

The Interactional Patterns of Socializing into Reading Strategy Development in an ESL Reading Class*

Sun-Young Kim
(Catholic University)

Kim, Sun-Young. 2008. The Interactional Patterns of Socializing into Reading Strategy Development in an ESL Reading Class. *Linguistic Research* 25(2), 21-44. The primary purpose of this study was to examine the different patterns of interaction ESL Korean students engaged in while learning reading strategies through the classroom interaction in the context of a TOEFL reading class. From a perspective of L2 socialization, this study explored how interactional patterns could constrain or promote the opportunities to develop reading strategies. This paper examined the sequences of peer interactions to observe to what extent the students' utterances were organized in the way to facilitate their learning of reading strategies. Using the strategy-related utterances and interviews with students, the researcher identified two different sequences of interactions that helped to understand the learner differences in reading strategy use. The results showed that the Korean students were better able to negotiate difficulties and expertise under the complete sequence of interaction described as asking questions, helping behaviors by others, and returning the initial task. On the contrary, under the incomplete sequence of interaction, the opportunities to develop students' own strategies often went awry in the middle of the classroom practices. The present study argues for the important role of the socially organized activity in reading strategy development in L2 reading classes. (Catholic University)

Keywords reading strategies, patterns of interaction, L2 socialization

1. Introduction

Until recently, research on reading strategies conducted under the cognitive approach in the L2 literature has focused on identifying the characteristics of proficient learners in using the strategies and on developing reading strategy instruction for less proficient L2 learners. This development of reading strategy instruction linked to the theories of

* I'd like to express my appreciation to anonymous reviewers for their valuable criticism and suggestions. All remaining errors are of my own.

reading development (i.e., bottom-up processing, top-down processing, interactive approaches) does not account for the role played by social (classroom) interaction. In this respect, the scope of an interaction is limited to the individual learner him/herself (Grabe, 1991; Hudson, 1998). Recent studies on L2 reading strategies can be understood as an attempt to accommodate sociocultural dimensions of reading strategy development, such as cooperative learning with strategy instruction, portfolio approach, and peer tutoring (Donato & McCormick, 1994; Gillet, 1994). Within this paradigm, L2 reading in academic setting is viewed as a social practice that takes into account social (peer) interaction and comprehension as the outcome of both individual and social process.

Many studies (Atkinson & Ramanathan, 1995; Morita, 2000; Prior, 1994; Spack, 1997) have explored the academic discourse socialization of L2 learners by focusing on the use of reading strategies. Those studies showed that L2 readers should have an opportunity to recognize a full range of reading strategies used by group members to self-access, reflect on, and share various aspects of L2 reading strategies. From this perspective, 'previously perceived successful comprehension strategies' are not necessarily the appropriate strategies in that these strategies may be differentially appropriate. However, few studies have been concerned with the issue of the pattern of interaction that often constrains or promotes opportunities for developing reading strategies in various ways. One of the difficulties emerging from the prior studies is that they failed to elaborate how patterns of interaction could shape types of socialization in various ways and thus the learning outcomes.

Rather than taught those strategies explicitly in class under the assumption of their systematic application in L2 reading, I, as a teacher, designed the mini-lessons (i.e., preparing for, teaching, and discussing the assigned reading) to give my learners the opportunities to develop their own reading strategies through the classroom interaction. Korean L2 learners were expected to gradually learn how to utilize the appropriate strategies by preparing for, performing, and evaluating their mini-lessons. The role of the mini-lesson was to encourage Korean learners to be active participants through the engagement in the interaction with peers and to provide the opportunities for sharing their expertise and difficulties in learning reading strategies.

The purpose of this study was to explore how 'patterns of interaction' ESL Korean learners engaged in during the mini-lessons promoted or constrained the opportunities to develop reading strategies. Throughout the mini-lessons that offered the range of opportunities, Korean learners were expected to share various aspects of reading

strategies (i.e., how, when, and where to use the particular strategy). As an attempt to understand the interpersonal dynamics in learning the strategies, this study extended the studies of reading strategies into the framework of L2 language socialization comprising the interpersonal dimension of the reading strategy use. The specific research questions raised here were as follows.

1. What are the interactional patterns of shaping Korean students' ways of socializing into the use of reading strategies in an ESL reading class?
2. How do these patterns, if any, promote or constrain the opportunities for a group of Korean students to develop appropriate reading strategies specific to their L2 learning?

2. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical aspect framing my study is *Language Socialization* (Duff, 1995, 2007; Morita, 2000; Ochs, 1988; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, 1986b). Language socialization emphasizes the interdependence of the language acquisition and sociocultural knowledge through interaction and the process of being socialized into the social practice of the classroom culture. One of the elements of language socialization is the conceptualization of the novice/expert relationship and the related scaffoldings occurring through 'asymmetric information of novice and expert' (Pool, 1992, p.594). Unlike L1 socialization that views novice/expert relationship as static and unidirectional (i.e., teacher/student, parent/children), L2 socialization (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Rogoff, 1990) introduces the concept of '*guided participation*' to address the socialization process occurring on a bi-directional continuum.

Another element of this theory is the concept of activity (Leont'ev, 1981; Rogoff, 1990; Vygotsky, 1978), which provides a framework for understanding reading strategy development within the context of the socioculturally organized activities. According to the activity theory, L2 learners, to construct their own reading strategies, should know why (object-oriented activity), how (goal-directed action), and where (situated learning) to use the particular strategy applicable to their L2 reading.

The choice of activity depends on the learners' needs, the nature of the text, and the demands for reading tasks. While classroom activities should provide an environment

that involves adult ESL learners in considerable learning situations, ESL classroom has to be small enough to meet diverse interests of adult L2 learners. In evaluating the traditional classroom (i.e., a large IELP classroom) as an appropriate language socialization space, Duff (2007) demonstrated that classroom practice could create barriers to successful participation and stressed the fundamental tension that existed between the teacher's need to engage all the students and to ensure the participation of inactive learners. To understand reading strategies as a social process, it is important to create a participatory climate that is less hierarchical than the climate produced by traditional approaches. In this context, using small groups (Brookfield, 1992; Draves, 1997) in adult ESL learning promotes teamwork and encourages cooperation among members. My tutoring class, appropriately structured, emphasized the importance of learning from peers and allowed all the participants to be involved in discussion through one type of class activity (mini-lesson) and to assume a variety of learners' roles.

3. Literature Review

3.1 Interactive Approach to Reading Strategies

In the context of self-interaction, the researches in explicit reading strategies instruction are characterized as nonexistence of the role played by social interaction, performance-oriented, and the assumption of the existence of the universal reading strategies applicable to every learner (Bremner, 1998; Chamot & O'Malley, 1994; Green & Oxford, 1995; O'Malley et al, 1985; Padron, 1991; Skehan, 1989). Those typical strategy training studies, using 'encapsulated instruction' and viewing reading strategies as the product of one's cognitive process and personality, emphasized the effectiveness of the strategy instruction and their systematic application to L2 reading process.

The mixed results of those studies could be used as the evidence of the limited application of direct strategy instruction. Although the positive results were reported in some studies (Bremner, 1998; Green & Oxford, 1995; Padron, 1991), differential gains depending on individual characteristics (Skehan, 1989), culture (O'Malley et al., 1985), and ethnicity (Chamot & O'Malley, 1994) might explain the nature of L2 reading strategies that could not be generalized across learning contexts.

These performance-oriented studies seem to support that it is nearly impossible to teach

the appropriate strategies without learner-specific information (i.e., ways of developing the strategies), and that the strategies used by good learners may not be immediately transferable. This suggests the need for process-oriented studies that examine L2 learners in a rich natural setting over an extended period of time (Ellis, 1994).

Some studies (Chamot, 1987, 2001; Politzer & McGroarty, 1985) conducted under the cognitive approach, though interactional dimensions were not accounted for, also provided the evidence against the direct strategy instruction. As Politzer & McGroarty (1985) demonstrated, good strategies might be differentially appropriate for various types of skills and learner behaviors. Chamot (1987, 2001) also invalidated the strategy instruction in that good strategies may be good or bad depending on the personal approach to L2 learning.

3.2 Sociocultural Approach to Reading Strategies

From the sociocultural approach to reading strategies (Donato & McCormick, 1994), reading process is viewed as a social process that takes into account the interaction among learners. Under this approach, the role of the social interaction among learners should be seriously considered in reading strategy research (Cohen, 2000; Cotterall, 1995; Donato & McCormick, 1994; Fuchs, Fuchs, Mathes, & Simmons, 1997; Gillette, 1994; Klinger & Vaughn, 1996, 2000; Klinger, Vaughn, & Schumm, 1998; Navarrete, 1985; Liang et al., 1998; O'Connor & Jenkins, 1996; Stevens & Slavin, 1995).

The early studies on 'reading strategy instruction with cooperative learning' are characterized as 'intervention studies' that investigated the effectiveness of the classroom interaction on the reading strategy and thus reading comprehension. Stevens and Slavin (1995), in their experimental study involving fourth-grade students from ethnically diverse schools concluded no significant difference between cooperative group and direct strategy instruction group although the outcomes from both groups were superior to those of 'no instruction group'. On the other hand, Fuchs et al. (1997) and Klinger et al. (1998) conducted the similar studies and reported the results in favor of the strategy instruction with cooperative learning, though the qualitative information about L2 learner's developmental process was not addressed.

Such limitations were later improved by other studies (Klinger et al., 1998; Klinger & Vaughn, 2000) that attempted to combine both the quantitative and qualitative approaches. In their studies, qualitative approach (audiotape in Klinger et al. and classroom observation and videotape in Klinger & Vaughn) was used to explain the

outcome measures. Specifically, discourse analysis of the peer talk (total turn speaking regardless of length) was examined to explain how L2 learners were assisted by peer interaction. One of the weaknesses of their studies is that the quality of utterances (i.e., talks actually negotiated, endorsed, or rejected during the interaction) was not captured by the percentage of talks devoted to the strategy-related discussion. Klinger and Vaughn (2000) and Cotterall (1995) conducted the similar study and showed how cooperative learning method could help L2 readers learn reading strategies through peer L2 interaction. Despite their methodological contribution to reading research, the study based on ‘previously successful strategy instruction model’ is considered one of the weaknesses.

As an alternative approach to direct strategy instruction (Donato & McCormick, 1994; Gillette, 1994), or ‘portfolio approach,’ both studies involving college L2 learners employed the portfolio technique to examine the impact of performance-based portfolios on the development of learning strategies. Instead of proving explicit strategy training, they required L2 learners to document and reflect on their own growth and concluded that the portfolios provide the longitudinal evidence of growth in strategy use. Those studies clearly illustrated how individual learners were socialized into constructing their own strategic learning through learner diaries (Gillette, 1994) and through portfolio (Donato & McCormick, 1994). Despite their contribution to understanding individual L2 learner’s progress in strategy development, the importance of interaction in this process was not accounted for in their studies.

All the studies reviewed here, though attempting to accommodate the sociocultural aspects of reading strategies, have failed to recognize the importance of dimensions of interaction (interaction patterns), which may constrain the interactional opportunities for developing reading strategies. Since L2 readers in an academic setting often engage in critical dialogs with specific purpose and intention to develop their own strategies, there are many ways patterns of interaction can go awry.

As Liang et al. (1998) argues, working together does not constitute the condition for scaffoldings to occur (Jacob et al., 1996). Especially, in academic setting, where strategic learners come to the class with learner-specific purposes and interests, the dimensions of interaction are considered dynamic, shaping types of socialization in various ways. This calls for further research to examine the quality of interaction (i.e., interactional dynamics in L2 classroom). As an attempt to address these issues, this study examines the patterns of interaction that may either provide opportunities for developing reading strategies or constrain these opportunities in L2 reading class.

4. Method

4.1 Participants

To explore the research questions addressed above, I chose ‘*case study approach*’ to examine the case (i.e., reading strategy development of a group of Korean L2 learners). The case study, though not often used in L2 reading studies, enables the researcher to pay close attention to the particular classroom practices (mini-lesson) and the insider’s perspective on reading strategy development.

The five participants were selected from intermediate class (level 4 and 5 in a 6-level program) in the Intensive English Language Program at an urban university in the US and all were native Koreans preparing for TOEFL test to enter the university in the US. Two regular meetings were held per week for five months, and each class met for 1.5 hours (total 72 hours: 24 weeks). In my five-month study, each participant was required to conduct at least one mini-lesson based on the assigned TOEFL reading.

During the mini-lesson, each student as a tutor presented the assigned TOEFL reading to the peer students to explain her/his own ways of solving reading problems. In this process, other students as experts or novices participated in the discussion to address their use of reading strategies. Thus, the mini-lessons led by the students provided opportunities to develop their reading strategies through the interaction with peers.

4.2 Data Collection

Data were collected during a five-month period through three methods. First, mini-lessons were tape-recorded, which served as the primary data to analyze various interpersonal dynamics in L2 classroom. Second, interviews with each presenter were transcribed right after each mini-lesson, which provided information about the use of reading strategies. Finally, partially structured interview data were transcribed at the end of the project.

4.3 Data Analysis

The transcripts of the mini-lessons and from two respective interviews were reviewed and coded; categories and related topics were established by classifying those data. Also, the mini-lesson data were linked to the data from the two types of interview data.

First, all the data from the mini-lessons and interviews were categorized into two patterns of interaction through the classification system (sequence of interaction, Navarrete, 1985). And two patterns of interaction emerging from data were defined as:

- Complete Sequence of Interaction (i.e., raising question, involving peers, and returning to the initial task)
- Incomplete Sequence of Interaction (i.e., any break-downs of the complete sequence of interaction)

The following sample illustrates the pattern of the complete sequence (the excerpt from Park's mini-lesson) under which a learner-specific problem was negotiated through the sequence of interactions.

Asking help:

15. Park: (*looking at audience*) *What is wrong with me? How can I...?*

Peer involvement:

22. Song: *... to improve your comprehension, use all information...*

25. Kang (*joining discussion*) *Let me to you explain this question.*

Returning to task:

34. Park: *It is very clear for me.*

41. *... O.K. I got it.*

(mini-lesson, March. 5, 2006)

The following excerpt from Lee's mini-lesson describes the pattern of the incomplete sequence (i.e., a case of not returning to the initial task) that fails to involve the peers in the strategy-related discussions.

Asking help:

35. Lee: (*looks at audience*) *Ur, what is the main topic this passage?*

Peer involvement:

41. Park: *You read again? What about reference question?*

46. Lee: *It will take more time.*

Not returning:

65. Lee: *I don't know, but... Can I move next question?*

(mini-lesson, March 17, 2006)

Second, using the content analysis combined with the qualitative interpretation, total utterances (speaking turns regardless of lengths) from the entire mini-lessons of the two different sequences of interaction were counted and then classified into the amount and types of helping utterances as the measures of the range of opportunities. Using the similar coding scheme used by Klinger & Vaughn (2000), the strategy-related incidences among all the utterances were then subcategorized into one of the three categories:

- The utterances devoted to *asking for help* for the particular problem (i.e., “*How does fast reading improve reading comprehension?*”)
- The utterance devoted to the *basic instruction* that provides the simple aspect of reading strategies (i.e., “*You can minimize the break of the meaning and ...*”)
- The utterances devoted to *elaboration of reading strategies* (i.e., “*Let me explain it this way. Look at this example, then ...*.”)

Third, using conversation analysis (i.e., analysis of the question-answer pairs), ways of negotiating difficulties and expertise during the mini-lessons were examined from the interview data conducted right after the mini-lessons. Finally, the learners' progress in reading strategies was reported using descriptive statistics.

5. Results

5.1 Strategy-Related Utterances under the Different Sequences

The investigation of the transcripts yielded a total of 1011 utterances (speaking turns regardless of lengths): 512 utterances in the complete sequence of interaction and 499 utterances in the incomplete sequence of interaction. 142 speaking turns out of 512

utterances under the complete sequence belonged to the strategy-related utterances while 98 out of 499 belonged to the strategy-related speaking turns. Table 1 summarizes strategy-related utterances, which were classified into three subcategories.

Table 1. Utterances devoted to helping behaviors by each category

Category	Types of Mini-Lessons	
	Complete Sequence	Incomplete Sequence
Total utterances	512	499
Strategy-related helping utterance (% of helping utterances)	142 (28%)	98 (20%)
Among all helping utterances		
Asking for help (%)	16%(22/142)	19%(19/98)
Basic strategy instruction (%)*	36%(60/142)	50%(49/98)
Elaboration of strategies (%)*	49%(70/142)	31%(30/98)

Note: the percentages reported are rounded. “*” denotes t-test statistics indicating two sequences are different at the 10% significant level.

There was no big difference in total utterances produced under the mini-lessons of the different sequences of interaction (512 versus 499 utterances respectively), but the difference in strategy-related helping behaviors (142 versus 98 respectively) indicated that relatively more speaking turns under the mini-lesson of complete sequence of interaction were devoted to helping peers or sharing the difficulties and expertise. The percentage of utterances devoted to strategy-related helping behaviors varied between types of the mini-lessons, from 28% in complete sequence to 20% in incomplete sequence, indicating that more interactional opportunities were offered under the complete sequence.

The investigation of the subcategories provided a detailed illustration of how the range of opportunities was offered by the mini-lessons of the different sequences. When it comes to subcategories of the strategies-related helping behaviors, no big difference was found in ‘learners’ requests for help.’ Actual percentage of utterance (16% under complete sequence relative to 19% under incomplete sequence) devoted to asking help was slightly great under the incomplete sequence, indicating that the learner’s need for assistance didn’t vary between the two types of the mini-lessons.

Given ‘Asking for help’, ways of responding to and helping the classmate were accounted for by the two types of helping behaviors: providing the basic instruction of

the particular strategy and providing further elaboration of the particular strategy. The comparisons of those categories clearly explain how the helping behaviors of the different sequences can be qualitatively different. Under the incomplete sequence, the helping behaviors associated with 'the basic instruction' were dominant, meaning that the learners devoted more effort to providing the simple aspect of reading strategies (50%). This figure is compared with that (36%) under the complete sequence.

However, the percentage of strategy-related utterance devoted to 'elaboration of reading strategies' varied across the mini-lessons (31% in incomplete sequence and 49% in complete sequence). Under the mini-lessons of the complete sequence, the learners tended to participate in the classroom discussion in the form of the engagement in each other's contribution. Since 'elaboration of reading strategies' occurred when peers joined in the discussions to provide further illustration, most of the peer talks under the complete sequence were attributed to engaging in other's contribution as an additional explanation. It indicates that difficulties and expertise are more likely to be negotiated when the strategy-related helping behaviors are conveyed in the form of 'elaboration' relative to 'basic instruction.'

On the other hand, most of the peer talks under the incomplete sequence were attributed to providing the basic instruction instead of providing the further illustration. About 50% of the strategy-related utterances were devoted to the basic instruction. In this respect, the peers under the incomplete sequence of interaction tended to provide simple aspects of reading strategies while the peers under the complete sequence tended to provide various aspects of reading strategies through the further illustration of the particular strategies or a detailed explanation with the examples.

In short, the wide variation of the mini-lessons of the different sequences was found in their abilities to engage in other's contribution, or elaborations brought by peers into classroom. 'The elaboration of reading strategies' was dominant under the complete sequence while 'basic instruction' was dominant under the incomplete sequence. Thus, the mini-lessons involved the different forms of opportunities, but the opportunities existing in the form of 'elaboration' tended to promote the development of the learners' own reading strategies.

5.2 Strategy Use under the Different Patterns of Interaction

The qualitative interpretation of the speaking turns provides the good illustration of understanding how interactional opportunities can be constrained or promoted under the

different sequences of interaction. The samples used here represent the typical mini-lessons of each sequence analyzed under the prior approach. In the below, ways of communicating expertise and difficulties are illustrated to explain the range of opportunities existing under the different sequences of interaction.

5.2.1 Complete Sequence of Interaction

Under the complete sequence of interaction, expertise and difficulties were often negotiated under the dominant role of the expert learners. The extract below clearly shows the importance of ‘the further elaboration’ during the interaction and how peers’ effort to elaborate the particular problem helps the learner return to his initial task.

The following excerpt from the part of Park’s mini-lesson showed how Park shifted expertise from the expert learners through the sequence of interaction with peers (i.e., bringing his difficulty in line 15, involving peers in line 19, 27 and 36, returning to initial task in line 41).

...

13. **Park:** (looks confused) No, I am sorry. It is natural, because, you know, I, like ur¹⁾
14. I don’t have any idea about this passage, even if ur, if, I prepared for this spending
15. 5 hours last night. (looks at audience) What’s wrong with me? How can I help
16. reading comprehension? I am, ur, tire of memorizing all: the words in passage, but
17. have to keep, you know, do this. Because, this make me feel studying. But, it not
18. helping me a lot, I think, it didn’t work when taking the TOEFL [exam].
19. **Song:** Ur, I understand what you are saying. I also have the same problem before in
20. Korea. (looks at student Park) You can’t not memorize all the words, because I, ur, I
21. English vocabulary are endless. Don’t you agree tutor? (looks at tutor) I

1) Transcript convention: (.) = pause; ? = rising intonation; uhm= filler.

- have lots of
22. words, but, ur, I can still working when I study. To improve your comprehension,
23. use all information like questions that giving some hints. May be try to, ur,
24. understand the story although when you don't know the, the words.
25. **Park:** (looks at Song) (1.0) Is it working? I think you have small time when to read
26. and looking at looking at questions before see, right?
27. Kang: (joining the discussion) Let me you to explain using this problem. Right now,
28. you are not any reading from the passage, and ur, only looking at the question 1 of
29. number 1[What is the topics of paragraph?]. Then, you just know we are talking
30. about the April Fools Day. Right? Now, read the passage, I believe strongly, now,
31. you can understand the meaning from the, sentence, no, no, the passage. Because, ur,
32. we are talking about April Fools. Is it better? Try yourself, you feel: difference in
33. comprehending the passage.
34. **Park:** (smiling) It is very clear for me. But, ur, how this did making help to read, ur,
35. ur for me. Is it O.K. For me, tutor? (looks at tutor)
36. T: Well, In previous tutoring class, we were talking about this issue, I mean, How
37. do my student get familiar with the TOEFL reading when they first face
38. reading passage. If we don't know about the topic, it will take some time to figure
39. out. So, I believe it seems to help students' comprehension by providing background
40. information about topic. Try it, why not?
41. **Park:** uhm, also you agree with his thinking. O.K. I got it...

(mini-lesson, April 11, 2006)

In line 13, Park as a relative novice intentionally described his problem over general reading comprehension. Song as a relative expert in this matter immediately identified his problem (heavy dependence on rote-memorization) and indicated the importance of understanding the meaning from contexts (lines 19-24). In the following interaction, while Kang as a relative expert (lines 27-34) further elaborated the problem using a specific example, the tutor explained the rational for using background information (lines 36-40). Park returned to his initial problem and finished conversation. Throughout this complete sequence of interaction, the difficulties faced by Park were negotiated, and most of the peer talks were conveyed in the form of the "elaboration" (i.e., a detailed illustration and explanation with an example).

In short, under the complete sequence of interaction where the learners devoted higher percentage of the speaking turns (49% of the strategy-related utterances) to providing further elaboration, expertise and difficulties were often negotiated through the sequence of 'asking help', 'elaboration relative to basic instruction', and 'returning to the initial task.'

5.2.2 Incomplete Sequence of Interaction

Under the incomplete sequence of interaction, expertise and difficulties were not often negotiated during the interaction, and thus interactional opportunities tended to be constrained. The analysis of the peer talks showed that higher percentage was devoted to providing 'the basic instruction' (50%) instead of providing 'elaboration of reading strategy' (31%). The extract below shows that patterns of peer assistance, under the dominance of the basic instruction, revealed the strong tendency toward describing simpler aspect of reading strategies or producing task-irrelevant talks. The following excerpt from Lee's mini-lesson (on the main idea question) illustrates this point.

...

35. **Lee:** I will move following questions. O.k.? (smiling) first question ask
ur, us what
36. is what the main topic this passage. (looks at audience) Every time when
I solve this
37. main idea problem, I usually read passage again [repetition] because, ur,
as you
38. know, to me, reading as much as possible seem to me -uhm- to improve

reading

39. comprehension. But, sometimes I am not sure because, ur, uhm, if this
ur this
40. approach also help me - capture the main idea problems - of the TOEFL
reading.
41. **Park:** (looks at Lee) So? You read again? To solve only one question?
If so, what
42. about the reference question? You can also do this for this question.
43. **Kim:**(looks at Lee & smiling) uhm uhm ur if you read the passage again,
it take
44. more time and have less time to read. But, once you understand author's
tries to say,
45. you can get the main idea.
46. **Lee:** (looks at Kim) I know, I know. Reading two times, it will definitely
(?) take
47. more time. And what does the author try to [say in this passage?
...
63. **Kang:** (joins the discussion) To me, time is important in TOEFL test.
Also, from
64. my experience, I can say something like this, ur, I think anybody can not
solve all
65. problems after read passage twice. I think - because we can't spend over
5 minutes
66. on reading.
67. **Lee:** (looks at Kim) I don't know, but I just read one passage I want
answer the
68. main idea, [...] anyway, because I used to it. Anyway, can I move next
question? I
69. really want to finish my presentation quickly (looks tired). ...

(mini-lesson, January 17, 2006)

In line 35, Lee as a relative novice expressed his difficulty in solving main idea problem. While Park's comment in line 41 was rejected by Lee because it was not related to the specific question (main idea) raised by Lee, both Kim's and Kang's comments on time issue in line 43 and in line 63 were also not endorsed by Lee

because they were describing simpler aspect of "re-reading strategy." Eventually, he did not return to his initial task, withdrawing from interaction (line 67). Throughout this incomplete sequence of interaction, Lee's difficulty (appropriateness of the re-reading for main idea problem) was not negotiated at all. Most of the opportunities under this incomplete sequence were missed during the interaction.

In short, under the incomplete sequence of interaction where the learners devoted higher percentage of the speaking turns (50% of the strategy-related utterances) to providing the basic instruction, expertise and difficulties were often negotiated through the sequence of 'asking help', 'the basic instruction relative to elaboration,' and 'non-returning to the initial task.' Thus, the range of the opportunities tended to be closely related to the helping behaviors conveyed in the form of 'the elaboration.'

5.3 Participants' Evaluation of Interactional Patterns

Using the interview data related to the respective mini-lesson data, which were categorized into the two different sequences of interaction (complete and incomplete sequence), I analyzed the exchange of speaking turns (the question-answer pairs). The turns between speakers, the function of discourse marker, and the use of minimal response were analyzed to assess the learner's evaluation of the mini-lessons under the different sequences of interaction.

The total exchange of speaking turns observed from the interview data was classified into two categories: 'the orderly exchange of the speaking turns' and 'lack of co-ordination of the speaking turns.' Then, I examined whether the differences in two types of adjacent pairs existed under the different sequences of interaction. The comparison of the correct and the incorrect adjacent pairs indirectly provided ways of evaluating the mini-lessons from the interview data. Especially, if the second part of the utterances (interviewee's response) was not the expected one, it was considered incorrect adjacent pairs.

5.3.1 Peer Communication under the Incomplete Sequence of Interaction

The representative interview extracts related to the mini-lessons of the different sequences of interaction were selected to illustrate how different types of question-answer pairs could explain the peer interaction occurring during the mini-lessons. In the following extract from Kim's interview, both the speaker and the

respondent (Kim) talked about the mini-lesson (under the incomplete sequence of interaction). The sequence of question-answer pairs focused on how the presenter was helped from the peers during the mini-lesson.

...

7. I²) ... How long did you prepare for it?
8. P: Well (.), ur I think preparation is still very important right?
9. actually, they didn't prepare for class.
10. I: How do you know ur they were not prepared for the class?
11. P: Because they talked a lot, but ur they didn't know story of reading
12. assignment.
13. I: O.K. Any help from your friends in solving the problems?
14. P: Uhm, they tried to help using key word, but ur I couldn't remember others.
15. I: Anyway, who are they? Could you tell me?
16. P: Well, they? (.) My friends. ...

(interview right after mini-lesson, Feb. 14, 2006)

In the sequences above, Kim's response to the interviewer's question tended to be characterized as the pairs lacking in co-ordination of turns (3 incorrect pairs relative to one correct pair). In lines 8-9, Kim talked about the importance of preparation instead of the expected response (i.e., about 2 hours), indirectly indicating he was not well prepared. The discourse marker ('well') followed by unrelated longer explanation indicates that Kim felt some conflict in responding to the first part of the utterances (Schiffrin, 1987). On the other hand, in lines 10-12, Kim immediately but correctly responded to the question, producing negative impression of the mini-lesson. In lines 15-16, Kim's response was irrelevant in that he failed to provide the meaningful answer as expected. Specifically, Kim didn't even remember who was trying to help him during the mini-lesson.

The discourse marker 'well' in this exchange of turns was again interpreted as indication of hesitation used to avoid negative response to the question. When it comes to 'they' found in this extract, Kim frequently use 'they' (4 times) to indicate his peers because he couldn't identify the learner with whom he interacted during the mini-lesson. He didn't even remember the learner who had helped him use 'key

2) 'I' indicates Interviewer while 'P' means Participant.

word'during the interaction. It suggests that ways of engaging in the class discussion under the incomplete sequence of the interaction were mainly related to the incorrect question-answer pairs.

This extract could be characterized as lack of coordinating the orderly exchange of speaking turns (3 pairs relative to one correct adjacent pair), the discourse mark 'well' as a strategy for avoiding negative response and as hesitation, and the frequent use of the 'they' due to the failure to identify the particular peer. The frequent occurrences of those instances helped the researcher understand the mini-lesson under the incomplete sequence of interaction. The irrelevant responses coupled with the discourse marker explained how many opportunities were missed during the interaction. Especially, this typical extract from Kim's interview indicates that the difficulties and expertise were not well negotiated, and thus interactional opportunities to develop reading strategies tended to be constrained under this sequence of interaction.

5.3.2 Peer Communication under the Complete Sequence of Interaction

In the following extract from the interview with Lee, both the interviewer and the interviewee discussed the mini-lesson (under the complete sequence of interaction). The evaluation of the particular mini-lesson by Lee was examined through the analysis of the sequence of question-answer pairs.

...

6. I: Can I start right now?
7. P: (smiling) Yes, you can.
8. I: How long did you prepare for the mini-lesson?
9. P: Usually about one hour.
10. I: How do you feel about your peer's preparation?
11. P: I feel the same way. They are good.
12. I: What did you learn from your friend during the mini-lesson?
13. P: Ur, Song talked about ur how to read fast. Because it's very
14. interesting, I ask him how fast is ur fast. According to Song and Kang,
15. I have to read reading at least 30 % faster.
16. I: Did Song help your understanding?
17. P: Actually, Kim helped me better. ...

(interview right after mini-lesson, March 17, 2006)

The sequences of the question-answer pairs above were characterized as ‘the orderly exchange of speaking turns’ (4/5 pairs). In lines 7, 9 and 11, Lee’s quick and brief responses to the questions were highly relevant, and this second part of the utterances indicates how he felt about the interaction with peers during the interaction. In addition, discourse marker ‘well’ frequently used in describing the mini-lessons of incomplete sequences was not observed. In many instances under the incomplete sequences, ‘well’ was closely related to disagreement (i.e., negative aspect of the mini-lessons). On the other hand, the pair in lines 12-15 lacked in co-ordination since a participant did not provide the straight answer to the question. But the response to the question in line 17 implies that he got helped by both Song (expected answer) and Lee. The final point was related to ‘they.’ While ‘they’ (one instance) was not often used, he successfully indicated the specific learners (i.e., Kang, Kim, and Song) with whom he interacted during the mini-lesson.

The analysis of the question-answer pairs above indicates that the orderly coordinated exchange of speaking turns tended to be related to the positive evaluation of the mini-lesson by the presenter. Specifically, the quick response produced without hesitation (no instance of ‘well’) and the further explanation reflected the learner’s positive participation toward the mini-lesson. This interpretation was reinforced by the less frequent use of ‘they’ and by the more frequent use of ‘him’ or ‘specific name of the learners.’ The participant’s ability to classify the specific learners with whom the participant interacted during the mini-lessons provides an indirect illustration of how the particular mini-lesson helped the learners negotiate their difficulties and expertise.

Table 2 below presents the instances of two types of adjacent pairs under the mini-lessons of the different sequences of interaction. The table indicates that interview data related to the mini-lessons of complete sequence of interaction showed higher percentage of the correct adjacent (77%) pairs than that (54%) under the mini-lessons of the incomplete sequence of interaction.

Table 2. Question-answer pairs under the different sequences

Types of Mini-Lessons			
Mini-Lessons of Complete Sequence		Mini-Lessons of Incomplete Sequence	
<i>Correct pairs</i>	<i>Incorrect pairs</i>	<i>Correct pairs</i>	<i>Incorrect pairs</i>
95	29	57	48
<i>% of correct one</i>	<i>% of incorrect one</i>	<i>% of correct one</i>	<i>% of incorrect one</i>
77%	23%	54%	46%

Note: Some pairs not constituting organization of the turn-takings were excluded.

On the other hand, higher percentage of incidences of the incorrect pairs (48% in incomplete sequence relative to 29% in complete sequence) under the incomplete sequence of interaction tended to explain the learner's inability to describe the detailed content of the mini-lessons asked by the interviewer or the learner's unwillingness to provide negative opinion about interaction occurring during the mini-lessons. Thus, lack of co-ordination of the speaking turns indirectly indicates less active engagement with peers during the mini-lessons and explains why many opportunities to develop reading strategies were missed during the interaction.

6. Conclusion

This study examined 'patterns of interaction' to help understand the process of how the learners developed reading strategies during the tutoring project, using one type of classroom activity, or mini-lesson. Throughout the mini-lessons, the Korean learners could share the various range of reading strategies and thus have the opportunities to develop the reading strategies appropriate to their own way.

As Navarrete (1985) demonstrated, this study showed that working together did not necessarily lead to the learning opportunities available to the students, thus raising the issue of the quality of interaction. It was found that the different patterns of interaction were able to explain wide variation in the learners' abilities to engage in other's contribution, or elaborations brought by peers into classroom. In particular, the students' behaviors of elaborating reading strategies were obvious under the complete sequence of interaction while interactional opportunities available often went awry under the incomplete sequence. Since 'elaboration of reading strategies' led the students to better engage in others' contributions during the classroom practices, it tended to promote interactional opportunities to develop reading strategies specific to them.

The analysis of the speaking turns provided further illustration about why the different patterns of interaction could promote or constrain interactional opportunities during the mini-lesson. Under the incomplete sequence of interaction, the difficulties and expertise the students brought to the classroom were not well negotiated through the interaction, thus tending to constrain opportunities to develop reading strategies. As evidenced by the higher percentage of the incidences of the incorrect pairs under the incomplete sequence, the learners were unable to engage in the detailed content of the

mini-lessons.

This lack of co-ordination of the speaking turns indirectly indicates less active engagement with peers during the mini-lessons and explains why many opportunities to develop reading strategies were missed during the interaction. In the case of peer communication under the complete sequence of interaction, the learners engaged in the coordinated exchange of speaking turns, which indicated the learners' willingness to contribute to the others' problems occurring during the mini-lessons. Therefore, the complete sequence of interaction often provided the opportunities for the students to negotiate difficulties and expertise through the engagement in strategy-related classroom discussions.

This study provides some pedagogical implications applicable to L2 classrooms. First, the students' ways of using appropriate reading strategies are learner-specific, suggesting that the strategies once identified as good strategies may be differentially appropriate. In this respect, rather than provide an '*encapsulated strategy instruction*', teachers need to provide learning environment where the students can develop their own reading strategies (Klinger & Vaughn, 2000; Morita, 2000). Second, as many studies (Cotterall, 1995; Jacobs et al, 1996; Navarrete, 1985) pointed out, working together itself does not necessarily lead to learning opportunities, highlighting the interpersonal dynamics in L2 classrooms. This suggests that classroom teachers in ESL classrooms should focus more on maintaining the quality of interaction rather than on structuring the classroom activities, such as small group discussions, mini-lessons, or pair works.

References

- Atkinson, D., & Ramanathan, V. 1995. Cultures of writing: An ethnographic comparison of L1 and L2 university writing/language programs. *TESOL Quarterly* 29, pp.593-568.
- Bremner, S. 1998. Language learning strategies and language proficiency: Investigating the relationship in Hong Kong. *Asia Pacific Journal of Language in Education* 1(2), pp.490-514.
- Brookfield, S. D. 1992. *Understanding and facilitating adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chamot, A. U. 1987. The Learning Strategies of ESL Students. In A. Wenden & J. Robin (Ed.), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*, pp.71-83. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Chamot, A. U. 2001. The Role of Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition. In M. P. Breen (Ed.), *Learner Contributions to Language Learning: New Directions in Research*, pp.25-43. London: Longman.
- Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. 1994. *The CALLA Handbook: Implementing the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Cohen, A. D. 2000. *Strategies-based Instruction for Learners of a Second Language*, NASSP Bulletin. Vol. 84, No. 612, pp.10-18.
- Cotterall, S. 1995. Developing a course strategy for learner autonomy. *English Language Teaching Journal* 49(3), pp.219-227.
- Donato, R., & McCormick, D. 1994. A sociocultural perspective on language learning strategies: *The role of mediation*. *The Modern Language Journal* 78, pp.453-464.
- Draves, W. A. 1997. *How to teach adults*. Second ed. Manhattan, KS: Learning Resources Network.
- Duff, P. A. 1995. An Ethnographic of Communication in Immersion Classrooms in Hungary. *TESOL Quarterly* 29, pp.505-537.
- Duff, P. A. 2007. Second language socialization as sociocultural theory: Insights and issues. *Language Teaching*, 40, pp.309-319.
- Ellis, R. 1994. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., Mathes, P. G., & Simmons, D. C. 1997. Peer-assisted learning strategies: Making classrooms more responsive to diversity. *American Educational Research Journal* 34, pp.174-206.
- Gillette, B. 1994. The role of learner goals in L2 success. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (eds), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*, pp.195-213.
- Grabe, W. 1991. Current developments in second language reading research. *TESOL Quarterly* 25(3), pp.375-406.
- Green, J. M., & Oxford, R. 1995. A Closer Look at Learning Strategies, L2 Proficiency, and Gender. *TESOL Quarterly* 29, pp.261-297.
- Hudson, T. 1998. Theoretical perspectives on reading. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 18, pp.43-60.
- Jacobs, D. L., Watson, T. G., Sutton, J. P., & Jones, B. 1996. Effects of a cooperative learning method on mathematics achievement and affective outcomes of students in a private elementary school. *Journal of Research & Development in Education* 29(4), pp.195-202.
- Klinger, J. K. & Vaughn, S. 2000. The Helping Behaviors of Fifth Graders While Using

- Collaborative Strategic Reading during ESL Content Classes. *TESOL Quarterly* 34(1), pp.69-98.
- Klinger, J. K., Vaughn, S., & Schumm, J. S. 1998. Collaborative strategic reading during social studies in heterogeneous fourth-grade classrooms. *Elementary School Journal* 99, pp.3-22.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. 1991. *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leon'ev, A. N. 1981. The Problem of Activity in Psychology. In J. V. Wertsch (eds.) *The Concept of Activity in Soviet Psychology* (pp.37-71). New York: M. E. Sharpe.
- Morita, N. 2000. Discourse Socialization through Oral Classroom Activities in a TESL Graduate Program. *TESOL Quarterly* 34, pp.279-308.
- Navarrete, C. 1985. *Problem resolution in small group interaction: A bilingual classroom study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
- Ochs, E. 1988. Culture and Language Development: *Language Acquisition and Language Socialization in a Samoan Village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Connor, R. E., & Jenkins, J. R. 1996. Cooperative learning as a inclusion strategy: A closer look. *Exceptionality* 6, pp.29-51.
- O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., and Kupper, L. 1985. Learning Strategies Application with Students of English as a Second Language. *TESOL Quarterly* 19, pp.557-584.
- Padron, Y. N. 1991. The Effect of Strategy Instruction on Bilingual Students' Cognitive Strategy Use in Reading. *Bilingual Research Journal* 16 (3&4), pp.35-51.
- Politzer, R. L. & McGroarty, M. 1985. An Exploratory Study of Learning Behaviors and Their Relationships to Gains in Linguistic and Communicative Competence. *TESOL Quarterly* 19, pp.103-123.
- Poole, D. 1992. Language socialization in the second language classroom. *Language Learning* 42, pp.593-616.
- Prior, P. 1994. Response, revision, disciplinarity: A microhistory of a dissertation prospectus in sociology. *Written communication* 11, pp.483-533.
- Rogoff, B. 1990. *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. 1986a. Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15, pp.163-191.
- Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. 1986b. *Language socialization across cultures*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Skehan, P. 1989. *Individual differences in second language learning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Spack, R. 1997. The acquisition of academic literacy in a second language: A longitudinal case study. *Written communication* 14, pp.3-62.
- Stevens, R. J., & Slavin, R. E. 1995. Effects of a cooperative learning approach in reading and writing on academically handicapped students. *The Elementary School Journal* 95(3), pp.241-262.
- Vygotsky, L. S. 1978. *Mind of Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Process*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kim, Sun-Young

Catholic University

43-1 Yeokgok 2-dong, Wonmi-gu, Bucheon,

Gyeonggi-do 420-743, Korea

E-mail: sunyoung0412@catholic.ac.kr

Received: 2008. 08. 14

Revised: 2008. 09. 23

Accepted: 2008. 09. 26