

classroom interaction. *CELA Report Series 2.40*. Albany, NY: National Research Center on English Learning and Achievement.

This report provides a useful discussion on the benefits and potential drawbacks of the various methods such as field notes, videotapes, and audiotapes used to study classroom discourse and learning. Based on a view of language learning as a dynamic and socially grounded practice, the discussion includes descriptions of actual data collection procedures used in a study of interaction in a senior-level physics class to illustrate the advantages and disadvantages to using different methodologies. The researchers argue, for example, that using two cameras allows for the best access to the classroom's communicative events, including both verbal and nonverbal exchanges between teacher and students. Although the focus of the study used to illustrate the various points made in the report is not on language learning per se, the discussion of the different methods for collecting interaction data is useful.

Gee, J., & Green, J. (1998) Discourse analysis, learning, and social practice: A methodological study. *Review of Educational Research*, 23, 119–169.

The authors present a conceptual and methodological framework for the investigation of learning in social settings. Emphasizing the relationship between theory and method in research design, their approach is a combination of various discourse analytic and ethnographic perspectives. The first part of the article describes the socioculturally-based theoretical perspectives on language and discourse on which the framework is based. The second part is an application of the proposed framework. Samples of actual classroom discourse are provided to illustrate the need for different analytic approaches to study the dynamics of moment-to-moment interaction and to link the complex patterns of language use that build up over time to actual learning. The paper concludes with suggestions for future research on learning in social settings.

Hall, J. K., & Verplaetse, L. S. (Eds.). (2000). *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

This collection of studies on classroom interaction and second and foreign language learning emphasizes particular aspects of interactive environments that promote language learning. While there is variation among the studies in terms of the learning context and issues addressed, they each share certain elements. For example, each provides evidence that supports a sociocultural perspective on language development. In addition, each breaks from traditional studies of second language acquisition in that ethnographic and discourse analytic methods are used to

investigate the dynamic, moment-to-moment interactions characteristic of classroom talk. Findings show that certain interaction patterns used by teachers and certain interaction exchanges between classroom participants can foster the construction of a collaborative classroom community and simultaneously promote language learning. The volume concludes with a discussion of future research possibilities and suggestions for organizing instruction in order to optimize meaningful language learning opportunities in both second and foreign language classrooms.

Hellerman, J., Cole, K., & Zuengler, J. (2001). Developing thinking communities through talk: Two case studies from science class. *CELA Research Report Series 14001*. Albany, NY: National Research Center on English Learning and Achievement.

This study looks at the interaction of two linguistically and culturally diverse high school science classrooms. While not concerned specifically with language classrooms, it is included here because the researchers' analytic focus on particular linguistic means used by teachers to socialize students into particular kinds of learning communities during interaction and their attempts to connect these uses of language to the teachers' pedagogical philosophies are useful additions to research on teacher-student interaction. In their analysis of audio- and videotaped data collected from one classroom over a five-year period, the researchers found that the teacher consistently used the first-person singular pronoun 'I' when introducing conceptual information. She also used the pronouns 'you' and 'we/us' but for different purposes. The first-person plural was used when the teacher wanted to point out student deficiencies or weaknesses and change their behavior or thinking. The second-person singular and plural pronouns were used to distinguish student responsibility for learning from the teacher's for teaching as in T: "You're adult now, you decide where the voids are." (p. 9). The authors argue that the teacher's distinctive use of these pronouns over time served to socialize the students into particular understandings of the role of the teacher and their role as students. The findings point to the significant role that teacher actions and beliefs play in socializing students into particular communities of learners.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 453-483.

In this article, Kumaravadivelu offers a framework for conducting what he terms *critical classroom discourse analysis* (CCDA). He begins by reviewing two approaches commonly used to analyze classroom interaction in L2 classrooms, the interaction approach and the discourse approach.

While both approaches have provided useful insights into classroom learning, the author argues that their limited focus has produced “only a fragmented picture of classroom reality” (p. 456). To construct his framework, he draws on ideas and concepts from two current schools of thought, Foucauldian poststructuralism and Saidian postcolonialism, and from educational applications of this work. These ideas are then integrated into a three-dimensional perspective on discourse: the sociolinguistic, the sociocultural, and the sociopolitical, which he uses to review some recent classroom studies that provide “glimpses of the possibilities and potential of CCDA” (p. 472). He concludes with suggestions for conducting critical discourse analysis and a list of research questions for further explorations into classroom-based L2 learning.

Rojas-Drummond, S. (2000). Guided participation, discourse and the construction of knowledge in Mexican classrooms. In H. Cowie & G. van der Aalsvoort (Eds.), *Social interaction in learning and instruction: The meaning of discourse for the construction of knowledge* (pp. 193–213). Amsterdam: Pergamon.

Although the research reported on here is concerned with interaction and learning in math classrooms, the methodologies used to analyze the data in addition to the findings have something to offer those interested in documenting links between interaction and language learning. Rojas-Drummond and her colleagues investigated the particular discursive strategies teachers used to guide students’ participation in instructional activities and then compared the use of these patterns across classrooms. Standard discourse analytic methods were used to examine their transcriptions of videotaped data. The interactions were examined on three levels and then characterized according to five dimensions describing the teaching-learning process. Once they characterized the classrooms, Rojas-Drummond and her colleagues compared students’ performance from two fairly different learning environments, as defined by the typical patterns of teacher-student interaction, on two dynamic assessment arithmetic tests. They found that those in a classroom typified by an inquiry-based IRF outperformed their peers whose classroom interactions were dominated by the IRE recitation script. Teacher actions in the higher performing classroom that were found to differ significantly from the other group included using complex actions in the third part of the IRF that affirmed student responses, probed students’ understandings, elicited student elaborations, and modeled desired actions, strategies and outcomes. The framework outlined in Table 1 (pp. 198–199) detailing particular teacher and student behaviors indicative of each teaching-learning dimension could be usefully employed in research on interaction found other kinds of classrooms.

Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Toward a sociocultural practice and theory of education*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

*Dialogic Inquiry* is a three-part analysis of sociocultural theory and practice in the classroom. Wells first compares the theoretical insights of Vygotsky and M. A. K Halliday on language learning and development. Despite their different orientations, Wells finds them compatible; both, for example, believe that language development is a process of making meaning with others. Wells builds upon these ideas in the construction of a conceptual framework for understanding the role of discourse in learning. In the second part of the book, Wells gives examples from classroom interaction to illustrate the co-construction of knowledge among teacher and students and the functions that different dialogic exchanges serve in the process. A case study is included as an example of a collaborative community in which scaffolding is an important part of knowledge building. In the third part of the book, Wells discusses the importance of the zone of proximal development (ZPD) using examples taken from his own research on classroom interaction.

## OTHER REFERENCES

- Barnes, D. (1992). *From communication to curriculum*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Berman, R., & Slobin, D. (1994). *Relating events in narratives: A crosslinguistic developmental study*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Boxer, D., & Cortés-Conde, F. (2000). Identity and ideology: Culture and pragmatics in content-based ESL. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 203–220). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Boyd, M., & Maloof, V. M. (2000). How teachers can build upon student-proposed intertextual links to facilitate student talk in the ESL classroom. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 163–182). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Cole, M. (1996). *Cultural psychology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Consolo, D. (2000). Teachers' action and student oral participation in classroom interaction. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 91–108). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Duff, P. (2000). Repetition in foreign language classroom interaction. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction*. (pp. 109–138). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gergen, K. J. (1994). *Reality and relationships: Soundings in social construction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gutierrez, K. (1994). How talk, context, and script shape contexts for learning: A cross-case comparison of journal sharing. *Linguistics and Education*, 5, 335–365.
- Hall, J. K. (1998). Differential teacher attention to student utterances: The construction of different opportunities for learning in the IRF. *Linguistics and Education*, 9, 287–311.
- Johnston, P., Woodside-Jiron, H., & Day, J. (2000). Teaching and learning literate epistemologies. *CELA Research Report Series 13009*. Albany, NY: National Research Center on English Learning and Achievement.
- Lemke, J. L. (1990). *Talking science: Language, learning and values*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.
- Lin, A. (1999a). Doing-English-Lessons in the reproduction or transformation of social worlds? *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 393–412.
- Lin, A. (1999b). Resistance and creativity in English reading lessons in Hong Kong. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 12, 285–296.
- Lin, A. (2000). Lively children trapped in an island of disadvantage: Verbal play of Cantonese working-class schoolboys in Hong Kong. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 143, 63–83.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nassaji, H., & Wells, G. (2000). What's the use of 'triadic dialogue'? An investigation of teacher-student interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 21, 376–406.
- Ninio, A., & Snow, C. (1996). *Pragmatic development*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Nystrand, M. (1997). Dialogic instruction: When recitation becomes conversation. In M. Nystrand, A. Gamoran, R. Kachur, & C. Prendergast (Eds.), *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language learning and teaching in the English classroom* (pp. 1–29). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Nystrand, M., & Gamoran, A. (1997). The big picture: Language and learning in hundreds of English lessons. In M. Nystrand, A. Gamoran, R. Kachur, & C. Prendergast (Eds.), *Opening dialogue* (pp. 30–74). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Reed, E. (1996). *Encountering the world: Toward an ecological psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Rex, L. (1997). *Making a case: A study of the classroom construction of academic literacy*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Rex, L., Green, J., & Dixon, C. (1997). Making a case from evidence: Constructing opportunities for learning academic literacy practices. *Interpretations*, 30(2), 78–104.
- Rex, L., & McEachen, D. (1999). “If anything is odd, inappropriate, confusing, or boring, it’s probably important”: The emergence of inclusive academic literacy through English classroom discourse practices. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 34, 65–127.
- Schieffelin, B., & Ochs, E. (1986). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 15, 163–191.
- Shotter, J. (1996). Living in a Wittgensteinian world: Beyond theory to a poetics of practices. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 26, 292–311.
- Shotter, J. (1997). Dialogical realities: The ordinary, the everyday and other strange new worlds. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 27, 245–357.
- Sullivan, P. (2000). Spoken artistry: Performance in a foreign language classroom. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 73–90). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tomasello, M. (1999). *The cultural origins of human mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wells, G. (1993). Reevaluating the IRF sequence: A proposal for the articulation of theories of activity and discourse for the analysis of teaching and learning in the classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 5, 1–17.
- Wertsch, J. (1991). *Voices of the mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wertsch, J. (1994). The primacy of mediated action in sociocultural studies. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 1, 202–208.
- Wong Fillmore, L., Ammon, P., McLaughlin, B., & Ammon, M. S. (1985). *Final report for learning English through bilingual instruction*. Berkeley, CA: University of California at Berkeley.