Language Research Bulletin, *24*, ICU, Tokyo

The Problematic Panacea: Conflict in an Autonomous Learning Environment

Chris Hale
English Language Program
International Christian University

As a language teacher, there is nothing more satisfying than to witness one's students engaged in active and lively discussion with minimal teacher interference. However, looks can be deceiving, and even within what appears to be equal participation, tensions and conflicts can emerge among participants. If a teacher's gradual withdrawal from the learning process is considered the ultimate goal of autonomous leaning pedagogy, how then can educators ascertain what is actually occurring in student-directed communicative tasks? In this study I examine a semi-autonomous EFL learning environment where students were left alone to complete a communication task. With no teacher present, students were left to negotiate break-downs and repairs on their own. The transcript data shows that a "boss" figure emerged to direct the task and effectively stifle meaningful input from co-participants. The data also shows that without a teacher present to facilitate the task, some students were dominated, marginalized and, in one example, brought to tears.

Talk that occurs between students is an important component of classroom discourse, and while some researcher/educators may feel it lacks pedagogical relevance, others have shown that students have as much, or more, to learn from one another as from a teacher (Chaudron, 1988; Ellis 1994; Kagan, 1992; Pica, 1987). With group and pair work tasks gaining in prominence in the communicative-driven EFL/ESL classroom, research into what is actually occurring in student-student exchanges is particularly relevant to the field. Assigning group-work has become a panacea for teachers intent on having students use language rather than simply react to it. Even in the beginning levels, it is not uncommon to see students exchanging ideas on any number of topics while teachers roam the classroom, delighting in the fact that the students are expressing themselves in the target language. By placing students in situations where they are required to negotiate, self-monitor, and repair their way through a language task, it is thought, students will gain "ownership" of the language and in turn benefit from the increased motivation that comes from being in control. Students are forced to make themselves understood "no matter what."

While I do not discount the importance of providing autonomous learning and speaking opportunities, as a single teacher it is virtually impossible to monitor all of the conversations going on in one classroom, which begs the question, what is really going on? Are the students fully engaged in the task, or are they discussing unrelated topics? Should it even matter, as long as they are communicating in English? In an effort to more closely examine the content of group and pair discussions in the EFL classroom, I collected data on one encounter. The data set is from

a group discussion by advanced Japanese high school students who were left to complete a task without an instructor present. In particular, I was interested in seeing how students negotiated with one another to complete the task, and whether or not the participation was balanced. If a "teacher" or "boss" figure emerged, I wanted to know how the others orientated to him or her, and whether this was an impediment to completing the task they were assigned. If one were to accept the notion that social learning environments are beneficial, it would follow that there would be a need to look at the power relationships that occur between the participants in group-work activities, and in particular, when a teacher is not present to mediate the talk.

Rationale for Student-Centered Language Learning

The rationale for pair/group work is derived from the belief that affording students more autonomy in the classroom will foster an environment where they are able to take ownership of the learning process, resulting in a concomitant increase in intrinsic motivation and feelings of empowerment (Ellis, 1998: Kohonen, 1992; Little,1997). A gradual reduction of a student's dependence on the teacher (knower) allows for fuller cognitive processing of classroom tasks and the language employed to complete them (Lawrence & Sommers, 1996). According to Wang and Peverly (1986), effective learners are those who are "seen as being capable of learning independently and deliberately through identification, formulation and restructuring goals . . . and engagement of self-monitoring" (p. 353).

It is widely believed among sociocultural theorists that at some point in the learning process, the learners' dependence on scaffolded, teacher-driven instruction (interdependence) should ultimately give way to self-sufficiency (independence) and ownership of the learning. Bruner (cited in van Lier 2001) refers to this deconstruction of the scaffold model as *handover*. Hennessey (2005) describes *fading* as the ultimate goal of the teacher: "Fading then involves a gradual abbreviation and withdrawal of help, and learner participation increases as independent thinking and skills are developed" (p. 267). The teacher's role should move away from the traditional "expert," associated with recitation and transmission models of teaching, and become one of "advising, structuring, guiding and assessing" (p. 268) learning.

The push towards more autonomous, student-centered learning is a byproduct of the backlash against traditional classroom pedagogy, epitomized by overuse of the *initiation-response-evaluation* (IRE) script, and particularly in second language learning, of grammar translation and audio-lingual methods that limit self-directed output (see Barns, 1992; Cazden, 1988; Ellis, 1990; Gorsuch, 1998; Hall & Walsh, 2002; Zuengler & Bent, 1991). In these latter methods, emphases is placed on a student's ability to copy, or imitate, the expert (teacher) at the expense of more complex cognitive, self-directed operations.

While it is believed that more autonomy will empower learners, the very nature of institution-based, educational discourse dictates that the learners cannot be fully independent of teachers. The concept of *agency*, as described by Lantolf and Thorn (2006), denotes a student's freedom to perform a task or activity, while still being bound by "social groupings, material and symbolic resources, situational contingencies, and individual or group's capabilities, and so on" (p. 238). Therefore, while students may be autonomous while performing tasks, they are restricted in how much actual autonomy they are afforded. According to Little (1997), "in formal educational contexts as elsewhere learning can proceed only via interaction, so that the freedoms

by which we recognize learner autonomy are always constrained by the learner's dependence on the support and cooperation with others" (p. 204).

Research on Group Work: Who Needs Teachers?

Many site Vygotskyan theory as the rationale for collaborative learning, and in particular the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). It is in the ZPD where knowledge is developed, and this is inherently a social endeavor: The ZPD is "the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86).

The research on group and collaborative learning has been mixed with some researchers lauding the practice (Crowley, 1997; Faltis, 1993; McGroarty, 1989; Romney, 1997; Wells, 2006) and still others offering a more pessimistic view (Carson & Nelson, 1996; Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Leki, 1990). In a 2001 study of non-native English speakers engaged in group-work at an American university, Leki (2001) found that the non-native English speakers (NNESs) were often traumatized by the experience of working within groups with native English speakers (NESs). Students were marginalized by the more dominant personalities in the groups, which lead the less aggressive members to simply sit quietly and accept direction on collaborative segments of the task. Even though the foreign students had vast experiences that should have been valued by the other members of the group, efficiency dictated that the native speakers would do the bulk of the work, and the foreigners would play supporting, and largely silent, roles. As his class was engaged in group activities, one of the teachers in Leki's study gloated, "Who needs teachers? They can do it themselves" (Leki, 1990. p. 54). According to the teachers in Leki's study, they were completely unaware of the group dynamics, and instead focused on the end result.

Another pitfall of placing students into group and pair work is that quite often students have conflicting views of the assignment and how to complete it. Lantolf and Thorn (2006) note that "subjects ostensibly involved in the same task are in fact in different activities due to each subject's personal history, goals, and current abilities" (p. 236).

Power and Classroom Discourse

The institutional nature of formal learning environments presupposes, and even reinforces, certain power-structure relationships. Teachers are granted "expert" status over students by nature of their position in the social hierarchy. The teacher is the "knower", and referee in classroom discussions, dictating who will speak and for how long (Edwards & Westgate, 1994; Thornborrow, 2002). Traditionally, turns are allocated and ended through the use of IRE sequences initiated by the instructor. When teachers orchestrate socio-cognitive learning environments, research suggests that content retention is enhanced (Hall & Walsh, 2002; Hennessy et al., 2005), but only in situations where the power to direct the content in the classroom is more evenly balanced between students and teachers.

Methods

Context and Participants

The research was conducted in a Japanese high school where the participants were advanced language learners in their final year of study. The high school is considered *academic* in that the curriculum is rigorous and students are expected to go on to elite Japanese universities. The graduation rate is 99%, and the number of students going on to university within two years of graduation is 98%. The interaction from which the data in this study comes involved five participants of similar advanced ability. The course was an elective, and focused mainly on conversation practice within a global-issues framework. Topics for discussion were chosen by the teacher, initially, then students alternated brining in their own topics for discussion. Class format involved a reading segment, usually an article taken from an English newspaper, followed by teacher scaffolding by way of comprehension checking. Finally there was a free discussion element lasting from 20-30 minutes at which time the teacher withdrew from the conversation and served as an observer - only interjecting when an unrepairable breakdown occurred. The classroom format resembled that of the *small circle*-type described by Damhuis (2000) where L2 learners were encouraged to "self-initiate output for optimal SLA and active, transactional learning" (p. 248).

The topic of discussion when this research was conducted was the then recent race-rioting in the suburbs of Paris. Readings relating to the topic were presented and discussed prior to the collecting of data with a teacher present. An article critical of the government's response to the riots, as well as one written by a foreigner in Japan praising Japan's strict immigration policies, were covered. The data for this study was taken from the discussion part of the segment. However, contrary to the normal format, during this discussion the teacher withdrew *completely*, leaving the students alone in the room to discuss the topic themselves for 30 minutes.

Participants**:***
Gibson- Only male in the group, takes on the "Boss" role fairly early. Aligned with Liz
Liz- Aligned with Gibson in the conversation
Mona- Disagrees with Gibson and Liz. Aligned with Elmo
Elmo- Disagrees with Gibson and Liz. Aligned with Mona
Ann- Refuses to take a stand. Eventually withdraws from activity
All students share the same L1, Japanese
* All names used in this study are pseudonyms

Data Collection

The data collection method followed that of conventional conversation analysis (CA) approaches (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Mehan, 1979); however where strict CA calls for the researcher to avoid looking at factors external to the actual conversation data, I felt it relevant to include some biographical information on the participants. This decision was based on the belief that all conversation is infused with socio-cultural paradigms that can and should be part and parcel to the analysis. As will be seen in the analysis, knowledge of one of the participant's relationship with a foreigner is imperative to understanding the breakdown in the conversation- a salient factor that is not revealed in the conversation itself.

The conversation was recorded to Mini Disc and transcribed in its entirety. The transcription was analyzed to isolate segments relevant to my research questions. Primarily, I isolated segments that indicated the emergence of a "teacher" or "boss" figure, and how the other participants orientated to him or her. I also wanted to see how the participants dealt with breakdowns in the conversations, and what methods they employed, if any, to repair them. Only the parts relevant to this study are included here (for a full transcript, see Appendix B). After the conversation was transcribed, I contacted the participants and asked them to explain and/or clarify their utterances in light of my research focus.

Findings

Summary

The findings indicate that there emerged a central "boss" figure who quickly took control of the direction of the task. The other participants allowed themselves to be led by the boss, though only after offering resistance. The absence of a teacher to moderate the conversation resulted in a significant breakdown that ultimately led to one student completely withdrawing from the conversation amid frustration and even tears.

Who's the Boss?

The "boss" figure in this group discussion, Gibson, is indicated by the number and length of turns in the transcript relative to the other participants. It was Gibson who put an end to the pre-task small-talk and directed the others with an open ended question.

1)	Gibson:	Ok, I'll start. Yesterday we talked about the, *NANTEUINO* {what's it called}, riots, *BOUDOU* {riots}, riots in France. And (.) so (.) please explain about that-
2)	ALL:	E::H What? *NANDE MINA* {Why US/ Everyone ELSE?}
3)	Elmo:	*MUZUKASHI.* {It's difficult}
4)	Liz:	((reading)) "The riots started on the 29th in a Paris suburb over the accidental deaths of two teenagers". So two teenagers were chased by police. They THOUGHT they were chased by police, running to a, a *NANTEUNO* {what's it called}?
5)	Gibson:	Powerplant
6)	Liz:	Powerplant. And they were, they (.) [they
7)	Gibson:	[Died]
8)	Liz:	Died of electricity.
9)	Gibson:	And there was a rumor that [ah
10)	Liz:	[That] the police KILLED them.
11)	Mona:	And the neighbors got angry
12)	Gibson:	Yeah, got angry
13)	Liz:	Yeah, and those boys are like im imm[igration
14)	Gibson:	[Immigrants.

15) Liz: Immigrants.
16) Mona: They lived in a poor area, like, slum.
17) Liz: In a suburb of Paris. And that is the cause of the first riot.

By asking the others to converse about the topic, Gibson was imitating the normal role of the teacher. The others in the group immediately challenged his role, as indicated in line 2. However, Liz immediately aligned with Gibson by offering to start. Gibson then manages to subtly re-assert himself as the boss in lines 5, 7 and 14, where he assisted Liz by providing the correct English vocabulary during her turns.

Gibson's opening comment in line 1 appears to be an attempt at being humorous, to break the ice, so to speak, during an exercise that, for the first time, had no teacher present acting as facilitator. However, had Gibson truly intended to be only the facilitator, he would have withdrawn completely, only participating when necessary to clarify or disentangle an irreparable break-down. Gibson's active participation in the conversation indicated that he was much more involved than would the teacher have been. In fact, it is Gibson who directed the entire course of the conversation, from its light-hearted beginning, to its heated argument, and ultimately to the break-down at the end.

Choosing Sides

Gibson set the stage for tension when he asked the participants to indicate whether or not they agreed with the proposal (that strict immigration laws are good for Japan). By forcing the students to take sides so early, he disallowed for sufficient debate - a point not lost on Ann.

42) Gibson: So, let's discuss if you agree, or disagree with this policy.
43) Mona: *JAA KOREKARA IKIMASU KA* {so should we start here}*?*
44) ALL: *YOOSHI*! {let's do it}
45) Gibson: Shall we start?
46) ALL: OK
47) Gibson: First I wanna ask you which you stand. Which side you stand? Do you agree with him or disagree with=
48) Elmo: =Disagree
49) Mona: Disagree
50) Liz: OK, raise your hands, agree?
51) Liz: Ah, no one?
52) Elmo: No one agrees?
53) Liz: Only I and Gibson agree.
54) Gibson: Yeah, I agree. And Mona and Elmo disagree. How about Ann?
55) Ann: *KYU DA NA IROIRO.* {everything is a bit too sudden}
56) ALL: ((Laughter))
57) Gibson: What do you think is a good point. No. Bad point.
58) Elmo: Ah, Patrick Agree?
59) Liz: Disagree. Bad point, disagree.
60) Mona: Well, I think that Japan doesn't allow enough immigrants, like, ah,

		the United Nations is always saying to Japan we should admit, accept? Admit more foreigners *MITOMERU*. {admit}
61)	Elmo:	I heard that last year, Japan admitted only 10 or[11]
62)	Mona:	[12]
63)	Elmo:	12 immigrants, refugees, in the whole year.

Gibson's insistence on taking a stand immediately caused the conversation to take a decidedly controversial tone. By agreeing with the proposal, the students were, in essence, stating that Japan should not admit immigrants (i.e. aligning with the strict government policy). And disagreement indicated that the students thought Japan should be more open to immigration (against government policy). Interestingly, Gibson and Liz, who had already aligned with one another, took the same side while Elmo and Mona indicated disagreement with the proposal. Ann, who had been largely silent throughout the discussion, did not indicate any position, to which Gibson in line 54 asked her unequivocally to state her side. Ann refused to do so, saying instead that it was too early in the discussion to formulate an opinion. The others laughed at this, either because she was refusing to respond in the preferred way, or because they were amused with the seriousness with which she took the subject. In either case, Ann had positioned herself as an "outsider," refusing to follow the rules of the discussion which Gibson had constructed.

It's Not Fair

As the students offered their opinions supporting their views, Gibson managed to get Mona to admit that, for right or wrong, employers would prefer to hire Japanese workers over equally skilled foreigners (line 87, Appendix B). At this point Ann interjected herself into the conversation, saying, exasperatingly, that what Gibson has proposed (and to which the others were agreeing to) was not fair. At this point Ann's opinion has been made explicit, that she was actually aligned with Elmo and Mona. Gibson agreed with her stand, but said, essentially, that's life - Japanese companies would always prefer Japanese workers over foreign-born workers. He went on to argue his point:

91)	Gibson:	Yeah, it's not fair, I think but because company wants to earn money a lot and then if they can do so they don't want to use money for just education of foreign workers. To learn Japanese or something.
92)	Ann:	You have to say, SAME skill, Japanese and foreigner. They can speak Japanese, both of them. You mean SAME SKILL.
93)	Gibson:	No, um,
94)	Ann:	Why you [say-
95)	Elmo:	[yeah] that would be discrimination=
96)	Ann:	=Yeah.
97)	Gibson:	No, I don't think so.
98)	Ann:	[Why?]
99)	Elmo:	[Why?]

Ann confronted Gibson at line 92, pointing out a flaw in his argument that if Japanese and foreign workers had the same skills, a company would be required to allocate funds to train the foreign workers, thus making them less attractive. Ann demanded that Gibson define what he meant by "same skill," which to her would presuppose Japanese language ability. It was Elmo who first mentioned the concept of discrimination, to which Ann agrees. Gibson was placed on the defensive, having to explain his opinion that even if a foreigner has Japanese ability, he or she will never be fluent, and therefore the playing field would never be even:

100)	Gibson:	The skilled people, foreigner wants to learn Japanese, but can't=
101)	Mona:	=But the foreign worker has a strong will to lean Japanese, but maybe they don't have a chance to learn. So It's not fair to [them.]
102)	Elmo:	[yeah]
103)	Ann:	[mmm]
104)	Gibson:	Yeah, it's not fair, but that is reality, ah that's life. So that's why I am going to attend college in Australia, so I can learn the language well enough to get a job against a native speaker.
105)	Ann:	*ITSURYUGAKUSURUNO* {when are you leaving to study abroad?}
106)	ALL except G:	((laughter))

As support for his argument, Gibson mentioned that this uneven playing field, tilted in favor of native (or native-like) speakers, was the reason he would be attending university in Australia- so that he could learn English well enough to compete with native speakers for the same jobs. At his mentioning this, Ann asked ironically, though nonetheless pointedly, when he would be leaving (the clear implication being that whenever it is, it is not soon enough). At this point Ann's frustration at the course of the conversation, and her animosity towards Gibson, were placed into clear view. Likewise, Gibson's frustration intensified as well.

Breakdown

As the conversation continued, the two sides offered their support. Gibson explained that immigrants could get work in small businesses, but would never work in large companies, to which Mona agreed, but again, claims it was because of discrimination. Gibson disagreed that it was discrimination. Conspicuously missing from the exchange was Ann, who only made transient comments. It was not until line 157 that she spoke again, in a full sentence, and her frustration was made vividly apparent:

152)	Mona:	Most of foreigners coming to Japan CAN'T do some special work, like doctor or something, so they do, like cleaning work or something. So I don't think most foreigner can get to work in a big company, they have to do the easier job.
153)	Liz:	Yeah but=
154)	Gibson:	=But payment is low.
155)	Mona:	Because there is discrimination.

156)	Gibson:	No, I don't think discrimination, but the level of life will be different.
157)	Ann:	This all NONSENSE what you are talking about. I'm getting really PISSed off now.

Undeterred, Gibson continued to make his case, this time directly addressing Ann to whom he restates what they are talking about (line 159, Appendix B). Ann had become visibly upset and began to cry, as evidenced by Mona's comment in line 160 (Appendix B), "Are you OK Ann? Are you crying?" Ann did not speak again until line 183. Leading up to this turn, there had been uncharacteristic stretches of silence, indicating some were beginning to feel uncomfortable at the sight of Ann crying. Liz took the initiative by suggesting that they should move on. Following 23 seconds of silence, The "Boss" suggested a different topic (can the riots happen in Japan?), then addressed Ann directly in a way he thought was light-hearted:

182)	Gibson:	How about Ann. You look angry today.
183)	Ann:	Huh?
184)	ALL	((nervous laughter))
185)	Gibson:	You look angry today.
186)	Ann:	*MMN* {yes}
187)	Mona:	She's OK. Maybe she *MEGAITAI*? {do your eyes hurt?}
188)	Ann:	I don't like to say anymore. Nothing. I don't want to speak. Sorry.
189)		(5.0)
190)	Liz:	OK, so let's talk about France, um, why did the government wait for two weeks to stop the riots?

While Ann did not participate much at all in this entire segment, at line 188 she officially removed herself completely from the conversation. The conversation continued for several more turns until the end of the class period, and even extended slightly beyond. The final comment on the recording is Mona's final emphatic comment at line 205 (Appendix B) in Japanese "I want to speak Japanese!"

Looking for Answers

Following the transcription of this data, I separately asked both Ann and Gibson about the tension they encountered. Gibson indicated that he was aware of Ann's annoyance, as it was obvious on her face, but he attributed this to the fact that they were discussing a controversial topic. Such topics were common in their course, though it had never gotten to the point where a student refused to speak. I asked him if he thought it was because the teacher wasn't present. He did not think so. As the students were well versed in the course format, he thought they did just fine. I asked him if he thought he played the teacher role, and he thought that perhaps he had, "a little. But the questions were already prepared by the teacher before, so all I did was ask what was on the paper."

Ann's comments were very telling in that she explained the reason for her behavior. In previous classes, Ann was vocal and contributed actively to the conversations. I asked what the

difference was about this one. She indicated that her sister was recently engaged to a foreigner and that she was particularly sensitive to discrimination he was suffering in Japan. She did not expect to react the way that she did, but when she perceived Gibson and Liz to be validating discriminatory hiring practices, or claiming that the best unskilled foreigners could hope for were menial jobs, she grew more and more upset. She said she felt powerless in the conversation.

Discussion

In the absence of a teacher acting as facilitator (or power holder) in the conversation, students appeared to assign one themselves, either wittingly or not, which resulted in tension and the eventual alienation of other participants. Gibson's role as boss was reasserted by Liz, and their alignment remained throughout the task, where, through a hasty vote, they positioned themselves against the others. Had a teacher been present to mediate the conversation, Gibson might not have felt obliged to take that role. Ann's stress about the topic, and her eventual emotional break-down and withdrawal could have been avoided had there been a perceptive facilitator present who could have stepped in when the conversation became decidedly too controversial. No one could have guessed that Ann's sister was engaged to a foreigner, but had the conversation been more cordial, she might have been more apt to share it, which could have been a fine point from which to expand the topic. On the contrary, the divisive nature of the conversation - taking sides over immigration - led Ann to keep to herself, thinking that both Gibson and Liz were racists.

So what went wrong? For all intents and purposes, the task, which was effectively scaffolded and clearly not beyond their abilities, was successful, with all students participating. As a language teacher, there is nothing more satisfying than to witness one's students engaged in an active and lively discussion. However, looks can be deceiving, and even within what appears to be equal participation, tensions and conflicts can emerge. If a teacher's gradual withdrawal from the learning process is considered the ultimate goal, the question remains whether full withdrawal is indeed prudent. With the ever increasing emphasis on group and pair-work activities in EFL and ESL settings, teachers are often unaware of the group dynamics that play out.

Conclusion

It is imperative that students be supported by teachers while at the same time given ample opportunities to experiment with and use the language unimpeded by those same teachers. Interdependence, rather than full dependence or independence, should be the underlying goal of classroom discourse. However, if the teacher is oblivious to the process, how can he or she accurately judge the product? Without sufficient background into the nature of group dynamics, and the power struggles that often emerge, teachers are sending students unwittingly into a potentially stressful, traumatizing environment.

Assuming learning results from interaction with more capable peers, it would follow that when creating group-work tasks, teachers would need to have clear understanding of every student's current state of knowledge relevant to the task, and place students in appropriate groupings. This does not bode well for the vast majority of teachers who simply have students

make groups based on who happens to be sitting near one another in a classroom.

Misalignment of participants' orientation to a task can lead to any number of difficulties including, again, power struggles, breakdowns and misunderstandings. These potential problems can be addressed and ameliorated by a perceptive teacher/facilitator, but in most group-work settings, teachers are not always present and thus not aware of the problem - until it is too late to address. While fleshing out possible solutions to this problem in depth is beyond the limited scope of this paper, perhaps providing adequate teacher training, which encompasses not only teaching pedagogy but also group dynamics, can go a long way toward alleviating the potential problems that can arise from group and pair-work activities. If teachers are aware of the potential pitfalls, and sufficiently trained in techniques to avoid them, they will be better equipped to provide a productive environment where student autonomy can foster learning, rather than shut it down.

References

Barns, D. (1992). From communication to curriculum. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Damhuis, R. (2000). A different teacher role in language arts education: Interaction in a small circle with teacher. In J.K. Hall and L.S. Verplaetse (Eds.). *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction.* (pp. 243-264). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Carson, J. & Nelson, G. (1996). Chinese students' perceptions of ESL peer response group interaction. *Journal of second language writing,* 5, 1-19.

Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Connor, U. & Asenavage, K. (1994). Peer response groups in ESL writing classes: How much impact on revision? *Journal of second language writing,* 3, 257-276.

Crowley, M. (1997). Aligning assessment with classroom practices: A promising testing format. *Mathematics teacher,* 90, 706-711.

Edwards, A.D. & Westgate, D.P.G (1994*). Investigating classroom talk*(2ndedn). London: Falmer Press.

Ellis, R. (1990). Instructed second language acquisition. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ellis, R. (1994). The study of second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1998). Discourse control and the acquisition-rich classroom. In Renandya & G. Jacobs (eds*.) Learners and language learning*. Anthropology series 39. Singapore: RELC.

Faltis, C. (1993). Joinfostering. New York: Macmillan.

Gorsuch, G. (1998). *Yakudoku* in EFL instruction in two Japanese high school classrooms: An exploratory study. *JALT Journal,* 20 (1), 6-32.

Hall, J.K., & Walsh, M. (2002). Teacher-student interaction and language learning. *Annual review of applied linguistics,* 22, 186-203.

Hennessy, S., Deaney, R., & Ruthven, K. (2005). Emerging teacher strategies for mediating 'technology-integrated instructional conversations': A socio-cultural perspective. *The curriculum journal*, 16 (3) 265-292.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). Conversation analysis : principles, practices, and applications. Cambridge ; Malden, Mass. Polity Press

Kagan, S. (1992). Cooperative learning. San Juan Capistrano, CA. Kagan Cooperative Learning.

Kohonen, V. (1992). Experiential learning in foreign language education. London: Longman.

Lawrence, S., & Sommers, E. (1996). From the park bench to the (writing) workshop table: Encouraging collaboration among inexperienced writers. *Teaching writing in the two year college,* 23, 101-111.

Lantolf, J.P., & Thorn, S.L. (2006). Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development. Oxford: Oxford university Press.

Leki, I. (1990). Potential problems with peer responding in ESL writing classrooms.

CATESOL journal, 3, 5-19.
Leki, I. (2001). "A narrow thinking system": Nonnative-English-speaking students in group projects across the curriculum. *TESOL quarterly,* 35 (1) 39-67.
Little, D. (1997). Autonomy and self-access in second language learning: Some fundamental issues in theory and practice. In Müller-Verweyen, M. (ed.) *New development in foreign language learning: Self-management – autonomy. Standpunkte zur Sprach- und Kulturvermittlung* 7: 33-44. Munich: Goethe Institute.
Mehan, H. (1979). Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
McGroarty, M. (1989). The beliefs of cooperative learning arrangements in second language instruction. *Journal of the national association for bilingual research education,* 13, 127-143.
Pica, T. (1987). Second language acquisition, social interaction, and the classroom. *Applied linguistics,* 7, 125.
Romney, J.C. (1997). Collaborative learning in a translation course. *Canadian modern language journal,* 54, 48-67.
Thornborrow, J. (2002). Power talk: Language and interaction in institutional discourse. Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited.
van Lier, L. (2001). Constraints and resources in classroom talk: Issues of equality and symmetry. In C. Candlin and N. Mercer (eds.) *English language teaching in its social context: A reader.* London: Routledge.
Vygotsky, L. (1978). Mind in society. Boston: Harvard University Press.
Wang, M. C., & Peverly, S. T. (1986). The self-instructive process in classroom learning contexts. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 11, 370-404.
Zuengler, J., & Bent, B. (1991). Relative Knowledge of Content Domain: An Influence on Native-Nonnative Conversations. *Applied Linguistics* 12 (4), 397-415.
Wells, G., & Arauz, R.M. (2006). Dialogue in the classroom. *The journal of the learning sciences,* 15 (3), 379-428.

Appendix A
Conversation Analysis Transcription Symbols

.	(period) Falling intonation.
?	(question mark) Rising intonation.
,	(comma) Continuing intonation.
-	(hyphen) Marks an abrupt cut-off.
::	(colon(s)) Prolonging of sound.
wo:rd	(colon after underlined letter) Falling intonation on word.
wo:rd	(underlined colon) Rising intonation on word.
word	(underlining) Stress on syllable.
word	The more underlying, the greater the stress.
WORD	(all caps) Loud speech.
CAP ITALLICS	Utterance in subject's L1.
°word°	(degree symbols) Quiet speech.
⇑word	(upward arrow) Raised pitch.
⇓word	(downward arrow) Lowered pitch
>word<	(more than and less than) Quicker speech.
<word>	(less than & more than) Slowed speech.
<	(less than) Talk is jump-started—starting with a rush.
hh	(series of h's) Aspiration or laughter.
.hh	(h's preceded by dot) Inhalation.
[ ]	(brackets) Simultaneous or overlapping speech.
{ }	(curved brackets) Translation of L1 utterance.
=	(equal sign) Latch or contiguous utterances of the same speaker.
(2.4)	(number in parentheses) Length of a silence in 10ths of a second.
(.)	(period in parentheses) Micro-pause, 0.2 second or less.
( )	(empty parentheses) Non-transcribable segment of talk.
(( ))	(double parentheses) Description of non-speech activity.
(try 1)/(try 2)	(two parentheses separated by a slash) Alternative hearings.
$word$	(dollar signs) Smiley voice.

Appendix B
High School Discussion Data

For full appendix of transcribed data, please see hyperlink: Problematic Panacea Appendicies: http://docs.google.com/fileview?id=0B1kstBNaVKeLMmI2MGZiNmUtMzI2NC00OGQxLTg0NjUtNDMwM2ZhMGY0ZTZi&hl=en