

Some Effects of Teacher Talk on Learners' Involvement in Classroom Active Communication

Saïd Keskes, Ferhat Abbas University, Setif

Abstract

This paper attempts to understand the potential reasons for learners' low participation in class. It explores the relationship between some interactive patterns of teacher's pedagogical discourse and learners' involvement in interactive communication, because research stresses the importance of committing learners in the learning process to achieve efficient learning. And committing learners means favouring participation. One way of dealing with the issue is to de-structure teacher talk and diagnose factors in it that potentially impede learners' participation in class, focusing on some specifically psycho-affective traits of teacher, such as turn-allocation, interaction patterns, participation roles and quality of teacher's and learners' pedagogical acts. The underlying hypothesis is that the quality of teachers' talk in terms of psycho-affective features would likely affect learners' participation in class.

ملخص

هذا المقال محاولة لفهم الأسباب المحتملة وراء مستوى المشاركة الضعيف للمتعلمين في القسم، كما يتقصد العلاقة بين بعض أنماط الخطاب البيداغوجي لدى المعلم ومشاركة المتعلمين في عملية التواصل التفاعلي، لأن البحث في هذا المجال يؤكد على إشراك المتعلم في عملية التعلم لتحقيق تعلم ناجح، وإشراك الطلبة يعني الحث على المشاركة في القسم . ويمكننا أن نتعامل مع هذه المشكلة عن طريق تفكيك خطاب المعلم وتشخيص العوامل المعيقة لمشاركة المتعلمين في القسم، والتركيز على بعض السمات البسيكو عاطفية لدى المعلم كتوزيع الدور ونمط التواصل والمشاركة ونوعية الأفعال البيداغوجية عند المعلم والمتعلم. وتتمثل فرضية هذا المقال في إمكانية تأثير نوعية خطاب المعلم من حيث سماته البسيكو عاطفية على مستوى مشاركة المتعلمين.

Introduction

Investigating classroom reality is increasingly becoming a timely topical issue during the last two decades by means of the classroom observation research paradigm. Classroom realm is a space which has not yet been devoted the attention it merits in my country. Historically, research has concerned very intensively itself with “what to teach”: curriculum design, material design, programming, needs analysis, teaching methodology, classroom activities, techniques, etc. and also with “how to evaluate and assess what has been taught”: test design, construct validity, content validity, concurrent validity, face validity, test format, marking techniques, textbook evaluation, etc. However, between these two extremes there is an in-between area, I would call it the “grey-zone” which has remained and still remains insufficiently explored, visited, and described to cater with the new challenges that face foreign language teaching and more particularly English. This paper is indirectly concerned with language teaching and learning because it basically explores attitudes and pedagogical discourse in the first stance. That is how teachers and learners behave with one another to facilitate teaching and learning. These issues are inextricably bound up with issues related to classroom-democracy practice. It is a question of rights and duties from the teacher and learners to favour a positive atmosphere susceptible to foster English learning through active participation. The stake then is that what actually happens between teachers and learners in the heat of lesson deployment. The implementation of the teachers’ “Fiche Pédagogique” does not very often withstand the constraints of classroom reality and the conflicting personalities of the stakeholders. Exploring this *terra incognita* is sharing the teachers’ preoccupations by favouring self-mirror watching for self-appraisal from the pedagogical point of view. Let the teacher appreciate his fairness with learners’ rights and duties.

Literature Review

Recent research in language teaching has identified a number of contributory factors to learning, apart from considerations of syllabus design and teaching methodology. Among these are: the importance of the learner in his own learning process, the reinterpretation of the syllabus by the teacher and the learners, and the self perception of the teachers as being primarily responsible for all curricular tasks and management of classroom on-going interaction. Allwright & Bailey (1991:28) make the point that "Learners do not learn directly from the syllabus. They learn, partly, from whatever becomes of the syllabus in the classroom, but they can learn from other things that happen too. We must study the interactional processes that are responsible for what happens in our classrooms".

Input, Output and Classroom Process

Methods and products of second language instruction were the leitmotiv until studies realized that the choice of method was the most significant decision facing language teaching professionals, precisely because the choice of method would override all other decisions in terms of the expected overall effect on the rate of language learning, and therefore on school achievement in languages. No serious consideration was granted to the various ways that the individual teachers implement the methods and neither was there any granted to the learners' reactions to the method implementation in the classroom. After early skirmishes with the idea the relative frequency of items in the input might alone suffice to explain the processes of second language acquisition (Larsen & Freeman, 1976) and after Krashen's attempts to explain sequence through his monitor theory (1991/1982), the field came to be largely dominated by Krashen's Input Hypothesis (1985). He posits comprehensibility as the catalyst for language development. "If we focus on comprehension and communication, we will meet the syntactic requirements for optimal input". (Krashen 1985: 154) Krashen, returning to rate of acquisition as a main concern, posited that for most effective learning input merely needed to be made comprehensible. Comprehensible input itself remained the main causal variable. Once again, the focus on the linguistic environment in terms of input and output did not help second language researchers to see some understanding emerge as far as the acquisition process is concerned. Allwright (1991) claims that the limelight was set on the extreme poles of the situation under investigation: those of methods and outcomes neglecting the interaction which occurs between both phenomena. These issues led second language researchers to pay attention to the concept of interaction. Gass & Mackey (2006) among others realized the importance of interaction and started to link input and output to interaction. It was considered to be extremely beneficial to gear efforts towards the study of the learning outcomes in relation to the input and output generated during the on-going classroom interaction. Interaction then appears to be the most important challenge to face (Setvick 1996, Barnes

& Tood 1977, Breen & Candlin 1989, Prabhu 1992; Warwick-Menard, 2007; Mackey, 2006; Silver, 2000 among others).

Second Language Acquisition and Interaction

An important work in this direction has been by Wagner-Gough & Hatch (1975) in which they highlight the importance of going beyond the acquisition of sentence level syntax and taking into consideration the conversational interactions in which learners engage. The role of interaction in second language acquisition evolved from Long's work (1985) translated in his interaction hypothesis. He stresses the importance of comprehensible input however he also believes that interactive input is more important than non interactive input. These strategies include aspects of conversation such as comprehension check, clarification requests, topic shifts, and self and other repetitions and expansions. He claims that speakers modify interactions using these devices in order to avoid conversation problems, and repair discourse when non-understanding sequences arise. Pica (1994: 494) and Long (1985) assert that the need to exchange unknown information will result in the negotiation of meaning characterized by modifications in the interactional structure of conversation, as participants seek to make incoming speech comprehensible. In sum, according to Long, the potential source of comprehensible input is characterized by opportunities for learners' interactions in which they modify and restructure the interaction to arrive to a mutual understanding (Pica et al 1994:739). Long (1996) believes that what makes input comprehensible is modified interaction or negotiation of meaning. Many researchers (e.g, Edmondson, 1999; Ellis, 1999; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Loschoky, 1994; Pica, 1987; Varonis & Gass, 2000) hold a similar view on the significance of input modifications which result from the interactional process. Consequently there have been a number of studies which focused on the ways in which negotiated interaction helps learners to understand and acquire input (Mackey, 1999, 2006; Long, 2005; Ellis, 1994). Allwright & Bailey (1991) believes that their studies considered interaction rather globally, failing to link particular learning outcomes to particular interactive work done during instruction. What appears problematic at this point is the fact that second language acquisition researchers focused on the linguistic quality of input instead of focusing on the interactive classroom discourse provided by the teacher's speech and learner's utterances during instruction, hence they did not grant attention to the actual classroom interactive work of the participants. They neglected the various variables affecting, in one way or another, the organization and structure of negotiated interaction and its impact on the process of second language acquisition. Gass & Mackey (2006) claim that it is worth asking questions about the mechanisms of interaction. This led researchers to focus on the classroom process and hence interest in contextual factors (Hellerman, 2006; Reder & Davila, 2005; Garton, 2002). Allwright (1998) wonders "How could they find it possible to neglect the whole area investigating the importance of classroom itself as the social context for

language teaching." He claims (ibid.) that "It is worth focusing on the doing rather than the planning, just because it is surely whatever actually happens in the classroom that really matters, that makes a difference to our learners' progress. So, classroom process researchers (McLean, 1990, Celce Murcia 1990, Polizter, 1985) assert that it is high time to move toward the study of the actual teaching -learning processes for a better understanding of the process of learning and acquisition. So they proposed to link research to the classroom instead of focusing on method, input and output.

Classroom-Centred Research

The loss of faith in large scale methodologies and focus and input-intake and output led researchers to raise an interest in the learning process. This research looks no more at the classroom as the setting of investigation but rather as an object to be investigated. Other researchers felt it necessary to retreat further back from prescription to description. Then Allwright (1998) puts more emphasis on the distinction between learning and acquisition. This time, he defines learning as interaction. It also follows that classroom interaction, in the target language, can now be seen as not just offering language practices nor just learning opportunities but as actually constituting the language development process in itself. The officially implemented language teaching methodology in Algeria is the cognitive communicative approach which insists on the facilitative role of interaction and advocates the promotion of interaction in the classroom. However, relative success or failure regarding its implementation may have to do with the educational stakeholders' incapacity to look at reality with a new vision. They still insist on prescribing methodologies without investigating classrooms.

Classroom Discourse

Discourse has many important roles and effects on learning. According to Allwright (1984:14) "The discourse is the local expression of the relationship between people [...]the state of willingness to make progress in the target language, to use the opportunities afforded in terms of input and practice opportunities". Discourse, in other words, is the external manifestation of the socio-affective climate prevailing in the classroom and potentially controlling the teaching-learning phenomena. Examination of the descriptive studies of the discourse characteristics of interaction together with their effects on learning can possibly contribute to a better understanding of classroom language learning phenomena. Van Lier (1988) claims "If the key to learning are exposure to input meaningful interaction with other speakers, we must find what input and interaction the classroom can provide. We must study in detail the data or the language we use in the classroom in order to see if and how the different ways of interacting in the classroom affect learning". Allwright (1990: 146) claims: "I soon realized that I would not be able to understand teacher behavior if I did not also study learner behavior. So I moved to focus on the behaviors of learners but still

mostly on the details of the relationship between learners and teachers". Discourse is not something prepared beforehand by the teacher and subsequently poured down into the learner; it is rather jointly constructed by contributions from both parties so that the learners are not just passively fed from the instructor's plan. One of the most important aspects of interactive discourse is turn taking behaviour of the teacher and the learner.

Turn-taking System

Long (1996) reported that there were a significant greater number of students' pedagogical moves, social skills behavior and rhetorical acts in group work than in teacher fronted classroom. The concept of turn has been considered and ascribed multiple definitions (Harris 1981, Goffman 1974, Chaudron 1988, Van Lier 1988). The main consensus in foreign language classroom research is that classroom interaction is not random but governed by some rules, regulations, conventions and norms which are most likely determined by teachers (Goffman 1974, Mc Howl 1998, Mehan 1979, Schegloff 1981). The nature of interaction in foreign language classrooms is perhaps the most critical issue concerning formal foreign language learning. Differential treatment towards learners been investigated by Allwright (1991), stating that there is some evidence that some learners receive more opportunity than others to participate in the events. Most consistent finding concerning T-S interaction is that teachers tend to call more frequently on students they believe to be the most capable (Brophy & Good, 2005; Cooper and Good 1993; Alington 1991; Babad, 1993). According to Van Lier (1988) classroom interaction differs from any other interaction in respect to the rules that determine who will speak next, when, about what, and the length of the turn. If paying attention to the input is believed to be a prerequisite for comprehension and, thus, learning, rigidly controlled and organized turn distribution can be considered to restrict learners in their power, motivation and initiative to change and influence discourse (Van Lier 1988, Mc Howl 1998, Ellis 2004).

Amount of Talk

Studies in teacher talk demonstrate that language teachers do most of the talking: two-thirds of the talking time in the classroom (Lagaretta 1997; Ramirez et al 1986). These findings indicate that generally language learners have very limited time to participate in classroom interaction and thus to negotiate meaning, test hypothesis through output and practice their knowledge. Teacher talk has pedagogical functions: explaining, commanding, questioning, modeling, feedback and others. The problem turns about the idea of the functions of teacher talk. How teachers deal with explanation is very important. Inappropriate or over explanation hinders rather than help students to comprehend. If teachers devote long amounts of time to explanation or management of instructions, learners have fewer opportunities for participation. The quantity and the quality of the different pedagogical acts the teacher uses have different effects on learners' learning

opportunities. Another important issue is that the teacher tends to adjust his speech to learners to maintain communication.

Interactive Roles of Participants

In order to identify the interactive roles of participants, it is useful to recall that they are inextricably bound up with teacher talk through pedagogical discourse and its effects on learners' participation. Therefore, it is crucial to have available a means that is capable to describe accurately teachers' pedagogical discourse. Discourse has been approached through different angles, belonging to different traditions: psychometric, ethnographic, interaction and discourse analysis. Since our interest in this research is to describe classroom discourse, we have adopted a model which is linguistic in perspective, purporting to describe classroom discourse in structural-functional terms. The leading models in this perspective are Bellack et al Model (1966); Sinclair and Coulthard Model (1975,1992); de Landsheer and Bayer Model (1974); Van Lier Model (2004). However, the Interaction Analysis models are influenced by sociological investigation of group processes (Flanders Model 1960; Moskowitz Model (1976); Bailey Model (1985, 1997); Fanselow Model (1977). The review of these models has revealed their incompleteness to systematically describe teacher's discourse from the socio-psycho-affective perspectives. Each model displays advantages and limitations. Consequently, an eclectic multiple perspective model imposes itself and Allwright's (1988, 1990) model appears to be relatively an appropriate descriptive tool from the point of view of participants' interactive roles where four modes of participation are proposed: *compliance* (the likely response of co-operative learners to directions from the teacher to see whether they respond just to what is required from them no more nor less); *direction* (the mode where the teacher initiates, evaluates and directs interaction and which shows whether he attempts to impose his ideas without leaving to learners any possibility to express their own opinions; *navigation* (the mode which shows the learners' attempts, if any, to seek change of direction to the course of events) and finally *negotiation* (the mode describing potential learners' attempts to reach decision making). This is the model we have chosen to describe classroom discourse and modes of participation

Hypothesis

The hypothesis set is that the quality of teachers' pedagogical discourse and other psycho-affective features (turn-allotment system and modes of participation) would likely affect learners' participation in class positively or negatively

Research Methodology

- Choice of the Method

The nature of our study is to explore teachers' and students' interactions in class, a case which actually calls for a descriptive method to diagnose the situation in order to come out with a series of recommendation when needed to be addressed to the teacher to introduce potential changes in order to improve the act of teaching

- Population and Sampling of the Study

The population of the present study consists of a teacher who has individually exposed problems related to his learners' participation when the lesson is being taught. It is a case study which does not seek any generalisation of the observations and recommendations registered. Names of pupils reported are fictitious.

- Data Gathering Tools

What do we need to do in order to try to understand the reasons behind the learners' low participation in class? Data of course has to be collected. How? By getting directly into the classroom to video-record a lesson and then transcribe it. Why get into the classroom and not do the job through questionnaires, interviews, etc. It is because classroom observation is deemed to provide a genuine opportunity to obtain a faithful picture of classroom reality.

- What is Needed to Obtain Data for Analyses?

Therefore a bit of a lesson is going to be described, then analysed with you. I have said a bit of a lesson because it is quite unrealistic to study a whole lesson for it is a time consuming affair. I would need a whole day to do it and not the twenty minutes allotted for my intervention. I present below the different stages I went through to organise my data: yes it is a question of organisation. Language in the classroom and speaking patterns taking place are highly structured and follow a relatively rigid organisation. A lesson deployment proceeds through teaching exchanges corresponding to a three-move structure, known as IRE (Initiation-Response-Evaluation) according to the Sinclair and Coulthard Model. The framework of description and analyses has also integrated a second model: Allwright's to depict the psycho-affective dimensions of teacher and pupils' talks. With the Sinclair & Coulthard Model we have divided the transcribed lesson in Main Transactions, Transactions, Sub-transaction, and Sub-exchanges. Very briefly I would say that each structure of the lesson (Transactions, Sub-transaction, and Sub-exchanges) is defined as a thematic unit, corresponding to a topic. In this communication, only Main Transaction 1 is concerned.. The portion of the lesson analysed is displayed below:

	Main Transaction: Reading comprehension F 008 to F 144	
Transaction I.1 Reading the Text F 008 to F 027	Transaction I.2 Questions F027 to 075	Transaction I.3 Synonyms F 076 to F144
	Sub-transaction 1.2.1 Question 1 F027 to F030	Sub-transaction I.3.1 Miserable F078 to F083
	Sub-exchange I.2.1.1 F031 to 033	Sub-transaction I.3.2 Have prescribed F083 to 107
	Sub-transaction I.2.2 Question 2 F 034 to F 038	Sub-exchange I.3.2.1 F 093 to F 107
	Sub-exchange I.2.2.1 F 038 to 040	Sub-transaction I.3.3 Disease F108 to 121
	Sub-exchange I.2.2.2 F041 to F043	Sub-exchange I.3.3.1 F113 to F121
	Sub-exchange I.2.2.3 F044 to 045	Sub-transaction I.3.4 Cured F122 to 144
	Sub-exchange I.2.2.4 F046 to F050	Sub-exchange F 128 to F135
	Sub-exchange 1.2.2.5 F050 to F055	
	Sub-transaction I.2.3 Question 3 F056 to 062	
	Sub-transaction I.2.4 Question 4 F063 to F071	
	Sub-exchange 1.2.4.1 F071 to F072	
	Sub-exchange 1.2.4.2 F073 to F 075	

Once the segmentation of Transaction 1 accomplished, we need to describe and analyse the exchanges that have taken place within each Transactions, Sub-transaction, and Sub-exchanges according to the features related to teacher and learners talks, both quantitatively and qualitatively to check our hypothesis. To recapitulate, data collection procedure relies on the following tools:

- Sinclair & Coulthard Model to segment the transcript in transactions, exchanges, sub-exchanges, phases and episodes according to a thematic criterion
- Sinclair & Coulthard Model to structurally describe exchanges on the basis of an IRE system which consists of three moves: Initiation-Response-Evaluation. However, in classroom talk, experience has proved that the exchanges do not always comply or correspond to this triadic organisation. We can obviously add many other elements to the system. All of us agree that when teacher "initiate"(ask a question), learners "bid" for answering", wait to be "nominated" by the teacher before providing an answer. Answering. Other more daring pupils answer without being "nominated" by the teacher. The teacher and pupils may also "react" to what has been said. Hence, the system is far from being limited to the IRE cycle.

Sub-transaction 1.2.4 can make a good example to illustrate this sub-transaction has needed 12 floors to ratify pupils' answers and close the exchange:

- 2 initiation moves (1 Starter and 1 Elicit),
- 5 reactions moves (2 reaction-bid where the pupils "Interrupt" the teacher, 3reaction-interruption: 1 reaction where a pupil interrupts another pupil and 2 reactions where the teacher interrupts pupils),
- 1 Nomination move,
- 2 response moves (1 response-reply" where the pupil tries to answer and 1 response where the correct answer is being repeated),
- 2 Feedback-accept moves (where the teacher accepts a pupil's answer by positively evaluating it)

INITIATION MOVE

1- Initiation-strater- The teacher starts the transaction by saying "then" which is a framing word but the pupils interrupted her
063 T: then" 00

RESPONSE MOVE

2- Reaction-bid- Pupils interrupt her before she asks the question

064 PP: madam madam

3- Initiation-elicite- The teacher attempts to maintain discipline and silence, then, she asks a question

065 T: euch" 0 number four why did her doctor decide to send to France"

4- Reaction-bid- Pupils interrupt her again to get the floor

066 PP: madam madam

5- Nomination- (P) The teacher nominates a pupil

067 T: Alm yes"

6- Response-reply- (Miss) The pupil tries to answer but she makes a pronunciation mistake

068 P: her doctor has decided (wrong pronunciation: desided) +

7- Reaction- interruption- (M2) Pupils interrupt the pupil to correct her

069 PP: /decided/ chorus

8- Response (M3)- The pupil repeats her answer, correcting it

070 P: decided to send her to 0 to France because her illness is difficult to be treated in Algeria 00

EVALUATION MOVE

9- Feedback-accept- The teacher accepts the answer by repeating what the pupil has said.

071 T: because her illness is difficult to be treated 0 in 0 Algeria 0 write down" (Almani writes on the blackboard: her doctor has decided to send her to France because her illness is difficult to be treated in Algeria)

10- Reaction-interruption- The teacher corrects the pupil who is writing on the black board

071T: France capital letter

11- Reaction/Elicit (G)- The teacher interrupts the pupil then asks the class to correct the mistake

071 T: send send you correct your s (five seconds)

12- Feedback-accept- When the pupil finishes writing on the blackboard, the teacher evaluates positively the answer

071 T: is difficult 0 to be treated in Algeria 00 (checking the answers on the black board)

- Sinclair & Coulthard Model has also been used to interpret the teacher and pupils' moves in terms of pedagogical acts. For instance in the above sub-transaction, we have 2 initiation moves which have been pragmatically and pedagogically interpreted as Starter and Elicit)

- Allwright Model has served to assign transactions and exchanges the kinds of modes of participation that have been performed by the teacher and the pupils. This level of analyses overrides an exchange limits but encompasses larger units of segmentation to tell whether teachers and learners have adopted appropriate attitudes to favour participation

In this paper, it is a question also of classroom turn-allotment system, which has to do with how turns are distributed amongst the participants. When the teacher allots turns, it is a case of turn-giving. However, when pupils take turns without the teacher's permission or nomination, it is a case of turn-getting, which are consecutively and more delicately explained below:

Turn-giving: it concerns the teacher and is coded as follows:

- **O** : when the teacher makes a turn available without making a solicit
- **P**: when the teacher makes a personal solicit
- **G**: when the teacher makes a general solicit

The description of the teacher's turn-giving system will be detailed in terms of the type of giving used by the teacher to give floors to pupils:

TP (Teacher-Pupil): Teacher gives Turn to a pupil

TPs (Teacher-Pupils): Teacher solicits all pupils together

Turn-getting: It concerns the pupils and is coded as follows:

- **Accept (Ac):** when a pupil responds to a personal solicit
- **Steal (St):** when a pupil responds to a solicit made to another.
- **Take (T1):** when a pupil responds to a general solicit
- **Take (T2):** an unsolicited turn particularly when it is available.
- **Make (M1):** an unsolicited turn, during a current speaker's turn, without intent to gain the floor (e.g., comments that one is paying attention)
- **Make (M2):** when a pupil starts a turn while another speaker is in progress with the intent to gain the floor (i.e., interrupt, make a takeover bid).
- **Make (M3):** when a pupil performs a turn to rehearse a word, for pronunciation practice when a word is spoken by the teacher.
- **Miss :** when a pupil fails to respond to a personal solicit.

The description of the pupils' turn-giving system will be detailed in terms of the type of getting used by the pupils to talk:

PT (Pupil-Teacher): A pupil gets a turn from the teacher without being nominated

PsT (Pupils-Teacher): A group of pupils gets a turn from the teacher without being nominated

PP (Pupil-Pupil) : A pupil gets the floor from another pupil without being permitted.

If we implement the turn-allotment system on Sub-transaction 1.2.4 already introduced above, we shall notice that at the level of turn-giving, the teacher has performed a personal solicit (P) in floor 067 when she nominates a pupil and a general solicit in floor 071. However, at the turn-getting level, a pupil provided a wrong pronunciation, corresponding to a "Miss", then a group of pupils took the floor without nomination in 069. The quality of this turn is symbolized by M2. In floor 070, the pupil performs a turn to correct himself symbolized by M3.

RESPONSE MOVE

2- Reaction-bid- Pupils interrupt her before she asks the question

064 PP: madam madam

3- Initiation-elicite- The teacher attempts to maintain discipline and silence, then, she asks a question

065 T: euh" 0 number four why did her doctor decide to send to France"

4- Reaction-bid- Pupils interrupt her again to get the floor

066 PP: madam madam

5- Nomination- (P) The teacher nominates a pupil

067 T: Alm yes"

6- Response-reply- (Miss) The pupil tries to answer but she makes a pronunciation mistake

068 P: her doctor has decided (wrong pronunciation: desided) +

7- Reaction- interruption- (M2) Pupils interrupt the pupil to correct her

069 PP: /decided/ chorus

8- Response (M3)- The pupil repeats her answer, correcting it

070 P: decided to send her to 0 to France because her illness is difficult to be treated in Algeria 00

Results and Discussion

Turn-allotment systems and Modes of Participation of Main Transaction One

	Turn-allotment systems					Modes of Participation			
	Turn-giving		Turn-getting			C	D	N G	N V
	TP	TPs	PT	PsT	PP				
TR.1 (20 floors)	01	00	09	00	01	100 %	100 %	00 %	00 %
TR.2 (59 floors)	23	19	12	10	01	100 %	100 %	00 %	00 %
TR.3 (65 floors)	15	24	12	17	00	100 %	100 %	00 %	00 %
Total (144 floors)	27,08 %	29,86 %	22,91 %	18,75 %	0,13%	100 %	100 %	00 %	00 %

What insights can be drawn from the above table?

Teacher Turn-giving

In Transaction 1, for instance, the teacher gave only 1 turn by nominating a pupil, she did not solicit the rest of the class. "Nomination" is described with more delicacy as displayed in the table below. We can notice that in this transaction, the teacher has ignored all the class, leading a dialogue with one pupil. We believe this attitude counter-productive from the pedagogical point of view. In transactions 1.2 and 1.3, the teachers performed only 10 individual nominations and 20 general solicit. This is revealing about the teachers' heavy tendency in favouring whole-class answers rather than nominating pupils individually to provide them with opportunities to interact. Only individual interactions make pupils feel they have really learnt something and practised some language. The fact that the teacher has not performed a single open solicit suggests that she may not be ready to commit herself more in classroom pedagogical affairs, reducing pupils' margin of manoeuvring in class whenever they feel ready to provide answers. Pupils' rights in this respect are not respected. We may think of a teacher's preference to avoid interacting with individuals because the matter is too demanding from the pedagogical point of view. Collective answers very often hide wrong answers which may be given by pupils. In this case, the teacher could save some moments devoted for individual corrections.

	O (Open)	Personal (nominated)	General (solicit the whole class)
TR I	00	01	00
TR II	00	05	08
TR III	00	05	12

Teacher Other Acts

Besides to what the teacher has performed in terms of turn-giving, we need also to know the other pedagogical acts she also performed while doing her lesson. They may explain the reasons of the identified kinds of modes of participation. Therefore, it becomes useful to identify what pedagogical acts she have actually performed to see whether they might explain the modes of participation reported. To appreciate this we provide you with what actually happened between the teacher and the pupils, in terms of pedagogical acts. The list below displays, as an example, the sequence of floors performed in Transaction 1, both by the teacher and pupils

Initiation-marker (MR)- The teacher introduces the subject of the course

Nomination- (P) The teacher chooses the pupil Bellaala,

Response- (A) The teacher nominates pupil responds but makes mistakes

Reaction- interruption-The teachers interrupts the pupil, corrects her mistake

Response- The pupil Bellaala corrects her pronunciation but makes another mistake,

Reaction-interruption The teacher interrupts and corrects her

Response- The pupil BEL corrects herself, but, again, makes another mistake

Reaction-bid- Pupils want to take the turn, but the teacher ignores them

Reaction-repair- The teacher wants the nominated pupil to continue reading

Response- accept repair- BEL corrects the mistake but fears to pronounce another word

Reaction-repair- The teacher wants to help the pupil with the right spelling

Response-accept repair- BEL pronounces the word with difficulty

Reaction-interruption- The teacher interrupts gives the right answer

Reaction-repair- (MK) All the pupils repeat the word "successful" after the teacher

Responses- The nominated pupil carries on reading, then, she makes another mistake

Reaction-interruption-repair- The teacher interrupts her to correct the mistake

Response- The pupil makes another mistake

Reaction-interruption- Once again the teacher interrupts and corrects.

Response- Finally, the pupil finishes reading the text

Feedback- accept- The teacher repeats the last sentence as a sign of acceptance

The above report can yield the following teacher's pedagogical acts identified according to Coulthard's Model. Main Transaction 1 displays the acts performed by the teacher in the lesson.

	TR I	TR II	TR III
Markers and Starters	01	01	05
Nomination	01	05	01
Repair	08	03	00
Delay	00	01	00
Comp Check	00	02	06
Conf Check	00	02	05
Prompt	00	08	00
Elicit	01	18	26
Clarification Request	00	01	00

In the above table different ratios are reported. **Eliciting** is the act which is mostly performed by the teacher, representing 30% percent of the general acts performed. The teacher elicits display questions where the answer is known by everybody, which does not lead to open negotiation. The predominance of these questions entails that there is no exchange of information. It reflects the one way flow of information from teachers to learners. The second act is **Repair**. It takes place when pupils cannot provide a reply, which leads the teacher to introduce repairs through repair-initiation act. However, this act may hinder learners since we know that direct correction is a threat to learners' confidence suffering a loss of face. She almost never uses other repair acts such as confirmation check, clarification request, clue, etc, which are acts allowing negotiation. Teacher's repairs reinforce the directing mode of participation. The **Delay act** represents only 1.5%, the teacher tends to use repair initiation to correct learners. In fact, she does not wait or she does not use any strategy to draw their attention to the mistake made, or to give them the opportunity to correct them selves. The following act is **Prompt** representing 2.02%. It may be performed to allow three functions (1) to suggest that the teacher is no longer requesting a response but demanding one (2) to encourage the pupil to complete an utterance, or (3) to urge the pupil to give a complete sentence. In our corpus, the teacher seems to favour urging the pupils to give a complete answer. The two first functions are absent. This would affect negatively the quality of learners' production. **Comprehension Check** act represents 7%, which is not enough. It functions as an interactional negotiator. Generally, teachers perform this act to inquire whether the pupils have understood a previous utterance, explanation, etc. The data does not reveal that the teacher seeks to open any exchange with learners by means of this act. In the very few examples of comprehension check, she is not genuinely seeking information which helps her to decide whether to give further explanation or not. She realizes this act through the use of the word

ok and passes immediately to initiate another eliciting act. She does not even wait for learners to react. **Confirmation Check and Clarification Requests** acts are absolutely absent (0%). Researchers state that these acts function as interactional negotiators. Their absence may prove that the teacher tends to stick to the traditional role as a director. **Markers** and **Starters** acts are useful to clarify the opening and closing of a new exchange. The teacher does not very often make new topics salient; she does not make use of devices to indicate closure of one topic and introduction of another one. She does not make use of conversational frames such as ok, so, well, now, then. Again, this may reflect her tendency to monopolize turn taking management and the ongoing process of interaction. The Reply act is performed when the teacher both asks and replies the question asked, which sometimes has been noticed to happen in our corpus, excluding thus learners from assuming their roles of active participants and leaders of their own learning. This act reflects her extreme directing position.

Turn-getting and other Pupils' Other Acts

Turn-getting

At the level of turn-getting, the table below displays the pedagogical acts meant to be frequently performed by the pupils when a lesson is deployed. These pedagogical acts do not claim any exhaustiveness.

	TR I	TR II	TR III	Total
Accept (accepting nomination of the teacher)	01	05	05	34%
T1 (taking a floor while responding to a general solicit)	00	08	12	60%
T2 (taking an unsolicited turn when it is available)	00	00	00	00%
M1 (taking unsolicited turn without intent to steal a floor even if a peer is speaking)	01	00	00	3%
M2 (start a turn with intent to steal it)	01	00	00	3%
M3 (take a turn not addressed to the teacher or class to perform a task: repeat pronunciation...)	00	00	00	00%
Miss (failing to respond to a personal solicit)	00	00	00	00%

When we come to examine the turn getting system of learners, the getting patterns seem to cope exactly with the patterns of the teacher. This implies that the teacher succeeds at directing them or imposing her organisation on learners. Hence, learners either **Accept** a personal turn (nomination by the teacher) (34%) or respond collectively to a general turn addressed to the whole class **Take 1** (60%). The pattern **Take 2**, where learners take over an unsolicited turn made available by the teacher or other learners is also totally absent (0%). This may imply that the learners fear the teacher and do not risk taking turns without being solicited. Regarding pattern **Make 1** where learners make an unsolicited turn while someone is speaking without intent to gain the floor, we found two attempts only. The

same thing is found with pattern **Make 2** where learners start a turn to gain the floor of someone else. We recorded just two attempts where some learners bid for providing the right answer after other pupils' failure to provide it. Of course these attempts remain an exception. They represent only (3%) of the general outcome of the lesson. These results imply that learners' contribution or participation is very strict and controlled by the teacher. The teacher is the sovereign of her class in the sense that she controls rigidly turn- distribution. The turn taking is very ordered and severely controlled by the teacher. The teacher has the right to speak whenever she wants; but learners do not have such a right.

Pupils' Other Acts

As expected, pupils get turns to participate, but they perform other acts also when they interact with the teacher. They are the following displayed in the table below:

	Reply	Accept Repair	Repair	Bid	Acknowledge
TR I	01	07	01	03	00
TR II	13	02	01	05	02
TR III	16	00	00	10	05
TOTAL	44.77%	13.43%	02.98%	28.38%	10.44%

As the table shows, the **Reply** act represents 45% of the general acts. In this case learners provide the needed answer on the display questions asked by the teacher. This is the only opportunity for learners to participate. The second act **Bid** is performed when learners ask for the floor. It represents 28.43 %, which implies that learners do not have the right to speak if they do not ask for the floor. The **Accept- Repair** act refers to corrections. It represents 13.43% of the general acts. Learners accept the teacher's corrections without any negotiation. Some learners accept the correction by repeating it after the teacher and others do not even repeat it. They do not dare negotiate the correction with her and remain silent. May be they fear her. The **Acknowledge** act represents 10.44% where learners say simply yes or no. The **Repair** act is performed when learners try to correct each other. It represents 2.98% only. These ratios may be explained by the fact that the teacher stops them and rejects any learner-learner interaction. This again, implies that the teacher behaves with compliance.

Modes of Participation

In terms of modes of participation, we can derive from the data reported in the table displayed below, that the teacher has been very directive and the pupils seemed to comply with this.

Turn-allotment systems						Modes of Participation			
	Turn-giving		Turn-getting			Compliance	Directing	Navigation	Negotiation
	TP	TPs	PT	PsT	PP				
TR.1(20 floors)	01	00	09	00	01	100%	100%	00%	00%
TR.2 (59 floors)	23	19	12	10	01	100%	100%	00%	00%
TR.3 (65 floors)	15	24	12	17	00	100%	100%	00%	00%
Total (144 floors)	27,08 %	29,86 %	22,91 %	18,75 %	0,13 %	100%	100%	00%	00%

As already developed in the section devoted to the teacher's other acts, we have relatively understood why the modes of participations identified do not favour negotiation and navigation.

Conclusion

This study provides evidence that a systematic description of classroom interaction in terms of turn-allotment system and modes of participation can yield a viable diagnosis about how a lesson is actually performed by the teacher and students. The insights gleaned from classroom discourse and modes of participation data could serve as baseline for further recommendations to improve efficiency in teaching and learning.

References

- Allington, R. (1991). Children Who Find Learning to Read Difficult: Second Language Responses to Diversity In T.L. Good. and J.E. Brophy. Looking in the Classrooms. Longman
- Allwright, D. (1984). The Importance of Interaction in Classroom Language Learning. Applied linguistics 5(2): 156-171
- Allwright D. (1988). Observation in the Language Classroom: Longman.
- Allwright D. (1990). Turns, Topics and Tasks: Patterns of Participation in Language Learning and Teaching. In
- Larsen-freeman, D.: An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research. London: Longman. 165-187

- Allwright, D (1991). The Death of the Method. *Revue de phonétique appliquée*, 99-100-101, 79-87.
- Allwright, D (1998) Bring Classroom Language Learning to Life." GELI Newsletter (Grupo de Especialistas en Lengua Inglesa, Havana, Cuba) , Vol. VI, No. 1-2-3-4, pp 3- 17. Invited plenary talk presented at TESOL ITALY Conference, Rome, November.
- Allwright D & Bailey K. (1991). Focus on the Language Classroom: CUP
- Babad, E. (1993). Seating Locations of Sociometrically Measured Student Types: Methodological and Substantive Issues. *British Journal of educational psychology*.
- Bailey, K.M. (1985). Classroom Centred Research on Language Teaching and Learning. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed), *Beyond Basics: Issues and research in TESOL*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
- Bailey, K. (1997). Reflective Teaching: Situating our Stories. *Asian journal of English language teaching* 7, 1-19.
- Barnes, D. & Tood, M. (1977). *Language in the Classroom*. London: Open University Press
- Bellack, A.A. 1966. *The Language of the Classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press 181-206
- Bialystock, E. (1978). A Theoretical Model Of Second Language Learner. In C. Chaudron. *Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Breen, M & Candlin, C. (1989). The Evaluation of Teacher Training Program. In Nunan, D. 1990. *Understanding the Language Teacher*. Prentice Hall.
- Brophy, J.E & Good. T. L. (2005). Language Learners' Motivational Profile and their Motivated Learning Behaviour. *Language Learning*. Vol 55. no 4. December 2005 p613-659.
- Celce Murcia, M. (1990). "Interaction and Communication in the ESOL" *English Journal* 1999 vol 16: 90-97
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second Language Classrooms : Research on Teaching and Learning*. CUP
- Cooper, M. & Good, J. (1993). Context and Second language Development. *Language learning*, Vol 34. No 3. 145-220.
- Coulthard, M. & Sinclair J. De Landsheer, G. & Bayer, E. (1974). *Comment les Maitres Enseignent. Analyse des Interactions Verbales en Classe*. Bruxelles: Ministère de l'Education Nationale et de la Culture Française, Direction Générale de l'Organisation des Etudes.
- Edmondson, W. (1999). *Twelve Lectures on Second Language Acquisition: Foreign Language Teaching and Learning Perspectives*. Germany: Gunter Narr Verlag Tubingen.
- Ellis, R. (1994) *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1999). The Role of Modified Input and Output in the Incidental Acquisition of L2 Word meanings. *Studies in Second Language Learning*, 21, 285-301.
- Ellis, R; (2004). Learner Uptake in Communicative ESL Lessons. *Language Learning*. 51, 281-318.
- Fanselow, J. F. (1977). Beyond 'Rashomon' -Conceptualising and Describing the Teaching act. *TESOL Quarterly* 11:17-39.
- Flanders, Ned A. 1960. *Interaction Analysis in the Classroom: a Manual for Observers*, University of Michigan, An Arbor.

- Garton, S. (2002). Learner Initiative in The Language Classroom. *ELT Journal* 56/1 January 2002 : 47-56.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2006). Input, interaction and output: An overview. *AILA Review*, 19, 3-17.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis In The Classroom And The Language Learner* Longman
- Harris, Z. (1981). *Structural Linguistics*. In Van Lier. L. (1988). *The Classroom and The Language Learner*. Longman
- Hellermann, J. (2006) *Classroom Interactive Practices for Developing L2 Literacy: A Microethnographic Study of two Beginning Adult Learners of English*. *Applied Linguistics* 27/3: 377-404.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practices in Second Language Acquisition*. London: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. London: Longman.
- Krashen, S (1991) *Bilingual education. A focus on current research*. Washington,DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1976) An explanation for the morpheme acquisition order of second language learners. *Language Learning* 25: 125-135.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M. (1991). *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. London: Longman.
- Lagaretta, D. (1997). *Language Choice in Bilingual Classrooms*. University Press.
- Long, M.H. (1985) Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. Gass and C. Madden (eds.), *Input and second language acquisition* (pp. 377-93). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Long, M.H. (1996). The Role of the Linguistic Environment in Second Language Acquisition. *Handbook of Research on Language Acquisition: vol. 2. Second Language Acquisition* 413-468.
- Long, M. H. (2005). Methodological issues in learner needs analysis (pp. 19-76). In Long, M. H. (ed.), *Second language needs analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Loschoky, M. (1994). Instructional Effects of Cues, Participation and Corrective feedback: a Quantitative Synthesis". *American Educational Research Journal* 19: 559-578
- Mackey, A. (1999). *Input, Interaction and Second Language Development: an Empirical Study of Question*
- Mackey, A. (2006). From Introspections, Brain Scans, and Memory Tests to the Role of Social Context: Advancing Research on Interaction and Learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 28 No. 2, 369-379.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom*. Cambridge MA. Harvard University Press.
- Mack Howl, A. (2001). *How to Analyse Talk in Institutional Settings, a Casebook of Methods*. London: Continuum.
- Mc Lean, A. (1990). Destroying the Teacher: The Need for Learner Centred Teaching. *English Teaching, Forum* 198. 16-19
- Moscowitz, G. (1976). *The classroom Interaction of Outstanding Language Teachers*.

- Pica, T. (1994). Research on Negotiation: What Does it Reveal about Second Language Learning Conditions, Processes, and Outcomes? *Language Learning*, 44,493-527.
- Pica, T. (1987). Second Language Acquisition, Social Interaction, and the Classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 8, 3-21.
- Politzer, R.L. (1985). An Explanatory Study of Learner Behaviours and Their Relationships to Gains in Linguistics and Communicative Competence. *TEOSL Quarterly* 19: 103- 123.
- Prabhu, N.S. (1992). There is no Best Method- Why? *TESOL Quaterly* 24/2, 161-176.
- Ramirez, J.D. (1986) First Year Report Longitudinal Studies Of Immersion Program For Language Minority Children. Arlington VA: SRA Technologie.
- Reder, S. & Davila, E (2005). Context and literacy practices. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 25: 170-187.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1981). Discourse as an Interactional Achievement: Some Uses of "uh huh" and Other Things that Come Between Sentences. In Van Lier 1988 *The classroom and the Language learner*. Longman
- Stevick, E. (1996). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Silver, 2000
- Silver, R.E. (2000). Input, Output, and Negotiation: Conditions for Second Language Development. *Second Language Research Forum*, 345-371.
- Sinclair, J & Coulthard, M (1975). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse; the English Used by Teachers and Pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Sinclair, J & Coulthard, M (1992). 'Towards an analysis of discourse'. In Coulthard, M. (Ed) 1992. *Advances in spoken discourse analysis*. 1-34. London: Routledge.
- Varonis, G. & Gass, S. (2000). Effects of Negotiation on Language Learners' Output. *Language Learning*, 47, 589-639.
- Van Lier, L. (1988). *The Classroom and The Language Learner*. New York: Longman.
- Van Lier, L. (2004). The Architecture of the Language Classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 27, 152-155.
- Wagner-Gough, J. & Hatch, E. (1975) "The importance of input data in second language acquisition studies." *Language Learning* 25: 297-308. ..
- Warwick-Menard, J. (2007). 'Because She Made Beds. Every Day' Social Positioning, Classroom Discourse and Language Learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 53/2, 1-23.