CHAPTER THREE : THE RESEARCH DESIGN

3.1 : The Research Questions

This study seeks to explore whether present patterns of discourse and interaction employed by the 3 informants, are effective for this particular context of spoken "language in action" use. The insights gained can benefit my 3 SL informants in three main ways.

i) They will be equipped with better strategies to play their roles as intermediaries between the technology and student user groups.

ii) They will be able to organise and produce discourse with greater coherence and clarity at each macro phase of the programme.

iii) They can help to maximise the learning opportunities of their student audience in this instructional setting.

Bearing the above in mind, the research questions proposed are as detailed below:

1. From the analyses of the spoken data of the 3 CD-ROM familiarisation sessions conducted by the 3 informants, what are the typical or recurrent patterns of discourse which can be identified?

2a. How do the informants organise their discourse?

2b. Is their organisation of talk effective for this instructional context of target language use?
3.2 Laying the Groundwork

a) September to November 1994 - a preliminary study to investigate the importance of English as a tool for communication among the staff of this particular library was conducted.

b) At the conclusion of the study, 3 of the assistant library officers or "Penolong Pegawai Perpustakaan", agreed to be the informants of this study.

c) Spoke to the acting Head of this library about the objectives and benefits of the study and requested her to let me have these 3 assistant library officers as my informants. I assured her that their work schedules will not be disrupted and she will be kept informed of the progress of the study from time to time.

d) Wrote a formal letter to the Head of the A-Level Programme, to request for 12 students from Batch 13 to be the audience participants.

e) Filled the relevant forms to request technical assistance from the college Media Unit to videotape the CD-ROM familiarisation sessions conducted by P1, P2 and P3 from 12th - 15th December 1994, and to make duplicate copies of the tapes for my own study purposes.

f) Drew up a checklist of features to guide me while observing P1, P2 and P3's conduct of the CD-ROM sessions. (Please refer to Appendix I pp.214-215)

g) Drew up a schedule to assign students into three groups, each to be instructed by one of the assistant library officers. (Please refer to Table 2 p.56 : Schedule of partici-
pants and presentations.)

h) Prepared a questionnaire for P1, P2 and P3, and an evaluation sheet for their student participants to fill up respectively, at the end of each session. (Please refer to Appendices J pp.216-217 and K p.218 for sample copies of these.)

i) Made the necessary arrangements for recording an informal discussion session with five of the student participants. (The other 7 could not attend as they had tutorials.) This was done to obtain further feedback, suggestions and views regarding the CD-ROM familiarisation sessions they attended. (Please refer to Appendix L pp.219-220 for an itemised list of topics to guide student discussions during this session.)

j) Arranged for 2 follow-up feedback sessions with the three informants to be video-taped, (as recommended in Nunan 1992:94-96). This was done to give P1, P2 and P3 the opportunity to evaluate their own presentations and those of their peers and to contribute ideas for improvement.

Before the start of each follow-up feedback session, the relevant transcripts of the spoken data were distributed to the three informants to help them follow the CD-ROM sessions they had conducted and the verbal exchanges clearly. At the end of these two feedback sessions, the objectives, conclusions and recommendations were summarised, typed and distributed to keep my subjects informed and to provide them with ideas and strategies they could use in future CD-ROM orientation sessions. (Please refer to Appendix M pp.221-224.)
3.3 : The Subjects

Since this is an exploratory-interpretive study, there is no conscious effort to control the variables where the selection of subjects is concerned. The three informants are practising assistant library officers. They are interested to participate in the project and view this short training stint as relevant to their work and a good learning opportunity to upgrade their oral communication skills.

The three librarians are required to conduct CD-ROM familiarisation programmes to new intakes of students every year as part of the library orientation exercise or whenever there are requests from the academic staff or students. Within the organisation, they have the job designation of Assistant Library Officers or "Penolong Pegawai Perpustakaan". However, in this study, I have referred to them as "Pustakawan" (P1, P2 and P3) or librarians. The letter "L" for librarian is not used here, as it may be confused with the (L) Listener interactive role, used in the tabulated interactional structures. (See Appendices D, E and F.)

Given the fact that P1, P2 and P3 are acquiring the management of this kind of instructional discourse in a natural and untutored way, i.e. while they are on the job, their spoken data are bound to exhibit irregularities. Coulthard (1985:133) in his study of classroom discourse, explains that since the production of spoken discourse takes place spontaneously in real time, participants are bound to produce
not the best examples of speech. As such, it may be interesting to investigate how effectively P1, P2 and P3 are able to conduct these CD-ROM programmes on their own. Their strengths and weaknesses can be identified from their presentations to arrive at a clearer assessment of their training needs in this particular context.

P1, P2 and P3 have among them an approximate total of five and a half years of library work. Of the three, P2 has the longest record of service. He has previously worked with a State Handicraft Corporation as an Assistant Library Officer before joining this college library in May 1992. Since then, he has always been with the Reference Unit and is in charge of the publication of the library’s bimonthly newsletter "INFO" as well.

After his graduation in 1992, P1 worked in the libraries of a Federal government agency, an embassy and following that, as a lecturer-cum-librarian at a management institute in Kuala Lumpur. In March 1994 he joined this college library and has since been attached to the Reader Service and Reference Unit.

P3 joined the library in September 1994, 2 months after his graduation. This is his first job and he is with the Cataloguing division.

All three librarians hold Diplomas in Librarianship and Information Science from a well-recognised local institution of higher learning. While at college, they took a compulsory
basic English course which served mainly to upgrade their general language proficiency. They had minimal exposure to ESP i.e. English for Specific Purposes to prepare them with discourse strategies and presentation skills to introduce CD-ROM search literacy programmes to student library user groups.

P1, P2 and P3 have a fairly high level of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation to improve their communication skills. This is evident from their willingness to conduct these programmes "live" and allow the observational data to be recorded. Like most adult language learners in a workplace context, (Schleppegrell, 1991) it can be assumed that they possess content knowledge of CD-ROM databases and well-developed adult learning strategies.

3.3.1 The Student Audience Participants

The 12 student audience participants are from Batch 13, i.e. the June 1994 intake of college students to be admitted into the A-Level Programme. They are in the first semester of the Intensive English Course where Library research skills are taught as part of the Study Skills component. So this programme of instruction on CD-ROM search skills is of relevance to their academic course work. However, when a request was made for students to participate in the project, student response was initially not overwhelming. With a bit of persuasion I finally managed to obtain 12 volunteers from various classes.
3.3.2 : Briefing for P1, P2 and P3

A week before the video taping sessions began, an informal dialogue was held to brief the three informants on the following:

a) names of student members in each group and their majors,
b) date, time and approximate duration of each session,
c) the presence of the video cameraman from the Media Unit and how they can best position themselves and the students, and
d) the need to trim terminology to a minimum.

3.3.3 : Briefing for the Student Participants

On another occasion, the 12 students were briefed on the following:

a) the objectives of the CD-ROM familiarisation sessions,
b) the benefits of using CD-ROMs as library research tools,
c) details regarding the date, time and venue,
d) names of group members and instructors and
e) the presence of the video cameraman.

These briefings were to prepare P1, P2 and P3 and their students for what to expect and to defuse stress and tension.

3.4 : The Corpus of Data

The video tapes of the three sessions conducted were viewed repeatedly. With the aid of headphones, I listened to the conversational exchanges and transcribed the spoken data.
orthographically. Errors were checked before the typing of the three transcripts was done. Whenever necessary, turns were annotated with brief details of non-verbal cues noted from the video recordings, especially when a speaker controlled long (S) speaker turns. Hesitations or pauses were indicated with (...) or (..).

The rise and fall in intonation and changes in levels of stress and pitch were not marked on the transcripts as these were not pertinent to the issues under investigation. No attempt was made to edit the errors, false starts and hesitations. The spoken data were transcribed as they were produced except for the omission of minor redundancies and inaudible or distorted speech, especially when students were reading text from the computer screen. However, care was taken to ensure that these omissions did not affect the authenticity of the data.

The utterances were arranged according to numbered speaker turns and typed according to lines for ease of reference. These lines did not go according to changes in turn-taking. Each line could have more than one recorded utterance while each new turn was indicated with the speaker’s abbreviated address along the left margin, with a turn number, as shown in the extract on the following page.

T155. S1 : So, if you want to look for a certain subject we'll have to use the first way ... the index?
T156. P1 : Right.
   It is advisable for you to go to the Index.
T157. S1 : In that area?
T158. P1 : Right.

[See Appendix A p.156]
Although the process of transcription was very time-consuming and laborious, when performed with care and caution, the effort could be a worthwhile exercise as transcripts preserved the quality and essence of the spoken data for later coding and analysis. Bowers' favourable assessment of this technique, based on the four criteria proposed by Carroll (i.e. relevance, acceptability, comparability and economy), has lent added credence for the use of transcripts. (1987: 149-150)

To complement this corpus of data, other data gathering instruments were adopted to obtain relevant feedback, views and comments. These procedures included the following:

a) a questionnaire to obtain self-evaluation feedback from P1, P2 and P3; (Please refer to Appendix J pp.216-217)

b) an evaluation sheet to tap student views and comments; (Please refer to Appendix K p.218)

c) an informal discussion session to obtain further student feedback, views and suggestions for improvement; (Please refer to Appendix L pp.219-220)

d) two follow-up feedback sessions for P1, P2 and P3; (Please refer to Appendix M pp.221-224 for the summarised objectives and conclusions of these sessions.)

3.5 Methodology

a) In line with the method proposed by Prince (1984), I began by reviewing the written literature about CD-ROM databases, going through 3 of their manuals, observing P1, P2 and P3
conduct their CD-ROM familiarisation sessions and trying out the systems on my own to gain a better understanding of how to retrieve information from them. These procedures helped me to identify the likely difficulties first-time users may face and the limitations these databases inherently have.

b) The 3 CD-ROM familiarisation sessions conducted by P1, P2 and P3, were video recorded while I observed unobtrusively from a distance and recorded notes. To guide my observation, I drew up a checklist of features to look out for, as shown in Appendix I pp.214-215. The schedule for the recordings was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Librarian</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>CD-ROM Database</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12th Dec</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>S1, S2, S3 &amp; S4</td>
<td>UMI Proquest, Business, Periodicals Ondisc</td>
<td>51 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th Dec</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>S1, S2, S3, S4 &amp; S5</td>
<td>Times and Sunday Times Index.</td>
<td>52 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th Dec</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>S1, S2 &amp; S3</td>
<td>Wilsondisc, App. Science &amp; Tech. Index.</td>
<td>42 mins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2: SCHEDULE OF PARTICIPANTS AND PRESENTATIONS**

c) At the end of each session, P1, P2 and P3 were each requested to fill up the "Questionnaire for Librarian Instructors", to obtain their views and comments. (Sample attached in Appendix J.) Students indicated their responses on the student evaluation sheets. (Sample attached in Appendix K.) Later, I compared the responses obtained from P1, P2 and P3 and the students with my own observation notes to arrive at a fair assessment of each session’s strengths and weaknesses in
terms of the organisation of procedures used and the patterns of discourse produced.

d) The spoken data from the video recordings were transcribed orthographically. Utterances were arranged according to lines and speaker turns were numbered and indicated with the turn number and the abbreviated notations for participants. Multiple copies of the transcripts were made as the data had to be analysed procedurally to determine the interactional structure, the distribution of speakership and listenership, and the pattern of conversational engagements at each macro phase.

e) When the results were obtained, they were presented in tabled statistical summaries. For ease of reference, the more important statistical findings were displayed in pie charts and bar graphs. (Please refer to Chapter 4 pp. 74a, 74b and 91)

f) Following that, relevant segments of the transcribed data for the beginnings and endings were analysed in a discursive, interpretive manner. Using the categories of talk proposed by Bowers (1987 : 159-160), librarian and student talk was analysed to assess whether the informants used a variety of talk to engage the interest of their student audience or to prepare them for what to expect.

3.6 : Procedures for Data Analysis

To answer the first research question, the interactional structures of the 3 sessions were charted out according to
the guidelines given by Gremmo, Holec & Riley (1985). This was done using a columned worksheet with the lettered symbols (S, A, T, L) for the 4 interactive roles; i.e. Speaker, Addressee, Talker, Listener, and (O, R, C) for the Opening, Replying and Closing acts. Then the tabulated data was code-counted in turn to identify the following systematically:

a) - the total number of turns for each session;
b) - the total number of (S), (A), (T) and (L) turns taken by P1, P2 and P3;
[To cross check, the totals of (a) and (b) should tally.]
c) - the total number of student (S) and (T) turns;
[To cross check, the total of c) should tally with the total (A) addressee turns of the informants for each session.]
d) - the total number of non-verbal, monosyllabic, and non-verbal & monosyllabic turns performed by students;
(This was done to identify the reactive turns students performed to provide back-channel feedback)
e) - the total number of student non-verbal, one-word or short utterance turns and turns performed as complete (or poorly structured) sentences and questions;
(This was done to identify the number and nature of student proactive turns.)
f) - the total number of 2-turn exchanges (O+R),
  3-turn returns or transactions (O+R+C), (O+R+R),
  and multi-turn returns (O+Rn), (O+Rn+C).
[When f) was worked out, it was possible to determine how many exchanges, returns and transactions of varying lengths made up each session. To avoid confusion, the exchanges and returns were annotated with their turn numbers; e.g.
The above procedures a) to f) will provide partially complete answers to the first research question. To take the study from description to explanation (Candlin 1987), I will have to examine the raw data from various perspectives to discover where correlations can be drawn. Also, there is the need to look beyond the collected data to triangulate the feedback from the participants with my personal observations.

Before attempting to answer the second research question, I considered the findings of Psathas and Kozloff (1976). In their jointly published article entitled "The structure of directions", they declare that there is a recurrent 3-phase pattern in their data. These are:

a) a Situation phase,
b) an Information & Instructional phase and
c) an Ending phase.

Bearing this macro format in mind, I went through the transcripts to identify the macro phases for the 3 presentations to see whether Psathas and Kozloff's guidelines could be applied in this instructional context.

To begin with, the semantic framers and transitions were highlighted together with the turn numbers where they occurred. These were then checked against the interactional structures to see if they coincided with (O) opening and (C) closing turns. When the entire transcript was broken up
sequentially into macro phases and the turn boundaries were finalised, then the sequences of 2-turn exchanges, 3-turn returns and so forth were listed under the macro phase where they occurred.

This procedure enabled me to see clearly the pattern of interaction during each macro phase together with the total number of discursal engagements. In addition, using this worksheet format, I was able to plot in the proactive turns contributed by students to determine the frequency of these contributions and during which phases they were more likely to occur.

(See Table 11 p.107 for a tabulated example of the Hands-on phase of the 3 sessions conducted.)

To investigate the effectiveness of P1, P2 and P3's organisation of their discourse during these sessions, I employed the categories of talk proposed by Bowers (1987: 159-160). Only two phases i.e. the beginning and ending, were analysed in detail as in my opinion, these could adequately reflect the way the three informants structured their discourse.

The transcripts for the 3 beginnings were coded and analysed according to 2 categories of talk i.e. Sociate and Organise; while the transcripts for the endings were coded and analysed according to 6 categories i.e. Sociate, Organise, Present, Elicit, Respond and Evaluate. (Please refer to Appendices G p.206 and H p.210, for Bowers' definitions for these categories of talk and the analyses done.)

The aims of adopting these detailed analytical procedures are
to seek valid answers for the following issues which are embedded in the overall frame of the research questions:

a) do these presentations begin with a clear thesis statement or an expressed statement of intention?

b) is there a logical development of procedures according to chronological or sequential order?

c) are transitions and semantic framers used consistently and effectively?

d) do P1, P2 and P3 communicate at the students' level?

e) do they cite relevant examples to help students understand?

f) do they provide opportunities for students to initiate talk among themselves?

g) when and how often do students self-select to ask questions or contribute proactively towards the discourse?

h) do informants employ a variety of talk to engage students' interest?

i) are there any difficulties faced?

At each stage of the procedural analysis, the pertinent features were highlighted, count-coded and arranged in columned tables. Totals were double-checked to ensure they tallied with the total number of turns for each session. Turns performed by students individually were totalled separately from those they performed chorally or in unison. This was needed to identify the pattern of student participation at each macro phase.
Admittedly, inconsistencies and confusion prevail among adherents of various schools of thought in the discourse analysis arena. In order to maintain uniformity from the outset, I will define the critical terms to clarify how they are applied in this study.

To begin with, I shall adhere closely to the terms, procedures and approaches detailed by Gremmo, Holec and Riley (1985) in their joint studies conducted at CRAPEL on the analysis of interactive discourse.

In line with this model, participants are assigned 4 interactive roles (S=speaker, A=addressee, T=talker, and L=listener) and utterances are classified according to 3 main acts (O=Opening, R=Replying and C=Closing).

According to Gremmo, Holec and Riley (1985), the interactional structure can help to explain "spontaneous, oral, authentic discourse". Conversational participants are assigned 4 interactive roles, (S=Speaker, A=Addressee, T=Talker and L=Listener). Their contributions to the discourse are classified according to 3 primary speech acts, O=Opening, R=Replying, and C=Closing.

The tabulated interactional structure offers two advantages for analysing discourse data. Firstly, the relative distribu-
tion of turns among conversational participants can be clearly identified and quantified. Secondly, the nature of participants' turns performed as (S) speaker or (T) talker, and speaker dominance at each stage can be readily ascertained from the number of (S) turns monopolised by a particular speaker.

Interaction, in the view of the CRAPEL group, is the process of alternation of "floor-sharing" where contributions from all participants in a conversational exchange can be represented in the discourse. To be adequate, the description of interactive discourse must account for the following:

a) who speaks when and to whom,

b) the distribution of turns and

c) the possible association of the turn-taking distribution with speaker roles or rights to the floor.

3.7.2: Turn

A turn is the performance of one's contribution to the oral discourse by taking the floor. According to Riley, (1985:51) turns are treated as the basic "acts" of discourse and are performed communicatively as (O) openings, (R) replies or (C) closings.

Each turn can have more than one utterance and the length of the utterances within a turn can vary. In fact, sometimes a turn may be realised non-verbally by a nod of agreement, a shake of the head for disagreement, or a simple monosyllabic "Yes", "Yah", "Hmm" or "No". If a participant's contribution
or question is not heard or deliberately ignored, it is not considered to be a turn.

By the same token, a turn is not limited to a single illocutionary act. A participant can be assigned two or more consecutive turns. For example,

a) when he closes an exchange and initiates another by selecting a new (A) Addressee, or

b) when he performs a closing turn in which he imposes no obligation on his addressee(s) to reply, in which case they remain as (L) Listeners for that turn.

However, when the (S) Speaker initiates an opening turn immediately after that, he expects his (L) Listeners of the previous turn to be the (A) Addressees who have the duty to contribute some response at the end of his second speaking turn.

3.7.3 : Exchange

According to Greemno, Holec and Riley (1985:42), an exchange is the minimum unit of interactive discourse and is composed of an (O) opening and a (R) reply. \[ O + R \] The (O) opening turn is performed by the (S) speaker while the (A) addressee of the opening turn is expected to perform the (R) reply act.

If no reply, either verbal or nonverbal is forthcoming, then the current (S) speaker will continue to dominate the turn until he nominates a particular addressee to perform the reply, or until someone from the addressed group self-selects
to contribute the reply.

3.7.4 | Return or Transaction

In Riley's view (1985:51) any discourse engagement which involves more than 2 turns is classified as a "return". However, in the joint study conducted by Gremmo, Holec and Riley (1985:42) this is referred to as a "transaction". To maintain uniformity, I shall adhere to the term "return".

There are two ways to identify the end of a return. Firstly, it is signalled by a (C) closing act e.g. in the case of a 3-turn return (O+R+C) or a multi-turn return (O+Rn+C) where "n" is an unspecified number of reply moves.

Secondly, it is signalled by a change of addressee i.e. at the end of a 3-turn return (O+R+R) or a multi-turn return (O+Rn) the primary speaker will initiate an opening turn with a new conversational partner.

Once an exchange is completed, the speaker or initiator of the (O) opening turn has three options. This is where the CRAPEL model is in agreement with the guidelines proposed by Sacks et al (1974). According to them, the present speaker can either:

a) initiate a new exchange with the same conversational partner, with an (O) opening turn and an unspecified number of (R) reply moves e.g. [ O + Rn ].

b) turn usually occur when there is evidence of turn grabbing, an insertion sequence to reformulate or clarify a statement made earlier, or a question and answer session to resolve a
particular issue.]

b) nominate a new (A) addressee or
c) perform a closing turn in which he frees all participants of the duty to respond to the exchange.

The (O) opening turn of a return usually begins with the (S) speaker addressing the audience, with the (S A A A) structure i.e. assuming that it is a 3-member audience; or at least one of the members in the audience, with the (S A L L) structure.

The closing turn in the return has the (S L L L) structure as the (S) speaker does not expect any of the listeners to respond to the exchange. This happens when for example the (S) speaker wants to have the last say, or has concluded what he has to say and wishes to proceed to something else. Generally, the opening and closing turns of a transaction are performed by the same (S) speaker.

3.7.5: Interactive Roles

When a group of participants are engaged in interactive discourse, they can be assigned one of four interactive roles. These roles are generally equated to the functions and acts that a speaker performs in the turn-taking mechanism.

a) The (S) speaker is the one who initiates the (O) opening move in the exchange, or the one who initiates and closes the return.

b) The (A) addressee is the one who is addressed, i.e. the
one who is obliged to give the right of turn to the (S) speaker and has been nominated to give a verbal or nonverbal reply at the end of the speaker's turn.

The manner of address may be explicitly stated in words or sometimes it may be expressed through non-verbal signals and cues like eye-contact, gesture, or body language.

c) The role of (T) talker normally falls to the (A) addressee of the previous turn. This differs from the role of (S) speaker in that the (T) talker has no choice but to perform the (R) reply move and to address the previous (S) speaker as his interactive partner.

d) The (L) listener can participate in the interaction although he does not take the floor and is not the one who is addressed during a particular turn. At anytime, a (L) listener can possibly be the (S) speaker or (A) addressee. It is possible for a (L) listener to interrupt, such as grab the floor out of turn even when he is not addressed.

Listeners can also indirectly influence the course of an interaction through their continuous transmission of verbal or nonverbal cues to the speaker or addressee to indicate boredom, inattentiveness, fatigue, interest, enthusiasm, etc.

3.7.6 : Discourse Rights and Privileges

Discourse rights and privileges refer to a speaker's rights to the floor. In this context, when participants control discourse rights, they are expected to do the following :-
i) perform openings, replies and closings,
ii) evaluate addressees' comments and contributions,
iii) grab turns to self-correct or interrupt,
iv) take as many and as extended turns at talk as they want to finish saying what they have projected to say,
v) have the freedom to choose and address their conversational partner(s).

From the description of a speaker's discourse rights or the repertoire of his interactive acts, we can draw generalisations about his role in a particular context of interaction. In addition, the discourse rights and privileges of a dominant speaker may not remain constant throughout any encounter as there has to be a certain degree of floor-sharing and interactive exchange for participants to engage meaningfully in discourse so that instructional objectives can be met in this context of use.

3.7.7 : Proactive and Reactive Turns

To define what are proactive and reactive contributions to the discourse, I compiled the definition from 3 sources. They are:

i) Seliger's paper on learner interaction in which he explains the notions of (HIG) high input generators and (LIG) low input generators (1977),

ii) Wenden & Rubin's "Learner Strategies in Language learning" (1987), and

iii) Yngve's article on back-channeling behaviour (1970).
According to the guidelines and suggestions in i) and ii), proactive turns are the contributions or questions of good learners. These include talk initiated by students which reflect their willingness to take risks and help them manage their own learning. In the context of this study, proactive turns are used to fulfil the following functions:

a) to seek confirmation of information or procedures,

b) to ask for explanation or clarification,

c) to seek peripheral information not previously mentioned,

d) to express one’s own ideas, stand and intentions,

e) to initiate self-repair strategies when the addressee fails to get the message,

f) to take risks and learn by trial and error and

g) to interact with peers.

A reactive turn, on the contrary, is mainly student talk in response to the instructor. The instructor initiates the contact or solicits the reply which students are obliged to give. There is limited freedom to express views. Thus back-channeling signals which students perform as i) non-verbal turns, ii) monosyllabic replies and iii) a combination of non-verbal and monosyllabic replies fall into this category.

3.8 Conclusion

By adhering to these terms and the conceptual framework, I will proceed to

a) transcribe the oral data according to speaker turns,
b) chart the interactional structures for the three CD-ROM familiarisation sessions conducted by the three SL librarians,

c) identify the patterns and lengths for the interactional exchanges and returns/transactions for each macro phase of the three presentations,

d) identify the distribution of speakership,

e) identify the nature of student contributions,

f) identify the typical pattern of discoursal features commonly used by the three informants, such as semantic markers, question words, transitional phrases, pre-sequences, moves during extended talking turns, strategies for simplification of content or self-initiated repair strategies...etc.

The findings will be presented, selectively analysed and discussed in the following chapter. It is hoped that the outcomes of these investigative analyses can shed some useful insights on SL discourse patterns in this particular instructional setting, where SL librarians function as intermediaries between the technology and SL student user groups.