

An Examination of Categories for Interaction Analysis in English Classroom Research : The Communicative Aspect of Verbal Interaction

Hirowo SOHGUCHI*

(Received October 3, 1994)

Introduction

We have so far attempted to describe the teaching and learning processes in the junior high school English classroom without regard to different theories of language and language teaching. We have attempted to describe what is going on in the classroom without value judgment following as Flanders' remark: "there has been no mention of good and bad teaching [9: 3]."

However, the mere description of what is happening in the classroom might not be sufficient to content us. Flanders remarks that neutrality will not last long and calls his book 'a book about effective teaching [9: 3].' Chaudron relates description to the resulting effects in the following manner:

In addition to the intrinsic interest that the description of classroom processes has for researchers, probably the ultimate objective of classroom research is to identify those characteristics of classrooms that lead to efficient learning of the instructional content, ... [7: 1]

What is needed in our future research is, thus, a category system reflecting our view of English teaching—English as a means of communication. The author's concern in the present study is to examine Jarvis's categories [10; Note 1] and the ELCI categories [20; Note 2] and reveal how these categories relate to, or do not relate to, activities in the English classroom in terms of communication. A comparison of these two systems can be expected to lead to the development of an effective system for analyzing teacher-pupil interaction in the English classroom, where 'a positive attitude toward communication [13]' in

English should be fostered.

Jarvis's Categories and ELCI Categories within the Frame of Bellack's Teaching Cycle

Jarvis's categories in his Behavioral Observation System for Classroom Foreign Language Skill Acquisition Activities and the categories of the English Language Classroom Interaction System (ELCI) will be comparatively examined. (In the following discussion, see Note 1 for Jarvis's categories; Note 2 for the ELCI.)

Jarvis's system first divides classroom activities into those in the target language and those in English or the native language for both teacher and pupils. The target language categories include as lower level categories the *real* language and the *drill* language categories and those for *reading* and *writing*, each of which is further divided into its subcategories. The native language category also has its characteristic subcategories.

The ELCI system has been developed on the basis of the Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories or the FIAC system [9: 28-123] and has as its higher level categories all ten of Flanders' categories, with their subcategories developed by the present author.

Each of the Jarvis and the ELCI categories will be comparatively examined based on Bellack's teaching cycle made up of a sequence of moves: (Str)-Sol-Res-Rea [6: 4-6], pupil responding following teacher soliciting, teacher reacting following pupil responding, teacher responding following pupil soliciting, etc.

1. Real language categories

Teacher soliciting/pupil responding/teacher reacting categories

* 英語教育

In the Jarvis system, the teacher initiation categories for the real language activities are A, C, and E. Of these, 'Classroom Management' (C) can be coded in the category of 'Giving Directions' (66) in the ELCI system. (The teacher initiation category for drilling will be referred to below.) 'Information Explanation' (E) is 'Giving Information' (54) in the ELCI. Another teacher initiation category is the drill language subcategory 'Evoking Stimulus' (G), which together with 'Classroom Management' (C) will go into the same higher level direction-giving category in the ELCI.

Jarvis defines 'Evoking Student Response' (A) as "intended to result in an interaction." He further states that "most entries would be questions either personalized to individual students or relating to material studied [10: 336]." His examples are: 'How are you?', 'What time is it?', 'What color is your shirt?' The first and the second examples can very often be heard in real life situations in the English classroom. One of them is a conventional utterance found in the teacher-pupil exchanges beginning the class. The other might also be found in communication-oriented activities or the warm up stage in the class. As to the last example, it must be pointed out that if you can see the color of the shirt in the communication situation, you need not ask what color the shirt is.

Teacher questions play the most important part in teacher-pupil interaction. They will elicit pupil response, which can be followed by teacher reaction. Types of teacher question may influence the quality of pupil response. Questions can be *closed* or *open* [5: 17], *display* ('What's this?' 'It's a book.') or *referential* ('What do you think about sexual harassment?') [12: 276]. (Examples are mine.) Pupil response can be elicited not only by questions but also by directions in the imperative and other grammatical forms, which will go to C in Jarvis and to one of the subcategories (66) of the ELCI direction-giving category.

These two Jarvis and ELCI categories are very similar to each other. 'Classroom Management' (C) statements can obviously be a part of our classroom English, although Jarvis's examples

contain a little more variety than we usually find in our classrooms (e.g. 'Change the verb to the past tense in this drill.'). The problem here is whether it is necessary to distinguish A, a teacher-soliciting category in the target language, and C, another teacher soliciting-category in the target language, since in many situations both A and C teacher statements will be used to elicit pupil response, verbal or nonverbal, followed by teacher reaction. These teacher communicative statements can be found divergently in several ELCI categories. However, it is naturally a good idea to have both a teacher-communicative category and a teacher-drilling category so that we can separate communication from drilling, considering the present move towards communication-oriented language education.

Many of the examples Jarvis gives for real categories in the target language do not seem to be on a communicatively higher level in the strict sense. They are not sufficiently communicative to meet our expectations. These real categories, on the other hand, seem to be more effective when we consider the actual conditions in our English classrooms, where drilling and explanation are still the focus of attention. Considering this from what Jarvis indicates in his definition of A, natural communication might be obtained by personalized questions rather than by questions relating to the material studied [10: 336].

Pupil response in the real language activities can be coded with 'Responding' (2). Jarvis remarks that "...thus completing an interaction; e.g. 'Yes, I do have a sister.' 'I'm sixteen years old.' [10: 337]" When we consider the Sol-Res-Rea sequence in teacher-pupil interaction, we would surely expect these pupil responding statements to be followed by teacher reaction, which in most cases would be 'Facilitating Performance or Reinforcing Behavior' (D).

The teacher real language category D intends to reinforce and facilitate pupil performance "in a way that has a positive affective influence on students [10: 336]." Jarvis's examples contain statements that praise and encourage pupils ('You did very well, Paul.' 'Good.' 'Would it help you to

remember what John said?'), which might be related to the ELCI 22. Another example Jarvis gives seems to be a statement that would go to the ELCI feeling accepting category (12) ('I know how difficult this is.') The ELCI category for accepting pupil ideas (32) will have to be treated in D. All of the three teacher-responding categories should be coded with this category. No alternative way of classifying this seems to be possible.

Most of the ELCI teacher categories for real language activities in the target language appear to be coded with one or the other of the Jarvis categories. One exception is the ELCI 'Criticizing and Justifying Authority' category. This is the negative aspect in the Jarvis reinforcing/facilitating category.

Pupil soliciting/teacher responding (/pupil reacting) categories

Concerning pupil talk in the target language, Jarvis lists two types in each of the real and the drill categories. In the real language category, they are subcategories of 'Evoking Response' (1) and 'Responding' (2). Category 1 is a pupil initiation category, intending to elicit teacher response B. The ELCI has a pupil initiation category of Pupil talk—initiation, to which pupil statement in the target language eliciting teacher response naturally belongs. In our English classroom, such soliciting pupil statements would not often be expected. It might not be meaningless to have a category of the type in order to free the pupils from the passive learner position and facilitate pupil initiation.

Pupil reaction following teacher statements elicited by pupils might be unusual, but not impossible in the English classroom. Thus, the pupil reaction move of the Bellack's cycle in the title of this section was given in parentheses. Pupil statement as a reaction following teacher responding can only be coded with Jarvis's pupil category 2 or the ELCI pupil response (84, 86) or initiation statement (92).

The teacher initiating and pupil-responding target language categories in these two systems are not necessarily in accord with each other,

even when they look similar. The distinction between 'Asks Broad Question' and 'Asks Narrow Question' categories in the ELCI system, for example, is likely to affect considerably the content of pupil initiation and individual pupil response in the target language. In general, whether we have such a distinction as this or whether we have an aspect like display/referential [12: 276] is closely related to the subcategorization of the pupil talk categories based on the communication/drilling distinction.

The Jarvis categories and the ELCI categories have been examined so far in terms of real language activities and as constituents of the Sol-Res-Rea sequence. Teacher talk and pupil talk in teacher-pupil interaction, however, may not occur in a logical sequence. Teacher soliciting behavior may unintentionally elicit unexpected pupil reaction, and vice versa. For example, a teacher may utter Management statement C without any logical connection with what precedes in the interaction to maintain discipline and order [16: 21]. Following such teacher-management statements there may occur pupil nonverbal responses or reactions which are acoustically unobservable. Pupils may also use an 'Evoking Response' (1) without any language context, resulting in a discipline and order problem.

2. Drill language categories

Teacher soliciting/pupil responding/teacher reacting categories

In Jarvis's system, one of the teacher drill language categories is 'Evoking Stimulus' (G) used for drilling cues and modeling, which pupils are supposed to repeat. In the ELCI, these teacher statements will be categorized as 'Directing Pattern Drilling' (64) and included with 'Giving Directions' (66) (as well as other teacher direction statements in the native language 63 and 65) in the higher direction giving category. Pupils will respond individually (3) or chorally (4) in the target language. The ELCI pupil response categories, individual and choral, are considered to be based on the same principles. Teacher 'Repetition Reinforcement' category (H) following pupil

response will accept the preceding response (although 'it may be slightly correctional,') without any further pupil talk required, according to Jarvis [10: 337] and thus completes the cycle.

The distinction between 'Evoking Stimulus' (G) and 'Evoking Student Response' (A) should of course be made clear, as it is very often ambiguous especially in terms of interpretation of teacher question. Could we encode every teacher question as A in the Jarvis system? Don't some of the teacher question-pupil answer activities seem to be simply drilling activities? Is the question 'What color is your shirt?', given by Jarvis with the definition of A, a real language statement or a drill language statement, when directed to the person wearing the shirt? In a higher level communication class this might be considered to be G, in a beginning class A. Considering the present situation of communication activities in our junior high school English class, seemingly real language activities might be coded A, expecting qualitative development in this direction in the future. Otherwise, we might not have A at all.

The teaching cycle of teacher reacting statements following pupil response elicited by teacher initiation is most often observed in the drill language interaction as well as in the real language interaction stated above. Both of these have the same teaching cycle. It could be coded 46-84-32 (or 22) and 64-84-32 (or 22) in the ELCI, which would be A-2-D and G-3-H in the Jarvis system.

As was indicated earlier in the discussion of real language categories, the distinction between pupil talk categories is closely related to that between teacher talk categories. The ELCI pupil initiation category seems to include Jarvis' 'Evoking Response' (1) and 'Responding' (2), which are real language categories. On the other hand, the ELCI teacher questions, broad or narrow, will have to be coded A in the Jarvis system, because both of them intend to elicit pupil response.

Another difference between the two category systems is related to teacher reinforcing statements, i.e., the Jarvis system has 'Facilitating Performance or Reinforcing Behavior' (D) for real language interaction but no such teacher talk

category for the drill language interaction ('Teacher Prompting' (J) has been defined in a slightly different way from the real language D. [10: 337]), while, in the ELCI, 'Praises or Encourages' (22) can take care of both pupil responses in real and drill language activities.

'Teacher Prompting' (J) as a drill language category can be used when pupils are stuck for a word, etc., with no intention of correction of forms [10: 337]. In the case of the ELCI, 'Accepts or Uses Ideas of Pupils' (32) is the category to accept, prompt, and develop pupil response in drilling as well as in real language activities.

As to Jarvis's 'Modeling or Correcting' statement (P), the ELCI does not have a corresponding category. It may be coded 'Giving Information' (54), which does not evoke a student response as in the case of Jarvis [10: 337]. This may be the structuring move in Bellack's teaching cycle. There may further be a possibility of teacher accepting category (32), since Jarvis's category contains 'a corrective representation of a student utterance [10: 337].'

It is very hard to consider a situation where a pupil starts a drilling cycle involving the teacher in the classroom. Pupil reaction toward the teacher in drilling activities also seems impossible.

3. Reading and writing categories

The ELCI, following Flanders procedures, selects only verbal communication in the classroom, while it prepares a subcategory for recorded sounds. One of the characteristics of the Jarvis system which differ from the ELCI is that it selects a medium based on visual stimuli, i.e., it has a reading and writing category with four subcategories [Note 1] as well as the real language and the drill language categories examined so far. Activities accompanied by reading and writing may or may not involve teacher-pupil or pupil-pupil interaction. Categorization depends upon comparative prominence of visual and verbal components at the moment in the interaction. Thus, most of the classroom events categorized

by the Jarvis system, verbal or visual, will be, in the ELCI, encoded in verbal behavior categories, a part of it in the category of 'Silence or Confusion' (09).

4. Native language categories

Teacher soliciting/pupil responding/teacher reacting categories

The ELCI has Flanders' ten categories as its higher level categories. Nine of them are dichotomized according to the difference of the language used [20: 170]. In the Jarvis system, language difference is considered on a higher level and the native language section has three categories for the teacher and two for the pupils. The teacher's categories are 'About Target Structure or Sound System' (K), 'About Meaning' (M), and 'Management' (N): K for grammar and sounds, M for native language equivalents and translation, and N equal to the target language C. K and M may or may not intend to elicit pupil response. When no response is required, they will be coded with 'Giving Information' (53) in the ELCI.

Pupil statements elicited by teacher talk K or M are 'Answer about Target' (9), which, according to Jarvis, completes an interaction [10: 338]. The definition does not anticipate teacher reaction following pupil response, contrary to our expectations. Thus, the Jarvis system does not have a category used for teacher reaction in the native language completing the teaching cycle. An alternative way to complete the cycle might be to use K or M, as they do not seem to be appropriate according to the definition. The remaining alternative will be to use + or -, depending on the context. Teacher reaction, however, is considered to play an important part in teacher-pupil interaction.

Pupil soliciting/teacher responding (/pupil reacting) categories

Pupils will ask questions about the target language in the native language, which are coded with 'Student Question about Target' (8). Teacher response categories can be K or M. An

inappropriate pupil statement might be related to 'Management' (N). Pupil reaction following teacher response seems to be improbable, but might occur as an affective statement expressing surprise, discontent, etc. The cycle is then completed. There is not a category that can be used for pupil reaction in the native language in the Jarvis system, while the only possible way in the ELCI is to code such statements as 'Pupil Talk—Initiation' (91).

5. Silence and other factors

The ELCI system has a category for silence or confusion, adopted from the FIAC system. It has constructive and non-constructive subcategories. Part of the pupil 'Writing' (5) and 'Reading Silently' (6) activities in the Jarvis system will be constructive (09) in the ELCI; simple confusion will be non-constructive (00), etc. For such classroom events as well as verbal behavior not encoded in the native language categories, such as joking and other positive or negative comment in the native language, Jarvis uses the two additional symbols + and -.

Not only silence after teacher soliciting (e.g. teacher question) but also silence in other contexts might be significant in the teacher-pupil interaction. The characteristic meaning of silence during the interaction could be observed on the matrix. The native language statements coded with the symbols of + or - in the Jarvis system might be included in one of the native language categories such as 'Praises and Encourages' (21) and 'Criticizes and Justifies Authority' (71) for the teacher; and 'Pupil Talk—Initiation' (91) for pupils in the ELCI.

One of the differences between the two classifications is that the ELCI has a category for tape recorder use as a subcategory of the teacher information-giving category, while Jarvis doesn't. Teachers often use tape recorders for modeling instead of their own voice. They might even use a taped native speaker voice as a soliciting stimulus and require the pupils to imitate. Whether we should have a category for audio-visual aids and where in the system the category should be locat-

ed are problems to be solved because of the possible greater variety of visual-aids and their use in the future.

Aspects for Observation and Analysis: A Conclusion

A comparative analysis has been carried out between the ELCI categories [20] and the Jarvis categories [10] according to the (Str-)Sol-Res-Rea sequence [6] so that we may find which categories are necessary to reveal distinguishing characteristics of our English classrooms, which may or may not reflect the communicative needs of the present time. The following are some aspects we have found which should be taken into account in the development of an analysis system.

The first difference between the two systems is on which level the language will be distinguished. Jarvis first makes the distinction on the higher level, while the ELCI chooses the lower level, following Wragg [23]. It might not be possible to tell in general which is better, because of the different aims of the researchers involved. One thing we can say, however, is that we should have language difference in the beginning, i.e., we need to have information of how often teacher and pupils use the English language. Without this, we might lose sight of the most characteristic feature of our English classroom. One point that should be made is that it might not be economical for us to have both native language and target language subcategories for every teacher and pupil function, as will be seen below.

It must be noted that the use of English in the classroom, however, is not always connected with communication. The distinction between real language and drill language in the target language category is useful for obtaining information about communication activities in the classroom. Even 'Classroom Management' (C), 'Information Explanation' (E), etc. will be significant as communicative input for pupils and different from apparently similar teacher talk in drill language.

Concerning past studies on language teaching methodology, Allwright states that "the only reasonable inference to be drawn from such research

is that, generally speaking, students learn the things they *are* taught better than the things they are *not* taught," in his *Prescription and Description in the Training of Language Teachers* [2; Reprinted in 1: 45-55]." What he says here might have disappointed the teacher-trainers as he points out, but, in fact, it can encourage us. That is, we learn what we have done and we don't learn what we have done badly; the more we do the more we achieve. Our concern is with what is going on in the classroom and how much is done. What we concentrate on will be communication.

The third subcategory under the target language category for Jarvis is 'Reading and Writing.' The ELCI as well as the FIAC system analyze only verbal behavior as "an adequate sample of his (=the individual's) total behavior [3-121]." How nonverbal components make up for the missing part of the Sol-Res-Rea sequence, however, is an interesting area for further classroom research. A limited number of types of nonverbal behavior can be considered as analysis categories. Moskowitz has lower level nonverbal categories co-occurring with teacher and pupil verbal behavior [15].

Flanders' characteristic categories are related to the affective area. Following Flanders, the ELCI also has positive and negative affective categories (11, 12, 21, 22, 71, and 72). The Jarvis system does not have any negative affective category either in the real language or the drill activities, though 'Prompting' (J) "is associated with encouragement [10: 337]." These affective categories might be significant, however, when we listen to what Brown says [7: 99]: "If we were to devise theories of second language acquisition of teaching methods which were based only on cognitive considerations, we would be omitting the most fundamental side of human behavior."

The concept of Flanders' indirect/direct teacher behavior [3: 122ff.] seems in a way to depend on affective factors, which will be closely connected to teacher reaction in the Sol-Res-Rea sequence. How much pupil freedom has been permitted or restricted and in what way the teacher reacts to pupils will be connected to learn-

ing results. Whether we decide to incorporate such affective categories might, however, have to be examined based on the aims of the analysis. It seems to be necessary to alter Jarvis's definitions of 'Responding' (2) and 'Answer about Target' (9), when they refer to these categories as "completing an interaction [10: 336-337]," because of the importance of teacher reaction pointed out above.

Examination of category systems will very often lead us to double or treble the number of categories. This makes classroom research a heavy burden for us, even when we observe classes recorded on audio or video tapes. The results of our classroom observations up to now seem to tell us something about possible reduction of category numbers. Concerning the use of different languages, we recognize in our data that the two languages did not appear with similar frequency. The veteran female teacher of English used the Directs Pattern Drilling category 90.9% of its total frequency in English. In the same class, the frequency of Pupil Talk-Choral Response was 97.5% in English. Other types of imbalance could be discussed when we consider the reduction of category number. The point of this is that it might not be necessary to bring the distinction between the target language and the native language into every subcategory.

A solution to the problem of category number can be seen in Oosato [24], whose system has twelve categories, each of which is given a different function according to different research objectives. His study is to analyze team teaching with ALT and contains no language distinction.

Some other problems include the time interval for categorization (three or five or ten or fifteen seconds), as to which Jarvis remarks that "there was some indication that very little information seemed to be lost by using a fifteen second interval [10: 340]." For drill-oriented English classes here, the problem is not that simple, when considering the possibility of teacher/pupil utterances sometimes occurring six times during a three second interval. In this respect, most textbooks present beautiful segments of teacher-pupil interaction, neglecting confusing records of analy-

sis, which, however, is the case in reality. Oosato represents the interval of classroom events by digital time. This is an aspect that needs a comparative study.

Fundamental matters that should be considered have been examined in many, if not all, aspects of English classroom interaction. It has been found that it is not easy to decide what to include and what not to include, depending on the objectives. On what level we should have a distinction is also important. A system which focuses on communication and with its limited number of categories will be our future concern. The Course of Study outlined in 1989 [13] includes "to develop the students' basic ability to understand and use a foreign language" and "to foster a positive attitude toward communication in the language." And this seems to be the current trend in English education.

Notes

1. Categories of Jarvis's Behavioral Observation System [10]:

Teacher target language categories: *Real*: A: Evoking student response; B: Evoked by student; C: Classroom management; D: Facilitating performance or reinforcing behavior; E: Information explanation; *Drill*: G: Evoking stimulus; H: Repetition reinforcement; J: Prompting; P: Modeling or correcting; *Reading and writing*: W: Presenting written language; Student target language categories: *Real*: 1: Evoking response; 2: Responding; *Drill*: 3: Individual response; 4: Choral response; *Reading and writing*: 5: Writing; 6: Reading silently; 7: Reading aloud; Teacher English Categories: K: About target structure or sound system; M: About meaning; N: Management; Student English categories: 8: Question about target; 9: Answer about target;

+ : Silence or English not in the above categories but which seems to facilitate learning; - : Silence or English not in the above categories but which seems to impede learning.

2. Categories of the ELCI system [20]:

Teacher Talk: 11: Accepts feeling (in Japanese), 12: Accepts feeling (in English); 21: Praises or encourages (J), 22: (E); 31: Accepts or uses ideas of pupils (J), 32: (E); 43: Asks narrow questions (J), 44: (E); 45: Asks broad questions (J), 46: (E); 53: Gives information (J), 54: (E), 58: Gives information by taperecorder; 63:

Directs pattern drilling (J), 64: (E); 65: Gives directions (J), 66: (E); 71: Criticizes or justifies authority (J), 72: (E); 83: Pupil talk — individual response (J), 84: (E); 85: Pupil talk — choral response (J), 86: (E); 91: Pupil talk — initiation (J), 92: (E); 09: Silence or confusion. Constructive use of time, 00: Silence or confusion. Non-constructive use of time.

References

1. Allwright, D 1988 *Observation in the Language Classroom*. Longman, London
2. Allwright, D 1972 Prescription and Description in the Training of Language Teachers. In Qvistgaard et al. (eds.) 3: 150-166 (Reprinted in Allwright 1988)
3. Amidon, E J and Flanders N A 1967 Interaction Analysis as a Feedback System. In Amidon and Hough (eds.) 1967: 121-149
4. Amidon, E J and Hough, J B (eds.) 1967 *Interaction Analysis: Research, Theory and Application*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts
5. Barnes, D, Britton, J and the L. A. T. E. 1971 *Language, the Learner, and the School*. (Revised edition) Penguin
6. Bellack, A A, Kliebard, H M, Hyman, R J and Smith, F L 1966 *The Language of the Classroom*. Teachers College Press, New York
7. Brown, H D 1987 *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. (Second edition) Prentice-Hall, London
8. Chaudron, C 1988 *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning*. Cambridge University Press
9. Flanders, N A 1970 *Analyzing Teaching Behavior*. Addison-Wesley
10. Jarvis, G A 1968 A Behavioral Observation System for Classroom Foreign Language Skill Acquisition Activities. *Modern Language Journal* 52: 335-341
11. Kitaichi, Y, Funatsu, K, Iwaki, R and Namita, K (eds.) 1978 *Teaching English as a Foreign Language: A Book of Reading*. Eihosha, Tokyo
12. Long, M H and Sato, C J 1983 *Classroom Foreigner Talk Discourse: Forms and Functions of Teacher's Questions*. In Seliger and Long (eds.) 1983: 268-286
13. Ministry of Education 1989 *Course of Study for Lower Secondary School in Japan*.
14. Moskowitz, G 1968 The Effects of Training Foreign Language Teachers in Interaction Analysis. *Foreign Language Annals* 1 (3): 218-235
15. Moskowitz, G 1971 Interaction Analysis — A New Modern Language for Supervisors. *Foreign Language Annals* 5 (2): 211-221
16. Nolasco, R and Arthur, L 1988 *Large Classes*. Macmillan Publishers, London
17. Qvistgaard et al. 1972 *Applied Linguistics: Problems and Solutions*. AILA Proceedings Copenhagen, Julius Groos Verlag, Heidelberg, III
18. Seliger, W S and Long, M H 1983 *Classroom Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition*. Newbury House
19. Sohguchi, H and Harada, I 1980 Interaction Analysis of the English Teaching-Learning Activities II: Toward an Effective Analysis System 1. *Memoirs of the Faculty of Education, Kumamoto University, The Humanities*, No. 29: 181-186
20. Sohguchi, H and Harada, I 1981 Interaction Analysis of the English Teaching-Learning Activities II: Toward an Effective Analysis System 2. *Memoirs of the Faculty of Education, Kumamoto University, The Humanities*, No. 30: 169-178
21. Sohguchi, H and Harada, I 1984 Interaction Analysis of the English Teaching-Learning Activities III: Toward an Effective Analysis system 3. *Bulletin of Center for Educational Technology, Faculty of Education, Kumamoto University* No. 1: 13-16
22. Widdowson, H G 1978 *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford University Press
23. Wragg, E C 1970 Interaction Analysis in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Modern Language Journal* 54 (2) 116-120 Reprinted in Kitaichi et al. (eds.) 1978: 119-127
24. 大里文人 1994 授業分析で見る Team Teaching. 池浦貞彦教授退官記念論文集編集委員会編「英語学と英語教育」210-222頁 開隆堂

要 約

新指導要領のコミュニケーション重視の姿勢を俟つまでもなく、わが国の英語教育においては、コミュニケーション能力の重要性がとくに指摘されている。コミュニケーションを指向する授業はどのような授業であるのか、英語の授業の中では現実に如何なる活動が行われているのか等、関心が持たれる。Classroom Researchの視点からの活発な授業分析研究が望まれている。

このような背景の中で、教師・生徒間のコミュニケーション活動に焦点を当てた分析システムの開発が求められる。本研究では、Jarvisの外国語の授業分析システムを著者による英語の授業分析システムと分析比較を行っている。Jarvisのシステムはリアル言語とドリル言語の区別を立てており、その意味でコミュニケーション活動に関心を示している。両システムが同一の視点を異なったレベルにおいて区別していることが授業分析の結果にどのように影響するのか、検討が求められる。

これら2つの分析システムが、特にコミュニケーションとの関連で、どのような長所、欠点を持つのかを明らかにし、望ましい分析システムの開発につなきたい。