sheet to 8)) that was son wasn't it [[so]] that might mean he's an only (-) son.
9 ... he has half (1) he has half brothers and stuff [[so]] that he you'd probably think he wasn't, that that...
10 7 Guy est fils unique 8 OK [[so]] we're [sticking with false 9 Still false
11 it means something different there 7Yeah [[so]] Maria and Guy have the [same mum 9/8 OK OK...
12 he says that my dad has a s- a daughter [who is [[so]] 8 Oh with another] ((shows sheet to 7))
13. ... ((shows sheet to 7)) 9 Well [[so]] they don't have the same mum do they ?
14. ...so they don't have the same mum do they ? 7[[So]] that's faux 8Yeah [that's false
15 . 7 Martin habite] chez Guy 9 [[So]] 7 Martin lives with Guy
16 7 It doesn't say anything 9 [[So]] it's pas clair, we don't know 7 No that means
17 . 8 It doesn't say] that no 9 [[So]] 8 Pas clair 9 ((nods))

A clear parallel to this would be the role of the word *mean/s*. In A1's transcript the word is used only twice by the group members, both times to ask the researcher for an item. In B3's transcript it is used as often between the members of the group as they try to

establish meaning as it is to the researcher after earlier attempts to solve the problem independently had proved fruitless.

Thus we see again that concordancing can give us useful data to add to our strategy coding as we attempt to identify how our readers cope successfully with challenging texts.

6.3.3 Individuals within groups - an analysis of roles, turn-taking and decision-making within groups

6.3.3.1 Introduction

The three elements here of role, turn-taking and decision-making all offer a different approach to an important element of the study, that is, whether reading in groups can be beneficial to some learners and detrimental to others. A discussion of the implications of these findings is in Chapter 7, where the balance between advantage and disadvantage is explored with a view to good practice recommendations. Here it is important to explore the influence of each of these viewpoints on the outcome of the group work.

It would be misleading to suggest that rhetorical organisation plays a large part in the interaction between the groups viewed in this study. Billig's (1987) view (underpinning his analysis of rhetoric in social psychology) of the part played by (theatrical) role and game rules (collaboration and competition) in society (see Chapter 4, section 4.3.2.4), does hold good in some respects. We need to remember that some of the participants of the study were certainly behaving according to game rules which they perceived to be in operation at the time. This may have been either according to their own view of their role

within the school, class and subject or because of the presence of the external researcher, or because of their specific group dynamic. In other words, we would be naïve to imagine that the performance of subjects in the group context was not partially located in a number of factors, independent of their foreign language reading ability. There were almost certainly both specific and also more general and less visible issues. For example, positive affect for some may have been caused by a 'Hawthorne' type 'glow', or by the fact that the investigation was managed by a formally dressed stranger-researcher, or by the fact that they were working in a formal setting. Greater task tenacity might have emerged from a competitive element, in that few subjects wanted to be seen to 'throw in the towel' too early. (A contrast for some between the individual and group performances). Equally, these issues could have had a negative affect (eg the stranger, the formality) and certainly the presence of a video-camera may have inhibited some. The groupings, although mostly notionally unproblematic, may have caused less visible effects on certain individuals. (Group B1 showed this in a very overt way, but group A1's and A4's dynamics were both 'uneasy' in certain respects, as has been demonstrated.)

In addition to this, and more helpfully for the study, (because it is more concrete and thus more verifiable), we can investigate the power of certain individuals to influence the approach to tasks, the time spent on individual elements of tasks and the decisions made during tasks. Such influences can be identified much more tangibly through the use of the approaches described earlier. Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) classification of transactions, exchanges, moves and acts as well as their definition of frames as markers of the boundaries of transactions, although designed mainly for teacher-pupil interaction are still appropriate here. Barnes and Todds's (1995) categories of moves within the

social domain also help to shed light on what is happening within the group discussions. We need to bear in mind for this analysis two further issues in discourse analysis, both arising from pragmatics. Grice (1975) defined four maxims which underlay communication and held that most if not all communication conformed to this. The four principles were quality, quantity, manner and relevance. These signified that people when communicating essentially said what was true and evidence-based, and in a form which gave sufficient information, was clear and relevant. Grice also realised that there might be a conflict with politeness, defined by Blum-Kulka (1997, p50) as 'the intentional, strategic behaviour of an individual meant to satisfy self and other face wants in case of threat, enacted via positive and negative styles of redress.' Brown and Levinson (1987) describe face as positive when the person speaking wishes to be well thought of and negative when s/he wishes to have autonomy or space and not contribute to discussion. These issues stand as a background informing device for analysis which might include an evaluation of motives. In making this analysis we are concerned with the division of turn-taking and the responsibility for decision-making and therefore a sensible approach would be one recommended by Pomerantz and Fehr (1997). In this we are advised to select a sequence of transcript, to characterise the actions within it, and to consider how the speaker packages the actions and what options are given to the interlocutor by that packaging. Furthermore we are encouraged to consider how turn-taking contributes to the understanding of those actions and how this might implicate certain roles and relationships within the group.

6.3.3.2 Task influences on discourse

We have already established that the two different asks used caused reading approaches to vary, with a more linear processing preferred for the FP task in most cases. Because the FP task is more open-ended and does not have a defined set of questions to answer, it is possible that behaviour might vary within the task completion process. The possibility of a major impact is much greater if someone can offer a plausible decision and effectively signal the end of the task. This might occur because a subject wishes to take on the role of 'solving the problem', either out of a desire for personal success or from more competitive motives. It might also happen because s/he might feel demotivated by the task and seek to end it rather than continue. There appeared to be little difference between the roles in groups A4 or B1, but there are two issues worth raising in regard to the other groups. In Group A1 there were a similar number of transactions observable in each of the tasks (8 in the TFI and 4 in the FP task). In the TFI task only Subjects 26 or 28 ever framed (ie initiated or closed) any transaction. In the FP task Subject 19 opened two frames and the researcher opened one and closed one. This suggests that in a more open-ended task the better readers have a greater ability to influence direction and that less good readers, without the structure inherent in a TFI task, tend to hesitate more and look for guidance. Of course the power of patience or impatience is also relevant and in Group B3 Subject 7 forced an early closure (and an incorrect judgement) in the FP task, perhaps because he had been very subtly and skilfully prevented from dominance during the TFI task. Subject 8 is responsible for initiating most of the new transactions, although all three previously close them by summary remarks. Subject 7 is often slightly out of

step in this in the TFI task, where he twice inserts a comment which is intended to frame a new transaction, but this fails to happen. He also twice adds a comment to complete a summary where it appears that Subjects 8 and 9 feel it is unnecessary. This possibly then accounts for his desire to solve the problem presented by the FP task as quickly as possible.

But we need to look more closely now at the detail of the individual roles within all four focus groups and for this purpose the specific roles of Subject 10 in Group A4, Subjects19,26 and 28 in GroupA1, Subject 7 in Group B3, and Subjects16 and 3 in B1 are reviewed.

6.3.3.3 Subject 10 in Group A4

We have already compared Subject 10's strategy use between her individual and group protocols, and have examined the nature of the overall talk of Group A4. If we now look at Subject 10's role in the group (which also contained the most successful individual performer, Subject 14), we can make some conclusions about the effect that individuals can have on others irrespective of their relative abilities.

If we look at the division of the transcript into transactions we see that Subject 14 tends to frame the majority of them, with Subject 10 taking the remainder. But Subject 10 summarises and thus completes a transaction more than Subject 14. Subject 11 is far less involved in these particular moves than either of the other two participants.

If we look within the transactions there is an immediately obvious discourse contrast regarding the use of interrogatives during the TFI task. Subject 14 poses questions on 18

occasions (this includes the vocabulary enquiries to the researcher), while Subject 10 asks only 7. This can best be put into context by the fact that Subject 11 asks 10 questions (despite having only 18.6% of the transcript lines). Barnes and Todd (1995) take the view that questions can create tentativeness which invites other participants to contribute and thus prevents closure. This pattern then indicates that the discourse of Subject 10's utterances is characterised by a more declarative style. At exchange level she is approximately equal to Subject 14 in her use of framing statements introduced by such items as *well, right, now, good, OK,* and *so*. But if we consider only the item *yeah* in the same context, her use is double that of Subject 14 and five times that of Subject 11. It is difficult to differentiate absolutely between *yeah* used as a simple concurrence with (and perhaps encouragement of) a previous speaker and *yeah* as an affirmative declaration of one's own position, but the transcript examples below will illustrate some instances of the latter type of use by Subject 10. It is significant that these examples come from the section of the transcript where decisions are being made about the TFI statements.

The first extract simply demonstrates her confidence in her handling of the material and her apparent liking for leading. Here she makes an assertion about the first statement, and we see that, even in an uncontentious context, she wishes to voice her position more than once.

Extract A

128	10	Ah well the first one's gotta be false
129.	14	Yeah cause that means Guy is um
130.	11	What's fils unique ?
131.	10	Guy's um, is, is an only child

132.	14	Only child
133.	10	well he's not
134.	11	He's not an only child so that's false.

The clear use of *well* and *gotta* establish a desire to frame the exchange and to show strength of opinion. She supplies the response to Subject 11's question and emphasises the original assertion with *'well he's not'* (line 133) underlines this. Both Subjects 14 and 11 show concurrence, but there is a sense that all three have reasoned it to be the same response, have contributed and are happy with this.

The second extract demonstrates another type of exchange from the transcript, which is both initiated and concluded by Subject 10. She starts by beginning to read TFI statement number 3, and finishes by articulating a decision about the statement. She has a tendency within the group to state her ideas rather quickly and her translation at line 148 is in fact incorrect. Despite the pause, Subjects 11 and 14 do not manage a correction, but 14 does query the origin of the information. We see that Subject 10 then shows 14 something on the task sheet and can guess that she is pointing to a piece of text, ie not justifying the translation but seeking an answer. She has found a plausible piece of text for her mistranslation and correctly realises that this text would lead to the decision ' false'. Subject 11 does not speak during this exchange. Subject 10's role is to lead - each of her moves is a declarative statement, with markers such as *'It said ..'*, *'Yeah look'*, *Oh no, they ..'* , *'look'*, *'So that's ..'* all affirming that her statements are true. Subject 14 is reduced to the two monosyllabic concurring utterances, *'Yeah'*, and appears to be exercising her right

to adopt 'negative face', rather than risk perhaps either being wrong or being overruled by Subject 10's determined projection of her own 'positive face'.

Extract B

146.	10	Maria
147.	14	And Guy
148.	10	and Guy, I think that's live with their mum (4)
149.	14	Where's it say that ?
150.	10	* ((points))
151.	14	*
152.	10	It said there's a lot of other people who live there as well. Yeah look ((points))
153.	14	Yeah
154.	10	Yeah, chez nous il y a - Oh no they live with their dad, look, chez nous
155.	14	Yeah
156.	10	il y a mon père ((points))
157.	10	So that's false (3)

We saw already in Section 6.2.2.2 that parallel behaviour by Subject 10, and a reticence by the other two participants to argue a counter-case led to an incorrect decision about Statement 2. Below, in the third extract, we see Subject 10 apparently needing to assert her position even when it is uncertain whether this is different from that of the others. Perhaps being in a hurry to get through the task, she confuses responses to different statements.

Extract C

227. 14 The fifth one is

228. 10 Don't know

229. 11 We knew she had a baby but we didn't know what it's called

230. 14 Number six

231. 10 I don't think that

232. 14 was false

233. 10 Yeah but look she's got elle (2) and Philippe's male isn't it ?

234. 14 *

235. 10 I think he's male so that might be false the baby one. So six is false.
Seven (1)

The response to TFI statement 5 is, strictly, '*impossible to say*', but many groups reasoned it to be false, and this was noted in the performance tables. Earlier Subject 14 had suggested that it was false, and it seems that here she may be accepting Subject 10's 'Don't know' (line 228) as impossible to say, especially with Subject 11's clarifying statement. It might be that Subject 10 actually meant that she didn't know rather than that the TFI response should be *pas clair* - this is unclear on the videotape. Therefore she may still be thinking it through for herself. Subject 14 moves on to Statement 6, but Subject 10 wants to clarify further and finally states that she thinks it is false. In doing this she apparently by-passes Statement 6, thinking that it is the response she has just given (to Statement 5). Her use this time of '*I don't think* ..', '*Yeah but look* .. ' and '*So* ..' on two occasions continues the declarative stance which evidently inhibits Subject 14 especially, who again has an inaudible turn, which leaves us uncertain whether she is fully in agreement or not. But in this context one might expect that someone with doubts would express them through a direct question form or at least a question tag. Line 233 has a

rather declarative use of *isn't it* with a falling intonation, and therefore this cannot be classed as tentative move towards re-opening the discussion but rather as a semi-coercive bid for dominance.

But the focus on Subject 10 alone does not explain the dynamic. In the second section of the transcript where they are discussing the TFI statements, Subject 10 has 47 individual turns to Subject 14's 36, and Subject 11's 25. Given that Subject 14 was to go on to the individual tasks and perform radically better than Subject 10 it is worth a comparison of the overall nature of their dialogue. In that section Subject 14 has six introductory framing statements, and eight statements which offer a potential conclusion to a transaction. The remainder of her moves break down into reading aloud, questions, translation, and full or partial rationales for responses. She also has three inaudible moves. Subject 10 does not initiate much during the first discussion about the responses, but she offers a potentially concluding framing statement for the majority of the TFI statements on both sets of discussions. In 19 of her moves (nearly 50%) she has *well*, *yeah*, *look* or *so* re-enforcing the power of her statements. She poses few questions and uses comparatively few modals, but we should also note that she alone of the three participants uses the expression *I think* (11 times in the TFI task alone). This *is* uttered in the tone which is suggested by Barnes and Todd (1995, p161) as a sign of tentativeness and the renunciation of a claim to prior knowledge. Therefore it is probably as much the other participants not offering challenges as it is her assertiveness which allows her to dominate. Given that she contributes directly to two incorrect answers and argues for two others which have been counted as partially rather than wholly correct, her influence is considerable. Perhaps the greater surprise is not that Subject 14 went on to score so

highly or Subject 10 so poorly in the individual tasks, but that Subject 10's individual protocol is so sparse.

6.3.3.4 Subjects19,26 and 28 in Group A1

Group A1 were noted in Section 6.2.2.3 as being the least exploratory of the four groups, and were also significant for their very disproportionate allocation of turns amongst the four participants, (with the two male members of the group having very low percentage engagement.) Of these two Subject 17 achieved approximately parallel scores to Subject 28 in the individual tasks despite their vastly different contributions to the group tasks (eg 3.9% and 36% of moves, respectively in the TFI task). Subject 17 made only 14 moves across the two group tasks, of which six consisted of a single word. Although Subject 19 also had a small number of moves (approximately 17%) his case is not similar as he was responsible for some of the more difficult translations both in the TFI text reading and in the statement discussion section. There he did not make many suggestions but smoothed the way for decisions by translating key phrases. His manner might be described as quietly authoritative. In the FP task (where his percentage contribution was 12.3%) he suggested the correct penfriend early in the reading, because he was apparently able to make the link between the difficulty of the text and the style of the fourth penfriend. An analysis of his moves in the FP task shows that he had a power far beyond his contribution, not because he asserted one, but because he generally contributed meaningfully when he spoke and because the other participants clearly respected his opinion. We saw earlier that he had more framing moves in the FP than in the TFI task, and this perhaps demonstrates a greater motivation in that more global decision-making

context. A very high scorer in the GAP test, he was also perhaps regarded as a more able student by the class and therefore by the other members of the group. Almost half of his moves were translations, with some correct or at least plausible versions offered after some struggling by Subjects 26/28, as in Extract A. Only six of the twenty-four moves had any element of tentativeness overtly expressed. The remainder were simple declarative statements, sometimes only of a single word (see Extract C). This is not marked by any specific persuasive or assertive vocabulary, but within the context of the transcript often supplies an important input in a low-key manner. His longest statement comes at the end when he is the group member who is apparently most able to review the evidence (see Extract D). His initial suggestion about author identity is adopted by the others but he has doubts by that stage and rehearses the possibilities. It is significant that they want his agreement before they are willing to close the task, and perhaps equally significant in the light of his low percentage input that he is not greatly interested in taking his general analysis and following it through to a more specific conclusion.

Extract A, then, shows his ability to offer a key to a comprehension problem which is unresolved by the others in the group:

Extract A

46.	28	Bien] what's bien ? I've forgotten. We've just done it, bien
47.	19	That's
48.	26	When
49.	28	No it's not when
50.	19	That's a lot, innit, or something ?
51.	26	When isn't it ?

52. 28 Bien (1) Is bien when ?

53. R Em, j'aime bien together means I like a lot, doesn't it, or I *do* like something.

His contribution is offered but not pursued when it is not taken up by the paired female subjects alongside him. He does not seek actively to persuade, and in fact has more tentativeness about this translation than any other he subsequently makes with a double qualifier though the question tag and the use of *or something*.

Extract B gives an example of his ability to make connections between sections of text by reading on and referring back, and so hints perhaps at the real potential of his superior reading competence. The item *compositeur* and the name Tchaikovsky are in separate paragraphs. Furthermore he knows that the word is composer without articulating that again and he knows Tchaikovsky is a composer. Since we see comparatively little cultural knowledge in the transcripts, this sets him apart a little.

Extract B

114.26 The (4) com- (2) Composer (1) I think, no it's

115.28 What's [years

116.26 What's compositeur] =

117.19 It says he likes Tchaikovsky

118.28 Mm

119.26 Mm (4)

120.28 The (1) composer (2)

The separation of the four at the beginning of this section is total. Subject 17 is not involved. The extreme hesitancy on the part of Subject 26 at line 114 and the fact that Subject 28 is looking at a different piece of text and not engaging in any dialogue leaves Subject 19 to read ahead. We cannot know whether Subject 26's partial translation at line 114 has given him an impetus to scan for relevant detail or whether he was already ahead of the group at that point. The girls' response at lines 118 / 119 may be a return to dialogue, but Subject 28 reverts to her previous point immediately afterwards. Here then we have an example of a section of text where there are no framing or response moves because the group are pursuing individual lines of investigation. About 30 lines later Subject 28 reaches that point in the text where the composer is named, and exclaims; '*Piano music by yeah Tchaikovsky*', the integration with the previous section being demonstrated by the use of *yeah* in that context.

The fact that Subject 19 knows vocabulary better seems to emerge through the task, and he readily takes on the role by the end of providing information which is clearly not known by the other participants, rather than wait for them to struggle as before, as in Extract C.

Extract C

147.28	Er (1) One disc (1) *
148.28/26	((compare task sheets, point)) *
149.19	Sixty
150.28	Sixty (-) francs. Disc is music
151.26	Piano by
152.28	Piano music by yeah Tchaikovsky. Un de cinquante trois, three

153.26	Three
154.28	Cinquante
155.26	Oh yeah
156.28	Cinquante, twen=
157.19	Fifty
158.28/26	Fifty three francs
159.?	Un de trente
160.19	Thirty
161.28/26	Thirty eight

By this stage he has become the authority figure, as least as regards French numbers. He responds three times, the first after some considerable hesitation and comparing of sheets by Subjects 26 and 28, the second after an indication that a false translation is emerging and the final time as a matter of course. Here the other members of the group are clearly listening as they repeat each time the number he has given. But his input here is on the very simple level of one-word-translation, and his moves are not framing fresh exchanges or contributing to task completion in any other sense than basic meaning construction. Even here then when he has a kind of influence, he is still not shaping the discussion. We could return to the point made much earlier in the chapter that the group's discourse is characterised as cumulative for the most part and that within that style of talk there is little dominance involved.

At some point however the group need to make decisions. In Extract D we see his ability to recap and make general inferences from the whole text. At this point he is evidently eager to make a comment because he speaks immediately after the question is posed by the researcher. But, despite perhaps being able to seize control and argue through his ideas in a more persuasive manner, he chooses to make a brief and rather indecisive

judgement, and clearly does not wish to explore the implications of his indecision further.

After that he does not really contribute except to move to closure with his final input.

Extract D

179.R	OK, are you still, which Sasha are you thinking of as the one who wrote it ?
180.19	Could be any because it says she went on a balloon with discs and that could be tells outrageous lies or the Maths freak, and she kept going on about, like, music and stuff like that so it could be [the first one
181.28	It says she spent] a hundred pounds
182.26	Yeah
183.28	I think Sasha Two (2) because she spent a lot of money. I don't know how many francs there are in English money, but it sounds like a lot
184.R	Em, it's about ten francs to the pound at the moment
185.26	I think Number Four though because it said about the balloon at the beginning
186.28	Now you've said that it doesn't sound that much really (3) Go on then go with Number Four
187.19	I don't mind any
188.28	You can't say you don't mind any
189.19	Yeah, it could be any of them though
190.26	((to 17)) What do you think ?
191.17	Yeah I think Number Four
192.26	((to 19)) And what do you think ?
193.28	Are you going to go with us ?
194.19	Yeah all right then
195.all	Four then

We are left then with a sense that here is a participant who could have had a more major impact on the task, and although we cannot be sure why this was so, it would seem logical to note two possible reasons. The more obvious one may be that his motivation was simply not that strong, although we can note that in the FP task he did speak quite regularly throughout the transcript, even if not very much in total. His comments do also demonstrate that he was actively reading the text. (As the only participant present for a group session who did not complete the individual tasks, he has left one valuable channel of investigation impossible). Perhaps sufficient motivation to gain anything other than a superficial reading was absent. But another reason might be the group dynamic. The nature of the dialogue between Subjects 26 and 28 which dominated the discourse of both tasks possibly reinforced Subject 19's reluctance to input more. The major characteristic of their rather cumulative discourse are the instances where they worked almost individually, but aloud. This may have made greater input from a third person difficult. Each of the extracts above hints at this tendency for 'parallel' rather than interactive dialogue, but Extract E demonstrates this point at length.

Extract E

10. 28	Today I'm free to go (2) This is hard
11. 26	Je fais
12. 28	Temps
13. 26	Temps
14. R	Temps means time
15. 19	*
16. 28	Time free I go
17. 26	Beaucoup *
18. 28	I go time free

19. 26	What's beaucoup ? (2) What's beaucoup or [beaucoup or whatever it says ?
20. 19	I choose]
21. R	Beaucoup means a lot
22. 28	Je fais
23. 26	So that one's a lot, so (1) I
24. 28	Fais means go doesn't it ?
25. 26	Yeah
26. 19	Yeah
27. 28	Fais is go so I go a lot
28. 26	Cho-
29. 28	I go a lot
30. 28	Choses
31. 19	Is that one I choose or what ?
32. 26	Is choses .. ?
33. R	Choses means things

In the 23 lines of Extract E, we see only two brief instances (lines 24-26 and lines 30-32) where there is dialogue. For the remainder of the time, although participants may be listening to each other partly they are not actually interacting at all. The language here is qualitatively different from that of Group A4 where Subject 10's desire to lead the task was visible in the discourse she adopted. Here we see the great majority of the 'discussion' at text-driven level, ie at the level of translation into English. The individual meanings of words are being identified, but there is comparatively little attempt to form global meaning from the jigsaw which emerges. Along with this is a complete absence of framing moves or declarative / tentative language. The one point of true interaction arises from a question not to the researcher but amongst the group. This is clear evidence for the

text being too difficult and the strategies insufficient to compensate. It is especially significant that they are looking at the first couple of sentences of the text. One could argue that it might be either very important or yet completely unimportant to get a good translation of this section. It does act as an advance organiser for the text, but equally gives no specific information. Yet neither of these aspects of approaching a text are discussed, because such a strategic approach is not part of the group's existing work skills. If we extract each of Subject 26 and Subject 28's lines during Extract E we find they make quite a lot of sense as a connected string, and this proves that they are not interacting, but also demonstrates why there is no need to assert positions and gain dominance. They are working almost completely as individuals. Subject 19 on the other hand always steps into the dialogue and makes it a dialogue at least with one of the pair if not both. They do almost inevitably at some point (sometimes six or more lines below) pick up his input and move it on with their own. But even this is not really dialogic in character. The discussion in Chapter Seven on the value of group work tasks for reading will address this issue.

6.3.3.5 Subject 7 in Group B3

Group B3 was intended in part to explore whether it was possible to create an 'able' group. Although it was assembled using the same criteria as the other groups, ie essentially friendship grouping in the normal classroom, the three students involved were all among the identified successful readers on both sets of evidence. This was the only group of which this was true. It was the most successful group in performance terms but

also in their use of strategies and their ability to generate exploratory talk. The three members were very equally involved and Subject 7 is chosen for focus because, on the basis of the individual tasks, he was slightly weaker than the other two participants. In the TFI task his own contributions are characterised by a high frequency of moves which move ahead in the text often to translate the next section. These moves are not specifically marked by discourse items which in themselves indicate a desire for dominance, but the content of his statements has the subtext of an assertion that the preceding section is now complete and the group should refocus on the next. This tendency is shown in Extract A, in two short sections from the beginning of the transcript.

Extract A

5.	All	My parents are divorced
6.	9	And
7.	7	I've been, they were married for [two years
8.	9	two years] yeah, that looks about right
9.	8	Yeah
10.	7	Er, beaucoup, what's that mean ?
11.	8	Er, I'm not sure
12.	9	We know but we *
13.	8	Yeah I was just going to say that
14.	7	Deux frères=
15.	9	I have=
16.	7	et soeurs=
17.	9	I have=
18.	7	something about brothers and sisters

24.9 She's (1) three

25.8 half sisters and two half brothers (1)

26.9 Yeah

27.7 Moi, me, and j'ai quatorze ans, fourteen, er, years old,

Again, as with Group A1 we do not see any sort of fight for control at this point, and it is difficult to be sure whether Subject 7 is in fact making a decision that the group should move on, or simply ploughing an individual furrow. There is a sense even in the short extracts above and certainly throughout the transcript that Subjects 8 and 9 are in real dialogue much of the time. If we look at Barnes and Todd's (1995) discourse moves of initiating, extending, eliciting and responding we see many more examples of the first than of the other three (which all require some kind of dialogic action). Similarly in the categories they present in the social domain there is little evident from the 'supportive behaviour' section. In terms of the first section where the group is constructing meaning, Subject 7 almost never reacts to anything the other members have said. He asks five questions but three of these are to the researcher. Subjects 8 and 9 on the other hand frequently react to each other's statements. In the decision phase of the task there is much more even reaction. As the male with two females Subject 7 may have felt slightly more separated, but the seating arrangement did bring all three participants into close contact and there are several instances of a direct approach from Subject 8 to Subject 7.

The contrast between the two phases can be shown by the following extract, where there is only dialogic interaction between all three subjects.

Extract B

256.8	Guy doesn't argue very often
257.7	True
258.8	Does it say that ?
259.7	Yeah
260.8	OK that's true isn't it ?
261.9	Where, does it say anywhere ?
262.7	It doesn't say anything
263.9	So it's pas clair, we don't know
264.7	No that means pas clair, [not that we don't know
265.9	Yeah but it's not clear]. ((to 8)) Yeah but it's not clear is it anywhere because it doesn't say
266.8	It doesn't say but they all seem, he said they were happy didn't he ?
267.7	Yeah
268.8	OK

Every line here could be classed as reaction to a previous contribution, and we showed in the previous section that it was precisely this level of exploratory discourse which made Group B3 the most successful group. But a more detailed analysis of the individual contributions to the discourse, as typified here, is that Subject 7 while now much more in 'reaction' mode, still reacts more by declarative statement than by either questioning or offering more tentative interpretations. Each of his five moves here is apparently intended to close a unit. Line 257 is offered as a response to Question Six, with the subtext being: 'so we can move on'. Line 259 reinforces this with a 'Yeah' which is not supporting a previous statement but is intended to stifle a doubt. In fact the response is the correct one, but without reasoning it does not have validity in this task context. Subject 9 wants the evidence and is assertive enough against both other group members to probe further. At

line 262 he weakens his position by stating effectively that there is no evidence, but the intonation here makes this a definite statement not a tentative one which might want someone else to locate a relevant piece of text. As Subject 9 seizes on the logic of that statement in line 263 (saying that this would make the correct response, 'pas clair') Subject 7 reacts to this negatively, taking an over literal reading of what she has just said to turn the argument against her. Again Subject 9's assertiveness ensures that the matter is not left there (cf Subjects 10 and 14 in the previous section) and she argues cogently for a '*pas clair*' response. At this point Subject 8, as a major organiser through the task, reminds them of the key sentence in the text, which states that the family is happy. Subject 7 concurs and we cannot know whether he has been convinced by that logic or is simply happy that his original assertion (made without a rationale) has been vindicated.

In conclusion then we can see that this more detailed move by move analysis reveals a slightly less even exploratory ethos to the group dynamic. This is not to denigrate Subject 7's contributions which in forging ahead in the text supply important readings. And are therefore significant. But we need to note the other contributory factors such as the persistence of Subject 9 in asking questions, both of herself and others (she most visibly re-reads sections of text to check on both meaning and statement decisions). Subject 8 also asks questions regularly, but additionally significant is her calm and authoritative central organisation. She uses the interjection '*OK*' twenty times during the TFI task, almost always to assert not a reading, but a calming statement of closure of a stage and a need to look ahead. This is rarely done in impatience or as a desire to impose but almost always as a leader, who in fact seems to be unquestioned. Thus a single marking item can reveal a great deal about the dominance which comes from a persuasive participant who

also listens very carefully to the other members of the group. Subject 8's very high reading scores may again suggest that she is acknowledged within the class to be an intellectual ' authority' figure.

But given the dynamic revealed above it is perhaps not surprising that in the single decision-making element of the FP task, they were less successful. They began, apparently, with an intention to construct the meaning of the entire text again, but were short-circuited by Subject 7's desire to read much more selectively, to exclude possible authors almost immediately and then to make an early decision. In this he chose the wrong author and the subsequent debate was not able to find sufficient detailed evidence to substantiate or counter that initial assertion. Subjects 8 and 9 clearly thrive on logical procedure and reasoned argument. It raises the important issue about single global decision tasks that there needs to be initial metacognitive decision-making about procedures between the participants, overtly discussed and agreed if such tasks are to be at their most successful.

6.3.3.6 Subjects 16 and 3 in Group B1

Group B1 has been shown in section 6.2 to be the only overtly disputative group, but they have also, ironically, demonstrated this more open discussion about procedure in both the TFI and FP tasks. Extract A shows the opening to the FP task, with three of the four subjects involved.

Extract A

1. 3 She says hello and then she says I go (2), then something about the library, (-) I go to
2. 2 Shall we start with, like, Sasha One and see if it's ?
3. 3 Just read it through because you'll be able to tell (3) rather than doing it over (1) and then she says (-) I go (2)
4. 15 Well read it to yourself and see what everyone thinks

While this is not positively dialogic, the reactions are clearly made. Subject 2 was the only participant in the study who attempted to approach the FP individual task from this perspective, ie reading first to see if it might be Sasha 1, then to see if it could be Sasha 2 and so on. His attempt to suggest the same approach here fails because Subject 3, while not aggressive towards him, wants to translate, and Subject 15 decides she wants to make her proposals heard at this point, although, for a short while, in a more reasonable manner. To an extent there is then a split in approach because although the translation process continues there is no coherence to the discussion, as Extract B demonstrates very pertinently.

Extract B

17. 3 And then she says, er, I am, sport teams, plays in sport teams (1) I, I adore by doing
18. 15 Thought you said that meant library
19. 3 Yeah I did
20. 15 Well, what's that mean then ? (3)
21. 3 * Fine, I just guessed. I don't know what it means, do I (4)
22. 2 What does FNAC mean ? Is that like a local library ?
23. R Er, FNAC is the name of a kind of a bookshop chain, so I suppose it's a bit like WH Smith would be, there's one in lots of big towns (4)
24. 3 J'adore faire du
25. 2 I don't think it could be Sasha Four, [the Maths freak

26. 3 Is patinage], is that painting or something ?

27. R No, patinage ? (-) It's ice-skating

28. 3 Right. I adore doing ice-skating

29. 15 I know who I think it is

30. 3 My favourite sport (3), I do with six, with six people (2), em, on fait (1), we do (2)

31. 2 Says she does something about music

32. 3 With a balloon (1) Ballon, (1) what's a ballon ?

33. R It's a ball

Here we have several transactions and exchanges in operation. Line 17 follows on from the previous section (shown as Extract A) and the intervening lines have been a dialogue between Subjects 3 and 16. Subject 2 speaks at line 16 but does not complete his statement and we cannot be certain of his intention. Subject 3 continues to translate as Extract B begins, but at that point Subject 15 takes up the rather aggressive stance she adopted for much of the TFI task. The four line dialogue with Subject 3 typifies the distrust of each other's opinions, and both the discourse content and tone demonstrate their antipathy. Each of the four lines is declarative and challenging. 'Thought you said ...', 'Yeah I did', 'Well, what's that mean then ?', '* Fine, I just guessed.' The initial move from Subject 15 is technically a question, but hardly a tentative one, and the intonation pattern and choice of words are such that it emerges rather as a challenging statement. As such it is met by a strongly declarative response, with 'yeah' here used as a defence of the earlier expressed opinion. The use of 'well' and 'then' to frame the next move from Subject 15 pursues the challenge with a clear intention to gain dominance at least in that particular relationship. Subject 3's admission that he may have been wrong reveals, perhaps, that he is not seeking dominance but merely trying to offer interpretations. 'Fine'

operates strongly as a defence of his practice, and legitimises guessing as a valid activity for the task. His follow-up ' I don't know what it means, do I (4)' uses the force of the question tag, not as question but declaration, similarly to turn 'ignorance' into a normal and acceptable situation, of which he need not be ashamed. The four second pause after this final move in the frame indicates that they have perhaps moved outside the boundaries of an appropriate tone. Subject 15 is initially quiet and when she next speaks at line 29 she is ignored.

However she has succeeded in moving the attention of the group to the section ahead where the word *librairie* appears. At line 22 Subject 2 enquires about the meaning of *FNAC*. The intonation of: 'What *does* FNAC mean ?' offers a small move towards Subject 15 who has raised a legitimate point, if in a very negative manner. Subject 3 has clearly retreated into individual mode now. Lines 24, 26, 28, 30 and 32 form a monologue, sometimes connected to an enquiry / response with the researcher, but in no contact with the comments from Subjects 2 and 15 who are exploring the more global question of authorship, probably both individually as well. In other words we do not have a dominant participant at this point because in effect we do not have group work. If a power struggle emerges which becomes unpleasant there is always a possibility that both protagonists will fail to gain the dominance they are seeking because the remaining members will not grant it. Positive face has failed for this period of time so each participant is ensuring the continuation of negative face as a means of continuing their individual progress in a public arena. The contrast with the dialogic character of discourse in the Group B3 is stark, at least in this section, and the major reason would appear to be the disputative nature of the talk. The group has addressed procedure, but

rules for positive collaborative behaviour (unwritten and not discussed by this group) clearly cannot be taken for granted.

Extract C demonstrates that the members of the group can construct a more positive dialogue, but that again it is the potential for discord between the same two participants which threatens the process. This section shows most strongly that there is no dominance within Group B1 and perhaps this is part of the problem. It opens with a direct enquiry between the two female members of the group, with Subject 15 (having been ignored earlier) feeling that she will receive a response from Subject 16 if not from the two males. Because this is no longer about meaning construction but about closing the task with a definite authorship decision, both Subjects 2 and 3 are immediately drawn back into dialogue.

Extract C:

35. 15 Who do you] think it is C. (Subject 16) ? I think it's Sasha One (3)

36. 2 Yeah, but the letters aren't [boring

37. 15 Or Sasha] Three

38. 3 Yeah

39. 2 Sasha Three, cause the letters aren't boring, cause it says that she, like, does lots

40. 15 Yeah but she goes over the same things over and over again and it does because that's what, if you said that that means library and she's said about it there as well

41. 3 But it probably doesn't [because they'd have one word

42. 15 She's repeated herself]

43. 3 for library wouldn't they, not two ?

44. 15 So what does that mean then ?

45. 3 [I don't know

46. 2 Does libre] mean library ?

47. R Er, libre means free. What you've got there is temps libre [which means free time

48. 2 ((holding out task sheet)) So it's not talking] about the library is it. So it's [got to be Sasha Three

49. 15 Yeah, well there is] some things which are repeated

50. 3 But you should read it all the way through [before you start deciding

51. 15 Yeah, but there is] Shut up A (Subject 3), there is some things that are repeated (1)

52. 3 But you always * You read about the first three lines and then you start deciding

53. 15 I've read it all (1)

From lines 35 to 49 there is some element of discussion. Subject 16 does not join in despite the invitation from 15 to give an opinion. The pause at the end of line 35 suggests that each member is considering evidence. Subject 2 rejects 15's proposal but at the same time she is herself considering the possibility of another author. During the majority of this section Subject 3 is accommodating rather than argumentative, as if he feels unwilling to risk similar conflict. So at line 38 he concurs with 15's second suggestion with the single word: 'Yeah'. He disagrees with Subject 15 about the repetitive nature of the letter, but does so by admitting again that he was mistaken earlier about the meanings of the two words, *libre* and *librairie*. The lack of substantial meaning construction has the effect of creating an increased subjectivity in the decision making which is therefore without real concrete evidence. The source of the conflict earlier, ie the meanings of just

two words, now forms a major plank in Subject 15's argument: these two words mean the same, therefore she is repeating herself. Subject 2's rebuttal is on the basis that the author 'does lots'. The struggle for dominance in the actual decision making is very real and is characterised specifically by the use of '*yeah*', '*but*' '*so*' and '*well*'. These markers appear at the opening to 9 of the 19 lines, constantly reinforcing the opinion of the current speaker and asserting the differences in position, which appear to expect no further discussion. In other words they are all attempts at closure. All three of the participants in the conversation at this point use these markers, so we have here a real tripartite struggle for dominance rather than a single subject asserting dominance and being allowed to proceed. The fact that Subjects 2 and 3 share an opinion does not emerge because each of them addresses Subject 15 rather than enter into dialogue together. The last five lines reveal the inevitable result of advancing opinions without real evidence. Subject 15 settles obstinately (lines 49, 51) for her initial decision about the authorship, while Subject 3 returns to accusing her of not reading the text. Subject 2 has again withdrawn from the debate at this point, having at least tried to resolve it by finally fixing the meaning of *libre* at line 46. Perhaps his rather declarative statement at line 48, characterised by a rhetorical device of the word *so* used twice, *So it's not .... So it's got to be ....* , is the final straw for Subject 15 and in effect makes her dig in her heels without being able to supply evidence. It is also important to note here the large amount of overlapping. The effect of this is actually to reduce the dialogic quality still further. At times we cannot even be sure that the disputative comments are actually responding each to the other. Lines 41-51 contain 5 overlapping sections, involving all three of the participants who are engaged at that point. Again it is apparently a battle for a supremacy

of ideas with only the two, legitimate, topics (the task and the approach to the task) being discussed, yet we cannot help but infer that there is more of a personal slant to the conflict. It would be wrong to conclude that this is definitely a gender conflict - we have no direct evidence of that. But it would be equally wrong to exclude the possibility. If it is a gender-based dispute, we can note that the coercive style used more by boys than girls in Brewster's (1999) review of her 1987 data has here been very well adopted here by a female group member.

In Extract D, we see a resolution which, although not quite final, does hold for all but Subject 2 to the end of the session. The need to draw evidence in from outside sources continues, as they have still made comparatively little progress in terms of precise textual meaning. They link in line 93 with the comparable letter in the individual task, seeking a rationale across the two letters (which was not relevant as they had been written by different authors). They draw in impressions about the character of the author (lines 94, 96) and suggest what might be expected in the stylised format of penfriend letters (lines 97, 98, 100). Because there is broad agreement emerging, and perhaps because the agreement is in line with Subject 15's opinion the dialogue is less combative. We still see markers such as 'but', 'well', 'right', but uttered in less assertive tones. Subject 3's move in line 95 demonstrates this by acknowledging the possibility of 15's last statement through 'Right' plus an inaudible but not aggressive further comment, and then continuing with 'maybe' before ending with a softer 'but', which tails off in an accommodating tone. Subject 16 also uses 'maybe', Subject 3 uses 'could'. Lines 98-101 offer a connected exchange which links line by line with Subject 16's move building on Subject 2's

reasoning and adding humour, and Subject 3's summary picking up the logical development with 'because' and ending with a question tag which invites agreement from the others. This section allows Subject 15 to repeat her decision on authorship as a conclusion. Subjects 3 and 16 are then both happy to agree immediately.

Extract D:

93.	3	The last one actually talked about her brothers, talked about herself and her brothers and sisters really, but all she talks about is
94.	15	Well they obviously don't come first - she obviously thinks of herself first if that's all she can write about - she's writing all about herself and then her brothers and sisters are last
95.	3	Right * maybe she hasn't got any brothers or sisters, but
96.	16	Maybe she doesn't like them
97.	3	She could perhaps talk about her parents. I think it's [Sasha One
98.	2	But you'd just say] Oh I've got some brothers and sisters
99.	16	But I don't like them !
100.	2	You wouldn't say what they like, [things or anything. You'd just say you'd got brothers and sisters
101.	3	Because she does repeat herself quite a lot - it's a pretty boring letter. It's not exactly exciting, is it] ?
102.	15	Sasha One then
103.	3	Yeah Sasha One I'd say
104.	16	Yeah

Essentially, what we appear to have in group B1 is a desire for equality of opinion. The disputes throughout both tasks occur when a participant appears to be trying to gain dominance. The most constructive periods are when there is broad agreement and each member is happy to add evidence. The discourse varies in this way through all the

extracts we have considered. Clearly the group might function even better if the ground-rules could be set, not by external edict, but from within. If aggression were removed, more deliberate consideration of textual evidence might then follow, and the performance would then be enhanced.

Across the four focus groups we have seen a variety of styles of working, illustrated by a range of discourse structure. A comparison is made more possible because the groups were extremely task-focused throughout. Redundant or off-task talk is almost non-existent, and there is a seriousness of approach in all four groups which were investigated in detail. As a result the contrasts which emerge demonstrate clear messages about the ways in which these learners are reading, and the ways in which it might be possible to help them read more successfully. These issues form the subject of Chapter Seven, and follow the summary of the follow-up questionnaire in section 6.4 overleaf.

6.4 The follow-up questionnaire

The questionnaire (Appendix L) was completed by 28 subjects (which included one person who missed the entire programme, and one person present only for the testing, and excluded one person who did group task but not individual task and one person who did the individual but not the group task). The 24 subjects who completed the whole programme also completed the questionnaire, and their responses are separated from those of the other four respondents in the summary which follows.

Given the overwhelming preference for the group mode of working (which is entirely in line with the original questionnaire reported on in Chapter 3) the discussion needs to be viewed in conjunction with the analysis of the group transcripts already presented in this chapter in sections 5.3.3, 6.2.2 and 6.3.3.

6.4.1 The responses to the preference questions:

1. Which did you **enjoy** more, working by yourself or working in the group ?

   By myself 3 In the group 25

   Why ?

   1. Preferred group, was part of a group (23)

   Because I can discuss anything with the group

   Because I could discuss with my friends

   Because I felt more confident

   Because I felt more confident in speaking in a group

   Because I like to see if the answer I say is right

   Because I wasn't nervous and I could discuss with people so it wasn't all up to me to get the right answers

   Because it made it easier and you can discuss the answer

Because it seemed to make it better because if something was wrong it wasn't only you that had made the mistake it was the whole group

Because people help you

Because we all worked together well and we all knew different things

Because we could talk about our answers and exchange opinions

Because we worked together well and found out what the paragraph said quicker

Because when I'm in a group I know that other people can help as well

Because when you make a statement they can either agree or disagree with you, so it helps you out

Because working in the group with my friends made me feel more secure

Because you can share your answers and see what they think

Because you can talk about the answers together and understand the question in the first place

Because you had a chance to discuss

I felt a lot more confident in what I was doing

I felt more confident and less nervous because my friends were there to discuss with

I felt more confident in front of Mr .... and the recorder

It was easier

+ One blank box

2. <u>Preferred group - did not do groupwork</u> (1)

Because I don't feel as nervous

3. <u>Preferred individual - did both modes</u> (1)

Because it was my decision and I didn't have to convince anyone

4. <u>Preferred individual - did not do groupwork</u> (1)

Because I liked the worksheet more and giving independent answers

5. <u>Preferred individual - did testing but neither individual nor groupwork</u> (1)

I was away for the groupwork

6. <u>Missed entire programme</u> (1)

Because if we work together we will learn off each other about new frases [sic] or words about French

Of clear significance here is the response under section 3. above which can be identified as Subject 3 who was involved in the examples of purely disputational talk with Subject

15 in the group task. He is the only participant of the 'core 24' (those who completed the full programme) to state a preference for the individual mode.

Eight of the respondents from the core 24 identified an affective reason for group work preference (using terms such as 'confident', 'secure' and 'mistakes' in their rationale). It is perhaps important to remember that reading is viewed as a difficult skill and that confidence can be a crucial aspect of reading competence. Here, there is no clear correlation, however, between those who made such statements and a level of performance in individual tasks or in reading ability as measured by the GAP test and this demonstrates that there is a need to see affective issues as separate from ability issues.

The majority of the group indicated that discussion was an important element of group work for them, and within this they may have considered such discussion as was described earlier as exploratory talk. But it is interesting, especially when viewed with the items under section 6.2.2 with regard to the disadvantages of group work that disagreement is perhaps not valued as much as it might be. There are some responses that hint at this and two which actually mention differences of opinions positively (' Because I like to see if the answer I say is right' and ' Because when you make a statement they can either agree or disagree with you, so it helps you out'). But in general more 'collaborative' perhaps even cumulative talk is valued more than the resolution of conflicts (see the examples of Groups A1 and A4 transcripts as discussed in 6.2.2)

2. In which format did you do the **best work** ?

By myself 7 In the group 20

Why ?

1. Preferred group, was part of a group (19)

Because I could discuss with the other people when I thought what they said was wrong

Because I could exchange opinions with other members of the group

Because I was more confident and seemed to remember more of my French

Because instead of just doing what I thought, I thought it was better working together

Because it was 3 peoples knowledge not just mine

Because there was more people to help you out

Because we all did our bit towards the work

Because we all spotted different things in the text

Because we could share answers with each other before answering

Because we discussed it. And so the answer was clearer

Because we knew different things and we knew a lot more all together

Because when I talk to the other people we say what the right answer is

Because you can get a better answer if your [sic] in a group

Because you could discuss it with people to make things right

Because you could talk about the questions to understand it and then decide the correct answer

I found it easier to concentrate and I understood it better with other people

I think I felt more confident

In a group because you had other people to confirm with and help you

Other people had different answers so we would get a better answer overall

2. Preferred group - did not do groupwork (1)

Because I could talk to the other people

3. Preferred individual - did both modes (5)

Because I felt more confident as it was my own work

Because I found it easier to concentrate

Because you won't copy from other people

I concentrated more by myself - I didn't get distracted

I felt as though I had to do better than what I did in a group

4. Preferred individual - did not do groupwork (1)

Because I didn't do the groupwork

5. Preferred individual - did testing but neither individual nor groupwork (1)

I was away for the groupwork

6. Missed entire programme (1)

I was away

Here it is noticeable that a few more of the core 24 were concerned with their own performance in the group context. The five subjects involved divide between four groups, two of which are A groups and two of which are B groups. Therefore there is no indication that the order of the two modes of working was significant. Subject 3's is the first response listed (' Because I felt more confident as it was my own work') but the other 4 came from respondents who had enjoyed the group task more. 'I concentrated more by myself - I didn't get distracted' was said by Subject 16, also in Group B1, who was also apparently affected by the disputational nature of some of the talk. In her individual TFI task she achieved three correct answers, but did not identify the correct author of the penfriend letter. In the group task she has some input to discussions about three of the statements which indicates that she may have the correct answer in mind, and she supports the group in choosing the wrong penfriend in the FP task. Her performance is better in the individual task in that she clearly actively considers more evidence, but the achievement is not significantly better.

'I felt as though I had to do better than what I did in a group' was offered by Subject 11 from Group A4 who was physically the 'odd one out' sitting away from the pair of Subjects 14/10. We have already demonstrated that 11 made significant contributions to that discussion despite having substantially fewer moves than the other two subjects. She completed the group tasks before the individual tasks and perhaps felt she was carrying that lack of substantial involvement in terms of speech turns into that second stage. In the

event her performance in the individual tasks was not as good as she scored 2/8 on the TFI task and noted only 1 reason for the choice of penfriend author. Just as in the Part One study we see a difficulty in accurate self-evaluation.

'Because I found it easier to concentrate' was written by Subject 12 who scored 2/8 on the individual TFI task and noted 4 reasons for the choice of penfriend. In Group B4 the dialogue was the most cumulative in that there was more concurrent speech than in any other group. Subjects 12 and 13 often translated or reasoned simultaneously, but not always in harmony and not always as part of a listening process. Subject 12 appears from the recording to be the one of the two who wants to read chunks of text and to reflect, while Subject 13 is the driving force and the most task-led on the TFI task. The recording is also interesting in that Subject 29 clearly gains from listening to the others (who are seated either side of her) and makes progressively more and more contributions as the tasks develop. (She had contributed the item ' Because I wasn't nervous and I could discuss with people so it wasn't all up to me to get the right answers' to Q1 here)

'Because you won't copy from other people' was Subject 25 who scored 4/8 on the TFI and noted 4 items in the FP task. This subject performed well when her reading scores are considered, and took a strong role in the group, where she asked for and clarified more items than she did in her individual tasks, where perhaps had more inhibitions about asking for help. This statement hints at a more general educational view that individual performance is more valid than collaborative achievement, but appears to be the only such voice in the survey. In the section below on the disadvantages of reading in a group she offered 'You won't think up your own answers', which was one of only two similar contributions.

The 19 subjects who still felt their work was better in the group predominantly offered reasons concerned with discussion and ideas sharing, as shown above, and this is in harmony with the responses to Q1.

6.4.2 The responses to the 'objective' questions

Here it is worth comparing the two sets of responses which together draw out the advantages and disadvantages. A general overview comparison of this is followed by a summary of the advantages / disadvantages noted by the five who felt they worked better in the individual mode as described above in 6.4..1.

In general the advantages were by this stage of the questionnaire quite predictable. The emphasis remained on collaborative work and sharing with the affective advantages of groupwork noted by a few respondents. But it is the list of disadvantages which picks out the earlier made point about a reluctance to disagree or an assumption that disagreement would be a negative factor. Fifteen of the 24 respondents specifically mentioned non- or disagreement, but none of these indicated that it might be useful. Evidently the style of disagreements, their purpose within a problem-solving exercise and positive resolution strategies are all areas which could be discussed amongst groups of learners. The transcripts abound with examples of potential positive disagreements which are not expressed at all or are smoothed over without proper discussion.

Of the five who preferred the individual mode in terms of their own achievement, one (Subject 16) highlighted a potential personal gain as an advantage of groupwork ('You get more confident and you speak more often'). The remaining four noted the sharing of information as the major advantage. In terms of the disadvantages there was an element

of the expected about Subject 3's response ('Sometimes you disagree with people') and that of Subject 16 ('Some people might interrupted you when your talking [sic]). There is also, perhaps, some further clarification of the earlier comment about concentration from Subject 12 ('If someone can't read very well it can be a bit annoying'). Subject 25, as mentioned earlier, was still concerned with the validity of collaborative responses with: 'You won't think up your own answers'. Subject 11 raised the affective issue of a lack of personal confidence within a group with 'I think that if you do this and someone keeps getting most of the work right it makes me feel silly'. Although more respondents thought the group context helped confidence this is not always the case.

3 What are the advantages of reading in a group ?

1. Did both tasks (24)

As I said above we can all do our bit to the work
If one person does not know the others might
If one person doesn't know a word it is likely that another member can help them
If you are stuck you can get other group members to help you
If you don't understand something you can ask the people in your group
If you don't understand something you can help each other
If you don't understand something you could ask
In groups is easier because we know more work together than on our own
It makes it easier and it's not only you that makes the mistake
Makes it easier because if you don't know a word the other people might
That you can talk to each other and see what the right answer is
The other people can help you out & you don't feel embarrassed as much
The whole group helps each other out and you can work things out quicker
You can check with each other on the answers
You can discuss the work and you don't feel nervous
You can find answers more easily, because if you don't know it then somebody else might
You can help each other
You can talk about it to your people in your group

You can talk about the work

You don't have to do all of the work

You don't have to work it out by yourself

You get more confident and you speak more often

You get to share ideas with each other and there might be some french you don't know but the group does so it helps

You have lots of people interpreting it so the answers are more likely to be accurate

2. Missed groupwork (2)

Reading with others

You get to be with your friends

3. Missed both group and individual tasks (2)

As I said earlier if we work together we won't get stuck we can ask each other if they don't know then you can ask the teacher

You can check out your answers with someone else

4 What are the disadvantages of reading in a group ?

1. Did both tasks (24)

I think that if you do this and someone keeps getting most of the work right it makes me feel silly

If I person thinks that it says one thing and another person thinks it's something else, it might be hard

If someone can't read very well it can be a bit annoying

If someone does not agree with you

If you have an answer and nobody else agrees

If you've got the right answer but the other two think that it's wrong

It's hard to concentrate when people are talking around you

May have different opinions and disagree

Might disagree on something

People disagree a lot

Some of you may not agree on the same answers

Some people might interrupted you when your talking

Some people won't take part & leave it up 2 [sic] the others

Sometimes you can disagree with the other people

Sometimes you can't agree with each other

Sometimes you disagree with people

That the other people might think that it is one answer and I might think it is another answer

The disadvantages of working in a group is if we can't get the right answer and if we don't work well with the other members

The other people can do the work for you

You could all disagree and then start arguing

You learn but not properly by yourself

You may all think different things

You might be right but the other members might not agree and out vote you

You won't think up your own answers

2. Missed groupwork (2)

It does not always get your best work because you feel more relaxed

You don't get to read as much yourself

3. Missed both group and individual tasks (2)

If you are sitting with someone annoying then you could get distracted

Less confidence

5. What are the advantages of reading by yourself ?

1. Did both tasks (24)

I am putting myself on a test to see how much I know

I found it easier to make a decision

Is that many things you can answer seem easier, you don't get as worried

It's only you with your own opinion

No one can disagree with you

Quick easy

That you can think of an answer straight away and don't have to talk to someone else

There is no-one there to argue with you

There's no arguing about the work

Use your own opinion

What I think the answers are is what I say

You can concentrate easily

You can do everything in your own time

You can express what you want to say

You can think up your own answers

You can think your own answers

You can work in silence and it makes you think more

You don't have to agree with other people

You don't have to wait for people

You get to learn lots of new words

You have more time and your not being rushed

You have more time You don't have to rush

You learn how to understand the questions by yourself

You might not be able to answers by yourself

2. Missed groupwork (2)

It can get the best out of your work

You get better at reading

3. Missed both group and individual tasks (2)

More confidence

You can concentrate

6. What are the disadvantages of reading by yourself ?

1. Did both tasks (24)

Harder

If I keep asking about words I don't know it makes me feel stupid

If there is words you don't know there is no-one else there to help you

If you are stuck you're on your own

If you are unsure you cannot check with another member of the group

If you don't know the answer you've got nobody to ask

Is that you are by yourself and if you don't know your answer then you get a bit worried about it

That you cannot talk to another person to see if you have got a question right

There might be quite a few words you don't know and confuses the whole text

You can be unsure and can't talk with the group

You cannot confer with anyone if you are stuck

You cannot discuss your views and interpretations with others

You can't discuss it with other people

You can't get help and

You don't get other peoples opinions

You don't get other people's opinions

You don't have a second opinion

You don't have anyone to help you out if you get stuck

You don't have anyone to help you out with the answers

You have no one else to check your answers with

You have to do it all yourself

You have to read all of the time

You might not know any of the words and you can't ask anyone

You might not understand words and it will take longer to work out

2. Missed groupwork (2)

You feel nervous

You may make mistakes and not realise it

3. Missed both group and individual tasks (2)

You can't ask anyone if you get stuck You will always have to make the teacher get in and out of her chair

You have no-one to check your answers

Chapter Seven

The Part Two Programme - Synthesis

Recommendations for Teachers and Researchers

7.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to review the findings summarised in Chapters Five and Six and to attempt to draw together consistent messages about the reading process which are true for this cohort of learners at the time when the investigation was conducted. Strictly speaking, we cannot generalise, either for the same group on other occasions or for other groups of learners, in any predictive sense that they *will* behave in a certain way when they read in a foreign language. Nevertheless, we have sufficient data from this group on this occasion to make interesting comment about the issues which will affect these and other readers in other contexts. The range of ability in this cohort makes the data 'representative' in a broad sense. The multi-directional analysis allows a wide range of interpretation, so that the issues raised are fully observed. Teachers and researchers reading this will recognise their own learner-readers in these discussions and will know instinctively that some of these findings *can* be generalised for these subjects. They may in any case like to carry out similar investigations to discover how far these results generalise, and to modify the implications according to any differences which arise. If this is done then we can all benefit from finding additional ways which will take further our overall understanding of how teachers can construct a variety of reading experiences which will motivate learners to read and which will facilitate their learning through reading.

In such investigations it is vitally important to summarise some of the major points for the participants. Therefore a sheet of notes and advice was prepared for the class involved in the Part Two study. This is included as Appendix P.

The chapter will consider what we have learned about:

- The different ways in which individuals and groups (collectively) approach reading and construct meaning
- The indicators of success in individual reading and any associated task factors
- The indicators of success in group reading and any associated task factors
- Examples of correlation / non-correlation between measured reading ability and success in FL reading tasks, in terms of performance both as individuals and as individuals within groups

These factors will be reviewed, taking into consideration the various lines of focus adopted by the study, ie:

- Task performance measurements (as demonstrated by individuals and groups)
- Apparent strategic competence (as demonstrated by individuals and groups)
- Use of the language of reasoning (as demonstrated by individuals and groups)
- The nature of group talk (as demonstrated by groups)
- Group roles in turn-taking and decision-making, ie managing the processes of the groups, as revealed by discourse analysis techniques (as demonstrated by groups)

Thus the review is intended to give concrete evidence towards answering the two questions:

- Why are some readers reading more strategically / successfully than others ?
- Under what circumstances / for what kinds of learners is group reading more useful to reading and language development than individual reading and vice versa ?

These questions also involve a consideration of the kinds of reading approaches / behaviour which seem most linked to reading task success and the implications of task-type for reading behaviour / success.

As a result of that discussion we will be able to make some suggestions about:

- Teacher-led training for reading in a foreign language
- Peer-mediated training for reading in a foreign language
- Teacher education on foreign language reading related issues
- Future research

7.2 What have we learned about reading behaviour ?

7.2.1 The different ways in which individuals and groups (collectively) approach reading and construct meaning

The approaches to reading the texts and completing the tasks were monitored in both the individual and the group contexts. This can be viewed in two ways. It can be seen as simple evidence of the range of approaches used by a range of learners to attack identical tasks, ie as an interesting phenomenon in itself. Or it can be regarded as evidence towards

establishing whether successful readers read in certain ways or indeed, whether unsuccessful readers also have common approaches. The latter issue is reviewed in sections 7.2.2 and 7.2.3, the former here in this section. Since this chapter is drawing together the different findings from chapters Five and Six, it is legitimate to explore again the issue of approaches to reading as this will provide a basis for the comments on the various aspects of success in reading.

As the table 5f (see p156) demonstrated, the approaches used in the individual tasks were assigned to one of nine categories. Of these, for the TFI task, the task-led option, (reading the text only as a source of material to respond to the eight TFI statements rather than as a complete and separate entity), was the most common, used by 15 of the 27 participants, 11 of these exclusively. This is entirely in tune with most reading observed in foreign language classrooms over a number of years. Course books tend not to prepare their learners in terms of different ways to read, and in many cases do not either set a sufficient variety of task types to elicit different reading styles. There are materials which do much more to achieve this (eg the *Authentik* series) but such resources are not commonly used. The practice of strongly task-led reading also reflects an approach expected by GCSE examiners, especially at 'overlap' or higher tier levels, as questions often demand skimming and scanning approaches rather than linear reading. Time constraints alone in these examinations would prevent candidates from reading entire texts, and so it is an accepted maxim amongst teachers preparing candidates that reading skills tends to equate with rapid key information retrieval techniques. At the highest level (questions targeted at the A*, A, B candidates) there is also an expectation that inferencing will be involved, but again this demands that candidates isolate the key piece of text and then read

carefully. Of course as we stated in Chapter One, this is an entirely legitimate standpoint in terms of one aspect of language learners' reading development. But gaining the connected and developing meaning of a text is another important skill and such task led approaches as we have seen here do not help greatly with this aspect of language use. Neither do they allow for the consolidation of language knowledge of both lexis and syntax or for new language learning which often also occurs through the exposure to a more natural flow of language offered by a more linear reading approach.

The FP task was itself unknown to the participants, but as a task type (ie a global decision-making task) was also quite unfamiliar to them. Task-led approaches were difficult to implement therefore, and as a result a different pattern emerged. Reading silently was the most popular approach to this task in the individual context, with a total of 15 subjects adopting this method either with the whole text or with sections of text. But as well as these prevalent approaches there were a total of six other methods used for each of the TFI and FP tasks. Table 7a overleaf presents the approaches made by the 27 subjects who completed the individual tasks, see key below.

Key to Table 7a, Column 1 - Reading approaches

Approaches used	**Code in table 7a**
Read whole text silently	WTS
Read whole text aloud	WTA
Read whole text in French, translating sections (ie words, phrases, sentences) at a time	WTF+T
Translate whole text into English	WTT
Read sections of text silently	STS
Read sections of text aloud	STA
Read sections of text in French, translating sections (ie words, phrases, sentences) at a time	STF+T
Translate sections of text into English	STT
Read TFI task statements or pen-friend descriptors individually and seek answers from text	TL

Table 7a - Approaches to reading by individuals

TFI task

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
	B2	B1	B1	A3	A3	B2	B3	B3	B3	A4	A4	B4	B4	A4	B1	B1	A1	A2	A1	B2					A2	A1	A2	A1	B4
WTS						✓				✓																		✓	✓
WTA	✓																✓												
WTF+T																													
WTT							✓				✓															✓			
STS											✓			✓	✓	✓							✓				✓*		
STA																													
STF+T			✓									✓																	
STT														✓															
TL		✓		✓	✓			✓	✓	✓		✓	✓					✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓*		

Four Penfriends task

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
	B2	B1	B1	A3	A3	B2	B3	B3	B3	A4	A4	B4	B4	A4	B1	B1	A1	A2	A1	B2					A2	A1	A2	A1	B4
WTS					✓	✓	✓		✓	✓				✓							✓	✓	✓				✓		
WTA	✓																✓												
WTF+T																													
WTT				✓				✓					✓					✓								✓			
STS											✓				✓	✓									✓				✓
STA																													
STF+T			✓									✓																	
STT		✓									✓	✓								✓								✓	
TL		✓*																											

Thus, as well as the major approach for each of the individual tasks we see that in the TFI task 10 participants chose to read silently at least as part of their approach, 6 used translation in some form or other and just 2 read aloud without translating. In the FP task the same two subjects read aloud, and 11 used translation.

Thus, as both reading silently and translating increased significantly between the TFI and the FP task, we have clear evidence of the task effect which was expected and which caused the choice of these two task types for the investigation. Both of these approaches can in certain circumstances constitute evidence of a more linear approach, and both to an extent may also show attempts to integrate meaning. Silent reading is of course opaque in terms of our knowing what is really happening, but if it is prolonged and if the verbalisation which occurs before and after the silence demonstrates forward movement in the text then we can securely infer an essentially linear process. We might also justify a reading of this silent linear process as an attempt to gain a block of meaning before verbalisation of what has been gained, ie an attempt to integrate meaning. This is different from the TFI task-led approach which simply seeks to locate sufficient textual evidence to be able to choose the correct response. So we can maintain that at least the silent reading which subsequently produces valid comment about the text and task does have a different quality. Where we have verbalised translation we can see much more overt evidence of both linear processes and integration if they occur.

The group tasks (see Table 5h on pp160/1) were similarly task-led on the TFI tasks, and more linear on the FP task. Table 7b extracts the relevant group data from Table 5h.

Table 7b - Approaches to TFI and FP tasks by group

	Group A1 (2M 2F)	**Group A2 (1M 2F)**	**Group A3 (2F)**	**Group A4 (3F)**
Approach to text and task (TFI)	Read / translate text, then turn to task	Task-led, very little detailed translation	Task-led, self-sufficient, least words requested	Read / translate text, then turn to task, then repeat task responses
Approach to text and task (FP)	Translate first para, make a guess, and then continue to translate to verify	Silent reading, then translation of random elements	Some linear translation before decision made	Limited reading / translation before decision made. Subject 14 encourages closer reading to verify
	Group B1 (2M 2F)	**Group B2 (1M 2F)**	**Group B3 (1M 2F)**	**Group B4 (3F)**
Approach to text and task (TFI)	Start by reading / translating text, but very soon become task-led	Start by reading text silently (2 mins approx) then task-led	Read aloud / translate majority of text before task is started	Task-led
Approach to text and task (FP)	Reading approached differently by different subjects. 1st suggestion as to author made early and then discussion accompanies reading	Start by reading text silently (2 mins approx) then begin task with initial decision on author	Reading aloud / translation interrupted by Subject 7's wish to make an early decision. Translation less linear thereafter	Some silent reading followed by some translation

Three groups read the text before addressing the task, with a further group reading silently for a short period of two minutes before they became task led. Thus there is a slightly greater tendency in the groups (approx 50%/50%) than amongst individuals to try to construct meaning before answering questions. This may simply be a result of a

perceived need to create a shared agenda rather than any conscious choice of method on the basis of good reading practice. Some approaches transferred from individual to group mode 9or vice versa) and some did not. Subject 1 who had already read both entire texts in French aloud in her individual session did not attempt to do the same in the group, but in fact suggested an initial silent reading. Subject 17 may have chosen to read aloud in his individual session because he had played such a small part in the group and now wanted to try a different method. Clearly, prolonged silent reading in a group is far less common as a major approach. However, those subjects who participated only very slightly in the dialogue (eg Subjects 17 and 27) do appear from the video evidence to be focused on the text / task sheet through much of the process, and therefore may be reading silently for a greater amount of time than their co-participants. (This was also true of P4 in the Part One Study pilot group.) Translation is a major means of operation in a group context since this is the obvious method of foregrounding comprehension of text and interpretation of task in order to discuss both. This applies to both task-led and linear reading approaches as an overt translation of the relevant TFI statement and the accompanying text was more common in the group than in the individual sessions, perhaps again because there was a need to establish the common ground for discussion. If such verbalisation of the text and the issues around the task is seen to lead to an enhancement of understanding and of efficiency in reading, then in very general terms we might suppose that group reading offers more than individual reading. But we will still need to examine the correlation of individual and group performances to decide how generalised that benefit might be.

7.2.2 The indicators of success in individual reading and any associated task factors

There was no clear correlation between any one reading approach and success in the tasks for the individual reading context. Although six of the best nine performers in the TFI task were task-led in their approach, others who were task led did much less well. For example, Subjects 4 and 8 (the second and joint third best performers) and Subjects 2 and 21 (two of the least successful on that task) were all task led in their approach. On the other hand, Subject 14 (the best performer) but also Subjects 3, 27 and 29 (the three least successful performers) read the text and then addressed the task. All others used the varying approaches with varying degrees of success. We must also remember that only one-third of the cohort achieved half-marks or above in that task, so few performances were highly successful.

The FP task was different in that only one student used an approach which could be described as task-led. Other behaviours did not have any specific effect except for the case of silent reading approaches (see below)

Similarly as we saw on pp156-158 the number of vocabulary items requested or clarified did not equate with success. Generally those who asked for more words were not any more able to integrate the newly discovered meaning into a broader comprehension, although Subject 18 showed that this was possible.

A much stronger correlation with task success is the amount and type of verbalisation, especially in the initial stages of the task. In the FP task all of the 5 participants who

failed to identify the correct penfriend author either read the whole text or sections of the text silently. They made a decision about the penfriend author and then verbalised some reasons, often very hesitantly and with quite approximate accuracy in terms of textual detail. When asked to look for the opinions (the device used to force a further approach to the text) they were unable for the most part to find anything that challenged their decision and found either nothing more or further more approximate detail. In contrast Subject 14 (who noted five appropriate reasons) identified the correct author after a near silent reading and gave three reasons immediately. When she was asked to look for opinions with which to agree or disagree, she then set about looking at a section of text she knew she had understood less, and by engaging in just a short piece of verbalised meaning construction, managed to locate two more reasons very speedily. In other words the quality of her subsequent verbalisation demonstrated the meaning construction processes which had accompanied her silent reading, but this was rarely true of other silent readers to the same extent.

In all, six of the top ten performers in the FP task appeared in the top ten 'verbalisers' (by quantity of transcript lines) for that task. Those that did not included Subject 2 (who adopted a task led approach which shortened the process and in fact was 11th in the line quantity count), Subject 4 (who gave a very brief gist translation which nevertheless managed to highlight four appropriate reasons) and Subjects 14 and 22 (both of whom read the whole text silently first). In these four cases the quality of the verbalisation which occurred was high. There were also four who verbalised sufficiently to appear in the top ten line count, but did not appear in the top ten performers. Subject 11 offered a quite detailed translation of certain sections but then failed to capitalise on it by turning

the half-comments from that process into reasons at the end. Subject 20 verbalised *about* his actions (in a more genuine think-aloud manner) to a greater degree than all the other participants, but did not always draw in a more integrated meaning through that process. He also used a great many pauses which caused a higher line count, and, finally, debated between two authors. Thus his verbalisation, although very interesting and informative about his processes was not as task-efficient as that of others, who were more successful. Subject 26 has a high 'line count' because she asked for more vocabulary items than anyone else. Subject 28, like 11, did not make sufficient capital out of the text she did understand and also was unsure at first between two authors.

Taking all of this into account, we can say that in a task which specifically required linear reading and integration of meaning, we see a clear indication of the following conclusion. That those who verbalised in sufficient detail and attempted to integrate emerging meaning (particularly within paragraphs) either while reading or after a period of silent reading were more successful. Those who either read silently and then failed to verbalise or who skimmed too quickly, and did not in the process integrate meaning, tended to be less successful. The verbalisation process appeared to help the integration which is needed. Those who verbalised less were more rarely as successful as those who verbalised more.

In the TFI task the amount of verbalisation which occurred was less significant. Because some participants chose to translate and then discuss the TFI statements while others moved straight to that process, we can not make comparisons based on a line count alone. Also in the TFI task (to a greater extent than in the FP task) some participants hesitated

much more significantly, spoke in shorter units of language and therefore used more lines, but fewer words. Again this makes a simple quantitative count unhelpful for the most part. Nevertheless four of the top nine performers in the task appeared in the top five 'verbalisers' in terms of line count. Therefore when verbalisation was full and effective there was again a correlation between the amount of overt mental discussion of the reading process, the meaning of the text and the task responses. Three of these, in fact, were task led, (including Subject 18 who made the second highest number of vocabulary requests). This demonstrates that when constructing the meaning of task statements and then seeking verification from within the text, the depth of understanding can be linked to the amount of verbalisation. The more that thoughts were aired, the closer the subject came to an accurate reading. Again this may simply be an external representation of the inner behaviour of better readers, but it may also indicate that the verbalisation process itself can improve comprehension.

The role of strategy use in both tasks was similar insofar as the most useful strategies used by more successful readers were those which explored meaning rather than simply jumped to conclusions. The use of translation (signalled as paraphrasing text) was the most common strategic activity by the majority of participants, especially those who did best on the two tasks. In some cases in the TFI task this translation activity was focused more on the task statements than on the text, but that in itself did not differentiate the good from the less good readers. On the other hand the absence of translation did tend to correlate with poorer scores, as silent reading was often evidently not a successful approach. But translation by itself did not necessarily lead to full understanding and task success. We saw that the most significant strategies were when meaning was integrated

(or when text was restated with a view to holding it in working memory), when tentative interpretations were made and then such hypotheses were either maintained or modified and when new ideas caused an overt adjustment of comprehension. Pausing to reflect and stating a failure to understand were also useful as long as the section then did as a result receive further focus and was not just abandoned as a lost cause. Meaning construction processes such as guessing unfamiliar items through the identification of cognates or using context were sometimes visible from the verbal reports offered, but of course would sometimes have occurred within the reader's mind without report. Clearly, as always in the reading process, the use of such strategies signalled a better rather than a poorer reader.

The concordancing analysis showed that certain expected key terms for reasoning which indicated tentative readings (eg modals such as could and might, adverbs such as possibly and probably) were not common even among the more successful readers. Similarly, *I think* was not used much by many participants either. The word *something* did indicate uncertainty however and was used by some participants as a 'substitute modal'. The best readers did tend to explain their interpretations by giving reasons and therefore the words *so* and *because* were much more commonly used, often linked to the word *say* or *mean.* Perhaps because the individual protocols were comparatively sparse, we can assume that much mental activity which might have revealed more through concordancing was silent. Subject 20, who produced the best example of a true think-aloud protocol significantly used 26 examples of both *think* and *say** across both tasks, plus nine of *because* and five each of *might* and *something*. This demonstrates that the process itself was not as

accessible for the majority of the participants, despite Ericsson and Simon's (1993) maxim that anyone can think aloud quite easily. Thus, a very useful aspect of the concordancing process has been to demonstrate that the evidence we have of the thought processes involved has probably been insufficient and that further work on getting better records of the reading processes of this age group is necessary.

7.2.3 The indicators of success in group-based reading and any associated task factors

The performance measurements of the groups show less variation on the TFI task than did the individual participants on that task. On an individual basis TFI scores ranged from 0 to 8 (maximum) while in the groups they ranged from 3 to 8 (maximum). Individual FP scores ranged from an incorrect choice of penfriend to 8 (of 14 possible) correct details noted but the group FP task produced a narrower range with the majority failing to choose the correct penfriend and the two groups who were successful giving at most two very imprecise reasons for their choice. (We should remember of course that owing to the nature of the text and the author there were only four reasons available for the choice of author in the group FP task.)

In the group as in the individual context there was clear variation in how the TFI task was approached and this did not correlate with outcome. The most and least successful groups used the same approach, of textual translation followed by task completion. Other groups between the two extremes used either that or a task-led approach. However other factors which occurred in the groups might indicate that it is more important to choose an

approach to reading the text which makes clear to all of the participants what is happening, and therefore enables discussion to be held on a more equal footing. Examples of such factors would include the disputes in Group B1, the unwarranted influence of Subject 10 in Group A4, the extreme lack of participation by Subject 17 in Group A1 and Subject 27 in Group A2 and the role of Subject 7 in the FP task in the most successful group, B3.

Strategy use by successful groups correlated with the findings of the individual task analyses insofar as the more detailed was the overt articulation of the processes, and the broader the strategy use, the more successful were the group on both tasks. This does not mean that length of transcript alone determined success; again it was the quality of each of the above factors which was important. Group B3 produced the longest transcript and fulfilled all of the above qualities. Group A1's transcript was the second longest, but they achieved the poorest group performance. If we look at evidence of the types of strategies used by these two groups we find in the B3 transcript a great deal more questioning, more precise exploration of more difficult text, more discussion of conflicting viewpoints. Once again we saw the tentative interpretations made and explored by all members of the group, with hypotheses made, and then challenged and maintained with evidence. Again we saw real attempts to integrate text by references during discussion to other sentences or paragraphs, sometimes to clarify the current section of text, sometimes to refine an earlier reading. In the A1 transcript, however, the discussion is often in fact simultaneous monologue and does not contain a sufficient quantity or range of the above qualities.

For the above reasons the nature of the group talk was found to be a very important factor. Mercer's (1995) three categories of talk (with the extension of Brewster's [1999] definitions of collaborative or persuasive talk for the exploratory category) described different types of collaboration very accurately and correlated with successful performance in the same ways that Mercer had maintained. This was underpinned by reference also to Almasi's (1995) categorisation of instances of sociocognitive conflict. Thus disputative talk did not allow for fully developed readings or responses to the tasks, and this was mirrored by Almasi's category of conflicts with others. Cumulative talk could produce success for individuals working 'alone' within the group context, but again did not allow a higher level of success, where full discussion was needed to unravel a task. The opening to the FP task by Group B3 demonstrated that once the true dialogic nature of the earlier discussion was removed and the talk became more cumulative, the more this group also became prey to the misunderstandings and unsubstantiated evidence which characterised the other groups at various key points. On the other hand exploratory talk and conflicts with self, often characterised by questioning, were always present at each group's most successful moments. At its best we might describe this type of talk additionally in terms of Erickson's (1982) 'improvisation'. This was intended to describe a teacher's ability to facilitate learning through the use of two elements. The first of these was the ATS (the Academic Task Structure), which was a patterned set of constraints provided by the logic of sequencing in the subject matter content of the lesson. The second was the SPS (the Social Participation Structure), a patterned set of constraints on the allocation of interactional rights and obligations of various members of the interacting group. Essentially this means that the teacher is able to modify both the

content and the tasks for individual learners during the lesson in order that both individuals and the class as a whole learn effectively. Group B3 alone in their TFI task showed signs of having a collective ability to modify their direction to take into account the various needs of the participants. The video evidence shows that at times Subjects 8 and 9 waited quietly (with mutual recognition of the action) for Subject 7 to pursue a line of translation or interpretation, even if they were not convinced it was worth while. They would then draw from it any useful material and subsequently redefine the next direction. Subject 8 also allowed Subject 9 to pursue individual questions, before recapping and moving on. This group had also agreed a procedure at the beginning, and rarely simply moved on without a tacit agreement that it was appropriate to do so. They had approximately equal numbers of turns, which also signals that participants were generally heard fairly. Thus their route through the first task was very much a negotiated one, able to be influenced at most points by any member of the group, and in that sense was very much an improvisation both in terms of the content and the participation pattern. It appears that Subject 8 was a natural organiser who did not seek either personal dominance during the task or a higher 'personal score' at the end, but viewed the instruction to be collaborative very literally. In fact it was a lack of such personal assertiveness and desire for dominance at the point where Subject 7 hijacked the FP task that prevented Subjects 8 and 9 from stating a real determination to attack more logically the difficult passages of the text. By addressing Subject 7's argument without sufficient precise evidence, they failed to choose the correct author and this made the FP task much less successful not just in its outcome but also in its whole process.

The concordancing software was used to investigate the prevalence of key words for reasoning in the groups in the same way as for the individual transcripts. Again there was a general lack of modals / adverbs of possibility, although as with the individual transcripts, the words *something* and *like* were used to qualify statements or questions in a manner which suggested more tentative interpretations. If we follow the findings on group discussion of both Phillips (1985) and Brewster (1987) we might decide that this was mainly due to task effect, in that the more modal structures would be associated with tasks which had a greater problem-solving element. Although the FP tasks especially in this study do have an in-built problem-solving aspect they could perhaps in general rather be described under Brewster's category of 'summary' tasks which lead to a largely 'expositional' discussion.

However the analysis still produced notable findings and consequent differences between groups. The most and least successful groups were discussed in this way in section 6.3.2.4, where we found that there was variation in number of uses of the key terms, but more specifically that it was the range of those uses and their effect which made for an even greater contrast. The texts in this study were challenging enough to prevent a simple 'read and comprehend' process from taking place, and it seems clear that the more participants pause to consider alternatives, and the more they are able to refer back and forward in arguing for conclusions, the greater the chance of gaining a better understanding. The quality of these processes is partly revealed by the concordancing analysis, which allows us to identify a lack of certain key terms of reasoning. If we then conclude that there might be value in finding a way to elicit such terms more frequently within discussions, we might suggest a policy of equipping groups with a series of steps

to consider when faced with a difficult section of text or task. This could cause different lines of exploration which in turn could take the discussion onto a further level. This proposition is developed further in section 7.4.1.

Further discourse analysis showed that success in the group tasks was also dependent on the roles of the respective participants within each group. Such roles were often not defined by ability but by personality. In many cases the more aware group members did at least either lead discussions (eg Subject 18 in Group A2 and Subject 1 in Group B2) or prevent false directions through their interventions (eg Subject 19 in Group A1). In other groups more than one member could collaborate effectively together to keep the discussions on track (eg Subjects 12/13 in Group B4 and all of Group B3 in the TFI task). In a minority of cases a determined group member could exert unwarranted influence (eg Subject 10 in Group A4, Subject 7 in Group B3's FP task, Subject 4 over the FP decision in the dyad group, A3). This was most noticeable where there was not an especially assertive resistance by more able members. In the case of the truly disputative group (B1) the issue of dominance was very overt and did not therefore act in a hidden manner. With such open argument there was also, on some occasions at least, a process of resolution before it was possible to move forward. This made certain part of the two tasks quite successful.

The next section focuses specifically on the roles of the most able readers, as individuals and in the groups.

7.2.4 Examples of correlation / non-correlation between measured reading ability and success in FL reading tasks, in terms of performance both as individuals and as individuals within groups

To recap, of the seven participants who appeared in both of the reading tests with an age of 12.6 or better, five were also in the top ten on the FP individual task, (six, if we add Subject 4 who appears to have been the major anomaly, see pp164/5, of the Blue Gap test variant). The two exceptions were Subject 7 (no clear explanation) and Subject 19 who missed the individual programme. Three of the seven (plus Subject 4) were also in the top nine of the TFI task. The additional two exceptions were Subject 3 (whose results were the most anomalous of the whole group) and Subject 13 (whose reading was task-led and who did not seem to be able to integrate text at all well as she dealt with the task statements).

Of the two reading tests, the 1997 version was a good predictor of the FP task results with eight of the top twelve also appearing in the top ten of the FP task scores. Subject 19 was again absent, leaving only Subjects 12 and 18 as high scorers on the FP task who had not appeared in the top group on the 1997 tests. (Subject 26 was the only 'good reader' not to appear in the top FP group - her many requests for vocabulary having impeded rather than assisted successful comprehension). Again we see that being a good L1 reader is probably significant in the type of reading required by the FP task, ie linear, well-integrated meaning construction before a global decision is made. Success in the GAP test on the other hand did not correlate with success in either one of the tasks, even if we exclude those who took the problematic Blue variant.

The seven good readers and Subject 4 played a variety of roles within their groups, demonstrating that group leadership is not automatically linked to ability. As we saw, B3, the most successful group, consisted of three of the seven and the group dynamic, although harmonious and collaborative, also drew out some key differences. Subject 7 was the more independent within the group, but also marginally the weakest of the three, so his separate moves were not always helpfully exploratory. Subject 8 took on the anchor role, intellectually, organisationally and physically, being seated in the middle. Subject 9 was characterised by her re-reading of key sections and very effective questioning. Subject 7 transferred his TFI approach (ie translation) to the group context and seemed to be less patient with the collaborative ethos which the other two established. Subjects 8 and 9 who had both been task-led for the TFI task individually, now translated, but were much more collaborative and exploratory in the process.

Subject 3 was, as we have seen, part of the most disputative group. He had had very mixed success in the individual tasks, although it is impossible to know whether he appreciated this himself. As the analysis on pp188-196 demonstrates he was more able to gain the overall meaning of the FP text than to locate relevant points and make judgements about the TFI statements. Certainly in the group context he was trying to recreate an integrated understanding of the TFI text. He played a full part in this group, but did not appear be seeking dominance through the process. Unfortunately, however, the approach he favoured was at odds with the wishes of one very strong group member, hence the conflict. Subject 2 (also male, and possible also a strong reader) was apparently happy to collaborate, but Subject 15, who certainly had achieved more on the individual TFI task, was more active in her pursuit of dominance in the group. Subject 3 was clearly

happier as an individual then as a member of that particular group, as his post-activity questionnaire demonstrates. We cannot say, obviously, whether he would work more positively as part of a different grouping.

Subject 4 was one of the two friends who formed the dyad as a result of the absence of two further intended members of the group. As a member of an 'A' group she was completing the group tasks before the individual versions, and could therefore capitalise on what appears to have been a leading role in the relationship (as least as regards French). She worked in a collaborative way for the most part, but her dominance occasionally showed, most interestingly when Subject 5 suggested the correct penfriend author and, having resisted this opinion very strongly, Subject 4 eventually succeeded (through amicable persuasion) in changing her partner's mind. Here we see that intellectual leadership can sometimes lead to negative outcomes.

Subject 13 appeared to have a very even contribution along with Subject 12 to Group B4's tasks. Subject 12, although not as strong a reader had been as successful in both of the individual tasks. The characteristic of the group's discourse was a mixture of real dialogue and simultaneous monologue. Subject 13, as the better reader has a slightly greater input into the decisions, for example on one occasion seeing the significance of a negative structure in a TFI statement. But Subject 12 as a strong personality who was also able to construct meaning and make decisions shared much of the leader role with her.

One apparent effect, already referred to in the post-questionnaire section of Chapter Six, was that the third member of the group was drawn into saying more as the tasks progressed. This was perhaps caused by the very even balance between the two other participants, including occasional partial agreements which allowed a third person to

align herself with one or other view. It also helped that she (Subject 29) was seated between them and therefore had access to a physical comparison of text and task sheets and brief moments of individual dialogue with each.

Similarly in Group A4 we have seen some extensive analysis of Subject 14's apparent inability to project intellectual leadership in spite of Subject10's lack of precision about both meaning construction and decision-making.

Finally Subject 19 was an example of the participant who appeared potentially able to mount a major influence, but who failed to find the motivation to do so. The lack of an individual transcript from him due to absence is a big disappointment.

These cases demonstrate that few of the strong readers made as great an impact in the groups as one might expect. Bennett and Cass's (1988) findings were partly verified in that the most able group was also the most successful. But the mixed success of the triads which contained two more able and one less able member did not bear out their contention that those groups would be less successful than those which had a more able with two less able members.

7.3 Questions arising from the discussion, and some possible responses

7.3.1 Why are some readers reading more strategically / successfully than others ?

In this study we have found nothing to dispute the great importance for reading success of the language knowledge / competence factor, which the researchers from Clarke (1980) to Ridgway (1997) have identified as significant. The L1 reading ability factor was also held to be of importance by the majority of those writing on the subject (see Section 3.2.2) and this has seemed also to be borne out by this study, especially in terms of the FP task. To these factors we have added a description of strategy use which seems to support both the Hosenfeld (1984) and Block (1986) positions. The relevance respectively both of concrete strategy lists which can be coded as part of reading behaviour and of more generic strategic areas such as Block's local and general factors has emerged through the use of the P&A coding system which offered a very broad view of strategic behaviour. There is a task effect in the approach to reading but we found less of an effect in terms of the strategies used between the two tasks. One exception to this was the greater importance of integrating meaning in the FP task, and the fact that 'better' readers (according to the tests) appeared to be able to use this strategy whereas 'poorer' readers did not. We know that the FP task effect causes more linear reading to occur and that the nature of a global decision task will also elicit from some readers a sense of the need to integrate the developing meaning of the text in order to fulfil the task. There is therefore a role here for practice both with and without a teacher to raise awareness of reading in this way and to offer opportunities to experience it.

We have also noted the relevance of the ability to verbalise the thought processes involved in meaning construction. We might wish to investigate further whether the verbalisation is only the surface evidence of a deeper reading ability, or whether the verbalisation process itself enhances the reading ability. If the former we would only encourage verbalisation as part of diagnostic testing. If the latter then we would use it as a teaching and learning process. It seemed that Subject 18 was a good example of the latter case, with his very careful reading, vocabulary checking and subsequent reasoning gaining him a higher achievement than expected from his reading score. Subject 26 who followed a similar pattern and achieved parallel scores may be another such example. She also verbalised a great deal, although not as effectively in terms of her reasoning as Subject 18. She started from a higher reading base in terms of the 1997 scores, although a lower GAP score, and might have been expected to do better than him, and her case is not as conclusive. Subject 14 whose group performance was quite hesitant, but whose individual performance was the best of the cohort may be a further example. We identified that a major difference between the group and the individual contexts for her was the amount of time she had to consider her response to the tasks. Her style of verbalisation in the individual tasks built on a more considered approach, around short periods of silent reading, which was incompatible with the more insistent style of group dialogue initiated by Subject 10. What was certainly going to be a good performance perhaps became an even better one through the cumulative effect of the verbalisation she produced.

Another feature of this issue is that group dialogue often produces greater verbalisation than does the individual context, partly because more than one person is involved and

partly because individuals must justify their thinking to others. Clearly this must enable some group members to achieve more highly simply because they are given elements of textual comprehension they might otherwise not achieve. The B groups (as groups) all matched or improved (some substantially) the respective individual performance levels in the TFI tasks. This might be an indication that the increased verbalisation enhanced comprehension and thereby performance. But of course it might also be a 'context-order' effect as they were addressing as a group parallel tasks to those which they had addressed individually. The reverse was not true of the A groups (where performance differences varied much more between the two contexts). Here seven subjects from the various groups matched (3) or improved slightly (4) their group scores as individuals but four had an individual score which was worse. Only Subject 14 made a substantial gain between the two contexts. This might suggest that group dialogue is an important factor within the context, but has a weaker power to influence behaviour out of the context. The context order seems to have been less important here.

It seems it would be useful then to find further ways to explore the issue of the role of verbalisation. This could be a factor which is vital if we wish to exploit fully the benefits of different approaches to foreign language reading.

7.3.2 Under what circumstances / for what kinds of learners is group reading more useful to reading and language development than individual reading and vice versa ?

The question of individual v group reading is difficult to interpret, and like much language learning data is also difficult to generalise when clear issues do seem to emerge. The most important factor at a time when motivation to learn foreign languages is no longer growing, and certainly post-compulsory uptake is declining is that the learners themselves overwhelmingly prefer to work in groups. The original questionnaire, the informal feedback from the Part One study and the post-questionnaire for the Part Two study all demonstrate a vast preference for group over individual reading.

Some learners rise to the occasion through collaboration or competition but, as we have seen throughout Chapters Five, Six and earlier in the present chapter, some learners fail to achieve as highly in the group context as they do through individual tasks. We have seen that competition raises the ability of some learners, or perhaps raises their motivation sufficiently to allow them to reach and demonstrate their true ability to read and understand texts in French. We have seen that the same competition can inhibit less secure or less extrovert learners so that they fail to demonstrate their true potential. In addition we have seen that task and to an extent text priming can play a part in success whether in the individual or group context and that therefore our set of results might be modified if the programme were to continue through further sets of tasks in both contexts. All of this is not surprising. Other researchers have found that it is difficult to generalise about the benefits of group work for all. For example, Cooper, Marquis and

Ayers-Lopez (1982) found a variation in the degree to which children could access 'the giving and receiving process as it occurs within the complex stream of classroom interaction', (ibid p79). They also classified moves as teacher or learner bids and found that the children who received the most unsolicited information were also the ones most frequently sought after as consultants, ie they were obviously open to participation in dialogue, (ibid p76). This factor seems more important than actual ability. It is difficult to discern such a quality as a researcher, but even more difficult for younger learners to be aware it in themselves.

A variety of learning styles is inevitably present in any class of thirty learners, and this will apply within the area of foreign language reading to their choice of text and task approach and their preference between individual and collaborative working. Teachers need to plan to reflect that diversity sometimes through a dictation of how people will work (to ensure exposure to a variety of methods) but sometimes through offering choice (to allow for a more relaxed affect for individuals and also to allow the effects of motivation to be realised).

What was clear was that where individuals or groups considered their approaches to both text and task and articulated this, more confident readings usually resulted. In a group context this was especially important. '*Shall we read it through in English ..... ?*' (as line 1) was more conducive of an exploratory approach than '*Why don't you just look at the first question ....?*' (as line 20). Therefore group training or at least an initial overt discussion of group protocol is important, but might be better elicited through a group's experience of working together initially and recognising the pitfalls than through simple instructions to work in a certain way.

There are factors in each group which could be construed as benefits or disadvantages of the context, and sometimes the same factor can be argued to be both.

In Group A1, we have the respective cases of Subjects 17 and 19. Subject 17 achieved much better on his individual tasks after making a very low input to the group dialogue. Yet his post-programme questionnaire clearly favours group work. One conclusion is that he needed the concentration of an individual context to reach his own reading potential. But we might also argue that the rather full discussion of both tasks by Subjects 26 and 28, (even if, as most of it was cumulative in nature, it was rather ineffective), allowed Subject 17 to be given a model for his individual tasks. Neither his low reading scores, nor his extremely low input in the group would have predicted his middle of the group ranking on both individual tasks. We can guess on the other hand that Subject 19 whose input was also low would have achieved highly on the individual tasks but in so doing would have drawn little from the group context.

In Group A2 on the other hand a very low contributor (Subject 27) went on to be the lowest scoring participant in the individual tasks despite the good example of the other two participants, particularly Subject 18. He, however, as we have seen, achieved much more highly than his reading scores would have predicted, and again may have benefited from the group context to prime his individual effort.

Group A3 as a dyad, cannot be analysed in quite the same way, but Group A4 demonstrated the positive effect of providing a platform for a lower achiever (Subject 10) to explore and probably learn more than she was to be able to do alone. Counter to this is the negative effect of the group context on Subject 14's role within that context. However

we do not know whether she so severely underachieved in the group compared with her potential or somewhat overachieved individually as a result of the group experience.

Group B1 would appear to have been a negative experience for all involved, and it is true that two of the participants commented more positively on the individual context in some questions on their post-programme questionnaire. One might imagine that because the participants had already worked as individuals before coming to the group context, they had more pre-set ideas about how they were going to attack the tasks. But this is not as simple as it appears, as Subject 15 who advocated so strongly a task-led approach had in fact translated before doing the task in her own individual session. Even here there is a counter argument. Perhaps the fact that the disputes were in the end reconciled and the tasks were completed moderately successfully would give a more positive effect on further work. Certainly their group score greatly exceeded the mean individual score and the range of individual scores, and this would suggest a more positive group affect than we might imagine. Additionally, Subjects 2 and 15 both preferred the group context throughout their questionnaires.

Group B2 had a more uneasy dynamic with a strong female, a moderately strong but quite quiet male and a quiet weaker female who spoke very little. The tone was very cooperative but a slight awkwardness perhaps prevented a fuller exploration of either text or task. Certainly the weaker member did not gain in confidence during the process as did Subject 29 in group B4 for example.

B3 as we have seen operated very successfully with all three participants benefiting from the context in terms of the raising of the mean scores to the maximum obtained by the group. Whether the less successful FP task is an indicator that effective group

collaboration can sometimes be a time limited quality is impossible to say, but raises an issue about group constitution which needs to be addressed in future work.

In Group B4 there were two quite evenly able participants who dominated the discussion especially at the beginning of the session. A clear indication of the potential benefits of the group mode would appear to be that the third member of that group (Subject 29) grew visibly in confidence during the group session, and contributed more frequently at the end of the TFI and through the FP task.

In conclusion, clearly we cannot expect that a single finding will emerge about the value of group work. The discussion above has demonstrated that many learners can benefit from reading collaboratively, (sometimes without realising it). We need to take learner wishes into account, and supply a variety of experiences but this study suggests that collaborative reading should have a very real and regular place in the curriculum. The following sections look at how this might be implemented in different education and training contexts.

7.4 Suggestions arising from the questions and responses

7.4.1 For teacher-led training for reading

Teachers do have a very real ability to facilitate skills development in a direct way. As we saw in Chapter Three there is insufficient evidence to conclude that strategy training affects learners' behaviour permanently and in some cases teacher led strategy-training programmes can result (Cotterall, 1993) in strategic reading being exercised *only* when

focused on by the teacher. It would seem sensible therefore (where reading strategies are concerned) to advocate the use of collaborative group work on reading tasks as a viable extension to such training. By moving the strategy work away from the whole-class focus and into a group context, with careful task setting, learners could be enabled to use more strategies more often and thus become accustomed to more strategic thinking.

Collaborative work also offers a further direction to the valuable work done recently on individual think-aloud studies applied to reading, (see Pressley and Afflerbach, 1995 for a summary). It can achieve this by making public and so more familiar the thinking processes which are often hidden in individual reading.

Thus, on a practical level, a mixture of teacher-led sessions and group-based peer-learning sessions could be a way to develop strategic competence. For such strategy training formal 'reading lessons' as used extensively in TESOL and in many MFL contexts outside the UK, would seem to be a sensible addition to the teaching programme. These are described briefly by Nuttall (1996, p.30) and at greater length in Aebersold and Field (1997). The essential quality of such lessons is that the teacher can model good reading behaviour not in a didactic style, but by setting up small tasks which cause certain behaviours, then taking feedback about the processes which occurred, and finally allowing further practice. This involves the use of pre-reading and while-reading tasks, highlights such strategies as prediction and can also focus, for example, on the identification of key-words, inferencing unfamiliar lexis, and the sequencing by meaning of chunks of text. To an extent this is modelled in the *Authentik* newspaper collection, and is therefore already available. But as we said in Chapter One, a large objection to such an initiative is that in these lessons there would be much more English used than is

currently recommended. However the enhancement of modern language lesson discourse to include more cognitively stimulating discussion about how we learn would seem to be an advantage which far outweighs the loss of target language for perhaps half of one lesson in four or five. For group-based work which follows on from such modelling task-styles become crucial, because it is through the careful construction of tasks that a teacher can, from a distance, cause different discussions to arise amongst groups of learners, and hence cause them to utilise different reading approaches and strategies.

These conclusions point very strongly to the need for UK secondary school teachers to consider how they might re-value the role of reading in the eyes of their learners. This would enable not just better reading but better language learning in general. And, in addition to this, if we accept that a prerequisite of greater self-direction in language learning is the ability to read effectively, it would enhance the baseline level for the development of learner autonomy. Teachers who take an *active* role in the development of strategic reading in their learners will find that what seems initially to be increased teacher dependence later becomes increased learner independence, as strategy use becomes internalised as a part of the reading process. When we have moved further in these directions with learners in classrooms, it will be enlightening to measure again student attitudes to foreign language reading.

7.4.2 For peer-mediated training for reading

It is important to expand on the recommendations regarding peer-mediated training noted in the previous section. This study has shown that there is a very clear significance in the constitution of groups and their behaviour as groups during the task process. This should not be left to chance. We have seen that some researchers favour single-sex groups, others particular combinations of ability. But perhaps more crucial with KS3 and KS4 learners is their own awareness that they have the power to make the group context work or fail. Whatever the group constitution, an agreement to discuss procedures and an awareness that pausing to consider options are both highly significant in enhancing both the task completion process (and the eventual 'product') and the discourse involved (which would seem to be influential in learning for some irrespective of the product). We are not simply reiterating the procedure rules promoted by researchers such as Mercer et al (1999), (which are very important in terms of 'politeness' and organisation issues) but also looking towards activating an awareness of strategic reading on a broader scale. Therefore we would recommend making part of each group reading task an initial discussion about the best way to approach the specific task. This allows members of a group to decide between the various options: to read text aloud; to read silently; to choose to focus on a paragraph at a time or on the whole text, to be task-led or text-led. Most importantly, it makes part of that discussion the reasons why such choices are favoured for this text and task and so raises awareness of why reading approaches do sometimes differ. This can be modelled through a questioning by the teacher of the more aware students to begin with but can quickly become part of normal group behaviour.

The second element relates to the approach to difficulties in the text or task. Product-based learning emphasises correct outcomes rather than useful processes, and learners need to be supported in discovering that a greater emphasis on the latter often creates a better version of the former. The push to make a decision and move on is very evident in many of the individual and group transcripts, and we have noted more than once the lack of some terms for reasoning and decision-making, such as modal phrases. Groups working independently can perhaps benefit initially from an emphasis in the previous teacher modelling stage of questions during feedback which include the verbs *think*, *might* or *could*, the adverbs *possibly* and *perhaps*. Feedback around the issue of: *here is a problem, what options do we have in terms of meaning* ? (ie *what could it mean ?*) or *in terms of the answer* ? (ie *does this mean that ... . ?*) would allow a certain process to be modelled which would then become natural independent behaviour for some learners.

Additionally, some prompts in the form of questions such as those above, can temporarily be given to groups to remember and use in appropriate circumstances.

In all of these cases the intention is not to prescribe behaviour but to suggest approaches. This method of modelling and prompting continues with more and more advanced techniques, but does not remain as an ongoing dominant presence. The process of group work should in general be a free agenda, but participants are entitled to methodological support as their own capabilities mature.

Finally, there is real value in sharing systems and approaches, either by altering group constitution to allow some cross-fertilisation or by instituting some whole-class discussion of how to read effectively.

7.4.3 For teacher education on foreign language reading related issues

Teacher education programmes (whether in the initial phase or as part of continuing professional development) should (and possibly do) focus on the wider role of reading within language learning and the importance of collaborative reading as a means of more general language learning and consolidation. On the first point there have been many studies, for example Little, Devitt and Singleton (1989), Mitchell and Swarbrick (1994) and Swarbrick (1999), all related to the UK context, which have demonstrated the power of authentic material to harness motivation and cause learning. The currently growing awareness of content and language teaching through European projects such as BILD and national schemes such as SALT2000 also indicate the power of reading to learn both content and language. Teachers have more recently begun much more to try inductive methodology which often involves classification tasks, which themselves commonly involve reading. Others have experimented with the use of such tasks as logic puzzles. The significance of this type of reading over that found in many more common coursebook materials is that it activates cognition in far more ways, can motivate effectively and can lead to more general language learning through developing, for example, grammatical awareness.

On the second point this study has demonstrated that learners can become very engaged in discussions about the meanings of texts and the task completion processes around them. Whatever their relative success the twenty seven participants took the tasks very seriously and group discussion was never flippant. The Part One study showed similarly

that the benefits of collaboration appear to be evident from the beginning of such work. The very full literature on socially shared cognition (see Chapter Three) demonstrates fully the importance of dialogic interaction in L1 language development, and it is vital now that teacher educators find ways to describe and demonstrate the benefits gained from talking (even if in L1) about L2 meanings and structures. We know that motivation is often increased by collaboration, and we know that reading requires motivation. In addition this study has demonstrated that text penetration can be greater if a framework is created which will allow different modes of attack. Reading can justifiably be assigned a greater importance than it currently has in many schemes of work, more challenging texts can be added to the often bland choice currently available. No-one doubts the value of collaborative speaking as a valid learning experience. Collaborative reading could now also become a regular learning methodology, worthy of full discussion in teacher education programmes, and not just an occasional feature in the curriculum.

7.4.4 For future research

7.4.4.1 Unanswered questions

Some of the questions posed, especially those concerning correlations between approaches to reading and success or the advantages and disadvantages of the two reading contexts, did not require single concrete answers but rather the presentation of evidence with a view to gaining greater understanding of the issues. Individuals will read differently from each other in the same situation and differently themselves in different situations. In this sense there cannot be definitive answers either from any future studies.

We have shown that the data gathering method of using verbal reports of thinking / reading / task discussion is valid, in terms of the richness of evidence that it can produce. On a theoretical level, therefore, further studies using both think-aloud and peer interaction data gathering methods would be worthwhile in that they would reveal the reading behaviour of younger learners in still more detail. This study created groups from a notional friendship base, but did not actually ask for friendships to be identified by the subjects themselves. (The class seating plan, based on free choice of seating places was used). Perhaps a stronger group dynamic can be achieved through an agreement that to work with a friend is often appropriate but that pairings of friendship pairs to create fours is a matter on which a teacher will also have a valid view. This study saw no firm evidence in retrospect of a need to avoid mixed-sex groupings, but gender effects would be worth monitoring over a longer period as groups became more accustomed to working together (in harmony or discord).

7.4.4.2 Proposals for research

A useful further investigation would be a longitudinal study of the effects over a period of perhaps six months of the use of both individually based and group based reading contexts. This would therefore involve a number of tasks, (although probably not a much greater number of task-types). Again both individual and group contexts could be compared, perhaps with a mixture of choice and prescription over the group constitution. If more task-types are used the distinction between those which demand a more linear approach and those which allow a greater range of approaches to be used should be preserved, as this allows for useful comparisons. Such a programme would offer greater

insights into the role of reading in overall language competence and motivation. Even if absolute cause-effect correlations would not be possible in terms of attainment gains, a substantially different and enhanced reading programme could be considered at least a partial causal factor if such improvements *were* made. On the other hand the transcripts of discussions and the views of teachers and learners would offer more conclusive evidence on the role of a reading programme in any motivation gains and could play a part in assigning more concrete causal links between reading and language learning.

Of even greater importance in such a programme would be some analysis of the role of verbalisation. The aim here would be to investigate the distinction between verbalisation as surface evidence of reading ability and verbalisation as a factor in the shaping of reading competence. If the latter is found to exist, then both individual think-aloud and group interaction as processes would be shown to have a vital role not just in the development of reading skills on the part of individuals but also in the potential for group reading to form a zone of proximal development for language learners.

Such a programme could be founded perhaps on a comparison of readings, with and without verbalisation, of a set of parallel texts and tasks with very closely equivalent language and question levels. This would enable a much greater insight into an area, which for this author from this study has emerged as the next most pressing and stimulating research question.

Bibliography

Abraham, R.G. and Vann, R.J. (1987) Strategies of Two Language Learners: a Case Study, in Wenden, A. and Rubin, J. (1987) *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*, London, Prentice Hall International

Adwick, C. (1995) Task-styles in the Common Entrance papers for French, Dissertation (M.Ed.) - University of Nottingham

Aebershold, J.A. and Field, M.L. (1997) *From Reader to Reading Teacher*, Cambridge, CUP

Afflerbach P. (1990) The influence of prior knowledge on expert readers' main idea construction strategies, *Reading Research Quarterly* 25 31-46

Afflerbach, P. and Johnston, P. (1984) On the Use of Verbal Reports in Reading Research, *Journal of Reading Behaviour* 16:4, 307-322

Alderson, J.C. (1984) Reading in a foreign language: a reading problem or a language problem ? in Alderson, J.C. and Urquhart, A.H. (1984) *Reading in a Foreign Language*, Harlow, Longman

Alderson, J.C. and Urquhart, A.H. (1984) *Reading in a Foreign Language*, Harlow, Longman

Almasi, J.F. (1995) The nature of fourth graders' sociocognitive conflicts in peer-led and teacher-led discussions of literature, *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30:3, 314-351

Allwright D. and Bailey K.M. (1991) *Focus on the Language Classroom: an introduction to classroom research for language teachers*, Cambridge, CUP

American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Reading Proficiency Guidelines (1986) http://www.actfl.org/htdocs/pubs/guidelines.htm, accessed 14/03/00, 13.33pm

Anderson, R.C. and Pearson, P.D. (1984) A schema-theoretic view of basic processes in reading comprehension, in Pearson, P.D. (ed) (1984) *Handbook of Reading Research*, New York, Longman

Authentik Language Learning Newspapers, Authentik, 27 Westland Square, Dublin 2, Ireland.

Bailey, K.M. and Nunan, D. (1996) *Voices from the Language Classroom*, Cambridge, CUP

Baily, C.A. (1996) Unobtrusive computerised observation of compensation strategies for writing to determine the effectiveness of strategy instruction, in Oxford, R.L. (ed) (1996) *Language learning strategies around the world: cross-cultural perspectives,* University of Hawai'i at Manoa: Second language teaching and curriculum center technical report 13

Bakhtin, M.M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination*, Austin, University of Texas Press

Bakhtin, M.M. (1986) *Speech Genres and Other late Essays,* Austin, University of Texas Press

Barnes, D. (1976) *From Communication to Curriculum*, Harmondsworth, Penguin

Barnes, D. (1992) The role of talk in learning, in Norman K. (ed) (1992) *Thinking Voices*, London, Hodder and Stoughton

Barnes, D. and Todd, F. (1977) *Communication and Learning in Small Groups,* London, Routledge

Barnes, D. and Todd, F. (1995) *Communication and Learning Revisited*, Portsmouth, NH, Boynton/Cook

Barnett, M.A. (1988) Teaching reading strategies: how methodology affects language course articulation, *Foreign Language Annals,* 21:2, 109-119

Barnett, M.A. (1989) *More than Meets the Eye*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall

Barr, R., Kamil, M.L., Mosenthal, P. and Pearson, P. D. (1991) *Handbook of Reading Research, vol II*, Mahwah, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum

Beech, J.R. and Singleton, C. (eds) (1997) *The Psychological Assessment of Reading*, London, Routledge

Bennett, N. (1985) Interaction and achievement in classroom groups, in Bennett, N. and Desforges, C. (eds) (1985) *Recent Advances in Classroom Research*, Edinburgh, Scottish Academic Press

Bennett, N. and Cass, A. (1988) The Effects of Group Composition on Group Interactive Processes and Pupil Understanding, *British Educational Research Journal,* 15:1, 19-32

Bennett, N. and Desforges, C. (eds) (1985) *Recent Advances in Classroom Research*, Edinburgh, Scottish Academic Press

Bereiter, C. and Bird, M. (1985) Use of thinking aloud in identification and teaching of reading comprehension strategies, *Cognition and Instruction*, 2 131-156

Bernhardt, E.B. (1991) *Reading Development in a Second Language*, Norwood NJ, Ablex

Bernhardt, E.B. and Kamil, M.L. (1995) Interpreting Relationships between L1 and L2 Reading: Consolidating the Linguistic Threshold and the Linguistic Interdependence Hypotheses, *Applied Linguistics*, 16:1, 15-34

Billig, M. (1987) *Arguing and Thinking: a rhetorical approach to social psychology*, Cambridge, CUP

Block, E. (1986) The comprehension strategies of second language readers, *TESOL Quarterly* 20:3, 463-494

Blum-Kulka, S. (1997) Discourse Pragmatics, in van Dijk, T.A. (ed) *Discourse as Social Interaction*, London, Sage

Born, W. (ed) *The Foreign Language Learner in Today's Classroom Environment*, Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Middlesbury, Vermont, 53-75

Bossers, B. (1991) On thresholds, ceilings and short-circuits: the relation between L1 reading, L2 reading and L2 knowledge, in Hulstijn, J.H. (ed) (1991) *Reading in Two Languages*, AILA Review 8, Amsterdam

Bree, D.S. (1969) The Understanding Process as seen in geometry thereoms and the missionaries and cannibals problem, *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 30, 1675-A

Brewster, J. (1987) Co-operation and Control: A Study of Interactional Strategies Used in Task-Based Collaborative Learning in the Primary School, M Phil Dissertation, University of Birmingham

Brewster, J. (1999) Exploring Gendered Talk: Some Effects of Interactional Style, in Tosi, A. and Leung, C. (1999) *Rethinking Language Education*, London, CILT

Brown, A.L. (1980) Metacognitive Development and Reading, in Spiro, R.J., Bruce, B.C. and Brewer, W.F. (eds) (1980) *Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension*, Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum

Brown, J. D. (1988) *Understanding Research in Second Language Learning*, Cambridge, CUP

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1987) *Politeness: Some Universals in language Usage* Cambridge, CUP

Bryman, A. and Burgess, R. (eds) (1994) *Analyzing Qualitative Data*, London, Routledge

Butterworth, G. and Light, P. (eds) (1982) *Social cognition : studies of the development of understanding*, Brighton, Harvester Press

Carrell, P.L (1989) Metacognitive awareness and second language reading. *The Modern Language Journal* 73:2, 121-134

Carrell, P.L. (1991) Second Language Reading: reading ability or language proficiency ?, *Applied Linguistics* 12, 159-179

Carrell, P.L., Devine, J. and Eskey, D.E. (1988) *Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading*, Cambridge, CUP

Carton, A. (1966) *The Method of Inference in Foreign Language Study*, The Research Foundation of the City of New York

Carton, A. (1971) Inferencing: a process in using and learning language, in Pimsleur, P. and Quinn, T, (eds) (1971) *The Psychology of Second Language Learning*, Cambridge, CUP

Carvel, J. (2000) Pupils to learn how to think, *The Guardian* 06.01.00, p4

Carver, R. (1977-8) Towards a theory of reading comprehension and rauding, *Reading Research Quarterly*, 13, 8-64

Cavanaugh, J.C. and Perlmutter, M. (1982) Metamemory: A Critical Examination, *Child Development* 53, 11-28

Chafe, W.L. (1993) Prosodic and Functional Units of Language, in Edwards, J. and Lampert, M.D. (eds) (1993) *Talking Data*, Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum

Chamot, A.U. and O'Malley, J.M. (1994) *The CALLA Handbook: implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach*, Reading Ma, Addison-Wesley

Chaudron, C. (1988) *Second Language Classrooms: research on teaching and learning*, Cambridge, CUP

Clarke, M. (1980) The short circuit hypothesis of ESL reading - or when language competence interferes with reading performance, *Modern language Journal* 64(2), 203-9

Coady, J. (1979) A psycholinguistic model of the ESL reader, in Mackay, R., Barkman, B. and Jordan, R.R. (eds) (1979) *Reading in a Second Language: Hypotheses, organisation and practice*, Rowley MA, Newbury House

Cohen, A.D (1987) Studying Learner Strategies: How we get the Information, in Wenden, A. and Rubin, J. (1987) *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*, London, Prentice Hall International

Cohen, A.D. (1998) *Strategies on Learning and Using a Second Language*, London, Longman

Cohen, A.D. and Hosenfeld, C. (1981) Some uses of mentalistic data in second language research, *Language Learning*, 31:2, 285-313

Cole, P. and Morgan, J. (eds) (1975) *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, New York, Academic Press

Cooper, C., Marquis, A. and Ayers-Lopez, S. (1982) Peer learning in the Classroom: Tracing Developmental Patterns and Consequences of Children's Spontaneous Interactions, in Wilkinson, L. (ed) (1982) *Communicating in the Classroom*, New York, Academic Press

Cotterall, S. (1990a) Reciprocal teaching: A Problem-Solving Approach to Reading, *Guidelines*, 12:2, 30-39

Cotterall, S. (1990b) Developing Reading Strategies through Small-Group Interaction, *RELC Journal*, 21:2, 55-69

Cotterall, S. (1993) Reading Strategy Training in Second Language Contexts: some caveats, *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 16.1 71-82

Coulthard, M. (1977) *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*, London, Longman

Crain-Thoreson, C Lippman, M and McLendon-Magnuson, D 1997 Windows on comprehension: reading comprehension processes as revealed by two think-aloud procedures Journnal of Educational Psychology, 89, 4 579-591

Cummins, J. (1979) Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children, *Review of Educational Research* 49, 222-251

Cummins, J. (1991) Conversational and academic language proficiency in bilingual contexts, in Hulstijn, J.H. (ed) (1991*) Reading in Two Languages*, AILA Review 8, Amsterdam

Devine, J. (1988a) A case study of two readers reading: models of reading and reading performance, in Carrell, P.L., Devine, J. and Eskey, D.E. (1988) *Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading*, Cambridge, CUP

Devine, J. (1988b) Language competence and L2 reading proficiency, in Carrell, P.L., Devine, J. and Eskey, D.E. (1988) *Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading*, Cambridge, CUP

Devine, J., Carrell, P. and Eskey, D. (eds) (1987) *Research in Reading English as a Second Language*, Washington, DC, TESOL

Dickson, W.P. (ed) (1981) *Children's oral communication skills*, New York, Academic Press

van Dijk, T.A. and Kintsch, W. (1983) *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*, New York, Aademic Press

van Dijk, T.A. (ed) *Discourse as Social Interaction*, London, Sage

Donin, J. and Silva, M. (1993) The Relationship Between First- and Second-Language Reading Comprehension of Occupation-Specific Texts, *Language Learning*, 43:3, 373-401

Dornic, S. (ed) (1977) *Attention and Performance, VI*, Hillsdale NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum

Dörnyei, Z. (1995) On the teachability of communication strategies, *TESOL Quarterly*, 29:1, 55-85

Draper, S. and Anderson, A. (1991) The significance of dialogue in learning and observing learning, *Computers and Education* 17:1, 93-107

Edwards, J. (1993) Principles and Contrasting Systems of Discourse Transcription, in Edwards, J. and Lampert, M.D. (eds) (1993) *Talking Data*, Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum

Edwards, J. and Lampert, M.D. (eds) (1993) *Talking Data*, Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum

Edwards, A and Westgate, D.P.G (1994) *Investigating classroom talk*, London, Falmer Press

van Ek, J.A. (1975) *The threshold level.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Oxford, Pergamon Press

Elley, W.B. (1984) Exploring the reading difficulties of second-language learners in Fiji, in Alderson, J.C. and Urquhart, A.H. (1984) *Reading in a Foreign Language*, Harlow, Longman

Elley, W.B. (1991) Acquiring Literacy in a Second Language: the Effect of Book-Based Programmes, *Language Learning* 41:3, 375-411

Ellis, N. and Beaton, A. (1993) Factors affecting the learning of foreign language vocabulary: imagery keyword mediators and phonological short-term memory, *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Experimental Psychology*, 46a, 533-558

Ellis, N. and Beaton, A. (1995) Psycholinguistic determinants of foreign language vocabulary learning, in Harley, B. (ed) (1995) *Lexical issues in language learning*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamin

Ely, M., Anzul, M., Friedman, T., Garner, *D. and Steinmetz, A. (1991) Doing* Qualitative Research: Circles within Circles, London, Falmer Press

Ericsson, K.A. (1988) Concurrent verbal reports on reading and text comprehension, *Text*, 8:4, 295-325

Ericsson, K.A. and Simon, H.A. (1980) Verbal Reports as Data, *Psychological Review* 87, 215-251

Ericsson, K.A. and Simon, H.A. (1993) *Protocol Analysis: Verbal Reports as Data*, Cambridge, Ma, MIT Press

Erickson, F. (1982) Classroom Discourse as Improvisation: Relationships between Academic Task Structure and Social Participation Structure in Lessons, in Wilkinson, L. (ed) (1982) *Communicating in the Classroom*, New York, Academic Press

Faerch, G. and Kasper, G. (eds) (1987) *Introspection in Second Language Research*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters

Faulkner, D., Littleton, K. and Woodhead, M. (eds) (1998) *Learning Relationships in the Classroom,* London, Routledge

Flavell, J.H. (1970) Developmental Studies of Mediated Memory, in Reese, H.W. and Lipsitt, L.P. (eds) (1970) *Advances in Child Development Behaviour vol 5*, New York, Academic Press

Flavell, J.H. (1981) Cognitive Monitoring, in Dickson, W.P. (ed) (1981) *Children's oral communication skills*, New York, Academic Press

Flesch, R. (1962) *The Art of Readable Writing*, London, Macmillan

Forman, E.A. (1981) The role of collaboration in problem-solving in children, Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University

Forman, E.A. and Cazden, C.B. (1998) Exploring Vygotskian perspectives in education: the cognitive value of peer interaction, in Faulkner, D., Littleton, K. and Woodhead, M. (eds) (1998) *Learning Relationships in the Classroom,* London, Routledge

Garner, R. (1987) *Metacognition and Reading Comprehension*, Norwood, NJ, Ablex

Garner, R. and Reis, R. (1981) Monitoring and Resolving Comprehension Obstacles, *Reading Research Quarterly* 16, 569-582

Glachan, M and Light, P. (1982) Peer Interaction and Learning: can two wrongs make a right ? in Butterworth, G. and Light, P. (eds) (1982) *Social cognition : studies of the development of understanding*, Brighton, Harvester Press

Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*, Chicago, Aldine

Goffman, E. (1974) *Frame Analysis*, New York, Harper and Row

Goodman, K.S. (ed) (1968) *The psycholinguistic nature of the reading process*, Detroit, Wayne State University Press

Goodman, Y.M. and Goodman, K.S. (1990) Vygotsky in a whole-language perspective, in Moll, L.C. (ed) (1990) *Vygotsky and Education*, Cambridge, CUP

Gough , P.B. (1972) One second of reading, in Kavanagh, J.F. and Mattingly, I.G. (eds) (1972) *Language by Ear and by Eye*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press

Graddol, D., Maybin, J. and Stierer, B. (eds) (1994) *Researching language and Literacy in Social Context*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters

Gregg, L.W. and Steinberg, E.R. (eds) (1980) *Cognitive Processes in Writing*, Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum

Grellet, F. (1981) *Developing Reading Skills*, Cambridge, CUP

Grenfell, M. and Harris, V. (1993/4) How do pupils learn ?, (parts 1 and 2), Language Learning Journal, 8, / 9, 7-11

Grice, H.P. (1975) Logic and Conversation, in Cole, P. and Morgan, J. (eds) (1975) *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, New York, Academic Press

Gu, P.Y. (1996) Robin Hood in SLA: What has the learner strategy research taught us ?, *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching* , 6, 1-29

Harley, B. (ed) (1995) *Lexical issues in language learning*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamin

Harri-Augstein, S. and Thomas, L.F. (1984) Conversational Investigations of Reading: the self-organised learner and the text, in Alderson, J.C. and Urquhart, A.H. (1984) *Reading in a Foreign Language*, Harlow, Longman

Hayes, J.R. and Flower, L.S. (1980) Identifying the Organisation of Writing Processes, in Gregg, L.W. and Steinberg, E.R. (eds) (1980) *Cognitive Processes in Writing*, Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum

Hayes, J.R. and Simon, H.A. (1974) Understanding written problem instructions, in Gregg, L.W. (ed) (1974) *Knowledge and Cognition*, Potomac, MD, Lawrence Erlbaum

Hayes-Roth, B. and Hayes-Roth, F. (1979) A cognitive model of planning, *Cognitive Science* 3, 275-310

Hedegaard, M. (1990) The zone of proximal development as basis for instruction, in Moll, L.C. (ed) (1990) *Vygotsky and Education*, Cambridge, CUP

Hemmings, E. (1996) *The influence of personality on individual learning styles and motivation in second language learning* , Dissertation (M.Ed.) - University of Nottingham

Hockaday, F. (1984) Collaborative learning with young children, *Educational Studies* 10:3, 237-242

Hood, P. (1994, unpublished) Questionnaire and Test Data from the Listening While Reading Project

Hood, P. (1996) Early foreign language reading competence: some issues and evidence, *Language Learning Journal*, 13, 16-18

Hosenfeld, C. (1976) Learning about Learning: Discovering our Students' Strategies, *Foreign Language Annals*, 9:2, 117-129

Hosenfeld, C. (1977) A preliminary investigation of the reading strategies of successful and non-successful second language learners, *System* 5, 110-123

Hosenfeld, C. (1979) Cindy: a learner in today's foreign language classroom, in Born, W. (ed) *The Foreign Language Learner in Today's Classroom Environment*, Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Middlesbury, Vermont, 53-75

Hosenfeld, C. (1984) Case studies of ninth grade readers, in Alderson, J.C. and Urquhart, A.H. (1984) *Reading in a Foreign Language*, Harlow, Longman

Hulstijn, J.H. (ed) (1991) *Reading in Two Languages*, AILA Review 8, Amsterdam

Jenkins, N. and Cheshire, J. (1990) Gender Issues in the GCSE Oral Examination, part one, *Language and Education*, 4, 261-292

Johnson, D.W. and Johnson, R.T. (1989) *Cooperation and Competition: Theory and Research*, Edina, MN, Interaction Book Company

Just, M.A. and Carpenter,, P.A. (1980) A theory of reading: from eye fixations to comprehension, *Psychological Review*, 87, 329-354

Kavanagh, J.F. and Mattingly, I.G. (eds) (1972) *Language by Ear and by Eye*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press

Kern, R.G. (1989) Second language reading strategy instruction: its effects on comprehension and word inference ability, *Modern Language Journal*, 73:2, 135-149

Kern, R.G. (1994) The Role of Mental Translation in Second Language Reading, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 16:4, 441-461

Kieras, D.E. and Just, M.A. (eds) (1984) *NewMethods in Reading Comprehension Research*, Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum

Kintsch, W. (1988) The use of knowledge in discourse processing: a construction-integration model, *Psychological Review*, 95, 163-182

Kintsch, W. and van Dijk, T. (1978) Toward a model of text comprehension and production, *Psychological Review*, 85, 363-394

Knight, S.L., Padron, Y.N. and Waxman, H.C. (1985) The cognitive reading strategies of ESL students, *TESOL Quarterly*, 19:4, 789-792

Krashen, S. (1982) *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*, Oxford, Pergamon

Kress, G. (1985) Socio-Linguistic Development and the Mature Language User: Different Voices for Different Occasions, in Wells, G. and Nicholls, J. (eds) (1985) *Language and Learning: An Interactional Perspective*, London, Falmer Press

Kuhn, T. (1962) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press

Laberge, D. and Samuels, S.J. (1974) Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading, *Cognitive Psychology*, 6, 293-323

Lee, J. and Schallert, D.L. (1997) The Relative Contribution of L2 Language Proficiency and L1 Reading Ability to L2 Reading Performance: A Test of the Threshold Hypothesis in an EFL Context, *TESOL Quarterly*, 31:4, 713-739

Lesgold, A. and Perfetti, C. (eds) (1981) *Interactive Processes in Reading*, Hillsdale NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum

Levinson, S. (1983) *Pragmaticsl, Cambridge, CUP*

Lewis, M.M. (1948) Fundamental Skills in the learning of a second language, *English Language Teaching Journal,* 1, 169-173

Light, P. and Littleton, K. (1998) Cognitive approaches to group work, in Faulkner, D., Littleton, K. and Woodhead, M. (eds) (1998) *Learning Relationships in the Classroom,* London, Routledge

Lincoln, Y.S. and Guba, E.G. (1985) *Naturalistic Inquiry*, Beverly Hills, Sage

Little, D., Devitt, S. and Singleton, D. (1989*):' Learning Foreign Languages from Authentic Texts'*, Dublin, Authentik

Littleton, K. and Light, P. (eds) (1999) *Learning with Computers*, London, Routledge

Lotman, Y.M. (1988) Text within a Text, *Soviet Psychology,* 26:3, 32-51

Mackay, R., Barkman, B. and Jordan, R.R. (eds) (1979) *Reading in a Second Language: Hypotheses, organisation and practice*, Rowley MA, Newbury House

MacWhinney, B. (1995) *The CHILDES Project: tools for analyzing talk*, Hillsdale NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum

Mason, J. (1994) Linking qualitative and quantitative data analysis in Bryman, A. and Burgess, R. (eds) *Analyzing Qualitative Data*, London, Routledge

Maybin, J. (1994) Children's Voices: Talk, Knowledge and Identity, in Graddol, D., Maybin, J. and Stierer, B. (eds) (1994) *Researching language and Literacy in Social Context*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters

Maykut, P. and Morehouse, R. (1994) *Beginning Qualitative Research*, London, Falmer Press

McCarthy, M. (1991) *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*, Cambridge, CUP

McDonough, S.H. (1995) *Strategy and skill in learning a foreign language*, London, Edward Arnold

McDonough, S.H. (1999) Learner Strategies, *Language Teaching*, 32, 1-18

McLeod, J. (1965) *GAP Reading Comprehension Test*, London, Heinemann

Mehan, H. (1979) *Learning Lessons,* Cambridge, Mass, Harvard University Press

Mercer, N. and Wegerif, R. (1999) Is 'exploratory talk' productive talk ?, in Littleton, K. and Light, P. (eds) (1999) *Learning with Computers*, London, Routledge

Mercer, N. (1995) *The Guided Construction of Knowledge*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters

Mitchell, I. and Swarbrick, A. (1994) *Developing skills for independent reading* (PF22), London, CILT

Moll, L.C. (ed) (1990) *Vygotsky and Education*, Cambridge, CUP

Moll, L.C. and Diaz, S. (1985) Ethnographic pedagogy: promoting effective bilingual instruction, in Garcia, E.E. and Padilla, R.V. (eds) (1985) *Advances in bilingual educational research*, Tucson, University of Arizona Press

Moll, L.C. and Diaz, S. (1987) Change as the goal of educational research, *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 18, 300-311

Moll, L.C. and Whitmore, K.F. (1998) Vygotsky in classroom practice: moving from individual transmission to social transaction, in Faulkner, D., Littleton, K. and Woodhead, M. (eds) (1998) *Learning Relationships in the Classroom,* London, Routledge

MonoConc for Windows, (1997) (concordancing software), Houston, Tx, Athelstan

Morse, J.M. (ed) (1994) *Critical Issues in Qualitative Research Methods*, Thousand Oaks, Sage

Morse, J.M. (1994a) Qualitative Research: Fact or Fantasy in Morse, J.M. (ed) (1994) *Critical Issues in Qualitative Research Methods*, Thousand Oaks, Sage

Morse, J.M. (1994b) "Emerging from the Data": the cognitive processes of analysis in qualitative inquiry in Morse, J.M. (ed) (1994) *Critical Issues in Qualitative Research Methods*, Thousand Oaks, Sage

Naiman, N., Fröhlich, M., Stern, H.H. and Todesco, A. (1978) *The Good Language Learner*, Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

National Curriculum for Modern Foreign Languages (1991, revised 1995), London, HMSO

Nisbett, R.E. and Wilson, T.D (1977) Telling More Than We Can Know: Verbal Reports on Mental Processes, *Psychological Review* 84:3, 231-259

Norman K. (ed) (1992) *Thinking Voices*, London, Hodder and Stoughton

Nunan, D. (1992) *Research Methods in Language Learning*, Cambridge, CUP

Nunan, D. (1996): Towards autonomous learning: some theoretical, empirical and practical issues.' In Pemberton, R., Li, E.S.L., Or, W.W.F., and Pierson, H.D (eds) (1996) *Taking Control: autonomy in language learning*, Hong Kong, Hong Kong University Press

Nunan, D. (1997) Strategy training in the clasroom: an empirical investigation, *RELC Journal* 28:2, 56-81

Nunan, D. and Lamb, C. (1996): *The self-directed teacher*, London, CUP

Nuttall, C. (1996) *Teaching Reading Skills in a foreign language*, Oxford, Heinemann

Oakhill, J.V. and Cain, K. (1997) Assessment of comprehension in reading, in Beech, J.R. and Singleton, C. (eds) (1997) *The Psychological Assessment of Reading*, London, Routledge

Olshavsky, J (1976-7) Reading as problem solving: an investigation of strategies *Reading Research Quarterly* 12, 654-74

Olson, G.M., Duffy, S.A. and Mack, R.L. (1984) Thinking-Out-Loud as a Method for Studying Real-Time Comprehension Processes, in Kieras, D.E. and Just, M.A. (eds) (1984) *NewMethods in Reading Comprehension Research*, Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum

O'Malley, J.M. and Chamot, A.U. (1990) *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*, Cambridge, CUP

O'Malley, J.M., Chamot, A.U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Russo, R.P. and Küpper, L. (1985) Learning strategy application with students of English as a Second Language, *TESOL Quarterly* 19, 557-584

Oxford, R.L. (1990) *Language Learning Strategies: What every teacher should know*, New York, Newbury House

Oxford, R.L. (ed) (1996) *Language learning strategies around the world: cross-cultural perspectives*, University of Hawai'i at Manoa: Second language teaching and curriculum center technical report 13

Oxford, R.L., Lavine, R.Z., Felkins, G., Hollaway, M.E. and Saleh, R. (1996) Telling their stories: language students use diaries and recollection, in Oxford, R.L. (ed) (1996) *Language learning strategies around the world: cross-cultural perspectives*, University of Hawai'i at Manoa: Second language teaching and curriculum center technical report 13

Padron, Y.N. and Waxman, H.C. (1988) The effect of ESL students' perception of their cognitive strategies on reading achievement, *TESOL Quarterly*, 22:1, 146-150

Palincsar, A.S. and Brown, A.L. (1984) Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities, *Cognition and Instruction*, 1:2, 117-175

Paris, S.G., Lipson, M.Y. and Wixson, K.K. (1983) Becoming a strategic reader, *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 8 293-316

Pearson, P.D. (ed) (1984) *Handbook of Reading Research*, New York, Longman

Perret-Clermont, A.N. (1980) *Social Interaction and Cognitive Development in Children*, London, Academic Press

Phillips, T. (1981) *Difficulties in foreign language vocabulary learning and a study of some of the factors thought to be influential*, MA dissertation, University of London, Birkbeck College

Phillips, T. (1985) Beyond Lip-Service: Discourse Development after the Age of Nine, in Wells, G. and Nicholls, J. (eds) (1985) *Language and Learning: An Interactional Perspective*, London, Falmer Press

Pickett, G.D. (1978) *The foreign language learning process*, London, British Council English Teaching Centre, Occasional Paper

Pimsleur, P. and Quinn, T, (eds) (1971) *The Psychology of Second Language Learning*, Cambridge, CUP

Pomerantz, A. and Fehr, B.J. (1997) Conversation Analysis: An Approach to the Study of Social Action as Sense Making Practices, in van Dijk, T.A. (ed) *Discourse as Social Interaction*, London, Sage

Potter, J. and Wetherell, M. (1994a) *Discourse analysis and social psychology*, London, Sage

Potter, J and Wetherell, M. (1994b) Analyzing Discourse, in Bryman, A. and Burgess, R. (eds) (1994) *Analyzing Qualitative Data*, London, Routledge

Poulisse, N., Bongaerts, T. and Kellerman, E. (1987) The use of retrospective verbal reports in the analysis of compensatory strategies, in Faerch, G. and Kasper, G. (eds) (1987) *Introspection in Second Language Research*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters

Pressley, M. and Afflerbach, P. (1995) *Verbal Protocols of Reading*, Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum

Reese, H.W. and Lipsitt, L.P. (eds) (1970) *Advances in Child Development Behaviour vol 5*, New York, Academic Press

Rees-Miller, J. (1993) A critical appraisal of learner training: theoretical bases and teaching implications, *TESOL Quarterly*, 27:4, 679-689

Resnick, L. B., Levine, J.M. and Teasley, S.D. (eds) (1991) *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition*, Washington DC, American Psychological Association

Ridgway, T. (1994) Reading Theory and Foreign Language Reading Comprehension, *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 10, 2, 55-76

Ridgway, T. (1997) Thresholds of the Background knowledge Effect in Foreign Language Reading, *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 11, 1, 151-168

Robson, C. (1993) *Real World Research*, Oxford, Blackwell

Rodgers, T. (1969) On measuring vocabulary difficulty: an analysis of item variables in learning Russian-English vocabulary pairs, *IRAL* 7, 327-343

Roehler, L.R. and Duffy, G.G. (1991) Teachers' Instructional Actions, in Barr, R., Kamil, M.L., Mosenthal, P. and Pearson, P. D. (1991) *Handbook of Reading Research, vol II*, Mahwah, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum

Rubin, J. (1975) What the good language learner can teach us, *TESOL Quarterly* 9, 41-51

Rubin, J. (1987) Learner Strategies, Theoretical Assumptions, Research History and Typology, in Wenden, A. and Rubin, J. (1987) *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*, London, Prentice Hall International

Rubin, J. and Thompson, I. (1982) *How to be a More Successful Language Learner*, Boston, Ma, Heinle and Heinle

Rumelhart, D. (1977) Toward an interactive model of reading, in Dornic, S. (ed) (1977) *Attention and Performance, VI*, Hillsdale NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum

Samuels, S.J. and Kamil, M.L. (1988) Models of the reading process, in Carrell, P.L., Devine, J. and Eskey, D.E. (1988) *Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading*, Cambridge, CUP

Sarig, G. (1987) High level reading in the first and foreign language: some comparative process data, in Devine, J., Carrell, P. and Eskey, D. (eds) (1987) *Research in Reading English as a Second Language*, Washington, DC, TESOL

Schegloff, E.A. (1991) Conversation Analysis and Socially Shared Cognition, in Resnick, L. B., Levine, J.M. and Teasley, S.D. (eds) (1991) *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition*, Washington DC, American Psychological Association

Schiffrin, D. (1994) *Approaches to Discourse,* Cambridge, Ma, Blackwell

Seliger, H.W. (1983) The Language Learner as Linguist: Of Metaphors and Realities, *Applied Linguistics* 4, 179-191

Sharan, S. (1980) Cooperative learning in small groups: Recent methods and effects on achievement, attitudes and ethnic relations, *Review of Educational Research*, 50, 241-271

Sharan, S. (ed) (1990) *Cooperative Learning: Theory and Practice*, New York, Praeger Press

Silverman, D. (1993) *Interpreting Qualitative Data*, London, Sage

Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. (1975*) Towards an Analysis of Discourse: the English Used by Teachers and Pupils*, Oxford, OUP

Singer, H. (1981) Instruction in reading acquisition, in Tzeng, O. and Singer, H. (eds) (1981) *Perception of Print*, Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum

Singleton, D. (1997) Learning and processing L2 Vocabulary, *Language Teaching* 30, 213-225

Slavin, R.E. (1980) Cooperative Learning, *Review of Educational Research*, 50, 315-342

Slavin, R.E. (1990) *Cooperative Learning: Theory Research and Practice*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall

Smith, F. (1971) *Understanding Reading*, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston

Smith, P. (1985) *Language, the Sexes and Society,* Oxford, Blackwell

van Someren, M., Barnard, Y.F. and Sandberg, J.A.C. (1994) *The Think Aloud Method: A practical guide to modelling cognitive processes*, London, Academic Press

Spiro, R.J., Bruce, B.C. and Brewer, W.F. (eds) (1980) *Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension*, Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum

Stanovich, K. (1980) Toward an interactive-compensatory model of individual differences in the development of reading fluency, *Reading Research Quarterly*, 16:1, 32-71

Stern, H.H. (1975) What can we learn from the good language learner ?, *Canadian Modern Language Review* 31, 304-318

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990) *Basics of Qualitative Research*, Newbury Park, Sage

Swaffar, J.K., Arens, K.M. and Byrnes, H. (1991) *Reading for Meaning: an integrated approach to language learning*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall

Swarbrick, A. (1999) *More reading for pleasure in a foreign language* (PF36), London, CILT

Talbot, G. (1997) Testing an L2 reading strategy programme, *RELC Journal* 28:2, 128-141

ten Have, P. (1999) *Doing Conversation Analysis: a practical guide*, London, Sage

Thompson, I. (1987) Memory in Language Learning, in Wenden, A. and Rubin, J. (1987) *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*, London, Prentice Hall International

Tosi, A. and Leung, C. (1999) *Rethinking Language Education,* London, CILT

Trabasso, T. and Suh, S. (1993) Understanding Text: Achieving Explanatory Coherence Through On-Line Inferences and Mental Operations in Working Memory, *Discourse Processes*, 16, 3-34

Tudge, J. (1990) Vygotsky, the zone of proximal development, and peer collaboration: Implications for classroom practice, in Moll, L.C. (ed) (1990) *Vygotsky and Education*, Cambridge, CUP

Tzeng, O. and Singer, H. (eds) (1981) *Perception of Print*, Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum

Unwin, D. (1970) *GAP Reading Comprehension Test Manual*, London, Heinemann

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978) Mind in Society: the Development of Higher Psychological Processes, in Cole, M., John-Steiner, V., Scribner S. and Souberman E. (eds and trans), Cambridge Ma, Harvard University Press

Vygotsky, L.S. (1981) The genesis of higher mental functions in Wertsch J. (ed) (1981) *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology*, Armonk NY, Sharpe

Vygotsky, L.S. (1986) *Thought and Language*, (ed Kozulin, A.), Cambridge, Ma, MIT Press

Waern, Y. (1979) *Thinking aloud during reading: a descriptive model and its application.* (Report no. 546) Stockholm: Department of Psychology, University of Stockholm

Wareing, S. (1994) Gender, Speech Styles and the Assessment of Discussion, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Strathclyde

Webb, N.M. (1985) Verbal Interaction and Learning in Peer-Directed Groups, *Theory into Practice* 24:1, 32-39

Webb, N.M. and Kenderski, C.M. (1985) Gender Differences in Small Group Interaction and Achievement in High- and Low-Achieving Classes, in Wilkinson, L.C. and Marrett, C.B. (eds) (1985) G*ender Influences in Classroom Interaction*, Orlando, Academic Press

Weber, R. (1991) Linguistic Diversity and Reading in American Society, in Barr, R., Kamil, M.L., Mosenthal, P. and Pearson, P. D. (1991) *Handbook of Reading Research, vol II*, Mahwah, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum

Wells, G. (1992) The Centrality of Talk in Education, in Norman, K. (ed*) Thinking Voices,* London, Hodder and Stoughton

Wells, G. and Nicholls, J. (eds) (1985) *Language and Learning: An Interactional Perspective*, London, Falmer Press

Wenden, A. and Rubin, J. (1987) *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*, London, Prentice Hall International

Wertsch J. (ed) (1981*) The concept of activity in Soviet psychology*, Armonk NY, Sharpe

Wertsch, J. (1991) A Sociocultural Approach to Socially Shared Cognition, in Resnick, L. B., Levine, J.M. and Teasley, S.D. (eds) (1991) *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition*, Washington DC, American Psychological Association

Wertsch, J. and Tulviste, P. (1998) L.S.Vygotsky and contemporary developmental psychology, in Faulkner, D., Littleton, K. and Woodhead, M. (eds) (1998) *Learning Relationships in the Classroom,* London, Routledge

White, P. (1980) Limitations on Verbal Reports of Internal Events: A Refutation of Nisbett and Wilson and of Benn, *Psychological Review* 87:1, 105-112

Wilkinson, L. (ed) (1982) *Communicating in the Classroom*, New York, Academic Press

Wilkinson, L.C. and Marrett, C.B. (eds) (1985) G*ender Influences in Classroom Interaction*, Orlando, Academic Press

Wood, D. J., Bruner, J.S. and Ross, G. (1976) The role of tutoring in problem solving, *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17:2, 89-100

Appendix A

The Part One Study

The three texts / tasks used
for the group sessions

Письмо от друзей по переписке

Задание 31

г. Новгород
7 августа

Здравствуй!

Меня зовут Коля. Мне двенадцать лет, и я живу в Новгороде, в квартире. У меня есть мама, папа и сестра, Люда. Ей семь лет. Я люблю спорт. В школе я играю в волейбол и в футбол. А ты тоже любишь футбол? Люда плавает в бассейне и читает книги. Я также люблю музыку и я уже пять лет играю на балалайке. Я неплохо играю. Я играю в оркестре в школе - мы играем по вторникам и по четвергам. Я также люблю слушать музыку - поп-музыку и классическую музыку. Я слушаю музыку по радио. Я также слушаю диски.

Пиши мне, пожалуйста! Коля

Ответьте: ✓ да x нет ? не знаю

1 Коля живёт в Москве.
2 Ему одиннадцать лет.
3 У него есть сестра.
4 Она играет в волейбол.
5 Коля играет в теннис.
6 Он уже шесть лет играет на балалайке.
7 Он играет в оркестре.
8 В оркестре они играют по средам.
9 Коля слушает кассеты.
10 Коля слушает классическую музыку.

TASK TWO

Read the letter and decide in the group the meanings of the underlined words

Здравствуй
Меня зовут Виктор Вондарчук. Я школьник, и я живу в Новгороде. У меня много интересов. Я спортсмен. Летом я играю в футбол, а зимой в хоккей. Я также плаваю. У нас в городе хороший бассейн. Там можно плавать и зимой и летом. Я также люблю гулять в парке. По субботам я хожу в магазины: там я делаю покупки. Я покупаю одежду, книги и пластинки, когда у меня есть деньги. Вечером я иногда хожу в молодёжный клуб: там я играю в бильярд и дартинг. Я встречаюсь с друзьями и с подругами. Мы танцуем, слушаем музыку и разговариваем.
Пиши мне,
Виктор

TASK THREE

You have 4 Russian penfriends - 2 boys and 2 girls,
who are <u>all</u> called Sasha !

Sasha 1 writes fairly normal letters
Sasha 2 repeats himself over and over again
Sasha 3 writes outrageous lies - she exaggerates everything
Sasha 4 is a Maths genius and writes everything in puzzles

Which Sasha wrote this letter ?
What is he / she telling you about ?
How much detail can you give ?

Привет
Я пишу сегодня о моих хобби. Я очень люблю музыку и я играю на тромбоне, на барабане, на пианино и на флейте. Я очень хорошо играю, и в школьном, и даже в петербургском синфоническом оркестре.
Я тоже страстно люблю спорт. Я часто играю в теннис и в бадминтон. По субботам я занимаюсь гимнастикой, джудо и плаванием. Я чемпион.
Я люблю читать романы, и, когда мне было десять лет, я даже написал роман о школе. Было отлично.
Я смотрю телевизор по вечерам. У меня в спальне три телевизора - так я смотрю все передачи каждый день.
Пиши мне о твоих хобби.

Саша.

Appendix B

The Part One Study

The two texts / tasks used
for the individual sessions

1. Read and answer the questions

Мне очень нравится ходить по магазинам по субботам - я особенно люблю универмаг, потому что там так много интересного. В субботу я был в универмаге. У них новые футбольные майки из Англии - моя любимая команда в России - Спартак, но я также люблю английскую команду Ливерпул. Тоже в универмаге хорошие кассеты и компакт-диски - они много стоят, как майки, но мне очень хочется их посмотреть.
Но я не люблю ходить с мамой и с папой в универсам. Это ужасный магазин. Каждую пятницу мы идём в магазин - мы покупаем хлеб, молоко, лимонад, сыр, рыбу, чай, и так далее. Но после этого мы иногда идём в ресторан и покупаем Биг-Мак и кока-колу. Отлично.

?????? *Да - ✔* *Нет - X* *Не знаем - ?*

1. *Он ходит по магазинам по средам*
2. *В универмаге скучно*
3. *Он не любит русскую футбольную команду*
4. *Он любит слушать музыку*
5. *У него проигрыватель*
6. *У него много денег*
7. *Универсам - ужасный*
8. *Он любит ходить в Макдоналдс*

You have 4 Russian penfriends - 2 boys, 2 girls, who are <u>all</u> called Sasha.

Sasha 1 writes fairly normal letters
Sasha 2 repeats himself over and over again
Sasha 3 writes outrageous lies - she exaggerates everything
Sasha 4 is a maths genius and writes everything in puzzles.

Which Sasha wrote this letter ?
What is he / she telling you about generally ?
How much detail can you give ?

Привет,
Я был севодня в центре города - мы ходили по магазинам - очень хорошо. Это было утром - с десяти до двенадцати часов. Мы были в универмаге. Мы ходили два часа в универмаге. Этот универмаг очень большой и очень хороший. Мои друзья тоже любят этот магазин, потому что он очень большой. Мы всегда смотрим компьютеры в универмаге. Мы очень любим играть в компьютерные игры дома. Так мы их смотрим в универмаге, чтобы узнать, хорошие ли эти игры. Мне нравится играть на компьютере. Мы тоже слушаем поп-музыку в универмаге. Там много хороших дисков - мы особенно любим рап-музыку из Америки, как например Ту-Пак, Макавелли и так далее. Американская музыка очень хорошая, по-моему и можно многое послушать в универмаге.
Пиши скорее,
Саша.

APPENDIX C - FOREIGN LANGUAGE READING PROJECT TRANSCRIPTS
TRANSCRIPT ONE - PILOT GROUP - JANUARY 1997

Coding Key:

- Speakers are identified where possible, ie P1 - P4; Ps indicates 2 or more pupils speaking where their identity is not certain. P? indicates an utterance by one pupil whose identity is uncertain.
- Extracts read from the task sheet are in Russian, are transliterated into Roman script and are in italics.
- An utterance which is not certain is enclosed by single round brackets
- Incomprehensible speech is indicated by the symbol *
- The sign = indicates latched speech, ie that there is no pause between the 2 or more pupils speaking
- Overlaps are indicated by square brackets at the beginning and end, ie [and]
- Pauses are counted in whole seconds with the pause length enclosed in round brackets, ie (3) indicates a three second pause.
- A noticeable pause of less than 1 second has the symbol (-)
- Actions carried out by the speakers are indicated in double brackets, eg ((leans towards P2 and points to sheet))

Task One - from Novaya Iskra - 1, p.63 (John Murray, 1996)
Transcript:

1	P2	*Zdravstvuite, menya zovut Kolya*, right so Kolya (-) *menya* (1)	RA text ru, tr
2	Ps	*Mnye* =	Correct pron
3	P1	Mnye Forget that one =	Echo + organise
4	P3	*Yemu* =	RA st ru
5	P2	It says dvenadtsat lyet, so he's 12 (1)	tr
6	Ps	*I ya* (1) *zhivu* (-) *v* (1) *Novgorodye*	RA text ru - chor
7	P1	So that's nyet (-) the first one's nyet.	Give answer 1
8	P3	Yeah.	agree
9	P2	*Ya*	RA text ru
10	P4	[second	(see 11)
	P2	*menya*] =	RA text ru
11	P4	What's the second question ? =	(asks for clarif)
12	P1	*emu odi-* =	RA st ru
13	P2	*Odine-*=	RA st ru
14	P1	*O- O- Odikats-*	RA st ru
15	P2	It's umm (-) *odin-* , *odinnadtsat lyet*	Clarify RA st ru
16	P1	Well that's, umm =	Pause to think
17	P3	[That's true	Give answer 2
	P2	That's false] he's 12 (1) So ya	Give answer 2 + move on
18	P?	*	
19	P2	*syestra, syestra* [1] You've got	RA st ru + tr
20	Ps	*Ya menya est mama, papa i sestra* =	RA text ru chor
21	P2	So that's true isn't it ?	Give answer 3
22	P4	Da	agree
23	P2	[((laughs))	
	P3	*Ona*]	RA st ru
24	P2	*Ona* (-) *igraet v voleybol*. Right, so he plays football =	RA st ru + tr
25	P4	No, volleyball, yeah =	Correct tr
26	P2	No, he plays, *v shkolye ya igrayu v voleybol i*	Disagr + ra text ru
27	P?	[Yeah	agree
	P1	So that's] da, true. Er	Give answer 4 + start to move on
28	P2	*Kolya igraet v tennis* (-) That's false isn't it ?	RA st ru. Suggest answer 5
29	P1	I don't know.	Not know
30	P3	*A ty*	RA text ru
31	P?	(It's funny) =	(comment)

32	P1	Tennis and football, so that's false (1)	Mistr - give answer 5
33	P2	False, so it's (1)	Agree + move on
34	Ps	*On*	RA st ru
35	P1	*Uzhe*	RA st ru
36	P2	*Sestra*	RA st ru (misrd)
37	Ps	No	disagree
38	P1	That's er =	Try to summarise
39	Ps	*shest*	RA st ru
40	P1	*lyet* =	RA st ru
41	P2	*lyet igraet*	RA st ru
42	Ps	*na balalaike*	RA st ru
43	P3	*Na bala [laike*	RA st ru
44	P2	*Na balalaike*] (2) Yeah, no, *ya* (-) *ya lyet* (-) *igrayu na balalaike* (-)	RA st ru / RA text ru
45	P1	Yeah, so that's true. No, no it's (1)	Give answer 6, then withdraw
46	P2	Can you find it ? Have you found it ? =	Seek org clarif
47	P3	There, look =	Give org clarif
48	P2	I know, I know where [it is	Give org clarif
	P1	No it's umm] =	disagree
49	P?	Yeah =	agree
50	P1	false (-)	Give answer 6
51	P2	Yeah it's false	agree
50	P1	It says it says *nyet*	Give reason
51	P2	I can't see it. Where is it, [I can't see it	Seek org clarif
	P1	There	Give org clarif
	P2	There]	echo
52	P2	where's say, where's it say *nyet* ? =	Seek org clarif
53	P1	There (2)	Give org clarif
54	P2/P3	[says *pyat*	Correct reading
	P1	It's false]	Defend answer
55	P2	It says [*pyat*	Correct reading
	P1	It says] *nyet* (-)	Defend reading
56	P1	Oh it does, yeah, sorry =	Admit reading wrong
57	P2	*On da. On igraet*	RA st ru
58	Ps	*On igraet v orkestre*	RA st ru
59	P2	In an orchestra, innit ?	Tr + seek confirm
60	Ps	Yeah =	Agree
61	P1	Yeah that's true	Give answer 7
62	P2	Yeah, Da	Agree
63	Ps	*V* (1) *orkestre oni igraet* (-) *na* (-) *s*	RA st ru
64	P2	*Sregam*, [*sregam*	RA st ru
	P3	*Sredam sredam*] =	Correct pron
65	P2	Where are you, umm ?	Seek org clarif
66	P?	*	
67	P3	*Po sredam*	RA st ru
68	P2	*Ya slushayoo mu- mu-* (...) False, innit ?	RA ru from diff. part of text + Give answer 8
69	P1	Mmm	agree
70	P2	Nyet * (.) *Kolya*, where are we now ?	Affirm 8, RA st ru + seek org clarif
71	P1	[9	Give org clarif
	P2	*Kolya*] =	RA st ru
72	P1	*Kolya* =	RA st ru
73	Ps	*slushaet kasseta* =	RA st ru

74	P2	I've just read that. *Ya* (-) *slushaya* (-) *muzy- muzyku.* I don't know if that means * musical looks like radio, so it means =	Locate + RA text ru + uncertainty + use of cog strat to try to clarify reading
75	P4	* (.....) ((paper being shuffled))	Seek org clarif
76	P1	Yes =	agree
77	P2	*Slushaet* means * *radio*, radio	Tr
78	P1	Yeah	agree
79	P1/P2	* ((P2 points to P1's sheet)) (2)	Give org clarif
80	P2	Yeah *Kolya*	Agree + RA st ru
81	P2	So (2) Is that false or don't know ? =	Seek clarif of answer
82	P1	10 10's true (-)	Clarify answer 10
83	P2	OK, we're on 9 though, aren't [we ?	Clarif org
	P1	Yeah I know] sorry (-) no, no [9's false	Give answer 9
	P2	false] false. We've done it.	Agree + signal task end

Task Two - adapted from Iskra - 2 (Stanley Thornes)
Transcript:

1	Ps	*Zdravstvuitye, menya zovut* (-)	RA text ru chor
2	P1	*Vik-*	RA text ru
3	Ps	[*Viktor Viktor Viktor*]	RA text ru chor
4	P2	*Von-* (-) *dar-*	RA text ru
5	P3	Yeah. *Vondar-*	Agree + RA text ru
6	P2	*Ya* (.)	RA text ru
7	P3	[*shkol-*	RA text ru
	P2	*shkolnik*] What does shkolnik mean ? =	RA text ru + seek vocab clarif.of item 1
8	P1	Sounds like a school =	Offers meaning via strat - analogy with fam item
9	P2	No it's not	disagree
10	P2/3	*Shkol- shkola,* [it's	Defend disagreement
	P1	I know] but they change as, in the context you're saying, isn't it, in the words so it could mean [school	Defend analogy using KAL
	P2	*Ya*] *shkolnik i ya zhiv er ya* =	RA text ru
11	P2/P3	*zhivu v*	RA text ru chor
12	P2	[*Hobgorodye*	RA text ru
	P?	*] =	
13	P1	[*Novgorodye*	Correct pron
	P3	That's an n]	Explain correction
14	P1	[*	
	P2	See It] might mean (-) I go to school (-)	Offer a reading
15	P3	and [I	Tr
	P2	in Novgorodye	Tr
	P1	Nov- Novgorodye] =	Tr
16	P2	So does it mean school then do you reckon, the first [one ?	Seek peer opinion on meaning
	P1	yeah] =	Affirm reading
17	P2	Yeah ? (.)	Check affirmation
18	P4	*U menya* =	RA text ru
19	P2	*Ya,* no [*ya*	RA text ru (misread)
	P4	*u menya*] =	RA text ru (correc ?)
20	Ps	[*U menya mnogo*] (-) *mnogo* [*in- un-*] *teresov*	RA text ru chor
21	P2	*interesov* umm	Consider item 2 by saying it aloud

22	P1	interesov	Consider item 2 by saying it aloud
23	P2	So it's (.) I (-) no it's ya	Attempt tr
24	P?	*	
25	P2	names, names, isn't it ((leans over to P1, points at paper)) cos my	Offers reading + offers org clarif + uses analogy
26		name is ya zovut isn't it ?, [I mean	
	P1	yeah] , well if it says zovut it would be a [name	Agrees conditionally with analogy
	P2	It's my] that 's what I mean, my (-) so it's what what's u ?	Continues clarif + asks for voc meaning
27	P1	that's just em I'm not sure it just starts off =	Unsure - offers meaning as set phrase
28	P1	[*u menya*	
	P2	it's my] * *unteresov* (-)	Attempts reading
29	P1	*interesov*	Repeats word aloud
30	P4	*in-* (-) *interesov* (5) ((rustling of paper))	Repeats word aloud
31	P2	I don't know it (2)	unsure
32	P1	Let's come back to that one	Makes org. decision
33	Ps	*Ya, ya* [*sportsmen sportsmen*] =	RA item 3 ru chor
34	P2	sportsman	Offers meaning
35	Ps	sportsman, sportsman	Echo meaning chor
36	P3	I'm a sportsman	Clarifies reading
37	P2	*Let*	RA text ru
38	P1	*Letom* =	RA text ru
39	P2	That's a p =	Disagree on pron
40	P1	That's an I =	Defend pron
41	Ps	*Letom, ya igrayu v futbol, a zimoy* =	RA text ru chor
42	P2	That's winter (1)	Offers meaning of item 4
43	Ps	*	
44	P1	yeah, zimoy is winter	Confirms reading
45	P2	*Ya* *	RA text ru
46	P4	I play [football - football is what I play]	Tr (previous clause)
	P2	*Tam* what's the	Seeks clarif of item 5
47	P1	I'm not sure what tam means * let's see *tam* =	Unsure
48	P3	We've done that I play football and in winter I play hockey =	Makes erroron. org suggestion re previous sentence
49	P2	we've done it already =	Disagrees
50	P3	I know =	Defends
51	P2	Right, *ya* * we've already had it . We were just wondering out what this tam means (1)	Explains present action
52	P1	Read the sentence after. (1) er *tam mozhno* (2) *plavat'* =	Strat - continue reading + RA text ru
53	P2	*i zimoy i letom*, so that's like, err, it's winter and spring or is it summer	RA text ru + tr
54	P1	it's summer isn't it ? =	Correct tr
55	P3	summers's em =	Try to clarify tr
56	P2	Spring Spring. So it means (2) hold on I think we've sort of read the question er the thingy wrong. It's *ya na* (1) *gorodye khorosho bassein. Tam mokho.* (1) Do you know what that means ?	Defend tr - Strat = read preced sentence RA text ru + seek clarif of meaning
57	P1	I haven't got a clue (1)	Unsure
58	Ps	*	
59	P2	Right, so then (1) it means something [like he plays	Clarifies reading
	P1	it's something that he does] in winter and summer	Clarifies reading
60	P2	yeah, so (2)	Agrees
61	P1	tam =	Repeats word

62	P2	it could be something what's town, what could tam be, it could be a sport or something	Strat = explore context + make guess
63	Ps	*	
64	P2	Could be, could be anything (2) could be swimming ?	Strat = make guess
65	P1	It's not though	Disagree with guess
66	P2	I know, that's what I mean it could be anything. (2) Go on	Defend statement + move on
67	P2	*Ya tak* (-) *takzhe* (-) *plavayu*	RA text ru - wrong sentence
68	P1	where are you ?	Seek org clarif
69	P2	we're on the next one here	Gives org clarif - now on correct text
70	P1	oh right	agree
71	P3	I play in the park	tr
72	P2	No it's *g gu gu* [*gulrat'*	Disagree with tr by RA ru item 6
	P1	*Gulyat'*]	Echo item 6
73	P1/2	*Gulyat'*	Echo item 6
74	P2	*v parke* I play (1) No because that's igrayu	Tr + corr own tr by naming correct word
75	P2	I, (-) I (-) swing	Tr - Make a guess from world knowl
76	P1	swim, swim in the park	Echo but mishear or make altern. Guess
77	P2	Swing (1)	Affirm prev guess
78	P2	I swing in the park (2) I (go out with the cat) (..) erm I (-) I (3) I something in the park (...) umm (.....) umm (...)	Repeat prev guess + Try out new guess + clarify sentence
79	T	If you get to a point where you are absolutely sure that what you would do next is get a dictionary and look up, then you can decide as a group that's what you'd do. I mean we want to try and avoid you doing that as a first thing but if you say, well it could mean a lot of things, we'd need to check it in the dictionary, you could say that, that's alright.	Researcher offers extra strategy
80	P2	Look at the last one (tries to read last underlined word)	Moves onto another item (misses 3 out)
81	P4	Where are you ? Where are you ?	Seeks org clarif
82	P2	No, I was just reading that. I'm just reading all of them. *Garting*	Explains strategy - skimming rest of text RA item 9
83	P3	(laughs)	
84	P1	Let's stay with the one we're working on	Suggests order of working
85	P2	I'm sorry, I don't know it. All right, the next one is *porkya-*	Unsure -moves on
86	P1	*pokupayoo* (3)	RA item 7 ru
87	P3	Read the [sentence	Strat = read context
	P1	*pokupayoo*] *odezhdu*, (pupils 2/3 whisper) *knigi i plastinki* (3)	RA text ru
88	P2	Right *Ya*, it's *ya* (3) So it's *ya* (reads unintelligibly) whatever. That's the part of the sentence	RA text ru - unsure
89	Ps	(read separately the rest of sentence - try word *den'gi* several times)	RA text ru chor / ind
90	P4	*Denzi*	RA item 8
91	P1	How do you get denzi ?	Seeks clarif of pron
92	P2	Right, so we've got to go back to the first one	Suggests return to item 7
93	P1	*Ya pokupayoo*	RA ru item 7
94	P2	Yeah	agree
95	P1	That would mean=	Starts to clarify

96	P2	Just think, you have to think of the sentence really (2) I don't know half of the words, they're quite hard, aren't they ?=	Strat = context of sentence + unsure + comment on text diff
97	P1	I don't think we've covered them yet=	Explan of task diff
98	P2	(3) Give up on it. Do you know any of them ?	Suggest task end + seek vocab knowldge
99	P2	*Dengu* [*garting*	RA items 8, 9 ru
	P1	*Dengi*]	Corrects pron of 8
100 101	P2	*pazgovarivet.* Do you know any of them ? *	RA item 10 + seek vocab knowledge
102	P4	That last one must be something like yours sincerely	Use knowledge of forms to make guess of item 10
103	P2	Yeah, yours sincerely. It could be yours sincerely (4)	Agree with reading
104	P2	No because it begins with n doesn't it ? It begins with r and ends with n=	Disagree because of spelling
105	P1	*razgovarivaet* (4)	RA item 10 ru
106	P2	Umm (5) I give up.	Unsure - wants task end
107	T	The second from last one - the line underneath it has made the first letter not very clear. It's actually a d but the line has covered up the tail	Researcher offers clarification of spelling of item 9
108	Ps	*darting, darting.* I play darts	Strat = recog cognate
109	P2	Right	Agree
110	P3	*Dengi* - I have a den or something	Strat = use cognate for item 8
111	P1	*U menya est dengi*	RA text ru
112	P2	I have a den=	Tr, using cognate guessed
113	P1	I row a dinghy=	Sugg alter cognate
114	P2	I have a dinghy	Clarify reading
115	P1	Yeah it could be.	Agree
116	Ps	(read it again separately)	RA text ru
117	P2	I have a dinghy, I have a den. No he's only a kid, isn't he supposed to be a kid ?=	Review readings + strat = seek confirmtn via world context
118	P1	Doesn't say the age, does it ? No,=	Explore world contxt
119	P2	Yeah, no it doesn't	Admit path closed
120	P4	He goes to school	Offers clarif reading
121	P1	Yeah	agree
122	P2	So I reckon it's I have a den *	Closing item 8
123	P3	That's=	Pause to think
124	P2	I can't think of any others	Unsure - wants task end
125	P1	I haven't got a clue what the last one is	unsure
126	P4	Nor have I	unsure
127	P2	A. (P3) thinks it's yours sincerely	Suggests other member's reading
128	P1	That would be there, it wouldn't be that one	disagree
129	P2	That's umm=	Pause to think
130	P1	That's *muzyku*	Tr item in last sntnce
131	P2	That's. What are you on ?	Seeks org clarif
132	P3	It says his name=	Defends reading
133	P1	That's his name there. Oh sorry, that's his name there	Clarif reading + admits error
134	P2	It's * That's his name altogether. I mean that's something like my isn't it ?	Clarifies reading further
135	P1	That's his name there, Viktor	Clarifies r'ding again

136	P2	Yeah I know but that's with his name, isn't it ?	Defends reading
137	P1	That's probably something like yours sincerely or something like that	Suggests same reading as if it is new
138	P2	But the thing is that can't be yours sincerely because (2) look it goes *ty*, no [*my*	Disagrees with reading using strat = KAL
	P1	That's probably] the Russian equivalent there. But that varies.	Defends reading strat= unsure
139	Ps	(read last sentence)	RA text ru chor
140	P3	I play in a band or something	Tr
141	P2	It could be I play in a band	Agree with tr
142	P1	Yeah	Agree
143	P2	There you go. * We've done most of them, haven't we ?	Ends task - justifies ending task
144	P1	It's just that and that, *tam* and *gulyat*	Summarises task coverage
145	P2	* We've finished now. I think that's it. Yeah, too much.	Ends tasks - justifies
During the section. Lines 80 - 145 there is regular backround noise from (mainly) P3 and P4 reading half aloud in Russian			

Task Three - Four Penfriends task
Transcript:

1	Ps	(read aloud in chorus first three sentences)	RA text ru chor
2	P2	I think I'd pick Sasha 3 actually	Suggest answer (task 1)
3	P3	Well carry on	Suggest continue with reading
4	Ps	(continue reading to the end of para 1)	RA text ru chor
5	P2	Orchestra. So it's I play in an orchestra, well not I play, something in an orchestra - I play these in an orchestra or something like that	Tr + clarify tr + unsure
6	P1	Yes I think it probably is Sasha 3	Agree with answer to task 1
7	Ps	(read)	RA text ru chor
8	P2	Well is the answer * I think it is	Raffirms answer
9	P4	(continues reading)	RA text ru
10	P2	Well it's obvious isn't it ? Who plays a trombone, drums=	Justifies answer
11	Ps	a piano and a flute ?	Continue justific
12	P1/2	And in an orchestra	Continue justific
13	P1	And are very good at it=	Continue justific
14	P2	And are very very good at it. Yeah, exactly. It's a bit (1) of a lie. I reckon Sasha 3 ((P2 wants to finish the task))	Continue justific + seek task end
15	P1	There's more than one question	Clarify tasks
16	P2	Oh I forgot about that. What is it telling you about ? That she plays, what she plays and how good she is=	Agree + offers info for task 2
17	P1	Yeah	Agree
18	P2	And like at the end there's things about television and that - if you look *v spalnye*, what's in the house and like how many bedrooms she's got and that=	Offer further info for task 2
19	P1	Yeah	Agree
20	P2	How much detail can you give ? About what ?	Read task 3 - ask for clarification
21	P1	Umm, about what's in the letter	Give clarific
22	P2	She plays=	Start to give info
23	P1	We know what she plays	State that this is covered already

24	P2	She plays the trombone, the drums=	Continue to give info
25	Ps	the piano and the flute in an orchestra	Continue to give info
26	P2	She's very good at it. Umm she's got three bedrooms in her house	Continue to give info
27	P2	No she's got three televisions.	Correct own info
28	P1	She plays tennis [and badminton	Continue to give info
	P2	She's got one bedroom]	Continue to give info
29	P1	She plays tennis and badminton	Repeat info
30	P2	What's that, *de de* [*des* ?	Seek meaning of vocab item
	P1	*desyat*]	Clarify pron
31	P2	[*des*	RA
	P1	I don't know] what that is	unsure
32	P1	It's *desyat let* - ten, ten years old (...)	RA + clarify
33	P3	That's about it	Seek to end task
34	P2	That's all	Seek to end task
35	T	Can you get any more detail ? The middle paragraph ?	Researcher suggests further detail
36	Ps	(read beginning of para 2 together)	RA text ru
37	P2	Something like I'm good. Something about sport isn't it ?	Offers gist reading
38	P1	*Strasto, strastno* (..)	RA vocab item
39	P2	That could be something like really good or really bad	Suggest reading of vocab item
40	P3	Mm	Agree
41	P2	Ya, what's the first word ?	Seek meaning
42	P1	I think it's probably that, is Sasha 3 a girl or a boy ?	Start to suggest reading + clarify detail about writer
43	P2	Sasha 3 is sh- her. It's got to be a her anyway, hasn't it ? So	Clarify + ask for reason
44	P1	Well, I think that means likes [*	Suggest reading
	P2	She likes sport,] she likes sport=	Clarify reading
45	P1	And she plays tennis and badminton	Tr
46	P2	We've already said that	State that this is covered already
47	P1	I know	Agree
48	P3	What's that bit there ?	Seek meaning
49	P1/2	*Po subbotam*	RA unknown item
50	P2	We didn't get anything out of it - we just read it	Unsure RA not always good strat
51	Ps	(read on)	RA text ru
52	P2	She does gymnastics	Tr
53	P1	*Dzhudo*. Sounds like Judo	Strat = recognise cognate
54	P2	Judo, and *plaviet, plaviet*, what's *plaviet* ?	Echo + seek meaning
55	P3	She's got a (plait) in the middle ? (...)	Suggest near cognate reading
56	P2	(laughs)	
57	P2	I don't know. That's it I think	Seeks task end

58	T	The last paragraph. You gave some detail about that.	Researcher suggests further detail
59	P2	*Ro- roman* * *desrat let* . No you said that.	RA isolated words
60	P1	*Tak*=	RA isolated word
61	P2	*Shkolu, shkole*, so it's something like, *napikal roman*, I do roman at school. yeah=	RA text ru + try tr using strat = cognate
62	P1	Roman's called Latin	Clarify via world knowledge
63	P2	it's got roman	Defend tr
64	T	If I tell you that that one word *roman* means novel ?	Researcher offers correct tr
65	P1	Novel=	echoes
66	P2	Novels. I read novels at school=	Clarifies reading
678	P2	I read novels at school=	Repeats
69	P3	Yeah	Agrees
70	P2	Oh I can't read it, *otlichno*=	Unsure about pron
71	P4	*Otlichno*=	Offers pron
72	P2	So I'm excellent at reading novels=	Recog word when heard and tr
73	P3	Writing [novels	Corrects tr
	P2	reading] novels	Repeats orig. tr
74	P2	I think writing actually would be better. I'm excellent at reading wouldn't sound right, would it, so it makes sense to say excellent [at writing	Modifies tr via world / ling knowledge
	P1	Excellent at] writing	Echoes tr
75	P2	*Ya smotryu televizor*	RA text ru
76	Ps	*televizor po vecheram*	RA text ru chor
77	P2	So it's something like I have a television and a chair, or something like that, not exactly but, *vecher, vechera, vechera*	Offers reading - unsure
78	P1/4	*	
79	P2	I have a television and a chair or something	Repeats reading
80	P1	Maybe it means in colour or something - a colour tele	Suggests alternative from world knowledge
81	P2	Yeah, so I have a colour tele	Agree
82	Ps	(chorus read)	RA text ru chor
83	P2	So I have one bedroom and three teles	Clarifies reading
84	P1	Three teles in the bedroom	Question correctness of tr
85	P2	Three teles in the bedroom ?	Echo questioning
86	P1	I've got a bedroom and three televisions=	Echo tr
87	P3	[*	
	P2	No it's saying] what she's got look, I have 3 bedrooms, I mean 1 bedroom	Clarify reading
		and 3 TVs and=	
88	P3	Yeah, but if it is number 3 she's=	Justify reading
89	P1	[she's exaggerating	Justify reading
	P3	exaggerating	Justify reading
	P4	*]	
90	P2	Yeah, that's all. OK then !	Ends task

Appendix D - Alphabetical list of coding categories used for Part One Group transcripts

Coding used	Notes (where necessary)
Admit	(eg path closed, reading wrong)
Affirm	(eg no. 8, previous guess, reading)
Agree	(eg with answer, with reading, with translation)
Agree conditionally	(eg with analogy)
Ask for reason	
Ask for vocabulary	
Attempt	(eg translation, reading)
Check affirmation	
Clarify organisation	(eg tasks)
Clarify reading	(eg answer, using world knowledge
Clarify pronunciation	
Closing item	
Confirm reading	
Consider	(eg by saying it aloud)
Continue justification	
Continue to give information	
Continue to clarify	
Correct own information	
Correct pronunciation	(eg, pronunciation, reading, translation)
Defend analogy using KAL	
Defend answer	(eg analogy, answer, disagreement, pronunciation, reading, translation)
Disagree	
Echo	
End task	
Explain	(eg correction, present action, strategy)
Explore world context	
Give answer	(eg answer, reason, clarification, organisational clarification)
Guess	
Justify answer	(eg answer, reading)
Mishear	
Mistranslate	
Modify translation	
Move on	
Not know	
Offer	(eg reading, further information, clarification, gist, meaning, pronunciation)
Pause to think	
Question correctness	
Read aloud	(eg text, statement, in chorus)
Recognise	(eg word when heard)
Repeat	(eg information, guess, word)
Researcher offers	(eg clarification, translation, strategy)
Review reading	
Seek clarification	(eg of answer, organisation)
Seek meaning	
Seek to end task	
Start to give info	(eg to give information, to clarify)

State that this is covered already	
Suggest	(eg answer, reading, alternative)
Suggest action	(eg continue with reading, task end, order of working)
Summarise task coverage	
Translate	
Try to clarify	
Try to summarise	
Unsure	
Use strategy	(eg knowledge of forms, world knowledge, cognate, explore context, make analogy with familiar item, guess, read preceding sentence, continue reading, skim text)
Withdraw	(eg suggestion)

Appendix E - Subject P2 Think Aloud Protocol

Note:
(the use of ..... throughout indicates a substantial pause)
(the comments: reads question, reads lines xx, indicate reading aloud)

I'm just reading it through at the moment. ..... (reads first line hesitantly)
I'm just trying to answer the first question. (reads part of first question) .....
The question's (reads whole question) and the first line says (reads first line + first word of line 2) so I think, number one, nyet. Number two (reads question) (reads lines 2/3 of text) ..... I'm trying to work out what they are in English and then read through the paragraphs and try and see if I can work it out. ..... So basically it's talking about a department store but I don't know what skuchno means. ..... So it's (re-reads lines 2/3) ..... So I think number two's nyet as well. Number three (reads question) I don't understand the third question as much as I did the others, but, well actually I don't think I understand any of them but I'm trying my best to work out what they are. ..... I'd have to say nye znaem, which is I don't know on this one. Number four (starts to read question) Oh God, what's that say ? (finishes reading question) Umm ..... The third line is (reads from end of line 3, hesitates over the word byl, then stops) .... Umm. I'm just looking through at the moment, trying to work out like what it is - I'm not sure so I'm gonna say nye znaem and try and come back to that one later. Number five is (reads question) and ..... I'm just looking for ..... I'm trying to work these out by looking at like to see if the words that are in the question and in the actual in the actual paragraph. But it doesn't all make sense cos I don't know what all of the words mean but ..... So it's (reads question five) so I can't yet see that in the paragraph but I'm having a look. ..... I think number five has to be nyet. No actually I think number five's da. Number six (reads question) I think that's what it says, I don't know what they mean but it's just ..... I think I'll have to say nye znaem and see if I can come back to that one as well. ..... Number seven is (reads question). Umm. ..... I"m just looking through the thing at the moment. I think that will be nyet, number seven. Number eight (reads question). Umm. ..... I think that'll be da.

The next sheet is about, this one's about the penfriends. (reads task instruction). So I'll try and read the letter. Right. (reads first six lines) ..... So far I can understand some of the words and I can recognise them from what we've done in our Russian lessons, but umm I don't quite understand all of it. Right. (reads further, but misses out one sentence - reads less fluently and appears not to realise that komputery is a cognate, reads through to end of text). ..... Right well I've read all the letter and ..... I don't think it's the Maths genius because I don't, no actually, I don't think it's the Maths genius because it's not all in puzzles, ... umm ..... I can't, I don't think it's umm Sasha 2 who repeats himself over and over and over again because I know there's a lot of things like there's komputery and univermag a lot of times but I don't think like it's really bad, umm, ... I would say it's Sasha 1 who's writing just normal letters to his or her friends. Umm, just telling about what's happening and a lot about thinks like, some things about America and things. I came up with this - I thought it was the right one because umm it's not, it doesn't seem to be outrageous lies and they don't umm seem to be repeating themselves over and over again and it isn't a Maths genius who's always doing puzzles because otherwise it would be all numbers and things like that. I might be wrong but that's what I think it is anyway so .....

Right I'll go back to sheet number one where it's on about true / false and I'll just go back to some of the ones I didn't get before. Number seven, I don't know if I did number seven, but I think that's da. Number four (reads question) I'd say that was umm, let me just have a look. I'm just looking over it again now. I don't know about number seven because I didn't actually look, but, umm, I'm

just checking over the paragraph now to see whether I can get the answer to number four, umm, ... I don't know whether I can actually see it. All I can see at the moment is that umm he likes a lot of things. All it's going on about is khleb, moloko, limonad, syr, ryba, and chaya and all things like that. But I can't see anything about muzyku at the moment but I'm just looking through more carefully now, umm, phew Gosh umm, I would say the answer to this is da - I think he does like it, he likes music. I think that's what the question is saying anyway from what the question is saying that he likes music and I think he does. And I think that's all of them I don't think I left any out.

Interview questions from researcher:

Can you tell me a little bit about doing that, and was it easy or not to do ?

It wasn't , it was quite, I think that one was the easiest, the one about Sasha, but I didn't understand it all, because some of the words we haven't, I haven't heard of before and things like that.

You know when we did it before, when you were working with the group, and now doing it like this by yourself ? is there any difference between reading in the two different ways ?

Yes because when you're with your group, you're all putting ideas together and like you do it together, but whereas like I'm on my own, you have to think ofit all yourself and that's umm .....

How easy was it to say what you were doing while you were doing it ?

It was easier than I thought it would be. It's just normal like you're talking to someone else.

So you found you could come up with what was going on in your mind. It's called thinking aloud ?

Yes.

Is it helpful to do that ?

Yeah, it helps you to think, to know what you're doing.

Right, so if you say what you're thinking that somehow helps ...

Yeah, it opens it out a bit more.

Appendix F

Procedures for testing and training - Stage 2 data collection School R. Nottingham, October 1999

Introduction to Project:

The project is looking at how learners use reading in their foreign language work. It's not a test and the information we get will be confidential. People read in lots of different ways, both in their own language and when they learn a foreign language. By finding out more about this teachers will be able to offer better ways of working in foreign language reading. We will ask you to do 2 lots of reading for us - one session by yourself, and one in a group of 3 or 4 people. More about that later. We will need your names to match up the different pieces of work you do, but if I write about this you will have numbers or code-names given.

GAP Test

But first, we want to find out something about how you read in English as well as in French. So I'm going to give you a short reading task booklet now. You'll have 15 minutes to do the tasks. The blue and pink booklets are different but at the same level.
Read instructions from GAP booklet

Think Aloud Training

One way that we find out about how we read is to ask people to say out loud what they are doing while they are reading. This is a bit like children who often talk out loud to themselves while they are playing - you probably all did that when you were quite young ! You can do this with any kind of problem-solving, for example with Maths problems.
It might be a sum such as 24 x 11 and you could do it like this:
Right, 24 times 11- the easy way here is for me to say 24 times 10, which is 240, and then I need another 24, because it's really times 11, so that must be 264
Or like this:
24 times 1 is 24, put in a 4 and carry 2, and then put in a 0 and do 24 times 1 is 24, so that's 240 + 24, equals 264

So let's try that - I'll give you a sum, you work it out, talking as much as you can out loud about what you're doing, while you're doing it and then I'll ask you for some examples of what you said.
Here's the sum: 13 x 12

What kind of things did you say ? (Take feedback)

Now, it might be that I have to solve a simple problem which goes like this:
Your football team has a squad of 21 players, including 3 goalkeepers. In a match you can name a team of 11 plus 5 substitutes. You normally name 1 goalkeeper among the 5 subs. Today you hear that 2 of your defenders, 2 of your midfielders and 1 of your goalkeepers are away or injured. How many of the rest of the squad will you not be able to name for today's match ?

OK, I need 16 players but that should include 2 goalkeepers. It says I have 3 but then it says that 1 is away or injured, so I'll only have the 2 I need. There's 21 players and it looks like 2+2+1 are away - that makes 5, so 21-5 = 16 and that's how many I need, and I've got my 2 goalkeepers so that means I need them all - no-one's left out.

So let's try that - here's another problem - do the same as before and I'll ask you afterwards what sort of things you said.

You're out shopping on Saturday and you have £12.50. Your bus-fare home is 75p and you have to buy a birthday card for your brother - you're allowing 99p for that. You promised your best friend you'd buy the new single by Mel C, which is on offer at £2.99. Your lunch (burger and chips) will be £1.99, and you're too hungry to miss it. In the record shop there's also an album by B*witched on offer at £5.99. Can you afford it ?

What kind of things did you say ? (Take feedback)

If you're reading something in a foreign language, you might also be thinking about what the words mean as well as doing the task set.
Firstly try to work out whether these two sentences are true or false. There may be something in them which means they **must be** false or they **could** be true. You will probably be thinking about it in English, not in French - that's not a problem.

French text-1
Vrai ou faux ?

1. Mon frère Marc est fils unique
2. Je vais samedi au cinéma, parce que je n'aime pas les films

What kind of things did you say ? (Take feedback)

This might be a lot harder because you have to try to follow how you work out the meaning of the words in order to find the answers to the true/false questions

So now try this French text (which is very hard) and especially look at the two questions which come after it.

Le Soleil a rendez-vous avec la Lune Le 11 août, peu après midi, sur une ligne
Cherbourg- Strasbourg, la France est plongée dans un éphémère crépuscule.
Dramatique ou fascinant phénomène, les Français peuvent assister à une éclipse totale de soleil.
Paris plongée dans l'obscurité, Jesse Norman chantant lors du rendez-vous céleste...
Des instants inoubliables immortalisés ici-même.

Questions - vrai ou faux

1. Il y a une éclipse de soleil à Paris
2. L'éclipse se passe le matin du 11 août

What kind of things did you say this time ? (Take feedback)

What we are going to do next week and the following week is to ask you all to do 4 reading tasks in French. 2 of these will be by yourself and I'll ask you to think aloud while you are doing them. 2 others will be in groups - you **don't** have to think aloud while you are doing these, but only to work together to find the answers. You'll be recorded on tape for the think-alouds and on video and tape for the group tasks. No-one apart from me will know who you are when you do this.

Appendix G Texts / tasks and FK reading data information

1. True/False *(Individual Think Aloud text)*

Read this letter from Chantal and decide whether the statements that follow it are *True*, *False* or *Impossible to say*

Le week-end je suis très active. Je travaille le samedi, mais le soir je vais souvent à la disco avec mes amis. Je fais du sport le dimanche. A la disco on peut écouter des disques en plusieurs styles, mais mes artistes préférés sont Robbie Williams et Lauryn Hill. On danse beaucoup. C'est un bon entrainement pour le rugby et aussi on ne peut pas parler, car la musique est trop forte! Une de mes amies fume. Elle m'invite tout le temps fumer aussi, mais je dis toujours, 'non', parce que je joue au rugby. Et les cigarettes sentent vraiment mauvais !

Je travaille dans un supermarché. Je travaille de huit heures du matin à six heures du soir. L'année dernière ce n'était pas intéressant, parce que je poussais les chariots tout le temps. Mais maintenant je travaille dans le rayon boulangerie / pâtisserie avec le pain et les gâteaux. Les pains au chocolat sont supers !

Le dimanche je joue au rugby. C'est amusant parce que deux de mes amies jouent aussi. L'équipe est la meilleure de notre région et nous avons gagné beaucoup de jeux. Le soir je regarde la télévision - je suis toujours très fatiguée !
- Chantal

Vrai / Faux / Pas clair

1. Chantal travaille le samedi et le dimanche dans un supermarché
2. Elle aime surtout la musique classique
3. A la disco elle boit et fume beaucoup
4. Elle a commencé à travailler dans le supermarché la semaine dernière
5. Elle travaille dans le rayon 'boucherie'
6. Elle aime regarder les matchs de rugby le dimanche
7. L'équipe de rugby ne joue pas très bien
8. Dimanche soir elle va aussi à la disco

196 words
10.8 Words per sentence
4.5 characters per word
73.4 FK Reading Ease
5.6 FK Grade Level

2. Four Penfriends *(Individual Think Aloud text)*

You have four French penfriends, all of them called Sacha. It's not too difficult to work out which one is writing to you because they all write in very different styles ! Sacha 1 is very repetitive - the letters are boring because it's the same information over and over again
Sacha 2 tells outrageous lies most of the time
Sacha 3 writes fairly ordinary letters
Sacha 4 is a Maths-freak and writes mainly in puzzles - you have to work out what she's saying.

Read this letter and

1. Decide which Sacha wrote it
2. Give as many reasons for your decision as you can
3. Which of the opinions in the letter do you agree with / disagree with and why ?

Salut !
Cette fois je vais te dire quelque chose sur ma famille.
Tu sais déjà que j'ai un frère et deux soeurs. Ma soeur aînée est très belle et elle chante très bien - en français naturellement, mais même en anglais aussi ! Elle a fait plusieurs disques et a enregistré la chanson principale d'un film très populaire.
Mon frère aîné a les cheveux assez longs mais il est très sportif. Il a joué au foot pour l'équipe nationale, mais maintenant il joue à Londres. Il est devenu aussi très célèbre pour son travail à la télévision.
Ma soeur cadette chante aussi, comme ma soeur aînée, mais elle préfère la musique classique. Elle n'a que douze ans mais elle est déjà très populaire dans toute l'Europe.
J'ai oublié de te dire les noms - mes soeurs s'appellent Charlotte et Céline et mon frère s'appelle David.
Et finalement, mes parents. Ma mère s'appelle Edith et elle a eu des problèmes récemment au parlement européen, mais j'espère que tout va bien maintenant. Mon père Jacques est le président de la France. Alors, il est tout le temps très occupé!
Ecris-moi un peu de ta famille aussi !
Amitiés,
Sacha

193 words
11.9 words per sentence
4.5 characters per word
74.6 FK Reading Ease
5.8 FK Grade Level

3. True/False *(Group reading text)*

Read this letter from Guy, and decide whether the statements that follow it are *True*, *False* or *Impossible to say*

Ma famille est très intéressante ! Mes parents sont divorcés et tous les deux se sont mariés avec d'autres partenaires. Donc j'ai beaucoup de frères et soeurs. J'ai une soeur, (Nathalie) trois demi-soeurs et deux demi-frères.
Moi, j'ai quatorze ans. Ma soeur la plus âgée (Chantal) a vingt-deux ans, et a un bébé elle-même. Mon frère le plus jeune (Luc) a deux ans. Il est le fils de ma mère et de son nouveau mari. Mon père a une fille de quatre ans, (qui s'appelle Maria) avec sa nouvelle femme.
J'ai dit que ce n'est pas facile !
Chez nous il y a mon père et ma belle-mère, ma soeur Nathalie, la petite Maria, mon demi-frère Martin et moi. C'est une famille très heureuse. Par exemple tout le monde aide le soir quand on fait le dîner. La petite Maria aime mettre les verres et les couteaux etc sur la table. Nathalie fait toujours une salade verte et moi j'aime bien choisir une bonne bouteille de vin dans le garage !
Nous regardons la télévision ensemble, et nous aimons surtout les jeux et les feuilletons.
Comment est ta famille ? J'espère qu'elle est moins compliquée que la mienne !
-Guy

Vrai / Faux / Pas clair

1. Guy est fils unique
2. Guy est plus âgé que Chantal
3. Maria et Guy ont la même mère
4. Martin habite chez Guy
5. Le bébé de Chantal s'appelle Philippe
6. Chez Guy on ne se dispute pas souvent
7. Les parents préparent toujours le dîner le soir
8. La famille aime écouter de la musique jazz

195 words
12.1 words per sentence
4.4 characters per word
74.6 FK Reading Ease
5.8 FK Grade Level

4. Four Penfriends *(Group reading text)*

You have four French penfriends, all of them called Sacha. It's not too difficult to work out which one is writing to you because they all write in very different styles ! Sacha 1 is very repetitive - the letters are boring because it's the same information over and over again
Sacha 2 tells outrageous lies most of the time
Sacha 3 writes fairly ordinary letters
Sacha 4 is a Maths-freak and writes mainly in puzzles - you have to work out what she's saying.

Read this letter and

1. Decide which Sacha wrote it
2. Give as many reasons for your decision as you can
3. Which of the opinions in the letter do you agree with / disagree with and why ?

Salut !
Je vais t'écrire aujourd'hui de mon temps libre. Je fais beaucoup de choses !
Comme sport, j'aime bien les sports d'équipe. J'adore faire du patinage et alors, je préfère le sport qu'on fait sur glace avec une équipe de six personnes. On ne fait pas ça avec un ballon, mais avec une sorte de disque. Je ne suis pas très forte, mais c'est super, ça !
Le soir j'aime bien être seule (je ne suis pas au salon avec ma famille !) - je regarde la télévision, j'écoute quelque-chose ou je joue sur l'ordinateur. J'aime la musique pop mais aussi la musique classique. Mon compositeur préféré est un homme, qui vivait en Russie dans les années 1800, et qui a composé l'ouverture de 1812.
Quand je suis au centre-ville, je vais à FNAC (c'est une grande librairie avec des livres, des disques et des CD-ROMs). Aujourd'hui il y avait trois disques que je voulais acheter. Un de soixante francs (un disque de musique piano de Chaikovski), un de cinquante trois francs, et un de trente-huit francs. J'avais cent francs, et alors tu peux décider les deux que j'ai acheté.
Voilà, c'est tout. Amitiés,
Sacha

191 words
12.6 words per sentence
4.5 characters per word
76.3 FK Reading Ease
5.7 FK Grade Level

Appendix H Pressley and Afflerbach's (1995) inventory of observed reading behaviour (drawn from self-reports) [slightly edited for content]

I Identifying and Learning Text Content

Before reading (MC/BR)

- Constructing a goal
- Overviewing the text
- Deciding to read only particular sections
- Deciding to quit reading
- Activating prior knowledge
- Summarising what was gained from previewing
- Generating an initial hypothesis

During reading (MC/DR)

During linear reading -

- Linear reading of text
- Reading only some sections
- Skimming
- Automatic processing
- Reading aloud
- Repeating / restating text to hold in working memory
- Repeating / restating a thought which had occurred in reading
- Making notes
- Pausing to reflect on text
- Paraphrasing part of text
- Explicitly looking for related words concepts or ideas in text
- Looking for patterns in the text
- Predicting / substantiating:
  - hypothesizing a tentative interpretation of text meaning
  - predicting content or structure
  - concluding previously hypothesis is valid / invalid
  - looking for information (in)consistent with expectations
  - retrieving information thought about earlier
  - adjusting a tentative expectation/interpretation immediately after generating it
  - adjusting initial ideas about text content based on newly encountered information
  - maintaining/defending an hypothesis
  - jumping back to reconsider previously read information
  - generating several tentative hypotheses
- Resetting reading or learning goals at a different level of understanding

More about identifying important information -

- Looking for information relevant to specific reading goals
- Deciding which pieces of information in text are important
- Looking specifically for what is 'news' in the reading
- Dismissing information presented in text because it is not consistent with prior knowledge

- Looking for acquiring key words
- Looking for topics sentences
- Looking for topic paragraphs
- Noting parts of text to remember for future reference
- Noting references in the text that should be looked at or considered later
- Highlighting, underlining etc
- Explicitly skipping examples because general points are not provided in them
- Copying key sentences
- Adjusting importance ratings as additional text is encountered

Conscious inference making - **(MC/DRcim)**

- Inferring the referent of a pronoun
- Filling in deleted information
- Inferring the meanings of words based on internal and external context clues
- Inferring the connotations of words and sentences (not just literal meanings)
- Relating information encountered in text to prior knowledge
- Making inferences about the author
- And making inferences about the state of the speakers or actors in a text
- Confirming / disconfirming an inference with information in subsequent text
- Stating /drawing of / deducing implied conclusion

Integrating different parts of text - **(MC/DRintg)**

- Explicitly attempting to get the 'big picture' of the meaning before worrying about how details are organised
- Generating the big idea of the meaning of text as well as the development of ideas about component parts
- Noting different parts of texts and their interrelationship
- Holding representations of the ideas developed in text in working memory
- Combining text structure and contextual clues to determine the meaning in the text
- Looking elsewhere in the text for information related to a point currently being encountered in the text
- Searching through the text after a first reading hoping to find a macrostructure that can account for all of the content
- Of the reading the text to search for intersentential connections
- Relating the currently read text to a previous portion of text
- Making notes to assist integration

Interpreting - **(MC/DRintp)**

- Paraphrasing parts of text into more familiar terms
- Visualising concepts relations emotions
- Identifying 'symbols' or 'symbolic language' and translating the meaning of these symbols
- Instantiating prior knowledge schemata that are activated by information in the text
- Empathising with messages in text
- Making claims about what the author really wanted to say
- Constructing interpretive conclusions
- Constructing interpretive categorisations
- Enacting what the text instructs the reader to do
- Constructing alternative interpretations of what is going on in the story

- Constructing alternative perspectives on a story from the perspective of different characters
- Pretending to deliberate with others while reading the text

After a reading (MC/AR)

- Rereading
- Recitation
- Listing
- Constructing cohesive summary
- Self-questioning, self-testing
- Imagining how hypothetical situations might be viewed based on information in text
- Reflecting on information in text
- Re-reading parts of text following reflection
- Continually evaluating and reconstructing an understanding
- Changing one's response to a text as understanding is reconstructed
- Reflecting on / mentally recoding text in anticipation of using it later

II Monitoring

Monitoring text characteristics - **(MonTC)**

- Whether text content is relevant to reading goal
- Difficulty of the text
- Author's style
- Linguistic characteristics of text
- Specific biases reflected in text content
- Relation of this part of text to larger themes in text
- Relation of this text to other sources
- When text is ambiguous
- Relationship between own background knowledge and text content
- Tone of text

Monitoring the meaningful processing of text - **(MonPT)**

- One's purpose in reading the text
- Own behaviours / strategies in processing the text
- Reading behaviours / strategies in the service of the reading goal
- One's typical reactions to the type of text being read
- The difference in reaction to the text compared to typical reactions to this type of reading
- Effectiveness of processes and strategies used to determine meaning
- Cognitive capacity available and when comprehension processes are challenging capacity limit
- Awareness that some things are not yet understood, but expectation that they will be
- Whether overall meaning of text is comprehended or reading goal is accomplished
- Text getting easier to read as meaning becomes more certain
- When the end of a unit of meaning has occurred
- When the reading goal has been achieved

Monitoring problems - **(*MonProb*)**

- Loss of concentration
- Reading too quickly
- Reading too slowly
- Text is poorly written
- Unfamiliar terms in text
- Failure to understand what has been read
- Lack of background knowledge is affecting comprehension negatively
- Inconsistency between personal beliefs and information in text
- Inconsistency of one's expectations about meaning and information encountered in the text

Activation of processes to accommodate text and task demands - **(ActTask)**

- Subjects make decisions about how much to interpret text strictly
- Decision to rank order reading tasks / goals given contextual constraints
- Decision to skip material
- Decision to skim material
- Decision to read material carefully
- Decision to construct the meaning of text carefully because aware that the text is difficult
- Decision to reset reading goal at a lower level
- Decision to look up background material in other sources
- Decision to dispense with processing of some part of text because of awareness of capacity overload
- Decision to focus on some content and not other material because of beliefs about strengths and weaknesses
- Decision to re-read material in one section because it is not yet understood
- Decision to reread material in one section because it is interesting
- Decision to just keep reading in hope that later content will become clearer
- Attempt to pinpoint confusions

Activation of processing due to awareness of difficulties at the word or phrase level - **(ActDiffwp)**

- Evaluating the importance of an unknown word or phrase to the overall meaning of text before trying to determine its meaning
- Greater attention paid to an unknown word or phrase when encountered
- Use of context clues to interpret a word or phrase
- A 'candidate meaning' for an unknown word or phrase is generated and evaluated in its context
- Generating hypotheses about confusing words or phrases and attempts to evaluate by reading beyond the same sentence
- Just keep reading, forgetting about the word
- Use a dictionary

Activation of processing due to awareness of difficulties in understanding meaning beyond the word or phrase level - **(ActDiffglob)**

- Aware of comprehension difficulty, but doing nothing (for a reason)
- Aware of comprehension difficulty, and
  - States failure to understand

- Reads slowly and carefully
- Suspends judgement
- Pauses to scan to find source of difficulty
- Carefully analyses information presented so far
- Rereads last section
- Formulates a question about the difficulty
- Looking ahead in the text
- Re-attending to parts of the text likely to be understood

- Recognises inconsistency of possible interpretations
- If a part of text cannot be understood, shifts to a different part
- If a part of text cannot be understood thinking of an analogy
- Adjusting an unattainable reading goal
- Seeking other information from other sources
- Reading on and giving up on interpretation of that point
- Distorting information in text to construct an interpretation
- Distraction
- Quitting

Post reading monitoring and decisions to process additionally -

- If task is completed but text not entirely understood, does not continue processing
- If task is not completed, continues search for meaning

III Evaluating

Consistent evaluative mindsets - **(Emind)**

- Anticipatory evaluation based on prior knowledge of topic
- Acceptance
- Scepticism
- Reader's stance is that text must be evaluated by determining meanings not stated explicitly

Evaluating the style of the text - **(Estyle)**

- Is writing good or bad
- Are examples effective, compelling
- Physical text

Evaluating the content of the text - **(Econt)**

- Deciding early in the reading whether piece contains important information and deserves to be processed
- Approval / disapproval of the content, arguments made and so on
- Making evaluative comment on topics covered
- Revising evaluations as text is processed further
- Overt affective reactions
- Approval / disapproval of characters places etc
- Long-delayed evaluation

Appendix I Expected specific answer strategies for the four tasks

1 True/False Think Aloud text

Vrai / Faux / Pas clair ?

1. Chantal travaille le samedi et le dimanche dans un supermarché

Text source: *Je travaille le samedi, mais le soir je vais souvent à la disco avec mes amis. Je fais du sport le dimanche*

Expected strategies:

- reading on from a key point in the text to gather the maximum evidence
- ignoring irrelevant material (clause 2 of sentence 1)
- questioning of assumptions if meaning does not become clear (eg, here *travaille* is a false friend)
- inferring from context (in source text but also from times given at beginning of para 2) that *travaille* means work
- scanning for other points in the text where the theme is mentioned (to establish the location of the job)

Likely process:

Note samedi and dimanche in task statement, then scan for those two words at beginning of text. If this is done then the contrast between *Je travaille le samedi* and *Je fais du sport le dimanche* would in itself give the answer False as long as the text is also scanned for *supermarché* (see bullet point 5 above)

2. Elle aime surtout la musique classique

Text source: *A la disco on peut écouter des disques en plusieurs styles, mais mes artistes préférés sont Robbie Williams et Lauryn Hill*

Expected strategies:

- Understanding meaning of the word *surtout*
- Using world knowledge to identify that RW and LH are not classical musicians

Likely process:

Note *la musique classique* in task statement and skim to find names RW and LH - note also use of *artistes préférés* to confirm this decision

3. A la disco elle boit et fume beaucoup

Text source: *Une de mes amies fume. Elle m'invite tout le temps fumer aussi, mais je dis toujours, 'non', parce que je joue au rugby*

Expected strategies:

- Scanning for the presence of a form of *boire* and/or *fumer*
- If vocabulary is not known then inferring meaning from known items / cognates such as *invite / non / joue au rugby*
- Identifying *fumer* as a word to look up if not known

Likely process:

Ask for meanings of boit and fume. Scan for either, find fume twice in extract above. Infer meaning of *invite* as cognate. Identify familiar words *non* and *je joue au rugby* and give answer False. If uncertain check meaning of *dis* and *parce que*

4. Elle a commencé à travailler dans le supermarché la semaine dernière

Text source: *L'année dernière ce n'était pas intéressant, parce que je poussais les chariots tout le temps.*

Expected strategies:

- Identifying parallel structures in *la semaine dernière* and *l'année dernière* and checking meaning if not known
- Realising that the last clause of the sentence is not essential
- Reading around the key point to establish relevance of material
- Grammatical knowledge - awareness of perfect tense form or identifying it as a key item to look up

Likely process:

Noting the parallel forms *la semaine dernière* and *l'année dernière*, checking meaning and deciding False because of the contrast between them

5. Elle travaille dans le rayon 'boucherie'

Text source: *Mais maintenant je travaille dans le rayon boulangerie / pâtisserie avec le pain et les gâteaux.*

Expected strategies:

- Identifying parallel but different forms
- Reading on to ensure accuracy of meaning construction

Likely process:

Noting the parallel forms *le rayon boucherie* and *le rayon boulangerie / pâtisserie*, checking meaning and deciding False because of the contrast between them

6. Elle aime regarder les matchs de rugby le dimanche

Text source: *Le dimanche je joue au rugby*

Expected strategies:

- Identifying parallel but different verbal meaning

Likely process:

Using familiar vocabulary *(je) joue au rugby* and *(elle) aime regarder les matchs de rugby* to establish that the meaning of text and task statement is different

7. L'équipe de rugby ne joue pas très bien

Text source: *L'équipe est la meilleure de notre région et nous avons gagné beaucoup de jeux.*

Expected strategies:

- Identifying *équipe* as a key word
- Identifying negative structure in task statement
- Grammatical knowledge - superlative or identifying *meilleure* as key word to look up
- Inferring *de notre région* from context and via cognate
- Confirming by identifying *gagner* as a key word to look up

Likely process:

Ask for meaning of équipe then check that task statement has negative meaning. Ask for word *meilleure*. Make a decision or go further to check *de notre région* and even *nous avons gagné* as confirmation

8. Dimanche soir elle va aussi à la disco

Text source: *Le soir je regarde la télévision - je suis toujours très fatiguée !*

Expected strategies:

- Holding in mind the sense that the last section of text is about Sunday, and that therefore *le soir* here means Sunday evenings
- Inferring from last clause that this also excludes going to the disco
- Recalling that the disco was mentioned at the beginning of the text and re-reading it to check which days were mentioned

Likely process:

Using familiar vocabulary to establish contrast between *elle va à la disco* and *je regarde la télévision*. Possibly check back at beginning of text to find *Je fais du sport le dimanche*

2. <u>True / False Group reading text</u>

Vrai / Faux / Pas clair ?

1. Guy est fils unique

Text source: *Donc j'ai beaucoup de frères et soeurs. J'ai une soeur, (Nathalie) trois demi-soeurs et deux demi-frères*

Expected strategies:

- Identifying *fils unique* as key element
- Extracting <u>relevant</u> information (ie re: 1 sister)

Likely process:

Establish meaning of *fils unique* then note sentence *Donc j'ai beaucoup de frères et soeurs*

2. Guy est plus âgé que Chantal

Text source: *Moi, j'ai quatorze ans. Ma soeur la plus âgée (Chantal) a vingt-deux ans*

Expected strategies:

- Identifying or looking up comparative structure
- Identifying pronominal reference that *moi* = Guy, and then deciding which sentences are relevant

Likely process:

Noting the structures containing numbers + word *ans*, and then looking to see who each refers to. Check meaning of task statement, (ie who is older than who ?) before making decision

3. Maria et Guy ont la même mère

Text source: *Mon père a une fille de quatre ans, (qui s'appelle Maria) avec sa nouvelle femme.*

Expected strategies:

- Recognising that *ont* means they have
- Identifying key word *même*
- Reading on to establish relevant detail

Likely process:

Scanning for occurrences of the name Maria to focus on a section of text, then noting meaning of whole sentence but especially of last clause through identifying *nouvelle* and *femme*

4. Martin habite chez Guy

Text source: *Chez nous il y a mon père et ma belle-mère, ma soeur Nathalie, la petite Maria, mon demi-frère Martin et moi*

Expected strategies:

- Identifying or looking up expression *chez nous*
- Scanning list for relevant names and understanding pronominal reference that *moi* = Guy

Likely process:

Recognising *chez* as familiar item, identifying meaning of *nous* then scanning list of names for Martin and Guy. Realising that *moi* here is Guy

5. Le bébé de Chantal s'appelle Philippe

Text source: *Ma soeur la plus âgée (Chantal) a vingt-deux ans et a un bébé elle-même*

Expected strategies:

- Scanning for names Chantal and Philippe
- Identifying meaning of *elle-même*
- Understanding of use of bracketed names to identify various members of the family, ie that Chantal's baby is not referred to pronominally elsewhere

Likely process:

Scanning for Philippe and realising that the answer can only be *faux* or *pas clair*.
Scanning for Chantal and establishing the meaning of the second half of that sentence.
Check meaning of *elle-même* to establish that this does not refer to a female baby.
Realising that this must be *pas clair* because we don't know that it is false.

6. Chez Guy on ne se dispute pas souvent

Text source: *C'est une famille très heureuse*

Expected strategies:

- Using general clues to construct meaning
- Identifying negative structure
- Identifying *souvent* as key word

Likely process:

Establish meaning of task statement, then read or re-read carefully for general meaning clues. Scanning for form of *se disputer* will yield nothing and 'world knowledge' about divorces may lead to wrong answer 'true'

7. Les parents préparent toujours le dîner le soir

Text source: *Par exemple tout le monde aide le soir quand on fait le dîner. La petite Maria aime mettre les verres et les couteaux etc sur la table. Nathalie fait toujours une salade verte et moi j'aime bien choisir une bonne bouteille de vin dans le garage !*

Expected strategies:

- Identifying *toujours* as key word
- Using several pieces of evidence (in simpler language) if more concrete statement (in more difficult language) is not understood

Likely process:

Establishing meaning of task statement, especially of word *toujours*. Then using the range of sentences about the family's preparations for dinner to show that it is false.
Alternatively identifying meanings of *tout le monde* and *aident*

8. La famille aime écouter de la musique jazz

Text source: *Nous regardons la télévision ensemble, et nous aimons surtout les jeux et les feuilletons.*

Expected strategies:

- Scanning for presence of theme
- Realising that a parallel theme might be present instead of the theme mentioned

Likely process:

Scanning for elements of *écouter de la musique jazz* and finding none. Inferring that because *Nous regardons la télévision* is present, this means the answer is false.

Notes:

The two true/false texts have in common the need for certain strategies, including above all:

- The need to gain a global gist understanding of the text before starting the task
- The need to keep that global understanding in mind during the task
- The need to identify the key words both in the true/false statement and in the text, and especially to locate and consider the meanings of verbs
- The need to read sufficient text around the 'matched' words/phrases found to establish the real meaning of the text
- The need to pay attention to qualifiers, especially adverbs of frequency and negatives and to pronouns
- The need to question lexical assumptions if the meaning is not clear
- The need to substantiate world knowledge with textual evidence

3. The Four Penfriends texts

Generic Task :

You have four French penfriends, all of them called Sacha. It's not too difficult to work out which one is writing to you because they all write in very different styles !

Sacha 1 is very repetitive - the letters are boring because it's the same information over and over again
Sacha 2 tells outrageous lies most of the time
Sacha 3 writes fairly ordinary letters
Sacha 4 is a Maths-freak and writes mainly in puzzles - you have to work out what she's saying.

Read this letter and

1. Decide which Sacha wrote it
2. Give as many reasons for your decision as you can
3. Which of the opinions in the letter do you agree with / disagree with and why ?

Notes:

In each of these two tasks there is a need to read and make a decision about the identity of the writer at some point in the process. In the texts below key phrases or sentences have been identified (in an italicised larger font) to demonstrate that from a fairly small evidence base of predominantly accessible language, the task can be completed. The major task is question 1, with questions 2 and 3 included to give extra prompts towards encouraging readers to consider as much of the text in evidence as possible. For example, clearly it does not matter whether the readers agree or disagree with the writer's opinions, but this question causes readers to look for further material and this occasionally revises their view of the outcome to the major task (question 1).

Thus a major strategy in approaching these tasks is to skim to discover gist content and then to scan for evidence of the style of any of the 4 Sachas. This automatically involves lexical strategies such as inferring meaning or at least identifying key words to look up, and in some cases using world knowledge. It often necessitates the re-reading of key passages. Other sections of each text are relevant but not necessarily needed to make the relevant judgement. In constructing meaning from these other sections, different and perhaps more complex strategies might be needed. In both cases the openings to the letters are linguistically quite difficult, but an awareness of the formalities of letter openings and closings will enable one of two approaches. Either this will make these sections either more accessible (guesses are more possible) or this knowledge will allow them to be omitted from initial consideration if necessary because they are less likely to be crucial in the decision-making process.

(relevant sections highlighted, comments on strategies embedded in bold type)

A . The Think Aloud text

Salut !
Cette fois je vais te dire quelque chose sur ma famille.
Tu sais déjà que j'ai un frère et deux soeurs. *Ma soeur aînée est très belle et elle chante très bien* **(identifying that *chante* is a key word if not known and that sister's description is a theme)** - en français naturellement, mais même en anglais aussi ! *Elle a fait plusieurs disques* **(*faire* is one of a group of key word verbs without which it can often be very difficukt to establish meaning. Already with these two sections the reader can consider a possible author)** et a enregistré la chanson principale d'un film très populaire.
Mon frère aîné a les cheveux assez longs mais il est très sportif. *Il a joué au foot pour l'équipe nationale,* **(need to establish *équipe* as a key word - sense of the clause very evident once this is done, as *nationale* easy to infer),** mais maintenant il joue à Londres. *Il est devenu aussi très célèbre pour son travail à la télévision.* **(the two words, *célèbre* and *télévision* are enough to allow an inference of meaning, but a positive strategy is to identify *devenu* as a key word to look up - if *travail* is misunderstood in this case it does not affect meaning)**
Ma soeur cadette chante aussi, comme ma soeur aînée, mais elle préfère la musique classique. *Elle n'a que douze ans mais elle est déjà très populaire dans toute l'Europe.* **(knowledge of structure *ne que* not common but here it can be ignored with no consequence - the cognates *populaire* and *Europe* are sufficient to allow meaning to become clear. *Toute*, if established, strengthens the case for Sacha 2)**
J'ai oublié de te dire les noms - *mes soeurs s'appellent Charlotte et Céline et mon frère s'appelle David.* **(use of world knowledge could here give an explanation for the identities of the brother and sisters, but it is not essential to task completion)**
Et finalement, mes parents. Ma mère s'appelle Edith et *elle a eu des problèmes récemment au parlement européen,* **(the cognates *problèmes, parlement* and *européen* reinforce the hypothesis even if the whole sentence is not fully understood)** mais j'espère que tout va bien maintenant. *Mon père Jacques est le président de la France.* **(again cognates alone give the sense of this sentence)** Alors, il est tout le temps très occupé!
Ecris-moi un peu de ta famille aussi !
Amitiés,
Sacha

B The Group reading text

Salut !
Je vais t'écrire aujourd'hui de mon temps libre. Je fais beaucoup de choses !
Comme sport, j'aime bien les sports d'équipe. *J'adore faire du patinage et alors, je préfère le sport qu'on fait sur glace avec une équipe de six personnes. On ne fait pas ça avec un ballon, mais avec une sorte de disque.* **(in this text it is a more careful consideration of meaning which is crucial. Because Sacha 4 writes in puzzles she is inevitably more difficult to understand. After *patinage* has been recognised / established, the key words here are mainly cognate, ie *préfère, sport, six personnes, ballon, disque.* Glace and équipe may be known or can be looked up. The difficulty seems to be concentrating on a gradual emerging meaning through a close and perhaps repeated reading)** Je ne suis pas très forte, mais c'est super, ça !
Le soir j'aime bien être seule (je ne suis pas au salon avec ma famille !) - je regarde la télévision, j'écoute quelque-chose ou je joue sur l'ordinateur. J'aime la musique pop mais aussi la musique classique. *Mon compositeur préféré est un homme, qui vivait en Russie dans les années 1800, et qui a composé l'ouverture de 1812.* **(again there are several cognates to help with the meaning construction, but, also again, it is in the overall sentence structure that the biggest clue is given - why does she not name him ?)**
Quand je suis au centre-ville, je vais à FNAC (c'est une grande librairie avec des livres, des disques et des CD-ROMs). Aujourd'hui il y avait trois disques que je voulais acheter. Un de soixante francs (un disque de musique piano de Chaikovski), un de cinquante trois francs, et un de trente-huit francs. *J'avais cent francs, et alors tu peux décider les deux que j'ai acheté.* **(the only example of a mathematical puzzle, but it should provide the final clue. There is a need though to avoid the mistranslation of *librairie* as library and to understand *acheter* - without these two lexical items the meaning is obscured without, again, very close reading)**
Voilà, c'est tout. Amitiés,
Sacha

Appendix Ji Metacognitive / Cognitive / Social Strategy Use

Strategies in Use

Organising an approach:
Read whole text silently (a)
Read whole text aloud (b)
Read whole text in French, translating sections (ie words, phrases, sentences) at a time (c)
Translate whole text into English (d)
Read sections of text silently (e)
Read sections of text aloud (f)
Read sections of text in French, translating sections (ie words, phrases, sentences) at a time (g)
Translate sections of text into English (h)
Read T/F task statements individually and seek answers from text (i) **TF task** Make hypotheses about Sacha's identity and seek justification from text (i) **FP task**
Metacognitive
Clarifying (ie asking researcher) an approach to reading / task completion (j)
Stating a need to look at certain sections first (k)
Stating a need to look at certain sections again (l)
Stating a need to review evidence (m)
Suggesting moving on to a new section (n)
Suggesting an answer to a question without supporting evidence in order to move on (o)
Cognitive
Expressing a lack of understanding (p)
Identifying via an incorrect cognate (q1) Identifying a cognate (q2)
Identifying a related word in target language (eg je bois / boisson) (r)
Identifying a word from a set (eg reciting days of week to find the right one) (s)
Trying to create a context for an unknown word (t1) Inferring a word from lexical context (t2)
Inferring a word from grammatical context (u)
Inferring a word from world knowledge (v)
Inferring meaning from knowledge of formal convention (eg letter formats) (w)
Identifying a need to look up a word (x)
Offering a clarificational reading of a section (y)
Reviewing evidence (z1) Repeating / signifying understanding / 'mental filing' (z2)
Trying out a hypothesis (if ..... then ..... / it might be that ,.) (aa)
Stating an answer and giving reasons from text (bb)
Inferring an answer from world knowledge (cc)
Inferring an answer without concrete support (+ eg the word isn't there, can't remember reading it) (dd)

Social
Reading aloud together (ee)
Translating aloud together (ff1) Translating aloud simultaneously but separately (ff2)
Asking group member(s) where we are (gg1) Telling group member(s) where we are (gg2)
Asking group member(s) for a meaning (hh1) Giving a meaning to group member(s) (hh2)
Asking group member(s) for an opinion (ii1) Giving group member(s) an opinion (ii2)
Checking that the group agree with procedure (jj1) Stating that one doesn't agree with procedure (jj2)
Checking that the group agree with interpretation (kk)
Agreeing with a statement (ll)
Disagreeing with a statement (mm)
Defending a position (nn)
Deciding that the task is finished (oo)

Appendix Jii Metacognitive / Cognitive / Social Strategy Use: Group reading

TFI task: Groups A1, B1 B3

strategy	Group A1 count	Group B1 count	Group B3 count
Metacognitive			
Clarifying (ie asking researcher) an approach to reading / task completion (j)			
Stating a need to look at certain sections first (k)		4	1
Stating a need to look at certain sections again (l)		2	5
Stating a need to review evidence (m)		2	4
Suggesting moving on to a new section (n)	2	9	1
Suggesting an answer to a question without supporting evidence in order to move on (o)			

Cognitive	Group A1 count	Group B1 count	Group B3 count
Expressing a lack of understanding (p)	8	8	9
Identifying via an incorrect cognate (q1) Identifying a cognate (q2)	3		
Identifying a related word in target language (eg je bois / boisson) (r)			
Identifying a word from a set (eg reciting days of week to find the right one) (s)			
Trying to create a context for an unknown word (t1) Inferring a word from lexical context (t2)	5	5	 1
Inferring a word from grammatical context (u)		1	
Inferring a word from world knowledge (v)			
Inferring meaning from knowledge of formal convention (eg letter formats) (w)			
Identifying a need to look up a word (x)	23	8	8
Offering a clarificational reading of a section (y)	25	18	32
Reviewing evidence (z1) Repeating / signifying understanding / 'mental filing' (z2)	13 21	2 5	6 38
Trying out a hypothesis (if ..... then ..... / it might be that ,.) (aa)			3
Stating an answer and giving reasons from text (bb)	3	8	11

Inferring an answer from world knowledge (cc)		1	
Inferring an answer without concrete support (+ eg the word isn't there, can't remember reading it) (dd)	7	11	3

Social	Group A1 count	Group B1 count	Group B3 count
Reading aloud together (ee)			
Translating aloud together (ff1) Translating aloud simultaneously but separately (ff2)	3 7		2
Asking group member(s) where we are (gg1) Telling group member(s) where we are (gg2)	2 1	2 3	1 2
Asking group member(s) for a meaning (hh1) Giving a meaning to group member(s) (hh2)	7	7 3	14 1
Asking group member(s) for an opinion (ii1) Giving group member(s) an opinion (ii2)	3	2	3
Checking that the group agree with procedure (jj1) Stating that one doesn't agree with procedure (jj2)		1 5	
Checking that the group agree with interpretation (kk)	1		
Agreeing with a statement (ll)	19	15	
Disagreeing with a statement (mm)	5	5	3
Defending a position (nn)	1	15	1
Deciding that the task is finished (oo)			2

Appendix K Concordance word items

1. Actually
2. Again
3. Any
4. Anything
5. (Be)cause
6. But
7. Can('t)
8. Could(n't)
9. Did(n't)
10. Does(n't)
11. Do(n't)
12. Example
13. Have(n't)
14. If
15. Is(n't)
16. Just
17. Like
18. Maybe
19. Mean(s)
20. Might(n't)
21. Must(n't)
22. No
23. Not
24. Obviously
25. Oh
26. OK
27. Or
28. Probably
29. Said
30. Same
31. Saying
32. Say(s)
33. Show(s)
34. So
35. Something
36. Talk*
37. Then
38. Think
39. Though
40. Thought
41. We
42. We'*
43. Well
44. Would(n't)

Appendix L Follow-up questionnaire

9K Reading Tasks in French - October 99

NAME:

Please answer these questions about when you did the reading tasks in French just before half term - be very honest and write your own opinions !

1. Which did you **enjoy** more, working by yourself or working in the group ?

By myself ☐ In the group ☐

Why ?

2. In which format did you do the **best work** ?

By myself ☐ In the group ☐

Why ?

3. What are the advantages of reading in a group ?

4. What are the disadvantages of reading in a group ?

5. What are the advantages of reading by yourself ?

6. What are the disadvantages of reading by yourself ?

Thank You

Appendix M Think-Aloud Transcript - Student 7

True-False task

Turns / speakers / transcript	PA section	Coding notes
1) R Okay		
2) 7 Em	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
3) 7 The weekend		
4) 7 Em at the weekend.		
5) 7 activities.		
6) 7 Em Samedi Saurday		
7) R Mhm.		
8) 7 Em	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
9) 7 Disco		
10) 7 avec		
11) 7 with my friends.		
12) 7 Em I play sport	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
13) 7 on		
14) 7 Sunday?	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
15) 7 em	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
16) 7 disco		
17) 7 em that means	MC/DR	Pausing to reflect
18) 7 em		
19) 7 oh it's got something to do with music.	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
20) 7 Em mais mes artistes préferés sont Robbie Williams et Lauryn Hill.	MC/DR	Reading aloud
21) 7 Er. My favourite artists are Robbie Williams and Lauryn Hill.	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
22) 7 Em.	MC/DR ??	Linear reading ??
23) 7 Em.		
24) 7 Entrainement, what does that mean?	ActDiffwp	Using dictionary
25) R Entrainement means training.		
26) 7 Em I'm training for rugby	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
27) 7 at		
28) 7 no em	MC/DR	Adjusting an interpretation
29) 7 carry on carry on	ActDiff$_{glob}$	Suspends judgement
30) 7 Amies	MC/DR	Reading aloud
31) 7 Amies fumes.		
32) 7 Friends.	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
33) 7 No.		
34) 7 Yeah. Friends.		

35)	7 Rugby again.	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
36)	7 Cigarettes.	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
37)	7 What's sentent mean?	ActDiffwp	Using dictionary
38)	R Er smell.		
39)	7 Smell.	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
40)	7 Ah. I get it now.	MonPT	Overall meaning of part of text is comprehended
41)	7 At the rugby club, there is a smell of cigarettes.		
42)	7 And I travel to the supermarket.	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
43)	7 (10)	$ActDiff_{glob}$??	Reads slowly and carefully ??
44)	7 Um.	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
45)	7 em.		
46)	7 Something about he's going shopping.		
47)	7 Je de huit heures. Eight	MC/DR + MC/DR	Reading aloud + Paraphrasing text
48)	7 Eight hours		
49)	7 du matin. In the morning.		
50)	7 Six hours soir.		
51)	7 Six hours		
52)	7 is that sun?	MC/DRcim	Contextual clue - context
53)	R Which word?		
54)	7 S O I R.	ActDiffwp	Using dictionary
55)	R Soir means evening.		
56)	7 Ah. Evening.	MC/DR	Restating text
57)	7 Em.	MC/DR	Pausing to reflect
58)	7 Park.	MC/DRcim	Contextual clue - cognate
59)	7 tout le temps	MC/DR	Reading aloud
60)	7 Mais maintenant je travaille dans le rayon boulangerie. Ah that's bakery.	MC/DR + MC/DR	Reading aloud + Paraphrasing text
61)	R Mm.		
62)	7 Pâtisserie is	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
63)	7 em	MC/DR	Pausing to reflect
64)	7 and I get a gâteaux.	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
65)	7 Pains au chocolat are great. Are super.		
66)	7 The pains au chocolat are super.	MC/DR	Restating text
67)	7 Em.	MC/DR	Pausing to reflect
68)	7 On dimanche	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
69)	7 em	MC/DR	Pausing to reflect
70)	7 Thursday?	ActDiffwp	Using dictionary
71)	R Dimanche is		
72)	R Sunday.		
73)	7 Sunday, yeah.	MC/DR	Restating text
74)	7 I play rugby	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
75)	7 amusement park	MC/DRcim	Contextual clue - cognate

76)	7 deux de mes amies. Er with two of my friends.	MC/DR + MC/DR	Reading aloud + Paraphrasing text
77)	7 Beaucoup because.	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
78)	7 Beaucoup because?	ActDiffwp	Using dictionary
79)	R Beaucoup means a lot.		
80)	7 A lot. Em	MC/DR	Restating text
81)	7 Le soir je regarde. In the evening I watch T.V.	MC/DR + MC/DR	Reading aloud + Paraphrasing text
82)	7 Je - jours très fatiguée. Chanel.	MC/DR	Reading aloud
83)	7 I think I've done there.	MonPT	Achieving a goal
84)	R Okay. So you going to have a look at some of the		
85)	7 Yeah.		
86)	R Statements now		
87)	7 (13)	MC/DR ??	Linear reading ??
88)	7 Gotta say whether it's true or false?	MC/BR	Constructing a goal
89)	R Mhm.		
90)	7 Erm. Number one	MC/BR	Constructing a goal
91)	7 travel.	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
92)	7 (12)	ActDiffglob ??	Reading slowly and carefully ??
93)	7 What does Chantal mean?	ActDiffwp	Using dictionary
94)	R Er that's the name of the person who's written the letter.		
95)	7 Ah.	MC/DR	Pausing to reflect
96)	7 Chantal travels	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
97)	7 on Saturday.		
98)	7 or - no		
99)	7 and on Sunday dans le supermarché.		
100)	7 Is that faux?	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
101)	R What? Er. Which word?		
102)	7 Er. Number one.		
103)	R Yeah. Oh sorry.		
104)	7 Yeah.		
105)	R Are you saying is it false? Yeah.		
106)	7 Yeah.	MonPT	Achieving a goal
107)	R Well if it's false, why would it be false?		
108)	R I mean, I'm not saying it is or it isn't		
109)	R but I'm just saying what are the reasons?		
110)	7 Mm.	MC/DR ??	Explicitly looking for related ideas ??
111)	7 (4)		
112)	7 Doesn't really say but looking at the words,	MC/DRcim	Drawing conclusion
113)	7 it doesn't say anywhere else.		
114)	R Mhm.		
115)	R So do you try		
116)	R Tell me what you tried to do to find out.		

117)	7 Erm. Just like scanning the page to see if there are any other words to connect it with it.	MC/DR	Explicitly looking for related ideas
118)	R Okay. Sure		
119)	R I mean if you're happy with the decision that's [fine		
120)	7 Yeah. I'll go. Yeah.]	MC/DR	Maintaining an hypothesis
121)	R Yeah? That's fine.		
122)	7 Em.	MonPT	Achieving a goal
123)	7 Ah number two's faux.		
124)	7 As well because she likes	MC/DRcim	Drawing a conclusion
125)	7 em She likes em		
126)	7 Artists are Robbie Williams and Lauryn Hill.		
127)	R Mhm.		
128)	7 What does beaucoup mean?	ActDiffwp	Using dictionary
129)	R Er. A lot.		
130)	7 A lot.	MC/DR + MC/DR	Restating text + Pausing to reflect
131)	7 A lot.		
132)	7 A lot and		
133)	7 a lot em disco.	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
134)	7 Mm. Don't know about that one. Just go to the next one.	$ActDiff_{glob}$ + $ActDiff_{glob}$	Suspending judgement + Shifting to a different part of text
135)	R Mm.		
136)	7 (9)	MC/DR ?? + MC/DR ??	Linear reading ?? + Explicitly looking for related ideas ??
137)	7 Em.		
138)	7 (10)		
139)	7 Don't know number three or four	$ActDiff_{glob}$	States failure to understand
140)	7 but I know number five is false.	MonPT	Achieving a goal
141)	R Why is it false?		
142)	7 False because it doesn't say she goes to the butcher's.	MC/DRcim	Drawing a conclusion
143)	R Right.		
144)	7 (7)	MC/DR ?? + MC/DR ??	Linear reading ?? + Explicitly looking for related ideas ??
145)	7 Sunday.	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
146)	7 Number six I think is false	MonPT	Achieving a goal
147)	7 because it says em	MC/DRcim	Drawing a conclusion
148)	7 Elle aime regarder les matchs de rugby le dimanche.		
149)	R Mhm.		
150)	7 That means she watches a match of rugby	MC/DR	Maintaining an hypothesis
151)	R Mhm.		
152)	7 on Sunday, but in the text it says she plays rugby.		

153) R Okay.		
154) 7 Em.	MC/DR ?? + MC/DR ??	Linear reading ?? + Explicitly looking for related ideas ??
155) 7 (9)		
156) 7 Joue pas très bien. Em.	MC/DR	Reading aloud
157) 7 Très bien means very good.	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
158) 7 The l'équipe de rugby.		
159) 7 (9)	MC/DR ??	Pausing to reflect ??
160) R You can ask for a word if you want to.		
161) 7 What?		
162) R You can ask for a word if you want to.		
163) 7 Okay. em.	ActDiffwp	Using dictionary
164) 7 What is l'équipe		
165) R It means a team.		
166) 7 A team	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
167) 7 of rugby		
168) 7 is not very good.		
169) 7 Em.	MC/DR ?? + MC/DR ??	Linear reading ?? + Explicitly looking for related ideas ??
170) 7 (15)		
171) 7 Don't know about that last one there.	$ActDiff_{glob}$	States failure to understand
172) 7 The équipe de rugby	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
173) 7 and then the last one.		
174) 7 Dimanche soir		
175) 7 mm on Sunday evening		
176) 7 she		
177) 7 va ausssi à la disco.	MC/DR	Reading aloud
178) 7 Disco. On Sunday something something something disco. Er.	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
179) 7 Sunday evening.		
180) 7 (10)	MC/DR ?? + MC/DR ??	Linear reading ?? + Explicitly looking for related ideas ??
181) 7 Think that one at the bottom's false.	MonPT	Achieving a goal
182) 7 Because it says she plays sport on Sunday.	MC/DRcim	Drawing a conclusion
183) R Right.		
184) 7 Number eight. Faux.	MC/DR	Maintaining an hypothesis
185) R Okay. [Ss-		
186) R You] missed out three and four.		
187) 7 [Yeah.		
188) R Did] you want to check * on those before you -?		

189) 7 Em	ActDiff$_{glob}$	Task not complete, continuing search
190) 7 Yeah.		
191) 7 What does		
192) 7 no. Three and four.		
193) R Mm.		
194) 7 Em	ActDiffwp	Using dictionary
195) 7 Fume and boit.		
196) R Boit means drinks		
197) 7 [Okay		
198) R and] fume means smokes.		
199) 7 At the disco she drinks and smokes a lot.	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
200) R Mhm.		
201) 7 Em.	MC/DR ??	Explicitly looking for related ideas ??
202) 7 (7)		
203) 7 ((whispers)) Disco disco disco disco disco		
204) 7 Em.		
205) 7 Doesn't say how old she is so	MC/DR + MonTC	Tentative interpretation + Text content not relevant to goal
206) 7 Can't be connected with that.	MC/DRcim	Drawing a conclusion
207) 7 Em disco.	MC/DR ??	Explicitly looking for related ideas ??
208) 7 (12)		
209) 7 What does écouter er	MC/DR	Jumping back to reconsider prev. read information
210) 7 it's in the top set.		
211) R Mhm.		
212) 7 Er. E C O U T E R?	ActDiffwp	Using dictionary
213) R Em, écouter.		
214) 7 Yeah.		
215) R Means listen.		
216) 7 Em.	MC/DR	Pausing to reflect
217) 7 Em.		
218) 7 Plus- [em	ActDiffwp	Using dictionary
219) R Em.] Plusieurs. Means like many or several.		
220) R Plusieurs styles would be like different styles maybe [various different styles		
221) 7 Em.]	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
222) 7 At the disco she drinks and smokes a lot.		
223) 7 (5)	MC/DR	Pausing to reflect
224) 7 Think that might be false.	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
225) R Okay.		
226) R Could you say why?		
227) 7 Mm.	ActDiff$_{glob}$	States failure to understand
228) 7 I don't know really.		

229)	R That's okay. Don't worry. That's okay.		
230)	R So is that as many as you can do on this one?		
231)	7 Yeah.	MonTC	Achieving a goal
232)	R That's fine.		

Four penfriends task

Turns / speakers / transcript			PA section	Coding notes
1)	R	Let's try the second one. This one's a bit different. Erm. [In the second one		
2)	7	Is this in French] as well?		
3)	R	Yeah. But I'm gonna read through what you have to do.		
4)	R	Okay. ((Reads out instructions)) Okay?		
5)	R	And again you can ask for words		
6)	7	Okay.		
7)	7	Quelque chose	ActDiffwp	Using dictionary
8)	R	Er. Something.		
9)	7	Something.	MC/DR	Restating text
10)	7	(23)	MC/DR	Linear reading
11)	7	Ah. This might give an idea to it. Em.	MC/DRcim	Drawing a conclusion
12)	7	Says em Il joue au foot pour l'équip nationale,	MC/DR	Reading aloud
13)	R	Mhm.		
14)	7	Does that mean she plays football for the national team?	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
15)	R	Mhm.		
16)	7	So that's like an outrageous lie, so	MC/DRcim	Drawing a conclusion
17)	7	could be number two, but we don't know yet.	MonPT + MC/DRintg	Achieving a goal + Looking elsewhere in text for related information
18)	R	Okay.		
19)	7	(25)	MC/DR	Linear reading
20)	7	Yeah. It's number two, cos then it says at the bottom	MonPT + MC/DRcim	Achieving a goal + Drawing a conclusion
21)	7	my father Jacques is the president of France.		
22)	R	Okay. Well actually you got you got two two obviously quite good reasons for that. Can you find any more reasons that would make it sure that it was number two?		
23)	7	Em.	MC/AR	Rereading parts of text following reflection
24)	7	(9)		
25)	7	There's also em	MC/DR	Maintaining an hypothesis
26)	7	my mère s'appelle Edith. My mère called – my mum called Edith		
27)	7	em something to do with the er European parliament.		
28)	R	Mhm.		

29)	7 Then it says	MC/AR	Rereading parts of text following reflection
30)	7 (28)		
31)	7 Yeah. I think that is number two. She's saying like	MC/DR	Maintaining an hypothesis
32)	7 her sister plays football for the national team.		
33)	7 Her mum is em something to do with the European parliament, and her dad's the		
34)	7 the em		
35)	7 the president of France which seems a bit ridiculous		
36)	R ((laughs)) Okay. Right. Em		
37)	7 Em		
38)	R It mentions as well that there are some opinions as well. Do you agree with them or disagree with them and why.		
39)	7 Yeah.		
40)	R Depends whether you can spot any opinions, but if you can, see if there's anything there that you can say whether you agree or disagree.		
41)	7 (11)	MC/AR	Rereading parts of text following reflection
42)	7 What does belle mean? B E L L E?	ActDiffwp	Using dictionary
43)	R Beautiful or pretty.		
44)	7 (19)	MC/AR	Rereading parts of text following reflection
45)	7 Em.	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
46)	7 My brother		
47)	R No my sister		
48)	7 is very beautiful.		
49)	7 Nat – naturellement ?	ActDiffwp	Using dictionary
50)	R Er naturellement can mean like naturally, but it can also mean of course.		
51)	7 French of course. Em.	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
52)	7 Même	MC/DR	Reading aloud
53)	7 anglais aussi. Elle a fait plusieurs disques et		
54)	7 I think that's someone. That means like her sister	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
55)	R Mhm.		
56)	7 is like a very popular film star.		
57)	7 [Or something.		
58)	R Okay.] So that that would be another reason		
59)	7 Yeah. [Why		
60)	R Yeah.		
61)	7 I think she's a liar.	MC/DR	Maintaining an hypothesis
62)	R Okay. ((laughs))		

63)	R That's fine.		
64)	7 Tells outrageous lies for most of the time.	MonPT	Achieving a goal
65)	R Right. Okay.		
66)	R [That's it.		
67)	7 Yeah.]		
68)	R That's finished then.		
69)	7 Okay.		
70)	R Thanks very much.		

Appendix N - B3 Group Transcript - Strategy Coded

True-False task

Turns / speakers / transcript	PA section	Coding notes
1. 8 Shall we read through it in English ?	MonPT	Own behaviours
2. 9 Yeah, just like try and work out what everything says	MonPT	Own behaviours
3. 8 OK, my family is [very interesting	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
4. 9 very interesting]	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
5. all My parents are divorced	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
6. 9 And	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
7. 7 I've been, they were married for [two years	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
8. 9 two years] yeah, that looks about right	MC/DR + MC/DR	Paraphrasing text + Concluding previous hypothesis is valid
9. 8 Yeah	MC/DR	Concluding previous hypothesis is valid
10. 7 Er, beaucoup, what's that mean ?	MonProb	Unfamiliar terms in text
11. 8 Er, I'm not sure	$ActDiff_{glob}$	States failure to understand
12. 9 We know but we *	MonTC	Relationship between own knowledge and text content
13. 8 Yeah I was just going to say that	MonTC	Relationship between own knowledge and text content
14. 7 De frères=	MC/DR	Reading aloud
15. 9 I have=	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
16. 7 et soeurs=	MC/DR	Reading aloud
17. 9 I have=	MC/DR	Restating text
18. 7 something about brothers and sisters	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
19. 9 I have	MC/DR	Restating text
20. 8 Er yeah, de, um some brothers and sisters	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
21. 7 Two, some brothers and sisters	MC/DR	Restating text
22. 9 Yeah.	MC/DR	Concluding previous hypothesis is valid
23. 8/9 I have a sister, Natalie	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
24. 9 She's (1) three	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
25. 8 half sisters and two half brothers (1)	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
26. 9 Yeah	MC/DR	Concluding previous hypothesis is valid
27. 7 Moi, me, and j'ai quatorze ans, fourteen, er, years old,	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
28. 9 Yeah	MC/DR	Concluding previous hypothesis is valid
29. 7 And	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
30. 9 my [sister	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
31. 8 My] sister is	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text

32. 9	Probably that means probably older doesn't it, cause that	ActDiffwp	Candidate meaning evaluated in context
33. 7	Plus âgée, yeah older. Chantal (-) a vingt-deux ans (1)	MC/DR + MC/DR	Paraphrasing text + Reading aloud
34. 9	So	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
35. 8	She's um	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
36. 7	Twenty=	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
37. 9	Twenty two=	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
38. 8	Twenty two. So that's * , and um	MC/DR + MC/DR ??	Restating text + Tentative interpretation ??
39. 9	And my	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
40. 7	Beb, beeb,	MC/DR	Reading aloud
41. 9	Baby sister	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
42. 7	Baby sister	MC/DR	Restating text
43. 9	Oh no well it doesn't say sister there. She's	MC/DR	Adjusting a tentative interpretation
44. 7	Um, my, mon frère	MC/DR	Reading aloud
45. 8	And hold on, Chantal is twenty two and she has a what ?	ActTask + $ActDiff_{glob}$	Decision to re-read + Formulates a question about difficulty
46. 9	Oh	MC/DR	Pause to reflect
47. 7	[A baby, a little baby, she has a little baby	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
48. 9/8	((talk quietly together)) *]		
49. 8	OK. (1) Um, my brother (6)	MC/DR + MC/DR	Concluding previous hypothesis is valid + Paraphrasing text
50. 7	Er	MC/DR	Pause to reflect
51. 9	Well we	MC/DR	Pause to reflect
52. 7	Plus jeune, Luc	MC/DR	Reading aloud
53. 9	What does that ((points to sheet, shows 8))	MonProb	Unfamiliar terms in text
54. 7	Deux ans, two years	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
55. 9	What does, what does that mean ? ((points to sheet, shows 8))	MonProb	Unfamiliar terms in text
56. 8	Yeah, what does jeune mean ? ((shows 7))	MonProb	Unfamiliar terms in text
57. 7	Jeune, I don't know	$ActDiff_{glob}$	States failure to understand
58. 9	Yeah, what does, what does that mean ? ((shows R))	ActDiffwp	Use a dictionary
59. R	It means young		
60. 9	Oh	MC/DR	Pause to reflect
61. 8	Oh right, so	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
62. 9	So that means younger	MC/DR	Using patterns to adjust interpretation
63. 7	A young	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
64. 9	Younger	MonProb	Correcting a peer
65. 7	Younger	MC/DR	Restating text

66. 8 My younger brother is two	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
67. 9 Yeah. Um he is (4) Do we know fil ?	MC/DR + MC/DR + MonProb	Concluding previous hypothesis is valid + paraphrasing text + Unfamiliar terms in text
68. 8 ((shakes head))	ActDiff$_{glob}$	States failure to understand
69. 9 Er what's fil ?	ActDiffwp	Use a dictionary
70. R Fils. Er means son, er you know son, son-daughter son, not sun, the sun		
71. 7 Mon père a un fils	MC/DR	Reading aloud
72. 8 He is [the son of	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
73. 9 The son]	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
74. 8 my mum	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
75. 9 And	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
76. 8 And (3) No not sure about	ActDiff$_{glob}$	States failure to understand
77. 9 Well she said she had two half brothers so it's (-) probably something to do with a step-dad or something like that [*	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
78. 8 OK,] alright	MonPT	End of a unit of meaning
79. 9/8 My dad	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
80. 7 This is a lot harder than the other one	MonTC	Text difficulty
81. 9 My	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
82. 8 What was ? ((shows sheet to 9))	MonProb	Unfamiliar terms in text
83. 9 God, I don't	ActDiff$_{glob}$	States failure to understand
84. 7 *		
85. 8 Er, I don't know what that means	ActDiff$_{glob}$	States failure to understand
86. 9 It's son isn't it	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
87. 8 Yeah	MC/DR	Concluding previous hypothesis is valid
88. 9 Son. So. My dad's, my dad's son has yeah	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
89. 8 Isn't fille ? (1) What's fille again ?	MC/DR + ActDiffwp	Tentative interpretation + Use a dictionary
90. R Fille is daughter		
91. 8 Daughter, right, [thank you	MC/DR	Restating text
92. 9 Right *] Yeah	MC/DR	Concluding previous hypothesis is valid
93. 8 My dad has a daughter (2) four, who's four years old. [She's called Maria	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
94. 9 She's called Maria]	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
95. 7 ((sings)) Maria	MC/DR	Restating text
96. 8 She's (1) with (2)	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text

97.	7	Avec with sa nouvelle femme, a woman. (2) He is with another woman	MC/DR + MC/DR	Reading aloud + Paraphrasing text
98.	8	Oh yeah, and that was with a son with my mum and another man ((shows sheet to 7))	MC/DR	Jumping back to reconsider previous information
99.	7	Yeah	MC/DR	Concluding previous hypothesis is valid
100.	8	OK	MonPT	End of a unit of meaning
101.	7	Yeah, they're split up, they're split up	MC/DR	Concluding previous hypothesis is valid
102.	8	OK	MonPT	End of a unit of meaning
103.	7	J'ai dit c'est, que ce n'est pas facile. What does=	MC/DR + ActDiffwp	Reading aloud + Use a dictionary
104.	9	Facile=	ActDiffwp	Use a dictionary
105.	7	facile mean ?	ActDiffwp	Use a dictionary
106.	R	Facile means easy		
107.	7/9	Easy	MC/DR	Restating text
108.	9	It isn't	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
109.	7	Je n'ai pas. It's not easy or something	MC/DR + MC/DR	Reading aloud + Tentative interpretation
110.	8	[Yeah to understand or whatever	MC/Dr	Tentative interpretation
111.	9	((reads to herself quietly)) *]	MC/DR	Pause to reflect
112.	8	OK. Chez nous, do we know chez nous ?	MonProb	Unfamiliar terms in text
113.	7	Um	MC/DR	Pause to reflect
114.	8	Chez	MC/DR	Read aloud
115.	9	We know chez - chez is like our	ActDiffwp	Candidate meaning evaluated in context
116.	8	Yeah, chez is our house	MC/DR	Adjusting a tentative interpretation
117.	9	Yeah our, so our	MC/DR	Restating text
118.	8	And then nous is our so it's like	ActDiffwp	Candidate meaning evaluated in context
119.	7	Em par exemple	MC/DR	Reading aloud
120.	8	There is my dad and my beautiful mother, my sister Natalie	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
121.	9	my * sister, the little Maria	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
122.	7	My	MC/DR	Restating text
123.	8	Yeah	MC/DR	Concluding previous hypothesis is valid
124.	7	My little Maria et my	MC/DR	Restating text
125.	9	Half brother	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
126.	7	Half brother Martin et and me	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
127.	8	OK	MonPT	End of a unit of meaning
128.	7	C'est une famille très (1)	MC/DR	Reading aloud
129.	8	Heureuse	MC/DR	Reading aloud
130.	7	Heureuse, what's that mean h-e-u-r-e-u-s-e ?	ActDiffwp	Use a dictionary

131.	7/9	((shake heads))	ActDiff$_{glob}$	State failure to understand
132.	R	Heureuse means happy		
133.	7	Happy	MC/DR	Restates text
134.	8	OK. It is a very happy family	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
135.	all	Yeah. For example	MC/DR + MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid + Paraphrasing text
136.	7	Um (2) Is it something like on Monday they take, they took us out to dinner, fait le dîner ?	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
137.	9	Evening, Monday evening. ((to 8)) Is monde, monde isn't Monday ?	MC/DR + MonProb	Paraphrasing text + Unfamiliar terms in text
138.	7	No it's not	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis invalid
139.	8	I don't know, it's something [*	ActDiff$_{glob}$	States failure to understand
140.	7	Monde] What does that mean ?	ActDiffwp	Use a dictionary
141.	R	Yeah in that one you have to take the three words together so tout le monde all together means everybody		
142.	9	Oh right	MC/DR	Pausing to reflect
143.	9/8	Well everybody (1)	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
144.	8	[The evening	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
145.	9	*] God, we know that ((shows sheet to 8))	MonTC	Relationship between own knowledge and text content
146.	8	Everybody has dinner together in the evening	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
147.	9	Yeah	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
148.	7	And (-) except, no, the little, petite Maria	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
149.	9	The little Maria (-) like	MC/DR	Restating text
150.	7	Um (2)	MC/DR	Pausing to reflect
151.	9	They probably *	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
152.	8	Couteaux is knives isn't it ? (1)	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
153.	9	Yeah	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
154.	8	Etc on the [table	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
155.	9	Table]	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
156.	7	The little Maria, no it's not something like helps lay the table	ActDiffwp	Candidate meaning evaluated in context
157.	9	*		
158.	8	OK	MonPT	End of a unit of meaning
159.	7	Natalie, Natalie helps make the salad, the green salad.	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
160.	9	But where's ?	MC/DR	Pausing to reflect

161.	7	Is it something going on about how they make the dinner all together ?	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
162.	8	Yeah, yeah OK. We'll do, we'll say that then and go on to the next paragraph	MC/DR + MonPT + MonPT	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid + Awareness that some things are not understood but will be + Reading behaviours in service of goal
163.	7	Yeah	MonPT	Reading behaviours in service of goal
164.	9	Um we (2)	MC/DR	Pausing to reflect
165.	7	[The next part	MC/DR	Looking for topic sentences
166.	9/8	We watch the television] [together	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
167.	7	Television together] and	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
168.	9	And we like	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
169.	7	Um (2) I think that's a TV programme, no it's not	ActDiffwp	Candidate meaning evaluated in context
170.	9	((shakes head)) *	ActDiff$_{glob}$	States failure to understand
171.	7	What does feuilletons mean ?	ActDiffwp	Use a dictionary
172.	R	It means soaps		
173.	7	We like soaps yeah	MC/DR + MC/DR	Restating text + Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
174.	8	OK and	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
175.	9	Oh soaps and	MC/DR	Restating text
176.	8	Er how is your family ?	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
177.	9	((reads aloud indistinctly))		
178.	7	J'espère (1) et mon	MC/DR	Reading aloud
179.	9	I don't know about that	ActDiff$_{glob}$	States failure to understand
180.	8	Is it as complicated as mine ?	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
181.	9	Yeah	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
182.	7	Guy	MC/DR	Reading aloud
183.	9	OK	MonPT	End of a unit of meaning
184.	8	OK so we've got Guy is an [only child	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
185.	9	Only child] No	MC/DR + MonPT	Paraphrasing text + Achieving goal
186.	8	That's false that's easy	MonPT + MonTC	Achieving goal + Linguistic characteristics of text
187.	9	Oh no you ((shows sheet to 8)) that was son wasn't it so that might mean he's an only (-) son. Does he have, he has half (1) he has half brothers and stuff so that he you'd probably think he wasn't, that that was still faux cause he	MC/DR + MC/DR	Jumping back to reconsider previously read information + concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid

188.	7	Guy est fils unique	MC/DR	Reading aloud
189.	8	OK so we're [sticking with false	MC/DR + MC/DR	End of a unit of meaning + Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
190.	9	Still false] Yeah	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
191.	8	Guy is (-) [older than Chantal	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
192.	9/7	Older than Chantal]	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
193.	7	That's false	MonPT	Achieving goal
194.	9	That's false	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
195.	7	Because she's 22	MC/DRcim	Drawing a conclusion
196.	8	OK	MC/DR	End of a unit of meaning
197.	7	and he's 14	MC/DRcim	Drawing a conclusion
198.	8	Maria and Guy	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
199.	7	[Are both	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
200.	8	Are] the	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
201.	7	Live with their mum, no	MC/DR + MC/DR	Paraphrasing text + Adjusting tentative interpretation
202.	9	No	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis invalid
203.	8	Are the same thing	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
204.	7	It's got something, no their dad, no their mum, it's got something to do with their mum, mère	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
205.	8	OK	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
206.	9	[Where was that bit, we saw même earlier,	$ActDiff_{glob}$ + MC/DR	Formulates a question + Explicitly looking for related words in text
207.	7	Ont la même mère] What does même mean ?	MC/DR + MonProb	Restating text + Unfamiliar terms in text
208.	9	We saw it before but I can't remember where it was, was it with, where was it ((shows sheet to 8))	$ActDiff_{glob}$	Pauses to scan for sources of difficulty
209.	8	Maybe it's like they've both	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
210.	9	[It's there it's there look ((points))	MC/DR	Explicitly looking for related words in text
211.	8	the same mum.] Oh yeah	MC/DR	Adjusting initial ideas based on new information
212.	7	Guy and Maria both have the same mum	MC/DRcim	Confirming an inference
213.	8	Was that ?	ActDiffwp	Use a dictionary

214.	R	Yeah, um, même can actually mean more than one thing. In Number 3 that you're looking at même does mean the same. When you saw it up in the text it means something different there		
215.	7	Yeah so Maria and Guy have the [same mum	MC/DR	Restating text
216.	9/8	OK OK]	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
217.	7	Is that true or false ?	ActDiff$_{glob}$	Formulates a question
218.	9	Well was it his sister or his half sister, (1) cause then * was it	ActDiff$_{glob}$	Formulates a question
219.	8	Um	MC/DR	Pausing to reflect
220.	9	Well he says that my dad has a s- a daughter [who is so	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
221.	8	Oh with another] ((shows sheet to 7))	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
222.	9	Well so they don't have the same mum do they ?	MC/DR$_{cim}$	Drawing a conclusion
223.	7	So that's faux	MonPT	Achieving goal
224.	8	Yeah [that's false	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
225.	7	Martin habite] chez Guy	MC/DR	Reading aloud
226.	9	So	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
227.	7	Martin lives with Guy	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
228.	9	Oh no, chez means * or maybe it doesn't there	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
229.	8	Where's Martin ?	ActDiff$_{glob}$	Formulates a question
230.	9	((points)) [Mon demi-frère Martin et moi	MC/DR	Reading aloud
231.	7	((points)) It mentions it up here] Martin et moi. Yeah it is	ActDiff$_{glob}$	Pauses to scan for sources of difficulty
232.	9	But that's just about his family it doesn't say	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis invalid
233.	7	Oh yeah	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
234.	9	Well does it say that [they *	ActDiff$_{glob}$	Formulates a question
235.	8	My half brother] Martin and	MC/DR	Restating text
236.	9	Me, well this is all about his family	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
237.	8	Ah chez nous, that'll be like we all live together	MC/DR + MC/DR	Adjusting initial ideas Based on new information + Tentative interpretation
238.	7	Well they wouldn't, why, oh what is that ?	Econt	Disapproval of arguments
239.	9	[((reads from text indistinctly))		
240.	7	That must be vrai then]	MonPT	Achieving goal
241.	8	OK true	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid

242.	7	Yeah	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
243.	9	Um	MC/DR	Pausing to reflect
244.	7	The baby [Chantal s'appelle Philippe	MC/DR + MC/DR	Paraphrasing text + Reading aloud
245.	9	Is called Philip]	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
246.	7	That's pas clair because it doesn't say	MC/Drcim + MonPT	Drawing a conclusion + Achieving a goal
247.	8	OK, um, where are we, number six	MonProb	Loss of concentration
248.	7	Yeah ((reads statement)) (4)	MC/DR	Reading aloud
249.	8	That means doesn't argue, doesn't it ?	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
250.	9	Um yeah, what does the souvent, pas souvent ?	MonProb	Unfamiliar terms in text
251.	8	We have had haven't we ?	MonTC	Relationship between own knowledge and text content
252.	9	Yes we know it	MonTC	Relationship between own knowledge and text content
253.	8	Is it often, often ?	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
254.	R	((nods))		
255.	9	Doesn't argue	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
256.	8	Guy doesn't argue very often	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
257.	7	True	MonPT	Achieving goal
258.	8	Does it say that ?	ActDiff$_{glob}$	Formulates a question
259.	7	Yeah	MC/DR	Maintaining an hypothesis
260.	8	OK that's true isn't it ?	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
261.	9	Where, does it say anywhere ?	ActDiff$_{glob}$	Formulates a question
262.	7	It doesn't say anything	MC/DR	Adjusting an interpretation
263.	9	So it's pas clair, we don't know	MC/DRcim	Drawing a conclusion
264.	7	No that means pas clair, [not that we don't know	MonProb	Disagreeing over nature of task
265.	9	Yeah but it's not clear]. ((to 8)) Yeah but it's not clear is it anywhere because it doesn't say	MC/DR	Maintaining an hypothesis
266.	8	It doesn't say but they all seem, he said they were happy didn't he ?	MC/DRcim	Drawing a conclusion
267.	7	Yeah	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
268.	8	OK	MC/DR	End of a unit of meaning
269.	7	((reads statement 7))	MC/DR	Reading aloud
270.	9	Um the parents prepare [dinner	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
271.	8	Dinner together] in the evening	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
272.	7	No it's not because the whole family helps out	MC/DRcim	Drawing a conclusion

273.	9	Yeah I think it's	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
274.	7	Yeah cause it says up here	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
275.	9	I think that's, I think that's faux because it seems. I think they seem to	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
276.	8	OK	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
277.	9	All help	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
278.	7	Yeah that's	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
279.	8	Faux	MonPT	Achieving goal
280.	7	Faux	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
281.	9	The family like to listen to [jazz music	MC/DR	Paraphrasing text
282.	7	Jazz music] It [doesn't say	MC/DRcim	Drawing a conclusion
283.	8	It doesn't say] that no	MC/DRcim	Drawing a conclusion
284.	9	So	MC/DR	Tentative interpretation
285.	8	Pas clair	MonPT	Achieving goal
286.	9	((nods))	MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid
287.	7	Pas clair. Finished then	MC/DR + MC/DR	Concluding previously stated hypothesis is valid + End of a unit of meaning

Appendix O - Group B1 Transcript

A True-False Task

1. 2 Here it says, my family is (-) very interesting
2. 3 And then it says my parents are, I think it's, divorced
3. 16 Yeah
4. 15 Yeah
5. 2 I think it's two years
6. 3 Yeah, something like that (1) and then it says with (2) I think they've both got partners, new partners or something (3) He's got (-), anyone know what donc means ? (2)
7. 2 No (2)
8. 3 What's that ?
9. R It's something like so or therefore, that kind of thing
10. 2 I think he's got some more brothers and sisters
11. 3 Yeah, step-brothers and sisters
12. 2 Yeah [and he's got
13. 3 My sister Natalie is] (2)
14. 2 He's got three, three [step-sisters
15. 3 Step-sisters]
16. 2/3 And two step-brothers
17. 2 ((to 16/15)) Are you going to speak ?
18. 16 * (1)
19. 2 My, em, he's, I have [fourteen
20. 15 Why don't you] just look at the first question and see whether it's true or not. What's the first thing mean ?
21. 3 All right, then
22. 2 All right. It's like his family - is he unique or not, so what does * mean ?
23. 3 So what it means is he hasn't got any brothers
24. 16 We did that in the lesson, but it didn't mean what we said, cause we all thought it meant unique, and it wasn't. What was it ?
25. 3 Only child
26. 2 Only child
27. 15 It's wrong because does that mean he's an only child and he's not, is he ?
28. 3 Well he is in a way because they're step-brothers and sisters
29. 15 They're not going to * are they
30. 3 Well he's got step-brothers and sisters
31. 15 ((pointing)) Yeah it says that he's an only child. It's saying that he's an only child there and it's false because he's not obviously because he's got (-) sisters and brothers
32. 16 Step-brothers
33. 3 Well he was originally an only child but he's got step-brothers
34. 15 Well he's not now is he ?
35. 16 He's not now
36. 2 No he wasn't because [he's had one sister
37. 16 Shut up !] Shut up !
38. 2 Right, er, Guy's
39. 3 My sister
40. 2 Are we still reading the question first ?
41. 15 No ?
42. 3 No because the next answer is in the next paragraph

43. 15 How do you know ?
44. 3 Because it says [Chantal there and Chantal in the question
45. 2 Yeah well they're]
46. 15 Well it might say Chantal somewhere else as well
47. 3 Is it how much, how old is Chantal ? Plus âgé
48. 2 Older than
49. 15 Does it mean Guy is older than Chantal, is that what it means ?
50. 3 Or Chantal's older than Guy
51. 15 Well is, no, the question is he older than [Chantal
52. 2 Yeah] which is false because it says that he's fourteen and she's, er, twenty [yeah, two
53. 3 Twenty two] So that's false, and then, then it says, she's got a baby I think (2) so it's definitely
54. 15 What's the, what's the next question ? (1)
55. 3 Who's Maria ? (3) My brother
56. 2 Is called Luke
57. 3 And he's (-) two
58. 2 What's, it says it says that his dad is called
59. 15 No, it's
60. 2 No that's his mother
61. 3 That's his brother Luke (-), mon frère (4)
62. 2 Maria is [his dad's new partner (2)
63. 3 He is] he is (2)
64. 15 What does that mean ?
65. 2 What's même ?
66. R Er, where it says elle-même, that means she herself (4)
67. 3 What's nouvelle ?
68. R It means new
69. 3 I think that says she's got a new, a new baby called Maria, because it says Maria et Guy
70. R Ah, when you asked for même, did you mean même in Question Three or même in the text where it says elle-même ?
71. 2 Même in Question Three
72. R Right, même in Question Three, sorry, that means the same. That word's a bit strange because it has more than one meaning, but in item three, Maria et Guy ont la même mère, même there means the same
73. 3 I think it means, did Maria [and Guy have the same mum
74. 15 Did Maria and Guy have the same mum]
75. 3 Which is false because it says he is his dad, I think
76. 2 Yeah, that's his new sister, Maria
77. 15 Come on, let's go on to the next one, Four
78. 2 Right, er, Martin lives
79. 16/3 Martin lives with Guy
80. 16 Oh yeah
81. 2 Martin lives with Guy
82. 3 That's in the next one
83. 2 Yeah, em, so we just carry on reading through the text (2) It says, j'ai, I have
84. 15 Yeah he does, look
85. 3 Yeah
86. 15 Yeah, that one's true - next one
87. 2 Em, is it .. ?
88. 15 Chantal's baby is called Philip or Philippe [or whatever

89. 3 Where, where are you going ?
90. 15 Question Five
91. 2 We're looking at the [questions
92. 3 You haven't] even read any of it
93. 15 So, I'm saying, is Chantal's baby called
94. 3 We haven't done Four yet
95. 15 Yeah we have, we've just done it, yeah we have
96. 16 Yeah we have
97. 15 We've just said that he lives with her, him
98. 2 Yeah, but who's the new baby called ?
99. 3 We haven't even read it , how do we know ?
100. 15 Well. We're trying to find
101. 2 It doesn't say anything
102. 3 You didn't give a reason, you just said straight away
103. 15 No, I said, (-) I just read the thing out, Chantal's baby is called [what it says
104. 2 Maria] It's Maria because it goes with petite
105. 15 So it's false then isn't it - number five is false
106. 2 No it's not
107. 15 Yes it is because it says down there
108. 2 Oh yeah
109. 16 Don't say Philip there does it ?
110. 2 Maria. Says la petite Maria (3) Question Six ?
111. 15 What does Question Six mean then ?
112. 2 I don't know (1) Something about Guy
113. 3 Something about arguments (1) dispute (30
114. 2 What does souvent mean ?
115. R Souvent means often
116. 2 [Oh yeah, disputes
117. 3 have arguments] (10)
118. 2 It doesn't say anything about (6). Yeah that's false because it doesn't tell you anything about that (1) disputes (3)
119. 3 What does, em (1) feuilletons mean ?
120. R Feuilletons is like soaps on television
121. 3 Right (2)
122. 15 We'll leave that one and go on to the next one (3)
123. 3 Says something about dinner. Nathalie fait, is that does ? (1) une salade (2)
124. 2 Says [something about the parents,
125. 3 have dinner in the garage]
126. 2 his parents prepare the dinner (1)
127. 3 Where does it say that ? (-) Oh yeah
128. 16 Seven
129. 2 Question Seven, [* has dinner
130. 3 Par exemple] tout le monde aide le soir quand on fait le dîner (1) What does that mean ? (1)
131. 2 I think it's talking, the next passage it says about, er (2) er, [the baby Maria
132. 3 I think it says] Maria
133. 2 sits somewhere
134. 3 has a place at the table (4)
135. 2 Who's Nathalie again ?

136. 3 I think Number [Seven's false
137. 2 His sister]
138. 16 Mm
139. 2 Says Nathalie makes the salad
140. 16 Nathalie's the sister
141. 2 Mm (2) so onto Question Eight (2). His family likes [listening to jazz music
142. 15 Doesn't say] Doesn't say anything about that
143. 3 Have you read it ?
144. 15 Yeah (11)
145. 2 Question Six. Says in the last bit something about, does compliquée mean complicated ?
146. R Mm hm
147. 2 So that could be, like, he gets a few disputes there, because it's like complicated with all his brothers and sisters
148. 3 Yeah (2)
149. 2 *
150. 16 Mm (3)
151. 2 So I'd say that was true (2)
152. 3 What about the dinner one ?
153. 2 * We've done it. It's false because the sister makes the salad
154. 3 Yeah but they don't just have salad for dinner, do they ?
155. 2 I know but
156. 3 Well then (3)
157. 16 Yeah but that's all it says
158. 3 No it says the music one (8) What about the last question ?
159. 15 Does it say anything about music in the whole thing ?
160. 2 Don't think so. Just says about television
161. 16 It doesn't
162. 15 so it's false
163. 2 False because the family likes TV

B Four Penfriends Task

1. 3 She says hello and then she says I go (2), then something about the library, (-) I go to
2. 2 Shall we start with, like, Sasha One and see if it's ?
3. 3 Just read it through because you'll be able to tell (3) rather than doing it over (1) and then she says (-) I go (2)
4. 15 Well read it to yourself and see what everyone thinks
5. 3 What does beaucoup mean ?
6. 16 Is it a lot ?
7. R Yes it is, that's right
8. 3 I do a lot (2) choses
9. 16 Chores ?
10. 3 May be
11. 16 No
12. 3 Comme sport
13. R Choses means things

14. 16 Oh
15. 3 I do a lot of things
16. 2 So it can't be, er
17. 3 And then she says, er, I am, sport teams, plays in sport teams (1) I, I adore by doing
18. 15 Thought you said that meant library
19. 3 Yeah I did
20. 15 Well, what's that mean then ? (3)
21. 3 * Fine, I just guessed. I don't know what it means, do I (4)
22. 2 What does FNAC mean ? Is that like a local library ?
23. R Er, FNAC is the name of a kind of a bookshop chain, so I suppose it's a bit like WH Smith would be, there's one in lots of big towns (4)
24. 3 J'adore faire du
25. 2 I don't think it could be Sasha Four, [the Maths freak
26. 3 Is patinage], is that painting or something ?
27. R No, patinage ? (-) It's ice-skating
28. 3 Right. I adore doing ice-skating
29. 15 I know who I think it is
30. 3 My favourite sport (3), I do with six, with six people (2), em, on fait (1), we do (2)
31. 2 Says she does something about music
32. 3 With a balloon (1) Ballon, (1) what's a ballon ?
33. R It's a ball
34. 3 I think that's probably something about gymnastics [* ball
35. 15 Who do you] think it is C. (student 16) ? I think it's Sasha One (3)
36. 2 Yeah, but the letters aren't [boring
37. 15 Or Sasha] Three
38. 3 Yeah
39. 2 Sasha Three, cause the letters aren't boring, cause it says that she, like, does lots
40. 15 Yeah but she goes over the same things over and over again and it does because that's what, if you said that that means library and she's said about it there as well
41. 3 But it probably doesn't [because they'd have one word
42. 15 She's repeated herself
43. 3 for library wouldn't they, not two ?
44. 15 So what does that mean then ?
45. 3 [I don't know
46. 2 Does libre] mean library ?
47. R Er, libre means free. What you've got there is temps libre [which means free time
48. 2 ((holding out task sheet)) So it's not talking] about the library is it. So it's [got to be Sasha Three
49. 15 Yeah, well there is] some things which are repeated
50. 3 But you should read it all the way through [before you start deciding
51. 15 Yeah, but there is] Shut up A (student three), there is some things that are repeated (1)
52. 3 But you always * You read about the first three lines and then you start deciding
53. 15 I've read it all (1)
54. 2 Says something about music. She does pop, likes pop music and classical music and she wants to be, [or she's got a

55. 3 She's got a disc]
56. 2 Compo-, compo- is that [a composer ?
57. 3 Avec] une sorte de disque (1)
58. 2 Is that composer ?
59. R Yes it is
60. 3 Je regarde la télévision - she watches tele (1)
61. 2 I think she's going to Russia
62. 3 le soir, in the evening, I have (1) être seule (1) je ne suis pas in the lounge with my family. She's saying something about she does something in the lounge with her family
63. 2 Could be Sasha One because it says about [music in the second paragraph and then
64. 3 What does quelque chose mean] ?
65. R Quelque chose means something
66. 3 I listen (1) to something (3) and [I play
67. 2 Could be Sasha One]
68. 3 Is that the computer ?
69. 15 Sasha Three
70. 2 Could be Sasha One because, because she's talking about music in paragraph two [and then
71. 3 Where, where's she]
72. 2 She's talking about disque de music piano
73. 3 Where does it say that ? (1)
74. 2 In paragraph three
75. 3 Yeah, but disque [could be CD ROMs
76. 15 ((whispered to student 16)) *
77. 3 It says the grand library, with livres, books, the disques et les CD ROMs. It's not music, is it, it's computers (1)
78. 2 Mm. (1) It can't be Sasha Two, can't be Sasha Four
79. 15 It's Sasha Three
80. 3 Yeah, it probably is Sasha Three
81. R So what reasons are you giving for it being Sasha Three ?
82. 3 She, she, she fairly, she talks just like
83. 15 Well she's not telling loads of lies is she ?
84. 2 She's not a Maths freak [and writing in puzzles
85. 15 No, or we wouldn't be able to] understand what she [was saying
86. 3 It's a fairly] ordinary letter
87. 2 Sasha One, she's
88. 3 Actually it could be Sasha One, because, em, she doesn't talk about, em, like if she's got any brothers or sisters, or what her parents are like. All she talks about is what she does in her spare time (2)
89. 2 Is this another letter from, like, (1) the letter that we were reading, like, in part one ?
90. 3 The last, last one ?
91. 2 Is this, like, an advance on the letter ?
92. R Er, well, not necessarily because if it were a different person, for example, then it wouldn't be, would it ? So
93. 3 The last one actually talked about her brothers, talked about herself and her brothers and sisters really, but all she talks about is
94. 15 Well they obviously don't come first - she obviously thinks of herself first if that's all she can write about - she's writing all about herself and then her brothers and sisters are last

95.	3	Right * maybe she hasn't got any brothers or sisters, but
96.	16	Maybe she doesn't like them
97.	3	She could perhaps talk about her parents. I think it's [Sasha One
98.	2	But you'd just say] Oh I've got some brothers and sisters
99.	16	But I don't like them
100.	2	You wouldn't say what they like, [things or anything. You'd just say you'd got brothers and sisters
101.	3	Because she does repeat herself quite a lot - it's a pretty boring letter. It's not exactly exciting, is it] ?
102.	15	Sasha One then
103.	3	Yeah Sasha One I'd say
104.	16	Yeah
105.	R	So we're going for One now are we ?
106.	All	Yeah
107.	R	Just, what about the opinions thing ? Did you spot some of the opinions that she's giving there ? If you did, do you agree with those opinions or not ? What sort of opinions is she giving ?
108.	2	Well, there's the one about the music, she likes the music
109.	3	She likes television, she watches television (1)
110.	2	Something about being on her own. Seule. [J'aime bien être seule
111.	3	*] (2)
112.	15	She's boring
113.	3	She likes Tchaikovsky
114.	2	I think it's Sasha Three
115.	3	One
116.	15	One
117.	3	One
118.	15	One
119.	R	If you disagree it doesn't matter, because obviously the idea is not That you force everyone to think the same thing (2) Anything else is there, any other opinions ?
120.	2	She likes sport quite a lot
121.	16	She likes being on her own at night
122.	3	*
123.	16	That's why I think so - she's just boring
124.	2	I think it's Sasha Three. She's not writing about the same stuff over and over again
125.	15	So which one is it ?
126.	R	I can't tell you yet, because other groups are coming to do it
127.	15	So we say One, T (student two) says Three.

Appendix P - The foreign language reading process - what have we learned ?

1. **Knowledge of language is important** - this may be obvious but it is important to remember. The more words you already know, the easier it will be to read. Reading effectively also means reading quite quickly so if you can recognise all the familiar words straight away you will feel a lot more confident about longer texts.
   The types of words least well known at KS3 are probably verbs - this shows that knowing some elements of grammar might be especially important for reading.
   BUT we should remember that one way of learning words is by reading, so if we don't read because we don't know many words, then we won't be able to read any better for a longer time.
   If we make the initial effort to read despite the difficulty we will learn more language and reading will then itself become easier.
   And then you can try even harder texts !

2. **There is no single right way to read**, but we can make comments about certain approaches:
   - We can contrast 3 major approaches
     - I reading the whole text and then doing the task
     - II reading the text and looking for any task responses as you do, eg a paragraph at a time
     - III working from the task, and using the text to get your answers

   - I ways of reading the whole text first include ...
     - A *reading it all through silently*: this is a good method if you know the vocabulary in the text quite well and can guess some of the unfamiliar words. One of the important skills to develop is to build up the meaning as you read. This means reading quite quickly but still understanding the majority of what you are reading. If you find this difficult then silent reading is probably not going to help - because part of a way to build up your understanding might be to say out loud what you think the text means
     - B *reading it aloud in French*: if you are an auditory learner, ie you learn best by listening to things, then reading aloud in French might help you recognise the words. You might not remember them by the way they look but then recognise them as you pronounce them. Again you need to be able to read quite quickly to get the overall meaning or you will forget what has gone before. Sometimes we can read things aloud (in any language) but not really take in the meaning as we go through a text. This then becomes a waste of time !
     - C *reading it aloud and translating it as you go*: for some learners this is the best of both worlds because you are reading it aloud (and getting help from the sounds) but also making sense of the text by saying it in English. This forces you to make decisions about more difficult sections rather than just skip over them in your head
     - D *translating it directly into English*: if you don't gain anything by reading the text aloud in French, then just putting it into English has the same benefits as method C

Is method **I** a good approach ?
Yes if you want to get the most out of doing the reading activity. Making sense of the whole text gives you extra practice of vocabulary, grammar, sentence structure and takes away some of the fear of reading longer texts in French. It also forces you into trying to decide the meanings of some new words.
The more you read connected text, the more you will be able to write more complicated sentences in French too, because you will have seen more examples of the way the language works.
When you come to the task you should be quicker as you should be able to find the answers immediately.
Any disadvantages ?
It probably takes longer, but your task score may well be higher and you will learn more.

- **II** ways of reading the text and looking for any task responses as you do, eg a paragraph at a time include ...
  - **E** *reading the section through silently, then checking the first task questions*
  - **F** *reading the section aloud in French, then checking the first task questions*
  - **G** *reading the section aloud and translating it as you go, then checking the first task questions*
  - **H** *translating the section directly into English, then checking the first task questions*

  All of the four ways, E-H, of Method **II** have the same advantages and disadvantages of A-D. Some readers would say that it is more manageable to do some text and some of the task at the same time as there is more chance that you will understand and remember relevant detail. Each piece of reading then links in to some questions. You may be able to work like this:
  - read a section
  - look at some questions
  - look for the answers and as part of that ...
  - re-read the section (it should make better sense now that you know what you are looking for)

- **III** ways of working from the task, and using the text to get your answers include ...
  - **J** trying to answer each task question by itself by looking through the text: this emphasises:
    the task rather than the text
    the process of completing the exercise ie a problem-solving task rather than the process of reading.
    You will know what you are looking for in the text and your reading is then very specific.
  - **K** looking at *all* of the task questions first and then trying to find the answers

Method **III** was preferred for the *True/False/Impossible to Say* task by about half of you in the study. All of these opted for J rather than K.
The advantages are that your reading is primed (ie you know what you are looking for) by the task questions and this can help you make more sense of the text. Sometimes this helps you to make sense of more difficult sentences because you narrow down what they could mean by thinking about the question. You may also finish the task sooner.
The disadvantage is that you will have less overall understanding of the text and you may not learn as much new language. There are also some pitfalls with this method which you can find out about under section 4.

3. When we meet unknown words we can …

- Look to see if they are like an English word, and then think if that would make sense
- Look to see if they are like another French word we already know and then think if that would make sense
- Try to work out whether the word is a noun (name of person / object) adjective or adverb (describing something or how something happens) or a verb (action) and then think what kind of meaning would make sense in that sentence
- Look at the words before and after the word and try to see if there are clues about the meaning
- Keep reading to see if something else gives a clue
- Re-read the last section to see if it gets clearer
- Use anything you know about the subject of the text to help you make a sensible guess
- Look it up in a dictionary - look at the range of meanings offered there and choose the best fit

In other words thinking about word meanings is very important. We can always simply go to the last step and use a dictionary, but there are two problems associated with this - It slows us up and takes our attention away from the page so we will have more difficulty remembering the overall meaning of what we are reading. It also appears that we remember better the new words we have worked out for ourselves than the ones we have looked up in a dictionary

4. We should <u>avoid</u> …

- Thinking that a word which looks the same as English is *always* the same. Generally it is but one good example is *travaille* which means *work* not *travels* in French. This caused quite a few problems in the True/False task we did last Autumn. It's a good idea to try out the word by saying the sentence aloud and thinking about whether it really makes sense.
- Deciding true/false statements just by looking for matches between the statement and the text. Sometimes this is one way to decide if a statement is true but we need to review all of the evidence. This includes the small words as well as the big ones, eg either the statement or the text might have a negative (ne ….. pas) so although the two look as if they are parallel they actually mean the opposite.

- Thinking that the subjects (people doing actions) are always the same in the task questions and the text - sometimes the *I* of a text and the *he / she* of the task questions are the same person, but sometimes they are not.
- Getting too worried about the beginning of a text if it seems very difficult. Sometimes the introductions are the hardest sections.

5. **We should <u>try to</u> …**
   - Integrate text. This means that when we work out what something means we should think as well about how that fits in with the section which came before. If we keep doing this we build up a picture of the whole text.
   - Say out loud what we think the text means and what more difficult words may mean. In fact the more we think about working out the meaning of the text and the answers (probably out loud is the best way of doing this), the more we will remember of what we are reading.
   - Re-read some sections. This may be that as we read and we find we are not sure, we immediately go back and re-read to see if we get a better idea.
     But it can also mean that as we get further on in the text we read something and then wonder if we were right about an earlier section. At that point it's worth going back for another look
   - Ask ourselves the question, *I wonder what* or *I wonder if.* In other words try to make predictions about what might be coming.

6. **When we read by ourselves we can best organise ourselves by …**
   - Looking at a title or the first sentence, then pausing and thinking what the whole text might be about
   - Remembering that if the first 1 or 2 sentences are very difficult, we can look ahead to see if it gets easier
   - Deciding whether we are going to read the whole text or look at sections and task questions together
   - Following the advice in section 3 of this sheet about unknown words
   - Trying to use the expression *it might mean ….* As often as we can (very few people did this !)
     (This is because it helps you to think of lots of possibilities)
   - Saying what we do know out loud

7. **When we read in a group we can best organise ourselves by …**
   - Following all 6 points in section 6 ! PLUS
   - Discussing as a group the best way of approaching the text and task
   - Agreeing that we will give reasons for our thoughts / ideas about the text and task
   - Checking to see if others in the group agree before moving on
   - Asking each other what words might mean
   - Referring back to what others said and trying to integrate meaning (see section 5, point 1)

PS Thanks to everyone in 9K who took part !

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
NOTTINGHAM