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Factors Influencing Interactional Competence: A Case Study of Level One and Two students at UWI St. Augustine.

Abstract

Interactional competence within the context of a foreign language, involves skilful navigation of the flow of ideas between two or more individuals. Interaction is influenced by sociocultural and socio-psychological factors. The main aim of this study was to investigate the factors and sub-factors that impeded the interactional competence of level one and two students pursuing Spanish majors and minors, at The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine campus. Data were derived from thirty level one and twenty-nine level two students in both a classroom setting and an examination setting. Six focus groups were conducted with level one and level two students. Questionnaires were administered to a total of twenty-nine (n=29) level two students of which twenty-two (n=22) were females and seven (n=7) were males, whereas in level one thirty students of which twenty-three were females (n=23) and seven were males (n=7). The researcher inspired after observing the difficulty encountered by students’ interaction in the classroom, led to a mixed method approach to data collection via focus groups and questionnaires. The questions prepared gained insight into the problems that affect students’ interactional competence and sought to investigate measures implemented to resolve the problems they identified. The analysis of qualitative data was carried out by thematic coding. On the other hand, quantitative data was analysed using numerical analysis. The main findings of the study indicated that level two students displayed a greater level of interactional competence than their level one counterparts. This could be attributed to the increased level of contact, practice as well as interaction with native speakers the contact for the level two was higher due to the fact that
they were in the programme longer whereas the level ones had only begun a few months prior. Also, it uncovered the challenges faced by level one and two students that hindered interactional competence; lack of preparation before attending the class, lack of knowledge on the topic and participants interest in the topic whereas for level one lack of practice, the lack of vocabulary, knowledge of grammatical structures and issues of translation.
Introduction

In today’s modern world which has increasingly become globalized, a foreign language is an important asset. It is invaluable that students become skilled and knowledgeable in a second or foreign language. Communication is essential for survival and due to increased globalization, it is necessary for economic growth and sustainability, as business and commerce are important sectors for the continued economic stability of Trinidad and Tobago. Due to the strategic location of Trinidad and Tobago and its proximity to Spanish speaking nations, the study of Spanish as a second language would definitely be a crucial step towards cementing communication and trading ties with Latin American countries.

Additionally, Spanish is the first official foreign language of Trinidad and Tobago which is observed in Street signs and numerous landmarks. The University of the West Indies has a Spanish language programme which is tailored to the specific needs of students and equips them for career opportunities in various fields not only nationally, but also regionally and internationally. The programme is intensive and dynamically designed to target various aspects of the language however, the focus of this research is interactional competence. The programme is taught by teachers who are native speakers of the language which provides students with a unique and enriched learning experience. The Common European Framework of Reference for Language, Teaching and Assessment (CEFR) is used as a guiding instrument for learning, teaching and assessment (Council of Europe 1) and is the method used to test interactional competence of the participants in this study.
The research being conducted investigates the factors influencing interactional competence of level One and two Students at UWI St. Augustine. Interaction is a significant aspect in learning a foreign language. According to Long (qtd. in Tecedor 2016) in second language (SL) learning, interaction with members of the speech community does not solely aid learners in the analysis of linguistic forms (23) but it allows learners to engage in significant social activities. In various studies conducted in the field of second language social interaction, it has been found that interactional competence is a key factor in becoming a competent speaker of the target language.

Rationale

The motivation for this topic was inspired by the observation of the lack of interaction between students in a year three Spanish conversation class. The need became promoted to identify if this dynamic was also observed within level one and level two student groups via comparative study. Additionally, there was a need to identify the factors that hindered interaction not only in a classroom setting but also under exam conditions as interaction is one of the most important factor in order to achieve effective communication. Also, as a current year three student with the hopes of entering the teaching profession in the near future, I would like to identify challenges in interaction experienced by students and identify its effects on the development of students’ second language learning, as well as strategies that could be implemented by both teachers and students to facilitate the development of this indispensable skill.

Aims

This study seeks to investigate factors that affect interactional competence of students at UWI (University of the West Indies) who are pursuing a major or minor in Spanish at the
A1/A2 and B1/B2 levels of the CEFR. This research incorporates a working definition of interactional competence, the importance of this skill in learning a second language, the factors that affect interactional competence and strategies that can be implemented to improve this skill.

**Objectives**

- To identify issues related to the lack of interaction between students.
- To uncover possible solutions to interactional challenges.
- To implement various strategies to assist students with greater interactional competence.

**Research Questions**

1. What factors influence level one students’ performance in the classroom setting?
2. What factors influence level two students’ performance in the classroom setting?
3. To what extent did these factors influence students’ performance in examination setting?

**Methodology**

This yearlong empirical investigation conducted at the University of the West Indies (UWI), St. Augustine included quantitative and qualitative data collections methods. The main focus was on investigating interactional competence of level one and level two students from the UWI. It is believed that by using this multi-faceted approach would better aid the researcher in understanding this relatively new concept in the field of second language acquisition. The data obtained would aid in exploring interactional competence in this specific concept. The qualitative method of data collection included observations and focus
groups while the quantitative data was gathered from questionnaires. Each research method was administered within the classroom context, as it was most natural and convenient to the participants. The researcher thought that this would contribute in gaining richer analytical data. The first method, observation, was implemented by the researcher asking lecturers for permission to sit and observe classroom practices. Once permission was granted, the researcher sat in a few classes and observed student interaction which aided in designing questions for the focus groups.

Focus groups, the second method of data collection, were conducted with six groups of students, who willingly took part. Three focus groups were comprised of level one students and the other three focus groups of level two students. The number of students who participated in each focus group was an average of ten students. Participants granted permission to be audio recorded during the focus groups. The researcher assured that their identity would be kept confidential and anonymous. In level one, a total of twenty-nine (n=29) students participated in the focus groups of which twenty-four (n=24) were females and (n=5) were males whereas in level two twenty students participated in the focus groups fourteen females (n=14) and six males (n=6). The questions were prepared by the researcher with the objective of gaining insight into the problems that affect student interactional competence and the measures implemented to resolve the problems they identified (see appendix A).

The data gathered from previous focus groups guided the researcher in the design of a questionnaire, which constituted the third method of data collection. Questions included in the questionnaire were more specific and targeted direct issues of interactional competence that were mentioned by the students in the focus groups. Participants who responded to the questionnaire did so voluntarily and anonymously. The sample size initially was set at sixty participants from the Spanish level one and two courses, these students were pursuing
majors/minors in Spanish however, of the expected sixty questionnaires only fifty-nine were answered. This total could be subdivided into thirty (n=30) year one participants and (n=29) year two participants (see appendix B).

The analysis of qualitative data was carried out by thematic coding. The responses were obtained from students by both observation and focus groups. On the other hand, quantitative data were analysed using numerical analysis. In this chapter background, rationale, aims and objectives, research questions and methodology. Chapter one reviews the literature pertaining to this study and the main theoretical framework that underpins this research is presented. This framework is used to analyse the main factors that influence the construct of interactional competence in this particular context. Chapter 2 presents the most significant quantitative findings arising from the questionnaire. In chapter 3, the findings gathered from class observation and focus groups as well as from questionnaires are discussed in light of previous research in the field. The final chapter highlights the most relevant outcomes, limitations and recommendations.
Chapter 1

Literature Review

The onset of the modern age has made different cultures easily accessible and influential at an exponential rate. This has given rise to the increase in interpersonal encounters and the need for the quality of interactional competency to be addressed. In this chapter, the interactional competence of second language speakers would be investigated from level one and level two Spanish speakers and the factors affecting the interactional competency levels of students by briefly identifying studies conducted by Canale and Swain (1980) and others in that field of study.

Second language interactional competence

A competent user of the language can be regarded as an individual who possesses the ability to skilfully and effectively manage the exchange of ideas with other individuals in a conversation. The same can be said of a second language user. However, effective communication incorporates the efficient manipulation of both internal and external factors facing users and their successful manoeuvring of the interaction. As Canale & Swain (28-31) state that Communicative Competence of individuals involves linguistic, pragmatic, discourse and strategic competence. Later on, Bachman (84) modified this model of communicative competence and proposed a Communicative Language Ability where the above traits interact with the context in which the interaction occurs. He explains that the individual’s strategic competence plays an important role in this interaction with the context. Canale & Swain and Bachman place communicative competence as a personal trait of an individual.
Interactional competence was first mentioned by Kramsch who defined it not only as: a shared knowledge of the world, the reference to a common external context of communication, but also [as] the construction of a shared internal context or sphere of intersubjectivity that is built through the collaborative efforts of the interactional partners (367).

These features as proposed by Kramsch and its main concern is language use in a specific context and not on the speaker's ability which is independent of context. Secondly, there is a greater focus on the co-construction of discursive practices by all speakers not only on specific individual. Thirdly, the theory describes the common interactional resources that participants use in order to co-construct a discursive practice and fourthly, in investigating what the discursive practice consists of. On the other hand, Interactional Competence is seen as the co-constructed speakers’ performance within discursive practices. It outlines a descriptive framework of socio-cultural characteristics shared by participants in the discursive practices (Young 4). Young disagrees with the claims made by Canale & Swain and Bachman by stating that interactional competence is communication between two or more individuals and includes the dynamics that the individuals utilize as they converse. He proposed six resources that are implemented in within a conversation: a) knowledge of rhetorical scripts, b) knowledge of register, c) knowledge of how to take turns-at-talk, d) knowledge of topical organization, e) knowledge of appropriate ways of participating in the practice, and f) knowledge of the means for signalling boundaries between practices and transitions within the practice itself (Young 6). Furthermore, Young (2011) characterizes context as “larger than the place and time of interaction, and includes the network of physical, spatial, temporal, social, interactional, institutional, political, and historical
circumstances in which participants do a practice. The relationship between context and practice is a complex one but it is not arbitrary” (428).

Many professionals in this field have suggested that the theory of interactional competence is a relatively new discipline that has been around for about four decades. Ellis and Van Lier (3) claim that language learning does not occur through interaction but within interaction (qtd. in Chioukh 2011). Canale and Swain (4) are the main proponents of the theory of communicative competence; this theory categorizes a learner’s competence in the language in terms of linguist, sociolinguistics and strategic competence. This provides insight on the knowledge and skills that are necessary for speakers to be proficient users of the language which means that they communicate accurately, appropriately and effectively in the target language.

**Alignment within the classroom setting**

Alignment has been said to be one of the newest addition to resources of interaction (Ding 742; Tecedor 25). During a conversation, participants would take turns as both listener and speaker. Participants would have an active role in the conversation as they would respond verbally to indicate that the message transmitted was understood.

Alignment could be defined as “the set of conversational devices that interactants use to position themselves with respect to their interlocutor’s message” (Atkinson, Churchill, Nishino, & Okada 2007; Nofsinger, 1991 qtd. in Tecedor 2016 p.26). There are various alignment moves such as assessments, collaborative contributions, and collaborative completions turn-taking, rephrasing, adding, finishing the speakers’ sentences.

The conversational devices implemented by the listener in relation to the message conveyed are those which signify alignment. In a study by Ding (2014) in collaborative
discussion the speaker has the ability to paraphrase the information of the precursory turn or add to what was said by the interlocutor. This required that students be actively engaged in conversation either with native speakers or even the lecturer.

Additionally, in a study done by Tecedor which focused on the manner in which beginning learners of Spanish expressed alignment. This is a type of interactional resource in peer to peer conversations. In a conversation, participants take turns between being the transmitter and receiver. There are only a few studies in this area: Dings, 2014; Masuda, 2011; Ohta, 2001, but the researchers have come to the realization that interactional resources are acquired or learnt by active participation in interactive practices by interacting with more proficient speakers of the language or even the teacher. For instance, Masuda states that turn taking is another aspect that is necessary and would allow a conversation continuity the following are features of turn taking “displaying and seeking agreement or confirmation, initiating interaction, introducing a new topic….” (521). Tecedor’s study examined the dialogue of learners of beginner Spanish and how these students implemented alignment moves which are features of interactional competence. These features include paraphrasing, adding, repeating, interrupting and confirming among others. She found that interaction with native speakers will definitely aid in the development of aligning and this by extension could improve interactional competence. These studies have focused on assessing what are the various factors that affect interactional competence. Also, in providing strategies for teaching and learning a second language.

Interactional competence is a skill that could be learnt overtime and mastered by language learners. According to various studies if foreign language learners are provided with opportunities to speak with proficient speakers their interactional competence would increase. Thus, interactional competence seems to go beyond communicative competence and is not only limited to the knowledge of form and function but requires adaptive measures within the
developing interactive process. In the field of second and foreign language acquisition a number of studies have been conducted specifically on interactional competence at it is viewed as an important aspect in communication.

Classroom Interactional competence

Fawzia (qtd. in Luu and Nguyen) suggested three categories of factors that influence oral interaction: student, social and educational factors. The bracket of student factors includes perception, attitudes, learning styles, background and personality types. The social factors comprise of the gender of the student and even how they feel in working with groups while pedagogical factors consist of the lecturer, topics and everything pertaining to the course (38). In another study conducted by Urmeneta & Walsh 2017 highlighted the issues experienced in the classroom in terms of interactional competence and its effects on learners and teachers. They discussed the relationship between linguistic and interactional resources which is crucial to communication within the classroom setting. The study on classroom interactional competence drew heavily on empirical and theoretical works by other contributors to the theory of interactional competence. It focused on the manner in which teachers’ and learners’ interactional decisions impacted learning based on what was done subsequently after the interaction. It was discovered that this has the potential to enhance language learning as well as the opportunities for language learning. The study also showcased various features pertaining to classroom interactional competence followed by an illustrative study. It found that feedback was the most crucial interactional practice a teacher could master because of its great influence on language learning.

Furthermore, in another study conducted by Nguyen and Luu (2010), various aspects of interactional competence were investigated, this included forms of interactional
competence which could be subdivided into teacher and learner interaction, learner and learner interaction as well as subsets of factors that fall within both groups. Another important area that was delved into were factors influencing oral interaction and classroom interaction and second language acquisition.

Thus, this chapter presented previous research in the field of interactional competence within the classroom setting, and the ability of students to improve interactional competency through the use of interactional resources or alignment moves. The following chapter will discuss the findings pertaining to the study.
Chapter 2

Results

This chapter presents the analysis of the data collected via questionnaires on various factors that hindered or promoted interaction. As mentioned in chapter one, this study entailed classroom observations, focus groups and questionnaires as methods of data collection. The researcher tried her best to observe the same group of students, as well as to allow the same students to be part of the focus group in order to have continuity and fluidity in the study. The questionnaire was distributed to thirty (n=30) level one students and twenty-nine (n=29) level two students, who willingly expressed their consent to participate in the study. The data presented in the figures below show illustrate results on the different factors that either hindered or promoted participants’ interaction. The researcher opted to present and group together the data of level I and level II students’ responses. This may allow the reader to engage with the results obtained in this study.

Fig. 1. The graph represents Level I participants’ self-assessment of speaking performance in the second language.
The figure depicts the responses of seven (n=7) males and twenty-three (n=23) females between the ages of 19-24. The majority of females rated their self-assessment of speaking as moderate which corresponds to fifty percent (50%) followed by good forty percent (40%) then very good. However, the majority of male students rated their speaking as good which corresponded to forty-two percent (42%). A few participants both male and female also believed that their speaking performance was poor with fourteen percent (14%) being male and four percent (4%) females.

Fig. 2 represents level II participants’ self-assessment of speaking performance in the second language.

Fig. 2 indicates the self-assessment of level two students. The main choice for participants was moderate. The majority of female participants which rated their speaking performance as moderate, represented forty percent (40%) of female participants, followed by good then very good. Male participants had forty-two percent (42%) indicating equal moderate, followed by good then to a lesser extent by very good. The data represented in the graph corresponds to twenty-nine (n=29) participants from level two which could be further
subdivided into seven males (n=7) and twenty-two females (n=22) between the ages of 19-23 years.

A notable difference between the collected data of level I and level II participants were that a few level I participants’ claimed that speaking performance was poor whereas none of the level II participants stated such. There was less difference between male and females of level two whilst there was greater difference with participants of level one between males and females.

![Graph](image)

**Fig. 3.** The graph indicates Level I class Participation Frequency

The data in Fig. 3 indicates that the males participated more frequently than the females in the classroom setting with forty-two percent (42%) of male students and thirty-six percent of females (36%) stating that they always participated in classroom discussions. The percentages for females who always participated and those who participated only a few times were similar whereas for males the percentages for participating sometimes and a few times were similar. None of the participants indicated that they never participated.
The information presented indicates that the males would always participate which correlated to forty-two percent (42%) of males, whereas only twenty-two percent of females indicated that they always participated. The category which represented participating sometimes within classroom setting was selected by fifty-nine percent of females and forty-two percent of male participants from level II. This was followed by a few times being the smallest category with only a few students selecting this option.

Comparing both figures, it is evident that males always participated within classroom settings. Females were more reluctant to participate in class. The majority of level two participants could be categorized as always or sometimes participating whereas the category for a few times had twice the percentage of level I. Students more level ones indicated a few times. None of the participants indicated never.
Fig. 5. The pie chart represents the percentage of level I students that interacted with native Spanish speakers.

Most of the female participants which correlates to fourteen (n=14) participants indicated that they practiced with native speakers whilst (n=9) responded negatively. With respect to the male participants five (n=5) responded in the affirmative while two (n=2) responded in the negative.

Fig. 6. The pie chart represents the percentage of level II students that interacted with native Spanish Speakers.

Fig. 6 pie chart is a representation of the level two students who practiced and interacted with native Spanish speakers. The majority of females stipulated that they practiced with Spanish speakers which corresponded to sixteen (n=16) females which is
representative of 72.2% whilst six (n=6) indicated that they did not practice with native speakers. The majority of males also indicated that they practiced with Spanish speaker which reflects six (n=6) out of the seven (n=7) male participants.

The data is very similar for both level one and two students.

![Bar Chart](image)

Fig. 7. Comfort of level I students interacting within the classroom setting.

The majority of students were comfortable interacting within the classroom setting. However, there were a few students who indicated that they were uncomfortable interacting in the classroom. The students cited various reasons as to the reasons they felt comfortable within the classroom setting such as classroom interactions are much easier as opposed to one on one among various other reasons. Some of the reasons for discomfort included shyness, afraid of making errors, judgement from other students and lack of advancement in conversation skills as compared to other students.
Fig. 8. Comfort level of level II participants interacting within classroom setting.

The graph reveals that most students were comfortable interacting in the classroom setting with nineteen (n=19) females responding in the affirmative and three (n=3) females in the negative. They stated that the main reason for the discomfort being anxiety. All the male participants responded in the affirmative. All the male level two participants felt comfortable interacting within the classroom setting whereas in level one there were both male and female students who were uncomfortable interacting in class.

Challenges Encountered by Students

Table 1

Challenges encountered by Level I students in conversation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Accent of the native speakers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Colloquial/Unknown words</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conjugation of regular verbs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Different accents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Formulating complex sentences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Formulating questions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Having to translate in your mind</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Health issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lack of confidence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lack of knowledge on the topic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The various challenges that affected the students’ interaction in conversation (see Table 1). Males were most affected by lack of practice, whilst females were most impacted by challenge fourteen (14) which was lack of vocabulary followed by challenge six (6) formulating complex sentences. Females also had issues with having to translate in their mind (challenge 8), lack of practice (challenge 12), speed of speaker (challenge 18) and accents of native speakers (challenge 21). Whilst the biggest challenges for males were lack of practice (challenge 12), speed of speaker (challenge 18) and native speaker accent (challenge 1).
Table 2 is indicative of the challenges that were faced by male and female participants in conversation. It is interesting to note that challenge eighteen (18) which was speed of native speakers was the issue that the majority of participants faced. The second challenge faced by the more male participants than females was challenge twenty-three (23), using the subjunctive. Females had difficulty with colloquial or unknown words which they stipulated as shown with challenge two. Another issue for females was lack of confidence. Whilst males had issues with comprehending and formulating complex sentences.

The challenges that most of the level I and II participants experienced varied with most level two students having a problem with the speed of native speakers, whereas level I students were challenged by thirteen (13) lack of practice for males and females challenge (14) lack of vocabulary.
Interactional resources

Table 3

In class context in order to maintain conversation – level I students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you risk saying whichever tense even though it may be a grammatical mistake?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81.82</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you clarify with a classmate or tutor?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you just not say anything at all?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you summarise the point reached in a discussion and help focus the talk?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72.73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you ask your partner questions?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you repeat part of what someone has said to confirm mutual understanding and help keep the development of ideas on course?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81.82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you initiate, maintain and close simple face to face conversation on topics that are familiar or of personal interest?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77.27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you intervene in a discussion on a familiar topic, using a suitable phrase to get the floor?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77.27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 9 represents the interactional resources utilized by the participants of level I in order to maintain a conversation within the classroom context.
Participants were more inclined to ask questions and clarifying what was said, with the majority of males and females applying these strategies in order to maintain conversations. Reformulating, initiating and intervening were options that participants indicated by both male and female participants. Risk saying anything was also a response that many of the participants reported, on the other hand saying nothing was the least popular response.

Table 4

In class context in order to maintain conversation – level II students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male  %</td>
<td>Female %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you risk saying whichever tense even though it may be a grammatical mistake?</td>
<td>5 71.43  19 86.36</td>
<td>2 28.57  3 13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you clarify with a classmate or tutor?</td>
<td>5 71.43  22 100.00</td>
<td>2 28.57  0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you just not say anything at all?</td>
<td>4 57.14  5 22.73</td>
<td>3 42.86  17 77.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you summarise the point reached in a discussion and help focus the talk?</td>
<td>5 71.43  19 86.36</td>
<td>2 28.57  3 13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you ask your partner questions?</td>
<td>6 85.71  19 86.36</td>
<td>1 14.29  3 13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you repeat part of what someone has said to confirm mutual understanding and help keep the development of ideas on course?</td>
<td>7 100.00  22 100.00</td>
<td>- 0.00  0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you initiate, maintain and close simple face to face conversation on topics that are familiar or of personal interest?</td>
<td>6 85.71  20 90.91</td>
<td>1 14.29  2 9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you intervene in a discussion on a familiar topic, using a suitable phrase to get the floor?</td>
<td>5 71.43  19 86.36</td>
<td>2 28.57  3 13.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 10. represents the interactional resources utilized by the participants of level II in order to maintain a conversation within the classroom context.

Participants were more inclined to ask questions and clarifying what was said with the majority of males and females applying these strategies in order to maintain conversations.

It can be noticed that, as in Fig. 9, reformulating, initiating and intervening were options elicited by both female and male participants.

Table 5

In exam context in order to maintain conversation – level I students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you risk saying whichever tense even though it may be a grammatical mistake?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you clarify with a classmate or tutor?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you just not say anything at all?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you summarise the point reached in a discussion and help focus the talk?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you ask your partner questions?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you repeat part of what someone has said to confirm mutual understanding and help keep the development of ideas on course?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you initiate, maintain and close simple face to face conversation on topics that are familiar or of personal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Can you intervene in a discussion on a familiar topic, using a suitable phrase to get the floor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 11. represents the interactional resources utilized by level I participants to maintain a conversation within examination context.

Table 5 showing the strategies implemented by participants in order to maintain classroom interactions both males and females indicated that they would reformulate what had already been said with one-hundred percent (100%) of the participants using this strategy. Also the majority of females also showed that clarifying, initiating as well as intervening and asking questions with these two having equal amounts of female participants implementing them as a strategy. However, males were also inclined to ask questions, initiate and intervene in that order. To a lesser degree participants would also risk saying anything more females than males did this, summarising was also another strategy that females opted to use. It was also shown that males were more inclined to saying nothing as opposed to the females.
Table 6

In exam context in order to maintain conversation – level II students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you risk saying whichever tense even though it may be a grammatical mistake?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male %</td>
<td>Female %</td>
<td>Male %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>72.73</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you clarify with a classmate or tutor?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male %</td>
<td>Female %</td>
<td>Male %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you just not say anything at all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male %</td>
<td>Female %</td>
<td>Male %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>42.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you summarise the point reached in a discussion and help focus the talk?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male %</td>
<td>Female %</td>
<td>Male %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>86.36</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you ask your partner questions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male %</td>
<td>Female %</td>
<td>Male %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you repeat part of what someone has said to confirm mutual understanding and help keep the development of ideas on course?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male %</td>
<td>Female %</td>
<td>Male %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>95.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you initiate, maintain and close simple face to face conversation on topics that are familiar or of personal interest?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male %</td>
<td>Female %</td>
<td>Male %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>90.91</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you intervene in a discussion on a familiar topic, using a suitable phrase to get the floor?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male %</td>
<td>Female %</td>
<td>Male %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>90.91</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 12. Indicates some of the interactional resources that were implemented by level II students under examination context.
The strategies implemented in order to maintain conversation under exam conditions. The main responses by male and female participants included the following: ask questions followed by reformulating, initiating and intervening. These four were also the most popular options amongst male students.

![Fig. 13. Features of interaction used by level One female students.](image)

Level one features of interaction employed by females in conversation. Females in level one indicated that adding was the feature of interaction that they implemented the most, paraphrasing and then repeating were the other main features that were indicated.

![Fig. 14. Features of interaction used by level one male students](image)
Males in level one selected confirmation as the main feature of interaction, indicating that they utilized always. Paraphrasing and interruption were also cited as a technique they used.

Fig. 15. Features of interaction used by level two male students.

Confirmation, repeating and paraphrasing were the options indicated by most participants.

Fig. 16. Features of interaction used by level two female students.

Repeating, paraphrasing and adding were the features utilized most by level two female participants. It is interesting to note that similar features of interaction were used by
both level one and two participants. However, level one males differed as they used interrupting and confirming instead of paraphrasing and adding. These findings are further discussed and compared in the following chapter where reasons are given concerning the major results as well as comparison with the research from the literature review.
Chapter 3
Discussion

In the previous chapter, the most significant findings from the data collected was presented. In this chapter the researcher attempted to synthesize the data discussing interactional competence with reference to other studies conducted in the field. The first question on the questionnaire assessed the speaking performance of the participants to determine the level at which each student rated their speaking performance. It can be noted that command and confidence in the use of the second language was definitely a factor that aided or hindered interactional competence. These factors that hindered or promoted interactional competence would be further addressed in this chapter.

*How are conversational skills influenced by Interactional Competence?*

Interactional competence is the ability to have a conversation that is mutually understood by two or more individuals. The majority of participants in the study had opportunities in which they could interact with native speakers of the language, which is an invaluable asset as this would definitely aid in the increase of interactional competence. However, participants who have a lower proficiency level in the language according to Masuda would build interactional competence at a much slower pace. Moreover, it would inhibit their ability to initiate and maintain conversation with native speakers (521). This challenge definitely affected the eleven participants of level one who indicated that they did not have conversations with native speakers versus the seven students of level two. It could be derived that fewer level two participants engaged in this practice due to students coming to the realization of the benefits of conversing with native speakers. Level one participants who did not interact with native speakers stated anxiety as the reason and the fact that they felt
they “needed to be as good as them” whereas level twos were more inclined to seek opportunities to interact with native speakers. This was observed even though Fig.5 and Fig.6. indicates only a negligible percentile difference between level one and two in their interaction with native speakers.

*Participation frequency*

The Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 in the results chapter, were representative of participation frequency within the classroom context. It was found that individuals from level two participated more frequently than those of level one and based on observations and analysis of the results this was confirmed. In level one as well as in level two, some students would not participate in class discussions which could be attributed to poor speaking performance as expressed by male and female participants. However, none of the level two participants self-assessed their speaking performance as poor, whereas in level one a few students stated that their speaking performance was poor. Another factor that was mentioned by participants in the focus group interviews was lack of knowledge on the topic that was being discussed, as a hindrance to their ability to effectively communicate. Students according to observations, showed a lack of interest in the topic being discussed or they had limited vocabulary on the topic which also affected their ability to maintain the conversation. These all contributed to some of the challenges that both level one and two participants encountered.

*Challenges that hindered Interactional Competence*

Additionally, participants also expressed affective factors which hindered interactional competence. The most notable factors included: motivation, lack of confidence, risk taking as well as certain cognitive gaps in terms of lack of preparation before attending the class, lack of knowledge on the topic and participants’ interest in the topic. In focus
groups, more level one students expressed “don’t like to make errors because I feel judged by other students” and also that more proficient users of the language were intimidating, “stronger students could be intimidating”. These reasons attributed to the students’ lack of participation especially in level one. These students would not participate in discussions to avoid feeling embarrassed or ashamed. According to observations, students would laugh and giggle when errors were made during class discussions. This was definitely a factor that affected the level one students as there was limited discussion. The same number of female participants in level one and level two also indicated that they felt uncomfortable in the classroom setting. Level two students had a greater level of familiarity than level one students, as such when errors were made these level two students would not laugh at their classmates. Students said that “we are all here to learn and everyone is at the same level” This level of familiarity also promoted interaction within the classroom setting for level two which had a greater level of communication occurring than those of level one. Another factor observed was that the lecturer would encourage all students to participate by asking direct questions and would correct errors that were made by students. Both lecturers had various activities planned to engage the students and that should have been able to promote conversation and interaction within the classroom. The activities were all task- based and were designed to incite some level of interaction from the students. They also tried to ensure that the classroom was a comfortable environment that was conducive to learning and would readily clarify any misunderstanding by the students.

Another interesting observation was that students would automatically code-switch if they felt that they could not explain themselves in the second language. This also occurred when the participants struggled to find the vocabulary or lexicon to adequately explain the point they were trying to discuss. They would immediately switch to English to explain what they were trying to say. The researcher observed that the level one participants were keener
on switching to English whilst this practice would occur to a lesser extent with level two participants. Level two students would actively try to explain their point in the second language and would switch when they could not find the adequate vocabulary to explain.

It was observed that level one participants’ speech was marked by errors and mistakes more than their level two counterparts. To become proficient in the language requires a lot of practice and experience. Additionally, another factor that hindered the student’s interactional competence was lack of practice, which is extremely important in mastering a foreign language. Lack of practice was an issue that the level ones stipulated the most. The lack of vocabulary, knowledge of grammatical structures, as well as trying to translate internally is not grasped immediately but requires consistent practicing. Speaking in a foreign language requires dedication and active learning by the students in order to develop competence which is learnt over time. Interactional competence development breaks with traditional ideologies of language acquisition which was seen as gradually building up and being contextualized in the mind of the learners. Campbell Larsen (2014) “Interactional competence development is not seen to be such a linear process with a clearly identifiable sequence of acquisition, but rather, emergent from the particular exigencies of talk-in-interaction that the learner finds him[herself] or herself [in]” (270).

Examination context

During the focus groups the majority of students expressed that for Spanish examinations in both level one and two that both male and female individuals spoke spontaneously under examination conditions. Only a few participants from level one claimed that they prepared beforehand and outlined the manner in which the conversation would unfold. Students’ mentioned that lack of knowledge on a topic was a hindrance in this context. In addition to lack of knowledge being a challenge, it also affected fluency with one
student stating that “fluency may struggle if not familiar with topic”. Another challenge mentioned by students was time constraints as these examinations are timed.

Atkinson et al. (2007) define alignment as “the complex means by which human beings effect coordinated interaction and maintain that interaction in dynamically adaptive ways” (169). Level one and level two participants were able to manipulate these communicative strategies well with repeating, paraphrasing and confirmation being the most popular choice of the various interactional resources (see tables 3 and 4) which indicates the implementation of these resources in the class context. In the examination context students of both level one and two also implemented interactional competence resources and similarly to classroom context repeating, paraphrasing, adding and confirming were used the most. On the other hand, level one students were keener on risk taking in the exam context (see table 5) whereas level two students would not take risks during exams and would try to be as accurate as possible. Collaborative completions turn-taking, rephrasing, adding were definitely utilized by participants and alignment moves such as assessments were also a factor used in the development of these interactional research.

These interactional resources are main components of alignment which would lead to greater interactional competence as these resources allow for the maintenance of conversations. In second language acquisition, it is important that students learn interactive resources as strategies for interactional competence. However, this could only be achieved within social interaction as such students may learn them during classroom interactions, then apply these to other interactive situations. My observations of participants in the classroom setting showed that many students especially in level one would not participate in classroom discussions when these discussions involved all the students within the classroom. The same students would participate time and time again, while the majority of the class would just listen. The classroom setting does allow for the learning and practice of communicative
strategies in interaction as students learn about situations in a virtual environment. This is known as classroom interactional competence. Walsh posits that interaction is central to teaching and learning and therefore, improvement of the quality of interaction in the classroom can positively impact teachers, learners and learning opportunities (130).

It is necessary that interaction be placed as a key factor in the learning and teaching of a foreign language which would drastically improve learning. It can be said that interactional competence is an important condition for learning a second language. The classroom setting is where students would be able to learn these skills that would aid in every conversation that arises. It is important to note however that to encourage interaction in the classroom it should be a comfortable environment that is conducive to learning. In this way interactional competence will be improved and developed amongst the students.

In the following chapter solutions to this problem will be further discussed. Additionally, limitations to the study and possible areas for future research will be addressed.
Conclusion

This study investigated the factors that promoted or hindered interactional competence in level one students and level two students as well as comparisons and contrasts of these findings. It comprised of participants who were Spanish majors and minors at UWI. This study focused on investigating by means of qualitative and quantitative data. The main findings of the study indicated that challenges affecting interactional competence for both level one and level two students included lack of preparation, lack of knowledge and interest in certain topic areas, familiarity with grammatical constructs and translation impairments during conversation. Level two students displayed a greater level of interactional competence than their level one counterparts. Increased contact levels with peers and native speakers, ongoing practice and longer time in degree programme, led to higher competency levels in level two students as compared to level one students. It also found that males were overall more confident than females and more equipped in navigating conversations successfully.

Increased competency levels can be attained with greater topics of interest that serve more practical purposes and stimulating increased student participation. The findings also, indicated that interactional competence varied depending on time spent practicing and interacting with native speakers, and time immersed in the subject matter and degree programme for both level one and level two Spanish students. The conclusions drawn can be applicable to foreign language students, in gauging their interactional competency, identifying key hindrances and seeking measures to improve communication skills.
**Limitations**

It was difficult to find sources and material that pertained to interactional competence specifically in the Spanish language. The majority of studies found dealt with learning English as a foreign language. Another limitation is the inability to make gender generalizations due to the unequal numbers of male and female participants. As a result, issues in interactional competence cannot be analysed accurately in an attempt to discover patterns and differences between the males and females with regard to language knowledge, use and performance.

**Recommendations**

In order to develop interactional competence of students by promoting more participation and practice, teachers should have different topics for discussion. There should be a dedicated segment of the class where topics that are more practical to everyday use are prevalent so that students are able to grasp interactional skills and communicative competence. This could be done alongside the topics of discussion that are already ingrained in the syllabus so that students receive a holistic competence in the language. Also, to encourage timid students to participate in class discussions more one on one or smaller group discussions this will assist in boosting self-confidence, reduce anxiety and nervousness.

Future research could be conducted in the context of a larger study with an equal ratio of male to female participants in order to make further generalizations about interactional competence.
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Appendix 1

Questions used to conduct focus groups.

1) How has your UWI experience in learning Spanish been so far?
2) How has the jump from CAPE Spanish to now been?
3) What’s your mental process like when it comes to speaking, writing, reading and listening in Spanish?
4) What are your strengths and weakness in speaking?
5) What are some of the issues you may be having in terms of interaction?
6) What factors aid your interaction abilities in Spanish?
7) What problems do you encounter inside and outside the classroom when speaking or using the classroom when speaking or using the language?
8) Do you feel comfortable interacting in class with other students?
9) How often do you practise and how would you rate your participation?
10) Do you consider interaction as a key factor in the learning of Spanish?
11) How was your interaction in the last conversation exam?
12) Did you prepare beforehand or was it improvised?
13) What would you recommend or suggest that would aid your interaction in the class?
Appendix 2

Dear student,
I am Donnar Hassanali, a first year student, doing HUMN 3099-Special Project. I am interested in knowing the challenges you encountered when interacting in Spanish. This is not a test, so there are no "right" or "wrong" answers and it is completely confidential. Please be honest with your answers so that Spanish language teaching may be improved which can benefit both you and future students. Thank you.

What is your sex? □ Male □ Female Age: ......................

1. What language course are pursuing? □ SPAN 1001 □ SPAN 2001

2. How many years have you been studying Spanish? ........................................................................................................

3. Have you visited a Spanish speaking country? □ Yes □ No
If yes, how long was your stay? ______ Weeks ______ Months

4. How would you assess your speaking performance in Spanish?
□ Poor □ Moderate □ Good □ Very good

5. How often do you participate in class?
□ Always □ Sometimes □ A few times □ Never

6. How often do you practice Spanish?
□ Always □ Sometimes □ A few times □ Never

7. Do you practise with native speakers? □ Yes □ No

8. When you realise that someone does not understand what you’re saying, what do you do? ...................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

9. When in doubt of which tense to use what do you do? ..........................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

10. When you do not know a word in Spanish what do you do? ..................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

11. Do you feel comfortable interacting in the classroom setting? □ Yes □ No
Why? ..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................

12. How often do you use any of the following features of interaction?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repeating what has been said</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrasing what has been said</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding to what someone has said before</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrupting the other person for clarification</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking questions</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing topics of your interest</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation words like ‘exactly’, ‘really’, etc.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. What problems or challenges do you face in an average conversation? Choose as many options as apply to you

- □ Having to translate in your mind
- □ Conjugation of regular verbs
- □ Using the Imperfect tense
- □ Formulating complex sentences
- □ Using preposition
- □ Accent of the native speakers
- □ Lack of confidence
- □ Lack of understanding
- □ Personal issues
- □ Health issues
- □ Having to translate in your mind
- □ Speech of speaker
- □ Colloquial/Unknown words
- □ Lack of practice
- □ Speed of speaker
- □ Different accents
- □ Teaching style

Other: ........................................................................................................................................

14. Do you feel comfortable under exam conditions interacting with your partner? □ Yes □ No

Why? ........................................................................................................................................

15. What type of feedback do you receive from your lecturers? ........................................................................................................................................

16. In **class context**, in order to maintain conversation   □ Yes □ No

Do you risk saying whichever tense even though it may be a grammatical mistake? □ □
Would you clarify with a classmate or tutor? □ □

Would you just not say anything at all? □ □

Can summarise the point reached in a discussion and so help focus the talk. □ □

Do you ask your partner questions? □ □

Can you repeat part of what someone has said to confirm mutual understanding and help keep the development of ideas on course? □ □

Can you initiate, maintain and close simple face-to-face conversation on topics that are familiar or of personal interest? □ □

Can you intervene in a discussion on a familiar topic, using a suitable phrase to get the floor? □ □

17. In **exam context**, in order to maintain conversation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you risk saying whichever tense even though it may be a grammatical mistake?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you clarify with a classmate or tutor?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you just not say anything at all?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can summarise the point reached in a discussion and so help focus the talk.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you ask your partner questions?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you initiate, maintain and close simple face-to-face conversation on topics that are familiar or of personal interest?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you initiate, maintain and close simple face-to-face conversation on topics that are familiar or of personal interest?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you intervene in a discussion on a familiar topic, using a suitable phrase to get the floor?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. What activities would you suggest to enhance interaction within classroom setting? ...........................................................

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

😊 Thank you! 😊