

## MODIFIED INTERACTION: TEACHING-LIKE AND CONVERSATION-LIKE DISCOURSE ON GRAMMAR IN EFL CLASSROOMS

HELENA DA SILVA GÓMES, ANNA DE FINA  
y JOSÉ MARÍA DÍAZ DE LEÓN

CELE - Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

The main object of this study was to conduct an exploratory investigation on the ways in which teachers and learners interact when talking about grammar in EFL classes. The study was qualitative and process oriented. The subjects were one bilingual EFL female teacher and an intermediate level group of 20 male and female young adult university students. Transcriptions were analysed first to identify the topics of interaction. Secondly, the fragments centered around the topic of *explicit grammar* were selected for further analysis. Two main *discourse types* emerged which were classified as *teaching-like* and *conversation-like* discourse. The interactions identified as conversation-like shared similarities with NS/NNS exchanges in a natural environment although they were centered on such a formal topic-like grammar. The appearance of *conversation-like* discourse was found to correlate with a specific type of *two-way information-gap task* identified as *teacher and students thinking-aloud about grammar*.

### INTRODUCTION

The problem of the role that formal instruction should play in foreign language acquisition has not yet been solved. Does the teaching of grammar help or does it have a negative effect on the acquisition of a foreign language?

Learning activities in the foreign language classroom may, in fact, focus on the grammatical features of the foreign language, rather than on giving the learner opportunities to communicate. It seems that the teacher always has a choice of behaving as an instructor or trying to be a conversational partner for the learners.

It is not exactly clear what place grammar should have in the communicative approach. Should communicative teaching focus only on meaning or should it also focus on form?

#### Transcription conventions

((...))	inaudible	::	preceding syllable or sound prolonged
( )	comments of the author	=	latched utterances
//	overlapping utterances	↗	rising intonation
(.)	pause	→	continuing intonation
(o.o)	long pause	↘	falling intonation
CAPS	loud	[ ]	phonetic transcription

We consider, in this study, that one way of approaching what Stern (1983) has called "the code-communication dilemma" is to observe and describe the different ways in which teachers and learners interact when talking about grammar in EFL classes. In fact, we feel that any argument on foreign language learning should be based on evidence about the foreign language classroom itself.

Most of the authors studying second language acquisition see it as the result of communicative experience (Krashen 1982, Stevick 1980). Several of them, especially Krashen, and Long (1983), underline the importance of comprehensible input in order for second language acquisition to occur. In fact, this interactionist view of second language acquisition, also adopted in this study, states that it is the discourse which learner and teacher jointly construct that is responsible for the learning of a foreign language.

With interaction analysis, researchers started looking at the work done by teachers and learners in classroom settings. Flanders (1970), Fanselow (1977) and Allwright (1980) proposed different sets of categories to characterize the different kinds of language use which occur in the classroom.

It became clear from these studies that classroom interaction is extremely complex, and that it may be approached in many different ways. It was also well established that interaction in classroom settings was quite different from interaction in natural settings.

Another important direction in the study of classroom research was discourse analysis. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and Sinclair and Brazil (1982), for example, tried to identify and characterize the different types of interaction that take place in the classroom. They found that many of the pedagogic exchanges could be typified in what they called the IRF sequence (Initiate, Respond, Feedback).

"IRF sequences" are far from the type of discourse we now believe would be adequate for effective language learning. Nevertheless, it is not clear that this type of exchange is the only one that may occur in foreign language classrooms (Ellis 1985). It is necessary to investigate how meaning is negotiated in the classroom and how input is adapted, before we know to what extent negotiation is possible in foreign language classroom settings. It seems to be well established that classrooms differ in the type of discourse they provide, as Ellis points out.

The study of foreigner talk, the register used by native speakers when addressing foreigners, showed that native speakers adapt their speech to the linguistic possibilities of the foreigners. In doing so, they simplify the formal characteristics of the input and modify the interactional structure of the conversation. Long (1983) showed that certain features, such as native speakers' relinquishing of topic control, comprehension checks, clarification requests, among many others, were the result of genuine negotiation of meaning between native and non-native speakers. Hatch (1983), on the other hand, posits that foreigner talk, besides promoting communication, serves also as a sort of implicit teaching mode.

Teacher talk shares several of the features found in foreigner talk. Although there are clear differences between both registers, such as the roles played by native speakers and teachers and the informal and formal settings in which these registers occur, it has been shown that teachers make important adjustments in their speech, both at the formal and the interactional level (Long 1983).

The interactional modifications found in teacher talk have the important function in second language acquisition, according to Krashen (1982) and Long (1983), of providing comprehensible input. According to both these authors, the crucial element in second language acquisition in classroom settings is comprehensible input. Krashen summarizes this idea in his well known formula  $i + 1$ , where  $i$  stands for input and  $1$  for the new elements that should be learned. It seems then that, for Krashen, the real value of foreign language classrooms does not lie in instruction but in the comprehensible input provided by teacher talk.

How this happens is not yet fully described. Could such a topic like grammar, for example, which has traditionally been associated with controlled instruction, be treated conversationally? What is the relationship between explicit grammar as a topic and the type of discourse that emerges from it? This study tries to answer these questions.

## THE STUDY

### *Subjects*

The subjects were one bilingual female teacher with considerable EFL teaching experience and an intermediate level group (about 170 hours of instruction) of 20 male and female university EFL students.

### *Data collection*

This study followed a qualitative process-oriented approach (see Chaudron 1988, Van Lier 1988). Nevertheless, the main interest was not to give a full ethnographic description of the observed classes but rather to analyze in detail the different ways in which explicit grammar was dealt with.

The data were collected using two complementary procedures:

- 1) A real time coding observation which consisted of observation notes about features of the situation (group organization, teaching materials, non-verbal interactions, etc.) from two independent non participant observers.
- 2) Audiotape recordings of 5 one-hour classes.

Subjects knew they were being recorded and the teacher was instructed not to depart from her regular syllabus or lesson plan for the day because of recording.

### *Data analysis*

The data were first transcribed according to conversational analysis techniques (Levinson 1983, Van Lier 1988). The first analysis was a topic analysis and allowed for the identification of six major topics:

- 1) Classroom management: all the utterances referring to the organization, coordination or direction of classroom activities.
- 2) Speech relations mechanism: all the utterances referring to the distribution of turns and the management of interaction itself.
- 3) Explicit grammar: utterances overtly focusing on the construction of the transitional competence of learners at a given stage: giving, discussing or asking for rules, explanations, examples, etc.

- 4) Implicit grammar: utterances which indirectly orient the learner's grammar construction mainly consisting of manipulations of the intake.
- 5) The world: utterances centered around information concerning the real world.
- 6) Teaching/learning process: utterances focusing on the characteristics of the process itself (whether something is difficult, easy to learn; whether it is new or has been discussed before, etc.).

Together with the topic analysis a very detailed analysis of the function of each utterance in context was carried out with the help of conversational analysis techniques, that is, analyzing the value of pauses, intonation, tone changes, listening responses, etc.

At this stage the whole interaction was analyzed and the topic analysis allowed for the identification as units of sequences centered around topics 3 and 4 above. The sequences focusing on grammar were then analyzed using the categories that Long (1983) used to characterize NS-NNS modified interaction.

Long has shown in different studies (1981 and 1983) that native speakers (NS) talking to non-native speakers (NNS) adopt a number of interactional and linguistic modifications in order to make their input comprehensible. He showed that conversations between NS and NNS were different in important aspects from conversations between NS and NS. Long outlined a number of strategies and tactics used by native speakers to avoid or cope with conversational trouble which are examples of interactional modification. The starting point of this study was the idea of discovering the use of the same devices by language teachers in their classrooms, to see whether the teacher-student exchanges resembled at certain points natural conversation between NS and NNS. To this end the categories described by Long were applied to the corpus.

According to Long, *strategies* modify interaction in order to avoid conversational trouble; they reflect long-range planning by NS and may concern what is talked about. *Tactics*, on the other hand, are modifications motivated by momentaneous conversational trouble; they are therefore unplanned (Long 1983: 131-132).

The strategies mentioned by Long are the following:

- S1 - Relinquish topic control
- S2 - Select salient topics
- S3 - Treat topics briefly
- S4 - Make new topics salient
- S5 - Check NNS' comprehension

Tactics are the following:

- T1 - Accept unintentional topic-switch
- T2 - Request clarification
- T3 - Confirm own comprehension
- T4 - Tolerate ambiguity

Long also includes a list of modifications used both as strategies and tactics, which are:

- ST1 - Use slow pace
- ST2 - Stress key words

ST3 - Pause before key words

ST4 - Decompose topic comment constructions

ST5 - Repeat own utterances

ST6 - Repeat other's utterances

The application of these categories to the corpus collected motivated a number of modifications to their definition in order to make them operational for the present study. For example ST1, ST2, ST3, were not codified given that they represent widely spread devices used by teachers for very different purposes. In that sense, although they represent modifications of the interaction, their occurrence does not add much information about classroom exchanges.

The categories which were modified are the following:

#### S1 *Relinquish topic control*

This category is defined by Long as attempts to pass control of current and subsequent conversational topics to the non-native speaker (Long 1983: 132).

Given the relative rigidity of topic management in classroom discourse, we coded under this heading attempts by the teacher to give the students control of the topic, but also included acceptance by the teacher of a student's intervention which causes the teacher to lose control of the topic.

Example:

T *I'm expressing something that happened uh huh something specific in the past it happened several times five times or several times*

S *But I have an idea now*

→T *Ok yes you have an idea*

Here T relinquishes control over the topic by accepting S's interruption.

#### T1 *Accept unintentional topic-switch*

This category is defined by Long as a tactic used by NS when the NNS misunderstands a question and answers on a different topic.

In classroom discourse a topic switch does not necessarily imply a complete change in topic, given that students and teacher rarely discuss freely. Nevertheless, there are slight changes in topics, adjustments or subtopics which are sometimes put forward by students. These changes may be accepted by the teacher even though they represent deviations from his or her planned topic.

Example:

T's topic in the following exchange is the difference between simple past and past continuous.

S *I begun (.) run (.) run for example that morning and =*

T *= Uh huh I began running*

S *running at morning and I continue until (O.O) mhm (.) three hours*

T *Well running and running and running OK yes could be. What else? Come on Francisco*

S *Yes about what passed? About past?*

→T *OK about the past yes*

Here there is a topic shift which is not complete, given that the student is still talking about the grammar point established by the teacher. But it seems that he does not understand that the main topic is past versus past continuous and he generically talks about past. T accepts his unintentional shift.

As said before the categories called tactics and strategies were defined by Long to characterize modified interaction. In this study we tried to see how modifications in the interaction between students and teachers made their conversation resemble that of NS-NNS. Three more categories were found in teacher talk that seemed to us important for describing a more conversation-like interaction, because their purpose was to insure communication and to encourage students' participation, not to reinforce formal accuracy. Our hypothesis, to be confirmed by a future study, is that NS also use these devices when talking to NNS.

T5 : repeat with correction

ST7 : encourage

ST8 : expand

*T5 Repeat with correction*

This category refers to a repetition of a previous utterance or part of it with a correction, but without stress or emphasis on the mistake. Its purpose is to clarify what was said or to indicate understanding of what was said.

Example:

T *Your homework Eva?*

S *I didn't make my homework*

→ T *You didn't do your homework uh huh (.) You didn't do your homework*

*ST7 Encourage*

Under this heading expressions were coded which aimed at positively reinforcing the student's performance to encourage him or her to participate in the interaction.

Example:

S *Because the concept (.) were like I don't know how to (.) how to explain*

T *No you're doing very well*

↗  
*ST8 Expand*

Under this heading the teacher's utterances which are aimed at clarifying an idea, example or explanation by the student are coded.

Example:

S *Elena heard a girl singing*

T *Mhm Elena heard*

S *a girl singing*

→ T *Uh huh OK (.) singing a song OK*

As stated before, some of Long's categories were not applied, basically because they were not relevant for our corpus, but sometimes because they were difficult to pin

down. The case of ST1, ST2 and ST3 has already been mentioned. Category S3 (treat topics briefly) was not employed because the way topics are treated in classroom discourse is largely predetermined and free conversation is very rarely found. On the other hand, the learning process itself may determine the necessity to spend more time on a given topic.

A last observation about categories concerns the fact that in Long's model, interactional strategies and tactics are placed together with linguistic strategies. Therefore, the definition of these categories is not always purely functional. For example, ST2 (stress key words) in classroom discourse can be used to make the input comprehensible but also to correct a student. There is no form/function correlation in this case. Other categories like T1, and T2 are defined in functional terms and are therefore more easily applicable.

What we mentioned before also applies to ST5 and ST6 (repeat own and other's utterance). These repetitions in classroom discourse are highly ambiguous. Sometimes they serve the purpose of better communication and more comprehensible input, but sometimes they are corrective devices. Therefore, it was necessary to interpret the situation and the function of these repetitions carefully when coding utterances under the headings ST5 and ST6.

The occurrence of Long's categories together with our new categories and other elements, such as student's participation and the task proposed, allowed us to describe what was called conversation-like discourse.

On the other hand, it was necessary to characterize teaching-like discourse: that is, discourse which is typical of the classroom and does not in any way resemble conversation. Teaching-like discourse is centered around the production of formally correct utterances, in opposition to conversation-like discourse where the emphasis is on comprehensible input. Therefore, the devices used by the teacher are directed towards the form of the utterances and not their content. Three strategies and five tactics were found to characterize teacher talk, particularly with respect to grammar. These are:

### *Strategies*

#### *TS1 Ask for rules, examples or explanations*

This strategy is used by the teacher in order to help students understand a grammar point, or to check their understanding of it.

#### *Example:*

*T Uh we have to see the difference between past (.) Uh huh? and past continuous*

*→ OK what's the difference between these two? When are we going to use the first and when are we going to use the second one?*

#### *TS2 Prompting and prodding*

These tactics are used by the teacher to make a student complete an utterance correctly or to hasten him in order to obtain an answer. Prompting and prodding are often repetitions of a previous utterance with a rising intonation, or utterances providing a cue to continue. Sometimes even listening responses can express prompting and prodding.

**Example:**

S *is mm (.) past continuous is was =*  
 T = *so was what?*  
 S *she were so late || so late*  
 T || *late to class or I*  
 → *wish she would come?*  
 S *early*

**TS3 Give unsolicited explanations, rules or examples**

Teachers sometimes explain a grammar point because they feel the need to do so, even though they have not been asked for an explanation by the students. Stretches of teacher talk which aim at making a grammar point clearer without answering a direct question from a student are coded under this heading.

**Example:**

T *Years ago when I was (.) when I was ten years old (.) ten years old uh huh? Here you have your past uh huh? Uh my mother my mother used what?*  
 S *To do very (.) very good cakes*  
 T *OK to make uh huh cakes to make cakes*  
 S *very delicious*  
 → T *very delicious cakes but the meaning is that your mother doesn't make cakes anymore (.) that is the meaning.*

**Tactics****TT1 Correct**

All utterances explicitly aimed at formally correcting a previous utterance were coded under this heading.

**Example:**

S *when I when I see the watch and then =*  
 → T *when I saw*

**TT2 Evaluate**

This category includes all utterances aimed at judging the accuracy of a student's utterance positively or negatively.

**Example:**

S *because I would be like a bird (.) I could fly to other places and I could travel up the air I would like to have the experience of flying without wings*  
 → T *Perfect*

**TT3 Ask for repetition**

This category differs from T2 in that the aim of the utterances coded under this heading is to make the student aware of a mistake or to direct his or her attention towards a grammar point.



**Example:**

*S I really believe in living happy without wealthy.*  
*T I really believe in living happy?*  
*S happy without wealthy*  
 → *T Uh huh huh without*  
*S without money*

**TT4 Simulate non-comprehension or create ambiguity**

This tactic is used by the teacher to draw attention to a particular formal point and to motivate the student's self-correction.

**Example:**

*S I wish I were inv[ai]sible because I =*  
*T = I wished I?*  
*S I wish I were (o.o) || I*  
 → *T || a bicycle?*  
*S No no no ((laughter)) invisible*

**TT5 Answer grammar questions**

This tactic refers to the teacher's explanations or examples of a grammar point given when requested by a student. It is interesting to code because it gives the analyst an idea of students' participation.

**Example:**

*S What is hints?*  
 → *T hints insinuar*

**Example:**

*S Yes it's the same as the past continuous?*  
 → *T Yes but she uh huh uh huh but here um OK I was let me see I was running then something happened you have first an action uh huh?*

The modifications applied to Long's model result in the following schema:

**CONVERSATION-LIKE DISCOURSE ON GRAMMAR\***

<i>STRATEGIES</i>	<i>TACTICS</i>
S1 Relinquish topic control	T1 Accept unintentional topic switch
S2 Select salient topics	T2 Request clarification
(S3 Treat topics briefly)	T3 Confirm own comprehension
(S4 Make new topics salient)	T4 Tolerate ambiguity
S5 Check NNS' comprehension	T5 Repeat with correction**

*STRATEGIES AND TACTICS*

(ST1 Use slow pace)	ST4 Decompose topic-comment
(ST2 Stress key words)	ST5 Repeat own utterances
(ST3 Pause before key words)	ST6 Repeat other's utterances
	ST7 Encourage**
	ST8 Expand**

\* Adapted from Long (1983)

\*\*New categories

(categories not used)

Teaching-like discourse will be analyzed with the following model:

*TEACHING-LIKE DISCOURSE ON GRAMMAR*

<i>STRATEGIES</i>	<i>TACTICS</i>
TS1 Ask for rules, examples or explanations	TT1 Correct
TS2 Prompting and prodding	TT2 Evaluate
TS3 Give unsolicited explanations	TT3 Ask for repetition
	TT4 Simulate non-comprehension or create ambiguity
	TT5 Answer grammar questions

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The data analysis based on the model of modified interaction NS-NNS outside the classroom (Long 1983) showed two types of discourse centered around the topic that we identified as explicit grammar:

- 1) Teaching-like discourse on grammar, which is characterized in this study as a type of discourse mainly concerned with the production of formally correct utterances.
- 2) Conversation-like discourse on grammar, where the crucial aim is the achievement of mutual comprehension.

In teaching-like discourse the teacher's behavior can be characterized in two main ways:

- 1) The teacher tries to prevent errors by using teacher strategies (TS).
- 2) He or she repairs errors by using teacher tactics (TT).

In conversation-like discourse the teacher insures comprehension and sustains the conversation by using strategies (S), tactics (T) or strategies and tactics (ST) as presented basically in Long's model and adapted for application to classroom discourse on grammar. The discourse produced will thus share many of the features of interaction between NS and NNS in natural settings.

Analyzing our corpus we observed that both teaching-like discourse and conversation-like discourse were centered around the same topic: explicit grammar, but they were elicited by different kinds of activities. Conversation-like discourse, such as the example in Appendix 2, occurs when the task is a two-way information gap activity,

which requires the exchange of information between the participants, each of whom possesses some piece of information not known to the other (Long 1980). In the present study we observed that this two-way information task occurs when the students talk about their internal target language system construction. We call this activity "thinking aloud about grammar" (see in Appendix 2 turns n. 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, for example). We consider this "thinking aloud" as a two-way information gap task since the teacher does not know the information the student is going to give. However, he has information that can help the student construct his own grammar. In this kind of activity the main objective of the teacher is not that students give a correct answer, but rather that they make explicit their conceptualizations about grammar.

This type of activity requires, then, an exchange of information for its completion and that is why it generates more conversational modification, more comprehension checks, more confirmation checks, more clarification checks, more repetitions, as we can observe in the sequence in Appendix 2. A modified interaction of this type is likely to promote second language acquisition (see Long 1981, Doughty and Pica 1986, among others).

In analyzing teaching-like discourse, as in Appendix 1, we tried to move away from traditional analyses of classroom discourse, which are directly influenced by instructional purposes and whose categories are exclusively based on the pedagogic function of the utterance. Instead, our decision to apply Long's model, with its concept of strategies and tactics, was due to the objective of describing classroom interaction in conversational terms and using the means provided by discourse analysis.

However, the definition of each category in teaching-like discourse is clearly influenced by the focus on language usage. It is also necessary to remember that in this analysis we define conversation-like discourse in the language classroom as characterized by the use of most of the categories of NS-NNS that are normally used outside the classroom.

Comparing the sequence in Appendix 1 with the sequence in Appendix 2, we notice the difference in the model's categories but also in the type of interaction that takes place. In teaching-like discourse the teacher has complete control over the interaction: he or she assigns turns (as in turn 49), he corrects (as in turn 31), asks for clarification (as in turns 3 and 51). The main function of the students' interventions is to answer questions, whereas in conversation-like discourse students ask for turn (Appendix 2, turns 32, 36), talk freely about grammar giving examples or rules (as in turns 2, 10, 24), etc.

In the sequence reproduced in Appendix 1, the task is of the one-way type: the correction of homework, which requires no exchange of information among participants.

The first analysis of the transcribed materials into topics and utterance functions showed that in the negotiation work, the most competent speaker (socially, cognitively or linguistically), generally assumes the greater responsibility for carrying on the conversation and establishing understanding. The presence of this asymmetrical aspect of conversation negotiation in NS-NNS interaction and our interest in investigating the teaching of grammar led us to analyze in more detail the teacher's discourse in terms of strategies and tactics. However, the learner's contribution appears in the analysis of utterance functions.

In discussing the results we would like to go back to the primary objective of this study: investigating the discourse on grammar in EFL classrooms. This was basically motivated by the general idea that it is not clear how a communicative approach and the teaching of grammar can be adequately related, and also by the strong claim that grammar is not adequately and sufficiently taught in communicative classes.

A first important point in starting research on this problem was our choice of a qualitative methodology for data collection and of a discourse analysis methodology for data analysis. We think that these methodologies give a better understanding of what goes on inside the classroom, if we consider classroom work as a negotiation process. As Breen and Candlin point out:

...communicating is not merely a matter of following conventions but also of negotiating through and about conventions themselves. It is a convention-creating as well as convention-following activity, so in learning how to communicate the learner is confronted by a variable process in which the speakers and hearers are most often engaged in the process of sharing meanings which are both dependent on the conventions of interpersonal behavior. In this way the classroom is the meeting place for realistically motivated communication, the authenticity of the classroom lies in its dual role of observation and laboratory during a communicative learning-teaching process. (1980: 90)

It is evident that communication is a meaning negotiation activity. Moreover, classroom interaction is a type of face to face interaction in which participants cooperate to build up communication, so the adequate place to study it is the classroom itself.

Nevertheless, it is important to stress that the results presented here should be interpreted cautiously given that our study was exploratory and was carried out with only one EFL teacher and group. Moreover, given the nature of the data, our model is based on high inference categories which need further testing. For this reason, further research has been planned to test our findings on a wider variety of subjects using the model and revising it.

With respect to the relationship between grammar and communicative teaching we would like to emphasize the most relevant result of our study, that is, the fact that conversation-like discourse occurs in our data when the participants are talking about explicit grammar. This contradicts the general idea supported by current psycholinguistic theory on second language acquisition which considers talking about the code and communication as mutually exclusive. This idea is expressed, for example, in Krashen's Monitor Theory (1981, 1982). We think that the concept of "optimal input", as proposed by this author, does not take into account the results of studies on modified interaction, which show that in order to sustain an adequate conversation, NS and NNS work together to obtain comprehensible input. This negotiation work takes place no matter what the topic is.

We do not mean to reject the role of input on second language acquisition, but we want to stress that it is necessary to reconsider the definition of "optimal input". We suggest, based on our present observations, that the relationship between acquisition, learning and the topic being treated as formulated in the monitor hypothesis should also be reconsidered. It seems that the topic alone cannot determine the type of interaction that will take place. Instead, this exploratory study indicates that it is the combination of topic and task which imposes the type of discourse being used.

Therefore, in the distinction between acquisition and learning, it is necessary to consider the type of discourse involved in the interaction more than the topic. It seems that when looking at the formal and informal linguistic environments in language acquisition and learning it is necessary to consider the role of the type of discourse involved, since it has been demonstrated that the type of discourse used in natural settings by NS talking to NNS can appear in the classroom with a very formal topic-like explicit grammar, depending on the task.

The empirical data of this study have also implications for the methodology of second language teaching since they support the statement that in order to acquire a foreign language the learner must be encouraged to communicate and that his or her language learning process, the language system and the process of developing an internal grammar of the language should be considered as authentic communicative topics. In fact, they can promote real communicative interaction between teachers and students. In order to identify what real communication is, it is important to compare interaction in the classroom with NS-NNS interaction outside the classroom, given that informal intake-type linguistic environments have been regarded as ideal for second language acquisition (Krashen 1981, 1982). In doing so we are moving away from the dominant tradition in most communicative methodology which maintains that interaction in the communicative classroom should be similar to NS-NS interaction and that therefore topics treated in the classroom should be about real everyday life.

## REFERENCES

- ALLWRIGHT, R. (1980). Turns, topics and tasks: Patterns of participation in language learning and teaching. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language research*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House. 165-187.
- BREEN, M.P. and C.M. CANDLIN. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 1, 2: 89-113.
- CHAUDRON, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- DOUGHTY, C. and T. PICA. (1986). Information gap tasks: Do they facilitate second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 20, 2: 305-325.
- ELLIS, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- FANSELOW, J. (1977). Beyond Rashoman-conceptualising and describing the teaching act. *TESOL Quarterly* 11: 17-39.
- FLANDERS, N. (1970). *Analyzing teacher behaviour*. Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley.
- HATCH, E. (1983). Simplified input and second language acquisition. In R. Andersen (Ed.), *Pidginization and creolization as language acquisition*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House. 29-47.
- KRASHEN, S.D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- KRASHEN, S.D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- LEVINSON, S.C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LONG, M. (1980). *Input, interaction and second language acquisition*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of California at Los Angeles.
- LONG, M. (1981). Questions in foreign talk discourse. *Language Learning* 31: 135-157.
- LONG, M. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics* 4/2: 126-141.
- SINCLAIR, J. and D. BRAZIL. (1982). *Teacher talk*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SINCLAIR, J. and M. COULTHARD. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- STERN, H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- STEVICK, E. (1980). *Teaching languages a way and ways*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- VAN LIER, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. New York: Longman.

## APPENDIX 1: TEACHING-LIKE SEQUENCE

N	TURN	UTTERANCE	S/T	TOPIC	UTTERANCE FUNCTION
1	T	page twenty two (.) page twenty two (.) ¿qué pasó? (.)		1	Sets task
2	S	((....))		—	
3	T	OK ((....)) you don't have what?	T2	5	Asks for clarification
4	S	= I don't have my exercise		5	Answers the question
5	T	= You don't have the exercise? You have it? (.) OK page twenty two? (.)	T3	2/1	Confirms own comprehension Addresses another student
6	S	Twenty two		1	Answers and clarifies
7	T	OK twenty two		1	Accepts
8	S	Twenty two		1	Another student confirms
9	T	OK? the first one		2	Assigns turn
10	S	Me? Worry?		2	Asks for confirmation
11	T	= Worry ↘ (.) OK		2	Confirms
12	S	Worry about?		3	Answers
13	T	Worry about → OK (.) number 1.2.3 (.) OK?	TT2	3/2	Accepts answer Assigns turn
14	S	Dreamed about		3	Answers
15	T	= I dreamed about and the next one is?	TT2	3/2	Accepts answer Assigns turn
16	S	get her in		3	Answers
17	T	= no (.) no (.) number two		1	Gives instruction
18	S	= Oh number two (.) worry about		2	Repairs
19	T	Uh huh (.) uh huh (.) uh huh and number four?	TT2	3/2	Accepts repair Assigns turn
20	S	= be jealous of?		3	Answers
21	T	= be (.) JEALOUS :: JEALOUS ::	TT1	3	Corrects pronunciation
22	S	= JEALOUS		3	Repeats
23	T	= Uh huh (.) uh huh (.) be (.) JEALOUS OF	TT1	3	Corrects
24	S	be (.) JEALOUS OF		3	Repeats
25	T	Uh huh . uh huh . uh huh (.) everything because you are doing very well (.) number five?	ST7	3/2	Encourages and assigns turn
26	S	((....)) of			
27	T	Uh huh . uh huh (.) number six?	TT2	3/2	Accepts and gives turn
28	S	dream about?		3	Answers
29	T	Uh huh . uh huh (.) y (.) number seven?	TT2	3/2	Accepts and assigns turn
30	S	be satisf[i]?		3	Answers
31	T	= be satis (.) [faid]	TT1	3	Corrects pronunciation
32	S	be satisfied with		3	Completes answer
33	T	Uh huh . uh huh (.) y (.) number eight?	TT2	3/2	Accepts and assigns turn
34	S	get nervous about		3	Answers
35	T	get nervous ABOUT:: and number nine?		3	Accepts and assigns turn
36	S	I don't (.) I don't be proud of		3	Answers

N	TURN	UTTERANCE	S/T	TOPIC	UTTERANCE FUNCTION
37	T	be proud of:: (.) y (.) number ten?	TT2	3/2	Accepts and assigns turn
38	S	((....))		—	
39	T	and eleven?		2	Assigns turn
40	S	((....))		—	
41	T	= eleven		2	Assigns turn
42	S	be excited		3	Answers
43	T	= be excited →	TS2	3	Prodding
44	S	= be excited from?		3	Answers
45	T	= ABOUT ↘	TT1	3	Corrects
46	S	about		3	Repeats
47	T	= be excited ABOUT:: and twelve?	TT2	3/2	Confirms and assigns turn
48	S	be afraid of		3	Answers
49	T	be afraid of ↘ OK (.) Uh huh (.) your sentence? Aida please?	TT2	3/2	Confirms and assigns turn
50	S	I don't think ((laughs)) about immortality?		3	Answers
51	T	Uh huh (.) think (.) about?	T2	3	Requests clarification
52	S	Think about immortality		3	Answers
53	T	= yes (.) number thirteen?	TT2	3/2	Accepts and assigns turn
54	S	= I am afraid of living alone		3	Answers

## APPENDIX 2: CONVERSATION-LIKE SEQUENCE

N	T	UTTERANCE	S/T	TOPIC	UTTERANCE FUNCTION
1	T	And when are you going to use past and when are you going to use past continuous?	TS1	3	Asks for rule
2	S	(o.o) past continuous is when the action is ((....)) was continuing		3	Gives rule
3	T	Yeah →	TS2	2	Listening response Prodding
4	S	When I was running ↗		3	Gives example Asks for evaluation
5	T	= Uh huh ↘		2	Listening response. OK pass
6	S	Mhm (o.o) =		3	Tries to continue
7	T	Yes you were running →	TS2	3	Prodding
8	S	And (o.o) en español no?		2	Tries to complete his example Asks for code switching
9	T	No in English why not?		2	Rejects code switching
10	S	Ahm I begun (.) run (.) for example that morning and =		3	Explains his example
11	T	= Uh huh I begun running	TT1	3	Correction

N	T	UTTERANCE	S/T	TOPIC	UTTERANCE FUNCTION
12	S	Running at morning and I continue until (o.o) three hours		3	Completes explanation
13	T	Well running and running and running OK yes could be/ what else? Come on (.) Francisco		3 2	Evaluates. Selects next speaker
14	S	Yes about what passed? About past?		2/3	Accepts and asks for clarification
15	T	OK about the past yes	T1	3	Accepts topic switch
16	S	Is something that have (.) that have been done // and and there are no =		3	Proposes explanation
17	T	// Uh uh		2	Listening response
18	S	There are few possibilities to be done in the future		3	
19	T	In the future? No now let me see (.) OK yes that action is in the past I went to the movies last week (o.o) and I'm going to the movies ahm next week ((...)) Uh huh	T3	3	Confirms own comprehension Tests student's hypothesis
20	S	In that case ehm (o.o) ah yes (.) may be may be the action need repetition (.) in the past		3	Puts forward a new hypothesis
21	T	In the past? I went to // the movies	T3	3	Confirms own comprehension Starts giving example
22	S	// the idea the idea		3	Interrupts and asks for turn
23	T	The idea?	T3	3	Confirms own comprehension
24	S	Because the concept (.) were like I don't know how to (.) how to explain		3/5	Tries to explain Expresses difficulty
25	T	No you are doing very well	ST7	5	Encourages the student
26	S	Mhmm (.) (o.o)			Doesn't say anything
27	T	OK how can you express that something happened several times in the past?	TS1	3	Proposes a grammar problem
28	S	with the past		3	
29	T	The past Uh huh I went uh huh ((...)) (teacher writes on the blackboard and reads aloud what she's writing) I went to the supermarket	TS3		Gives example
30	S	Super =		3	Repeats
31	T	= market Uh huh (.) umm (.) // last Saturday			Completes student's repetition of own example
32	S	=Uh // Uh huh I have an idea now =		3/2	Interrupts and asks for turn



N	T	UTTERANCE	S/T	TOPIC	UTTERANCE FUNCTION
33	T	// LAST SATURDAY = OK yes but how can you express this I went to the supermarket (o.o) five times mhmm? last week (.) or several times last week (.) yes? Five times (T writes on the blackboard) last week or several (T writes on the blackboard) uh huh? times why not? last Saturday or last week uh huh? I'm experiencing something that happened uh huh something especific in the past it happened several times	TS1	3	Rejects interruption Asks for explanation
34	S	///(....)		—	Doesn't understand
35	T	= five times or several times		—	
36	S	But I have an idea now		2	Asks for turn
37	T	OK yes you have another idea	S1	2	Gives turn
38	S	Another idea example for example when when when you're running →		3	Continues explanation
39	T	When I'm running	T3	3	Confirms comprehension
40	S	Uh huh when I'm running and (.) well when you are when you are realizing an action //		3	Continues example
41	T	// Are you talking about this one?	T2	3	Requests clarification
42	S	Yes		3	Confirms
43	T	Uh huh ↓		2	Listening response. OK pass
44	S	No about past continuous		3	Auto-repairs
45	T	Uh OK the second one Uh huh		3	Indicates comprehension
46	S	Ehh when you're doing the past continuous ahm =		3	Explains
47	T	= you're running yes	ST8	3	Completes the idea expressed by the student
48	S	Uh huh for example and and you're doing another thing in when when when you were running and because I run I run last month but you could say I was running when when when a car when a car crash against another		3	Completes hypothesis
49	T	How perfect no?	ST7	3	Encourages