Chapter 5: Observing Learning & Teaching in the Second Language Classroom

Content adapted from Lightbown and Spada (2006)
Most people would agree that learning a second language in a non-instructional setting is different from learning in the classroom.

Most believe that learning 'on the street' is more effective.

This belief may be based on the fact that most successful learners have had exposure to the language outside the classroom.
In this chapter:

- We explore the differences between
  - classroom settings for language learning
  - and other settings where people learn a new language without instruction

- We try to answer the following questions:
  - What is special about this 'natural' language learning?
  - Can we create the same environment in the classroom?
  - Should we create the same environment in the classroom?
  - Are there essential contributions that only instruction and not natural exposure can provide?
We are going to compare different learning settings/environments:

- **Natural acquisition contexts**
- **Structure-based instructional environments** (e.g. Grammar-Translation and Audiolingual methods)
- **Communicative** (p. 196), **content-based** (p. 197), and **task-based** (p. 205) instructional environments
Natural & instructional settings

Natural acquisition contexts:

Where can we find natural acquisition contexts?

- Contexts where the learner is exposed to the TL at work or in social interaction

- If the learner is a child, in a school situation where most of the other children are native speakers of the TL and where the instruction is directed toward native speakers rather than toward learners of the language.
Structure-based instructional environments:

What are the main characteristics of the structure-based instructional settings?

- In this settings, the language is taught to a group of second or foreign language learners.
- The focus is on the language itself, rather than on the messages carried by the language.
- The teacher’s goal is to teach students the vocabulary and grammatical rules of the TL.
- Some students in structure-based classes may have opportunities to continue learning the TL outside the classroom. However, for others, the classroom is the only contact with the TL.
- In some cases, the learners' goal may be to pass an examination rather than to use the language for daily communicative interaction beyond the classroom.
Communicative, content-based, and task-based instructional environments:

What are the general characteristics of communicative, content-based, and task-based instructional settings?

- They might involve learners whose goal is learning the language itself.

- However, the style of instruction places the emphasis on interaction, conversation, and language use, rather than on learning about the language.

- The topics that are discussed in communicative and task-based instructional environments are often of general interest to the learner (e.g. how to reply to a classified advertisement from a newspaper.)

- In content-based instruction, the focus of a lesson is usually on the subject matter (e.g. history or mathematics,) which students are learning through the medium of the second language.
Communicative, content-based, and task-based instructional environments (cont.):

What are the general characteristics of communicative, content-based, and task-based instructional settings?

- In these classes, the focus may occasionally be on the language itself, but the emphasis is on using the language rather than talking about it.

- The language that teachers use for teaching is not selected solely for the purpose of teaching a specific feature of the language, but also to make sure learners have the language they need to interact in a variety of contexts.

- Students' success in these courses is often measured in terms of their ability to 'get things done' in the second language, rather than on their accuracy in using certain grammatical features.
In the chart in Table 5.1, p. 111, we compare natural and instructional contexts for second language learning.

Think about the characteristics of the four contexts represented by each column.

For each context, decide whether the characteristics on the left are present or absent.

- Mark a plus (+) in the table if the characteristic is typical of that context.
- Mark a minus (-) if it is something you usually do not find in that context.
- Write '?' if you are not sure.

Note that the 'Communicative instruction' column has been subdivided into teacher-student and student-student interaction. What happens when learners talk to each other? Is that different from what happens in teacher-student interaction?
Learning one thing at a time?

- Language is not presented step by step.
- The learner is exposed to a wide variety of vocabulary and structures.
Frequent feedback on error?

- Learners' errors are rarely corrected.
- If their interlocutors can understand what they are saying, they do not remark on errors.
- They would probably feel it is rude to do so.
Natural acquisition settings

Ample time for learning?

- The learner is surrounded by the language for many hours each day.
- Sometimes the language is addressed to the learner; sometimes it is simply overheard.
Natural acquisition settings

*High ratio of native speakers to learners?*

- The learner usually encounters a number of people who use the target language proficiently.
Variety of language and discourse types?

- Learners observe or participate in many different types of language events:
  - brief greetings, commercial transactions, exchanges of information, arguments, instructions at school or in the workplace.
  - Older children and adults may encounter the written language in the form of notices, newspapers, posters, etc.
Pressure to speak?

- Learners must often use their limited second language ability to respond to questions or get information.

- In these situations, the emphasis is on getting meaning across clearly, and more proficient speakers tend to be tolerant of errors that do not interfere with meaning.
**Access to modified input?**

- Modified input is available in many one-to-one conversations.

- However, in situations where many native speakers are involved in the conversation the learner may have difficulty getting access to language he or she can understand.

  (e.g. An American learning Arabic as a second language participating in a conversation with eight Saudis who are conversing in Arabic or a Saudi learning ESL participating in a conversation with seven Americans conversing in English)
The events and activities that are typical of structure-based instruction differ from those encountered in natural acquisition settings.

In GRAMMAR TRANSLATION approaches, there is considerable use of reading and writing, as learners translate texts from one language to another and grammar rules are taught explicitly.

In AUDIOLINGUAL approaches, there is little use of the first language, and learners are expected to learn mainly through repetition and habit formation, although they may be asked to figure out the grammar rules for the sentences they have memorized.
Learning one thing at a time?

Linguistic items are presented and practiced in isolation, one item at a time, in a sequence from simple to complex (based on teachers or textbook writers)
Frequent feedback on error?

- Errors are frequently corrected.

- Accuracy tends to be given priority over meaningful interaction.
Ample time for learning?

Learning is often limited to a few hours a week.
Structure-based instructional settings

High ratio of native speakers to learners?

- The teacher is often the only native or proficient speaker the student comes in contact with, especially in situations of FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING (e.g. EFL).
Variety of language and discourse types?

- Students experience a limited range of language discourse types.

- The most typical of these is the **Initiation/Response/Evaluation (IRE)** exchange where the teacher asks a question, a student answers, and the teacher evaluates the response.

- The written language they encounter is selected primarily to provide practice with specific grammatical features rather than for its content.
Pressure to speak?

Students often feel pressure to speak or write the second language and to do so correctly from the very beginning.
Access to modified input?

- Teachers often use the learners' native language to give instructions or in classroom management events.
- When they use the target language, they tend to modify their language in order to ensure comprehension and compliance.
Designers of communicative language teaching programmes have sought to replace some of the characteristics of structure-based instruction with those more typical of natural acquisition contexts.

In communicative and content-based instruction, the emphasis is on the communication of meaning, both:

- between teacher and students
- and among the students themselves in group or pair work.
Learning one thing at a time?

- Input is simplified and made comprehensible by the use of contextual cues and gestures, rather than through structural grading.

- Students provide each other with simplified and sometimes erroneous input.
Frequent feedback on error?

- There is a limited amount of error correction on the part of the teacher, and meaning is emphasized over form.

- Students tend not to overtly correct each other's errors when they are engaged in communicative practice.

- Because the focus is on meaning, however, requests for clarification may serve as implicit feedback.

- The need to negotiate for meaning may help students see the need to say something in a different way.
Ample time for learning?

- Learners usually have only limited time for learning.

- In a typical teacher-fronted classroom with 25-30 students, individual students get very little opportunity to produce language in a sixty-minute class, and when they do, it’s usually in the form of a short response to a teacher’s question.

- When students work in pairs or groups, they have opportunities to produce and respond to a greater amount of language.

- Sometimes, however, subject-matter courses taught through the second language can add time for language learning. (e.g. In international schools in Saudi Arabia, students are exposed to the TL all the time as the medium of instruction. However, in public schools or language centers, students might only be exposed to the TL four hours a week.).
High ratio of native speakers to learners?

- It is usually only the teacher who is a proficient speaker.

- Learners have considerable exposure to the interlanguage of other learners, particularly in student-student interaction.

- This naturally contains errors that would not be heard in an environment where the interlocutors are native speakers, but it provides many more opportunities for students to use the target language than is the case in most structure-based instruction.
Variety of language and discourse types?

- A variety of discourse types may be introduced through stories, peer- and group-work, the use of 'authentic' materials such as newspapers and television broadcasts.

- Text materials may include both those modified for second language learners and those intended for native speakers.

- In the latter case, teachers use instructional strategies to help learners get the meaning, even if they do not know all the words and structures.

- In student-student interaction, learners may practise a range of sociolinguistic and functional features of language through role-play.
Pressure to speak?

- There is little pressure to perform at high levels of accuracy.
- There is often a greater emphasis on comprehension than production, especially in the early stages of learning.
Access to modified input?

- Modified input is a defining feature of this approach to instruction.

- The teacher makes every effort to speak to students in a level of language they can understand.

- If students speak the same first language, they may have less difficulty in understanding each other.

- If they come from different language backgrounds, they may modify their language as they seek to communicate successfully.

Communicative instructional settings
Many different observation schemes have been developed for use in second language classrooms.

*Why are they used?*

- to look at how differences in teaching practices are related to differences in second language learning
- in the training of new teachers
- in the professional development of experienced ones.
Excerpts from 4 transcripts of second language classroom interaction

- 2 present teacher-student interaction & 2 present student-student interaction

The teacher-student transcripts come from classrooms that differ in their approach to second language teaching

- structure-based instruction

- communicative approach
Classroom comparisons: Teacher-student interactions

With each transcript, there is a chart where you can indicate whether certain things are happening in the interaction, from the point of view of the teacher and that of the students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Errors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on errors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation of meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalinguistic comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Classroom comparisons: Teacher-student interactions

Characteristics of input and interaction

- Compare the two charts.
- What are the similarities and what are the differences?
Classroom comparisons: Teacher-student interactions

Characteristics of input and interaction:

Classroom A:

1. Errors:

Very few on the part of the teacher.

However, her speech does have some peculiar characteristics typical of this type of teaching (e.g. The questions in statement form-often asked with dramatic rising intonation: 'You don't know what it is?').

Students don't make too many errors because they say very little and what they say is usually limited by the lesson.
Classroom comparisons: Teacher-student interactions

Characteristics of input and interaction:

2. Feedback on errors:

Yes, whenever students do make errors, the teacher reacts.
Classroom comparisons: Teacher-student interactions

Characteristics of input and interaction:

3. Genuine questions:

• Yes, a few, but they are almost always related to classroom management.

• No questions from the students.
Classroom comparisons: Teacher-student interactions

Characteristics of input and interaction:

4. Display questions:

Yes, almost all of the teacher's questions are of this type.

Interestingly, however, the students sometimes interpret display questions as genuine questions (T: What are you doing, Paul? S: Nothing.).

The teacher wants students to produce any sentence in the 'present continuous' but the student worries that he's about to get in trouble and asserts that he is doing 'nothing'.

This is a good example of how the teacher's pragmatic intent can be misinterpreted by the student.
Classroom comparisons: Teacher-student interactions

Characteristics of input and interaction:

5. Negotiation of meaning:

Very little

Learners have no need to paraphrase or request clarifications, and no opportunity to determine the direction of the discourse.

The teacher is focused only on the formal aspects of the learners' language. All the effort goes into getting students to produce a sentence with the present continuous form of the verb.
Classroom comparisons: Teacher-student interactions

Characteristics of input and interaction:

6. Metalinguistic comments:

Yes, this is how the teacher begins the lesson and lets the students know what really matters!
Classroom comparisons: Teacher-student interactions

Characteristics of input and interaction:

Classroom B:

1. Errors:

Yes, students make errors.

Even the teacher says some odd things.

Her speech also contains incomplete sentences, simplified ways of speaking, and an informal speech style.
Classroom comparisons: Teacher-student interactions

Characteristics of input and interaction:

2. Feedback on errors:

Yes, sometimes the teacher repeats what the student has said with the correct form (e.g. 'he bugzz me' -emphasizing the third person singular ending).

However, this correction is not consistent or intrusive as the focus is primarily on letting students express their meanings.
Classroom comparisons: Teacher-student interactions

Characteristics of input and interaction:

3. Genuine questions:

Yes, almost all of the teacher's questions are focused on getting information from the students.

The students are not asking questions in this exchange.
Classroom comparisons: Teacher-student interactions

Characteristics of input and interaction:

4. Display questions:

No, because there is a focus on meaning rather than on accuracy in grammatical form.
Classroom comparisons: Teacher-student interactions

Characteristics of input and interaction:

5. Negotiation of meaning:

Yes, from the teacher's side, especially in the long exchange about who has a bicycle!
Classroom comparisons: Teacher-student interactions

Characteristics of input and interaction:

6. Metalinguistic comments:

No. Even though the teacher clearly hopes to get students to use the third person ending, she does not say so in these words.
Classroom comparisons: Teacher-student interactions

Although the activities in the two transcripts are both teacher-centered, the transcripts are very different from each other.
Classroom comparisons: Teacher-student interactions

Classroom A

- The focus is on form (i.e. grammar)
- The purpose of the interaction is to practice the present continuous.
- Although the teacher uses real classroom events and some humor, there is no real interest in what students are doing.
- There is a primary focus on correct grammar, display questions, and error correction.

Classroom B

- The focus is on meaning, conversational interaction, and genuine questions.
- There are, however, some brief references to grammatical accuracy when the teacher feels it is necessary.
This section presents some student-student interactions.

The transcripts are based on the interactions between second language learners engaged in different communicative tasks.

As in the previous section, there is a chart with each transcript where you can indicate whether certain things are happening in the interaction.

P. 121
Classroom comparisons: Student-student interactions

Characteristics of input and interaction:

Compare the two charts you have completed.

- What kinds of second language input and opportunities for interaction are available to learners in each of the environments?

- How are they different from each other?

- How are they different from the teacher-student interaction you looked at previously?
Classroom comparisons: Student-student interactions

Characteristics of input and interaction:

Communication task A

1. Errors:

There are many errors in the speech of both learners.

This includes grammatical and pronunciation errors.

These errors are present in several breakdowns in the learners' conversation.
Characteristics of input and interaction:

2 Feedback on errors:

There is no error correction in terms of form as the learners struggle to understand each other's meaning.

The difficulty they are having in communication may serve as a kind of implicit feedback.

That is, the fact that the interlocutor does not understand may signal that there is something wrong with what they have said.
Classroom comparisons: Student-student interactions

*Characteristics of input and interaction:*

**3 Genuine questions:**

Yes, there are many genuine questions.

Naturally, Student 2 asks most of these questions because he needs to get the information from Student 1 in order to draw the picture.

Student 1 also asks some genuine questions and these are almost always to ask for clarification.
Classroom comparisons: Student-student interactions

*Characteristics of input and interaction:*

4. Display questions:

No, there are no display questions because they engaged in a real communication gap exchange.

Student 2 cannot see the picture that Student 1 possesses. Therefore, all the questions asked are real questions.
Classroom comparisons: Student-student interactions

Characteristics of input and interaction:

5. Negotiation of meaning:

Yes, indeed!

Both learners are trying hard to understand each other, even though they often fail to do so.

This involves many comprehension questions and clarification requests, as well as repetitions of each other's utterances, often with emphasis, trying to understand what the other learner has just said.
Classroom comparisons: Student-student interactions

Characteristics of input and interaction:

6. Metalinguistic comments:

None
Classroom comparisons: Student-student interactions

Characteristics of input and interaction:

Communication task B

1. Errors:

Both learners make several grammatical errors, most notably the repeated failure to produce the reflexive form of the verb se souvenir.
Characteristics of input and interaction:

2. Feedback on errors:

There is no actual error correction provided.

Neither learner is really sure what the correct form is.

Instead, there is metalinguistic reflection and discussion as they try to figure out whether they are using the correct form of the verb se souvenir.
Classroom comparisons: Student-student interactions

Characteristics of input and interaction:

3. Genuine questions:

The questions that are asked are genuine.

The content is language form, but the students are genuinely sharing information about how to complete the task.
Classroom comparisons: Student-student interactions

Characteristics of input and interaction:

4. Display questions:

There are no display questions.

The students are actively collaborating to reconstruct the story and are asking real questions of each other.
Characteristics of input and interaction:

5. Negotiation of meaning:

At this point in the interaction, the students have agreed on the content of the story.

Thus, there is more NEGOTIATION OF FORM, that is, more discussion of whether they are using the correct forms to say what they've agreed they want to say.
Characteristics of input and interaction:

6. Metalinguistic comments:

Although they are not using words such as 'verb' or 'pronoun', the students are talking about language as they focus on trying to find the right form.
These two transcripts of student-student interaction are very different from each other.

Task A
- They focus exclusively on meaning
- They focus on trying to understand each other in order to complete the information gap activity.
- They are constantly using comprehension and clarification requests as they negotiate meaning.

Task B
- They focus on both form and meaning.
- They make several explicit statements about whether they are using the correct form of the reflexive verb se souvenir.
- They continually question the grammatical accuracy of their use of this form as they continue to discuss the content of the story.
In the previous activities, we have described and compared teacher-student and student-student interaction in terms of six observation categories.

Some observation schemes use many more categories.

Others focus on one category.

In the next lecture, we will review eight studies in which one particular feature of instruction has been examined.

- Four studies examine corrective feedback
- Four studies examine teachers' use of questions
Study 1: Recasts in content-based classrooms

Roy Lyster and Leila Ranta (1997) developed an observational scheme which:

• describes different types of feedback teachers give on errors

• examines student UPTAKE (how they immediately respond to the feedback)

This scheme was developed in French immersion classrooms where L2 students learn the TL via subject-matter instruction (i.e. content-based instruction).
They observed the different types of corrective feedback provided during interaction in:

- Four French immersion classrooms
- 9-11 year-old students

**Findings:**

1. Their study identified six feedback types.
1. Explicit correction

It refers to the explicit provision of the correct form.

As the teacher provides the correct form, he or she clearly indicates that what the student had said was incorrect, using expressions like:

- 'Oh, you mean ...
- 'You should say ...
- 'Fastly' doesn't exist. 'Fast' does not take -ly. That's why I picked 'quickly'.
2. Recasts

They involve the teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance, minus the error.

They are generally implicit in that they are NOT introduced by 'You mean', 'Use this word', or 'You should say'.

S1 Why you don't like Marc?

T Why don't you like Marc?

S2 I don't know, I don't like him.

Note that in this example the teacher does not seem to expect uptake from S1. It seems she is merely reformulating the question S1 has asked S2.
3. Clarification requests

They indicate to students either:

- that their utterance has been misunderstood by the teacher
- or that the utterance is incorrect in some way and that a repetition or a reformulation is required.

A clarification request includes:

- phrases such as 'Pardon me ...'
- a repetition of the error as in 'What do you mean by ...?'

T  How often do you wash the dishes?
S  Fourteen.

T  Excuse me. (Clarification request)
S  Fourteen.

T  Fourteen what? (Clarification request)
S  Fourteen for a week.

T  Fourteen times a week? (Recast)
S  Yes. Lunch and dinner.
4. Metalinguistic feedback

It contains comments, information, or questions related to the correctness of the student's utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form.

- **Metalinguistic comments** generally indicate that there is an error somewhere (e.g. 'Can you find your error?').

- **Metalinguistic information** generally provides either some grammatical terminology that refers to the nature of the error (e.g. 'It's masculine') or a word definition in the case of lexical error (e.g. Eat means: Put (food) into the mouth and chew and swallow it / Feed means: give food to.)

- **Metalinguistic questions** also point to the nature of the error but attempt to elicit the information from the student (e.g. 'Is it feminine?').
4. **Metalinguistic feedback (Cont.)**

S  We look at the people yesterday.

T  What's the ending we put on verbs when we talk about the past?

S  e-d
5. Elicitation

It refers to at least three techniques that teachers use to directly elicit the correct form from the students:

1. Teachers elicit completion of their own utterance (e.g. 'It's a ... ').

2. Teachers use questions to elicit correct forms (e.g. 'How do we say madrasah in English?').

3. Teachers occasionally ask students to reformulate their utterance.

   S  My father cleans the plate.

   T  Excuse me, he cleans the ???

   S  Plates?
6. Repetition

It refers to the teacher's repetition of the student's erroneous utterance.

In most cases, teachers adjust their intonation so as to highlight the error.
6. Repetition (Cont.)

Example 1: The repetition is followed by a recast:

S  He's in the bathroom.

T  Bathroom? Bedroom. He's in the bedroom.

Example 2: The repetition is followed by metalinguistic comment and explicit correction:

S  We is ...

T  We is? But it's two people, right? You see your mistake? You see the error? When it's plural it's 'we are'.

Corrective feedback in the classroom
Findings (Cont.)

2. All teachers in the content-based French immersion classes they observed used *recasts* more than any other type of feedback.
   - Recasts accounted for more than half of the total feedback provided in the four classes.

3. Repetition of error was the least frequent feedback type provided.

4. The other types of corrective feedback fell in between.
Findings (Cont.)

5. Student uptake was
   - least likely to occur after *recasts*
   - and more likely to occur after *clarification requests*, *metalinguistic feedback*, and *repetitions*.

6. *Elicitations* and *metalinguistic feedback* not only resulted in more uptake, they were also more likely to lead to a corrected form of the original utterance.
Lyster (1998) has argued that students in content-based second language classrooms (where the emphasis is on meaning not form) are less likely to notice recasts than other forms of error correction.

In this type of instruction, students may assume that the teacher is responding to the content rather than the form of their speech.

Indeed, the double challenge of

- making the subject-matter comprehensible
- and enhancing knowledge of the second language itself within subject-matter instruction

has led Merrill Swain (1988) to conclude that 'not all content teaching is necessarily good language teaching'.
Since Lyster and Ranta reported their findings, several other observation studies of the type of corrective feedback provided in second or foreign language classrooms have been carried out.

Some of them report similar results:

- that recasts are the most frequently occurring type of feedback provided by teachers
- and that they appear to go unnoticed by learners

However, others report that learners do notice recasts in the classroom.
Study 2: Recasts and private speech

- Amy Ohta (2000)
- She conducted a study on adult foreign language learners of Japanese
- She examined the oral language that learners addressed to themselves during classroom activities.
Corrective feedback in the classroom

**Procedure:**

- She was able to obtain this PRIVATE SPEECH by attaching microphones to individual students during classroom interaction.
  - The classroom interaction consisted of a focus on grammar and metalinguistic instruction.
Findings:

1. Learners noticed recasts when they were provided by the instructor.

2. Learners were more likely to react to a recast with private speech when it was directed to another learner or to the whole class rather than when it was directed to their own errors.
Conclusion:
Recasts do get noticed in classroom interaction even if they do not lead to 'uptake' from the student who originally produced the error.
Questions in the classroom

*Study 8: Wait time*

Presentation
Another way of observing teaching and learning in second or foreign language classrooms is to describe classroom behaviors without a set of predetermined categories.

Instead, the observer takes extensive notes of the activities, practices, and interactions between teachers and learners.

This approach to classroom observation is often referred to as ETHNOGRAPHY.

In doing ethnographic research in classrooms, the observer can either be:

- a participant in the classroom activities (e.g. as a teacher aid)
- or as a non-participant, someone who sits quietly and unobtrusively in the background, observing and recording.
Ethnographies involve qualitative studies that are much broader in scope than the studies described earlier.

Ethnographies do not only focus on learning or teaching but also on social, cultural, and political contexts and their impact on learners' cognitive, linguistic, and social development.
e.g. Martha Crago's (1992) study of Inuit children led her to argue that if children come from a culture in which silence is a respectful and effective way to learn from an adult, their second language instructor needs to know this so that the children's behavior is not misinterpreted as refusal to participate or inability to comprehend.
The following presentations provide summaries of three ethnographies carried out in second and foreign language classrooms:

- one in the South Pacific
- one in Canada
- one in Europe
Study 9: Language in the home and school

Karen Watson-Gegeo (1992)

A longitudinal study over several years

Nine families in the Solomon Islands

She explored language use practices in the home and in the school.
Findings:

1. The environments in the homes were rich and stimulating for both linguistic and cognitive development.

2. Nevertheless, a large number of the children failed in school.
Findings (Cont.):

3. A detailed analysis uncovered many differences in language use and values between the home and school setting.

- There was no use of the children's first language in school. Their first language was replaced with a restricted and often incorrect version of English.

- Part of the children's language socialization experience at home included parents:
  - negatively portraying their experiences at school,
  - expressing fears about their children's ability to succeed
  - and raising fundamental questions about the value of school in their lives.
Conclusion:

These factors were central in contributing to the children's lack of continued cognitive and linguistic development in school.
Study 10: Separation of L2 learners in primary schools

Presentation
Ethnography

Study 11: Socio-political change and foreign language classroom discourse

Presentation
Thank you