

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

USING QUESTIONING TO IMPROVE CLASSROOM PARTICIPATION IN THE FOREIGN
LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

ANNE LAWRENSON
SPRING 2015

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for a baccalaureate degree in World Languages Education
with honors in World Languages Education

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Matthew E. Poehner
Associate Professor of World Language Education and Applied Linguistics
Thesis Supervisor

Megan Hopkins
Assistant Professor of Education
Faculty Reader

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research project was to examine my own teaching and what I could do to increase student participation among my third year French students. While student teaching at an urban high school in central Pennsylvania, I realized that my students were hesitant to orally participate in class, so I began to look at how the questions I asked in my lessons affected their interactions in class. I looked at two types of interactional patterns typically found in world language classrooms, IRF, its variant IRE, and Instructional Conversations. I tracked student oral participation in French by collecting data when students spoke in French. I also recorded four lessons and examined the types of questions I typically asked, and how the different types of questions were related to student participation, in the classroom.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	V
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Literature Review	5
Chapter 3 Methods	12
Chapter 4 Results	17
Chapter 5 Discussion and conclusion	26
Appendix A.....	30
Participation Charts.....	30
Appendix B Transcripts of selected videos	45
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	58

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Participation Record	17
Table 2: Average Points	19
Table 3: Questions Pre-Intervention	20
Table 4: Questioning Post Intervention	21

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my mentor teacher, Olivia Quynn for welcoming me into her classroom, and also for her willingness to let me try new techniques while I was teaching. I would also like to thank her French three students who accepted the changes, and any bumps along the way with patience and flexibility. I would also like to thank my advisor Matthew Poehner for his feedback and for working with my constricted time schedule. I would like to thank my thesis reader Megan Hopkins for providing insightful feedback as well. Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for their support through this process.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Although participation is essential in almost all classroom contexts to support student learning, getting students to participate can sometimes be a struggle. Classroom participation comes in various modes, whether the students are participating by taking notes, completing written activities or engaging in conversation with the teacher or students. Especially in a world language classroom, where the students are often intimidated by their inability to fluently communicate in the target language, many students are hesitant to orally participate in the classroom. Increasing student participation benefits the students because they are able to gain ownership of the language by being able to produce more of it, and to produce it more fluidly, as well as being better able to communicate their thoughts and feelings to the class.

Upon starting student teaching in a French classroom at an urban high school in central Pennsylvania, I realized that my third year French students often did not voluntarily participate in the classroom, both when the regular teacher and I taught. Overall, the students were very hesitant to speak in French, even when directly asked a question or told to work with partners. The students often reverted back to English, even if they were taught how to respond in French. This was frustrating to both the students and to me, as I needed the students to participate to move through the activities in the lesson, while the students were frustrated that they did not feel they could meet the demands of activities.

I taught three periods of third year French students, with an average of 17 students in each class, and noticed that this was a problem for each period. This ruled out that the lack of

participation was specific to an individual group of students. In each period, there were dramatic differences in students' comfort with French, with some students capable of engaging in more difficult tasks and activities, and others struggling with not having as solid of a foundation in the language as some of their classmates.

Knowing that orally participating is essential in world language classrooms, I decided to look at how my own teaching promoted or did not promote participation in the class. The main research questions that motivated my research project were:

1. How can I encourage increased participation in upper level French classes, specifically level 3, and
2. How are different methods for encouraging participation related to students' frequency and modes of participating in my specific context?

To address these research questions, I explored several methods of encouraging participation. One method was to explore how my own teaching influenced the level of participation in the classroom. Specifically, I looked at the types of questions I asked and how often I asked those questions, and if and how these questions supported student participation in class. I also explored how a change in participation policy would encourage participation. With the cooperation of my mentor teacher, I changed the participation policy within the French 3 classes so that students' participation points were based on the number of times that they participated in the classroom, in French during the 50 minute period. Previously, the students received two participation points per day by attending class. If a student was absent, he or she would lose those points, but could make them up for full credit if they completed make up work. One concern before implementing the new policy was how to record student participation for

days that did not allow for the needed amount of oral participation. In talking with my mentor, we agreed that other forms of participation would still be valued by giving the students two points during these lessons if they were appropriately participating. Because it was impossible for the focus of every lesson to be on speaking, , if the students were participating in other manners, such as taking notes, reading articles, working individually on papers, or working on projects in groups, the students earned two points for participating in the manner that was appropriate to the lesson. This allowed me to value other forms of participation, outside of oral participation, while still requiring that the students speak during class. Oftentimes non-oral participation was given a separate grade if the students were working to complete something that could be handed in and graded.

Changing the policy held the students accountable for their participation by having their participation, or lack there of, affect their grade in the class, but it also held me accountable as well, because I had to be sure that I was offering ample opportunities for the students to earn their participation points during each class. Apart from changing the participation policy, I researched the types of questions typically asked in a world language classroom, and video taped my lessons so that I would be able to analyze the types of questions I ask while teaching, and what types of questions the students typically respond to. I also researched motivational factors for class participation to see how my interventions and classroom environment could have an effect on the participation in the classroom. I did this by asking the students questions on a variety of subjects throughout each lesson, trying to ask enough questions so that each student had the opportunity to respond twice in class. To do this, I often asked questions that had multiple potential answers, giving several students the chance to respond to the question. I also included oral reading of short passages, discussing how their weekends were, and going over

homework, among other opportunities, as acceptable participation modes. Because one of my goals was to have the students speaking during each lesson, stopping to ask questions did not disrupt the flow of the class, as time was already built in to allow for students to respond to those questions. I marked down each time the students orally participated in French so that I would have a running count of how many students were participating and how often they participated during a lesson. To help further encourage participation from students, I implemented French Fridays, where students were required to speak only in French for the entire period. On all other days the students were allowed to speak English as needed, although their participation points were dependent on when they participated by speaking in French.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

In this chapter, I will review the literature related to what constitutes participation in the classroom, and then I will describe the three most commonly used interactional patterns in the world language classroom. I chose to focus specifically on oral participation, because that was the aspect of participation that my students were struggling with. The students could read and write in French, and had no problem participating for those types of activities, but when asked to speak in French, they would not participate. I chose to look at interaction patterns to see how the questions I asked in class affected the students' ability to participate. I recorded the number of times that the students participated partly as a way to see who was speaking in class, but also as a visual reminder to the students that they were expected to orally participate, in French, each class period. I did not look broadly at participation because I wanted to focus specifically on the area where my students were struggling the most.

Before looking at why students participate, it is important to understand what participation looks like. Students can participate in multiple ways in the classroom (Corso, 2013). To engage the students, the teacher must tap into the beliefs and thoughts of his or her students, as well as making sure that the material relates to their lives. Oral participation is a critical aspect of any good world language classroom because it allows the students to communicate with one another and gives them the real world skills of communicating with speakers of the target language in a variety of contexts (Hall, 2001). Knowing that students need to be engaged in the lesson in order to participate, teachers need to be constantly thinking about

how they can encourage and increase engagement (Corso, 2013). While there is a risk in counting the number of times the students orally participate, as speaking does not automatically mean that the student is engaged, planning activities that allow the students to express their opinions and understanding of the material helps to relate the material back to the students' lives. To do this, it is suggested that the teacher make connections between the material and students' lives. In a classroom where the teacher does highly support the students' efforts to use the target language and creates a positive and safe classroom environment, there are often still students who choose not to participate in the class. This could be because another important motivating factor in encouraging oral participation is if the students can see a connection to their personal lives (Chuska, 1995). The students have to decide if the question is important enough to think about and answer, so they are more likely to respond when the questions relate to their own lives, or when they can see the application of the task in the future in their lives.

An important aspect of increasing student participation is understanding why students choose to participate in class. In his book *Improving Classroom Questions*, Kenneth Chuska (1995) states that there are a number of motivational factors that encourage students to participate in the classroom after the teacher has asked a question. One of the most important is whether or not the student feels safe and comfortable in the classroom environment (Chuska, 1995). If they have had positive experiences in the classroom, where the teacher supports and accepts wrong answers and works to correct them with the student, the students will be more likely to answer the teacher's questions. The opposite is true for students who have seen a classmate put down or made fun of by the teacher or another student for giving an incorrect answer (Chuska, 1995; Tepfenhart, 2011). The assurance that they are safe to respond incorrectly is important when answering recall questions, but it is also very important when answering

higher-level questions, as they often involve sharing opinions. This is particularly important for oral participation, as students are often intimidated by their non-native sounding accents and are afraid of being embarrassed amongst their peers.

There are a few general things that a teacher can do to increase overall oral participation in the classroom that are not specific to any questioning strategy. The teacher's own enthusiasm for the subject matter can do a lot to increase the students' participation because they will see that the material can be fun, even if the teacher is faking that enthusiasm a little (Chuska, 2013). Apart from enthusiasm, teachers can also increase overall participation by scaffolding activities so that the students have a high rate of success in completing them. By seeing that they have the knowledge base, at least when the teacher scaffolds the activities, the students might be more likely to participate in later lessons, because they have a history of success in the classroom.

There are three main types of interactional patterns, Initiation-Response-Evaluation, or IRE, Initiation-Response-Feedback, or IRF, and Instructional Conversations, or ICs. Initiation-Response-Evaluation, or IRE, questions are generally fairly scripted, with the teacher knowing the answer that the student should be able to produce (Hall, 2001). Generally the student says one or two words in response to the teacher's question, and the teacher gives them a one or two word evaluation of the response, typically telling them whether or not they produced the response that the teacher was looking for (Hall, 2001). This type of questioning is widely used in education systems that based on a Western European model, and typically give the teacher the majority of the control over student participation, rather than allowing students to supply an equal part of the conversation. Many educators have been critical of this type of questioning strategy because it does not often allow for complex communication, as the teacher effectively stops the communication in the exchange by telling the class whether or not the correct answer

has been given (Hall, 2001). If the correct answer has been found, the students typically have nothing more that they can offer in the exchange (Tepfenhart, 2011). Typically if students are only exposed to IRE questioning models, the students do not have the opportunity to participate often in the classroom, as the teacher is often the one in charge of the direction of the conversation, and says whether the response is correct or not (Todhunter, 2007).

Initiation-Response-Feedback, or IRF, questioning is similar to IRE, in that the teacher is initiating the discussion by asking a question, and the students are expected to provide a response to that question. For the initiation phase of the questioning structure, the teacher can give information, give a direction or ask a question, while the student responds in a way appropriate to the initiation, whether that is responding individually or as a class (Abd-Kadir, 2007). The teacher then has to decide how he or she will respond to that question, which allows for variance in the model (Abd-Kadir, 2007). According to Tony Wright in his book, *Classroom Management in Language Education*, IRF is the “default” for most educators, and was traditionally called the “teaching cycle” (2005). This questioning method is typically more flexible than IRE because the teacher can ask recall questions or questions that encourage students to think a little more deeply to come up with a response (Wright, 2005). One way for a teacher to do this is to try to incorporate student responses into the feedback that the teacher gives (Abd-Kadir, 2007). In order to promote deeper-level thinking, the teacher can ask genuine questions based on the responses given by the students, rather than having already prepared general feedback to the student responses (Abd-Kadir, 2007). In doing this, the teacher is also communicating to the students that he or she believes that they have a voice in the class, and that their opinions are valid. It also helps to make the questioning interaction a little more conversational, rather than asking rapid-fire questions that do not allow for elaboration (Abd-Kadir, 2007). Although not

seen as often with this method, students can also occasionally be the ones to initiate the questions, turning the traditional format on its head. Although students can initiate the questioning, this is done rarely, and the teacher is typically in control of the direction of the questions. Researchers have been conflicted about the usefulness of this questioning method, saying that it can minimize student learning and participation by cutting off the flow of the conversation, and can lead to a lack of learning (Ngwaru, 2011). Others say that there is potential in the questioning method if the teacher relates their questions to the student's lives (Ngwaru, 2011), and if they use the follow up portion of the method to initiate further discussion through conversation and initiate higher-order thinking (Abd-Kadir, 2007).

The final type of questioning usually used in world language classes is Instructional Conversations, or ICs. Instructional Conversations are the least often used type of questioning in the classroom. In Susan Todhunter's research, she defines an Instructional Conversation as a conversation that takes at least three turns in the conversation, and in which the teacher is asking questions that he or she does not have a set right answer to (Todhunter, 2007). Instructional Conversations are versatile, but are often found in activities that do not include direct instruction, such as discussion before planned activities, and during transitions from one activity to another. They can also be used as a means of instruction, and as a means of classroom management. As the name suggests, Instructional Conversations are open-ended conversations about a topic typically chosen by the teacher (Todhunter, 2007). Because the conversations are fairly spontaneous, the teacher does not necessarily know ahead of time which direction the conversation might take. The teacher leads and facilitates the discussion, but the students are responsible for what exactly is discussed and what conclusions can be drawn from the discussion.

Instructional Conversations are typically used as a means of producing and promoting realistic and authentic language in the classroom, much as one might use when visiting a country where the target language is spoken, or in a way that might be more typical of native speakers (Hall, 2001; Todhunter, 2007). Instructional Conversations can also be used as a way of relating the language back to the students' personal lives, and as a means of getting to know the students better (Hall, 2001).

Instructional Conversations are in direct contrast to IRE and IRF, as the student has much more control over the material learned, rather than the teacher, and the teacher acts to engage the students in a conversation, rather than participating in the exchange with a few word indicating whether or not the student came to the same conclusion as the teacher. Because the students are more active participants in the conversation, the students are required to think more critically than they might be when using other forms of questioning (Hall, 2001).

Unlike IRE and IRF, which are typically done as a whole class, Instructional Conversations can be done as a whole class discussion or when the students are working in small groups (Todhunter, 2007). However, the teacher has to be careful in using this questioning method, as it does involve having the students produce more language and share their opinions, which can be significantly more demanding and socially risky than answering a IRE or IRF question. It is suggested that the questions asked during ICs are familiar to the students and offer support (Todhunter, 2007). Because of the nature of ICs, the teacher has to have a high level of proficiency in the target language, and a strong desire to use the language in the classroom. He or she must also be willing to let the students control some portion of the discussion and to be able to share topically appropriate stories that the teacher may have to help farther the conversation (Todhunter, 2007). Often times ICs come about by digressions brought up by the students, at

which time the teacher must decide if his or her teaching philosophy allows for diversions that increase conversation in the target language (Todhunter 2007).

Chapter 3

Methods

Changes to teaching

I knew when trying to increase my students' participation, I needed to be aware of explicitly stating my expectations to each of my students. The first thing that I did to increase student participation was to talk to my mentor teacher about changing the participation policy for my third year French students. Previously the policy had been that the students received two points for each day that they were in the classroom, and lost the points if they were absent. The students could then make up their lost points by talking to the teacher to see what they missed. The students' absences were recorded in a notebook with sections designated for each class. The points that were made up by the students were also recorded in the notebook, and the participation grade was calculated every two weeks, with the final score dependent on the number of days that school was in session.

I felt that changing the participation policy would give the students an incentive to participate in the classroom, as their grade would be dependent on their oral participation. I made a few changes to the policy, but kept the overall structure the same. The students were now required to orally participate, in French, at least twice each class period, to help encourage participation in the classroom. Although speaking during class and engagement do not directly correlate, the goal was to scaffold the students in their participation to engage in the class, by having discussions, reading aloud, and supplying fact and opinion questions, so that I as the teacher was not the only person actively participating in the classroom. To scaffold the students, I asked a number of questions to guide them to feeling comfortable enough to participate in the class. I marked down each time the students spoke, marking down their participation on a chart

with each of their names. I accepted a wide variety of answers when marking down the participation points, as my main goal was to get them using the target language, rather than ensuring that they said something profound. I accepted one to two word recall answers to questions, volunteers to read sentences from homework and classwork activities, full sentence answers, and students who shared paragraphs or answered questions aimed at getting to know them better. The main factor in any accepted answer was that it had to be in French, regardless of whether the response was correct or incorrect. I purely wanted the students to say something in French, as they were very hesitant to speak in French at all. Before implementing the new policy I presented the new requirements to the students, discussed why we were changing the policy, and taught them a few useful phrases in French that they could use to express confusion and clarification. The student copied these phrases into their notebooks so that they could periodically go back and look at them, as they needed.

As another aspect of the participation policy, I also implemented what we called, “French Fridays” or “les vendredis en français.” Because I knew that the students could very easily say two things in French each class and then not speak for the remainder of the period, and still get credit for the day, I wanted to make sure that there was one day each week where they were required to use French for the whole period. When explaining the new participation policy to the students, I told them that they would be required to speak in French for the entire class period each Friday. The rule for these days was that if I heard anyone speaking in English, from the second the bell rang to signify the start of the class, the student would lose their participation point for that day. The students were reminded visually with a poster on the wall, indicating that they were supposed to be speaking only in French, every Friday, and I orally explained the rules for “French Friday” at the beginning of each Friday class, so that the students did not forget, and

accidentally speak in English. The students were also told that if they absolutely could not explain a problem in French, they were allowed to ask, in French, if they could use English to explain the problem. I would then tell them if that was allowed, which it almost always was.

Data Collection

The participation points were recorded on charts, with a row for each student's name and the dates of the class at the top. Absences were still recorded in a notebook, and students were still allowed to make up points by coming to see me before or after school. Those make up points were also recorded in the notebook, and the participation points were recorded in the online grading program every two weeks. Some class periods did not offer many options for the students to speak, typically when they were working on individual writing assignments, or when the topic necessitated more lecturing than normal, so all students were given two points for those days, as they were participating in the manner that was appropriate to the scheduled activities. These days were noted on the charts for each period. A record of the participation can be found in Appendix A.

Analysis of data

Along with the overall change in how the students would earn their participation points, I also changed the speaking requirements for classes on Fridays. The students were to speak only in French for the entire period during these days, and I was shocked how seriously they took the change in requirement. Unfortunately due to weather, first and second period only had a few French Fridays, but seventh period was present for the majority of the French Fridays (Appendix B). Many of my students made sure to speak with their friends in French before the lesson began and they were able to monitor themselves while working in small groups, so that they were still speaking in French. Looking only at seventh period, as they consistently had class on French

Friday, an average of 12.8 students orally participated in these lessons, with a class percentage of 67% of students participating in the classes. This data was based off of the number of students participating only on Fridays that had usable data. This is higher than the class average, so it shows that they were taking French Fridays seriously.

Knowing that the students could not participate in the classroom unless I gave them the opportunity to do so, I also looked at the questions that I ask in the classroom, and how that impacted students' oral performance. I realized early in my teaching that I expected the students to orally participate, but then did not plan my lessons in a way that gave them the opportunity to meet my expectations. I did not realize this until I was observing my mentor teacher, and was trying to figure out what made her such a successful teacher. It occurred to me that she was constantly asking the students questions, so I decided to look into how asking questions would engage my students in the lessons. After researching turn sequences in the classroom, I made sure to plan lessons that allowed the students to orally participate as often as possible. This was not always feasible, but the added awareness helped me to keep questioning a priority.

I recorded a total of six lessons, which when planned included activities that would allow me to use IRE, IRF or ICs. I then re-watched the videos, and chose specific sections of those videos where I used one of the questioning techniques. I transcribed and analyzed the clips chosen, making sure to change the students' names, and to leave in any grammatical mistakes made by myself, or my students. Although I had permission to film the students, I chose to have the camera directed on me so that the students would not be as intimidated with a camera watching the whole room. While this was less intimidating for the students, it did make it harder to hear the students, and to see them participating in non-oral ways, such as completing reading

activities, or moving around the classroom. Because my focus was only on oral participation, I did not feel that this severely hindered my analysis, but it does prevent me from being able to speak more broadly about participation in general. If I were to continue this research, a camera at the back of the room, where all of the students, and the activities were visible, would allow me to see participation as a bigger picture. The lessons that I chose to record were on a variety of subjects, and were recorded over a number of weeks, spanning October 2014 to March 2015. Transcriptions of the videos used can be found in Appendix B.

Chapter 4

Results

While reviewing the students' participation, I realized that each class was a little different, but that each class had a number of days in which I was unable to track participation individually, due to the activities that we were doing, such as tests, written papers, stations or more lecture-based lessons. I recorded data for 36 days, with a variety of snow days or un-recordable days. In first period, there were 9 missed classes due to weather, and 15 days that did not allow for individual, recordable oral participation. In second period, there were 10 missed classes due to weather, and 12 days that were un-recordable. In seventh period there were 4 days missed due to weather, or scheduled days off, and 15 non-recordable days. Overall this meant that I collected 12, 14, and 17 days worth of useable data in periods 1, 2, and 7, respectively (Table 1).

Table 1: Participation Record

Period	Recordable days	Non-recordable days	Snow days or no class	Total days
1	12	15	9	36
2	14	12	10	36
7	17	15	4	36

Because there were a number of days, due to snow or non-recordable days, it was necessary to look at the average number of points earned by each class, only on the days were I had usable data. I found that the average for each class was at least 2 points, which was the required number from each student in order to get the full points for the day, and that often that number was closer to 3, or above 3 (Table 2). The average number of students who earned their 2

points for the day was 7.8 (out of 15), 11.14 (out of 14), and 10.7 (out of 19). The average percentage of students who received their full two points per day was 52% for first period, 81% for second period, and 56.5% for seventh period (Table 2). I did not include data on students who were absent and made up points, as I felt that that was not reflective of their oral participation, as they had not been in the class to earn those points. For first and seventh period, where the average number of points earned is two points, or above, but the percentage of students who participated is closer to 50%, it seems as though there were a number of students answering multiple times, while still a little under half of the students in those classes participated once, or not at all during the lessons. This can also be seen in the appendix, where there is a break down of each student's participation. In periods 1 and 7, there were a number of students who were much more intrinsically motivated to learn French, so they frequently participated above and beyond the required number per day. Perhaps because these students participated so often, some of the less motivated students might have felt like they could get away with occasionally participating a few times a week. This could have caused the lower number of students who received the two points per day in first and seventh periods (Table 2). In second period, the majority of the students had fairly low motivation and engagement levels in the class; so fewer students would frequently volunteer more than the required amount per class period. This could be why the percentage of students who earned two points per day in second period ended up being much higher (Table 2). It was a little harder to fly under the radar without a classmate who would constantly answer the teacher's questions.

Table 2: Average Points

Period	Average number of points earned on recordable days	Average number of students who earned 2 points on recordable days	% of class with an average of 2 points earned
1	336/ 117= 2.87	117/15 =7.8	7.8/15 = 52%
2	507/ 156= 3.25	156/14= 11.14	11.14/14= 81%
7	629/ 204= 3.08	204/19= 10.7	10.7/19= 56.5%

I recorded one lesson pre-intervention, and transcribed two questioning methods that were used, IRF and an attempted Instructional Conversation. I found that in both of these questioning methods I spoke more than the students, and asked few questions compared to the number of words I was saying. For the IRF few students participated when compared with the number of questions asked (Table 3), but for ICs, a similar number of students participated in answering about the same number of questions. When looking at the transcripts I noticed that the students in both of these activities were very confused. They asked for clarification a number of times, such as in the exchange:

T: Est ce que vous pensez que la ville est plus animé que la campagne, ou la campagne est plus animé que la ville? [Do you think that the city is more animated than the countryside, or the country side is more animated than the city?]

S1: ??

T: Quoi? [What?]

S1: Did you ask

S2: what are you

S1: What are you asking?.

A lot of English was also used in this lesson, by me, as the teacher, and by the students (Appendix B). The students also gave one or two word answers for the IRF. When planning the lesson, I believed that the students had the language skills to be able to succeed at this lesson, but in practice, and when watching the videos, it was clear that this lesson was much too difficult for the students to reasonably complete. They lacked the language skills, and perhaps the life experience of being in the city, and the country, to really be able to succeed with this activity. I did not know enough about the ability level of the students when planning this lesson, and I was too insistent that the students speak in French, instead of English, that the activity did not go nearly as smoothly as it could have, had I given them the proper scaffolding.

Table 3: Questions Pre-Intervention

Type of question asked	Number of words said by teacher	Number of words said by students	Number of students who participated	Number of questions asked
IRF	196	20	6	11
IC	127	64	9	8

When re-watching the videos of the lessons I recorded, I noticed that there were several times when I used IRE or IRF, and that there were a few times when I tried to use ICs, but not all of those Instructional Conversations ended up being successful. By looking at the numbers of words that I said while using the different questioning methods, and comparing those to the number of words that the students spoke, I discovered that I say a lot more than the students during the class. The most notable was IRF# 1, where I said 346 words, while the students said

52 (Table 4). By also comparing the number of students who participated, with the number of total words said, it is easy to see that the students were typically providing one or two word answers, so the answers were not higher-order answers. For the majority of the transcripts the number of questions asked stayed consistent, with the exception of IRF #1 and IC #1 (Table 4). Looking at the transcripts, which can be found in Appendix B, both of these lessons asked the students their opinions, which was slightly higher order thinking than some of the others. Because of this, more scaffolding was needed to help the students understand, so I ended up asking more questions, and using more words to explain what I meant.

Table 4: Questioning Post Intervention

Type of question post intervention	Number of words said by teacher	Number of words said by student	Number of students who participated	Number of questions asked
IRE #1	53	10	4	6
IRE #2	52	30	4	9
IRF #1	346	52	11	19
IRF #2	142	24	5	8
IC #1	196	22	4 and whole class response	23
IC failed attempt	87	10	4	6

Like the research suggested is typical in world language classes, I used IRE fairly frequently to help review material from the previous day, or when the material was a little too hard for the students to elaborate on. In my pre-intervention lesson, I used IRE when the students were deciding whether or not the vocabulary words were more applicable to the city or the country. I would ask a question, and the students would give a one or possibly two word answer

to the question, and I would say yes or no if I agreed on the placement, occasionally asking other questions if I needed them to clarify their thinking. When assessing the effectiveness of this particular lesson, I realized that I used IRE for a majority of the lesson, and that was a lot of time that the students were not using the target language to communicate. I also realized that for this particular lesson the responses were more opinion-based, and that my yes or no evaluations could have unintentionally prevented some students, who disagreed on the placing of a word, from participating in the future. This was one of the problems that the literature also mentioned when using IRE; often the correct or incorrect evaluation stops the conversation from going any further, and prevents students with different opinions and backgrounds from participating. Seeing that IRE did not work out the way I had planned when used in main lesson activities, I found myself using IRE in my warm up review activities at the beginning of the periods. These activities were much shorter, and had specific right or wrong answers that the students had learned in the previous days. Taking into account the differences in lengths of the pre-intervention IRE excerpt, and the two post intervention IRE examples, the ratio between the amount of words spoken by the students and by the teacher was much more equal when the use of IRE questions were short, and concise, clearly true or false answers.

When looking at IRF, I realized that this is the questioning method I use most often in my classroom because I like to comment on the things that the students say, and I like to recast their sentences to correct any grammar mistakes. Interestingly I did not use this method in my pre-intervention lesson, but I used it consistently in later lessons. Although the students were still not equal partners in the communicative event taking place in the classroom, IRF#1 and IRF#2 (Appendix A) forced the students to use the knowledge that they had been learning in class, rather than just regurgitating factual information. In IRF #1, the students had never seen the

vocabulary words before, and due to the pictures, and the questions asked, we were able to determine as a class whether they were good or bad things to do while camping. This questioning method opened itself up to differences in opinion more than IRE, which can be seen in this example:

T : Alors, nourrir les animaux ! C'est une bonne idée de nourrir les animaux (thumbs up) ? [So, to feed the animals ! Its a good idea to feed the animals ?]

S : Oh non ! [Oh, no !]

T : C'est une mauvaise idée ! Une bonne idée ? [It's a bad idea ? A good idea ?]

(Students talking a little.)

S : Un canard ! [A duck !]

S2 : Oui ! [Yes !]

T : Un peu les deux ? Un peu les deux ? [A little of both ? A little of both ?]

S2 (agrees) : Un peu les deux. [A little of both]

Initially it had been decided as a class that feeding animals was a bad idea, but one student brought up the potential of it being less dangerous if feeding an animal that is used to human interaction, such as a duck. This was a direction I had not thought of, and due to this, I was able to give the students feedback that indicated that maybe there were two sides to this question. This then continued the conversation as we looked for other, potentially more acceptable examples of when one could feed animals. The students were able to take part in the lesson, rather than just being told off the bat if one vocab word should or shouldn't be done.

After researching Instructional Conversations, I thought that some of my lessons that focused more heavily on cultural aspects would offer great opportunities to use ICs and have the

students think about the differences and similarities in the two cultures. I recorded my attempts at ICs twice, once when comparing French and American music preferences, and when comparing the perception of comic books in the two cultures. I was met with varied success when using this method, as most often the students were uninterested in answering my questions, even when the questions were scaffold to a level that they could easily understand. The music activity in particular fell apart, as the students refused to participate in the activity, despite knowing that their grade was dependent on their participation. When the students did speak, there was no room for a continued conversation based off of what they said, so it made it difficult to have any real back and forth with the students, or with the class.

The Instructional Conversations were slightly more successful when talking about comic books, but I overestimated the students' understanding of American comics, so that kept the exchanges short, as they lacked the background knowledge needed to really make sure that the students understood the concept of lesson. There were a number of limitations that could have contributed to errors in data collection and in my interpretation of my transcripts. When collect data on student participation by marking down when each student spoke, it is always possible that I could have accidentally, incorrectly marked someone down who did not speak, or forgot to mark down someone who did speak during class. Trying to compile this data while teaching was more difficult than I had anticipated, and it took a few days to get used to marking everything down. It was also impossible to call on all students who had their hands raised for all of the questions, so it is possible that students who did not participate as often were not called on when they knew the answer, although I tried to call on students who did not typically participate as often as possible. The number of days in which it was impossible to collect data, for a number of

reasons, also limited the effectiveness of my data collection, hindering the scope of the conclusions that can be drawn.

Recording and transcribing my lessons came with their own set of issues. On the recordings it was occasionally difficult to understand what the students were saying, so gaps had to be filled in based on what could be heard. It was also occasionally difficult to sort out when specific questioning strategies were being used, due to combining the strategies throughout activities. Those activities were not chosen, so that piece of data is missing.

Finally my status as a student teacher limits the scope of the conclusions that can be made, as I am still trying to discover the teaching style that works for me, and I am learning from my mistakes as I go along. A veteran classroom teacher would likely have had a significantly different data set, so it is important to keep in mind that skill level of the researcher

Chapter 5

Discussion and conclusion

Having plotted out and calculated the number of times the students participated using the participation charts was both beneficial, and a hindrance. It was beneficial to be able to see which students were participating each day, and it was encouraging to see that so many of the students were answering more than two questions per day. Seeing that so many of the students were able to earn their two points per day, and that they are capable of speaking in French, and had the opportunity was helpful for my teaching because I could see that the students were getting the practice that they had been missing. The students also accepted the change in participation policy easily and without argument. They were willing to sit through any road bumps along the way, and after a few days of marking down their participation they did not have to be told the expectations for their participation.

Subjectively, I believe that the students have improved greatly since they have begun speaking more in French, and, at least from a teacher's stand point, they seem to be comfortable speaking in French, perhaps because they know it is expected of everyone. Through some of their answers I also felt like I had gotten to know some of the students better, and I was able to see where the individual students needed more help, or more practice. This was valuable for me as a teacher, as it let me see the needs of each of my students, and helped me to realize the ability levels and expectations I could have for those students. By asking questions, and seeing where my students were struggling, I was able to formatively assess the students, and inform my lesson

planning. By learning more about what my students can and cannot do, I was better able to plan my lessons around those areas that the students were struggling. This also allowed me to avoid planning lessons that were far beyond the students Zone of Proximal Development, which was a problem in my October 31 lesson, where the activities planned were simply too difficult for the students to reasonably accomplish.

There were some definite limitations for tracking participation on a chart. It was difficult to keep track of who had spoken during the class, so I found myself having to pause after each response to make down who had spoken. This did not take a lot of time out of the lesson, but it did break up the flow of the activities we were doing, as I would have to bend my head down to see the papers, which took my attention away from the students. It was also impossible to track which types of questions the students were answering. The students earned the same number of points if they answered a question in one or two words, as those who volunteered to read paragraphs to the class. Short of developing a symbol system for every type of activity completed, I could not come up with an efficient system to delineate between the different types of responses, which would have been infinitely more beneficial. The videos that I recorded did help keep track of the types of responses that the students gave, but because I decided to focus the video on myself, the video did not capture all of the ways that the students participated. During lessons that focused more on discussion, it might be more helpful in the future to record that section of the lesson, so that it is easier to go back and see for what the students actually ended up getting credit. This would be impractical in the long run, but it is a method that could shed more detailed light on what types of participation are going on in the classroom.

Another that might be more helpful might be to start off counting responses, regardless of difficulty level, until the students are accustomed to participating twice during the class, and then

inform the students that you will only be accepting responses that are a little more complex. This might be difficult to do daily, but could be used for specific lessons. While keeping track of who participated was difficult, the largest problem with this method of tracking participation was that not all activities lent themselves to oral participation. In each of the classes there were between 12 and 15 days (Table 1) where it was impossible to record data. This was either because we were doing writing activities, taking tests, or the lessons were more lecture based. While I had decided that I would give the students their participation points when this happened, I had not anticipated it happening so often. This was the largest limiting factor to the charts, and because of this I was not able to rely on this data as strongly as I would have liked, as I did not feel that it was as accurate a representation of the students' participation as I had hoped.

When looking at the types of questions I asked, and how that impacted student participation, I noticed an overarching theme: even when asking the students questions, I was still the one doing the majority of the talking. I knew that this was theoretically happening in my classroom, but it was not until I compared the number of words I spoke with the number of words my students spoke during the excerpts of my lessons, that I realize to what extent this was happening (Table 4). Before I started, I assumed that just by asking questions my students would begin to participate more in the classroom, and while that did happen to an extent, the amount of time that the students spoke was in no way equal to the amount of time I spent speaking to the class. Looking back at the transcripts of my lessons was helpful because it made me realize that I used all of the questioning methods, including IRE, IRF and ICs but they were met with varied success. In my future classes I will use the information I have gathered to create a user friendly system of tracking oral participation that does not just rely on me marking down each time the students speak. I will develop a system that allows me to track the quality of the responses, not

just the types and number of times the students responded. I will implement French Fridays at the lower levels, such as French two, and build an expectation early on in my classes, so that my students speak in French for the majority of the time in class, instead of occasionally. I will continue to monitor the types of interactions I have in my classes, and how the opportunities I give them affect the students' ability to participate in the class.

Appendix A

Participation Charts

FRENCH 3: PERIOD 1

JANUARY 29-FEBRUARY 24

French Friday

Student name

29-Jan

30-Jan

2-Feb

3-Feb

Student 1 C	ABSENT	1	ABSENT	
Student 2 M	2	1	2	
Student 3 Ch	ABSENT	2	2	
Student 4 Mi	1	1	2	
Student 5 S	1	2	2	
Student 6 N	0	3	2	
Student 7 A	2	1	2	
Student 8 C	1	2	2	
Student 9 F	2	2	2	
Student 10 D	1	2	2	
Student 11 K	1	2	2	
Student 12 An	2	2	2	
Student 13 T	1	2	2	
Student 14 M	1	2	2	
Student 15 K	2	3	2	

NO CLASS

DAY TOTAL:

17 28 28 0

NUMBER OF STUDENTS WITH TOTAL PTS FOR THE
DAY:

5 11 14 0

French Friday

2/5/2015 ALL STUDENTS EARNED 2 PTS -ALL PERIOD QUIZ		6-Feb	9-Feb	10-Feb	11-Feb	12-Feb
	2	ABSENT	1	2		2
	2	2	2	2		2
	2	1	0	2		2
	2	2	ABSENT	2	ASSEMBLY	2
	2	1	2	2		2
	2	3	3	2		2
	2	1	2	2		ABSENT
	2	2	3	2		2
	2	2	3	2		2
	2	2	2	2		2
	2	2	1	2		2
	2	3	3	2		2
	2	4	4	2		2
	2	1	2	2		2
	2	6	6	2		2
	30	32	34	30	0	30
	15	10	12	15	0	15

13-Feb	17-Feb	18-Feb	19-Feb	20-Feb
--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

NO SCHOOL

2	2	2
2	2	2
2	2	2

PEP RALLY

2
2
2

30
15

25-Feb	26-Feb	27-Feb	2-Mar
ABSENT	ABSENT	ABSENT	
2	1	2	
2	1	2	
2	2	2	
2	2	2	
2	2	2	
ABSENT	ABSENT	2	
2	2	2	
2	2	2	
2	1	2	
2	1	2	
2	2	2	
2	2	2	
2	1	2	
2	3	2	
26	22	28	
13	8	14	

NO SCHOOL-SNOW DAY

3-Mar	4-Mar	5-Mar	6-Mar	9-Mar
1		ABSENT		1
1		2		1
1		2		1
1		2		2
2		2		2
2		2		3
0		2		1
2		2		3
2		2		1
1		2		3
3		2		2
2		2		2
4		2		3
2		2		2

NO SCHOOL-SNOW DAY

NO SCHOOL

1		2		1
25		28		28
10-Mar	11-Mar	12-Mar	13-Mar	16-Mar
3	3	2	ABSENT	2
3	2	2	3	2
0	0	2	0	2
2	2	2	2	2
2	2	2	1	2
3	3	2	5	2
1	2	2	0	2
2	2	2	2	2
4	2	2	2	2
ABSENT	2	2	3	2
2	2	2	1	2
5	4	2	5	2
ABSENT	3	2	3	2
4	2	2	1	2
5	2	2	3	2
37	31	30	31	30
11	14	15	9	15
17-Mar	18-Mar	19-Mar	20-Mar	
1	2	2		
1	2	2		
ABSENT	2	2		
1	2	2		
2	2	2		
0	2	2		
0	2	2		
2	2	2		
4	2	2		
1	2	2		
1	2	2		
5	2	2		
2	2	2		
2	2	2		
2	2	2		
24	30	30		
6	15	15		

NO CLASS

Student name

	29-Jan	30-Jan	2-Feb	3-Feb
Student 1 B	2			3
Student 2 A	2			3
Student 3 M	1			2
Student 4 E	0			3
Student 5 S	1			3
Student 6 N	2	NO CLASS	NO CLASS	2
Student 7 Mo	1	NO CLASS	NO CLASS	3
Student 8 T	2			3
Student 9 Au	1			2
Student 10 Z	2			2
Student 11 Ni	2			2
Student 12 D	0			0
Student 13 Ma	1			2
Student 14 El	ABSENT			2
DAY TOTAL:	17	0	0	32
NUMBER OF STUDENTS WITH TOTAL PTS FOR THE DAY:	6	0	0	13

	4-Feb	5-Feb	6-Feb	9-Feb	10-Feb
	4	ABSENT	ABSENT	9	5
	4	3	2	ABSENT	4
	7	4	2	0	6
	3	2	2	2	1
	4	3	2	3	2
	3	3	2	1	2
	4	2	ABSENT	2	3
	3	5	2	4	3
	3	5	2	3	2
	2	1	2	4	1
	3	3	2	3	2
	0	0	2	0	0
	7	5	2	6	3
	2	1	2	3	2
	49	37	24	40	36
	13	10	12	10	11

11-Feb	12-Feb	13-Feb	17-Feb	18-Feb
	5			2
	5			2
	3			3
	2			3
	4			4
ASSEMBLY	2	NO SCHOOL	NO CLASS	2
	3			2
	2			2
	3			1
	2			2
	2			2
	0			0
	2			2
	2			2
	0			0
	2			2
	2		II	
0	37	0	28	28
0	13	0	14	14

19-Feb	20-Feb	23-Feb	24-Feb
2		2	2
2		2	2
2		2	2
2		2	2
2		2	2
2	PEP RALLY	2	2
2		2	2
2		2	2
2		2	2
2		2	2
2		2	2
2		2	2
2		2	2
2		2	2
28	0	28	28
14	0	14	14

Student name

Student 1 B

25-Feb	26-Feb	27-Feb	2-Mar
2	6	2	0

				38
Student 2 A	2	3	2	
Student 3 M	2	ABSENT	1	
Student 4 E	2	2	ABSENT	
Student 5 S	2	3	2	
Student 6 N	2	2	2	
Student 7 Mo	2	ABSENT	ABSENT	
Student 8 T	2	2	1	
Student 9 Au	2	3	2	
Student 10 Z	2	ABSENT	1	
Student 11 Ni	2	2	2	
Student 12 D	2	1	0	
Student 13 Ma	2	3	2	
Student 14 El	2	1	0	

DAY TOTAL: 28 28 17 0
NUMBER OF STUDENTS WITH TOTAL PTS FOR THE DAY: 14 9 7 0

3-Mar	4-Mar	5-Mar	6-Mar	9-Mar	10-Mar
1		2		4	2
4		2		4	6
4		2		2	3
1		0		1	0
3		0		3	4
2		0		2	4
2		1		3	4
2		1		4	2
6		2		7	4
2		1		2	3
2		0		2	4
0		0		0	0
3		1		2	4
1		0		3	2
33	0	12	0	39	42
10	0	4	0	12	12
11-Mar	12-Mar	13-Mar	16-Mar	17-Mar	
5	ABSENT	ABSENT	2	3	
5	2	5	2	2	
3	2	4	ABSENT	1	
3	2	4	2	1	
3	2	2	2	2	

2	2	2	2	1
3	2	1	ABSENT	0
3	2	1	2	0
3	2	2	2	5
3	2	0	2	0
2	2	4	2	3
ABSENT	2	0	2	0
4	2	2	2	2
2	2	1	2	1
41	26	28	24	21
13	13	8	12	6

18-Mar	19-Mar	20-Mar
--------	--------	--------

2	2	
2	2	
2	2	
2	2	
2	2	
2	2	
2	2	
2	2	
2	2	
2	2	
2	2	
2	2	
2	2	
2	2	
2	2	
2	2	
28	28	0
14	14	0

NO CLASS

Student name

- Student 1 K
- Student 2 C
- Student 3 H
- Student 4 J
- Student 5 T
- Student 6 D
- Student 7 B
- Student 8 Z
- Student 9 A
- Student 10 BR

	29-Jan	30-Jan	2-Feb	3-Feb
	2	1	2	
	1	4	2	
ABSENT		1	2	
	2	2	2	
	2	1	2	
	2	3	2	
	2	2	2	
	2	1	2	
	2	2	2	
	2	3	2	

			40
Student 11 Ab	3	3	2
Student 12 R	2	2	2
Student 13 AL	2	2	2
Student 14 M	2	2	2
Student 15 BR	2	3	2
Student 16 Ma	3	4	2
Student 17 Ta	1	2	ABSENT
Student 18 C	2	1	2
Student 19 An	2	1	2
DAY TOTAL:	33	40	36
NUMBER OF STUDENTS WITH TOTAL PTS FOR THE DAY:	16	13	18

4-Feb	5-Feb	6-Feb	9-Feb	10-Feb
ABSENT	2	3	1	2
2	2	3	2	ABSENT
2	2	1	2	2
4	2	5	2	3
2	2	2	3	5
3	2	2	4	3
3	2	1	0	1
0	2	2	ABSENT	0
3	2	5	2	2
3	2	ABSENT	2	5
5	2	5	2	4
3	2	ABSENT	ABSENT	ABSENT
4	2	2	3	5
4	2	6	2	0
ABSENT	2	2	2	ABSENT
4	2	ABSENT	2	5
2	2	6	4	4
2	2	2	1	0
ABSENT	2	ABSENT	1	2
46	38	47	35	43
15	19	13	13	12
11-Feb	12-Feb	13-Feb	17-Feb	18-Feb
		NO		
2	2	SCHOOL	2	2
ABSENT	ABSENT		2	2

36	29	36	38
18	11	18	19

Student name

	25-Feb	26-Feb	27-Feb	28-Feb
Student 1 K	2	1	2	
Student 2 C	2	1	1	
Student 3 H	2	1	3	
Student 4 J	2	4	3	
Student 5 T	2	2	3	
Student 6 D	2	1	2	
Student 7 B	2	0	2	
Student 8 Z	2	0	2	
Student 9 A	2	0	2	
Student 10 BR	2	2	ABSENT	
Student 11 Ab	2	1	3	
Student 12 R	2	2	3	
Student 13 AL	2	2	3	
Student 14 M	2	2	3	
Student 15 BRR	2	3	3	
Student 16 Ma	2	1	2	
Student 17 Ta	2	3	2	
Student 18 C	2	0	2	
Student 19 An	2	0	2	

DAY TOTAL:	38	26	43
NUMBER OF STUDENTS WITH TOTAL PTS FOR THE DAY:	19	8	17

3-Mar	4-Mar	5-Mar	6-Mar
2		0	
1		0	
2		1	
2		2	
2		1	
1		ABSENT	
0		0	
0		0	
1		ABSENT	
2		3	
2		1	
2		2	
2		3	

NO SCHOOL-SNOW DAY

NO SCHOOL

1			1	
3		ABSENT		
2			0	
1			4	
1			0	
0			0	
27	0	18	0	
10	0	5	0	
9-Mar	10-Mar	11-Mar	12-Mar	13-Mar
0	1	1	2	0
2	2	3	2	2
2	1	1	2	1
3	4	2	2	2
2	3	1	2	1
2	2	2	2	2
1	1	0	2	0
1	1	0	2	0
ABSENT	ABSENT	1	2	3
3	3	1	2	ABSENT
4	4	2	2	4
2	2	2	2	3
2	3	2	2	3
2	2	1	2	3
2	2	2	2	ABSENT
2	2	2	2	4
1	1	2	2	2
2	2	2	2	0
0	0	1	2	1
33	36	28	38	31
14	13	10	19	10
16-Mar	17-Mar	18-Mar	19-Mar	20-Mar
2	1	2	2	2
2	2	2	2	2
2	0	2	2	2
2	5	2	2	2
2	2	2	2	2
2	1	2	2	2
2	0	2	2	2
2	0	2	2	2
2	4	2	2	2

2	4	2	2	2
2	ABSENT	2	2	2
2	2	2	2	2
2	3	2	2	2
2	3	2	2	2
ABSENT	1	2	2	2
2	3	2	2	2
2	ABSENT	2	2	2
2	ABSENT	2	2	2
2	2	2	2	2
36	33	38	38	38
18	9	19	19	19

Appendix B

Transcripts of selected videos

Pre intervention:

IRE PI 1: October 31, 2014, period 1

(Students and teacher are working on filling in a Venn diagram that they started for a Bellringer)

T: teacher

T2: mentor teacher

T : We are making the Venn Diagrams because you are going to use them later on. Make sure you are writing these things down. So for our other words, so, animé. Animé. Est ce que vous pensez que la ville est plus animé que la campagne, ou la campagne est plus animé que la ville? [We are making the Venn Diagrams because you are going to use them later on. Make sure you are writing these things down. So for our words, so, animated. Animated. Do you think that the city is more animated or the country side, or the country side is more animated than the city?]

S1: ??

T: Quoi? [What?]

S1: Did you ask

S2: what are you

S1: What are you asking?

T: I asked:: Do you think C'est animé. Et est ce que vous pensez que la ville est plus animé que la campagne, ou la campagne est plus animé que la ville? So do you think the cou- the city is more animated than the countryside, or the countryside is more animated than the city?

Class: Ville. [City.]

T: Oui! La ville! Alors ici, animé. [Yes! The city! So here, its animated]

T: Alors, bruyant. Bruyant. C'est quoi? C'est dans la liste de vocabulaire. [So loud, loud.

What is it? Its on the vocabulary list.]

S3: ?

T: I'm sorry?

S3: La ville? [The city?]

T: La ville? [The city?]

T: Tranquille. Tranquille. C'est quoi tranquille? [Tranquil, tranquil, what is tranquil?]

Students: ?

T: Yep. Oui. Like quiet and tranquil. Alors, dans la ville, c'est tranquille ou dans la campagne? [Yep, Yes, like quiet and tranquil. So in the city, its tranquil or in the country side?]

S4: Campagne. [Country.]

T: Oui, dans la campagne. [Yes, in the country].

T: Clame. Dans la ville ou campagne? [Calm. In the city or the country?]

Class: Campagne. [City]

T: Oui, [Yes]

Students: ?

T: F?

S5: les deux? [Both?]

T: Oui, possiblement les deux. Peut-etre. Alors, dangereux. Uhhhh, c'est la, c'est difficile de voir, mais dangereux, possiblement les deux. Alors, mortel. Mortel? Okay. Um, C?

Mortel?[Yes, possibly both. Maybe. So dangerous. Umm, its there, its difficult to see, but dangerous, maybe both. So deadly dull, dull? Okay, um, C? Mortel?]

S6: Um Campagne? [Umm, country?]

T: Oui, probablement la campagne. [Yes, probably the country]

T: ((looks at card)) Nul. Nul. [Useless, useless].

ICs PI 1: October 31, 2014, period 1

((Students were asked to come up with points for a debate on whether they thought the city or country was better. They are now going over what they came up with))

S7: La nature est belle. [Nature is beautiful.]

T: La nature est belle. D'accord, est ce que les ville sont belle aussi? [Nature is beautiful. Okay, is it beautiful in cities too?]

S7: Il y a toujours l'extricit  et l'internet [There is always electricity and internet]

T: Et l'internet. [And internet.]

T: Est ce qu'il y a toujours l'extricit  dans la campagne? [Is it that there is always electricity in the country?]

S8: Les maisons sont grandes. [In big houses]

T: Les maisons sont grandes dans la campagne. [In big houses in the country]

T2: Mais dans la campagne, je n'ai pas de signal de mon portable. [But in the country, I don't have a signal on my cellphone.]

T: Oui. [Yes]

T2: Alors, quand j'étais en ville j'ai toujours le signal. [So,when I was in the city, I always had a signal]

T: Alors, une raison pour la ville? [So a reason for the city?]

S9: Il n'y a pas de hillbillies. [There aren't hillbillies]

T: D'accord Oui, et dans la campagne? Il y a [Okay, yes. And in the country?]

S9: Il y a des gangsters dans la ville. [There are gangsters in the city]

T: Il y des gangsters dans les villes. [There are gangsters in the city]

S: ?

T2: des hillbillies et des gangsters. [Hillbillies and gangsters]

T: D'accord, ça va. Et pour les villes? [Okay, that works, and in the cities?]

S10: Il y a des musées, des cinemas, des (?) et au restaurants [There are museums, movie theaters, and ? and restaurants.]

T: Des restaurants. Et il y a la meme choses dans la campagne? [Restaurants, and it is the same in the country?]

S11: Produit les legumes [Produces vegetables]

T: D'accord (laughing a little) [Okay.]

S11: (laugh)

T: On produit les fruits [One produces fruit]

S12: (?) it's fruit. [It's fruit]

T: Alors, elle produit les fruits, alors dans la ville, qu'est ce on est ce qu'on produit des legumes et fruit aussi? [Okay, so they produce fruit, so in the cities, what do they, do they make fruits and vegetables?]

S13: C'est facile de okay I'm gonna do this one. C'est facile de trouver des hopitals [Its easy to, okay I'm gonna do this one. Its easy to find hospitals.]

T: (giggles a little. This was not at all the response to the question) Oui, oui, est ce qu'on peut trouver des hopitals dans la le campagne? [Yes, yes, can you find hospitals in the country?]

S7: We're out of

T: You're out of C'est tout? [You're out of, that's it?]

S14: C'est mortel dans la campagne. [Its dull in the country]

T: Alors, c'est mortel dans la campagne. [Okay, so its dull in the country]

Post intervention:

IRE #1: Friday, February 6, 2015- 7th

T: Alors, Comment dit-on, you must, en francais? Comment dit-on you must en francais? Il y a 4 moyens. Ah, oui. [So, how do you say, « you must » in French ? How do you say « you must » in French ? There are four ways, ah, yes.]

S1 : Tu dois. [You should]

T : Tu dois? Oui, c'est bon, tu dois. Tu dois. Oui? [You must ? Yes, that is good. You must. Yes ?]

S2: Il faut. [You must]

T: Il faut, c'est bon. Oui, T? [You mist, that's good. T ?]

S3 : Tu devrais [You must]

T: Tu devrais? Oui, c'est bon aussi. Et... finalement? Ty ? [You must ? Yes, thats good too. And finally ?]

Ty: Tu ferais bien de. [You would do well to]

T: Tu ferais bien de. Oui, merci. [You would do well to. Yes. Thank you]

IRE #2 : Monday, February 2, 2015

T : Qui peut me dire, uh, des exemples des phrases ? Qui a des phrase qui utilise emporter pour des objets ici? N ? [Who can tell me, un examples of sentences ? That use « emporter » with the objects here ? N ?]

Nate : You want me to say... ?

T : oui. [Yes]

Nate : Emporter de la lotion anti-moustiques. [To bring bug spray]

T : (Nods head.) Emporte de la lotion anti-moustiques. Oui, merci. (Points to next student.) [Bring bug spray. Yes, thanks.]

D : K emporte des allumettes ? [K brings matches ?]

T : Des allumettes ? Celui la ? Oui, merci. Oui, Ta ? [Matches ? This one here ? Yes, thanks. Yes, T ?]

Ta : Nous allons emporté une trousse de premier soins. [We brought first aid kit]

T : Soins ? Oui (points to picture). Ki ? [Aid, yes. Ki ?]

Ki : C et S emportent un maillot de bains. [C and S bring swim suits]

T : Un maillot de bains, oui. Est-ce qu'il y a des autres ? Cory ? [A bathing suit, yes. Are there others]

IRF #1 : Friday, February 6, 2015

T : Sortez la liste de vocabulaire SVP. Et si vous n'écrivez pas la définitions dans la liste, un, maintenant, on peut faire ça. Alors, premièrement, oup, je n'sais pas... Ohup (clicking).
Premièrement, respecter la nature. Alors est ce que c'est une bonne idée ou une mauvaise idée de respecter la nature quand on fait du camping? [Get out your vocabulary please. And if you haven't written the definitions on the list, un, now you can do that. So, is it a good idea or a bad idea to respect nature when camping ?]

Students mumbling

T : Alors juste comme une classe. [Ok, as a class.]

S : bon idée ! [A good idea]

T : Oui ! Bien sur, c'est une bonne idée ! C'est une bonne idée ! bien sur. (clicks)

Alors, jeter les déchets ? Jeter... les déchets. [Yes, Of course, its a good idea ! Its a good idea. Of course. So, throwing trash ? Throwing... trash ?]

Students : Bonne idée. Bonne idée. [Good idea, good idea.]

T : C'est un bonne idée mais, mais c'est une bonne idée si vous jetez les déchets dans la poubelle. (points to trash can). Qu'est ce que c'est une poubelle ? Qu'est ce que c'est une poubelle ? Oui ? [Its a good idea, but, but it's a good idea if you throw trash in the trashcan. What is a trashcan ? What is a trash can ? Yes.]

Ta : C'est un trashcan. [It's a trash can]

T : Oui, c'est le trashcan. C'est le choses en gris la. Le choses en gris la, (points), c'est une poubelle. ... Alors, c'est une bonne idée si vous jetez les déchets dans une poubelle, mais c'est pas (makes a crossing motion with hands) une bonne idée si vous jetez (makes throwing

motion) les déchets dans la terre. (shakes head). Oui ? C'est la terre (draws imaginary circle with hand, pointing to the ground). [Yes, it's a trash can. Its the gray thing over there. The gray thing there, its a trash can. So its a good idea to throw the trash in the trash can, but its not a good idea if you throw the trash on the ground. Yes ? The ground.]

N : Ah oui. [Oh, yes]

Ki : Oui, ah oui. [Yes, ah, yes]

T : Si vous jetez (throwing motion) les déchets dans la terre, c'est un mauvaise (shakes head) idée, oui ? [If you throw the trash on the ground, its a bad idea, yes ?]

N : Jetez [Throw]

T : Alors, nourrir les animaux ! C'est une bonne idée de nourrir les animaux (thumbs up) ? [So, feed animals ! Its a good idea to feed the animals ?]

S : Oh non ! [No]

T : C'est une mauvaise idée ! Une bonne idée ? [Its a bad idea ? A good idea ?]

Students talking a little.

S : Un canard ! [Duck]

S2 : Oui ! [Yes !]

T : Un peu les deux ? Un peu les deux ? [A little of both ? A little of both ?]

S2 (agrees) : Un peu les deux. [A little of both]

T : Oui ? (calling on student) Qu'est ce que tu penses ? [Yes, What do you think ?]

N : Nourrir les uh, un ours, mauves-mauvaise, ce c'est mauvaise idée. [To feed a, un, bear is a bad idea]

T : (smiling) C'est une mauvaise idée (nodding). Oui, uh C'est ce que j'ai pensé aussi ! C'est pas de tout un bonne idée de donner les nourritures à des ours, oui ? Mais, qu-quand est ce

qu'il y a une bonne idée de nourrir les animaux ? Est ce qu'il y a des animaux qu'on peut nourrir ? [Its a bad idea. Yes, uh, thats what I thought too. Its not at all a good idea to give food to the bears right ? By when is it a good idea to feed the animals ? Are there animals you can feed ?]

Kie : On peut nourrir un canard. [You can feed a duck]

T : Oui ! On peut nourrir des canards, oui, tu as raison. Et aussi, est ce qu'il y a des autres animaux ? [Yes, you can feed ducks, you're right. And also, are there other animals ?]

S3 : Um, un fila ? [A fila]

T : Quoi ? Un... [What ? A..]

S4 : Un oiseau. [A bird]

S3 : Oui, un oiseau. [Yes, a bird]

T : Un oiseau (everyone laughs) ? Oui, on peut nourrir des-des oiseaux aussi. Oui, oui, tu as raison. On peut nourrir des oiseaux, oui. .. Oui ? (calling on another student). [A bird ? Yes, one can feed birds too. Yes, you are right. One can feed birds, yes. Yes ?]

Ma: Un poisson ? [A fish ?]

T : Oui, et aussi les poissons. Oui, et Te [Yes, and also fish]

Te : Uh... M

T : Quoi ? Ah, M a dit les poissons, oui. C'est bon. Alors, (pointing to power point) nourrir les animaux. [What ? Ah, M said fish, yes. That's good. So, feed animals..]

IRF #2 : Friday, February 6, 2015

T : Alors, uhh, regardez moi, ici. Ecoutez moi. Umm, d'accord, pourquoi vous ne devriez pas nourrir les animaux ? Qui ont (?) une reponse ? Oui, D ? [So, uhh, look up here. Listen.

Umm, okay why shoul'n't you feed animals ? Who has a response ? Yes, D ?

Devin : Um.. Les animaux, um, ont rage. {Umm, animals with rabies}

T : Oui, possiblement les animaux ont le rage, oui. C'est toujours une bonne idée de ne nourrir des animaux avec le rage. Ah, des autres idées ? Oui, Ca. [Yes, possibly animals with rabies, yes. Its a good idea not to feed animals with rabies. Other ideas ? Yes, Ca ?

Ca : Les animaux.. manger ton, ton droite. [The animals... to eat your, your, right.]

T : Ton quoi ? [Your what ?]

Catcher : Ton doigt. [Your finger]

T :Ton doight (holds up finger) ! Oui ! (Students laugh) Les animaux uh, peuvent manger tes doigts ! (laughs) C'est mauvais si les animaux mangent les doigts, ou le main, ou quelque choses comme ça. Oui, A ? [Your finger ! Yes ! Animals could eat your fingers ! Its bad if the animals eat your fingers, or hand or something like that. Yes, A ?]

A : Les animaux, sont mechants. [The animals are mean]

T : Oui, de temps en temps, les animaux sont mechants. Est ce qu'il y a des animaux qui ne sont pas mechants ? [Yes, some times the animals are mean. Are there any animals that aren't mean ?]

D : Un canard ? [A duck]

T : Possiblement un canard. [Maybe a duck]

S6 : Un lapin ? [A rabbit]

T : Un lapin, probablement des lapins sont pas mechants. Oui, les lapins sont mignon, oui. [A rabbit, probably a rabbit isn't mean. Yes, rabbits are cute, yes.]

S7 : Un ours. [A bear]

T : C'est mechant un ours, ou pas ? [Its mean, a bear, or not ?]

S7 : Oui. [Yes]

T : Alors probablement les ours sont mechants. [So, probably bears are mean]

ICs #1 : Tuesday, March 16, 2015

T : La derniere question : C'est cool de lire les bandes dessinées aux Etats Unis ? Qu'est ce que vous pensez ? Moi, je sais pas. (raises hands saying she doesn't know) Qu'est ce que vous pensez ? Oui (calling on student with their hand raised) ? [The last question : Is it cool to read comics in the US ? What do you think ? I don't know. What do you think ? Yes ?

S1 : Non, pas vraiment. [No, not really]

T : Non pas vraiment ? Pourquoi ? [Not really, why]

S1 : C'est, C'est.. uh je ne sais pas. [Its, its, uh, I don't know.

T : Tu sais pas ? C'est nerdy ? [You don't know ? Its nerdy ?

S1 : Yeah.

T : Je sais pas le mot pour nerdy, mais, c'est nerdy. Okay, peut-etre c'est nerdy Des autres opinions ? C'est cool ? Oui ? [I don't know the word for nerdy, so its nerdy. Okay, maybe its nerdy. Other opinions ? Its cool ?]

S2 : On regarde les films, mais pas les bandes dessinées. [One watches the movies, but not the comics]

T : Okay, alors c'est cool de regarder des films des super-héros. Qui a vu des films des super-héros ? [Okay, so its cool to watch super hero movies, Who has seen a superhero movie ?]

Students raise their hands.

T : Comme Spiderman, Batman, tous ça. Iron Man, the Avengers. C'est juste quelques personnes ?? Levez ta main si tu as regardé ! Okay, il y a beaucoup de personne n'est pas. Alors, les films sont plus- [Like Spiderman, Batman, Iron Man, the Avengers. Just a few people ? Raise your hands if you have seen them. Okay, a lot of people haven't. So the films are more]

Students talking, teacher stops and waits,

T : Les films sont plus populaire que les bandes dessinées qu'on lire, c'est ce que vous dites ? Okay. Des autres opinions ? Qu'est ce que vous pensez ? Des autres opinions ? C'est cool pour les adultes de lire les bandes dessinées ? [The films are more popular than the comics that you read, that's what you're saying ? Okay. Other ideas ? What do you think ? Other opinions ? Is it cool for adults to read comics ?

J shakes her head

T : J tu ne penses pas ? C'est pas cool pour les adultes de lire ? Pour les jeunes ? Qu'est ce que vous pensez ? C'est cool pour les jeunes ? [J you don't think so ? Its not cool for adults to read comics ? For kids ? What do you think ? Its cool for kids ?]

Students : oui [Yes]

T : Oui, peut-etre ? [Yes, maybe ?]

Failed IC, actual IRE #2: Thursday, February 26, 2015

T : Est-ce que la musique est important dans votre vie ? Et pourquoi ? Est-ce que la musique est important pour toi ? (5 seconds later) Personne veut parler aujourd'hui ! Oui, R. [Is music important to in your life ? And why ? Is it that music is important to you ? No one wants to talk today ! Yes ,R.

R : Oui, c'est relaxante. [Yes, its relaxing]

T : C'est relaxante, oui, c'est relaxante d'écouter de la musique. Des autres personnes ?

Oui, Ty [Its relaxing, yes, its relaxing to listen to music. Other people ? Yes, Ty ?

Ty : C'est amusant. [Its amusing]

T : C'est amusante aussi. Alors, c'est important, tu trouve que c'est important d'écouter de la musique ? J ? [Its amusing too. So its important you find that its important to listen to music ? J]

J : On peut danser. [One can dance]

T : Oui, on peut danser, si on ecoute la musique ! Merci. Les autres personnes ? B ?
[Yes, one can dance if you hear music ! Thanks. Other people ? B ?

B : C'est interessant ? [Its interesting ?

T : Oui, c'est interessant aussi. C'est interessant aussi. [Yes, its interesting too. Its interesting too.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abd-Kadir, Jan, Hardman, Frank. (2007). The Discourse of Whole Classroom teaching: A comparative study of Kenyan and Nigerian Primary English Lessons. *Language and Education*. 21 (1).
- Chuska, Kenneth R. (1995). *Improving Classroom Questions*. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Corso, Michael J., Bundick, Matthew J., Quaglia, Russel J. & Haywood, Dawn E. (2013) Where Student, Teacher, and Content Meet: Student Engagement in the Secondary School Classroom. *American Secondary Education*. 41 (3). Retrieved from: <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1509082937?accountid=13158>
- Hall, Joan Kelly. (2001). *Methods for Teaching Foreign Languages: Creating a Community of Learners in the Classroom*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Ngwaru, Jacob M. (2011). Transforming Classroom Discourse and pedagogy in rural Zimbabwe classrooms: the place of local culture and mother tongue use. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum* 24 (3). Retrieved from
- Tepfenhart, K. L. (2011). *Student perceptions of oral participation in the foreign language classroom*. (). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/870288798?accountid=13158>

Todhunter, Susan. (2007). Instructional Conversations in a High School Spanish Class.

Foreign Language Annuals. 40 (4). Retrieved from:

<http://search.proquest.com/docview/61870657?accountid=13158>

Wright, Tony. (2005). Classroom Management in Language Education. New York, New

York: Palgrave MacMillan

ACADEMIC VITA

Anne Lawrenson
5273 Deerfield Ave/ael5261@psu.edu

EDUCATION

- The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802 *May 2015*
World Language Education, French option
- Penn State Schreyer Honors Program *Fall 2012-present*
- Penn State University Dean's List *Fall 2011, Spring 2012, Spring
and Fall 2013, Spring and Fall 2014*
- Institute for the International Education of Students, *January- May 2014*
French Studies Program, Paris, France
- Studied abroad in India with Penn State Schreyer Honors College *July-August 2013*

TEACHING EXPERIENCES

Student Teacher, Altoona Area High School, Altoona, PA *January-April 2015*

- Created and implemented lessons daily
- Assessed student comprehension through written, and oral summative and formative assessments
- Independently designed and taught unit on opinions

Pre-service teaching, Altoona Area High School, Altoona, PA *September-November 2014*

- Observed mentor teacher
- Taught lessons to French three classes
- Analyzed teaching based on videos and supervisor feedback

Malani Foundation Community Outreach Intern, Online *May-August 2014*

- Designed syllabus for potential college class focusing on how to be a successful volunteer in Sri Lanka
- Created a white paper of English as a Foreign Language programs and teaching methods to be used to determine which program is used at the school run by the Malani foundation
- Created a housing contract for recently graduated students working as English teachers with a school in Sri Lanka, living in school owned housing

After school French co-teacher, State College, PA

September- November 2013

- Prepared lesson plans for a six-week introductory French class for 20 six to ten year olds
- Lessons included: interactive weather class, cultural lessons, creating menus for food vocabulary, teaching reading through reading and storytelling, among others
- Implemented and changed lesson plans based on success or needed improvements in the classroom.
- Dealt with behavioral management issues
- Cooperated with co-teachers to effectively manage classroom

Volunteer at CLC Charter school, State College, PA

October-December 2012

- Helped supervise middle school students, most of whom had a variety of learning disabilities in an after school program run by CLC Charter school
- Oversaw clubs run by students, and organized outside games
- Dealt with any behavioral management issues

Summer Camp Counselor, Hampden Township Recreation Department *June-August 2012*

- Supervised middle school students on field trips, daily activities, going to the pool
- Dealt with any disciplinary problems that arose
- Lead small groups, maintained a fun and engaging environment for students

OTHER WORK EXPERIENCES

Buyer for Plato's Closet, Mechanicsburg, PA

June-August 2014

- Purchased clothing items to be sold at the store
- Customer service, cashier

Restaurant Crew member at Chipotle, Camp Hill, PA

May-July 2013

- Prepared menu items for customers
- Prepared ingredients for next day
- Cashier