CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

5.1 Introductory

This chapter, which presents the analysis and interpretation of data, is divided into six parts. Part (i) is the analysis of Lesson 4 in terms of the relation between classroom interaction (characterized in terms of classroom treatment) and uptake. Part (ii) similarly analyses Lesson 3; Part (iii) Lesson 1; Part (iv) Lesson 2; Part (v) Lesson 5 and finally Part (vi) presents the analysis of Lesson 6.

Beginning with the quantitative aspect of data analysis, each part of the chapter moves on to a qualitative ethnographic approach to data analysis which, as will be seen, has offered interesting and valuable insights into the teaching-learning process. Interpretations about factors which facilitated uptake or hindered it are generally made on the basis of tape-transcripts of the classroom lessons and of the interviews with the teachers and the learners. Significant facts about what really happens in the classroom are brought to light.
5.2 About Word Treatment in Lesson 4

Taking instances of words uptaken by 7 or more (that is near 50 per cent or more) learners in Lesson 4, one may check if

(1) the treatment has been adequate in terms of variety of categories used and a balance of categories between the teacher and the learners.

(2) the categories assumed to facilitate uptake (see 4.6.4) have proved to do so.

This is not to totally negate the value of categories such as teacher giving mother tongue equivalent or teacher giving paraphrase. According to Twaddell (1973) however, these are of lesser value because such treatment "will almost certainly lead to quick forgetting unless it is promptly reinforced by being used to discover the meaning of other sentences." In the present data, it may be pointed out that even other much less significant categories such as 'repeats word/meaning' and 'reads word out from the text' are frequently used by the teacher, perhaps because the students' vocabulary is "drastically" limited and so even mere exposure is treatment of some sort. Such categories are sometimes likely to inflate the numerical count (of treatment) and give a false impression of overall treatment. Therefore, a
qualitative analysis of data will be used wherever necessary in order to give a true insight into treatment types and their value.

5.3 Uptake in Lesson 4

The total number of lexical items recalled by the 15 learners who were present for Lesson 4 is presented below in Table I.

TABLE I

UPTAKE LIST FOR LESSON 4

Total Number of Learners Present: 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words in order of highest uptake</th>
<th>Number of Reporters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Retain</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resorting</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Disservice</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Adult</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Suffering</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Literate</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Note</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Opportunity</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cooperative</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Inconceivable</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Neglect</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Illiterate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words in order of highest uptake</th>
<th>Number of Reporters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Antisocial</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Precious</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Demoniac</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Pale</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Pane</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Compassion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Technology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Humanists</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Employed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Incomplete</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Forged</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Trade Union</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Employer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Gained</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Pain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Operate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Regarded</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Analysis of Uptake in Lesson 4

The total uptake of 29 words in Lesson 4 may now be divided into 3 groups for convenience of analysis. The three groups are represented below in Tables A, B and C.
respectively. In each group the words are presented in descending order of the number of reporters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words</th>
<th>No. of Reporters</th>
<th>Total Categories used</th>
<th>Teacher Categories</th>
<th>Learner Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resorting to</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disservice</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffering</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconceivable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operative</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words</td>
<td>No. of Reporters</td>
<td>Total Categories used</td>
<td>Teacher Categories</td>
<td>Learner Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precious</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE C
(Group C)
WORDS REPORTED BY 2 OR LESS THAN 2 LEARNERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words</th>
<th>No.of Reporters</th>
<th>Total Categories used</th>
<th>Teacher Categories</th>
<th>Learner Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regarded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demoniac</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each group as also each word from the group may now be considered to see how it correlates with treatment.

5.4.1 Group A

Beginning with group A, represented in Table A above, there are 10 words that have each received a variety of
treatment ranging between 5 and 18 categories. Six of the 10 words have at least 8 categories of treatment shown against them. Only 'opportunity', 'inconceivable', 'disservice' and 'suffering' have a slightly lower figure (that is 7, 6, 5, 5 categories of treatment respectively). The distribution of effort between teacher and learners is also quite balanced (that is learners have put in about half the effort put in by the teacher) except in the case of 'retain', 'disservice and 'opportunity' where learner treatment is just 1 category as against 7, 4, 6 categories respectively of the teacher's and the word 'suffering' has received no treatment from the learners. Hence, there is an overall correlation between uptake and treatment in the case of most words in this group at least in numerical terms. However each word may now be considered in terms of quality of treatment as revealed by an analysis of the tapescript and of the interview data where necessary.

5.4.1.1 Retain

As noted above 'retain' has been recalled by 12 out of 15 (that is 75 per cent) of the learners present. It was focussed on in 8 different ways and apparently falls short of the description of adequacy (See Chapter IV) only in that there is a wide gap between teacher and learner effort. Treatment issues 7 times from the teacher and only once from a learner. However, it may be observed that among the 8 categories of
treatment exploited, there are two that appear potentially conducive to uptake. First, the only learner category used namely 'checks on meaning' has a 'React' function and second the teacher in 'confirming meaning' 'Reacts' in response to the learner. (See 4.6.4).

A look at the tape transcript (lines 238-240) shows Lata speak after having bid for a turn.

Lata : 'Retain' means 'keep it'?
    T : 'Keep it', 'keep in your possession', 'keep it',
        'keep, keep with you, don't throw them away'....

Here, Lata is checking on the meaning.

The teacher's response endeavours to give the meaning by several categories of treatment. It includes a synonym and three attempts at paraphrasing. What is worthy of attention is that a learner has put the query into the discourse and drawn the attention of other learners. How powerful learner intervention and the first teacher response to it can be, may be gauged from the fact that when the teacher at first, inadvertently confirmed the incorrect meaning given by Lata ('keep it' instead of 'keep') all reporters presented this wrong meaning because learners had perhaps switched off soon after noting it down and had not been paying attention to the teacher's attempts to rectify the error.
At the interview, learners explained to the researcher that they wrote 'keep it' because the teacher had said 'keep it' (See interview, lines 193-223).

The easy spelling of the word as also of its meaning may be another possible reason for its recall by 12 learners. Lastly, a synonym being available may also have encouraged uptake.

The discussion of the above exchange supports the view that there is a correlation between uptake and interaction and perhaps specially so when a learner intervenes or initiates the discourse. Here, an attention-drawing learning opportunity was created at first by a learner's query and then followed up by teacher-input, albeit, misleading at first.

5.4.1.2 Resorting to

This item received 10 different types of treatment and was uptaken by 10 learners out of 15. The distribution of categories of treatment between the teacher and the learner is quite striking. Six categories were used by the teacher and 4 by the learners. Learners have thus put in considerable work. In numerical terms therefore the treatment is adequate and correlates with uptake.

1 "This point will be discussed further in a relevant section - "How teacher input can mislead and/or confuse"."
An analysis of relevant portions of the tapescript may throw light on the qualitative value of the treatment and its relation with uptake. The analysis will also reveal the nature of the major learning opportunities.

A reading of the tapescript shows that the teacher was at a loss in giving the meaning of this item. At first she said:

T: To take part in, resorting. I can't do anything else, so I'll take, I'll do that. 'Resorting'.
Okay?

(Lesson 4, lines 658-659)

Aware of the fact that such input is too vague, the teacher turned to the observer for help and then all of a sudden decided to make use of the category 'Give example'. The value of this category (as already pointed out) lies in the fact that it provides learners an opportunity to listen carefully and process input with the help of clues provided. The teacher's first example was about students resorting to unfair means at examinations (lines 664-672). It is interesting to see how 3 different mother tongue meanings were construed from the same input by 3 different learners, none being correct. The analysis of the exchange discussed below supports the view that each learner takes away something different from the same lesson (Allwright 1984(b)), because
each learner processes input in the light of her own schemata (Breen 1983). In another paper Allwright speaks about learners characterizing learning opportunities "in very much their own terms". He admits that this characterization "would be guided by internal as well as by external factors" and emphasises the need for research to include ways of discovering "this characterization process" without which one cannot hope to go very far with the understanding of classroom language learning.

The following are the 3 different meanings that emerged from the heads of 3 different learners who listened to the teacher.

Nirmala बिना मेहनत के कुछ करना
(Do something without working)

The teacher having rejected this meaning, Kusum spoke as follows:--

Kusum सहायता लेना (Take support of something)

and finally Raakhi said:--

Raakhi अपनाना (make something one's own)

---

2 The characterization of Teaching and Learning Environments: Problems and Perspectives.

3 One wonders whether other learners present construed yet other meanings from the same input.
It is interesting to note that even though none of the meanings given is correct, each appears plausible in the context of the example given and Kusum's contribution seems the most plausible. One can hardly blame the teacher or the learners for the mismatch between intended input and the resulting uptake.

It must also be admitted that though the teacher's example did not enable the students to guess the meaning it was a good teaching strategy as it invited attentive processing of and listening to the target language. The learners would, it appears, have been able to negotiate the meaning if they had continued to listen to the second set of examples, the teacher gave, about a man resorting to various fair and foul means to obtain money. (See tapescript lines 651-701). Unfortunately, the observer offered the meaning 'make use of' just before the second set of examples were given. The learners simply took down this meaning and switched off. This is supported by learners' comments at the interview with the researcher. They plainly confessed that they withdrew soon after the meaning had been given.

Mamta: I paid less attention to the second example than to the first one because for the first one I was trying to work out the meaning. (See lines 53-55, interview with students after Lesson 4).
Kamleshwari said that the first example had suggested to her the meaning 'cheating'

Kamleshwari: Kusum was sitting with us, I said 'cheating' is the meaning. She said 'No, it cannot be cheating.' It must be something else.

Kamleshwari's words indicate that students talk among themselves during the teaching session, trying to help each other negotiate learning. This is gratifying, as overt interaction between/among learners is rare in the tapescript data.

The discussion of the above interaction suggests that

1) in order to encourage negotiation of meaning, 'giving an example' is a useful category.

2) more than one example may be necessary for learners to process meaning clearly.

3) the meaning should not as far as possible be given in a multi-word phrase or a synonym because this deprives learners of the chance to work it out themselves and thereby remember it.

4) learners should be made aware of the value of listening carefully and at length.
5) learner-talk in small groups (in order to negotiate meaning) may be encouraged in classes where learners feel inhibited to take turns publicly.

6) spontaneous learner contributions may be made in the mother-tongue, once learners feel involved in the interaction. Such contributions provide valuable learning opportunities to other learners. Even when a learner contribution is incorrect it creates a learning opportunity as it generates further interaction among learners or between learners and the teacher.

7) it is very likely that the lexical item 'resorting to' got stamped in learners' memory (short-term, perhaps) because of the interaction discussed above. If this view is accepted, it supports the weak form of Interaction Hypothesis (namely, interaction creates learning opportunities). (See Allwright: 1984(b)). In this case, there is some evidence for the strong form of Interaction Hypothesis (namely, that interaction is the learning process itself) as well. This is where the 3 learners, Nirmala, Kusum and Raakhi try to work out the meaning of 'resorting to'. The evidence is limited because the learners' efforts
did not continue long. (See 8.3.4) The teacher's second example was simply wasted on account of the observer's intervention and learners' unwillingness to attend further.

8) there is a significant correlation between uptake and treatment.

5.4.1.3 Disservice

This is yet another word recalled by 10 learners out of 15 present. The treatment figure shown against it (See Table A) is only 5 categories, 4 of which are used by the teacher and 1 by a learner. Thus from the point of variety and distribution of effort one may be inclined to regard it as 'inadequate' treatment. The qualitative value of the categories used may now be examined by studying the tapescript (lines 738-751).

Nirmala asked the meaning, thus introducing the word in the discourse. The fact that she asked the meaning indicates that the word was not familiar to her and probably to some other learners. However, it appears that the word

---

4This is the only instance in the recorded data that the observer intervened and that at the request of the teacher.

5The terms 'significant' and 'correlation' are not used in a statistical sense.
could be easily uptaken since the word 'service' is perhaps familiar and is commonly regarded as synonymous for 'employment' by some Indian speakers of English.

The teacher put across the word 'disservice' by focussing on the form of the word - thus:

T  Service is something that will help you ... Disservice is

Nirmala  not help

(lines 738-742)

The interruption by Nirmala suggests that she had grasped the negative prefix - 'dis-' even before the teacher could complete the sentence. The interruption itself provided a learning opportunity to other learners - in fact, it provided 'input'. (Though not phrased quite correctly). Once again, it is an instance of interaction between a learner and the teacher generating the learning opportunity and the interaction was initiated by a learner. The exchange, though short, illustrates how learning opportunities are created.

In terms of treatment this is a good example of how a single category of treatment, here, (focusing on a marker of negation) can be amply rewarding. Further paraphrase and familiar examples that followed (see lines 743-751) may also have aided recall of the word.
Hence, not variety of treatment alone nor its
distribution between the teacher and learners, but the
appropriate quality of treatment as well, needs to be
considered when speaking about the relationship between
interaction and uptake.

The above discussion

1) explains the value of appropriate treatment
   in facilitating uptake.

2) reinforces the value of learner initiation,
   learner intervention and involvement in
general in facilitating uptake.

3) highlights the process whereby learning
   opportunities are created.

4) suggests that teacher-learner interaction
   makes a word salient for uptake.

5.4.1.4 Adult

This word was uptaken by 9 learners out of 15 present.
It received 8 types of treatment and the distribution between
teacher and learner is quite balanced. T5 - L3. Thus, the
treatment is adequate in numerical terms and so to some extent
accounts for the uptake of the word by over 50 per cent of
the learners. However an analysis of the classroom tapescript
data may bring to light significant aspects which have a
bearing on the uptake of the lexical item.
The tapescript shows that of the 3 categories used by learners, only one is significant (namely, learner gives meaning) as it entails active student participation. The teacher also uses 3 less significant categories such as 'asking for meaning', 'giving a meaning equivalent in the text context' and 'reading out the word from the text'. In addition to this she gives the example of movies marked U (Universal) and A (Adults). The example is a familiar one and does not call for careful processing of language or understanding of ideas.

Except for 'correcting pronunciation' (which has a 'Reacting' function) other teacher categories have only the functions 'Give' and 'Ask'. This is not to undervalue such categories. They may be quite useful and lead to uptake if learners are motivated enough and alert to the learning opportunities that arise. The present batch being less motivated and less competent may miss them. It is therefore necessary to scan the data closely to see if there be any attention-drawing episode.

Such an incident is to be found in lines 639-642: Here, Lata, very loudly interrupts the teacher with the following:-

Lata : (Reading from the text) Miss, "I have been a teacher for nearly all my /ædʒult/ life"

T : /ædʒult / life ... What is, what is 'adult life'?
Very good you asked me.

(Lesson 4, lines 639-642)

Here, Lata mispronounces the word 'adult'. The teacher corrects her unobtrusively, by herself pronouncing the word correctly. The juxtaposition of the incorrect and the correct pronunciation is likely to have drawn learners' attention especially because Lata spoke loudly and without inhibition. Further, the teacher praised her for asking the question thus focussing attention on the word that was asked - (though actually perhaps to take away the embarrassment at being corrected).

It may be that learner attention is drawn more easily when a learner introduces a learning opportunity in the discourse. It must be remembered that the teacher and learner treatment that has been listed and commented on above came only after Lata's implied request for the meaning of the word 'adult' had been made. Learner initiation and participation (Kusum contributed the meaning - line 642) may possibly be an important reason for 9 learners uptaking 'adult' even though this episode is short.

The interview data lends some support to this view. At the interview, when Mamta was asked if she noticed that Lata had pronounced 'adult' incorrectly in class, she
answered:-

Mamta: Yes, Then Miss herself pronounced it right. - (Line 89, Lesson 4)

This suggests that Mamta was perhaps even aware of the teacher’s mode of correction. Asked whether it is helpful to listen to other learners, she said:

Mamta: Yes, if they don’t make mistakes. - (Line 95, Lesson 4)

This suggests that students prefer to model the teacher rather than their peers. However it appears that they may be willing to learn from a learner whom they believe to be competent. For example, Mamta says at the same interview that Kusum gave the meaning before the teacher did. This suggests that Mamta had been attentive to both Kusum and the teacher.

At another interview (See interview following Lesson 9 Lines 46-53) when Mamta is asked whether there is any particular reason for remembering the word ‘furrier’, she

6 It may be pointed out that actually the analysis is confined to the first six lessons for investigating the relationship between uptake and classroom interaction and the issue of retention of uptake over time. However, several excerpts from the interview data of Lessons 7 to 10 are discussed occasionally because they offer useful and interesting insights into the learning process as also into the major research questions. (See Chapter IV).
Mamta says:

Mamta  It recurred in the text again and again and I could not pronounce it. So the teacher repeated the correct pronunciation several times.

Mamta is a case of the good language learner who according to Rubin (1975) "monitors his own and the speech of others ... he is constantly attending to how well his speech is being received ..... He can learn from his own mistakes" as Mamta does.

In both instances, discussed above, a learner has availed of a learning opportunity which was generated from the teacher's implicit correction of a pronunciation error. Slimani (1987) on the other hand, suggests that uptake claims are hardly triggered off by error correction. "The teacher's provision of feedback does not seem to exert much of an impact on the learners' uptake." (p.317). She however is of the view that this may be because the mode of correcting in her data was defective. Mamta's awareness of learning opportunities can be seen in yet another comment of hers: (See interview following Lesson 10, Lines 26-30)

R  How did you learn the word 'gay'?  
Mamta  Someone asked the spelling of 'gay'

Her comment is suggestive of the link between interaction and uptake.
Coming back to the word 'adult', it appears that as all the interaction round the word issued from a learner query which had already roused learner attention, the treatment could facilitate uptake better.

One notices, therefore, that the qualitative aspect of 'treatment' cannot be overlooked. A qualitative analysis not only helps in understanding the relationship between uptake and treatment, it also reinforces the correlation which numerical counts may already have indicated.

Incidentally, certain interesting aspects which relate to the nature of uptake may be pointed out here. It is surprising to find that Lata who asked the meaning of the word, recalled the word but not its meaning. One wonders why the meaning did not register with her. Could it be because the teacher corrected her error in pronunciation and that left Lata rather upset for a while? Allwright (personal communication) holds the view that learners who participate in the interaction feel too involved to benefit from it. Their effort, however, helps other learners who may be merely attending silently. Perhaps this instance in the present data supports Allwright's view.

Seliger (1983) suggests a similar view:

In the case of initiated interaction, the initiator must attend carefully to his or her own output in order to make the intent of the utterance clear as well as attending to the response of the interlocutor.

This dual task may prove too heavy for average SL learners.
What is disconcerting, however, is that Kusum who gave the meaning of 'adult' in class, has also reported the word. Surely, she was already familiar with it. Could it be that sometimes learners carried away by the spirit of competing with peers, unduly try to inflate their uptake list? It may also be to impress the teacher.

At the interview a learner gave the researcher to understand that she knew that 'A' against movie titles meant 'for over 18 years of age' but she did not know that the 'A' stood for the word 'adult'. That she did not try to find out the link, shows perhaps, the lack of intellectual curiosity and the lack of motivation to learn by oneself. Her comment may be true of other learners as well, in which case the example given by the teacher was not as simple as suggested earlier. This also points to a teacher's difficulty in gauging how much learners already know.

The above discussion on the uptake and treatment of 'adult' suggests that

a) besides quantum and variation of treatment, the quality of treatment and the source of the treatment play a significant role in facilitating uptake.

b) learner initiation of and participation in the discourse draws attention of other learns to the word being focussed on and so facilitates uptake.
c) when a learner's error is corrected, a learning opportunity is created for other learners who may be listening.

d) students are possibly able to gauge and compare peer ability.

e) students prefer to model the teacher and take cues from her/him as well as from the more competent students.

f) a student interacting on an item may not be able to uptake it possibly because he/she feels too self-conscious to attend carefully.

g) the interaction of one learner or a few learners can help other silent ones in uptaking an item.

h) there is perhaps a tendency among learners to sometimes inflate their uptake lists by reporting familiar words. This may be with a view to impress the teacher and their peers.

5.4.1.5 Suffering

Nine students have reported this word. Only 5 treatment categories have been used. All the 5 have been used by the teacher and none by learners. Thus neither is there much variety in the treatment nor is the effort distributed between teacher and learners. Relevant data may now be examined to see why, despite insufficient
treatment, the word wasuptaken by over 50 per cent learners.

Apparently, this was a familiar word. This is suggested by the fact that no learner asked its meaning. Generally, all through the data, learners have sought opportunities to ask for the meaning as soon as a new word is encountered. It appears that this word might not have been reported, had it not been for the teacher’s unnecessary focus and confusing presentation.

The teacher, apparently recalled how Hindi-speaking learners of English are wont to confuse सफर (travel) with 'suffer' (feel pain). The teacher began by asking the present learners what 'suffer' 'meant'. Without waiting for a response she inquired whether it was the same as travelling. In chorus the learners answered, "No", and yet the teacher went on as follows:-

    T No, don't use the Hindi word सफर for English suffer ..................Suffer is to have trouble or pain. Alright? English. And don't mix up two languages. Remember when I was suffering from Borivli to Churchgate is wrong, is wrong. Okay? Sitting in a second class compartment is suffering because there are too many people there. But what you mean is 'travelling'. So the word for uh for Hindi
in English is travel. TRAVEL. But English 'suffer' is 'to feel pain'.

(See tapescript, Lesson 4, lines 432-443).

It is interesting that having related 'suffer' and 'travel', the teacher perhaps, inadvertently, reinforces the confusion by saying "sitting in a second class compartment is suffering", thereby acknowledging that there is a connection between travelling and suffering. In order to distinguish the two, it would have been appropriate to talk about travelling as though it was not suffering. The example actually, reinforces the similarity between travelling and suffering. Thus beginning with a mother-tongue interference problem, one gets to understand that first pain and suffering are related and then the two related to travel.

It may be that a few learners felt that a different meaning or a different word was being presented. Something to this effect was suggested by a learner at the interview with the researcher.

Researcher : ... Is it a new word for you?
S : Miss I know 'suffer'
Researcher : .... Then why did you write it? (that is list it as uptake)
S : I don't know what is the meaning of 'suffer'.

(Interview with learners. Lines 540-550).
However, as 7 out of 9 reporters have given the correct meaning and only 2 recalled the word without stating its meaning, one is inclined to feel that perhaps only a small minority may have been confused. 7

It must not be overlooked that the teacher did present the meaning of 'suffer' in a multi-word phrase 'feel pain or trouble', repeated it and illustrated the word 'suffering' through apt examples. Hence, it is difficult to say whether it was genuinely uptaken by the 9 reporters or did some who knew it already, take advantage of the confusing presentation to inflate their uptake list.

From the above discussion it appears that

1) the teacher has certainly created needless confusion but students have none the less got the meaning and the word right because they knew it quite well.

7 If it were possible to transcribe tapescripts, study them and also scrutinize uptake sheets between a teaching session and an interview session, learners could be more appropriately probed to explain 'uptake'. Constraints of time and other circumstances, however, defeat what seems desirable for research.

8 This appears to be a major drawback in the investigation procedure that one has to take learners on their honour, in reporting only words not known before. However, it is expected that the percentage of untrue reports will be small and it will be possible to weed them out on the basis of evidence from interviews or professional knowledge.
2) they may have listed it as uptake because they thought she was introducing a new word.

3) one could have used it as an instance of misleading treatment leading to confusion (suffering in a railway compartment) except that the students were probably so familiar with the word that if they were misled it was only temporarily.

4) misleading treatment can cause confusion but if a word is very well known, then not lasting confusion.

5) learner treatment of the word is altogether perhaps absent/because learners were familiar with the word.

5.4.1.6 Literate

As Table I indicates this word was uptaken by 8 learners out of the 15 present (that is about 50 per cent). It received by far the highest amount of treatment in this lesson. A variety of 18 categories are used. These are so distributed that the learners put in half as much work as the teacher. They guess meaning, give the meaning in English and in the mother tongue. The teacher gives a suitable example to bring out the meaning of the word; she deliberately re-inforces both word and meaning; corrects meaning (incidentally these are all categories assumed to
have the potential for facilitating uptake) and uses a variety of other categories.

The teacher begins by asking the meaning. In response, Nirmala answers 'Great books'. This is evidently because Nirmala's mind has harked back to the word "Literature" in Lesson 3. The teacher promptly corrects her.

T : No. 'Literate'. That is 'literature'
The correction offers a learning opportunity to other learners.
Next the teacher gives a cue which is yet another learning opportunity.

T : The opposite is 'illiterate'.
As no response is forthcoming, she presents a very apt example of voters who are literate signing their names and the illiterate putting their thumb impressions. This followed by the question "What's the meaning of literate?" at once brings the answer लिटरेटिव from Raakhi. To use a term from Bonamy (1984 p.10) the teacher "activates" the learners, that is, makes a reference to something they already know before proceeding with the learning point. Thus, the example here proceeds from the known to the unknown and enables learners to work out the meaning. Being involved in negotiating its

---

9It is sheer coincidence here that the word 'literature' is etymologically related to the word 'literate'.
meaning the learners are likely to uptake the word. Further treatment follows but even from the categories discussed so far, the correlation between treatment and uptake seems clear.

Both, the example given by the teacher and Raakhi's promptly guessing the meaning in the mother-tongue provide learning opportunities to all who may have been listening. This is indeed evidence for Allwright's weak form of interaction hypothesis - interaction makes learning opportunities available. 'Teacher-learner interaction' has made the word salient for recall. This is one of the saliency categories researched by Bonamy (1984).

5.4.1.7 Note

Seven out of the 15 learners present reported this word. That is just a little short of 50 per cent. Both in terms of variety and in terms of sharing of effort (Teacher 9 categories; learners 5 categories) the treatment is remarkably adequate. Attention may now be drawn to the 5 learner categories used. Three out of these 5 have the function 'Give'. (1) Give mother tongue meaning, (2) give meaning, (3) give example. As was assumed earlier, (see 4.6.4) these categories used by learners appear conducive to uptake. The teacher uses here 2 categories with 'React' as function and these were also assumed to be conducive to uptake. They are 'correct meaning' and 'add to meaning given
by learner'. Though the latter category has been shown under the function 'Give' in the category list, (See 4.2) it has a 'React' function as well. Other categories assumed earlier to be potentially significant for uptake are also used by the teacher. One of them is 'deliberately reinforces meaning'.

The following excerpt from the tapescript illustrates the above categories. Other aspects of treatment are not focused on here, even though they may also be likely to facilitate uptake.

Virbala Note? (Learner initiates discourse by asking meaning)
T What is 'to note'?
S Note the time (Learner gives example)
T What, what must we note?

.................

Virbala द्यान में रखना (Learner gives mother tongue meaning)
T hm, No that is to remember

.................

(T rejects meaning)
S To show ....... (Learner gives meaning)
T To see, we must .......

.................

(Teacher corrects meaning)
This short excerpt is a good example of meaning negotiation through interaction. The categories used are those which were assumed (See 4.6.4) to have the potential for facilitating uptake. It is such episodes that provide evidence for Allwright's strong Interaction Hypothesis (namely, that interaction is the learning process itself) in addition to the weaker hypothesis (namely interaction generates learning opportunities). The present data has very few instances which support the strong hypothesis. However, it appears that much more evidence would be found in the interaction of learners who are a little better equipped from the point of linguistic competence in the target language. Learners would then talk among themselves and to the teacher so that through the negotiation of learning opportunities, language would be learned. The teacher's ability to understand and speak the learners' mother tongue would be an additional advantage in dissolving learners' inhibition. As regards, the weaker form of the Interaction Hypothesis there is plenty of evidence.
For example, in the above excerpt almost every contribution provides a learning opportunity to those who are attending.

An interesting point to note is that 2 students who interacted have not reported the word in their uptake list. Kusum seems to have been, to some extent, familiar with the word and may, therefore, not have reported it. Other unidentified students who interacted may also have been familiar with the word though not with the precise meaning. But Virbala's not uptaking the word is not easy to explain since it was she who asked the meaning and also contributed the partially correct mother tongue meaning उम्मेद में रस्तना। One possibility is that the word may have just slipped out of her mind. Second, this may be further evidence for Allwright's view that those who participate are too involved to attend carefully and so to benefit from the interaction which however benefits the listeners. (Allwright: Personal communication).

The qualitative analysis of the treatment of 'note' discussed above as also other aspects of treatment such as variety and learner effort (also referred to above) point to a correlation between uptake and treatment.

5.4.1.8 Opportunity

Recalled by 7 learners, this word has a variety of 7 categories used. Hence in terms of quantum, the treatment
is a little less than what other words discussed so far received except 'disservice' and 'suffering' which had 5 categories each. In the case of 'opportunity', there is a wide gap between teacher and learner effort. (Teacher 6 categories, learner 1 category). A similar gap obtained in the case of 'retain', 'suffering' and 'disservice' already discussed. In the case of the last 3 words, qualitative analysis has already shown how specific aspects of treatment have a significant bearing on uptake despite less overall treatment and the wide difference between teacher and learner effort. It is, therefore, necessary to study 'opportunity' also in relation to the data.

'Opportunity' was used incidentally by the teacher. On realising that it was unfamiliar to the learners, the teacher proceeded to employ several categories of treatment to convey its meaning. Of these, perhaps, the category 'gives example' proved specially helpful. The teacher said that the opportunity of studying in a college did not come to everyone. The context of this example is familiar to learners in the difficult economic set-up in India. The teacher has once again "activated" learners to a state of readiness to listen by beginning with familiar knowledge in order to lead on to the unfamiliar word. Probably, because it is generally possible to make use of "activation" (Bonamy, 1984) while presenting an example,
the category of 'giving example' has a rich potential for uptake. T gives example and T gives synonym are both categories which were assumed (see 4.6.4) to have the potential for boosting uptake. Further, the fact that an easy synonym 'chance' was given, may also have aided uptake. Besides, the teacher focussed on the spelling of "opportunity" so that the word could register better. Considering the fact that the black-board was never used during these teaching sessions, the category 'focusses on spelling' assumes greater significance. It seems that the graphic form of a word leaves an impression on the mind more easily than the mere sound of a word. This view is supported by Fleming (1984, p.30). "It may .... be the case that seeing an item in print makes it easier for the learner to select it from the surrounding discourse and identify it as new." Lastly, being the last word explained during the session, it may have been fresh enough for easy recall when the recall sheets were handed out. This explanation, though apparently insignificant was given by learners when the researcher discussed with them the possible reasons for the uptake of the word 'alter' which was the last word in Lesson 2. It seems convincing enough psychologically in terms of "recency effect" (Snodgrass et al 1985).
The above discussion on the 'uptake' of 'opportunity' gives one to understand that

1) even in the absence of much variety of treatment, and student involvement, uptake may still be facilitated by certain categories effectively used by the teacher - here, for example, 'giving an example', 'giving a synonym' and 'focussing on spelling'.

2) the teacher can be the source of useful uptake - facilitating learning opportunities. This ultimately suggests a causal link between treatment and uptake.

3) certain psychological factors that influence memory are also relevant in influencing uptake, for example, 'recency effect'.

5.4.1.9 Inconceivable

This word was uptaken by 7 learners out of 15. The sum total of treatment categories used is only 6 but the distribution between teacher and learner is quite balanced. (Teacher 4, Learner 2). The overall treatment, 6 categories, though it be reasonable variety in itself, is low as compared to that of other words in this group, except 'disservice' and 'suffering' which have been discussed above. There may, therefore, it appears, be either other more
significant factors than treatment or specific qualitative aspects of treatment to account for 7 learners uptaking this word. That adequacy of treatment includes qualitative value of the categories has already been pointed out.

The tapescript shows that learner involvement is rather poor. They repeat meaning or ask meaning. They do not participate actively in the interaction - at least not overtly.

The teacher gives the meaning 'unthought of', 'unthinkable' before she proceeds to give a suitable example to convey the meaning. The given example of it being inconceivable for a mother to kill her child or a father to kill his son strikes home soon. This suggests that learners are sometimes attentive and involved in listening (if not in speaking). Perhaps the very idea was too shocking not to rouse them to listen. The students fit the meaning 'unthinkable' in the context of the example. Intuitively, the teacher may have judged it a better strategy to give the meaning before the example rather than ask learners to guess the meaning from the example because that might have been difficult and even frustrating, perhaps, in this case. Probably, the example made an impact on the young minds because it speaks of the closeness of filial ties and the sanctity of human relations.
The fact that at the interview, a learner said that the example helped her to remember the word (See lines 121-130, interview following Lesson 4) suggests that this category of treatment (namely, Teacher gives example) may have been intimately connected with the uptake of the word.

Incidentally, it is interesting to see Shilpa read the word carefully breaking it up into syllables. (See line 708) thus: in-con-ceiv-able. It shows that learners finding a poly syllabic word difficult, can, if they wish, make special attempts to learn it. This is an instance of a learning strategy being overtly practised.

The above discussion shows

1) how even a single powerful category of treatment (here, giving of an example) may influence uptake.

2) that learners are to some extent aware of learning strategies and occasionally adopt those appropriate to their needs. Useful pedagogic hints and suitable training in this area is, therefore, likely to be well received and may prove helpful.

3) specific aspects of treatment may lead to uptake thus pointing to a correlation which has not been affirmed in quantitative terms.
5.4.1.10 **Co-operative**

This word was uptaken by 7 learners and a total of 10 categories were used in its treatment. These were distributed as follows: Teacher 7 - Students 3. Thus in terms of variety and also in terms of distribution the numerical counts are quite satisfactory. Moreover, 2 of the 3 student categories have the function 'give'. As pointed out earlier, this is likely to facilitate uptake by drawing other learners' attention. It is otherwise more usual for students to keep 'asking'. The teacher also, in addition to using other useful categories, uses the category 'adds to the meaning given by a learner'. This is also one of the categories that was assumed to be potentially conducive to uptake. (See 4.6.4).

The tape script presents two short exchanges (see lines 534-543 and lines 600-606) where the meaning of the word is negotiated. Here, the mother tongue meaning of 'co-operate' is offered by an unidentified learner and then Kusum gives the meaning 'To help each other' which is accepted by the teacher. Later in response to "what's a co-operative effort?" comes the chorus reply "all together". The teacher adds to (rather modifies) this meaning by saying 'to work together'.

The students' chorus response suggests that the word was partially familiar to several learners including Kusum
who offered the meaning. The 9 learners who did not report the word include Kusum, Nirmala, Mamta, Raakhi and Virbala who are generally vocal. This suggests that being familiar with the word, they may have contributed the meanings cited above and so did not report the word as uptake. Their interaction however helped others to uptake the word. "Some learners put on a display for the benefit of other learners." (Slimani, 1987).

At the interview which followed Lesson 4, of the five interviewees present (namely, Kamleshwari, Mamta, Lata, Purnima and Nilam) only Nilam has reported the word. When the first three, (Kamleshwari, Mamta and Lata) were asked whether they had known the word before the English lesson, they answered affirmatively in chorus. Mamta said she knew the word as she had seen it used in relation to Co-operative Stores and Co-operative Banks. Lata said the word recurred in Secretarial Practice. She was familiar with its spelling but had not learned the meaning until the present teaching session.

(1) It is gratifying that those who knew the word did not report it. That makes the reports of the other 7 learners credible.

(2) It also explains that learners do not always try to inflate their uptake lists.
(3) Further, it explains why more than 7 learners did not report the word, even though the treatment is adequate, both quantitatively and qualitatively.

(4) Lastly, it lends support to the view that uptake may largely be the offshoot of classroom interaction. This would be true even in the case of learners who may have come across the word earlier without it registering on their minds.

Incidentally, an interesting point which came up at the interview may throw more light on the understanding of uptake. Purnima's queries (see interview with learners, lines 402-418) suggest that sometimes a good teaching strategy, if used inadequately, can cause confusion and prevent uptake. This seems to have happened to Purnima who insisted at the interview on clarifying the meaning of 'operate', 'co-operate' and 'co-operative'. It may be recalled (see tapescript lines 604-605, Lesson 4), that the teacher attempted to show how 'co-operate' was formed by prefixing 'co' to 'operate'.

T ..... Operate is to work. Co-operate is to work together.

A passing reference such as this without appropriate use of the blackboard and without explicitly pointing out how the prefix changed word meaning, may not be rewarding when the
L₂ learner's competence is average. The pedagogically useful learning opportunity, it appears, was lost, the teaching point did not register with most learners. 'Operate' was reported by only one learner. It may have interfered with the uptake of 'co-operate' in the case of some learners, Purnima being one of them.

Thus uptake may be hindered if a learning opportunity is not clearly presented and appropriately focused on.

5.4.1.11 Conclusion to Group A

This completes the analysis of the 10 words in Group A. Before starting on a similar analysis of Group B, it may be pointed out that in the case of certain words in this group (for example, resorting to, adult, literate and note) there were recognisable correlations in quantitative terms between uptake and treatment. However even in these cases, qualitative analysis of the data was taken up and it reinforced the vital link between treatment and uptake. Words whose treatment fell short of adequacy quantitatively considered were studied from the qualitative aspect as reflected in the tape script and interview data. It was found that one or the other aspect of treatment which could not be captured explicitly in quantitative terms had significantly affected uptake. This reinforces the connection between uptake and treatment and also points to the importance of qualitative analysis.
5.4.2 **Group B**

Words in this group (See Table B in 5.4) were claimed as uptake by less than 7 but more than 2 learners. The overall treatment in terms of variety of categories ranges between 7 and 14 categories and the distribution of treatment between teacher and learner is also quite balanced in all cases except in the case of 'anti-social' which has 6 categories used by the teacher and only 1 by a learner. Thus in quantitative terms, 7 out of 8 words in this group have been adequately treated.

One has however to check whether the quality of the categories used has anything to do with the fact that fewer learners were able to uptake the word. Are categories which were assumed to be potentially conducive to uptake (see 4.6.4) used in the treatment of words in this group or are different less useful categories used? A quantitative count cannot reveal this aspect. Moreover, the data will have to be studied closely to see what could have possibly hindered uptake. Therefore, the treatment of each word in this group will have to be analysed qualitatively in the light of the tapescript and interview data.

5.4.2.1 **Neglect**

The uptake sheets show that 'neglect' was in fact uptaken by many more learners (12 out of 15) but as 6 of
them could not recall the spelling correctly, their uptake of the word could not be taken into account. Obviously the spelling of 'neglect' is tricky for an $L_2$ learner. Students' interview with the researcher throws light on this point. Asked, 'why did you write NEGLED? (Neglect) a student said:

S .... I did not understand the pronunciation

R .... Whose pronunciation? Did you hear it wrong?

.........................

S I did not look at the spelling carefully.

R But the teacher said the word.

S hm

R How did it sound to you?

S Miss, 'Neglect' and 'Negled' the different?

R Did you hear /d/

S Yes Miss.

It appears that there were at least 3 causes for this error.

i) students' insufficient practice in listening.

ii) students not looking into the text book.

iii) the teacher not writing on the black board - hence students unable to co-ordinate aural and visual stimuli.
It is significant that a group of learners had the same spelling error which they attributed to the same cause (inability to process the pronunciation and match the sound of the word with its spelling). Thus six learners' uptake had to be rejected as a result of a major and a consistently recurring drawback in the teaching. One may therefore argue that the treatment in general facilitated uptake, because apparently the six learners (whose uptake was rejected on account of the spelling error) would in all probability have uptaken the word had it been highlighted on the blackboard.

The finding from this instance has obvious implications both for teachers and learners which will be dealt with under pedagogical implications (See Chapter VII).

Evidence suggesting the extent to which uptake is influenced by spelling or pronunciation of a word is also to be found in the interview data of Lesson 8. Two excerpts

---

10 A few learners, however, presented another variant of the error in spelling. They wrote 'neglate'. What they probably presumed the teacher to have said was 'neglet'. The researcher's experience in teaching spoken English suggests that some EFL learners find it difficult to discriminate between /e/ and /ei/ as in 'let' and 'late'.

11 See footnote on page 137.
are quoted below. The first suggests that the word was uptaken because the spelling of (not the word but) its meaning was easy. The second suggests that even the effort to uptake the word was abandoned in view of the difficult spelling.

(1) The researcher has asked the learners why/how all three of them were able to remember the word 'magnificent' and its meaning 'splendid'

Furnima Because it was the last word teacher explained.

Kusum It was the very last one ............

.................

............... Kusum Miss, spelling of 'magnificent', we already knew and the spelling of 'splendid' is very easy - 'did' and 'slen'.

Apparently Kusum was using a recall strategy but strangely enough she focuses first on the familiar 'did' rather than on 'slen'. The researcher probed them further thus:

R But how did you recall it?

Kusum One reason is, it was the last word.

R hm.

Kusum And we were all discussing its meaning. Bach gave a different meaning. And we
couldn't get it clearly at all. And we decided to look it up in a dictionary at home.

(Lines 233-262)

The last few words of Kusum point to learners' efforts to negotiate meaning in small groups even while the teaching session is in progress. Such small group interaction would also highlight words and make them salient for recall. Perhaps, teachers should encourage meaning negotiation in small groups and monitor each small group talk.

The second excerpt is as follows:-

(2) R  Wasn't 'exhilarated' a new word?
Kusum  It was difficult.
R  Difficult to remember?
Kusum  Saying 'exhilarated' 'Exhilarated', we would slip into 'exhibit'. (Laughs)
R  I understand.

Thus, in this case it was the pronunciation of the word (perhaps, its spelling too) which daunted learners and discouraged them from uptaking it.

5.4.2.2 Illiterate

One third the total number of learners present that is, 5 out of 15 learners reported the word 'illiterate'
even though it is not in the text-book and was only incidentally used by the teacher along with 'literate' which is there. This, in fact, suggests that the word attracted more learners than is normal in such cases. There is a general tendency among learners to disregard words that do not figure in the text-book and are not written on the blackboard either. This view is borne out by Fleming (1984, p.10). Therefore, one would perhaps be justified in saying that 'uptake of illiterate' in fact correlates with the treatment of the word because teacher effort as reflected in the treatment categories is considerable. It almost parallels the treatment of 'literate'. In addition, the teacher attempts to simplify the spelling and then the meaning by first saying 'put IL before 'literate' and then, 'Illiterate' is opposite of 'literate'. These hints should have facilitated uptake and apparently 5 learners benefited even though they had no opportunity of seeing the word in written form.

Not seeing the word in print or on the blackboard may have deterred learners from active interaction. They merely 'repeat spelling', 'ask spelling' and 'recall meaning' and that incorrectly too. They are not actively involved as in the case of 'literate'.

If we accept that, as pointed out earlier, learner initiation, intervention and contribution generally boost
uptake, then in the absence of such work, 5 reports of 'illiterate' as against 8 of 'literate' is not difficult to understand.

The fact that the meanings of 'literate' and 'illiterate' were interchanged by learners during class time indicates that students were finding it hard to keep the two words clear in their minds. As a result, 3 of them may have decided to shed load by concentrating on one word only - that being 'literate' which is in the text-book and is reported by 8 learners.

In fact, considering the amount and quality of treatment of 'literate' (already discussed above in Group A) one is inclined to feel that more than 8 learners would have recalled 'literate', if 'illiterate' had not interfered with its uptake. That is to say, it was perhaps a less rewarding teaching strategy to associate words opposite in meaning, close and yet not so close in spelling as to relieve the mind of the burden of keeping them apart. What might have helped learners to do so is perhaps the knowledge that IL is a negative prefix like IN. The teacher perhaps implied this but did not make it explicit.

Thus the uptake of the word 'illiterate' and to some extent even 'literate' seems to have been unduly hindered by the

1) teacher's dislike of blackboard use.
2) teacher introducing a useful word incidentally but overlooking the need to help the learners process it.

Thus, it appears that even when a word is, in an overall way, adequately treated, its uptake may be impeded by one or the other drawbacks in the teaching. This may be so even in the case of teaching which is by general standards good. There are, it appears, too many simultaneous demands made on a teacher in the classroom. Too many decisions have to be made and all too soon.

Perhaps what Allwright says with regard to error correction in the classroom, may also be appropriate in this present context.

The key task for the teacher, then is firstly to sum up the whole situation on the spot, and then to react appropriately, in public, conscious of the need to treat the problems of the individual without misleading or confusing the other learners.

(Allwright: 1975, p.103)

5.4.2.3 Anti-social

Five learners, that is one-third the number present, have reported the word. The total treatment in terms of number of categories used is 7. The teacher has used 6 and a student 1.
Apparently, other learners did not report the word because they knew it already. First, the word is constituted of the familiar 'social' and 'anti'. The negative prefix 'anti', unlike IL in 'illiterate' (discussed above) is commonly known to learners in the day to day context of newspaper headlines and speeches. They are likely to have come across expressions such as 'anti-government', 'anti-religious'. Moreover, the teacher used the terms 'pro' and 'anti' to bring out the meaning of 'anti'. Further, the term 'anti-social elements' is often referred to in the English press.

5.4.2.4 Precious

This word also appears to have been familiar to learners except perhaps a few. This is suggested by the fact that from the same text-book (in which 'A Call to Youth' appears), a short story entitled 'The Blue Carbuncle' by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle had been taught to these learners by another teacher before the present teaching sessions commenced. The word 'precious' had been 'crucial' in the story and hence the learners were already familiar with it. The teacher in the present experiment may not have known

\[12\] As listing of uptake entails listing only unfamiliar words, the question of correlation between uptake and treatment does not arise wherever there is some evidence to suggest that a particular word was familiar to the learners.
this, else she might have referred to the story in some way while presenting the word.

2) when a learner asks the meaning of 'precious' (line 754), another learner, "Raakhi" promptly offers the mother-tongue meaning – जिम्मेवारी (line 760). It is pleasing to find that Raakhi has not reported the word in her uptake list.

5.4.2.5 Pale, pane

These 2 words will be discussed along with 'pain' which is in Group C. As the 3 words are associated in the interaction, it is appropriate to discuss them together.

5.4.2.6 Compassion

This word appeared in Lesson 2, then in Lesson 3 and again in Lesson 4. It was considerably treated in Lesson 2. Fifteen categories of treatment had been used – Eleven by the teacher and 4 by the learners. It was uptaken then (that is after Lesson 2) by 6 learners out of the 9 that were present. The table below shows clearly that these 6 learners did not ever report the word in the Lessons that followed. In fact, even the 3 other learners who had been present did not list 'compassion ' as their uptake in Lessons 3 and 4. This is perhaps because the word had become familiar in the course of Lesson 2 even though they had failed to report it as their uptake. In Lesson 3, no learner has reported compassion
Anju, Kalpana, Kamleshwari and Asha are the 4 new learners (that is, they had been absent in Lesson 2). However, they do not uptake the word 'compassion'. This may be because the teacher merely reinforced the word in Lesson 3. She did not treat it in various ways, believing that learners had become familiar with it in Lesson 2. The reinforcement would have helped the learners who had attended Lesson 2 and had already become familiar with the word.

In Lesson 4, there are 3 reporters, Anjou, Rekha and Kamleshwari. They were absent in Lesson 2. Anjou and Kamleshwari were however present in Lesson 3 and so this was their second exposure to the word 'compassion' which may have helped them to uptake it. (See Table on page 171).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learners present</td>
<td>Learners who uptook 'compassion' (ticked names)</td>
<td>Learners present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Anjou</td>
<td>Anjou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Virbala</td>
<td>Virbala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kalpana</td>
<td>Kalpana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Kusum</td>
<td>Kusum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Nirmala</td>
<td>Nirmala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Purnima</td>
<td>Purnima</td>
<td>Purnima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Raakhi</td>
<td>Raakhi</td>
<td>Raakhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Rekha</td>
<td>Sumitra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kamleshwari</td>
<td>Kamleshwari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Neeru</td>
<td>Neeru</td>
<td>Neeru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Asha</td>
<td>Neelkamal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Mamta</td>
<td>Mamta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Lata</td>
<td>Lata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Shilpa</td>
<td>Shilpa</td>
<td>Shilpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 9</td>
<td>Total 10</td>
<td>Total 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus it seems evident that despite 11 categories of treatment, 'compassion' was uptaken by only 3 learners in Lesson 4. It is because it was already familiar to nearly 3 times the number (that is, 9 learners who attended Lesson 2 and also Lesson 4). Further, the categories used by learners in the interaction on this word, suggest that learners were familiar with it, and its meaning. The category 'Ask meaning' has not been used by any learner. Twice learners recall the meaning in chorus, and four learners use the word in the text context.

The teacher's effort in reinforcing the word and treating it again and again is perhaps deliberate because the word 'compassion' represents a key idea in Radhakrishnan's convocation address.

5.4.2.7 Conclusion to analysis of Group B

The discussion on the uptake of words in Group B suggests first that the number of learners uptaking a word may be small (even though the treatment is adequate) simply because the word is already familiar to some/all the learners. Secondly, in the case of some words, uptake may be impeded by some characteristic drawback in the teaching. (Here, for example, the teacher consistently avoiding the use of the blackboard).

The words in Group C will now be considered.
5.4.3 **Group C**

Words in this group were claimed as uptake by 2 or less than 2 learners. Their total treatment ranges between 1 and 4 categories except the treatment of 'demonic', 'trade union' and 'pain' which have 9 categories each. The nature of these categories has however to be examined.

For convenience in discussing them, some of the words will be considered in pairs or in groups of 3.

5.4.3.1 **Employer and 'employed'** are very likely to have been words already familiar to students of commerce.

5.4.3.2 **Technology and regarded** had been presented in earlier lessons. In fact, 'technology' is a crucial and a recurring word in all the 3 earlier lessons, while 'regarded' appears in Lesson 1. Therefore these words were likely to be familiar to those who have not claimed them.

5.4.3.3 **Incomplete.** That 'incomplete' was also familiar to learners is evident from the interaction. (See tape script lines 521, 522). On being asked by the teacher what 'incomplete' means, the learners' prompt chorus response is 'not complete'.

5.4.3.4 **Trade Union** is apparently another word familiar to students because of its commerce orientation. Learners may not be able to express its meaning in English but they are familiar with the concept of a 'Union'. In the lesson transcript data, a learner offers the word in
response to the question 'who forms a union'. Hence despite varied treatment the word has been claimed as uptake by only 1 learner.

5.4.3.5 Gained. This word appears only in the text-book. It is not used by any participant.\(^{13}\) Lack of any extra exposure may have prevented its uptake.

5.4.3.6 Ported, operate\(^{14}\) humanists on the other hand were apparently unfamiliar to most learners and might have been uptaken if their treatment had been adequate both in terms of quantity and quality. Each of the 3 words will now be considered separately.

**Ported**; The word was incidentally used by the teacher while trying to convey the meaning of 'demoniac'. The teacher was trying to point out that when knowledge is put to a bad use, such as forging a cheque, one is being demoniac. One would have expected students of commerce to be familiar with the word 'forge' or at least to have shown interest in learning it. The teacher, too, faced with blank expressions, is not inclined to put in any especial effort to teach the word. She says, "FORGED'. Doesn't matter, you just keep it in your

---

\(^{13}\) The word 'participant' includes the teacher.

\(^{14}\) In the sense of 'work'. The word is generally associated in the learners' mind with 'surgery'.
mind. Forgery, is a crime. 'Crime' bad thing. You can be put in prison for that, forgery'. She realises that learners may not be familiar even with the word 'crime' and so hastens to get back to 'demoniac'. However, she does employ a few useful categories such as giving an example, focusing on the spelling, and using the noun form of 'forge'.

It appears that learners are generally not inclined to negotiate the meaning of words that are not in the text-book. Both the teacher and the learners in this case, seemed reluctant to interact. Learners may have sensed from the teacher's words "Doesn't matter you just keep it in mind" that either the teacher was in a hurry to get on with the lesson or that she meant to suggest that they need not bother about the meaning of the word.

In any case, the conspicuous absence of interaction seems to explain the absence of uptake to a large extent. Only 4 categories of treatment were used and all by the teacher.

Operate: Only one learner claimed to have uptaken this word. Except for the teacher giving a near synonym, the word was not treated by any participant. (See lesson tapescript lines 604-605). (See also the discussion on 'co-operate' above), which points to how the teacher's casual presentation of the form of 'co-operate' tended to
interfere with the uptake of both words - 'co-operate' and 'operate'. Thus, it appears that the word was insuffciently treated so that its uptake could not be facilitated.

*Humanists*: was uptaken by 2 learners and has been treated only twice by the teacher. Learner treatment is conspicuously absent.

Even the two categories used by the teacher have hardly any potential for uptake. First, the teacher uses the word in reading from the text. Then she gives the meaning through paraphrase.

We must first and foremost make them feel that there are other human beings and make them feel sorry for others, who are not in as good a position as they are.

(Lesson 4, lines 167-171).

(underlining by researcher)

First, the pronominal links impede comprehension. Second, the paraphrase is hardly explicit to make the meaning clear.

It is evident, therefore, that the word has been inadequately treated both from the point of quantity and quality and that probably explains the poor uptake of the word.
5.4.3.7 Demoniac

Seven learners attempted to uptake the word 'demoniac'. Five of them presented the word with different varieties of atrocious spelling. Only 2 learners spelt it correctly and their reports were taken into account. It is obvious that the difficult spelling hindered the uptake of the word which received 9 different kinds of treatment. There are 3 learner contributions to treatment also.

It is regrettable that even when the treatment in general, is facilitative of uptake, learners are unable to surmount the difficult spelling of a word so as to benefit from the treatment. This again has important implications for pedagogy which will be discussed later.

5.4.3.8 Pain, pane, pale

The uptake from Lesson 4 as shown in Table I shows 1 report of 'pain' and 3 each of 'pane' and 'pale'. One's first reaction is to regard the 1 report of 'pain' as self-explanatory. Surely an easy word such as this would obviously be known to learners and hence not reported as uptake. A close study of the uptake sheets, however reveals a strange point. Kusum the best student in the class is the only one to have reported the simple word 'pain' and that too with a strange meaning - "a feeling of biting someone". Surely, one would have expected her to have known the word
'pain' and secondly how did such a strange meaning come to her mind? Perhaps the lesson tapescript data and learner interview data might offer a clue.

Analysis of the tapescript of Lesson 4 shows (See lines 442-514) that learners apparently knew the word 'pain'. They repeatedly offered the mother tongue meaning 'दरें'. The teacher did not seem to understand the Hindi word and so did not show any signs of accepting it. To complicate matters, she asked the students if they knew another word that was pronounced alike but spelt differently. Evidently she had 'PANE' in mind. Learners did not know this word but Kusum who apparently knew PALB (not PANE) asked the teacher for the meaning of PALB. Why did Kusum ask the meaning if as the interaction (see lines 478-482) suggests she knew it already? Did she think that the word similar to 'pain' which the teacher had invited was 'PALB'? Or, could it be that good learners seek opportunities to speak and show off knowledge? The teacher unfortunately heard 'pale' as 'pain'. Perhaps it worried her to find Kusum ask its meaning. She began again with: "Pain means - and was interrupted by a learner again eagerly offering the Hindi meaning दरें होता है न/. At this point the teacher exasperatedly went on as follows:

T No, no supposing I pinch you (making the gesture of pinch and gently pinching Kusum)
This perhaps unfortunately gave the learners to understand that the meaning दर्द had been rejected and 'pain' meant 'pinch'. The teacher presumably had rejected the Hindi word because she did not understand it and decided to show what 'pain' meant by literally demonstrating physical pain through a pinch. Action and gesture sometimes speak louder than words. The gesture was equated with the meaning of 'pain' without the teacher having realised it. Kusum then introduced 'pale' again and the teacher was side-tracked into dealing with the teaching of PALB. Thereafter, she could not resist bringing 'pane' in again and dealing with the two 'pane' and 'pain' together, believing she had distinguished the 2 words and taught 3 words - 'pain', 'pane' and 'pale'. As already discussed 'input' does not match 'intake'. It is likely that this might especially be so when a teacher in her zest introduces extraneous matter. The teacher continued quite unaware of learners' problems. In this context Rubin (1975) observes

As I have begun to observe classes, what fascinates me is how often the teacher plows ahead with the lesson seemingly with little awareness of what is going on in each student, ..... many foreign language teachers ... fail to attend to the learning process. If they attend to it more, they might be able to tailor their input to their students' needs ...

The episode discussed above and learners' comments when interviewed by the researcher suggest that some learners who
had been rudely shaken in their belief that 'pain' meant 'दर्द' began wondering if 'pain' was a different word which meant 'pinch' and not 'दर्द'.

Further, the effort of holding the two words 'pain' and 'pane' clearly in mind may have proved too much of a load. Could they have, therefore, decided to keep both words 'pain' and 'pane' out of their uptake list even though 'pane' had not been familiar and was relatively easy enough to uptake since through demonstration and example its meaning seems to have been conveyed. The only other possible reason (for this word not being listed as uptake) that comes to mind is that the word was extraneous to the text-book.

Kusum’s having reported both words 'pain' and 'pane' – the former along with the absurd meaning- 'a feeling of biting someone' remains to be explained. The interview with the learners may shed some light on the episode. Purnima who had written in her uptake sheet, 'fool pain' instead of 'feel pain' as the meaning of 'suffer', is being questioned by the researcher.

R You know the difference between 'feel' and 'fool', don't you?

Purnima But Miss I knew only about pain as trouble.

R You don't know the meaning of 'pain'?

What's the meaning of pain?
Purnima  Pain - uh - Miss 'pinch'.
R          Pinch?
Purnima   No Miss?
R          Tell me the Hindi word.
Lata       Miss to do like this (gesture of 'pinch')
R          Is that 'pain'?
Lata       What is this called in English? (repeating the gesture of 'pinch')
R          Pinch, pinch.
Lata       Spelling?
R          PINCH, pinch. But what's the Hindi word for pain?
S          स्फटक (poke, pierce).
R          Is it चुटचुट?

and then the researcher proceeds to elicit the well-known word स्फटक from the students enabling them to realise that 'pain' means neither 'pinch' nor स्फटक (poke, pierce)

(See interview with learners, lines 350-400)

Possibly, Kusum whom the teacher had pinched gently to demonstrate a pinch, may have equated 'pain' not with 'pinch' but with the feeling of wanting to hurt someone in general. It may be observed that students of ESL generally confuse 'beat' and 'bite'. So meaning to write 'beat' instead of 'hurt', Kusum may have written 'feeling of biting someone'.
This explanation is pure conjecture but it is conjecture, based on "a general pedagogic competence and professional awareness" (Prabhu, 1987) of learners' common errors and study habits.

The overall discussion of the above episode explains how the quality of interaction can affect uptake and sometimes adversely so. Hence, it may be that ESL teachers need training in avoiding confusing ill-planned teaching. Training in predicting learner error, and in probing learners' minds to see how they work would be useful assets to a teacher. As a starting point, learner interviews on a regular basis may be rewarding if learners and teachers could be induced to regard them as part of the teaching-learning experience.

5.4.3.9 Conclusion to analysis of Group C

The discussion of words in Group C and 2 words (pale and pane) from Group B suggests that

1) though adequacy of treatment generally facilitates uptake, it fails to be of much help if the word is difficult to spell.

2) inadequate treatment generally correlates with poor uptake.

3) it is pointless to look for correlations between uptake and treatment if the word is familiar to most learners and therefore not uptaken (since 'uptake' is necessarily expected to be words not encountered before).
4) The causes of a solitary few learners uptaking word(s) which others apparently knew and therefore did not claim as uptake need to be researched.

5) Over elaboration and extraneous input is likely to mislead/confuse learners and so hinder uptake.

6) If the teacher lacks even working knowledge of the learners' mother tongue, it is likely to impede the smooth progress of the lesson.

5.4.4 Conclusion to analysis of Lesson 4

The discussion of all the words uptaken in Lesson 4 suggests an overall correlation between uptake and treatment. The correlation is distinctly marked in the case of words in Group A. It is less clear in the other 2 groups from a quantitative point of view. But a qualitative analysis helps to reveal it.

PART (ii)

5.5 Analysis of Uptake in Lesson 3

Eleven out of 16 learners were present for Lesson 3 and 15 words were reported after the teaching of this lesson. They are presented in Table II in descending order of the number of reporters for each word.
**TABLE II**

**UPTAKE LIST OF LESSON 3**

Learners Present 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words</th>
<th>No. of reporters</th>
<th>No. of Categories used</th>
<th>Teacher Categories</th>
<th>Learner Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Concentration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Absorb</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Classics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Rapid</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Worse</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Verse</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Incomparable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Constitution</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Literature</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Achieved</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Essential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Principles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Worst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Good Souls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Compare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the total number of learners present for this lesson is 11 out of 16, a word that has attracted 5 or more learners may be said to have had good uptake. The cutting point accordingly would be at 'verse' which is number 6 in
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the serial order. The 6 words (1-6) may be called Group A. All the words in this group (except 'verse') have high uptake figures correlating with high variety of treatment.

The remaining words (except 'incomparable' and 'compare') will be discussed under Group B. It may be noted that the 7 words in this group have low uptake figures correlating with less adequate treatment.

'incomparable' and 'compare' do not fall in line and so would be discussed separately under Group C. Though both words in this group have received adequate treatment (10 and 12 categories respectively), 'incomparable' was reported by only 4 and 'compare' by just 1 reporter.

Thus we have the three word groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concentration</td>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td>Incomparable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorb</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Compare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>Principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Worst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good souls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each word from each group may now be considered from the point of quantitative and qualitative treatment it received. As interviews with learners could not be arranged
after the teaching of Lesson 3; conclusions can be drawn only on the basis of the lesson tapescript and observer’s notes.

5.5.1 Group A (Analysis)

5.5.1.1 Concentration

A look at Table II above shows that the word was reported by 10 out of 11 learners. Thus only one learner failed to uptake the word. Besides two good students, Kusum and Nirmala, who normally participate in the interaction and also tend to rank high on uptake were absent. Had they been present, the uptake figure may have been higher than 10. The treatment column, in Table II, points to the high figure 20, the highest perhaps in this data. What is more remarkable is the fair distribution of teacher and learner effort in the treatment of the word (T 12 - L 8).

Further, several of the categories employed by the teacher are just the ones which have already been shown to be potentially conducive to uptake. (See 4.6.4), namely, 'Gives example', 'gives clue to elicit meaning', 'gives clue to elicit word', 'adds to meaning given by learner', 'deliberately reinforces meaning' and 'deliberately reinforces word'. The first three of these invite interaction. In addition to these the teacher uses the categories of focusing on spelling, 'paraphrasing' and 'giving meaning in a multi-word phrase'. Among the 8 categories used by learners
are several which were assumed to be conducive to uptake
'Gives mother tongue meaning', 'guesses meaning in response
to a clue', not to mention others such as 'asks meaning',
'mispronounces word' etc. Therefore, it seems quite
pertinent and justifiable to link the high uptake figure 10
to the rich interaction that was generated. (See tapescript,
lines 234-329; 453-496 - Lesson 3). Analysis of a few of
these lines follows.

As these students, normally do not look into the
reading text, the teacher ingeniously gets them to do so
whereupon (See lines 234-243) Virbala ventures to read
out the word faltering with the pronunciation.

Virbala: /kæn/ /kænsən - etc.

Having focused on the word, the students must try to work
out the meaning too. So the teacher begins to give examples
which when processed serve as clues to the meaning of the
word. For example, "When you are reading with concentration,
can you see things around you?" "If you are reading a book
with no concentration, you'll read one sentence, you'll look
out, you'll listen to somebody, you are not reading with
concentration." The clue registers and the mother-tongue
meaning is elicited - 'ध्यान देना' The teacher
accepts it, adds to the meaning given - "Yes, yes - with all
your mind and heart." At this point, Neeru requests the
teacher to give the meaning in English. The teacher promptly
says "without distraction". She repeats it, but realising that the word 'distraction', itself may be unfamiliar, she proceeds to give a familiar example from the Mahabharata about Arjun's skill in archery to convey the meaning of 'concentration'. The narrative draws learners' attention and at this point the teacher focuses on the spelling of the word. Over 100 lines later she returns to the word and reinforces it by asking the learners its meaning. Thirty lines later, the word is again reinforced.

Thus, it appears that what contributed most towards making the word salient for recall is first the three instances of learner intervention - mispronouncing the word, guessing the mother tongue meaning and requesting the English meaning and second the teacher's attempts at deliberate reinforcement of the word and its meaning. Further, the narration of the incident from the Mahabharata could have contributed significantly as well.

It must be remembered that each query made, each response given, each clue offered or taken up, each example presented, attended to and in turn processed, each item repeated is a learning opportunity for several learners who may be ready to avail of it. Learning opportunities are created both by the teacher and the learners themselves. These opportunities facilitate uptake. A close reading of the tapescript lines mentioned above clearly suggests the
correlation between uptake of the word and the manifold learning opportunities that were generated through interaction in the classroom.

5.5.1.2 Absorb

'Absorb' is reported by an equally large number of learners – 10 out of 11 who were present. It has received an adequate treatment (13 categories) even though the actual number of lines negotiating the meaning of 'absorb' are fewer as compared to 'concentration' (Lines 330-341, 432-440 and 480-86).

What is significant is that in lines 330-341 it is a learner, Raakhi, introducing the word in the discourse by asking its meaning. As she mispronounces the word, the teacher does not understand her query and requests a repetition. Raakhi again pronounces it / ebsorb / but this time as she reads the rest of the sentence from the text, the teacher is able to get the word. The teacher promptly spells the word with a view to focusing other learners on it. She then pronounces it correctly and gives its meaning. This brief interaction may have helped other learners to attend to the word, its spelling and to note the implicit correction of its pronunciation. A number of useful categories of treatment are then employed by the teacher. By giving an example of a sponge absorbing water, the teacher is able to distinguish the usual meaning of 'absorb' from its context.
meaning of 'taking in' what's in the book while reading it.

The next set of lines, 432-440, have the teacher using the word in the text context and drawing Raakhi's attention to the word and its meaning because Raakhi had asked the meaning initially. This personal address to a learner by its very unusualness draws other learners' attention and the word gets highlighted.

Lastly, in the two lines, 485-86, the teacher deliberately reinforces the word and its meaning. This category of deliberate reinforcement appears to be a powerful facilitator of uptake.

Thus, in the short space of a few lines, the word has been made salient, particularly through learner intervention, teacher's personal address to the learner, teacher's giving of a concrete example and deliberate reinforcement.

It is specially significant that Raakhi who asked the meaning of 'absorb', who was personally addressed by the teacher about a hundred lines later, has merely recalled the word but not been able to state its meaning. Three other learners fall in line with her while six others were able to recall both word and meaning. This is the second instance of a learner not benefitting fully from the interaction which she has herself initiated. It gives support
to the tentative view that those who participate in the interaction are perhaps too involved and self-conscious to benefit from it. The interaction generated, however, benefits several other learners who may be attending.

5.5.1.3 Classics

Nine learners out of 11 that were present recalled 'classics'. The treatment figure 17 correlates well with the high uptake figure 9. More remarkable is the distribution of categories between the teacher and the learners (T 10 - L 7). The learners have put in singular effort in negotiating the meaning.

Among the categories used by the teacher is one that promotes interaction, for example, 'giving clues to elicit meaning'. The teacher also employs categories with 'react' as function. For example, she accepts meaning or rejects meaning. The categories employed by learners suggest that they are involved in the interaction. They give meaning, give examples in response to clues, they guess meaning in English or the mother tongue, again in response to clues offered by the teacher. In fact, the giving of clues is the teacher's strategy for stimulating learners to think and to speak. (All the categories discussed have been assumed (see 4.6.4) to facilitate uptake.)

At first, the teacher attempts to elicit meaning without offering any clues. These attempts prove unproductive
because learners seem to have associated the word 'classics' with classical music and dance. (See lines 501-514). The teacher then invites examples by offering clues. The following excerpt illustrates how rewarding the appropriate use of this category can be. Mamta, Asha and Virbala are seen to be interrupting the teacher with their responses. They are quick in uptaking clues to meaning.

T Is this book (pointing to the textbook) a classic? No. It is here today, gone tomorrow ... It'll be there for three or four years. After that nobody will read it. Then it becomes waste paper.

Mamta Mahabharata.

Asha Miss जो रहता है (that which stays)

T hm what?

Virbala जो रहता है (that which stays)

T Which has gone on for many, many, many years Hundreds of years that book has been read.

Virbala Ramayana

Thus the potentially strong category of giving clues to meaning encourages learner participation, and this learner involvement in turn seems to promote uptake through learners' negotiation of meaning.

It does seem that uptake is boosted if learners work out the meaning with the help of relevant clues rather than
being given the meaning straight away. In the latter case deliberate reinforcement becomes necessary to aid recall.

5.5.1.4 Rapid

Quantitatively considered the uptake of the word by 9 learners out of 11 is remarkable and the treatment figure 13 is adequate. Equally fair is the distribution of teacher and learner effort (T 9 - L 4).

It appears from a reading of the tapescript that learners had a vague idea of the meaning of 'rapid'. They associated it with mobility, with motion. Hence, Virbala's response 'चलना हुआ' (which is not a bad guess) as the mother tongue meaning of 'rapid'. In the short space of about 14 lines (see lines 461-475) the learners interact with the teacher and figure out the meaning. It appears that the word did not present much of a problem partly because it is disyllabic, easy to spell, not too difficult to pronounce and perhaps not altogether unfamiliar. The context in which it was used namely, travel in the past and travel today may also have helped to clarify its meaning. Hence, in addition to interaction, the factors listed above may also have contributed to its uptake.

It is gratifying to note that Asha, who in response to the teacher, gave the meaning 'fast' has not reported the word evidently because she already knew the word. Virbala
who had offered the incorrect meaning चलता हुआ (moving) has recalled the word but not stated its meaning. Could it be that she regarded the teacher’s clarification to be directed mainly at her and so felt too self-conscious to pay attention? Reference has already been made earlier to instances of interaction benefiting the learners who listen rather than the actual participants. In one of the earlier instances the participant involved was Virbala and in another, Raakhi. As Virbala’s overall uptake is rather poor across lessons, her case lends little or no support to the hypothesis under consideration. Unless other supportive instances are found in the data, the hypothesis remains merely a hunch.

5.5.1.5 Worse

Quantitatively considered 7 learners reporting the word out of the 11 learners present indicates that the word has had good uptake. Fourteen categories of treatment also appear adequate and so it may be said that uptake and treatment correlate positively. The teacher’s and the learners’ effort is also reasonably distributed. (T 10 - L 4).

A look at the qualitative aspect of categories suggests that appropriate categories have been discreetly used. In addition to categories assumed to be potentially conducive to uptake such as ‘giving example’, ‘giving clue’, the teacher focuses on the spelling of the word so as to distinguish it from ‘verse’. Next, she uses the category ‘explain meaning in terms of grammar’ by drawing attention
to the grammatical teaching point, degrees of adjectives; beginning with the familiar good, better, best and pointing to the corresponding forms of 'bad'. This strategy of resorting to grammar for establishing lexical items is not common in this data but has been effectively used here. The learners provide learning opportunities to other learners by giving the mother tongue meaning, by requesting the teacher to repeat the meaning, by themselves repeating the word. One of the learners on mishearing 'work' in place of 'worse' gives the mother tongue equivalent of 'work' कारन (which is a verb, while worse is an adjective). The teacher thus offers the clue 'it's an adjective'. This opens the way for a brief interaction between the teacher and learner on Hindi equivalents of 'verb' and 'adjective'. This short exchange of a learner offering an incorrect meaning, the teacher rejecting it implicitly by offering a clue to the right one may have focused the attention of other learners on the word and highlighted it for recall. (See lines 369–374).

Thus, this qualitative analysis of the discourse also points to a positive correlation between uptake and interaction.

It is significant that even though the word 'worse' does not occur in the reading text, learners paid attention to teacher talk, participated in the interaction and several of them reported the word as uptake. The tendency referred to earlier has generally been to ignore words which do not
figure in the text. Thus such words are hardly ever uptaken (for example, 'archery' in the present lesson). (See lines 277-291).

5.5.1.6 Verse

Only 5 out of 11 learners present recalled the word. Quantitatively this may not be remarkable. The word has been included under Group A (high uptake words) simply because a line had to be drawn somewhere to separate high and low uptake and it was decided that the cut off point might be drawn at words uptaken by near 50 per cent or more learners. Six categories of uptake is also not quite adequate and so one might say that poor uptake here correlates with poor treatment or could it be that the introduction of 'worse' and 'worst' interfered with the uptake of verse?

Qualitatively considered, the 4 categories employed by the teacher are (as assumed) not in any way powerful enough to induce uptake. The teacher paraphrases twice, repeats meaning twice, reads out the word from the text and focuses twice on its spelling. The learners simply repeat the word and read it from the text. No example is given, no clues to meaning offered, no deliberate reinforcement attempted. Learners' effort is minimum. However, a close reading of the tapescript (see lines 343-361) suggests that Purnima's intention in reading line 345 (which contains the word 'verse') from the text was implicitly to ask the meaning
of the word. The teacher seems to have understood Purnima’s request and so responds by giving the meaning. Thus (learner intervention) a learner’s introducing the word in the discourse may have drawn other learners’ attention and boosted up the uptake of the word, by 5 learners even though overall interactions was poor. In general, however (as only 5 learners uptook the word), the assumption that rich interaction is a powerful single factor facilitating uptake still holds.

Further it may be noted that Purnima herself reported the word but not its meaning. This supports the view that being involved in the interaction, she may have been too self-conscious to pay attention when the teacher responded to her query. As Purnima’s overall uptake across lessons (unlike Virbala’s) is substantial, this instance lends support to the hunch that learners who listen benefit more from the interaction than those who participate in it.

It has been pointed out above that the introduction of ‘worse’ and ‘worst’ as well as the extra focus these words received may have diverted learners’ attention from ‘verse’. This is an instance of the teacher getting sidetracked on her own initiative. Earlier in Lesson 4 it was found that ‘operate’ had, perhaps, interfered with the word ‘co-operate’ and ‘illiterate’ with ‘literate’, the latter ones in each pair being words in the text. If more instances of this
kind are found in the data, then it may possibly suggest that the strategy needs to be avoided as it imposes an extra burden on the learner and interferes with natural 'uptake'.

5.5.2 Group B

Group B (see p. 185) consists of words that were inadequately treated and were uptaken by only 1 or 2 learners except 'constitution' and 'literature' which were recalled by 4 and 3 learners respectively.

Most of these words appear to have been already familiar to learners and so there was no need for treatment. Being familiar they are not reported as uptake. The words are 'achieved', 'essential', 'principles', 'constitution' and 'good souls'.

5.5.2.1 Achieved, essential, principles

The tapescript shows that learners did not ask the meaning of these 3 words. In fact, on being asked the meaning they promptly gave it. (See lines 496, 502; 80-82; 584-85 respectively). The meaning of 'achieved' and 'essential' was given by learners in English. It was accepted and reinforced by the teacher. The meaning of 'principles' was given in Hindi by Virbala (line 585). Actually, Virbala was checking on the meaning but the teacher not able to understand Hindi, continued in her effort to
convey the meaning by resorting to the category 'Give meaning by using homonym.' She introduced 'principal' along with 'principle', focusing repeatedly on the spelling of the 2 words. The tapescript suggests that learners knew both words and so the brief interaction served merely to reinforce the 2 words.

5.5.2.2 Constitution

Apparently, 'constitution' too was a familiar word. No learner asked its meaning. Students merely repeated the word. The teacher presented the meaning in a multi-word phrase and later through paraphrase.

5.5.2.3 Good souls

Apparently 'souls' was taken literally and hence the Hindi equivalent आत्मा was given by the learners. The teacher had to clarify the meaning as used in the text. So she said that 'soul' referred to 'person' and 'good souls' to 'good people'. Perhaps as the word 'soul' was familiar, most learners chose not to report it. They either ignored the context meaning or did not understand it well enough to claim it as uptake.

5.5.2.4 Worst

No student effort was put in (that is no categories of treatment were used) in learning this word itself.
However the 4 categories used by learners to negotiate the meaning of 'worse' may have helped to learn 'worst' too. Learners may have preferred to reduce load by holding on to 'worse' and 'verse' and ignoring 'worst'. The teacher treated 'worst' on the same lines as 'worse' and along with it, except for the deliberate effort in articulating the final /t/ sound in 'worst'.

5.5.2.3 Literature

'Literature' alone in this group (Group B) seems to have been unfamiliar to most learners. Its meaning is difficult to express even if one knows it. Without adequate treatment its uptake would be difficult. One learner category (ask meaning) and 1 teacher category (paraphrase) was all the treatment used in dealing with the word. Thus, in this case inadequate treatment correlates with poor uptake.

The above discussion suggests that most words in Group B were listed as uptake by just a few learners because most learners were already familiar with them. 'Literature' alone seems to have been poorly uptaken because poorly treated. It points to the relation between interaction and uptake.

5.5.3 Group C

5.5.3.1 Compare; incomparable

These two words are grouped separately because their treatment in terms of a numerical count of treatment
categories as well as the nature of the categories employed appears adequate and yet the uptake figures are low. A close reading of the tapescript may provide an explanation.

'Compare' was uptaken by 1 learner and has received a variety of 12 categories of treatment. 'Incomparable' was uptaken by 4 learners and treated in 10 different says.

Learner contribution towards treatment is relatively low especially in the case of 'incomparable'. (Incomparable: T 8 - L 2); (Compare: T 9 - L 3) and this may be one of the factors that account for the words attracting fewer learners. It has been pointed out earlier that learner participation in the discourse highlights words for recall.

Both words, 'compare' and 'incomparable' are sufficiently treated by the teacher. Among the 9 types of categories she used for 'compare' are 'giving clues to the meaning of compare'; 'giving the opposite', 'relating the word to a different part of speech', and 'adding to the meaning given by learners'. The learners guess meaning in response to the clue given and they ask meaning. In the case of 'incomparable', the absence of learner contributions is further compensated for by the teacher's 'deliberate reinforcement of meaning' and 'deliberate reinforcement of word' and by reference to the negative prefix, 'in' (which learners know means 'not'). Normally such treatment would be followed by uptake as examples discussed earlier have shown.
Quite a few T categories used are those assumed to be conducive to uptake.

Therefore, it is necessary to

1) consider the nature of the word itself to see if it presented any undue difficulty to learners; and

2) analyse the lesson tapescript closely to see whether anything in the interaction could have impeded uptake.

*Incomparable* by its polysyllabic nature and its pronunciation (the stress on 'comp-') – thus, /ɪnˈkɑːmpərəbəl/ instead of /ɪnkəmpərərəbl/ (which is how learners would tend to pronounce it as a derivative of 'compare' /kəmpərə/) may have appeared a strange word to second language learners of less than average competence.

The moment, the teacher reads the word 'incomparable' from the text "two fruits of incomparable value", Raakhi intervenes to ask its meaning. The teacher sensing that 'compare' would be familiar, proceeds by first trying to elicit the meaning of 'compare' and then showing how 'incomparable' relates to it. Thus, the teacher instead of answering Raakhi's question, turns round to ask 'What is to compare?' Learners falter finding it difficult to express the meaning even though they know it. So the teacher gives them a clue.
T Compare and contrast. What is to compare?
When we compare 2 things what do we do?

Promptly, Virbala answers :-

Virbala Say same.

The teacher adds to this meaning to render it more explicit.

T We say what is same in both ... 'contrast', we say what is different in both ..., Compare 2 things. Say what is equal. 'Incomparable' means - you cannot compare it with anything.

This far the interaction is comprehensible. But the teacher, elaborates as follows:-

T It is better than - there is nothing like it - ...... absolutely nothing can compare with it ... when I'm comparing two things I try to teach you what is same in that and in this. All right? But in this, in these two things - there are two things which you cannot compare with anything. There is no comparison. These are so high up, beyond compare, you cannot tell, you cannot say, that is like this. Nothing is like this. This is above and beyond everything else. Okay? What are they? What are these two that are of incomparable value? Compare - they are
'incomparable'. 'In' means 'no', you cannot compare. Negative, you cannot compare them with anything. 'Incomparable value'. Above everything else. ...

(Lines 177-190) (underlining by researcher)

The above quoted elaboration uses a series of personal, demonstrative and indefinite pronouns whose pronominal references appear to be lost on most learners. The tapescript shows only Virbala keeping track, but apparently mechanically rather than through genuine understanding. This inability to process the elaboration is evident in the learners' choric response "Philosophy and religion" (line 211) which is totally out of place as an answer to the teacher's question 'Which are the two things of incomparable value'. The elaboration is repeated about 30 lines later (See lines 218-223) because the teacher finds learners nudging one another with questioning eyes. Feeling lost they are seeking help from peers. The teacher says:

T ..... Don't ask each other. I'll say it again. Two things are very important. They are of great value, so great, the value of these things is so great, nothing else is as great as these. It is of incomparable value. You cannot compare anything else with this. ..... 

This second instance of elaboration does not clarify the meaning of 'incomparable' any more than the first. Focus
then shifts to the word 'concentration' and then to 'bad, worse, worst' etc which bring 'compare' to the forefront again. By this time, the teacher talk quoted above has cast an air of unfamiliarity on the familiar 'compare' which had posed little or no problem in lines 164-172. So in line 410, Raakhi poses the question 'compare means?' This time the teacher responds briefly on the meaning of 'compare', but slips again into the elaboration (similar to earlier attempts) of 'incomparable'. Once again a series of demonstratives and personal pronouns obscure the meaning of 'incomparable' (See line 415-424). Once again Virbala responds in the manner of a meaningless chant and other learners pick up the refrain "Reading books and ..... ".

Instead, had the teacher picked on familiar examples of two concrete sets of demonstrable items of great value and shown how one was so far above the other that it could not be compared with the other, the meaning of 'incomparable' would have registered quickly and thereafter the transition to the text reference might have followed without hindrance.

To summarize the arguments presented above, 3 factors seem to have interfered with the uptake of 'incomparable'.

i) the nature of teacher talk in elaborating on the meaning of the word.

ii) inadequate learner participation in negotiating the meaning.
iii) the pronunciation of the word.
iv) the polysyllabic form of the word.

As regards the word 'compare', it may be useful to recall in what different ways learners use the word in day to day situations. Apparently they are familiar with the expression 'compare and contrast' as used in examination papers. In fact, the word 'compare' has probably come to be used frequently by speakers of Gujarati, Hindi in place of its mother tongue equivalent. Hence there was no need for learners to negotiate its meaning. It was a familiar word and so it has not been claimed as uptake.

Secondly the word 'compare' is not in the text-book. It has already been pointed out that the teacher used it to explain 'incomparable' which occurs in the reading text. As learners tend to ignore words not in the text-book, that may be one more reason for them to ignore the word 'compare'.

As the two words 'compare' and 'incomparable' are related from the point of derivation, they received near parallel treatment from the teacher and hence the near equal quantum of categories of treatment used to present them.

Therefore, if the figures in the treatment columns are high and the figures in the uptake columns are low, it does not suggest absence of a correlation between uptake and treatment. Treatment and uptake would, it appears, have
correlated in a direct and overt way if drawbacks in the teaching had not blocked uptake.

5.5.4 Conclusion to Analysis of Uptake in Lesson 3

From the preceding discussion it seems

i) that generally the words that are uptaken are the ones that have received adequate treatment. Adequacy of treatment relates to
   a) variety of treatment types used.
   b) nature of the treatment categories used (as certain categories have the potential for facilitating uptake more than others)
   c) distribution between the teacher and the learners of the categories of treatment employed.

ii) that generally low uptake figures relate to low treatment figures. But at times, the treatment is deliberately little because the lexical item is familiar to most learners. On the other hand, despite substantial treatment certain words may not be claimed as uptake because learners may already be familiar with them.

iii) that when despite a fairly adequate treatment, a word is uptaken by only a few learners, a closer analysis of data may reveal teaching drawbacks hindring uptake.
iv) a polysyllabic word with a difficult pronunciation or spelling may not be uptaken by many learners even if the overall treatment is substantial.

PART (iii)

5.6 Lesson 1: Introductory

Being the first lesson in the experiment, both the teacher and learners, who have met each other for the first time, need to get used to one another. The learners, as a result are shy of the teacher and the teacher on her part is perhaps trying to gauge their level of competence.

5.7 About Word Treatment in Lesson 1

A study of the treatment shows (1) that the treatment is not varied enough, (2) that categories with 'React' function are conspicuously absent, (3) that learner involvement is minimal. Out of the 19 words reported, 9 have received virtually no treatment from the learners. For the remaining 10 words, the learners have used the least significant categories such as repeating word, repeating meaning and reading word from the text. Such categories have hardly been found effective in highlighting words for recall. There are only 5 instances of learners asking for the meaning and 2 of learners giving the meaning.
The teacher does not encourage participation by trying to elicit words/meanings. She provides no clues which would invite guessing of meaning, no examples that would need processing nor does she reinforce meaning save in one instance discussed below. Like learners she is found most of the time to be using the category reading word from the text; repeating word or meaning. In addition to this she generally paraphrases and uses meaning incidentally in the text context. Quite often she monopolises talk. Thus, variation in treatment is very limited in this lesson. Though treatment variation improves in Lesson 2, it is only after Lesson 2 that the teacher goes into more depth and the variety of treatment makes the lessons richer and a wider field of learning opportunities is presented. It is for this reason that the reader was introduced first to Lessons 4 and 3 respectively.

5.8 Uptake in Lesson 1

The uptake of lesson 1 shows 19 words reported. Thirteen learners were present for this lesson. Thus a word uptaken by 6 or more learners may be said to have had a good range.

The following table presents words arranged in descending order of the number of reporters for each word. The number of treatment categories used and their distribution between the teacher and learners is also shown against each word.
## TABLE III

**UPTAKE LIST FOR LESSON 1**

**Learners Present: 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words</th>
<th>No. of Reporters</th>
<th>No. of Treatment Categories used</th>
<th>Teacher Categories used</th>
<th>Learner Categories used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regarded</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Exhibit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Glitter</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Obtain</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Effort</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Political Revolution</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Conquered</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Industrial Revolution</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Reformation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Span</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Comfortable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Occurred</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Telescoped</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Simultaneously</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Renaissance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Congratulate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Reward</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Times ahead</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Disciplined</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.9 Analysis of Uptake in Lesson 1

The first 6 words that have been reported by nearly 50 per cent or more learners, are put under Group A, to see if treatment and uptake correlate positively. Wherever there is a wide gap between treatment and uptake figures, the causes will be investigated. The remaining words are put under Group B and will be examined in relation to treatment as reflected in the lesson tapescript data. As proper interviews could not be conducted until after Lesson 2, interview data is not available for Lesson 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regarded</td>
<td>Conquered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit</td>
<td>Industrial Revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glitter</td>
<td>Reformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain</td>
<td>Span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>Comfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Revolution</td>
<td>Occurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telescoped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simultaneously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renaissance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congratulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Times ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disciplined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears that the concept of uptake – the requirement that learners should recall and report only
words which they encountered for the first time during a particular teaching session was not taken quite seriously at the first lesson of the experiment. Occasionally evidence suggests that some of the words reported were already familiar to learners. Such words will be isolated below.

5.9.1 Group A: Beginning with words in Group A

5.9.1.1 Glitter

'Glitter' was evidently a familiar word as it was used by the teacher who taught the story 'The Blue Carbuncle' to the same set of learners before the present experiment and yet it has been reported by 7 learners. It received no treatment except the teacher using the word incidentally in the text context. There is reason to suspect that learners wished to swell the uptake list and therefore included a familiar word.

5.9.1.2 Political Science

Similarly, 'political science' appears a familiar term. Learners would have come across it in the study of social sciences at school.

Having isolated the 2 words that seem very likely to be familiar to learners, the remaining words in Group A may now be studied in relation to treatment.
5.9.1.3 Regarded

This is one of the few words the learners ask the meaning of in Lesson 1. The teacher has almost finished the lesson, put away her reading glasses when Nirmala wants to know the meaning of 'regarded'. While the teacher fumbles for her glasses and before she can locate the word in the text, Nirmala has repeated her request 3 times. This itself highlights the word. The teacher at once gives the context meaning in a 'multiword phrase' - 'to be thought of' and then proceeds to point out the literal meaning. She then repeats the context meaning thus helping those who missed it the first time to take it down. Even though interaction is limited, the word becomes salient because a learner asks its meaning 4 times and the teacher repeats the meaning thereby reinforcing it. Thus, there is some correlation between uptake and treatment.

Secondly it must not be forgotten that from the experimental psychologists' point of view 'recency effect' (Snodgrass, 1985) also contributes towards recall of the word. 'Regarded' was the last word in the interaction. 'Uptake' was listed immediately after the teaching session concluded.

5.9.1.4 Exhibit

The tapescript of the lesson suggests that this word was familiar to some learners and unfamiliar to others. (See lines 188-190; 223-230).
In line 188 the teacher asks the meaning, a learner gives it promptly and the teacher accepts it. But about 30 lines later another learner, Virbala, asks the teacher for the meaning of the same word. The teacher gives it using a synonym. A student repeats the meaning and the teacher then relates the word 'exhibit' to 'exhibition' by asking the meaning of the latter. The learners apparently know 'exhibition' and that aids in the uptake of 'exhibit', specially because the teacher explicitly points to the derivation.

\[ T \quad \ldots \quad 'To exhibit' is 'to show'. \text{ When you exhibit something you have an exhibition.} \]

While in the earlier instance (lines 188-190) the teacher brought the word into the discourse, in lines 223-230 the word is introduced by a learner. This highlighting of the word is followed by appropriate treatment from the teacher. In the space of a few lines several learning opportunities are created facilitating uptake. The 8 categories of treatment used are fairly distributed between the teacher and the learners (Teacher 5, learners 3). The treatment is fairly adequate in terms of variety and distribution of effort. The correlation between uptake and treatment seems quite apparent. However, one cannot be sure whether the reporters of the word are those who already knew it.
5.9.1.5 **Obtain**

This word was evidently familiar to one learner at least. When the teacher asks for a small word to replace 'obtain', Kusum at once gives the word 'get'. It is gratifying that Kusum did not list 'obtain' in her uptake sheet. Both word and meaning get repeated by the teacher and learners and are also used in the text context. Within the space of a few lines several learning opportunities are created and a concentrated impression formed on the learners' memory. Secondly, recall may have been facilitated by the availability of an easy 3-letter synonym, 'get'.

5.9.1.6 **Effort**

The phrase "by hard work and disciplined effort" is used by the teacher and elicited from the students either individually or in chorus over 30 times across the lesson. This is a case of frequency of occurrence and repetition facilitating recall. The word 'disciplined' by itself, however, was uptaken by only 1 learner, probably because it is a familiar word in the educational setting of school and college or perhaps because it is rather difficult to spell. 'Effort' was recalled by 6 learners. There is little treatment it received to justify a correlation between treatment and uptake. Moreover, the expression 'disciplined effort' as a whole was not uptaken at all.
5.9.1.7 Conclusion to Group A

The above discussion on the uptake of words in Group A points to some correlation between uptake and treatment in the case of 'regarded' 'exhibit' and 'obtain'. The uptake of the word 'effort', on the other hand, appears to have been facilitated by the frequency of occurrence of the word during one class session. What is important is that the word was repeatedly elicited from the learners by a teacher question - 'How did they get their degrees?' The response 'by effort' thus got reinforced.

The uptake of 'glitter' and 'political revolution' do not correlate with the treatment received. These 2 words were apparently already familiar to learners who listed them either because they had not understood the researcher's directions for identifying uptake or because they simply wished to present a fairly long list of words.

5.9.2 Group B

From Group B the words that appear to have been already familiar to learners may be isolated. Thus:
- Industrial Revolution; conquered; comfortable, and congratulate.

5.9.2.1 Industrial Revolution

Like 'Political Revolution' in Group A, Industrial Revolution should be a familiar word. No learner asked its
meaning. The teacher too merely read the word from the text, used it in the text context, paraphrased it and asked learners its meaning. This is casual and incidental treatment without any intent of putting the word across because the teacher probably felt almost sure the learners knew it already.

5.9.2.2 Conquered

This word was spontaneously and appropriately used by Kusum in answering a question put by the teacher (see lines 558-559). It is very disconcerting to find Kusum listing it in her uptake sheet when she knew the word well enough to use it. One suspects the other reporters to have also known the word. How could a word with a difficult spelling be uptaken especially when it does not occur in the text, nor was it written on the blackboard, and the only exposure to it was of Kusum using it and the teacher accepting it? Like Kusum other learners may have known the word as it is likely to occur in books on history, drama and epic.

5.9.2.3 Comfortable

This word occurs only in the text book and is reported as uptake by 2 learners. It is too common to be unfamiliar.

5.9.2.4 Congratulate

This word is used in students' common parlance, in their day to day interactions and therefore not likely to be unfamiliar.
5.9.2.5 Remaining words in Group B

Of the remaining words in Group B, 'times ahead' and 'span' need to be specially discussed in relation to the tapescript as their treatment in numerical terms is quite substantial and yet the number of reporters is low.

A qualitative analysis may perhaps also explain why 'simultaneously', 'telescoped' and 'disciplined effort' which received some focus could not be uptaken.

Lastly, two more words 'graduate' and 'learned' (adj) are apparently unfamiliar words. One wonders why they were not uptaken. An analysis of the lesson tapescript may provide an explanation.

(i) Words substantially treated - but uptaken by 1 or 2 learners only. (Times ahead; Span)

Times ahead: Only 1 learner has claimed it as uptake. A total of 12 categories have been used and these are fairly distributed between the teacher and the learners. (Teacher 8 - Learners 4). But a look at the labels of these categories shows that 3 of the 4 categories used by learners are the casual ones of repeating meaning, repeating word and reading word from the text. Such categories generally do not make a word salient for recall or draw listeners' attention. The teacher however does use 2 categories which have been assumed to be conducive to uptake (see 4.6.4) namely, 'Giving a
synonym' and 'deliberately reinforcing word'. The rest of the categories used by the teacher - such as repeating word, repeating meaning, using word and meaning in the text context are not specially powerful in facilitating uptake. So, though a variety of categories have been employed, the nature of most of these is not of any special value for uptake. None has a react function which might lead to interaction and negotiation of meaning.

It might be helpful to analyse the relevant sections of the tapescript to see, how the expression 'times ahead' was presented. (See lines 267-269). To explain 'times ahead' the teacher uses a structure parallel to the one in the given text. This is helpful in suggesting the meaning to the learners. The text says "The times ahead of us are ..... difficult." The teacher says: 'Times ahead' 'future'. The future is very difficult. Thus she begins by giving the meaning in a synonym (future) which is familiar to the learners and then this is followed by the structure parallel to that in the text.

On page 9, lines 308-309, the same expression recurs. This time the teacher hardly attempts to be explicit. She says, "'Times ahead' of us. That means the time that is coming ahead is very difficult." This can be of no help to a learner who does not know what 'ahead' means. Most learners may not be able to link the words with the meaning
even though it is expressed through a parallel structure in the immediately preceding utterance, namely, 'The future is difficult'. The teacher apparently intended the juxtaposition of the two sentences to provide a clue to the meaning. But a second language learner often misses such clues. Hence, within six lines comes a student's query - 'times ahead?'

It appears that some learners linked the expression 'times ahead' with its meaning 'future' but did not understand 'ahead' by itself. This is suggested in Lesson 2, p.19 - lines 619-630.

T  If you don't understand you must stop me. Don't let me go ahead. What's 'go ahead'?

Virbala  Future

T  Not 'future'. 'Times ahead' is 'future'.

Thus it may be that in addition to the absence of interactive categories, the general difficulty of processing teacher talk may also have prevented the uptake of 'times ahead'.

Learners, it appears need training in picking up clues, processing teacher talk and creating learning opportunities.

S  Span:

Kusum asks the meaning of 'span'. She has claimed the word as uptake. Thus it is not always true that the learner who asks is too involved to benefit from the teacher's response.
Asha who may have listened has also reported the word. As Kusum's request is not heard by the teacher, Kusum repeats it. The word is thus introduced in the discourse by a learner and yet claimed only by 2 learners as uptake. Tapescript analysis may explain why this is so.

In numerical terms, there is variety of treatment - 8 categories have been used. Learner treatment is one third that of the teacher. However, qualitatively considered these categories of treatment, are not of an interactive nature. Perhaps, the only teacher category likely to facilitate uptake is the giving of a synonym. But after giving it ('time', 'period'), the teacher discourages learners from taking it down. "Don't write" she says. Apparently, she intended the expression 'span of centuries' to be grasped as a whole, so she proceeds to elicit the meaning of 'century' warning learners that century has nothing to do with 'century' as in cricket. Learners, perhaps, do not understand why they have been stopped from taking down the meaning. The teacher, repeatedly continues to use the word 'span' along with 'century' - thus 'span of centuries'. Only in lines 376-77 does the teacher explicitly say "span of centuries" that is "a period of many hundreds of years", but as this explicit rendering is a part of a lengthy piece of teacher talk focussed on the Renaissance, the Reformation and other topics, it may have been lost on learners. As a result perhaps - only 2 learners reported the word.
The above discussion on the uptake of 'span' suggests that -

i) uptake of a word is not always facilitated by a learner introducing it in the discourse

ii) some learners who initiate discourse benefit from the interaction it generates

iii) clear and explicit presentation of a word is very important for its uptake.

(ii) Words focussed on but not uptaken (Simultaneously; telescoped; disciplined effort)

'Simultaneously' is a useful word, which as the tapescript suggests received some focus from the teacher. (See pp.12-13 - lines 402-450). The overall treatment is however inadequate (only 4 categories) and learner treatment is nil.

Quoted below are two excerpts from the tapescript where the teacher attempts to explain the text sentence and especially the word 'simultaneously'. Each excerpt is analysed with a view to understand what might have made it difficult for learners to process teacher talk and infer the relevant meaning of the word.

---

15 The sentence in the text reads as follows:

"The movements which took place in other countries during a span of centuries have all occurred here more or less simultaneously."

(1) T If changes take place slowly,
S Yes Miss
T They have time to get used to it. But supposing
everything happens at the same time
'simultaneously'. Look at the word here
'simultaneously'. The next sentence.
S hm simulta-
T Simultaneously. In our country everything
happened together. We got freedom, we got
change, we had, we had from the plough to the
tractor, everything within a few years ......
...... How quickly the changes have taken place
When changes come one after another, we can't
get used to them. (p.12, lines 400-416;
underlining by researcher).

The teacher draws the learner's attention to the word asking
them to look at it in the textbook. Even though the teacher
does not give the meaning very explicitly by using a sentence
with a capula, for example, Simultaneously is/means .... she
does at first use a parallel structure namely "supposing
everything happens at the same time - simultaneously". This
would help learners to infer the meaning. However, the
elaboration that follows moves away from the meaning proper
as the following analysis will show:
If learners attempt to infer the meaning of 'simultaneously' by carefully listening to the teacher talk quoted above they would deduce the following as possible meanings.

a) at the same time.
b) happened together.
c) come one after another.

As (c) is not the correct meaning it would create confusion in a learner's mind.

(2) T ..... Too many changes have taken place, so quickly one after another, almost at the same time, simultaneously simultaneously, note the spelling 'simultaneously'.

(p. 13, lines 439-442. Underlining by the researcher)

Here, the juxtaposition of
a) one after another
b) almost at the same time.
c) simultaneously

would suggest to the learner that 'simultaneously' meant both (a) and (b) while it really means only (b). Hence the elaboration is misleading for the learner.

---

16 It must not be forgotten that these learners have little or no training in listening skills.
The discussion suggests that

i) 'uptake' may be impeded when learners find teacher talk difficult to process.

ii) when the word to be uptaken is difficult to spell.

The above analysis also has pedagogical implications both for the teacher and the learners which will be discussed in a later chapter.

Telescoped:

This is another word that received some attention though it was poorly treated in overall terms (only 4 categories) and only 2 learners claimed it as uptake.

When the teacher's attempt at elaboration, paraphrase, explanation do not succeed, the teacher is not always at fault. One must not forget that the reading text, from the point of view of linguistic structure and vocabulary, is far above the competence of learners.

The word 'telescoped' in the given context can hardly be rendered in a simple straightforward way. The learners' total vocabulary is so limited that it is extremely difficult to explain a point satisfactorily without employing words not familiar to the learners. This view is also expressed by the

---

17 The reading text, Yuvakbharati is prescribed by the Maharashtra State Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education, Pune.
teacher when interviewed by the researcher. She says (in a later context):

T .... if we can't get every single one of those words which they know and the phrase also makes sense to them, the meaning is not understood.... ................. they don't know simple words. Basic words they don't know. Now if we start teaching them basic words, they lose interest because for them ........... those big words are important because they come in the book ....

(See interview with the teacher after Lesson 6 'The Man Who Saved Pumplestdrop' - lines 61-64; 71-73; 75-76).

The teacher had in fact avoided explaining the word 'telescoped' as she did not regard it as crucial to the overall comprehension of the passage. In the same interview mentioned above she says:

T .... the comprehension is important - only the main thing is the thread of ... the comprehension. If they can understand the lesson well, I'd jump over certain things. And if I can use some other words to make them understand - then I would tell them I'm jumping over this because it is insignificant.

(lines 24-30)
The 'jumping over' is done, the lesson almost concluded when a learner asks the meaning of 'telescoped'. In attempting to use known words and structures the teacher often repeats and hastily rephrases structures with the result that her speech sounds incoherent and difficult to comprehend.

Telescoped is 'going one inside another'.

Before the Renaissance started, Reformation started, before - one going inside like a telescope. When there is a railway accident, supposing one goes, listen, two engines, listen girls listen. She wants to know the meaning of what's 'telescoped into each other'. I'll explain. Supposing two trains are going from two different sides, and there is an accident on the same track. It comes and dashes into each other - engines. Then, what happens? It just dashes? This compartment goes inside this, others, it's like, it's like, it's like a tube you can draw out. That way. One into another. One into another. Not one over another. One, one breaks and the other goes in another one. So before we were used to political freedom, we got something else, before we were used to that, inside that something went. So that we didn't know what to do. We were confused. Is that clear?
The above teacher speech was accompanied by gestures which may have aided comprehension to some extent. In fact, some blackboard work—a diagram perhaps—would have provided visual aid. But the teacher never used the blackboard. She feared students would be distracted if she turned her back to use the blackboard. She said she wanted to hold the learners' attention with her gaze (by eye contact).

It is significant that no one responded to her question "Is that clear?" Perhaps they vaguely understood or perhaps they had tuned out. In any case they had not grasped the meaning well enough to report it. Only 2 learners recalled the word but not the meaning.

The above discussion suggests that lack of clarity in the teacher's speech can hinder uptake and more so when talk is monopolised by the teacher (as in the above quoted lengthy speech) leaving no room for negotiation of meaning through learner participation.

**Disciplined effort:**

The expression "disciplined effort" was dealt with as a whole by the teacher. However, no learner recalled the expression as a whole. There is only 1 reporter for "disciplined" and 6 for 'effort'. The uptake of each word has already been discussed above. In terms of categories assumed to be conducive to uptake (See 4.6.4), the treatment of each word is quite inadequate. However, as already pointed
out poor treatment may not be the only cause of poor uptake.

It is legitimate to ask why the expression was not uptaken as a whole when the teacher had intended to explicate its meaning as a whole. In this connection, it may be worthwhile to pause and analyse the nature of the explication to see if it is simple enough for learners to process, simple enough for the meaning to register.

Two excerpts from the tapescript of Lesson 1 are quoted and analysed below.

(1) T Effort is - 'to make an effort' means to try very hard - to try. 'Disciplined' is a planned way - way of doing things. One day you work, one day you don't work, one day you come to class, next day you say, 'don't want', 'don't want', 'I won't go to class'. Then you are not disciplined at all. That effort is not disciplined. You try hard day by day, try a little more every day. I'll explain this when we come to it. 'Disciplined effort', Alright.

(Lesson 1, p.3, lines 100-108)

(2) T .... Do you get your degree within one year?
SS No
T No, you work hard year after year. Therefore that effort has to be disciplined and the effort
has to be continuous day after day after day.

(Lesson 1, p.5, lines 162-164)
(Underlining by the researcher)

The first excerpt gives the meaning of 'effort' explicitly in a multi-word phrase. Next, the teacher attempts to explain 'disciplined' by giving the familiar examples of daily class attendance. But as 'discipline' in this context is probably a familiar concept for learners, it is very likely they might have even switched off. The teacher then puts the two words together and comes very near explaining the complete expression - "if you try hard day by day, a little more every day" but very abruptly, she abandons the attempt with "I'll explain this when we come to it." almost suggesting to learners "Don't bother about it now."

In the second excerpt, the sentence 'that effort has to be disciplined' in no way suggests the meaning of 'disciplined effort'. The next sentence is indeed suggestive of the meaning but the teacher again stops without any attempt to check if learners have grasped the idea.

From the two excerpts above, a good learner might be able to sift and put together the relevant aspects of the meaning which are diffused in the teacher's speech. namely:

a) planned way of doing things.

b) trying a little more each day.

c) continuous trying day after day.
However an average learner lacks the required competence. Therefore, it would be a good idea to train her in this useful activity. The teacher could help learners by eliciting the meaning from them by providing appropriate clues and prodding as a follow-up of a lengthy speech. If this is done regularly it would give the learner an incentive to listen carefully to teacher talk. The alternative to this would be to give the meaning explicitly and let the learner take it down. The latter may help immediate short-term recall but would hardly aid long-term retention. Hence more useful uptake is likely to result when learners are themselves involved in negotiating meaning.

The teacher, as the above excerpts show has adopted neither strategy. The learner is left on her own to make sense of the teacher's elaboration and to process her speech appropriately. As the present set of learners can hardly do so it is not surprising to find the teacher's effort almost wasted.

It appears that the above discussion ultimately leads one to the importance of learner participation in classroom interaction for promoting uptake. In the event of needless elaboration and monopolisation of speech, learners can hardly be blamed if they fail to attend or to uptake. The 2 excerpts clearly suggest that such "elaboration" presented in monologue style appears to have interfered with the uptake of 'disciplined effort'.
(iii) Apparently unfamiliar words: Graduate, learned

Graduate

The tapescript of Lesson 1 clearly suggests that learners did not know the meaning of 'graduate'.

T Who is saying this?
S Radhakrishnan.
SS Radhakrishnan.
T To whom
SS To the students.
T Which students
S New students.
SS New students.
T New graduates.
SS Graduates.
T Not new students.

(lines 456-468)

From the above exchange it appears that the earlier reference to 'graduate' made by the teacher (see lines quoted below) suggested to the learners the general meaning 'student'. The questions that come to mind are (1) Why couldn't learners process the teacher's speech and arrive at the precise meaning? (2) Why was the word notuptaken by a single learner? Before these questions can be answered one would have to study the following stretch of teacher talk to gauge any problems it might have posed for learners.
Now this is Radhakrishnan's speech to the graduates of that year. All right. To the graduates of that year. What does he say the graduates have done? Those who got their degrees? What have they done? How have they got their degrees? Did they get them easily?

(App.2-3, lines 67-71).

Apparently this is very simple talk. Short sentences, easy, familiar words, not a single unknown word except perhaps the word 'graduate'. To grasp the meaning of this word, the learner needs to link 'what have the graduates done', with 'those who got their degrees' with 'what have they done' and 'how have they got their degrees'. Learners often lack this skill of comprehending pronominal reference and other anaphoric devices. Unless the meaning is given explicitly in a sentence which has a copula. For example, 'A graduate is a person who has got his degree', they fail to get it. This is not to suggest that meanings should be so presented. Such a strategy, in fact, needs to be used sparingly as it encourages mere rote learning without understanding. Instead the learners have to be taught the skill of grasping connected speech such as the above. The teacher can help learners to understand anaphoric references by asking leading questions that check on what they have grasped. In the present case, the teacher perhaps thought that 'graduate' was a familiar word.
The above discussion also answers partially the second question 'why was the word not uptaken'. In addition to the fact that the meaning of the word did not register easily, one has reason to suspect that the word itself—its form, its spelling were not easy to visualise. The teacher neither spelt the word nor highlighted it on the blackboard. The word does not occur in the text-book either. Hence the learners were expected to grasp it only on the basis of the aural stimulus presented which is rather remote from the graphic representation of the word. ( /gɹædʒuət/ 'graduate'). Under the circumstances discussed above it is not surprising that the word was not uptaken by ESL learners of average/less than average competence.

**Learned**: The word 'learned' does not occur in the reading text. It was not even part of the teacher's teaching plan (that is not 'planned input'). The teacher used it spontaneously in her speech. Then realising that it might be an unfamiliar word, she went on to elaborate on its meaning.

T: hm. He was the president of India. Okay? He was a very, a very learned man. 'Learned'? He knew. He was a very wise man. He knew a lot of things but he knew how to tell others.

(Lines 38-41. Lesson 1)
Not a single learner has reported the word as 'uptake'.
Why? Perhaps a qualitative analysis of the teacher's speech and observer's notes may provide an explanation.

(1) The teacher did not write the word on the black board. She did not spell it either. Hence learners had no opportunity to form a visual image of the word. The teacher pronounced it correctly /ˈlɜːrid /. It is quite likely that the pronunciation may not have suggested to the learners that the word is derived from 'learn' and spelt 'learned'. Such knowledge of word derivation would help both in understanding the meaning of the word and in its recall.

(2) The teacher could have merely said 'learned man' — 'a man who has much knowledge. Instead, the elaboration in the teacher's speech (see lines quoted above) is perhaps misleading as 'learned' does not mean 'wise' (Not synonyms).

(3) It may be alright to say 'He knew a lot of things'. However, when the teacher qualifies her statement by adding 'but he knew how to tell others', one has not only moved away from the word 'learned' itself but the coordinator is not appropriate. Perhaps, the teacher intended to use the co-ordinator 'and' instead of 'but'. In that
case, she may have wanted to say 'he knew a lot and could impart knowledge'. However, there is nothing in the word 'learned' to suggest this. In fact, the learned are not necessarily able to impart knowledge.

Thus, one wonders whether the elaboration had the potential to help learners understand the word and remember it or whether it puzzled them and discouraged even the effort to try and understand.

There appear to be pitfalls in an approach to elaboration that would assume the learners will perceive the meanings if enough redundant elaboration is provided. The very opposite may happen, and the learners could tune out what the teacher is saying.

(Chaudron, 1982)

The above discussion suggests that the uptake of both 'graduate' and 'learned' would have been facilitated if a graphic stimulus had been presented.

5.9.3 Conclusion to Analysis of Uptake in Lesson 1

It may be observed that this lesson has been analysed differently from other lessons. As pointed out at the beginning of the discussion, both in terms of treatment and uptake the lesson has been different. In view of this, attention was also turned to words that seemed important, had received some focus in the classroom but had either beenuptaken only by a couple of learners or not at all. To
investigate the causes, analysis of teacher talk where the particular words figured was taken up and it has revealed that learners may tune out and consequently uptake may be seriously affected if the teacher

a) monopolises talk.

b) needlessly elaborates.

c) constantly breaks off and rephrases utterances so that speech gets incoherent and difficult to process.

PART (iv)

5.10 Uptake in Lesson 2

Nine learners out of 16 were present for Lesson 2. Twenty-four words were claimed as uptake after the teaching of the lesson. They are presented below in Table IV in descending order of the number of reporters for each word.

Table IV ...
### TABLE IV

**UPTAKE LIST OF LESSON 2**

**Learners Present: 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words</th>
<th>No. of Reporters</th>
<th>No. of Categories used</th>
<th>Teacher Categories</th>
<th>Learners Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Alter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Compass</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Social</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Divine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Economic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Spark</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Strife</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Altar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Essential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Achieve</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Marvellous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Engineer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Skill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Proclaim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Peace</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Advanced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Merely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Agriculture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table contd...*
5.11 Analysis of Uptake in Lesson 2

As the total number of learners present for this lesson is 9 out of 16; a word that has attracted 4 or more learners may be said to have had good uptake. Accordingly 'alter', 'compassion' 'social' and 'divine' are put in Group A. The uptake figures of 'alter' and 'compassion' in this group correlate well with the variety of treatment.

Words which attracted 3 or less learners and received correspondingly little treatment are listed under Group B. Here poor uptake matches poor treatment.

Lastly, under Group C are words that appear to have received adequate treatment but were uptaken by only 1 or 2 learners. Thus :-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words</th>
<th>No. of Reporters</th>
<th>No. of Categories used</th>
<th>Teacher Categories</th>
<th>Learner Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 Liberation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Torn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Agriculturist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Scientist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Functioning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 A little part of god</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Individual words in each group

Individual words in each group may now be studied to understand what has facilitated or hindered their uptake.

5.11.1 **Beginning with group A**

5.11.1.1 **Alter; Compassion**

Each of these words has received similar amount and variety of treatment (15 categories each) and each word has been reported by 6 (that is 2/3 of learners present).
The bulk of treatment has in each case come from the teacher. (Teacher – 11 categories; learners 4 categories).

A look at the nature of categories employed by the teacher may also help explain the high uptake. It may be noted that the teacher has used categories that were assumed to have the potential (see discussion 4.6.3) for promoting uptake. For instance, she gives examples to present the meaning of each word. Secondly, the meaning of both words is deliberately reinforced. Thirdly, she gives a near synonym in each case (compassion – pity; alter – change). Besides, the 'react' function categories, for example, 'adds to meaning given by learner' (lines 537-539 – tapescript Lesson 2) and 'corrects pronunciation' (line 404) are employed in presenting the word 'compassion'.

It may also be observed that certain especially appropriate categories have been used in presenting each of the two words. For instance, i) the teacher's giving the mother tongue meaning of 'compassion' (दया) may have helped the word to register and aided recall. (ii) In teaching the word 'alter', the meaning is presented in terms of 'homophones'. The teacher introduces 'altar' which is pronounced like 'alter' but spelt differently. As she asks learners to look up the meaning of 'altar' at home rather than giving it herself, the learning load is kept low, at that moment, and confusion and/or interchange of meanings
of the two words is prevented. 'Altar' in fact, aids the recall of 'alter' (the word in the textbook). This view finds support in Henning, G.H. 1973.

...... strategies of encoding vocabulary in memory appear to change as a function of language proficiency. Low-proficiency language learners ...... encode items in memory on the basis of acoustic and orthographic similarities rather than by association of meaning. Therefore it would appear that they would benefit from ...... exercises that point out similarities and differences of sound and spelling of words.

Hence, the teacher has rightly geared the treatment to the level of competence of the present set of learners.

(iii) The teacher relates each word to its derivatives (for example, alter-alteration; compassion-compassionate). Even a partial familiarity with the derivative is likely to make the given word salient for recall by learners.

A study of the examples given by the teacher indicates that they are derived either from the learners' day to day experience or from their store of general knowledge. For example, in presenting 'alter' reference is made to a dress which if tight or loose needs alteration. Such an example is very likely to register with women learners. In presenting 'compassion', the examples are derived both from experience and Indian History. The teacher speaks first of patients in hospital whose condition rouses our compassion and then about Gautam Buddha's feeling compassion when he saw an
old man, a man ill and a man dying. Being derived from the learners' background knowledge, the example, at once strikes home and aids recall. A similar view is expressed by Bransford et al (1984) in relation to reading texts.

When subjects activated background knowledge in comprehending texts, they not only judged the texts easier to understand, they also remembered them better.

Here the teacher activates the learners' background knowledge.

As it was possible to arrange an interview with learners after the teaching of Lesson 2, the interview data may now be analysed to understand learners' views on what facilitated the uptake of 'alter' and 'compassion'.

The following sets of lines throw light on the uptake of 'alter':- lines 11-47; 101-118; 568-594, and the following on 'compassion' :- lines 58-90; 611-634.

There is some evidence to suggest that a word gets highlighted for recall if a learner says the word or asks its meaning, for example, see lines, 37-45 where the researcher is probing the learners to think about what helped them in recalling 'alter'. Virbala promptly offers 2 reasons.

Virbala "We were attention" and also
Nilam had said it very loudly.

Earlier in the same interview, learners suggested that they remembered 'alter' as it was the last word in the teaching
session. The uptake sheets were distributed soon after and so the word 'alter' was \(\text{fresh}\) in their minds. Apparently this may be a less significant factor, nevertheless it is convincing psychologically (Snodgrass et al 1985) call it "recency effect". Learners also held the view that the teacher by introducing 'altar' helped them to recall 'alter'.

Raakhi She (teacher) gave another spelling.

Researcher Yes, another word with a different spelling ALTAR etc.

(llines 103-106)

And later in lines 568-573 the same point is made by Mamta.

Researcher Now, Mamta, tell me how did you remember this word?

Mamta Miss had told us the meaning.

Researcher How did you remember it? Something must have happened in class.

Mamta Miss had given the other spelling.

Researcher What was the other spelling

Mamta ALTAR

Learners also remembered (though after some probing) the teacher giving the example of 'dress alteration' (see lines 115-123).
The general view seemed to be that focus on the spelling of 'alter' and the 'introduction' of the homophone 'altar' had specially made the word memorable.

The evidence in the interview data for the uptake of 'compassion' is still more convincing and interesting. See lines 58-90—some of which are quoted below. With hardly any probing from the teacher, the learners present one after another aspects of treatment that highlighted the word for uptake.

Researcher What made you get 'compassion' right?
S Compassion.
SS It was repeated several times.
Virbala And Miss had explained it so well and made sentences with it.
S And she gave examples.
SS Yes examples.
S Yes, yes.
Virbala And 'pity', she said 'pity' so we know its meaning is 'pity'.
S Miss gave examples again and again, so we could remember it.
Researcher What examples did she give? Do you remember?
Raakhi If a person is sick, how we feel in our hearts
S xx

Raakhi If a person is in trouble - etc.

Researcher Did the teacher give another example besides this one?

.............

Virbala .... Gautam Buddh

S Yes Gautam Buddh

Summarising the above learner views, we have the following aspects of treatment contributing to uptake.

a) Repetition of word (which may mean reinforcement)

b) Use of word in a sentence (that is in a context)

c) Variety of examples given

d) Synonym as meaning (that is, pity)

e) Reference to Gautam Buddh (drawn from background familiar to learners)

Mamta referred to one more aspect later in the interview namely, the Hindi equivalent इच्छा.

In the teacher's view, the mother-tongue equivalent इच्छा and the reference to Gautam Buddh seemed to have aided recall of the word 'compassion'. (See lines 235-242 - interview with the teacher on Lesson 2).

Nation (1980) presents a similar view regarding mother tongue equivalents when he says:
Learning is more efficient if the foreign word form is associated with a word in the mother tongue rather than a foreign synonym or definition. (p.18)

In general, it appears that learners' evidence corroborates the researcher's insights based on intuitive interpretation of tape script data (see discussion above).

5.11.1.2 Social

The third word in Group A was uptaken by 5 out of 9 learners. In terms of quantity, it received fairly adequate treatment - 8 categories. However, adequacy of treatment is not measured in quantitative terms alone. The distribution of categories between teacher and learner is (T6 - L2). The short excerpt showing the interaction around this word is quoted below. It may help in understanding the qualitative aspect of treatment.

T  What is social freedom?
S  Social.
T  'Social' means - what does the word 'social' mean? about what? 'social' refers to? about? 'scientific' is about science' - What does 'social' mean? about what? come on.
S  xx
T  Say, 'social' means about what?
Lata xx
The interaction begins with the teacher asking the learners "what is 'social' freedom?" A learner hesitantly begins with the word 'social' but cannot continue. It is obvious that the learner is not asking the meaning of 'social'. Apparently, learners would have known what 'social' meant. The teacher however tries to put across the meaning of 'social' and stops at that. When she asks what is 'social' learners are not able to answer promptly simply because it is difficult to express the meaning in English. That they knew the meaning of social, (not social freedom) is seen from the fact that they refer in chorus to the mother-tongue equivalent of 'society' समाज. The teacher's saying "what is scientific? "Scientific is about science" is rather inaccurate and therefore misleading. At any rate, the
teacher succeeds in getting the word 'social' out of the way. What has not been explained is 'social freedom'. The result is that the word 'social' has been claimed as 'uptake', by 5 learners. One suspects that the word was not unfamiliar to all 5. The categories used are T asks meaning, T gives clue, Learners guess meaning, Learners give a mother-tongue word, Learners repeat it in chorus, T elicits English word, Learner presents it (that is the English meaning). Most of the category labels are however those which have been assumed to have the potential for uptake. Even if 'social' has been genuinely uptaken, it is evident that 'social freedom' has neither been explained nor understood. The word 'social' was treated and the word 'social' was uptaken. Treatment and uptake correlate but the fact remains that the concept of 'social freedom' so crucial in the speech of Dr. Radhakrishnan has been ignored by the teacher.

Earlier (see lines 430-447) a learner asks the meaning of 'democratic spirit' but the teacher's response explains the meaning of 'democracy' as a form of government and even compares it with 'monarchy'. The learners do not insist on an explanation of 'democratic spirit' and the teacher continues with the lesson.
This word has 4 claimants out of 9 and 4 categories of treatment showing against it. (Three categories used by the teacher and 1 by a student). This is a very small amount of treatment and apparently hardly adequate in numerical terms. From the qualitative aspect also the labels of the categories used suggest that they are not specially conducive to uptake. (See assumptions with regard to potentiality in 4.6.3 and 4.6.4). For example, the teacher uses word in reading from the text, paraphrases and repeats meaning. As the categories appear to lack the potential for uptake, the uptake of the word by 4 learners out of 9 needs to be explained. A closer analysis of the data may be helpful.

The word is introduced as the teacher reads from the text the expression 'spark of the divine'. The expression recurs once in the text and the word itself several times in the teacher's speech. Each recurrence is an exposure to the word enabling it to get rehearsed. Could this limited frequency have contributed to uptake? Learners, in the interview data, seem to think so. (See lines 364-365). In response to the researcher's question, 'How did you remember 'spark'? (Raakhi answers,

Raakhi When referring to Hindu religion, teacher often used the phrase 'spark of the divine'.

5.11.1.3 Divine
Again about 90 lines later, in response to the researcher’s question 'How did you learn the word 'divine', Neeru says,

Neeru Miss said it again and again. (line 455)

Next, about 65 lines later the researcher asks Lata why she wrote 'divinal' instead of 'divine', Lata responds,

Lata Miss I remembered this word because it was repeated several times but the spelling\(^18\) (lines 523-24).

The actual frequency count of the word 'divine' is only 7 occurrences in the tapescript and 2 in the text but in learners' memory the frequency figure seems to be larger. Could it be because the gloss of the expression namely 'a little part of god' does occur frequently?

Incidentally, it may be pointed out that frequency of occurrence is believed to have a supportive role along with appropriate interactive treatment, in the boosting of uptake. But mere frequency in the absence of other interactive treatment categories is hardly a significant factor in facilitating uptake. This view is borne out in the present data.

\(^{18}\) Lata's report of the word could not be considered in the uptake count because of the incorrect spelling.
The following excerpt from Bransford presents a similar view.

Frequency of exposure is not sufficient to guarantee learning .... Frequency correlates with meaningfulness, imagery, age of acquisition and so forth.

(Bransford 1979, 92)

Having referred to learners' views on how frequency of word (repetition) aids uptake, it is pertinent to refer to a context where a learner thought the absence of word repetition (by the teacher) had hindered uptake. (See interview with learners on Lesson 8, lines 283-290).

T  Why didn't you recall 'seduce'?  
Kusum  I didn't remember it.  
T  You couldn't remember it? Why couldn't. you remember it? Was it difficult?  
Kusum  Because Miss uttered it just once and passed on.

The learner is suggesting here that when a word is repeated by the teacher it registers better.

Spark of the divine

As the learners are intrigued by the expression 'Spark of the Divine', and the teacher is intent on their

\footnote{See the footnote on p.137.}
comprehending the overall idea of goodness being inherent to man, it is not easy for the learners to bring the teacher back again and again to the words. First, Mamta asks the meaning of the complete phrase 'spark of the divine', but the teacher merely says 'divine' is 'God' — another learner ventures to ask 'divine'? and then third asks the meaning of 'spark', (lines 473-479). Thus, three successive queries highlight the expression and the meaning 'God' given in response registers well as it is an easy word. The interview data provides evidence here. See line 227, where in response to the researcher's question 'what's the meaning of divine?', the interviewees answer loudly in chorus 'God, God'.

Summarizing the above discussion, it appears that what helped the uptake of the word 'divine' with 4 learners may perhaps be

1) More than one learner asking its meaning and so drawing others attention.

2) The reported frequency of the word (that is the impression of its frequent occurrence - the impression being a transfer of the frequency of the gloss - a little part of God.)

3) The easy word - 'God' given as the meaning by the teacher.
5.11.2 **Group B**

Group B has a total of 16 words claimed as uptake. On the whole, poor treatment figures match poor uptake figures in this group. (1 or 2 reporters matched by 2 to 4 categories of treatment).

As 'economic' has 3 reporters, one may consider why. Similarly, one may inquire why 'essential' and 'functioning' that received just a little more treatment (6 and 5) than the other words in this group, failed to attract more than 2 and 1 learner respectively.

5.11.2.1 **Economic**

This word is uptaken by 3 learners and has 4 categories of treatment showing against it - 2 categories used by the teacher and 2 by learners. This amount of treatment is far too limited in variety to be regarded as adequate. The 2 categories used by the teacher are 'incidental use of word in the text context' and 'accepts word!'. The learner categories are 'using word in the text context' and 'repeating word'. These categories do not appear especially conducive to uptake. But 'economic' freedom' being a key idea in the reading passage, the word 'economic' recurs frequently in the tapescript. The entries of the category 'incidental use of word in the text context' are also therefore as many as 17 in the tapescript data;
the entries of 'uses word in the text context' are 5 and there are 3 entries of 'repeats word'. The total number of these entries makes the frequency count 25. But, as pointed out earlier, high frequency counts of words without adequate variety, quality and appropriacy of treatment can facilitate uptake only marginally.

As a matter of fact 'economic' can hardly be an unfamiliar word for students of commerce. One is legitimately inclined to suspect that the 3 learners reporting the word may have listed it in their uptake sheet to inflate their uptake figures. The learners almost admitted this when cross-examined by the researcher at the interview following the lesson. (See lines 213-224). At another point in the same interview (see lines 279-289) they seemed to suggest that they knew the word earlier but did not know its meaning. Thus they learned the word better in the English class. Here again, the argument does not hold because 2 of the 3 learners reported the word without stating its meaning. And Raakhi at the interview offered the meaning of 'economics' not of 'economic'.

The above discussion clearly suggests that adequate treatment is a dominant factor in influencing uptake. In the absence of such treatment, uptake figures generally remain low and frequency of occurrence by itself can only make a marginal difference, as far example, in the case of the uptake of 'economic', perhaps.
5.11.2.2 Essential

'Essential' was listed by just 2 learners as uptake even though it received a little more treatment than other words in this group. Six categories (T 4 - L2). Besides, a few of the category types used are of the kind that have normally influenced uptake in this data. For example, teacher 'gives a near synonym'; 'adds to meaning given by learner' and 'learner gives meaning'.

A look at the tapescript suggests that learners in general seemed familiar with the word and that apparently is the reason for not listing it as uptake. (See lesson tapescript Lesson 2, lines 161-163) where the teacher asks the meaning and two learners promptly respond. "Most important". Though not quite right, they had a fair idea of the word.

Of the two learners who listed the word in their uptake sheets, Raakhi had an individual explanation for uptaking it. (See lines 338-347 in the interview with students following Lesson 2). Having first come across the word in a book on book-keeping and looked up its meaning in the dictionary, Raakhi was in a way getting the word reinforced in the English class. That again suggests that it was not an unfamiliar word. 'Personal agenda' (Allwright: 1984(b)) - here, perhaps, the wish to be able to use the word in her special subjects may have motivated her consolidate the word.
In any case, even Raakhi's comments suggest that the uptake count for the word 'essential' stands low because learners already knew it.

5.11.2.3 Functioning

The word is part of the phrase 'Functioning realities' and is used by Radhakrishnan in the context of the need to put into practice in our day to day life the principles which all religions proclaim worthy. The teacher strives hard to present this idea of the need to show compassion to all mankind because man is made in the image of God. She however does not say what the 2 words mean in themselves. She could have done so and then linked them with the context. As the learners do not know the literal meaning of the 2 words, they fail to link them with the gloss the teacher presents. They repeatedly ask her the meaning of 'Functioning realities'. Thus the teacher and the learners remain at cross purposes. At the interview (on Lesson 2) with the observer/researcher the teacher says: "For me, I think a great - I would feel that I had done my work if I made them understand what Radhakrishnan wanted them (the university graduates) to do."

A brief analysis of the relevant excerpts in the tapescript will point to the need for the modification of what was in itself a good teaching strategy. The teacher first attempts to explain 'functioning realities' in lines 513-520 by glossing Radhakrishnan's message. In line 521 a
learner asks the meaning of 'functioning realities' indicating thereby that the message in lines 513-520 has not been grasped. The teacher continues to explain the same message again from lines 522-536. Then, believing that the learners have followed she goes on to other words and ideas until a learner again brings her back to 'functioning realities' in line 633. The teacher again attempts to convey the idea, this time in less abstract terms (see lines 634-647) but she does not weave in the words 'functioning realities' to establish the link between them and the glossed message. It appears that to those familiar with the words, the gloss would have been a very useful explication of the concepts. But the present learners, not being in a position to understand the literal meaning of the words, fail to see the connection between the concept and the words. They need to be helped in deducing links and inferring meaning.

Besides, the teacher's failing to offer appropriate help in understanding the link between the words and the concept used by the writer, the treatment categories used by the teacher and the learners are also not of an interactive character and therefore (as assumed in 4.6.4) lack the potential to facilitate uptake. Both the teacher and the learners 'use the word(s) (functioning realities) in reading from the text', the teacher 'repeats word' and 'paraphrases meaning'. Possibly the only category that may have highlighted
the word is when 2 learners 'ask meaning'.

Thirdly the word itself has a very low frequency of occurrence in the tapescript.

Summarizing the above discussion, the following points appear to have hindered uptake.

i) Inadequate treatment - inadequate with respect to variety of categories and interactive quality of categories used.

ii) Absence of genuine classroom interaction between participants to help negotiate meaning.

iii) Teacher's failure to explicitly point out the link between the meaning of the words and the concept they convey.

iv) Low frequency of occurrence of the word(s) (functioning realities) in the tapescript and in the reading text.

v) Inherent difficulty of the concept. The concept, 'functioning realities' is inherently difficult to understand and therefore difficult to explain.

5.11.2.4 Remaining words in Group B

Having considered, 'economic', 'essential' and 'functioning' in Group B, attention may now be drawn to the remaining words. The following it appears were already
familiar and therefore not uptaken: 'Peace', 'engineer' and 'scientist' (See lines 441-448; 222-223 in interview with learners). Inadequate treatment appears to be the main reason why the rest of the words in this group attracted only 1 or 2 learners. Thus treatment and uptake correlate in these cases.

5.11.3 Group C

This group consists of 4 words (spark*, 'strife', 'advanced' and 'agriculturist') which appear to be fairly adequately treated and yet have failed to attract more than 1 or 2 learners.

Each word may now be taken individually and examined in the light of tapescript and interview data to see what might have stood in the way of its uptake.

5.11.3.1 Spark and Strife

Initially, it may be pointed out that there is something common as regards the structure of the 2 words. Both words begin with a consonant cluster - /sp/ and /sk/ respectively. Speakers of Hindi learning English as a second language generally have problems with the articulation of such clusters. For example, they add a vowel sound before /sku:l/ pronouncing it /isku:l/ and /steːfn/ as /istəfn/ and so on. 'Spark' is a cause of worry also because the word is not pronounced the way it is spelled. Thus /spaːk/ not /spark/.
In 'strife' the /i/ in the spelling is pronounced as the diphthong /ai/ - thus /straif/. This also poses a problem for the second language learner. That these areas present learning difficulties is being stated here not merely on the basis of the researcher's intuition but on the basis of professional knowledge and experience of teaching English as a second language for over two decades. Further, the tapescripts and the uptake sheets of learners provide some evidence. See tapescript, Lesson 2, line 319. Here, Raakhi reading from the text pronounces 'strife' as /strɪːf/. Incorrect pronunciation in turn leads to incorrect spelling. For example, Purnima has written 'strify' instead of 'strife', and Lata too has misspelled the word in the uptake sheets. Had these 2 learners spelled the word 'strife' correctly, the number of reporters would have been 4 instead of 2. With regard to 'spark', both Mamta and Purnima wrote SPRAK instead of SPARK, so that 'spark' also had 2 reporters instead of 4. It is possible that other learners may have been unsure of the spelling and so refrained from listing the words.

Learners plainly confessed to the researcher at the interview that they did not look into the textbook and note the spelling of words. (See interview with students on Lesson 2, lines 172-183). The teacher sometimes spelled words but never used the blackboard. Learners' ability in

---

20 Words misspelt were not reckoned as uptake.
speech and listening skills being equally inadequate, it was generally a hit or miss affair making sense of the teacher's speech.

The interview data provides further useful evidence.

The learners present at the interview could recall the little bits of classroom interaction that led to the negotiation of the meaning of 'spark' (see lines 648-653; 305-314 in the interview script). They remembered the word and its literal meaning. This suggests that the treatment had facilitated the uptake of the word; the word had registered significantly but as the spelling had not been focussed on, it (the word) eluded the learners when the uptake sheets were given to them. From this discussion it follows that the importance of improving students' study methods and the usefulness of blackboard work are so obvious that they hardly need to be stressed.

A look at the tapescript lines 479-491 suggests that the learners were quite interested in negotiating the meaning of 'spark' through interaction in the classroom. They did not simply take down the meaning "a little bit of light" given by the teacher but kept asking each other and explaining the meaning to one another in Hindi. This was because the example of a lighted match producing a spark had been familiar and so led to a quiet discussion until Lata finally sought a clarification.
Lata  Miss, dim?
T    Not very dim. It is bright, but very little
S    Light
S    xx
T    Very little, very little, a spark, not a big
     fire, but a little spark, but that spark can
     start a fire etc ....

The teacher is thus obliged to comment on the literal meaning of 'spark'. She had initially been reluctant to dwell on the literal meaning, being intent on putting across the metaphorical/figurative meaning contained in 'spark of the divine', that is, god or goodness within each person. It may be observed, here, that the uptake of both 'spark' and 'divine' would possibly have been facilitated if the teacher had started off with the literal meaning and explicitly led the learners on to the figurative one stressing the importance of both lest learners should latch on to the literal one alone.

The following excerpt from the tapescript points to the fact that the teacher does not make explicit the figurative link possibly because she believes that learners can infer it themselves.

T    ................... .. Now, there is a
     little bit of good in us, we must let that
     good grow, so that as the Buddhist say: If
     you, let the good - there is good - in all
of us there is a little bit of good, of God in us. If we, if we let that spark grow what will happen? What do the Buddhists say?

(Lines 491-495)

'That spark' in the above quoted lines refers anaphorically to "a little bit of good, of God in us" and figuratively it stands for goodness in human beings. Most second language learners at the level of competence of the present set may not be in a position to see even the anaphorical link and it is doubtful if they can draw the figurative connection. Secondly the above quoted stretch of teacher talk is rather incoherent even for more competent learners than the present batch to process.

Thus while some learners may have succeeded in working out the literal meaning of 'spark', they may have been puzzled by the metaphorical 'a little bit of god' and in the final analysis the uptake of the word would necessarily have been blocked because of lack of clarity of meaning.

Summarizing the above discussion, it appears that several factors may have hindered the uptake of 'spark'.

1) Teacher's attempts to deal with the metaphorical meaning directly without referring to the literal one until obliged to do so by learners.
2) Teacher's not making the link between the literal and the figurative meaning explicit.  

3) Incoherent teacher talk.  

4) Teacher's inability to anticipate learners' difficulty with consonant clusters and the spelling of the word so as to focus on it by using the blackboard.  

Thus, while the treatment of 'spark' as far as the literal meaning is concerned appears adequate with regard to quantum, variety and interactive quality, the majority of learners could not benefit from it in view of the difficulties listed above.  

Among the treatment categories used to present 'strife' there are a few likely to be helpful in promoting uptake. For example, Teacher gives a synonym (fighting, war); teacher gives the opposite (peace); learner gives mother tongue meaning; learner mispronounces word, teacher corrects pronunciation. Thus, there is variety but hardly any interactive quality. As the meaning is given by the teacher, there is no need for learners to negotiate it. Such negotiation can very often fix the word in the memory.  

It has already been pointed out that 2 learners' uptake had to be disregarded on account of mistakes in spelling. It may be that some other learners were also daunted by the spelling.
Ten categories of treatment have been used. Seven categories are used by the teacher and 3 by learners. In numerical terms this is quite good. The 3 learner categories are 'learner mispronounces word'. (rather misreads word - 'advantage country instead of advanced country'); 'repeats word' and 'asks meaning'. A word is generally highlighted when a learner asks the meaning. The strikingly useful teacher categories are 'correcting pronunciation', 'giving the opposite' (that is developing countries as opposed to advanced countries); 'giving examples'(that is names of advanced countries). In addition to this the teacher uses paraphrase etc. Surely this is variety enough. However, there is hardly any negotiation of meaning through participants interacting. Interactive categories such as 'giving clues to meaning' and 'learners guessing meaning' or 'checking on meaning', 'seeking a clarification' etc are not used. Nor does the teacher reinforce meaning. However, even though the categories used are not promising enough to attract a large number of learners, they appear varied enough to guarantee atleast a few learners uptaking the word. What we have in the uptake chart is one solitary reporter. The tapescript may be analysed qualitatively to see if it offers a plausible explanation for such poor uptake.
As pointed out earlier, a learner introduces the word in the discourse by misreading it as 'advantage' (line 216) and the teacher promptly says 'advanced, advanced'. The word gets further highlighted when Shilpa asks its meaning. The teacher's response quoted below may now be analysed. (See lines 221-234)

T Advanced means very prosperous countries - very rich countries which know a lot - like, America and Europe

S Europe.

T We are all developing countries. Developing countries means we are trying to catch up with the others. We have just got our political freedom. We are trying to get our economic freedom and we're trying to get in line with the richer countries, which are advanced - 'advanced' means 'gone ahead' - What is 'ahead'. 'Time ahead' means what?

S future.

T 'future'. 'Ahead' means 'in front of'. So we are - those countries have gone ahead of us - they are first - we're trying to catch up with them. Who? 'we' means India.

First lines 221-222 may be taken up for discussion.
The teacher's response "advanced means prosperous countries - very rich countries which know a lot" is hardly precise as the meaning of 'advanced'. The teacher is thinking both of material prosperity and technical development ('know a lot'). For the learners, this may be difficult to process. Thus, the one learner who uptook the word has written 'advanced - rich country', which is erroneous as advanced could be used with respect to anything, not necessarily country and 'advanced' does not mean 'rich'. The learner's error can be traced back to the teacher's utterance:

"advanced means very rich countries".

It appears as though the teacher is to some extent aware of the unsatisfactory nature of the paraphrase already presented and hastens to rephrase it by using the word 'developing' countries as opposed to 'advanced' countries. Perhaps it may have been more helpful, had she presented first 'developing' as opposed to 'advanced' and explicitly substituted 'developed' in place of 'advanced'. She attempts to elaborate on 'developing countries'. In saying 'we are trying to get in line with the richer countries which are advanced', 'advanced' once again gets equated in the learner's mind with 'rich'. Again, apparently, in anticipation of this, the teacher hastens to add 'advanced' means 'gone ahead' and soon realises, perhaps, that she is in for further trouble because 'ahead' has already been associated with 'times ahead' in Lesson 1, so the teacher promptly proceeds to make herself
clear by first reinforcing 'times ahead' and then distinguishing it from 'ahead'. In response to her question, 'Time ahead'; means what? a learner at once answers, 'Future'. She accepts the answer and proceeds to sort out 'ahead' from 'time ahead' (without resorting to blackboard work which might have been of immense help). The attempt is hardly satisfactory even to herself, one feels. Far more explicit terms would have to be used than the teacher has time or patience for. In a moment, she finds herself using a series of personal pronouns - we, us, they, we, them and realising that their referents may be lost on learners, she quickly and briefly tries to clarify. the more important referent ('We' means 'India').

Incidentally, the dots and dashes in the transcript suggest that the teacher had been improvising. This is what often makes the teaching of English as a second language difficult and frustrating. Probably careful pre-class preparation would have saved a lot of effort and the resulting confusion in learners' heads. 'Gone ahead' would have been kept out altogether and might have been substituted by say, 'progressed'.

How the 9 learners processed the speech and what they learned or unlearned would be interesting to investigate given the facilities for suitable probing interviews.

At the brief interview which the present researcher conducted (see lines 456-90) it was found that some learners
still continued to say 'advanced' means 'rich country'. (See Raakhi - line 482); others said विनियोद की है/ which is correct and yet others sought clarifications such as: Instead of rich country can we write 'progress' also? (line 469) indicating that they were hardly sure of the meaning and probably the uncertainty had blocked the uptake of the word.

Thus, the main obstacle to uptake of the word 'advanced' appears to have been the lack of clarity in the teacher’s speech.

5.11.3 Agriculturist

Like 'scientist', 'engineer', agriculturist is likely to be familiar to learners and perhaps did not get reported on that account.

Secondly, though there are 7 categories showing against the word, a glance at the labels indicates that there is hardly any which is especially conducive to uptake. The learners 'use word in the text context', 'report word', 'use word in reading from the text'. The teacher 'incidentally uses word in the text context', 'accepts word', 'corrects pronunciation. Only the last 2 categories have a 'react' function. There is no treatment at all with regard to the meaning of the word and hardly any interactive categories are used.
Such treatment is hardly adequate either with respect to variety or quality. And mere quantum made up of the less significant categories repeated over and over again cannot promise uptake.

Incidentally, it may be pointed out that the word recurs 12 times in the tapescript but frequency of occurrence hardly contributes to uptake unless supported by rich treatment.

5.12 Overall Conclusions Based on the Analysis of Uptake and Treatment in Lesson 2

1) It appears that learners regard frequency of use (repetition of word/meaning) by the teacher an aid to learning.

2) Learners rarely insist on a clearer explanation if they fail to understand the teacher. Normally, when asked if they have understood, they answer in the affirmative.

3) In the absence of blackboard use, uptake is clearly adversely affected.

4) If the teacher has not clearly thought out an explanation before hand, the extempore one is likely to be so incoherent that uptake is necessarily hindered. Interview data supports this view.

5) Frequency of occurrence makes a marginal difference to uptake unless accompanied by interactive work.
PART (v)
Lesson 5

5.13 Introduction

The teacher's lesson plan (as discussed by her in the interview with the researcher) reveals that she was primarily concerned about communicating Radhakrishnan's message to the learners. She worked hard to present the total message in simple language, repeating the same ideas (about 6 of them, over and over again in monologue style. The missionary zeal shows itself clearly in the lesson tape script which suggests that the teacher did not merely wish to communicate the message of Dr. Radhakrishnan but to impress it on the minds of the learners. Carried away by her zest, the teacher could not resist listing as well as spelling out each concept contained in the message, thereby almost turning even the interview session into a teaching session. (See lines 36-47; 53-61; 76-94 and later 231-249). Politely interrupted by the researcher she succeeded in politely brushing away the interruptions with - 'I'll tell you the ideas in this passage' (Line 51) and again with 'I'll tell you what that last paragraph is. There are four ideas' (Lines 75-76). It was not until she had finished recounting the four ideas plus two others that followed as corollaries that the researcher could at least get on to relevant aspects of classroom interaction.
Apparently the teacher was guided by certain pedagogic considerations. According to the teacher the metaphor used by Dr. Radhakrishnan, namely, 'character is that on which the destiny of a nation is built', was difficult to explain because the words themselves were difficult for the learners. "So I got round the difficulty by not going into the words at all but trying to give them a general idea of the ideas in the passage." (Interview, Lines 12-15). Asked if any words were concentrated on despite her not wanting to concentrate on them, she answered -

T The trouble was that they (the learners) brought me back to the words .. They brought me back to the words, and I tried to get over it ..... (Lines 26-27)

As asked if she thought she had succeeded, she confessed, she hadn't "because we were at cross-purposes." (Interview, lines 33-34).

The teacher's impression that she and the learners were at 'cross purposes' is borne out by the lesson tape transcript. One notices long stretches of teacher talk, the teacher explicating ideas, repeating them, elaborating, but the moment she pauses the slightest bit, one or the other learner asks her the meaning of a word. Each query is introduced in the discourse after a fairly long stretch of explication. One wonders if the students were listening to the teacher.
Apparently they had their eye on the next difficult word and were waiting for an opportunity to ask the meaning. That they were not inclined to listen to lengthy teacher talk is borne out by the fact that at times the teacher has already explained a word in the course of her talk and yet a few lines later a learner asks her the meaning of the same word. See for example, tapescript p.13, where in lines 413-415 the teacher explains 'adhere' and yet 20 lines later a student asks 'adhere'? Similarly, she explains 'lacking in' in lines 195-198, but in line 199 she is asked for the meaning.

Exasperated by the interruptions and upset about her own lesson plan being thrown overboard, she recalled the lexical items that learners punctuated her talk with - "They asked me all these words and I put them off." (Lines 127-128). The tapescript however suggests that the teacher could not always "put them off". Whenever possible the learners succeeded in getting a brief interaction going and the teacher in spite of herself was drawn into it.

... Whether or not the teacher plans a lesson in advance, the actual working out of that lesson in class demands joint endeavour. The lesson in process is most often different from that which either the teacher or the learners anticipated before the lesson began. The social dynamic of the group insists that lessons evolve through explicit or implicit negotiation.

(Breen, 1985).
Perhaps it is pertinent to point out that one of the serious restraints on interaction in the series of lessons being discussed here, was the teacher's inability to comprehend the learners' mother tongue, much less speak it. Learners' spontaneous contributions in Hindi were almost invariably lost on the teacher.

Another of the teacher's comments 'when you come to a word, they'll stop you and in their minds also the progress of communication stops' (Lines 191-192) is not totally unjustified however biased it may seem. It does appear that students' thinking, concentration and application gets bogged down by their anxiety about the words that stare them in the face from the printed page.

And yet what is very interesting, very encouraging and highly significant (in this lesson) is that the words uptaken by the learners are the words which they themselves focussed on, words the meaning of which they negotiated by interacting,

Learners linguistic progress, it seems, is largely independent of what teachers teach ... in spite of all the efforts teachers have put into following syllabuses in their classrooms.

(Allwright 1986)

Having tuned out (as it appears) from the lengthy teacher-talk, they attended to what they themselves initiated or introduced in the discourse. Therefore it
appears that with the right kind of help from the teacher, students would be willing and gradually able to negotiate both the general meaning and the contextual meaning of words and through this the comprehension of a passage as well.

Asking, hinting, suggesting rather than telling and giving; checking, inviting feedback, clarifying rather than taking for granted, and deliberately reinforcing in a variety of ways appear to be promising means of promoting interaction.

Instructions will eventually make more sense if we accept its essentially interactive nature ...

(Allwright 1986)

5.14 Nature of the Interaction in Lesson 5

At the outset it must be understood, that it was at the behest of learners that most of the words listed in Table V received whatever treatment they did from the teacher. The teacher had planned to ignore words "except where they were necessary for the comprehension of the passage" (lines 3-4, interview with the teacher) and to simply summarise the ideas in the extract. (That is, the last paragraph of 'A Call to Youth'). (See Appendix A).

What motivated the learners to persist in asking the meanings of words is not easy to surmise. According to the
teacher, (personal communication) the learners' interest in word meaning issued from a competitive spirit of recalling and listing a larger and larger number of words and meanings in the 'uptake' sheets and this peer competition had interfered with their comprehension of ideas in the passage. At any rate, if the experiment instilled a spirit of competition and motivated effort, it is a good thing in itself. Whether the pursuit hindered comprehension of ideas or not is difficult to say with any certainty because there is no evidence to support either view. The researcher, however, is inclined to hold the view that comprehension would have been poorer if the words had been ignored as intended by the teacher.

Much more interaction could have been generated and many more useful learning opportunities created if the teacher's lesson plan had included the teaching of words through appropriate well-thought out categories of treatment. It is a credit to learners that despite the unwilling attitude of the teacher, their own restricted competence, a teacher fronted classroom with unequal distribution of power, they could still "navigate" (Allwright, 1984(a)) the teacher a number of times.

The overall picture we are beginning to see is one in which teachers may appear to be less powerful, less able to determine classroom events, than we might previously
have supposed, and one in which learners are relatively more powerful, more in command of what happens in lessons and of what they get out of them. We can interpret this as learners ... trying to make instruction more sensible than it otherwise would be ......

(Allwright 1986)

With greater co-operation from the teacher they might have succeeded in clarifying doubts which they brought up at the interview with the researcher. The interview transcript suggests that they were rather unsure of the meanings of at least 'reflect', 'declare' and 'animate' (see lines 541-545; 474-476; and 676 respectively). Given more opportunities to interact, these doubts might have been resolved in the classroom itself.

5.15 Uptake in Lesson 5

One may now consider the uptake in relation to treatment. Ten out of 16 learners were present for this lesson. Twelve words have been reported. More than half the items have been recalled by more than half the learners. The greater the number of reporters, for each word, the less idiosyncratic is learners' behaviour and the more common is success among learners. This lesson shows learners' behaviour as the least idiosyncratic when compared to other lessons. Table V below presents the words uptaken. They are arranged in descending order of the number of reporters for each word. The number of treatment categories used and their distribution between
the teacher and the learners is also shown against each
word.

TABLE V

UPTAKE IN LESSON 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Learners Present</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Words reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of reporters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>categories used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Reflect</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lacking in</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Destiny</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Declared</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Selfless</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Adhere</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Crumbling</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Animate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Great heights</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Humility</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Share</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Principle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.16 **Analysis of Uptake in Lesson 5**

The uptake of each word in the above table may now be considered in relation to variety of treatment types, quality of treatment and distribution of learner and teacher effort.

Words 1 to 7 may be put in Group A. These words are uptaken by over 50 per cent of the learners present. Words 8 to 12 may be placed in group B. Here, 4 or less than 4 learners recalled the word.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflect</td>
<td>Animate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking in</td>
<td>Great heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destiny</td>
<td>Humility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declared</td>
<td>Share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfless</td>
<td>Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crumbling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.16.1 **Group A**

Each word from Group A may now be considered.

5.16.1.1 **Reflect**

A variety of 17 different types of treatment have been used - 12 by the teacher and 5 by the learners. The teacher gives an example in response to which the learners
guess the meaning which she corrects. (line 399). Later she clarifies meaning (lines 458-462). She focuses on the spelling and relates the word to a different part of speech. The learners guess the mother-tongue meaning. But as some of these mother tongue words are unfamiliar to the teacher they are not accepted by her. Interview data and lesson tapescript data suggest that the learners did not feel quite clear about the meaning of 'reflect' as they could not understand the distinction between 'shadow' and 'image'. The word, however, received sufficient treatment to make it salient for recall. From page 12-15 (in the tapescript) the meaning is negotiated. The teacher's turns on these pages are much shorter. Teacher and student alternate in taking turns. This itself is indicative of interaction. At the interview the learners recalled the example the teacher had given about using a mirror to comb one's hair; they also recalled that the meaning 'shadow' given by a learner had been rejected by the teacher. Thus the correlation between uptake and treatment is quite apparent.

5.16.1.2 Lacking in

The teacher herself focussed on this word because it seemed essential for the comprehension of the passage. On page 6, lines 195-198 she gave a synonym, then a multiword phrase and repeated the synonym. Ironically
enough a learner asked the meaning in line 199; (indicating that she had either not been attending or that what was said had gone over her head). A close look at the tapescript, however, suggests that the teacher had hardly given sufficient time to the learners to assimilate the previous word 'declared'. Eager to get on with the summary of ideas in the passage, she had quickly moved on to the next word 'lacking in' while the learners were still grappling with 'declared' in which they had got genuinely interested (See tapescript p.6). Apparently they had wanted to continue the interaction and discover how 'declare' in cricket was different from 'declare' in the present context but the teacher had 'put them off'. As their mind was occupied they could not attend to the teacher explaining 'lacking in'.

Thus it was only when a learner asked the meaning of 'lacking in', that other learners turned their attention to her. (the learner). Teacher-learner turns then alternated as other learners joined in and the teacher repeated the synonym and the multiword phrase. Later on page 9 the teacher used the word in the text context. Nine categories of treatment (7 by the teacher and 2 by the learners) have been used. This is sufficient variety of treatment for securing uptake. However it appears that the relatively easy synonym 'be without' and the multiword phrase - 'do not have' as well as learner focus on the word especially helped in
making the word salient for uptake.

5.16.1.3 Destiny

This word occurs in the opening line of the last paragraph of 'A Call to Youth' (Character is destiny). The word intrigued learners. The teacher had deliberately ignored it. But on page 2 (tapescript) a learner asked its meaning. The teacher reluctantly said 'fate'. But when they could not understand 'fate' she beseeched them to wait until she had finished the paragraph. This perhaps intrigued them further. So hardly had they worked out the meaning of 'lacking in character' when Nirmala's mind harked back to 'Character is destiny' and she asked the meaning of 'destiny'. The teacher was again side-tracked. The sentence, 'you cannot reach great heights if you are lacking in character' was left midway and attention diverted to the opening line.

It is not easy to give the meaning of 'destiny'. No one would want to be in the teacher's shoes. She patiently gave a synonym, she paraphrased the meaning and used the word in the text context. However, it appears that what perhaps facilitated uptake of the word 'destiny' was not so much the 7 categories of treatment but the fact that learners introduced the word into the discourse twice, felt intrigued when the teacher put them off, tried as best they could to understand its meaning. Besides the word has an easy 4 letter synonym 'fate'. It is doubtful if the exact
connotation and significance were grasped. At any rate, the attempts to negotiate meaning (unsuccessful though) had focussed learners' attention on the word enabling them to uptake it, and 5 of the 8 could assign it the meaning 'fate'.

5.16.1.4 **Declared**

On page 4 (tapescript) the teacher merely reads the text sentence in which the word 'declared' occurs. Thus: "We must have young men and women who look upon each other as the living images of themselves as our Shastras have so often declared." As the meaning of 'declared' was not necessary for understanding the ideas that the text presented, the teacher ignored the word and continued to talk about the need to be selfless and to share what one has with others. The learners had spotted the word 'declared' and were waiting for an opportunity to ask its meaning. They got a chance on page 6 line 171. (See tapescript).

For about 20 lines they interacted with the teacher for its meaning. Apparently they understood the word 'declare' only in the context of the game, cricket. This familiar meaning neither fitted in the context of the lesson nor did it match the meaning which the teacher gave, namely 'said'. So they asked for the spelling of 'said' wondering whether they had heard it right. The teacher spelled it and having sensed some kind of dissatisfaction, elaborated on
the meaning of 'declared' by adding 'in public', that is 'said in public'. Learners were still unhappy as they could not figure out the meaning. Perhaps they did not realise that 'declare' has a general meaning in addition to the way it is used in cricket. A student at last ventured to ask the teacher for a clarification and other learners joined in. The request was partly phrased in Hindi and so it was with a certain amount of effort that the teacher was able to process their difficulty. Taken aback by this unanticipated query she proceeded to explain what 'declare' meant in cricket (lines 189-192). But before the meaning had registered, before learners could grasp the two senses, in which the word can be used, the teacher had hastened to explain other concepts that were important in Radhakrishnan's message. Apparently learners had not grasped the meaning of 'declare' in the sense of 'state' or 'announce'. This is suggested by Virbala's comment at the interview with the researcher.

Virbala This 'declare' and that 'declare' is the same meaning. Isn't it? That too is in public. (lines 474-475)

Evidently, she and perhaps other learners too had been trying to work out the meaning as well as they could. Several other comments at the interview indicate that learners
were unsure of the meaning even after the lesson had been completed. For example:

Lata  What's the meaning of 'declare'? 'Declare' is used in a cricket match. They declare

SS  xx

S  Afterwards, I thought it may be a different meaning.

S  I had asked Miss.

R  So now your problem is

Virbala  Yes, Miss xx that's another word.

(Lines 442-448)

Apparently the learners are complaining that the teacher didn't dwell on what they felt was a problem. Virbala adds:

Virbala  When she asked about the cricket match, I did pay attention, but I didn't think it fitted.

(Lines 498-99)

Incidentally, these words of Virbala are evidence of how a learner who asks for meaning/clarification provides a learning opportunity to other learners.
Learners later said that they had earlier encountered the word 'declare' in the context of declaring of election results and 'declare a holiday'. Therefore, had the interaction on this word continued a little longer, with the teacher eliciting the familiar uses of the word, the meaning could have been satisfactorily negotiated. But the teacher hardly sensed this need. "Next" she said, rather abruptly (meaning, 'let's go on to the next point').

Recalling the teacher's words to the researcher "they asked me all these words and I put them off" and "we were at cross purposes", one wonders if it might be more worthwhile for teachers to be trained in processing the working of learners' minds every minute and allowing the lesson to proceed according to the need of that minute, providing input that's needed at that minute rather than zealously holding on to a lesson plan even after it has lost its meaning.

21Virbala and Mamta are the 2 learners referred to. Virbala who said she had heard the word in the context of cricket and of voting had not grasped the meaning clearly as her own statements quoted above indicate. Hence, she has listed the word in her uptake sheet, as she was not sure whether it was the familiar word or a different one. Mamta who recalled the expression 'declare a holiday' has not listed the word apparently because she knew it. She was not one of the group that sought clarifications. It is, therefore, gratifying that she did not claim 'declare' as 'uptake'.
That the word 'declared' was uptaken by 7 learners is hardly surprising in view of the fact that

1) learners' interaction with the teacher had highlighted it.

2) the meaning (of 'declare') given by the teacher was easily statable and grasppable. (Hence, all 7 reporters were able to assign the meaning). The easy meaning helped uptake.

3) the word was familiar in the context of cricket and this familiarity aided recall.

5.16.1.5 Selfless

This, a word which the teacher had decided to concentrate on as it was crucial to the understanding of the ideas in the paragraph. Therefore, she herself introduced it early in the discourse by first asking its meaning. From lines 86-93 the teacher focuses on giving its meaning mainly through paraphrase and thereafter she weaves the word in her talk and asks learners questions on the text context which require them to use the word (See, for example, lines 102-106, 135-140, 440)\(^\text{22}\) This is a way of reinforcing

\(^{22}\)For example:

| T  | And what kind of work should you do? |
| Nirmala | Selfless |
| T  | Selfless |
| S  | Selfless - (lines 102-106) |
| T  | ...If we have lots of money, we must see that a little of that goes towards charity. So that other people who are poor get a little. What kind of service is that? |
| S  | Selfless |
| T  | Selfless service, selfless service. (lines 135-140) |
the word and enabling learners to get its meaning. It indicates that when the teacher is keen she can devise appropriate treatment to facilitate the uptake of a word. The teacher uses 8 categories of treatment and the learners use 3. Thus there is variety in treatment. However, what perhaps facilitated uptake was not merely variety of categories used but also the teacher's special effort (discussed above) in providing treatment.

5.16.1.6 Adhere

This word was not included in the teacher's agenda. The teacher however did briefly give its meaning—(line 409-10) both general and contextual. Yet, about 15 lines later (line 427) a learner asked its meaning and the teacher repeated it. She used 8 categories of treatment among which are: Giving a synonym, paraphrasing meaning, giving meaning in a multiword phrase and also reinforcing the meaning. The teacher, however neither made any special effort to establish the word and its meaning nor did she try to differentiate the general meaning from the context meaning clearly. Learners, therefore, remained unsure of the meaning. This is suggested in the interview data (Lines 412-413). The transcript suggests that learners attended only after a learner had brought the word back into the discourse by asking its meaning (line 427).
Numerically considered, there are 8 different types of treatment. But there is a wide gap between teacher and learner effort. (Teacher 7 categories - Learner 1 category). Apart from giving a 'synonym' and reinforcing meaning, other categories used are probably not specially conducive to uptake. Thus treatment is not substantially 'adequate'. It is apparently learner initiation that seems to have impressed the word on the minds of other learners.

5.16.1.7 Crumbling

The teacher intended "to jump" this word as it was not necessary for the comprehension of ideas. So, the teacher reads the sentence "We cannot climb the mountain if the ground at our feet is crumbling" (p.8, lines 259-60, tapescript). Without a pause, she continues to explicate and re-explicate ideas, for example, about being good ourselves before we can make others good. She speaks of the importance of service to others, responds to a learner's query about the word 'serve' and then herself introduces the word 'humility' and then follow 11 lines of treatment on 'humility' (see discussion on p.3849). Meanwhile some learners have been waiting for an opportunity to ask the meaning of 'crumbling' which the teacher had obviously ignored. In line 297 a learner at last asks 'crumbling?' The teacher is obliged to respond and so she briefly treats the word using the categories 'paraphrase' and then a
'multi-word phrase'. (tapescript lines 298-299; 301-302)

Teacher treatment is brief and insignificant but learner treatment plays an important role in the uptake of this word. Significantly a learner has introduced the word by asking its meaning. As it is highlighted, and other learners are attentively listening to the teacher, Kusum checks on the meaning given by the teacher and the teacher confirms it. (See lines 303, 304). These two categories, namely, 'Learner checking on meaning' and 'teacher confirming meaning' have 'react' functions - they are interactive in nature and so serve to draw other learners' attention to the learning opportunities thus created.

At the interview with the researcher, Mamta recalled the gesture used by the teacher to suggest the meaning of 'crumbling'.

Mamta She did like this with her
(meaning fingers) .......

23 T 'Crumbling' is becoming all uh like dust, crumbling, becoming dust. -(Lines 298-299).

T ..... 'Crumble' is 'become powder, become pow- become like dust. -(Lines 301-302).

24 Kusum xx dust?
T hm? dust .. Then -(Lines 303-304).
This suggests that even gestures are learning opportunities valued by learners as they help make memorable what happens in the classroom, and in turn facilitate uptake.

The above discussion on 'crumbling' further suggests that though the category types used are only 6, the lack of variety is compensated for by the brief teacher-learner interaction which highlights the word. The distribution of categories between the teacher and learners is also balanced. The teacher uses 4 categories and the learners 2. Treatment and uptake thus correlate.

At the interview with the researcher, the teacher pointed out that after almost explaining "crumbling" as 'becoming powder', she thought learners might associate it with the powder they put on their faces and so she thought it better to say 'becoming dust'. Here, the teacher's effort to modify input is guided by her intuitive insight into likely learner behaviour and possible language learning problems. In this connection, Stephen Gaies says:

In communication it is the responsibility of speakers to evaluate in advance the effect of an utterance on their listeners by taking into consideration both the immediate context and everything with which the referent is likely to be confused.

(Gaies; 1983(a), p.193)
5.16.2 **Group B**

The uptake of words in Group B will now be discussed and then overall comments on both groups will be presented together.

5.16.2.1 **Animate**

Here is another word which the teacher was simply not inclined to dwell on. She had decided to give a very rough gloss (See teacher's interview with the researcher, lines 226-249). With learners asking the meaning she was obliged to respond. Though she did give the general meaning as well as the context meaning one does not find the teacher making any special effort to help learners see how the context meaning fitted. The context meaning given was: 'to encourage people'. It is evident from the lesson tapescript that learners could not understand the word 'encourage' (See lines 386 in the tapescript). Even as they were trying to articulate the word, the teacher had moved on to the next sentence 'The whole of the East reflects our culture'. At the interview with the researcher, some learners pointed out that they had not understood the context meaning given by the teacher. (Interview script, lines 655-676).

Five categories of treatment have been used. (Teacher 3; Learners 2). The teacher gives the meaning in a multi-word
phrase, then gives the context meaning, and finally repeats meaning. Learners ask meaning and repeat meaning. Not only is the treatment poor in quantum and variety, it is poor in quality too. No categories with a react function have been used as in the case of 'declare' or even 'crumbling' above. As a result of inadequate treatment only 4 learners could uptake the word. As pointed out, some learners failed to understand the meaning of 'encourage'. They may have given up the attempt to hold on to the word when they could not make sense of the meaning.

5.16.2.2 **Great heights**

At the interview the teacher said that she was thrown off her balance by learners asking the meaning of 'great heights' "because they were drawing me into the metaphor and I did not ....... want to tell them either the metaphor or the meaning of 'great heights". (Lines 104-107). The lesson tapescript shows the teacher giving the literal meaning in different words including the example of Mount Everest as the highest mountain in the world. Kusum meanwhile has already given the meaning in Hindi शून्य उंचाई. Apparently the literal meaning was already familiar to most (if not all) of them. So that later when very briefly, in just a sentence the teacher hinted at the metaphorical meaning (lines 257-258), the learners may have tuned out or it may be that the meaning "improve our qualities" did not
register when it was given in so casual a manner. The focus on the literal meaning was it seems hardly necessary.

At the interview with the researcher, the learners spontaneously (that is with no probing) gave the metaphorical meaning both in English and in Hindi ('make progress' प्रगती करना). It may be noted that they did not give the metaphorical meaning in the teacher's words namely, 'improve our qualities' and that supports the point about 'tuning out' made above. How did they arrive at the metaphorical meaning 'make progress'? The researcher may here draw the reader's attention to the post-session test (match words with meanings) given after the uptake list had already been completed. In this test the meaning to be matched with 'reach great heights' was 'make progress'. The learners had matched it correctly and so could recall it as well as translate it into Hindi at the interview. It appears that this metaphor may be common in Indian languages too and so the teacher was needlessly concerned about 'being drawn into it'. In fact, at the interview with the researcher, the learners offered only the metaphorical meaning and added that the teacher had said 'hill' and 'Everest' (that is the literal meaning), thereby suggesting perhaps, that they were mature enough to understand the metaphor.
That only 4 learners reported the word even though 8 categories of treatment were used, is easily explained. The expression in its literal sense was already known to learners while the metaphorical sense did not register until the uptake sheets had been completed. (Learners were not allowed to look again at the uptake they had listed.)

5.16.2.3 Humility

The word was focussed on by the teacher because it is important for understanding the message in the lesson.
The teacher asked its meaning, paraphrased the meaning, repeated it and referred to 'pride' which is its opposite in meaning. This treatment is clearly insufficient to highlight a word for recall.

Secondly the word did not receive any treatment at all from learners. It has already been pointed out that in this lesson learners tended to tune out when the teacher spoke and attended when peers asked the meaning of a word. This further explains why the word was reported only by 3 learners.

5.16.2.4 Share

This word does not occur in the text book. The teacher introduced it in her talk as it was crucial in explicating the main ideas in the text. She focussed on the spelling, asked the meaning and illustrated the use of the word through several examples which were intended to explicate the idea of selfless service and of going out of oneself to help others. It is doubtful whether the learners listened to her. As already pointed out, they were generally inclined to tune out of teacher-talk of a monologue nature. Of the 4 categories of treatment used, 3 have the function 'give'. There is none with 'react' as its function. Teacher

For example: People who make lots of money must share their money with others. (lines 238-239)

Graduates .. must share their knowledge with others. (lines 237-238).
treatment of the word is little while learner treatment is nil. It has been observed in this lesson that most words uptaken by a larger group of learners are words which learners themselves focussed on whenever they negotiated with the teacher to work out the meaning.

Thus the main reasons for 'share' not being uptaken by more than 1 learner could possibly be

1) inadequate treatment
2) absence of learner involvement.

It is also possible that some learners were familiar with the word. However the researcher feels that 'share' as noun would be familiar rather than 'share' as verb.

5.16.2.5 Principle

This word has occurred and its meaning negotiated earlier in Lesson 3(see tapescript lines 579-605). Learners being already familiar with the word, it has not been listed as uptake except by 1 learner. The teacher has used the categories of 'deliberately reinforcing word' and 'deliberately reinforcing meaning', (because the word was important for the understanding of the ideas she was explaining). Such treatment would normally have met with higher uptake figures. But as already pointed out most learners knew the word.
5.16.3 Conclusion to analysis of uptake in Lesson 5

The above discussion of words in Groups A and B clearly indicates that in most instances high uptake figures against a word are matched by adequacy of treatment and vice versa. The discussion also suggests that words already familiar to learners (for example, principle) and words not clearly presented by the teacher (for example, 'animate' and 'great heights' - metaphorical sense) may not be claimed as uptake even though treatment counts may be fairly high in quantitative terms. Further, a word that is deliberately reinforced by the teacher, for example 'selfless', has a greater chance of being uptaken. Finally in this lesson more than in any other discussed so far, it appears that a word has a greater chance of being uptaken when a learner introduces it in the discourse rather than if the teacher does. This view is supported by Slimani (1987). However, it may be because in this lesson the teacher had a lopsided lesson plan of summarising ideas which she carried out with a missionary zeal repeating the same concepts, often in the same words over and over again (See tapescript lines 154-167; 234-240; 321-345; 352-360; 365-367; 420-425; 487-493; 506-526). The resulting lengthy monologues perhaps proved so monotonous to the learners that they ceased to listen when the teacher spoke. This does not however mean that teacher-initiated
turns would always draw less attention and the input provided by the teacher would have less chance of being uptaken. In fact, teacher initiated turns may have an equal chance of drawing learners' attention and teacher-input even a better chance of uptake if the teacher invites learner interaction and guards against monopolising talk.

Allwright (1986, p.7), summarising some of the findings (albeit tentative) of research conducted at Lancaster, observes:

... the teacher is generally much more highly valued as a source than any learner, for no doubt obvious reasons ..

5.17 Teaching Induced Errors

There are instances in the uptake data sheets of certain errors which can be traced back to inadvertent lapses in the teaching. For instance learners would recall a word correctly but assign an incorrect meaning to it. This incorrect meaning appears in some cases to be attributable to certain utterances made by the teacher. The interaction around each such instance is analysed below. Evidence from interview data is also quoted where necessary. This discussion is presented here separately (instead of along with the discussion on uptake) because it relates not to the uptake of words but to meanings of the words.
As three out of the 4 words discussed under the heading 'Teaching induced errors' are in Lesson 5, this section is placed at the end of the analysis of Lesson 5. The 4 words are:

(i) Humility  (ii) Crumbling  (iii) Selfless
(from Lesson 5) and  (iv) Retain (from Lesson 4).

5.17.1 Humility

The meaning learners assigned to this word in their uptake sheets was 'proud' (instead of 'not pride' or at least 'not proud'). It seems that the error can be traced back to the tapescript of the lesson (See Lesson 5, p.9, lines 290-296). The teacher says:

T  You are not proud. You are not proud. You have no pride, then you have humility. We mustn't say we are very clever. We must use what we know to help others. We must not be proud – PROUD. There is no word like 'proudy'. Pride is the noun, 'proud' is the adjective.

S  Adjective.

T  All right? Proud, PROUD.

She is a proud girl.

In the above excerpt one notices so much focus, so much stress laid on 'proud' that the significance of 'not' which is essential to the meaning of 'humility' is lost. The
teacher spells the word 'proud' twice, she distinguishes between the noun 'pride' and the adjective 'proud'. She even points to the common error learners are prone to committing namely, 'proudly'. She constructs a sentence using the adjective 'proud'. Is it therefore likely that the teaching focus led to the error? The teacher could have introduced the word 'humble' given examples of people behaving in a manner characterized as 'proud' or 'humble'. Then come to the noun form 'humility'. Would it have been better to say 'humility' is the opposite of 'pride' and not talk of 'pride' at all, unless the students had difficulty in grasping the word itself?

At the interview with the teacher, when the students recall of meaning was brought to her notice she said:

T You see, they don't listen to negatives. They only think of the big words. That not proud changes the meaning, they don't remember.

This view expressed by the teacher actually conflicts with Chaudron's who says:

Opposites are probably very noticeable for the L2 learner, owing to the predominant use of negation in such elaboration. e.g. 'chastity - 'no sex'; 'tranquility' - 'not getting excited'.

(Chaudron 1979)
One is inclined to agree with Chaudron because it appears from the teacher's explanation of 'humility' quoted above, that she did not stress the negative word - 'not'. Had she done so, the error may not have occurred. Such deliberate even exaggerated stress becomes necessary when blackboard work is avoided.

5.17.2 Crumbling

Learners recalled the word 'crumbling' but the meaning they assigned to it was either 'powder', or 'dust'. It is obvious that learners do not take cognisance of the form of a word. For example, the --ing form which is indicative of a participle here, while 'powder' and 'dust' are nouns.

The teacher treated the word as follows:--

T  'Crumbling is 'becoming all uh like dust, crumbling becoming dust. How can you have a big hill, if every thing is breaking up? For a hill to be very high, it has to become firm, not crumble. 'Crumble' is 'become powder''become powder', like dust.

Kusum  xx dust?

T  hm? dust ...

(p.10, lines 298-304)
It may be observed that the teacher did say 'becoming dust' 'become powder' like dust. What registered with the learners was only the nouns 'dust' and 'powder'.

At the interview the teacher explained that she thought they might think the powder they put on their faces, so she quickly added 'like dust'. "They (the learners) are drawn to nouns" she concluded. (Interview with the teacher on Lesson 5. Lines 287-288).

It appears that this observation of the teacher is (according to her) borne out by learners responses in Lesson 2 as well. At the interview with the researcher, the teacher refers to lines 105-154 of the tapescript of Lesson 2. She says she had asked the learners what needed to be done with the students that had been trained. She had expected the answer 'send them out' but "every other noun they said: 'engineers, agriculturists 'scientists everything 'country', uh uh 'university' everything except 'send them out' ..... you have to lead them through ...." (lines 25-30, interview with the teacher).

As the teacher is recalling the interaction of Lesson 2 after a lapse of time, she merely reproduces the overall impression. It is true that learners took quite long to pick on the required answer. However, though they did give one noun after another, several nouns listed by the teacher were never mentioned.
In any case if (as the teacher suggests) students are in fact drawn towards nouns, then the teacher ought to have highlighted 'becoming' sufficiently and emphasised the full expression 'becoming powder/dust'.

It seems it is very essential to train learners to
1) listen carefully and to check doubts at once.
2) perceive the different forms of words and be able to identify them.
3) develop basic control over syntax.

5.17.3 Selfless

Learners recalled this word but assigned the meaning 'for others' instead of 'not for oneself but for others'.

The interaction on this word is as follows:

T What's the meaning of 'selfless service'? What's the meaning of 'selfless'?
S xx
T For others.
Virbala For others.
T For others not for ourselves. Okay? When we do any work, we must do it for others. Not for ourselves ... Okay? Now that is selfless service.

(Lesson 5, p.3, lines 86-93)
Analysing this excerpt, one notices that the teacher herself gives the meaning 'for others'. One of the learners even repeats the meaning given by the teacher. Thus, the students may have listened to the teacher, as well as, the learner who repeated the meaning. They may have taken in the meaning and then switched off. Later, when the teacher elaborates 'For others not for ourselves' there is perhaps hardly anyone attending to her. Therefore, had the teacher said this initially and in fact put it the other way round namely, 'Not for oneself but for others', it is likely that the precise meaning would have registered with the students. Hence, it is not only what a teacher says but when and how that matters.

5.17.4 Retain

The learners recalled the word but they assigned it the meaning 'keep it' instead of 'keep'. A possible reason for their doing so may be traced in the classroom interaction. Three excerpts from the tapescript are quoted and analysed below.

i) T  Must we neglect science and technology? No we must retain it. We must keep it. We must keep it.
      (Lines 229-230)

ii) T  You must learn this - science, technology all these things must be learned. Retain them, keep them.
      (Lines 233-234)
iii) Lata: 'Retain' means 'keep it'?  

T: 'Keep it', 'keep in your possession', 'keep it', 'Keep, keep with you', 'don't throw away.'  

(Lines 238-240)

In (i) the teacher says 'keep it' twice - obviously because 'it' there refers to science and technology as a subject of study, as one set of learning/knowledge imparted to university students. The learners probably miss the anaphoric reference. In (ii) the teacher says 'keep them'. 'Them' here refers to science and technology taken separately. Again apparently the learners miss the anaphoric reference.

In (iii) a learner checks on the meaning, whether 'retain' means 'keep it'. Promptly the teacher's response echoes 'keep it'. Had the teacher been able to process the learner's difficulty in understanding cohesive links, she would probably have said 'No, 'retain' means 'keep'. As it happens, she says 'keep it' twice. Between the first utterance and the second, she says "Keep in your possession". Perhaps, realising that the word 'possession' may not be grasped, she later rephrases her utterance and says 'keep, keep with you', 'don't throw away'. However, it appears, that these attempts at simplifying are lost on the learners as they have probably switched off, after noting down 'keep it' as the meaning of 'retain'.
When learners were asked at the interview session, why they made the mistake, they said: 'Miss ने कहा छा ना' (Miss said 'keep it'). (Interview on Lesson 4, Line 208).

The above discussion suggests that this is perhaps a teacher-induced error unwittingly caused. It also points to the heavy demand made on teachers. They must listen carefully to learners' responses and be alert enough to anticipate possible problems which are likely to lead to error.

PART (vi)
Lesson 6
The Man Who Saved Pumple'sdrop

5.18 Introduction

Over the 5 sessions of 'A Call to Youth', students faulty study habits had been causing great concern to the teacher and the researcher.

(1) There was the problem of holding learners' attention. Often learners latched on to the first word uttered by the teacher and did not benefit from any useful information that followed.

(2) Learners did not note the spelling of words in the text-book.
(3) According to the teacher learners' undue worry about difficult words impeded comprehension of ideas.

It was felt that a change in the teaching strategy was needed to ensure that learners listened carefully and scanned the text for useful information and for the spellings of words. The first few pages of the tape transcript of Lesson 6 (which begins 'The Man Who Saved Pumblesdrop') illustrates the new strategy. The students first listen to the gist of the paragraph. Then they listen carefully to questions which require them to scan about 5 lines of the text and pick out either a relevant word or relevant information as required. The teacher gives necessary clues to enable learners to guess the meanings of words or she gives the meaning as a clue to help learners locate the word.

How far the change in strategy helped in overcoming the problem of attention will be discussed later. Whether the strategy benefited the class as a whole will also be considered.

The new teaching strategy briefly discussed above necessarily entails more learner involvement and participation leading to greater classroom interaction. The appearance of the transcript itself suggests this. Both
teacher and learner turns are short and follow one another in quick succession. The contrast between Lesson 5 and Lesson 6 is thus obvious. Whereas in Lesson 5, the learners had managed to get some interaction going, in Lesson 6 the teacher invites, encourages interaction - even insists on it. With patient effort and experienced skill she succeeds in getting learners to find out answers to questions, to locate words and guess meanings in response to clues. This kind of effort, on the teacher's part, though conspicuously absent in Lesson 5, had shown itself in earlier lessons, but never consistently over a whole lesson. It had met with success whenever the teacher had patience to wait for a learner to answer, prodding her meanwhile. (See for example tapescript, Lesson 3, lines 505-526, that is interaction on 'classics'.) Generally, however, the teacher seemed to be in too much haste to allow the necessary "wait-time" (Cazden, 1986) and so she preferred to answer the questions herself and proceed. Speaking about the patience and effort that the teacher's task demanded, the teacher says: "You have to lead them through - push them (that is the learners) back to the sentence." (Lines 30-31 - Interview on Lesson 2). Aware of

---

26 The kind of interaction where a teacher turn is one among several learner turns, perhaps, still remains a challenge in a teacher-fronted classroom.
the occasions when her efforts had met with success, she says:

"They (the learners) did it in spurts. Off and on ... it was not a continuous method - I mean a continuous reaction (of the learners) which you could gauge."

(See interview on Lesson 2, lines 109-111).

The discerning reader will see that in saying "it was not a continuous method", the teacher has unconsciously uttered the truth and then corrected herself. Perhaps it could not become "a continuous reaction" of the learners because the teacher had not striven to make it "a continuous method". And yet, no one who has had even a little experience of ESL teaching in adverse circumstances will blame her. In all sincerity she adds: "It was very difficult. Both for them and me." (See, Interview on Lesson 2, Lines 75-76.)

When asked by the researcher, whether learners would be more likely to remember words and meanings because they had been helped (in Lesson 6) to find them out for themselves, the teacher promptly retorted:

"No, I made them, not helped them, I told them I was not going to do it."

(See interview following Lesson 6, lines 120-121).
The teacher's words indicate that she had put in deliberate and determined effort.

It must, however, be pointed out that the teacher's focus was (as always) largely on comprehension. She had made it a point not to allow learners, as far as possible, to sidetrack her with queries on meanings of words. She was not going to neglect words but she would orient learners to focus on words only when it became necessary for answering comprehension questions. Towards the end of the lesson, as time was running out the teacher's grip on this orientation weakened.

5.19 Uptake in Lesson 6

The 19 words uptaken in this lesson are presented below in descending order of the number of reporters for each word. The total treatment received by each word as well as the distribution of treatment between the teacher and learners is shown in columns on the right.
### TABLE VI

**UPTAKE IN LESSON 6**

No. of Learners Present: 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words</th>
<th>No. of reporters</th>
<th>Total Treatment</th>
<th>Teacher Treatment</th>
<th>Learner Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Insignificant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 In succession</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Depression</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Harvest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Cause</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Consequently</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Principal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Owing to</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Quite</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Amenities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Hand to mouth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Casual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Prosperous</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Detour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Quiet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Grain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Direct route</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Excellent shops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Cheap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.20 **Analysis of Uptake in Lesson 6**

For convenience in discussing them, the words may be grouped as follows:-

**Group A** :- Words that have been reported by 5 (that is, near 50 per cent) or more learners and have received in numerical terms at least a good amount of treatment, that is 8 or more categories.

**Group B** :- Words that have received 8 or more categories of treatment regardless of the number of reporters.

**Group C** :- Words where the figures of the number of learners uptaking and the treatment figures are both relatively low.

Thus the words in the respective groups are:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>Owing to</td>
<td>casual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In succession</td>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td>quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>hand to mouth</td>
<td>grain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest</td>
<td>detour</td>
<td>cheap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause</td>
<td>direct route</td>
<td>quite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequently</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The word 'prosperous' cannot be included in any of the above groups and so will be considered separately.
5.20.1 **Group A**

Each word in Group A may now be considered in terms of treatment and in relation to any other factor that may have aided or hindered its uptake.

5.20.1.1 **Insignificant**

The word 'insignificant' which has been reported by 9 out of 11 learners present, received adequate treatment in terms of variety (15 categories); their distribution (Teacher 12, Learners 3); and in terms of quality too, as indicated by the category labels. There are categories with 'react' function namely 'teacher gives clue' (tapescript lines 877-878), teacher (here, observer) confirms meaning (tapescript line 1060). Then there are other categories which were assumed to be conducive to uptake (see 4.6.4) such as teacher deliberately reinforces word (tapescript line 1056), teacher deliberately reinforces meaning (tapescript line 1057), teacher gives an example (tapescript line 1056-57). The three learner categories, namely ask meaning (line 1052); check on meaning (line 1059) Guess (here, locate) word (line 879) are also likely to have played a crucial role in facilitating uptake. The last two

---

27This reinforcement is the result of word and meaning being juxtaposed and not in view of the example - else every example would count as reinforcement.
have a react function which was assumed earlier to be conducive to uptake. Lastly, the teacher focuses on the negative prefix. The correlation between uptake and treatment is apparent.

However, it may be worthwhile to analyse the tapescript to see how and at what point all the above interaction occurred in the classroom. The teacher tried hard to elicit the answer to the question why Pumplesdrop was not a tourist centre. She would have been very pleased if she had got the response - 'because it was insignificant' and further that it was insignificant because it was merely a shopping and business centre. Instead she got the response 'industrial town' which was factually an incorrect answer indicating that the earlier information regarding Pumplesdrop 'being a large buyer from distant industrial towns' had not registered with the learners. While correcting the learner, the teacher briefly pointed out that Pumplesdrop was only a business centre (See lines 865-877) and then repeated the question 'what kind of a town was it?' Was it boring? (line 878) At this point, Nirmala chanced to find the word 'insignificant'. As she could not pronounce it, she began to read out its spelling, thus drawing other learners' attention, and more so because the teacher praised her.

It may be observed that if the students had been very attentive to the teacher's question, the word 'boring' might
have got connected with the word 'insignificant' leading perhaps to a teacher-induced error later. However, "often learners are not paying enough attention to notice inconsistencies". (Allwright - personal communication).

After pointing to the negative prefix 'in' the teacher gave 'not a great place for people to come and see' as the meaning of 'insignificant town'. Further information was imparted. Several other words were dealt with, namely, 'prosper', 'depression', 'hand to mouth', 'detour', 'direct route' and save for the incidental use of the word 'insignificant' in line 900, the word did not receive any further treatment while the teaching session continued. Finally, after the lesson had ended, the tape-recorder switched off, a learner asked the meaning of 'insignificant' (line 1052) and met with the same response from the teacher - 'not a great town'. At this point the observer 28 unwittingly forgetting her non-participating role, entered the interaction and contributed the meaning 'not important'. That it registered at once is borne out by the fact that a learner repeated the meaning. The teacher then contributed a sentence 29

---

28 For convenience, the observer's turns are reckoned as the teacher's in the category count.

29T : Quite a few of the meanings you ask me are 'insignificant' 'not important'; you will know this when you learn more English.

(Lines 1056-1058)
to illustrate the word 'insignificant' and by juxtaposing the word and its meaning (not important) had them both reinforced in the same sentence. Further evidence of the fact that both word and meaning had registered with the learners is provided by a learner's question—seeking a clarification:

S Then 'significant' is 'important'?

The observer at once confirmed it with

O Yes. 'In' there is the negative.

It is, perhaps, pertinent to point out that almost all the teacher and learner categories of treatment used, are concentrated in the nine lines of interaction which occurred after the lesson had been officially concluded. What is important is that a learner initiated the extended interaction thereby reintroducing the word into the discourse and focusing the attention of other learners on the word once again. One wonders whether the word 'insignificant' would have been uptaken by as many as 9 learners if the extended interaction had not taken place. Almost every line of the extended interaction offers a learning opportunity. Of course 'recency effect' (Snodgrass et al 1985) has also to be taken into account when considering the uptake of this word as the uptake sheets were given to learners immediately after the extended session discussed above.
Another question that comes to mind is why did the teacher not give the meaning 'not important'. Why did she repeat the meaning 'not great'? It may be because the passage in the text-book opens with the words "The important but not capital town of Pumplin'sdrop ...." In any case, whatever be the reason, the meaning 'not great' hardly seems plausible even in the given context. It would be more precise, perhaps, to say 'not important' and add 'not important for the tourist' in this context.

Eight of the nine learners who reported the word 'insignificant' assigned it the meaning 'not important'. None assigned it the meaning 'not great' even though the latter was easy enough to remember and had as much chance of being recalled considering 'recency effect' too.

Were learners intuitively unhappy with the meaning 'not great'? Did they have a vague recollection of encountering the word earlier in another context? Would some learners associate the meaning 'not great' with the word 'insignificant' in all other contexts later? Is it pedagogically advisable to give only the context meaning of a word (even if it fits well in that context) to ESL learners of average and below average competence?

Besides drawing attention to these questions, the above discussion once again points to the fact that learner
initiation of interaction and learner participation in the 
discourse significantly contribute towards uptake.

5.20.1.2 In succession

_expression_ This expression was also uptaken by 9 out of 11 learners present. The treatment it received seems quite adequate in terms of variety, distribution and quality. Eleven different categories have been employed and these have been fairly distributed between teacher and learners. (Teacher 7 - learners 4). Among the categories used by the teacher are, deliberate reinforcement of meaning on 3 occasions (tapescript lines 398-99, 455 and 953) and deliberate reinforcement of word in line 951. Such reinforcement is very likely to play a crucial role in facilitating uptake as was assumed in 4.6.4.

The next category assumed to be highly conducive to uptake is 'the teacher giving a clue to elicit meaning from learners. (lines 347-48 - tapescript). When a clue is given learners are encouraged to find out the meaning themselves and the effort that goes into the task is likely to fix the word better in memory than if the meaning were given straightaway by the teacher. This seems to be the teacher's view as well.

_T_. See you found out things, that is why you'll remember them. If I give you meanings, you just listen to me, write it down, close the book, go home and forget it. (Lines 459-461 - Lesson tapescript)
Incidentally, this excerpt indicates that the teacher had consciously changed her teaching strategy. The learner category of guessing the meaning in response to a clue (line 349) has a 'react' function and so it has the potential for the uptake of the word as was assumed in 4.6.4.

It may be observed that unlike the interaction on 'insignificant' which occurred largely in one part of the lesson, the interaction in relation to 'in succession' / 'succession of' is spread over the lesson (see transcript, Lesson 6, pages 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 28) so that learners are constantly reminded of the word and its meaning. In fact one of the learner categories used is 'recall meaning'. At intervals learning opportunities are created and learners' attention is focused on the word. One reason for repeated reinforcement of the word, by the teacher is that the word appears quite crucial for the comprehension of the main ideas in the paragraph. It appears very likely that treatment has contributed largely to the uptake of the word.

At the interview with the learners, the researcher tried to check at random if learners could recall the meanings of 'in succession' and 'insignificant'. It was encouraging to find them able to do so promptly.

5.20.1.3 Depression

The word 'depression' was uptaken by 7 out of 11 learners present. Twelve categories of treatment were
used. Eight by the teacher and 4 by the learners. Thus in terms of variety and distribution, (the learners have used half as many categories as the teacher) the treatment appears adequate. Quality-wise it is not as rich as in the case of 'insignificant' and 'in succession'. The teacher does give a clue to enable learners find the word. She accepts the word which learners guess, accepts the meaning they recall, she herself focuses on the spelling and gives the meaning in a multiword phrase. Thus categories with 'give' as function and 'react' as function are both employed. What is missing is deliberate reinforcement of word by the teacher. The teacher herself said at the interview that she had not focussed on the word. (Lines 77-81). At any rate, it seems that the new strategy she adopted in this lesson, the strategy of getting learners involved by looking for the word in the text-book, noticing the spelling, repeating its meaning themselves (instead of having the teacher repeat it) is beginning to yield some dividend already. The uptake sheets now show fewer careless spelling errors. In earlier lessons there were many more instances ofuptaken words being rejected on account of wrong spelling. However, even the word 'depression' had to be rejected as the spelling was incorrect - it came close to the spelling of 'depreciation'. The researcher tried to probe learners to find out if (1) 'depression' was a familiar word (2) whether
the 2 learners who misspelt 'depression' (so that it resembled 'depreciation') had mixed up the two words 'depression' and 'depreciation'. For example, Nirmala had written 'depresiation'. Her response at the interview seemed to confirm the view. She referred to the terms N.N.P. and G.N.P.\(^{30}\) which are used in economics in relation to 'depreciation' of income. It was difficult to get learners to talk intelligibly enough on the issue. Despite several efforts, the researcher could not fathom whether learners had come across the word 'depression' in their commerce subjects. The last attempt was to get learners to bring their economics text-book and point out the word they had studied. This they did and the word they showed the researcher was 'depreciation'. Thus it is quite likely that 'depression' was not a familiar word, and that Nirmala certainly and perhaps Mamta too had mixed up 'depression' with 'depreciation'. According to Mamta, 'depression' had something to do with national income.\(^{31}\) Therefore, there does seem to be some truth in the teacher's

\(^{30}\)(See line 105, Interview with Nirmala and other learners on Lesson 6)

\(^{31}\)(See interview with Mamta and others, lines 76-77, 81-82 and line 98).
comment which would otherwise seem biased. "They don't pay attention to a word at all. It's just a - it's just an overall impression that matters." (See Interview with the teacher on Lesson 6, lines 108-109). Though this view is supported by learners' spelling errors found in the uptake sheets of earlier lessons, one can hopefully look forward to remedying the evil by using the strategy employed in this lesson - the strategy of getting learners to look into the text-books and notice the spellings of words carefully, and also by an appropriate use of the blackboard.

Going back to the analysis of treatment of 'depression' above, one notices that both numerical and qualitative aspects of treatment are likely to have facilitated uptake.

5.20.1.4 Harvest

This word was also reported by 7 learners. Twelve different categories of treatment have been used and these are fairly distributed between the teacher and the learners. (Teacher 8 - learners 4).

The word is introduced by Raakhi who asks its meaning in line 278 and again in line 281. The teacher refrains from giving the meaning. Instead she describes the process, 'harvesting'. She uses a gesture along with the verbal description. As learners listen to her and watch her they guess the meaning. Lata promptly says 'Cutting'. The
teacher improves on this to render it precise and complete by adding a few words.

T Cutting and collecting the grain. (line 299)

Then at the earliest opportunity (the same line in fact) she reinforces the word.

At the interview with the researcher, the learners gave some very interesting and convincing reasons for the uptake of the word. They said they were familiar with the process 'harvesting' but not the English word that denotes it. They could, therefore, understand the teacher as she described the process. Mamta and Kamleshwari said that the teacher's gesture helped them to recall the word. (See interview with Mamta and others, line 153 and line 166). Nirmala said she paid attention when Raakhi asked the meaning and the teacher talked about 'harvest'. (See, interview with Nirmala and others, line 515). Asha said the word 'harvest' had been used very often in the lesson and added that they were familiar with the concept. (See interview with Asha and Anjou, lines 135-136).

That the word has been used very frequently in the lesson is true. It is a word central to whatever happens in Pumpledrop in the first paragraph of the text. The word 'harvest' occurs 49 times in the tapescript.
The learners' comments indicate that when
1) the concept is familiar, the teacher's language
   is easier to process.
2) gestures help in understanding ideas as well as in the
   uptake of words.
3) learners are aware of some learning opportunities
   for example Nirmala paid attention to Raakhi's
   question - even remembered that it was Raakhi who had
   asked the meaning.
4) treatment has a definite and vital bearing on uptake.
5) in conjunction with adequate treatment, frequency of
   occurrence of a word has a role in facilitating uptake.

Because the use of gesture contributed significantly to the
uptake of 'harvest' it is pertinent to quote from another
interview with learners, an excerpt which reinforces the
importance of gesture. (See interview following Lesson 10,
lines 18).

R How did you remember the expression 'barbed
   wire'? 
Mamta Teacher had explained - there was the madhouse.
   Its walls were low and to prevent anyone coming
   in there were wires joined like this
   (demonstrates 'barbed' by a gesture of her
   fingers.)
R So did you get the meaning partly through the teacher's gesture, action?

Mamta Yes Miss, this kind of action. (Repeats finger gesture.)

5.20.1.5 Cause

The word 'cause' wasuptaken by 5 out of 11 learners. The treatment seems adequate in terms of variety of categories employed, their distribution as well as qualitative value. Nine categories have been used, 6 by the teacher and 3 by learners. The teacher first asks the meaning, later she gives a clue to meaning, a learner guesses the meaning. Earlier, learners ask for the spelling of the word and the teacher gives it. She also adds to the meaning given by a learner and gives the opposite of the word. There is sufficient treatment provided to aid the uptake of the word and so one would have expected a few more learners to have uptaken the word.

It may be necessary to analyse the tapescript to see whether the manner in which the interaction proceeded interfered with the uptake of the word.

A close analysis of the tapescript data suggests that the manner in which the negotiation of meaning was carried out may have unwittingly led learners to wrongly equate the
meanings of 'cause' and 'because' and later of 'reason' and 'result'. It also appears that the confusion which stemmed from the 'cause', 'because' equation was carried over to 'owing to', 'because of', 'due to', 'owe' and 'owning'. However, at the moment, only the first set of four words (cause, because, reason and result) will be discussed in relation to relevant excerpts from the tapecript data. Later, when the uptake of 'owing to' is considered, the second set of words may be looked into.

A close reading of the excerpt from Lesson 6 (lines 354-415) is necessary.

It appears that the teacher's efforts were directed towards helping learners

1) to understand that a succession of bad harvests had made the farmers around Pumplesdrop very poor. Poor harvests were the cause, poverty was the result. (As the word 'consequently' occurs in the next few lines, the teacher may have considered it useful to introduce the word 'result' as well.)

2) to find out the word 'owing to' in response to the clues she gave and further to deduce the meaning of 'owing to' with the help of clues given.
Perhaps the teacher had expected the learners to know the words 'cause' and 'result'. Apparently she mentioned the words together hoping one word would help in understanding the other. On realising that learners did not follow her, she restricted herself to asking them what 'cause' meant. Failing to get a response, the teacher spelt the word and then went on to say:

T  Tell me the meaning of cause. Another word for it.  

(line 362)

S  Because  

(line 363)

T  Ha, what is it? when you say 'because', what is it?  

(line 364)

What are you giving after that ... say, yes, yes  

(line 365)

(line 366)

S  xx  

(line 367)

S  xx  

(line 368)

T  Yes, tell me what is result?  

(line 369)

Kusum  Reason  

(line 370)

T  'Reason', that's right 'reason'. 'Cause' means 'reason'.  

(line 371)

What's result? ... What's result?  

(line 372)

SS  xx  

(line 373)

T  Allright, I'll give you a sentence, okay?  

(line 374)

Kusum  Miss, what we, what we get.  

(line 375)

T  What we get is the result. Allright?  

(line 376)
Now, it may be noticed that in response to the teacher's request that learners give another word for 'cause', a learner offers the word 'because' (line 363). The teacher's 'Ha' in line 364 is ambiguous. It does not indicate to the learners that 'because' does not mean 'cause'. In fact, the 'Ha' may have even suggested acceptance of the response (which it was never intended to). Thus the word 'cause' gets equated, in the learners' minds, with the word 'because'. The teacher is unaware of what has happened. She proceeds thus:

T  Ha, what is it? When you say 'because' what are you giving after that?

Apparently, the teacher is trying to elicit the word 'result'. "Say, say" she pleads, urging learners to speak. Two learners mumble something which even the tape recorder fails to catch. Desperately in line 369, the teacher reframes the question.

T  Yes, tell me what is 'result'?

Just at this point, Kusum, who seems to be, perhaps the only learner who has been following the teacher's queries and also thinking, albeit very slowly, answers.

Kusum  Reason.

T  Reason, that's right reason. 'Cause' means reason. What's result? what's result?
Now, Kusum's response 'reason' (line 370) is the belated response to the teacher's earlier question ... 'Tell me the meaning of 'cause'. Another word for it.' The teacher accepts it with the words 'Reason, that's right 'reason'. Thus, it is quite possible for the word 'reason' to get linked in the learners' mind as the answer to the teacher's question 'what is result'? in the immediately preceding line (line 369). So, first 'because' comes to be confirmed as the meaning of 'cause' and later 'reason' gets accepted (unwittingly though) as the meaning of 'result'. When in the next utterance (same speech) the teacher goes on to say "'cause' means 'reason'", the learners who may have been keeping pace utterance by utterance may not be in a position to hark back over 7 lines to make sense of this utterance. Moreover, some learners may have been too busy making a note of the erroneously inferred meanings of 'cause', 'because', 'reason' and 'result' to attend further to the teacher. Kusum alone gives evidence of having understood the teacher and pleases her a second time by answering the question 'what is result'?

Kusum Miss what we, what we get.

The discussion so far points to the teacher's difficulty in getting things right for Kusum and at the same time getting things rightly communicated to the rest of the
class who are operating on a different wavelength.

It would have been necessary to pause, to recapitulate, to check whether learners were catching up, to clarify, to reinforce and then proceed. The interaction suggests that the teacher has overlooked these essentials. This neglect and the ensuing confusion perhaps explains the relatively low number of students who uptook the word 'cause' even though in terms of categories employed the treatment had been adequate. Interview data will be discussed in the next few pages to see if it supports the interpretation of the tapescript data presented above.

The above discussion perhaps helps us to understand the teacher's comment.

It was not easy ... to frame the questions in such a way that they understood it. Understood the question and knew what they had to do.

- Interview on Lesson 2 ... lines 76-79.

Further, the discussion above, explains, perhaps, why the teacher often preferred to herself answer the question she had posed without waiting for learners to think out the answer and frame it in words.

The next stumbling block to processing the teacher's question begins at line 381. Evidently the teacher wants the learners to find out the word which means 'because of'
(that is 'owing to') but it is only 20 lines later in lines 401-402 that the question is put in a simple straightforward way and a learner promptly gives the correct response in line 403. Meanwhile, between lines 381 and 401, both teacher and learners (including Kusum this time) are tremendously strained in trying to follow one another. In line 383, the teacher asks a question for which there seems to be no answer in the text. 'What is the word for 'harvest' there'? the teacher asks. Surely 'owing to', the answer for which the teacher seems to be labouring is not the answer to the question she has framed. Kusum answers the teacher's question twice. Each time her answer is rejected by the teacher. But this series of exchanges pushes the teacher on to framing the question clearly in lines 401-402 and so a learner at once picks out 'owing to', the required answer. The teacher repeats the words 'owing to' and the meaning 'because of'. At this point, the learners discover that they have been reading 'owing to' as 'owning to' and wondering how it fitted. How the lesson then proceeded as a result of this strange confession will be discussed later in relation to the uptake of 'owing to'.

It may be worthwhile to analyse the interview data now to see if learners had any problem with the uptake of the word 'cause' and whether their comments tie up with the above discussion of the tapescript data.
The following is an excerpt from the researcher's interview with Mamta, Purnima and Kamleshwari after Lesson 6 (that is the opening paragraph of 'The Man Who Saved Pipplesdrop').

The researcher is trying to check if learners remember the meanings of some of the uptaken words.

Researcher ..... Now what is the meaning of 'cause'?

CAUSE.
Purnima Cause means uh
Researcher Kamleshwari? Yes? Purnima?
Mamta Because.
Researcher 'Cause' doesn't mean 'because'
Purnima 'Cause' means uh.
Researcher What is the cause of the strike?
Mamta Reason.

(p.4; lines 103-111)

Could it be that learners had been trying to say "'because' is used to indicate a 'cause'" and were thrown off the track when 'because' was rejected?

The above excerpt, in any case, shows that all the 3 learners being interviewed were not clear about the meaning of 'cause'. Even Mamta, one of the good learners remained under the impression that 'cause' meant 'because'. Only when the researcher used the word 'cause' in a sentence, Mamta was able to figure out the meaning.
The following is another excerpt from the researcher's interview, this time, with Nirmala, Kusum and others after the same lesson.

Rese archer  Okay, what's the meaning of the word 'cause'? Was it a new word?
Lata  Having, having, having.
S  Because.
Rese archer  CAUSE 'cause'.
Lata  Miss at the time of recalling it I was confused.
Nirmala  Miss, first xx.
Lata  I interchanged the meaning of 'owing to' and 'cause'.
Rese archer  Nirmala, what are you saying?
Nirmala  It was the first word 'cause'.
Rese archer  Yes, but what does it mean?
S  Having.
Rese archer  'Cause'. You (pointing to Kusum) gave the meaning.
S  Because of
Rese archer  You (still pointing to Kusum) gave the meaning in class.
Kusum  Reason.  (Lesson 6, Lines 323-338)

It is clear that students had failed to process correctly the classroom interaction - some of which has been
discussed above. In fact, the second excerpt from the interview data suggests that first the meaning of 'cause' came to be regarded as 'because'; later, when the teacher pointed out that 'owing to' meant 'because of' and as learners had read 'owing to' as 'owning to' and as 'owning' meant 'having', 'because' perhaps got connected with 'having' and as 'because' had already been equated with 'cause' in the learners' mind, 'cause' in turn may have got linked with 'having'. This may explain why Lata and an unidentified learner gave 'having' as the meaning of 'cause'. (See excerpt above). Besides, Lata admits she was confused. It is not clear what Nirmala meant by saying 'cause was the first word'. Did she mean first in the network of confusion? It is also not clear why Lata said 'she' interchanged the meaning of 'owing to' and 'cause'. She says in Hindi:

Lata : "Owing to" और "cause" की meaning में विपरीत कर ई है।

According to one learner (see above excerpt) 'cause' means 'because' and according to another it means 'because of'. Even Kusum appears to be puzzled until the researcher, who had observed the class session, reminds her that she had given the correct meaning of 'cause' in class. Thus, both excerpts from the interview data support the interpretation of the tapecript data (relating to 'cause) presented above.
As the researcher did not check whether learners remembered the meaning of 'result', it is not possible to substantiate the latter view that 'reason' and 'result' may have got semantically equated.

Literature in the field of language teaching suggests that teachers feel disconcerted about the mismatch between 'intake' and 'input'. What they perhaps fail to realise is that sometimes intake does match input though not the 'intended' input.

Incidentally, it may be pointed out that the uptake sheets of learners show that one student has recalled 'cause' but assigned it the meaning 'rich'. Another has listed "cause to" and assigned it the meaning "because". It would be interesting if one could work out exactly how learners process input and infer meaning.

**How learners process input, (other instances)**

In the above context, it is perhaps pertinent to pause in the analysis of this lesson and consider about half a dozen excerpts from the interview data of lessons 7 to 10. These excerpts offer interesting insights into the way learners process input.

(a) *Inhabitant*

Here is an instance of learners trying to figure out the meaning of 'inhabitant'.
S : We tried to think out its meaning.

(Line 95 - Lesson 9)

Virbala : Miss, once she (pointing to a student) asked the meaning of 'inhabitant', so she (pointing to another student) said it was the opposite of 'habit'.

(Lesson 9, lines 110-112)

The meaning learners assigned to this word was 'without habit'. It appears they started working from the familiar word आद्यन – 'habit'. Then, knowing that 'in' is a negative prefix, they put the two together disregarding the ending -ant, and concluded that the word meant 'without habit'.

The fact that the learners proceeded from the known to the unknown is significant.

The above error points to the need for teachers to focus on word forms (for example, here 'inhabit' -verb 'inhabitant' - noun) so that errors such as the above are prevented. It may be necessary and helpful for teachers to learn to anticipate the way learners are likely to process input.

(b) Generous

Kusum : At first we thought 'generous' meant 'beautiful'.
Researcher: Why? Explain to me why you thought so.

Kusum: 'Generous' is nice, therefore beautiful.

(Interview following Lesson 8, lines 300-303)

This appears to be a strange kind of learner logic.

Generous is nice
Beautiful is nice
Therefore generous is beautiful.

Kusum's explanation is hardly convincing and further probing was perhaps needed.

(c) Perhaps

At the interview following Lesson 8 it was amazing to learn that the meaning of 'perhaps' (apparently, a simple word) as understood by learners was अभी फूलें (It is now).

Kusum: 'Perhaps' is not a new word, I learned its meaning only yesterday.

Researcher: But then what did you think its meaning was?

Kusum: अभी फूलें!

Researcher: How is the word used according to you?

Kusum: "Bad times are perhaps over"

Researcher: hum?
That would mean 'Bad times are over now'.

Researcher  But now that you know the meaning (of perhaps), can you fit it in? Can you tell me the Hindi word for 'may be' (perhaps)?

Kusum  अब  (now)
Kusum  हो गया  (is over)
Kusum  है, है  (is, is)

(The last 3 responses show that the meaning was still not clear to Kusum).

Researcher  May be, may be not — so what is the meaning in Hindi?

Purnima  Sure नहीं  (not sure)

S  अस्वस्थ

(Thus, at last with considerable effort the right Hindi word was elicited from another student and the meaning of 'perhaps' made clear. (Interview following Lesson 8, lines 46-85).

Long after the interview, it struck the researcher that Kusum may, possibly have confused the word 'perhaps' with the word 'present'. It was not possible to check this with her. The incident, however, suggests that appropriate probing can be rewarding in enabling research effort to get at the learning process.
(d) **Be in harmony**

'Be in harmony' is the expression being discussed. The context in which it was used was of one's clothes being in harmony. The teacher had used the expression 'to go together'. Kusum recalled the word 'harmony' but put down 'to get together' as its meaning. Why? At the interview, the researcher asked her what 'to get together' meant and Kusum answered. दिल्लन, ओङक साथ मिलना She also said, ओङक साथ में खाना. The latter response shows that she got the meaning in Hindi in her head and translated it into English. Hence ओङक साथ मिलना - to get together. Further probing confirmed that she had understood the meaning.

It is possible that some learners resort to processing the meaning in the mother tongue and then translating it into English.

(See interview following Lesson 8, Lines 6-37).

(e) **Arrival; departure**

Learners had very very strange ideas about the words "arrival" and "departure". They had heard/read these words in announcements at railway stations. (Arrival and departure of trains). But
'arrival' they thought was the 'joining' of the train to the 'engine' and 'departure' was its 'separating' from the engine.

Researcher ... Arrival and departure?
Kusum I had heard of it but knew its meaning only in Hindi.
Researcher What is its meaning in Hindi.
Kusum We had a wrong Hindi meaning in our heads.
Researcher What was it?
Kusum जोड़ना To join
Researcher And what did you think 'departure' meant?
Kusum 'Departure' The train when it comes
Researcher hm
Kusum तो वह जो दो होते हैं न तो उससे मिलते हैं (Those two that are there get joined to it)
Purnima The engines that are in front.
Researcher hm?
Kusum तो जूतसे बूढ़ते हैं और 'departure' आने अलग होते हैं (So they join and 'departure' means they separate).

(The learners associated 'arrival' and 'departure' with the joining and the separating of the train to the engine only at terminus stations from where outstation trains leave. They did not think of 'arrival' and 'departure' of local trains.
According to another learner 'arrival' meant निकलना (to leave the house to go somewhere.)

(See Interview following Lesson 8, lines 93-197)

It is evident that processing of 'input' may be more difficult for a learner who already has preconceived ideas about the meanings of certain words.

Resuming the discussion of words in Group A, Lesson 6, the next word is 'consequently'.

5.20.1.6 Consequently

Five out of eleven learners reported this word. The treatment as the categories suggest in terms of variety, distribution and qualitative value seems quite adequate. Thirteen categories have been used. Nine by the teacher and 4 by learners.

In line 468, (see footnote lines 465-475) the teacher rejects the meaning given by learners, whereupon the learners

32T Allwright, 'consequently' What's the meaning (465) of consequently? ... Allright (466)
S Immediate (467)
T No, no, consequence (468)
S Miss give example (469) xx (470)
T Consequence means what? (471)
S Example दृंढिया-न (472)
T Allright, you - you don't - you haven't studied(473) in the English medium. Consequently, you find (474) English difficult.
S Result (475)
rather uncharacteristically ask her for an example, that is a sentence using the word. Apparently they are seeking a clue to the meaning of the word. Hitherto they had asked for the meaning straightaway. The change in the teaching strategy is making it incumbent for learners to adapt their strategy to the teacher's. It also indicates that the category 'Teacher gives example' is regarded valuable in processing input and in turn facilitating uptake too. It points to learners' awareness of the value of particular learning opportunities. They are moreover exercising control over input. The learners' request is phrased first in English and then in Hindi. As soon as the teacher gives an example (see lines 473-74) a learner is able to infer the correct meaning (line 475), and the teacher accepts it. In addition to these interactive categories, the teacher deliberately reinforces the word and its meaning by weaving it in a metaphor (sowing the seed and harvesting) which promises to be intelligible to learners. (See lines 671-681). Further, the teacher gives a synonym and also relates the word to a different part of speech. Powerful categories (some of which were assumed to be) conducive to uptake have been used and therefore one would have expected more than 5 learners to have uptaken the word. The discourse does not appear to have posed much problem. But a genuine difficulty is presented by the spelling of the word. Uptake entails
recalling a word and writing it out which is far more difficult than mere recognition. It is evident from the uptake sheets that the spelling posed a stupendous difficulty. Therefore, even though the general practice all along had been to reject uptaken words that were incorrectly spelt, an exception was made in this case. Thus if the spelling came close\textsuperscript{33} to the correct spelling and the meaning was also rightly assigned, the word was regarded as uptaken. It must however be understood that meaning counts are otherwise made separately and the assigning of meaning has not been taken into account when considering uptake.

5.20.1.7 \textbf{Principal}

Five learners have reported this word and 10 categories of treatment have been used - 8 by the teacher and 2 by learners. Thus, the treatment is substantial in terms of variety. In terms of distribution, though the bulk of the work has been done by the teacher, a learner has used 2 categories that have a react function and so rank high qualitatively in terms of the assumptions presented in 4.6.4. For example, Lata first checks on the meaning of 'principal' and then on the spelling of the meaning (that is spelling of 'chief'). A single learner has thus created 2 useful

\textsuperscript{33}For example, consequently; consequently.
learning opportunities which would have helped several other learners in uptaking the word. The teacher draws attention to the word by focussing on its spelling and distinguishing it from 'principle' which is pronounced alike but spelled differently. She even reminds learners about their encountering the word 'principle' in an earlier lesson and checks if they remember its meaning. It may be recalled that 'principle' had occurred in Lesson 3 and the teacher had even at that time mentioned 'principal' along with it. Some learners had then given the meaning प्रमुख अर्थात्. Further, the teacher gives a clue to help learners find the word 'principal'. Apparently, the word 'chief' which is given as a clue is itself unfamiliar to learners and so the teacher has to herself locate 'principal' in the text-book. Lastly the teacher deliberately reinforces the word and its meaning by juxtaposing them in near parallel structures. "It was the principal shopping centre. Why was it the chief shopping centre?" (Lines 167-168). The treatment therefore appears quite adequate.

As the word had been introduced in Lesson 3, some learners may have been familiar with it and that explains why more learners have not uptaken the word. Secondly, the teacher by checking on the meaning of 'principle' and focussing on the difference in spelling (between 'principle' and 'principal') may have generated some confusion in the
minds of a few learners who had not grasped the 2 words sufficiently well to keep them apart. This is suggested by 2 learners reporting 'principle' instead of 'principal'.

5.20.1.8 Conclusion to analysis of Group A

This completes the discussion of words in Group A. Treatment and uptake appear to correlate positively in the case of the first 4 words (insignificant, in succession, depression and harvest). On the other hand, despite adequate treatment 'cause' and 'consequently' were uptaken by a slightly smaller number of learners. Analysis of tapescript and interview data suggest that the doubts and confusion that arose during the processing of input, (relating to the word 'cause') remained unclarified and so interfered with the uptake of the word. Had there been further interaction between the teacher and the learners, the meaning of the word 'cause' might have been negotiated and uptake boosted.

In the case of the word 'consequently', the spelling seems to have deterred learners from focusing on the word and uptaking it.

Words in Group B may now be discussed.

5.20.2 Group B

These are words that received 8 or more categories of treatment each regardless of the number of learners who claimed to have uptaken them.
5.20.2.1 **Owing to**

Only 4 learners out of 11 present uptook this word. Eight categories of treatment were used - 6 by the teacher and 2 by learners. In terms of variety this is a fair range. In terms of distribution of effort (between the teacher and the learners) however, the treatment is less adequate. Only 2 categories of treatment have been used by the learners and of these one is the rather insignificant one of reading the word from the text. The categories employed by the teacher are giving a clue, and so helping learners to find out the word from the text. The teacher also gives a synonym as meaning and further she uses the meaning in the text context. Further finding that learners have misread the word 'owing to' as 'owning to', she attempts to clarify the meaning of 'owing to' and 'owning to'. The less significant categories used by the teacher are 'repeat word' and 'repeat meaning'. However, less student participation and the use of fewer categories that normally boost uptake may be only to a small extent, responsible for fewer claims of uptake. It appears that uptake may have been blocked on account of the confusion, in the learners' mind (see discussion above) regarding the meaning of 'cause' and 'because', which set in about 35 lines earlier and was carried over to the next word that is, 'owing to' and to its meaning 'because of'. Fresh confusion issued perhaps
from the learners' misreading of the word 'owing to'. A closer analysis of the tapescript may throw light on other related aspects of the interaction that may have hindered the uptake of the word.

Almost all the students misread 'owing to' as 'owning to', both in their minds and when reading aloud. They went on in this fashion for quite some time without either the teacher or the observer noticing that an altogether different word was being articulated. (See, for example, line 273, line 345). At line 401, the teacher who had been trying to put across the meanings of 'cause' and 'result' finally asked the learners to pick out the word which meant 'because of'. Very timidly a learner picked out 'owing to'. Pleased, the teacher repeated 'owing to' and its meaning 'because of' and also used the word in a sentence. It was at this point that Kusum was alerted and voiced the feelings of the class.

Kusum said: 'owing to' as 'owning to'. At first we thought 'owing' was 'owning'.

(Line 416)

At the interview when the researcher asked the learners how the confusion between the two words came about Kusum said:— (See lines 199-205 — interview with Nirmala and others.)
Kusum: "With 'owing to' it happened this way. I read it as 'owning'. Then, teacher explained with an example that meant 'because of'. I wondered how it fitted and was about to ask the teacher, when I thought of reading the sentence again and discovered the mistake."
as did her peers to their surprise and amusement.

After all the strain that learners undergo in 'making sense of instruction', the sudden discovery that they as a group have been labouring under the same error cannot but bring some comic relief. The teacher, on the other hand, is exasperated because of the unanticipated nature of the learners' problem.

She says to the researcher:

They did not know the meaning of - the difference between 'owing' and 'owning'. Okay? which never struck me ....... that is why their difficulties are such that we don't even know about. We are finding out more about their difficulties and why they do have these difficulties.

Continuing to comment on the "why" she puts her finger at once on what seems to be an easy solution

.... And this can be prevented by making them look at the text and the spelling ......

(See interview with the teacher after Lesson 6, lines 20-22).
It is evident that the error stemmed from the fact that students do not focus on a word and note its spelling.

Incidentally this error is very similar to the one which Kusum had earlier discussed with the researcher. Kusum had spoken about having misread the word 'sigh' as 'sign' (that is, 'h' as 'n') until the teacher's gesture demonstrating 'sighing' had sent her back to look at the word more carefully. The confusion had gone a step further because having read 'sigh' as 'sign' Kusum assigned it the meaning which means 'shine' and is an altogether different word. (See interview with learners after Lesson 1).

Resuming the discussion of the tapescript of Lesson 6 one notices that as the teacher gently chides the learners with "Where is the 'n' . . . ? (line 424), Nirmala attempts to resolve the issue by saying "This (in the text) is 'owing' and 'that' (that is what learners misread as) is 'owning'." Nirmala unfortunately uses the Hindi words यहाँ and यहाँ for 'this' and 'that' (line 427). The teacher, perhaps, fails to understand the Hindi words and so instead of saying 'Yes, that's right' or something to that effect, she goes on at great length to explain the meaning of 'owning'

---

34 Not part of the present classroom data.

35 Not the teacher in the present data.
forgetting that learners are familiar with the word 'owning' and that it was a sheer error of not looking into the books. Again Nirmala voices the view of the class with अब समझ गये (We have understood now). This seems a clear, polite and tactful hint for the teacher to get back to the lesson. But the teacher needlessly, perhaps even unconsciously sidetracks herself into explaining first 'owe' and 'own' (I owe money and I own money) and then considers 'owing to', 'because of' and 'due to' as almost synonymous. While the presentation of this synonymy appears justified in the context of the word 'owing to' in the text, the earlier 'owe money' and 'own money' is, perhaps, confusing for a second language learner at this point when she is already grappling with several other words, for example, 'cause', 'because', 'because of'. Unfortunately, the teacher does not check herself even now. She proceeds to explain and distinguish 'due to' in the sense of first, 'because of' and then in the sense of 'Rs 5/- are due to you.' I owe you Rs 5/-. Such juxtaposing of the two senses of 'due to' and giving the meaning almost in the same breath is apt to confuse even students whose competence in English surpasses that of the group being taught.

In what state of mind the barrage of uncalled for meanings, examples and elaborations left the learners is difficult to gauge. It may have left the learners too
perplexed to even attempt to sort out and process the overambitious dose of teacher input. That the uptake of 'owing to' was consequently affected seems a strong possibility. As pointed out earlier, only 4 learners were able to uptake 'owing to'.

It may be recalled that in Lesson 5 the teacher had strongly disliked being navigated by learners. Later, at the interview after Lesson 6 she had said that the comprehension of the passage was the main thing and to achieve that end "I'd jump over certain things". Her classroom behaviour, as discussed above, contradicts her comments because she gets sidetracked on her own accord. While navigation by the learners may be a useful practice serving to individualize instruction and render it comprehensible, the teacher's 'going into by-lanes' at her own will and without caution can be a potential danger to uptake in an ESL classroom.

Yet another occasion of the teacher getting sidetracked on her own initiative is to be found in the same lesson. (See tapescript lines 490-515).

The occasion for drifting away from the point in the lesson may be explained as follows. The teacher having given 'quite a lot' as the meaning of 'considerably' is interrupted by a learner who merely wants to check on the
spelling of 'quite'. Thus :-

S QUITE बराबर है? (that is, Is QUITE correct?)

In answer to this, one would have expected the teacher to say, 'Yes, that's right' or something to that effect confirming the spelling. Instead, the teacher's response is as follows:--

T QUITE? Allright. What, why 'quite a lot.' QUITE or is it QUIET, which is it?

(Lines 4^1/ (Underlining by the researcher.)

First of all it may be pointed out that the teacher is unwittingly asking the learners the same question which a learner has asked her in line 490; secondly, the teacher's use of a rising intonation which is characteristic of a question suggests that she has misunderstood the learner's question because it was partly in Hindi. It appears as though the teacher is responding to a question such as: What does QUITE mean? and as it is difficult to find a meaning equivalent for the word 'quite', the teacher decides to distinguish between 'quite' and 'quiet' so as to somehow bring out the meaning of 'quite'. This interpretation of the tapescript data is supported by the teacher's remarks in the interview data. Speaking to the researcher the teacher says:
they, didn't know the meaning of 'quite' ........... I was drawn away from that 'quite' and 'quiet' .... I had to tell them about the library. So if you can't find a meaning for that word, (here, 'quite' in 'quite a lot') however small ..... the meaning is not understood.

- (See interview script lines 51-64).
  (parenthesised portion is by researcher)

Apparently, as the tapescript suggests, the learners already knew the meaning of 'quite' and 'quiet'. Thus, unwittingly the teacher goes off at a tangent and later speaking to the researcher, she holds the learners responsible for sending her "off to the library".

T ..... Don't you see, if you go too far away from the parent word, then you get all lost.

(Interview script lines 58-59)

Continuing with the discussion of the uptake of words in Group B, the next word in the group is 'amenities'.

5.20.2.2 Amenities

Ten categories of treatment were used on this word - six by the teacher and 4 by learners. Thus, numerically considered the treatment appears adequate in terms of variety and in terms of distribution between the teacher and the learners. However, adequacy of treatment has also to be reckoned from
the point of view of the nature of the categories employed. The nature and value of the categories may be gauged first by a look at the category labels. The teacher uses 'paraphrase' to give meaning; elicits word by giving a clue (here, helping learners to locate word in the text). The teacher accepts the word guessed by a learner in response to the clue given. Further, she reinforces the word and the meaning. Thus learners have been involved in some way in listening to a clue, making use of it to guess meaning and the category of reinforcing word and re-inforcing meaning has been repeatedly employed by the teacher.

As only 3 learners have uptaken the word despite what appears adequate treatment, it is necessary to analyze the tapescript data, to understand at what point in the ongoing interaction the word 'amenities' received some attention. What was the prevailing atmosphere of the class while the categories of treatment were being used, what was the exact nature of 'reinforcement' (which is regarded as very helpful for uptake) and whether anything, however trivial seemingly, weighed on the learners' minds to divert their attention. Further, the interview data may also throw light on learner's personal problems (if any) in uptaking the word.

The word 'amenities' first appears on page 18 of the tapescript and recurs up till page 24. A close reading of
these 6 pages will show that the teacher's efforts at this time are focussed on putting across a few ideas which may be summarised as follows: 'The farmers around Pumplesdrop sold their crops to the shopkeepers and bought amenities of life from them. The shopkeepers bought these amenities of life from industrial towns and sold them some of the grain which they had bought from the farmers. Thus amenities of life were imported from industrial towns by railway and crops which had been bought from the farmers were exported by railway to the industrial towns. Pumplesdrop was only a business centre. It did not produce the amenities of life, nor could it grow crops.

It may be recalled that according to the new teaching strategy adopted by the teacher in the present lesson, the learners are expected to find out answers to questions asked by the teacher. The strategy obviously demands constant learner attention. As the word 'amenities' is crucial to the understanding of ideas summarised above, the teacher begins by helping learners to locate the word in the text. "You find it, I'm not going to say". After a learner has found the word, the teacher's efforts are directed towards comprehension of the above points. Patiently she tries to elicit answers from learners. But as learners are not trained in the basic tasks of listening and thinking and are not even used to looking into the book, they often give
random answers that are very trying for the teacher. On several occasions the teacher is so put off that she cannot but adopt a stiff tone and sometimes even uses stern words. For example, "Don't talk, don't open your mouth till you think." (Lines 649-651). This tactic gives a rude jolt but promptly fetches the correct answer. Pleased, the teacher continues and elaborates on the meaning of 'amenities'. Even as she is giving the meaning and in the same breath advising the learners to think before answering, Nirmala asks the meaning of 'amenities'. Evidently, Nirmala has neither been listening nor thinking. The teacher's patience is taxed beyond control. What follows is nearly 25 lines of chiding, exhorting, pleading and advising which wakes up the learners from mental stupor, at least a partial awareness of the teacher's expectations.

T  I've not come here just to give you meanings.
   Any dictionary will give you meanings. I'm here to teach you how to think.
   (See lines 668-669)

The learners probably sense that the meaning of 'amenities' was given while they were not attending and that the teacher is now intent on the comprehension, basically. She has never spoken so sternly to them before. The social atmosphere of the classroom is tense. As learners scan each other's faces, wondering perhaps, how best to cope with the
situation, the teacher says:—"Don't look at each other, you just think." (Lines 712-713) and so they concentrate on her questions answering them one after another. She encourages them by rewarding correct responses. They do trip occasionally but on the whole they show remarkable progress in uptaking ideas. Right up till page 24, neither the teacher nor the learners turn their attention to words. Learners soon seem to realise that with every correct response to a comprehension question, the teacher's attitude tends to relax while a wrong answer brings in a fresh barrage of words expressing displeasure.

It was stated above that the teacher reinforced the meaning of 'amenities' several times. It must, however, be made clear that of the two strategies of reinforcing (see description of categories, Chapter IV), she used only one, namely, juxtaposing word and meaning in a sentence. The other strategy of reinforcing is to ask the meaning again and again at intervals of time, whenever the opportunity presents itself. This latter strategy involves learners actively and so is more conducive to uptake. On the other hand, the juxtaposing strategy used by the teacher here, presents a learning opportunity which may be lost on learners unless they are attentive and have also understood the meaning prior to its reinforcement. Examples of this kind of reinforcement in the tapescript data will also show the
risk involved sometimes. For example line 824. "They want amenities of life. They want luxury goods." For a learner who already knows that amenities of life means luxury goods, the reinforcement is effective and serves its purpose, but a learner unfamiliar with the meaning is not only likely to miss noticing the reinforcement, but may even regard the parallel structure as indicating an additional item instead of an equivalent one. Chaudron (1982) speaks of the "potential ambiguity" that "parallel structures exhibit."

The above discussion

i) puts in proper perspective the point in the ongoing interaction when the word 'amenities' received some attention as also the point when learners earnestly began paying attention and thinking before actually answering a question.

ii) throws light on the prevailing social and psychological atmosphere of the class during that period of time. (pp.13-24 in the tapescript).

iii) explains the exact nature of 'reinforcement' (of the word 'amenities') which is otherwise a powerful category of treatment facilitating uptake.

In short, the discussion presents important pointers which help explain why more learners could not uptake the word 'amenities'. It is rather unfortunate that when the meaning
of 'amenities' was given by the teacher, most learners were not attending. After they had been woken up by the teacher's stern words, their attention had to be focussed on the comprehension of certain points. The reinforcement of meaning/word that followed was also of little help, therefore. The discussion further suggests that the social atmosphere prevailing in the classroom has a bearing on uptake. "Receptivity" (Stevick 1976) can be had when a socially conducive atmosphere prevails.

**Interview with Mamta, Purnima and Kamleshwari**

This interview after Lesson 6 provided the following information:

i) Mamta gave the researcher to understand that she did not list the word 'amenities' in her uptake list because she had learned it, in her commerce text along with the word 'facilities' and that the 2 words 'amenities' and 'facilities' were generally used together in commerce. This suggests that other learners may also have been familiar with the word and have therefore not reported it as uptake.

ii) Purnima reported the word 'amenities' and assigned it the meaning 'facilities' even though the word 'facilities' was not used by the teacher and does not appear in the tapescript. Purnima explained that
'amenities' was a new word for her and Kamleshwari had told her (apparently during the class session) that it meant 'facilities'. This suggests two things: (a) that Kamleshwari was also familiar with the words 'amenities' and 'facilities' (b) that Purnima was probably unable to infer the meaning of 'amenities' from the teacher's talk and the classroom interaction and so turned round to Kamleshwari for help. It has already been pointed out that the social atmosphere of the classroom was rather strained for the negotiation of lexical meaning.

iii) Learners depend on one another for negotiation of meaning.

Interview with Nirmala, Kusum and others

At this interview, learners suggested that they found the spelling of the word 'amenities' rather difficult. Nirmala spelt it AMINITIES while Kusum spelt the word as AMANITIBS. Nirmala further said that she broke the word up into syllables - thus /əmɪˈnɪtɪz/. The researcher helped her to see that the word was /əmənɪtɪz/ that is, /ɛ/ in place of /iː/. This suggests that some learners may have given up the effort to hold on to the word in view of the difficult spelling.
Summarizing the probable causes of only a few learners uptaking the word 'amenities' despite reasonably adequate treatment, it may be observed

i) Learners may have learnt the word in their commerce subjects.

ii) The difficult spelling of the word may have deterred learners from uptaking it.

iii) The social, psychological atmosphere of the classroom being rather tense for a while, learners perhaps thought it best to please the teacher by directing all their efforts towards the comprehension of ideas rather than attempting to negotiate word meaning, specially the meaning of 'amenities' which figured in the interaction at that time.

5.20.2.3 Hand to mouth

Reading through the tapescript one finds that the atmosphere is once again relaxed and congenial by the time this expression is taken up by the teacher for explication (See tapescript of Lesson 6, p.29). However, as time is

---

36 Even though learners were free to list words as uptake without assigning the meaning they preferred to list them along with the meaning.
running out, the teacher is unable to carry on with the new teaching strategy that was adopted in this lesson. Instead, she once again resorts to the earlier practice of giving the meaning herself and speaks on for 11 lines (Lines 985-996). At this point Nirmala declares that she cannot understand. This shows that the atmosphere is relaxed and a learner freely states her difficulty. The teacher explains again—making an attempt, this time, to involve learners in the negotiation of meaning. However, very soon she slips back into monologue (lines 1010-1017) and closes abruptly with "Okay? enough that will do", preventing learners from clarifying, checking or asking again.

Hence the only category of treatment which a learner has been able to use is that of asking meaning. (This is done by Nirmala when she states that she hasn’t understood—see above). The teacher uses 5 categories of treatment. These include 'asking meaning' 'paraphrasing', 'giving example', 'repeating example' and 'repeating meaning'. Both in terms of variety and quality as also its distribution between the teacher and the learners, the treatment does not seem adequate enough. Only 1 Teacher category assumed to facilitate uptake has been used, namely, Teacher gives example.

The interview data supports the view that some students did not understand the meaning of 'hand to mouth'.
Leeta, for example tells the researcher ".... I did not understand it when teacher explained it." (See interview with Kusum and others, lines 229-230). Further, when Nirmala was asked why she did not list the word in her uptake list, Kusum intervened to explain that she (Nirmala) did not know how to put it in English.

Incidentally, this suggests that learners preferred to list as uptake only the items of which they knew the meanings. Further, even though they were given the option of giving the meaning in the mother tongue, they avoided doing so and preferred to give the meaning in English.

Thus even if the expression, 'hand to mouth' may have been easy enough for learners to recall, it was not listed as uptake because learners were not able to understand the meaning as explained by the teacher. This, in turn suggests that for meaning to be negotiated, learner involvement is crucial. A monologue kind of presentation is less likely to favour uptake.

Only 2 learners were able to report the expression 'hand to mouth'. One of them being Mamta, it may be interesting to study the interview data for her comments. According to Mamta an expression with a parallel meaning seems to exist in Hindi and that had perhaps helped her to understand the teacher's explanation. Mamta could not
however give the Hindi expression. She gave evidence of having listened carefully to the teacher. She recalled that the teacher had explained the expression twice, but she did not remember that it was at Nirmala's request that the teacher explained it a second time. Though Mamta was not aware of the learning opportunity created by Nirmala, it may have helped her to understand the teacher better because she (Mamta) was familiar (in Hindi) with the concept being explained. On the other hand, other learners may have welcomed the opportunity Nirmala created, but they failed to profit from it.

From the above discussion it appears that

i) adequate treatment helps in communicating meaning.

ii) understanding of meaning by learners helps them in uptaking word/expression.

iii) learner involvement contributes largely towards negotiation of meaning.

iv) teacher input of a monologue type is less successful in communicating meaning of words/expressions unless the word/expression being explained has some mother tongue undertones to which a learner has had prior access. If a concept is familiar, teacher talk is easier to process.
v) possibly the primary reason why 'hand to mouth' could not be uptaken by more learners is that it did not receive adequate treatment. The teacher's wish to conclude the session with "enough that will do" may have deterred learners from further interaction.

5.20.2.4 Detour

Only one student in the group of 11 present has uptaken the word but has not assigned it a meaning. Obviously, she either did not understand the meaning or could not express it. Earlier, it was pointed out that learners generally reported words along with the meanings or not at all, even though they were free to merely report word(s) in the uptake sheet. Is it likely that other learners did not report 'detour' as uptake because they had some difficulty in understanding its meaning? If so, what was the nature of the difficulty and how/why did it arise? It may be possible to find answers to these questions by carefully studying the tapescript data.

However, before analysing the tapescript data, it may be worthwhile to just consider the treatment in terms of the categories used, their distribution among learners and the teacher, their qualitative value and variety. The treatment shows that 8 categories have been used - 4 by the teacher and 4 by learners. Thus numerically the distribution of treatment appears balanced. But in terms of quality the
category labels show that 2 of the categories used by the learners are the less significant ones such as reading the word from the text, and repeating meaning. In addition to this, a learner asks the meaning and another uses the word in the text context in response to a teacher's question. The 2 latter categories involve a more active participation. However, categories (with 'react' as function) that truly involve learners in meaning negotiation have not been used. Were they not used because no negotiation was needed or for other reasons is not clear. A study of the tapescript data and interview data may be helpful.

The 4 categories used by the teacher are giving meaning in a multi-word phrase, giving an example, paraphrasing and accepting the word used by the learner. Even though only one of these has a react function, these categories can facilitate uptake if used appropriately. This leads one to examine the tapescript to understand the nature of the example given, the language in which it was phrased and related aspects that hinder or facilitate uptake. It may also be worthwhile to note at what point in the ongoing discourse the word was introduced and whether that has had some bearing on uptake.

---

37 In this case, a learner reads the meaning from the notes in the text. Being a solitary instance of this kind, it has been included under the category 'reads word from text'.
The tape transcript shows that the word 'detour' first occurs incidentally on page 26 in the context of Pumpleadrop not being popular with tourists because there was no direct route leading to it. One had to make a 'detour'. The teacher paraphrases as follows:

T .... 'Slight detour' that is on the direct line, no, but if you changed and went a little round about you could reach it.

(Lines 897-899)

A number of factors make it difficult for the second language learner to process the above teacher discourse. The syntax is jerky and mutilated. The opening sentence has a negative idea but no negative sentence pattern to signal it. The subject of the sentence is not explicitly stated and so it is difficult for the learner to identify it. Moreover, as the negative word comes at the end of the statement, the learner may miss it altogether. Further, the learner may be quite justified in regarding the words "that is" as equivalent to the word "means", in which case the beginning of the teacher's explication might be uptaken as:-'Slight detour' means on the direct line", which is exactly the opposite of the meaning the teacher intended to convey. The next hurdle for the learner is the hypothetical construction "if you changed and went .... could reach", and lastly even if the learner can understand the expression "a little round
about way", she may still find it difficult to work out the
pronominal referent of "it".

It must be pointed out that the teacher makes no
attempt to pause and check on learners' comprehension. She
simply proceeds to other ideas and words and in fact on
page 29, she literally almost winds up the lesson with the
words: "Enough that will do. Now, let us see how much you
remember." (Lines 1017-1018). Such an utterance would
almost certainly suggest to most learners that the teacher
wanted to stop and so they were free to switch off. The
suggestion would have been all the more welcome considering
the fact that the change in the teaching strategy, in the
present lesson, had made great demands on the learners'
attention, particularly because they had not been used to it
before. Thus, it is possible that when Purnima asked the
meaning of 'detour' on page 30, line 1019 (even though the
teacher had already explained it on page 26 - see above),
most learners may have already tuned out.

In response to Purnima's question, the teacher gave
the meaning in a multi-word phrase, namely, 'not the direct
route' and then continued as follows:-

T .... Think, if you have to get down at some
junction and go round like this, that's a detour.
The meaning is given here. (that is, in the notes
in the text.)

(Lines 1021-1023)
Perhaps the teacher is trying to give an example. Examples are often quite helpful in elucidating concepts, in making ideas vivid. However, as the above example is couched in language that is rather vague, it may not have achieved its purpose. Probably, the words "Go round like this" may have been accompanied by some gesture, but they still carry a sense of vagueness. It would be difficult for an ESL learner to understand what exactly the word "this" was intended to represent. Without a moment's pause, that might have encouraged learners to clarify doubts or check on meaning, the teacher directs their attention to the notes in the text-book which read "diversion from the main road". It is very doubtful if learners understood the meaning of the word 'diversion' but sensing from the teacher's abrupt manner that she wished to conclude the session, they may have refrained from prolonging the interaction to seek a clarification.

At the interview with the researcher, Asha asked her what 'detour' meant. It is also interesting to note, that Purnima, who is the only learner who uptook the word, has not assigned it the meaning. This suggests that learners may have had some difficulty in understanding the meaning of 'detour' and this difficulty may have deterred some of them from reporting the word. At the interview, some learners also gave the researcher to understand that they had some problem with the pronunciation of the word. (See lines 353-358 - interview with Nirmala and others).
5.20.2.5 **Direct route**

As soon as the teacher has finished explaining 'detour', Nirmala asks her the meaning of 'direct route'. While giving an example to put across the meaning, the teacher also contrasts 'direct route' with 'detour'. (See lines 1036-1046 below).

T 'Direct' means what? Direct route, straight straight 1036
S xxx 1037
-T Now there is a bus that goes directly direct route, you don't have to change. Say, from Churchgate to Santacruz. Alright? There is a direct route. But from Marine Drive to go straight there is no direct route Marine drive, you have to go to Tardeo, change and go by another bus. That's not a direct route. 'Direct' is straight without changing 1042

'Detour' is 'going round' 1044

Nirmala Direct route आदेश without changing? 1045
T No, direct is 'straight' 'straight route'. Come on. 1046.

In line 1043 above, the teacher says 'direct' is straight without changing'. Nirmala misses the word 'straight' and so she equates 'direct route' with 'without changing'. Fortunately, Nirmala checks on the meaning and the teacher promptly corrects her. (See lines 1045-1046 above).
Thus 2 categories with a react function are used. An example is also given. Moreover, Nirmala by checking on the meaning creates a very useful learning opportunity, for her peers who may, like her, have failed to process the teacher's input rightly. One would expect these categories to help learners in uptaking the expression even though the total number of categories used is small. (4 categories used by the teacher, 2 by a learner). Surprisingly, only Nirmala has benefited, presumably because other learners were familiar with the expression 'direct route' or because they had not been paying attention.

Incidentally, it must be pointed out that Nirmala who is the only interacting learner is also the only uptaker of the expression. This contradicts the view that learners who are involved in the interaction fail to uptake the item even as the interaction helps the listeners in uptaking it.

From the above discussion it appears that the possible reasons for other learners not listing the item as uptake may be that

1) the words 'direct' and 'route' are familiar enough to be familiar to most learners.

2) most learners had switched off at the end of page 29 of the tapescript.

(See discussion above for possible reasons for doing so.)
5.20.2.6 **Excellent**

Only 1 learner has uptake the word apparently because this may be a word known to learners in their day to day interaction.

The word has been treated adequately both quantitatively and qualitatively. A total of 9 categories of treatment have been used, 7 by the teacher and 2 by learners.

The teacher begins by giving a clue to help learners find the word in the text-book. The learners respond to the clue and guess the word. The teacher accepts it and asks them its meaning. A learner gives the meaning 'good'. This indicates the learner's familiarity with the word. The teacher adds to the meaning by saying 'very good'. She then repeats the meaning and later reinforces both word and meaning. The learners use only 2 categories, namely, guessing the word and giving its meaning. Perhaps, as there is no need to negotiate the meaning, learners don't need to use more categories of treatment.

Thus, it appears that here is a case of adequate treatment not correlating with uptake because the word happens to be familiar to learners. If this interpretation is correct, then the treatment given by the teacher is in a sense almost wasted. It indicates how important it is for teachers to be able to gauge correctly when treatment is required.
5.20.2.7 Conclusion to the analysis of Group B

The discussion of words in Group B indicates that sometimes despite adequate treatment, a word may not be recorded as uptake because learners

a) may have had problems with processing of input and understanding the meaning of the word.

b) may have had problems with the spelling and/or pronunciation of the word.

c) may not have found an opportunity to clarify doubts by prolonging the interaction.

d) may have already known the word.

5.20.3 Group C

This is the group of words where poor treatment is matched by a small number of learners claiming the word as uptake.

5.20.3.1 Casual

Only 1 learner has claimed to have uptaken this word. The word occurs only in the text-book. It was not used during the interaction and therefore does not appear in the tapescript. It received no treatment. The printed word in the text was the learners' only exposure to it. It is difficult to say how/why one single learner focused on it and recalled it. She has not assigned a meaning to the word,
however. The researcher did not find the time and the opportunity to probe the learner at the interview to explain her idiosyncratic behaviour.

5.20.3.2 Grain

This word is used by the teacher in the text context. Only one learner claimed to have uptaken it. As the word 'grain' is commonly used in the context of 'food-grains', 'grain shops', it is very likely to be familiar to students—especially students of economics. In fact, it is rather strange that Kusum, a good student, should have listed it in her uptake sheet. One would expect her to know the word, surely.

5.20.3.3 Cheap

This is also a word used in day to day speech and sure to be familiar to learners and hence only 1 learner has claimed it as her uptake. The researcher suspects that even this 1 learner did so to boost up her uptake in the eyes of her peers. Some learners tended to vie with one another in the number of words they were able to recall. This competitive spirit led them to overlook the requirement of the experiment—namely, the need to recall only words which one did not know before.

The tapscript shows Kusum checking with the teacher on the meaning of 'cheap'.
Later, when the observer informally asked Kusum whether she was really unsure of the meaning of 'cheap', Kusum explained; "My neighbour had written 'cheap' as the meaning of 'principal'. I knew it was wrong and told her it should be 'chief'. She did not listen to me so I asked the teacher." This suggests that Kusum did not need to check on the meaning of 'cheap' herself. She did so to prove to Nirmala that she listened better and was smarter than her friend. Some learners, it seems, by displaying their knowledge create learning opportunities for others.

5.20.3.4 Quite, Quiet

Neither of the 2 words occur in the text-book. The teacher gave 'quite a lot' as the meaning of 'considerably'. (line 484).

For example, A learner merely checks on the spelling of 'quite' in 'quite a lot'.

S Miss QUITE बराजर के 'quite'. (line 490) The teacher instead of simply confirming the spelling, sidetracks herself into checking whether learners know the difference between 'quite' and 'quiet' though the latter word was neither necessary in the context nor had a learner asked its meaning or spelling. (See earlier discussion in 5.20.2.1).
T QUITE? Alright. What, why 'quite a lot'.
QUITE or is it QUIET, which is it?
S Quite.
T Which is /kwaiət/ which is /kwaiət/
S QUIET /kwaiət/ (line 495)
T Where have you to be quiet?
S Silent, /kwaiət/ (line 497)

The learner's responses in line 495 and in line 497 suggest that she knows the spelling, pronunciation and meaning of 'quiet'. Further in line 508, Kusum gives the partially correct mother tongue meaning of the expression 'quite a lot' but the teacher's response 'hm?' suggests that she probably did not understand it. It seems that part of the teacher's problem stems from her inability to understand the students' mother tongue. Thus the learner's query in line 490 above seems only a seeking of confirmation from the teacher. If this interpretation is accepted (see earlier discussion in 5.20.2.1), then it is likely that other learners were also familiar with both words 'quite' and 'quiet' and that explains why a larger number of learners have not listed the word as uptake.

At the interview with learners, the researcher asked Anjou, who had listed the word 'quite' in her uptake list, whether it was a new word she had come across for the first time. Anjou answered in the negative. Her friend, Asha, who
had listed both words then spoke apparently in defence of both herself and Anjou.

Asha Teacher showed the difference between 'quite' and 'quiet' and that is confusing sometimes. Thus Asha was even aware of the potential for confusion that this pair of words generally presents to ESL learners. Therefore, it appears that both Asha and Anjou were familiar with the words and yet listed them as uptake, probably to extend their uptake list.

5.20.3.5 Conclusion to the analysis of Group C

The discussion on the uptake of words in Group C suggests that if a small number of learners claim a word as uptake, it is not necessarily due to poor treatment. A word may not be claimed simply because it is already familiar to learners.

Prosperous is the only word that cannot be included in any of the above groups.

Three learners have reported the word as uptake and of these three, one (viz. Kusum) has not assigned it a meaning.

Six categories of treatment have been used - 5 by the teacher and 1 by a learner. The teacher gives a clue to help learners find the word in the text. A learner guesses the word in response to the clue. The teacher accepts the
word given and repeats it, and further relates it to the noun form 'prosperity' (see lines 259-261). Later the teacher gives a synonym as meaning. She uses a defining structure, namely, "Prosperous" is rich. This is the sum total of the treatment for the word 'prosperous'. However, the word 'prosper' (not 'prosperous') is used several times across the lesson and perhaps it gets equated with 'rich' in the learners' minds even though the teacher points out that 'to prosper' is 'to become rich' while 'prosperity' is the state of being rich. For example, see line 928, where the teacher asks 'what is to prosper?' and promptly comes the answer 'rich'.

At the interview with Nirmala, Kusum and others the researcher tried to check whether learners remembered the meanings of uptaken words and other related words. When learners were asked the meaning of 'prosperity', even a good student, Kusum, answered 'become rich'. It has already been pointed out that though Kusum uptook the word 'prosperous' she did not assign it any meaning presumably because she was not sure of the exact meaning. It seems that the distinction between noun, verb and adjective and the corresponding meanings is not clearly established in the learners' minds. Casual attempts to do so were made by the teacher but organised effort in this direction is what is needed.
Thus it may be that some learners hesitated to list 'prosperous' as uptake because they were likely to confuse its meaning with that of 'prosper' and 'prosperity' which were also used in the lesson incidentally. The preceding discussion has already indicated that learners generally preferred to list as uptake, words to which they could assign meanings.

Thus, the fact that a word has received less treatment may not be the only reason for fewer learners uptaking it. The difficulty of clearly grasping its meaning may also be one among other possible factors.

5.21 The New Teaching Strategy Used in Lesson 6

At the beginning of the analysis of Lesson 6, it was promised that the effect of the new teaching strategy on the class as a whole and other related questions would be considered. The following sections deal with the effectiveness of the new strategy in general, its role in dealing with the problem of attention and its usefulness in rousing learners' awareness with regard to language skills and independent learning.

5.21.1 The nature of the change in the strategy (See also 5.18)

It may be recalled that earlier (that is before Lesson 6) students used to be asked by the teacher to read a paragraph or a few lines silently. On doing so, if the words in the text appeared difficult, the learners asked the teacher for
the meaning. Alternatively, the teacher asked them the meaning hoping one or the other learners would offer it. If no one did, the teacher eventually gave the meaning herself. In Lesson 6, on the other hand, the teacher gives learners different kinds of clues\(^{38}\) (for example, read only the first five lines and find out the word which means 'rich'). It was expected that this strategy would necessarily demand that learners look into their books and scan the reading text for the required word meaning. This effort when successful would in turn encourage learners to infer meanings and to work on their own.

5.21.2 Effectiveness of the new strategy

5.21.2.1 The problem of attention, awareness, the need to think

It has already been pointed out that the new strategy used in Lesson 6 obliged the learners to look into the textbook and focus on the spelling of words. Consequently there were fewer spelling errors in the uptake sheets of Lesson 6. Further, learners became aware of some of their faulty study habits. The interview data suggests that they were also aware of the change in the teaching strategy and understood the pedagogic purpose it aimed at. (See discussion below). However, the problem of attention persisted.

\(^{38}\)This practice had been used in earlier lessons as well, but not consciously and consistently.
At times, learners continued to give random imprecise answers. This suggests that they did not make an effort to think. For example:

1) The teacher (on page 9) asks: 'When does a farmer become rich? What kind of harvest, must be have? Good or bad?' The question has been analysed by the teacher to enable learners understand it. Yet, a learner responds 'Poor harvest'. This is perhaps because they had been talking for sometime about Pumpleddrop having a series of poor harvests - so here, even without listening to the question, comes the answer 'Poor harvest'.

2) Another example is to be found on page 15. The class has been talking about the town Pumpleddrop having suffered considerably. In lines 510-515, the teacher says 'It suffered much - It suffered a great deal. Then to make sure whether learners had understood what it referred to, the teacher asks: 'Who suffered a great deal?' and promptly she gets the answer 'Poor persons'. Exasperated, she asks again. 'Who suffered? Who? Who?' and then at last she gets the chorus response 'Pumpleddrop'
The earlier answer 'poor persons' was perhaps based on an association between suffering and the poor – suffering being the lot of the poor. It is obvious that the learner had not listened carefully to the question.

Yet another example of a random answer is on page 22. Lines 760-770. The teacher says that luxury goods are brought from industrial towns for whom? She receives the following answers.

Asha (softly)  Businessman
S   (softly)  Poor farmers.
T   Ah? For whom? Yes? For whom? To sell to whom?
S   Poor men, poor men.

Evidently, when a learner says that luxury goods are going to be bought by the poor, she has either, not understood the meaning of 'luxury goods' or simply answered at random.

The transcript offers several other examples but only one more may be quoted here. (See page 16, lines 518-528).

The teacher asks 'what kind of work was done in the town? A student answers:-
S   Farming an ...
T   In the town.
S It was very
T What kind of work was done in the town.
SS Farming and fruitgrowing.
T In the town.

Earlier in the same lesson, the students had read about farming and fruitgrowing being the occupation of the people living around Pumplestop. Though the question now is about the town itself (In the town), the same answer is repeated.

It has already been pointed out that the teacher did take up cudgels by bluntly admonishing the learners and each such attempt met with a satisfactory answer. Each exhortation roused the learners and set them scanning the reading text for the required answer.

The above discussion and the examples of learners' classroom behaviour may be an eye-opener for a less experienced ESL teacher. The point that emerges is that teachers have tasks other than teaching to handle in the classroom. Improving learners' study skills and learning strategies is an additional challenge teachers ought to be taking up soon.

Evidence of learners' awareness

The interview data provides ample evidence of learners' general awareness of the aim of a language lesson and of the
teacher's intent in teaching Lesson 6 (that is the first paragraph of 'The Man Who Saved Pimplplesdrop').

Three groups of learners met the researcher after Lesson 6 and were asked the same questions, namely, 'What was the teacher's basic purpose in teaching the lesson?' 'What did she want you to be able to do?'

The excerpts quoted below indicate that most learners were aware of the teacher's definite attempts to teach comprehension, use of words in context, reading strategies etc. For example, Lata says:-

Lata Miss today it was this lesson, tomorrow it could be some other but whatever the lesson, one has to know how to find out answers and meanings and that the teacher meant to teach.

(See lines 52-55)

Later Lata also says:-

Lata Miss actually the meaning depends on the sentence. Anyone can give the meaning but we have to take the meaning that fits in the sentence.

(See interview with Nirmala and others - lines 52-55, and 287-89)

The two excerpts together point to Lata's awareness of the need to manage one's learning by mastering the required skills.
Another learner, Asha says:-

Asha  The teacher was telling us not to focus merely on words we recall but to try and understand the lesson, to be able to do this on our own. .......... and how to use words on our own. Because by just writing down words we are sure to forget them.

(See interview with Asha and others, Lines 4-9; 25-26).

A third learner Mamta says:-

Mamta  The teacher said that it is not necessary to know the spelling and meaning in isolation but to know how the words are used in sentences and to learn not merely to pass exams but how to learn English and compose sentences. The teacher was saying that we should not merely write the meanings of words but when she explains, to listen and note how the meaning changes.

(See interview with Mamta and others. Lines 207-211 and 218-221).

Again, both Asha and Mamta articulate the need to learn the language skills and not to learn the content by rote. They are aware that the focus is not on content. Kusum alone
insisted on saying that the teacher emphasised content. However what Kusum meant was that the content of the lesson was used as a means to an end - the end being the teaching of language skills. It is likely that the learners would have answered differently if they had been asked similar questions after the teaching of Lesson 5 (where the teacher had in 'monologue' fashion dealt with Radhakrishnan's message.)  

5.21.3 Did the whole class benefit from the new strategy?  

The observer noticed that the students who supplied the words by scanning the text were invariably only a few (in fact, Kusum and Nirmala most of the time). These students uttered the word so softly sometimes that the rest of the class could hardly hear it. They could not therefore locate it in the text quickly enough. The teacher repeated the word, encouraged the successful student and proceeded without checking whether other learners had also noted the word. She did not ever write any word on the blackboard. As a result, several of the slow learners failed to keep pace because this practice of reading the lines and looking at the words carefully was unfamiliar to them. In the earlier sessions, even the less vocal and less able learners had

---

39 The reader is reminded that at all interviews learners spoke more often in Hindi than in English. The interviews were later rendered into English for convenience.
interrupted the teacher to ask the meaning and others had kept pace because the lesson was proceeding line by line. Most students, therefore, knew which word was being talked about. This is not to say that the new strategy is in itself defective. It could be used better to ensure that the maximum number of learners benefit from it.

5.21.4 **Ways and means of making the new strategy more effective**

Perhaps ways and means of drawing in the slow learners into the interaction and helping them to keep pace with the better learners and the teacher would have to be worked out. For example, the teacher could ask the good learners to repeat the required word/meaning loudly after finding it out in response to the teacher's clue. Individual good learners may be made to sit with the weaker ones and explain to them how to use the clues. The teacher may herself repeat loudly the word, which learners have located, before proceeding to the next clue. She may encourage slow learners to contribute by giving them more time. Secondly, as it may not be possible to use the strategy in the case of all words, the teacher would have to use her own discretion in deciding when to use it or relinquish it.

This chapter has dealt with the analysis and interpretation of data. Lessons 1 to 6 have been analysed
in considerable detail. Occasionally reference was also made to Lessons 7 to 10. The next chapter discusses learners' test performance in relation to uptake.