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Abstract

The focus of this study is the use of communication strategies in teacher talk in ESL/EFL classrooms. Communication strategies consist of adjustments made by speakers to the formulation of their talk in order to facilitate communication, and these are clearly a potentially important aspect of teacher talk. Limiting communication strategies to those adaptations evident in the details of the interaction, the study uses a mixed method design to investigates firstly the type and frequency of communication strategies and their patterns of relationship across teachers grouped in terms of language background and teaching institution; and secondly the type and frequency of strategy use in relation to the focus of talk across the different phases of a standard lesson. The participants were three native speaker and six non-native speaker teachers, across three different ESL/EFL instructional settings. The data consist of a total of twenty seven recordings, made up of three lessons with each teacher.

The study reports results from three phases of analysis. The categorisation phase leads to an operational definition of communication strategies which integrates conversational modifications with lexical-compensatory strategies. The quantification phase of the analysis shows that the two types of strategy occur with different frequencies and functions. No important differences were found between NS and NNS teachers. However, significant task-related differences were detected. Finally a case study of three teachers revealed a relationship between the focus of talk and the incidence of communication strategies across the phases of the analysed lesson. The implications of these results are firstly that communication strategies are indeed a central element of teacher talk; secondly, that lexical-compensatory strategies and meaning negotiation strategies both contribute significantly to the construct; thirdly, that their use is important for both native speaker and non-native speaker teachers; fourthly, that they are used with significantly different frequencies and functions; and finally, that their use is influenced by teaching focus and activity type. It is also likely to be affected by factors such as teaching style. The thesis argues that, on the basis of the findings, further research into the use of communication strategies in teacher talk could make a significant contribution to teacher education.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Focus of the study

Since the 1970’s (Sinclair & Coulthard 1975) teacher talk has been of considerable interest in understanding and attempting to develop second language teaching. Its importance has been seen partly because of its potential role as a source of L2 input, and partly as a key interactional constituent of the language learning context. The implications are of interest generally in contemporary language teaching, and of course for teacher education and teacher development. This interest is motivated by the growing recognition of the role of teacher talk in determining the patterns of interaction and in effect the learning opportunities provided for the learners. The consensus is that through the investigation of teacher talk and classroom interaction we can come to a better understanding of the teaching learning process.

Teacher talk has normally been seen in terms of features such as types of teacher questions, amount of turns, potential interaction patterns, and teachers’ correction types. All these elements are important for the development of language pedagogy. Little attention, however, has been paid to what is potentially a very significant aspect of teacher talk, that is communication strategies (CSs). CSs are simply defined as the adjustments speakers make to the expression of their message in order to achieve communication. It is a little surprising that they have not been studied in teacher talk. This is partly because CSs imply adjustments which teachers clearly must make – something more than the minimum necessary for meaningful communication to take place. Teacher talk – indeed normal talk - can’t possibly be minimal. However, CSs are seen as particularly important in contexts where the speaker or listener lack shared means of understanding. Typically, second language teaching involves teachers in adjusting their talk in the second language so that their learners can understand them. This implies flexibility in communication which may help learners to enter the discourse and remain involved in its progression. In addition CSs are also important because many language teachers are themselves second language speakers. CSs then are central for three main reasons: as a support to facilitate the understanding of the second language learner; as a resource to help the second language speaking teacher; and fundamentally a resource used by all communicators in natural language use.

We cannot assume communication to occur unless mutual understanding between the speaker and the hearer is established. Understanding is seen as an interactive process which requires a certain level of participation and understanding from both participants. They need to demonstrate their
understanding across turns at talk especially when problems of understanding require them to exert extra efforts over the clarification process. The problematic moments provide a window through which the interactive process of establishing mutual understanding can more transparently be observed and investigated (see Taylor 1986 and Bremer et al. 1996 for a model of communication which incorporates understanding as an integral part of the interactive process; and Gass and Varonis 1991 for the application of a similar model in studies on SLA).

In handling communication problems, teachers - like any speaker - are probably constantly planning ahead, making on-line adjustments and monitoring or responding to problems as they become manifest. The adjustments involve the use of devices which have so far been the focus of two strands of research; the study of CSs used by learners to compensate for their linguistic problems in production, and the study of the discourse level interactional adjustments made by native speakers to negotiate their understanding of the learners’ utterances. The former have been widely associated with the concept of CSs; this thesis aims to extend that concept to the latter phenomenon as well. Focusing on both the teacher’s and not-yet-proficient students’ efforts to establish mutual communication, the study intends to identify and describe the CSs used by teachers as pre-emptive measures to avoid communication problems, as post hoc measures to deal with problems which have already occurred, and as conversational maintenance measures to sustain conversation.

The use of CSs is assumed to consist of adjustments to the speaker’s message, aimed at ensuring communication. This means avoiding communication problems by anticipating, monitoring and responding. These processes are initially focused on the speakers’ own problems in ensuring the interlocutor’s understanding. However, the same processes are also involved in the speaker’s efforts to adjust the formulation of the interlocutor’s meaning. In other words, the adjustments might mean for the speakers to help their interlocutors with their wording, and helping their comprehension by making timely and appropriate adjustments. To do this, they also make use of checking procedures, and repairing problems of talk through seeking clarifications and offering interpretation of the interlocutor’s intended meaning.

The investigation of the teachers’ use of CSs as signs of adaptation to the communicative needs of the students is informed by the interactional definition of CSs which views this phenomenon as ‘the mutual attempts of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where the requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared’ (Tarone 1980:420). This definition has been useful in locating CSs in the context of interactive talk and highlighting their role as tools used by
interlocutors in a joint negotiation of meaning to reach agreement on the communicative goals of interaction. We will demonstrate that an interactive approach has the capacity to cast light on the communicative/pedagogic aspects of teacher-student interaction including aspects which are not necessarily problematic in the sense of minimal meaning communication. In outlining what an interactive approach involves, our main intention is to contribute to the development of a conceptual analytic framework for the study of certain aspects of teacher talk which have so far been neglected. In so doing, we will also try to provide an impetus for the advancement of CSs research in instructional settings.

It is arguable that so far interactive approaches do not adequately deal with the pedagogically-oriented classroom interaction. One reason may be that CSs research still investigates adjustments from the learner side. The investigation of adjustments from the native speaker’s side is the province of negotiated input framework which has focused on the role of conversational modifications as a learner resource. No attempt has yet been made to investigate meaning negotiation from the point of view of both the learner and the native speaker. A second reason may be the nature of pedagogic interaction with its overwhelming emphasis on transactional communication. The current interactive approaches are informed by the divergent research agenda of the psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic traditions reflecting the divide between the cognitive and social aspects of interaction. Pedagogic interaction can be seen as an interface between the cognitive and social aspects of interaction. In chapter 2, the argument is developed that as the interactive phenomena in pedagogic interaction span the cognitive social domains, neither a pure psycholinguistic nor a pure sociolinguistic approach would succeed in uncovering the dynamics of this type of discourse.

The context of this study is the language classroom under normal circumstances. The use of naturalistic data and the study of CSs as integral elements of interaction raised certain methodological issues which are discussed in chapter 3. The methodology selected for this study represents a compromise between the demands of external and internal validity. Consistent with the case study design, the sample size is limited to allow a more detailed analysis of the data. The cases are located in three different settings and the observations are extended over three sessions for each case. Given the diversity of the settings in terms of curricular arrangements and the teachers’ language background (native and non-native speaker teachers), the patterns identified in the data could more confidently be taken as representative of the data settings. The steps taken to achieve a reasonable level of internal validity encompass first the establishment of the reliability of the
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observations, second the identification of patterns in the use of CSs through quantification of the
categories of analysis, and finally a criterion-related microanalysis relating the patterns of strategy
use to some aspects of teachers’ verbal behaviour for which empirical evidence has already been
established in the field.

A further aspect of the methodology can be seen in relation to the procedures followed in the
identification and description of the categories of teachers’ CSs. By definition, CSs are at the centre
of interaction; therefore, their identification requires methods and procedures of the analysis of
discourse over utterances, exchanges, and sequences. What makes these procedures more crucial in
the identification process is the different functions that CSs perform in classroom interaction. The
issue of functions brings in the consequences of the strategy use in terms of their effect on the
interlocutor, and this inevitably demands close consideration of the students’ responses or reactions
to the strategies used by teachers. The different types of teachers’ CSs and their various functions
are laid out in chapter 4.

1.2 Research aims

Our purpose is to investigate the use of CSs in teacher talk in second and foreign language contexts.
We are specifically interested in finding out the types of strategies, their forms, their functions in
the above-mentioned contexts, and their use by NS and NNS teachers. We will also investigate the
use of strategies in relation to different institutional contexts and in different phases of a lesson. Our
assumption is that the institutions in terms of the type of teaching materials and teaching-learning
procedures that they favour have an impact on the patterns of interaction and in effect on the
frequency and type of the strategies used by teachers. This assumption is supported by the study of
repair in classroom settings which according to Kasper (1985: 202) is influenced by ‘the socio-
interactional constraints exerted by the school as an institution, by the goals teachers and pupils are
supposed to achieve, and by the resulting actional and interactional patterns’. We further assume
that the type of language used by the teacher is influenced by the pedagogic aims of the activities
conducted in different phases of a lesson. We consider classroom discourse as a continuum along
which interaction is characterised by features which might bring it closer either to naturalistic or
pedagogic discourse (see Kramsch 1985). In fluency-based activities, the language assumes more
features in common with naturalistic discourse. Meanwhile, in accuracy-based activities, the
features of pedagogic discourse are likely to prevail. The assumption is that these differences in the
type of language used would again have an influence on the type and frequency of the CSs used by
teachers. The overall aim is to study teacher talk in terms of the communicative adjustments
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

teachers make in order to promote in-class communication. In this sense, teacher talk is viewed as a locus of constant interactive work.

1.3 Rationale

As acquiring communicative competence in a foreign or second language involves engaging in conversation, it is important to know what types of interaction and discourse processes underlie conversation and to what extent the classroom context can afford the interaction type and discourse processes which are conducive to learning and acquisition. The controversy surrounding the nature of the relationship between classroom interaction and 'natural conversation' raises the question whether classroom discourse is a replica of natural conversation or it is a type of institutional discourse with unique features not shared with natural conversation. The former view, which is suggested by the CLT paradigm, sees traditional patterns of interaction in L2 classrooms counterproductive and advocates practices which might enhance natural conversation in this setting. (for an account of this view see Nunan 1987, and Kumaravadivelu 1993). In contrast, there are researchers who argue that the recommendations made based on the first view are unrealistic and unattainable since there are fundamental differences between these two types of discourse (c.f. Seedhouse 1996, Van Lier 1988, Cullen 1998). The view developed in this study which considers natural conversation as the basic form of discourse from which the institutional discourse types are derived (for a detailed account of this view see chapter 2 section 2.7) is deemed to contribute to our better understanding of the teaching processes, and the processes which underlie the students' learning of the TL.

Central to the characterisation of the interaction and discourse processes is the fact that mutual understanding as the object of these processes is fraught with difficulties and that the examination of the difficulties and the adjustments that interlocutors make to resolve them is an important step toward achieving a reasonable account of the understanding process. The description of the process of adjustments to achieve mutual understanding is assumed to contribute significantly to the practical business of L2 language teaching. It is also assumed to contribute to the current debate in the literature about the role of input in SLA and the different ways through which input is made comprehensible (Hatch 1983; Larsen-Freeman 1979; Krashen 1980; Long 1983a, Swain 1985 among others).

The description of the different aspects of classroom processes assumes more importance when we take notice of the fact that teachers who espouse to communicative language teaching are kept in
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the dark about the verbal processes of a communicatively-oriented classroom. As Van Lier (1988:72-73) notes, the lack of clarity and precision in communicative teaching and learning has increased the teachers’ need to acquaint themselves with knowledge and understanding of classroom processes and of human interaction in general. The study of the strategic use of language for communicative/pedagogic purposes can shed light on this interesting aspect of teacher talk which can be of direct interest to this group of teachers.

Adopting an interactive perspective in studying CSs in teacher talk, we set out to examine the negotiation work between the teacher and the students and the constant restructuring of input and output that takes place as a result of their adaptations. The methodological framework developed for this purpose is intended to contribute to the study of teacher talk by enabling us to look at both sides’ contributions. The study of input modifications in teacher talk has focused on one side’s contributions without being able to show the antecedent verbal behaviour which elicited the modifications and their effect on the learners’ contributions. As mentioned by Faerch and Kasper (1986: 262) in these studies ‘the learner is seen as a passive recipient, rather than as one actively involved in the process of establishing communicative meaning’. The negotiated input framework looks at both sides of interaction to capture the negotiation of meaning which is going on between them. However, as Aston (1986: 138) argues since interactional modifications can be used in contexts where trouble is neither present nor imminent; it is hard to account for understanding on the basis of their frequency in interaction unless we are able to show their consequences in the learners’ verbal behaviour. As CSs are defined in terms of their functions as reflected by the local interpretation of turn-by-turn utterances, they are assumed to be more efficient indicators of the interlocutors’ attempts to reach mutual understanding.

Furthermore, given that the interactive framework of CSs is still not fully developed and there are controversies over the form and function of categories of CSs in the current typologies, the present study has insightful methodological and conceptual implications for the field of interlanguage CSs. In an attempt to account for both interlocutors’ attempts to agree on a meaning, we have integrated meaning negotiation into the concept of CSs. This has led to an extension of the current categories of CSs, as alternative meaning structures, to meaning negotiation devices which modify the structure of discourse. Focusing on the function of CSs in meaning negotiation, we have been able to show the impact of proficiency differential on the type, form, and functions of CSs as an indication of the different degrees of responsibility taken up by the teacher and the students in the process of negotiation of an agreement on meaning. The differences also reflect the pedagogic orientation of classroom interaction, which entitles the teacher to integrate instruction with
communication. The implication is that CSs used by teachers play a pedagogic role which indicates the impact of context on the forms and functions of CSs.

By virtue of revealing how native speaker and non-native speaker teachers deal with problems of communication, this study may further contribute to debates in teacher training on the impact of the language background on classroom interaction processes and to the study of pedagogic talk.

1.4 Organisation of the thesis
The thesis is divided into eight chapters. The first one is an introduction which states the research focus and the aims of the study. The second chapter reviews the relevant literature on CSs and teacher talk. Chapter three explains the methodology used in collecting and analysing the data. The description of the procedures followed in the pilot study and its contribution to the conceptualisation of the categories of analysis are also reported in this chapter. Chapter four presents the category system used in coding the data. Chapter five presents the results of the quantitative analysis done on the data. The results of the microanalysis of almost 10% of the data are presented in chapter six. Chapter seven provides answers to the research questions and discusses the results in the light of the theoretical framework and the aims of the study, directs attention to some of the limitations of the study, points out some of its implications, and makes suggestions for further research. Finally, chapter eight summarises the findings in the light of some general remarks about the significance of CSs in teacher talk.
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

The study of CSs, which was originally motivated by an interest in investigating the processes of second language learning and use, has now been transformed into a multidisciplinary research area incorporating different perspectives and different research agendas. The interdisciplinary approach has extended the notion of CSs and given the field a tremendous breadth and width with the unwitting consequence of creating certain issues over which forming a consensus seems to be difficult. In this chapter, we review the relevant literature focusing on issues surrounding the definition, identification, and classification of CSs. The issues will be discussed from different perspectives to give an overview of the field and at the same time develop a basis upon which the theoretical framework of studying teachers’ CSs can stand.

2.2 Defining communication strategies

As maintained by Faerch and Kasper (1984:45-46), the identification of CSs depends on the formulation of defining criteria determined by the researcher’s theoretical and/or practical goals. The earliest formulations of defining criteria were informed by a theoretical interest in delimiting the strategic aspects of communicative competence assumed to be essential in coping with the demands of unforeseen communicative situations and the practical considerations of controlling these aspects for pedagogic purposes. Accordingly, ‘problem-orientation’ and ‘consciousness’ with its associated concept of ‘intentionality’ were assumed to be the defining criteria of

[...] a systematic technique employed by a speaker to express his meaning when faced with some difficulty. (Corder, 1977) CSs. The following definitions reflect these criteria:

Conscious communication strategies are used by an individual to overcome the crisis which occurs when language structures are inadequate to convey the individual’s thought. (Tarone, 1977)

[...] potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal. (Faerch & Kasper, 1983b)

Faerch and Kasper (1983a, 1983b, 1984) made an attempt to delineate the theoretical conceptualisation of CSs. They locate CSs within an underlying cognitive structure as a sub-class of verbal plans. They characterise verbal plans as highly automatic and not subject to conscious scrutiny in contrast with CSs which can potentially be conscious since they are used in situations where the demands of the speakers’ communicative goals exceed their current linguistic resources. The word ‘potential’ in their definition reflects the possibility of automatisation of conscious plans over time and the effect of individual and situational variables on consciousness.
Basing the definition of CSs on problematicity and consciousness has been methodologically useful in delimiting the phenomena and in effect enhancing its usefulness. However, taking them as defining criteria is controversial. As observed by Bialystok (1990:4), CSs can be used in situations where there is no sign of problematicity, for example native speakers sometimes ‘provide lengthy definitions for words to ensure that the listener has understood even though no communication problem has been encountered’. With regard to consciousness, Bialystok (1990: 4) states:

If communication strategies are truly conscious events in language use, then it follows that speakers who employ them are aware (to some extent, in some undefined way) of having done so. Yet it is not self-evident when a strategy has been used may have been made no more or less consciously than any other choice. […] In communicative contexts, these choices serve strategic purposes and perhaps avoid potential misunderstanding by the listener.

Defining CSs as intra-individual phenomena puts constraints on the way they could be tracked down in learners’ protocols. One way, as proposed by Faerch and Kasper (1983a: 213), is to search for explicit strategy markers such as metalinguistic comments expressing admission of a problem or appealing for help and implicit markers such an increase in the hesitation phenomena. However, relying on strategy markers alone would leave covert strategies undetected. The highly developed proficiency of advanced learners enables them to predict problems and plan in advance so that their performance leaves no traces of the use of CSs (Willems 1987). Bialystok (1990:24) notes that ‘problems can certainly be assumed to exist when there are overt signs such as pauses, errors, false starts, and the like, but they undoubtedly also occur even when there is no external evidence to betray them’. To deal with this issue, the identification of CSs based on surface features is triangulated with the learners’ retrospective comments on the play-back of their performance (see Poulisse 1990; Poulisse et al. 1987). However, retrospective claims are subject to memory limitation and the constraints on the retrievability of cognitive processes. Ericson and Simon’s (1980) model of cognitive processing on which retrospection is based anchors the learners’ reports to conscious attention to problems, and thus makes no claims about the retrievability of automatised processes.

2.2.1 Classification of communication strategies
The earliest attempt to develop a typology of CSs was made by Tarone and her colleagues (Tarone, Cohen and Dumas 1976). Her revised typology (Tarone 1977) has provided the basis for most of the research conducted subsequently in this area (for a detailed review of the current typologies of CSs see Dornyei and Scott 1997). The five major categories of Tarone’s taxonomy each reflect a different sort of approach to solving the communication problem. They include: avoidance,
paraphrase, conscious transfer, appeal for assistance, and mime. The subsequent typologies have introduced certain organising principles which are assumed to make distinctions between the different types of strategic behaviour. Corder’s (1983) organising principle is the learners’ behaviour either to adjust their messages or to expand their resources in approaching a communication problem. The former are characterised as risk-avoidance and the latter as risk-running strategies. This distinction reflects the fact that in using resource-expanding strategies, the learner runs the risk of producing non-target-like forms. The organizing principle of Faerch and Kasper’s (1983b) taxonomy is the learner’s approach either to avoid the communication problem or to achieve some solution. The strategies selected based on these approaches are called avoidance (reduction) and achievement (expansion) strategies respectively. They further distinguish between formal and functional reductions. In using achievement strategies, the learner might use already existing resources as alternative ways of expressing meaning (non-cooperative strategies) or might appeal for assistance (cooperative strategies). Varadi (1983) selects ‘message adjustment’ as an organizing principle. First, he makes a distinction between reduction and replacement as two different types of message adjustment. Then, he divides each of the above categories into two types, the former into intensional and extensional realized as ‘generalization’ and ‘approximation’ respectively and the latter to ‘approximation’ and ‘paraphrase’.

Bialystok and Frolich (1980), and Bialystok (1990) proposed a taxonomy that is organized around the source of information that the learner draws upon to solve the communication problem. They identified three types of strategies each indicating a different source of information: L1-based strategies, L2-based strategies, and paralinguistic strategies. Paribakht’s (1985) organizing principle is the learners’ approaches, classified on the basis of the type of knowledge utilized in their realization. She classifies them as linguistic approach, contextual approach, conceptual approach, and mime. The first approach, which includes the majority of the strategies of the preceding taxonomies, encompasses knowledge of the native language and the second language. The second and third approaches draw on knowledge of the world or the learners’ background knowledge. The last approach is the same as Bialystok’s knowledge of paralinguistic features.

In their evaluation of the typologies of CSs, Poulisse et al. (1984: 79-80) capture two problems with the category definitions. First, they make the observation that some of the CSs are defined not explicitly enough to guarantee their reliable assignment to different categories. For example, the distinction between ‘meaning replacement’ and ‘generalisation’ as described by Faerch and Kasper (1983b:48-49) is not clear. They define the former as the preservation of the topic by the learner but referring to it by means of a general expression and the latter as filling a ‘gap’ with an item which
the learner would not normally use in such a context on the assumption that 'the generalised item can convey the appropriate meaning in the given situation/context'. The example they provide for generalisation is the use of 'animals' for 'rabbits'. However, 'animal', as a general term, could well be the target of 'meaning replacement'. Second, it is not known, they say, whether the qualitative judgments of learners performance implied by some of the definitions of CSs, for example qualifications such as 'acceptable', 'appropriate', and 'well-formed', which occur in Tarone’s definition of paraphrase and circumlocution, are the learners’ interpretations or the observer’s point of view. They conclude that unless the ambiguities in category definition are removed and it is made clear whose point of view is to be taken in the identification process, the results of studies done in the field will not be comparable.

They keep the distinctions between reduction and achievement, and also the distinction between L1-based and L2 based strategies. They replace L1-based strategies and L2-based strategies with 'interlingual' and 'intralingual' strategies respectively. Their reason is that the use of L2-based strategies such as approximation, circumlocution, and word coinage is not limited to L2. They are general approaches to solving problems which are also used by L1 speakers. Poulisse et al. (1984) use the term 'compensatory strategies' to refer to their typology. They borrow this term from Faerch and Kasper (1980: 92) who use it to refer to achievement strategies which are 'aimed at solving problems in the planning phase due to insufficient resources'.

One major issue in relation to the typology of CSs is the status of appeal for assistance which according to Scholfield (1987: 222) is qualitatively different from the other categories of CSs. He argues that in appealing for assistance, the interlocutors are involved in searching for a word, so their attention is shifted from meaning communication to form. While in opting for other CSs, the speaker maintains the focus on message by trying to communicate a meaning for which the word is not available. This interpretation of ‘appeal for assistance’ is related to the issue of point of view referred to earlier. In contrast to other CSs which are semantic categories, appeal for assistance is given pragmatic value since it is made contingent on the next move by the hearer (offering help). In interpreting this category, as mentioned by Scholfield (1987: 221), we will have to take into account speech act notions of speaker intention and hearer interpretation. If we take the hearer’s point of view, it will be difficult to maintain the distinction between direct and indirect appeal for assistance since indirect appeals may elicit as much help as do direct appeals. We will return to this issue later in this chapter. Following the early conceptualisation and categorisation of CSs, the concept has undergone certain modifications which have led to different perspectives in the study of this phenomenon. The next section deals with the psycholinguistic perspective.
2.3 The psycholinguistic perspective

The dual focus of the early studies on both the psycholinguistic processes of comprehension and production and the practical usefulness of the conceptualised categories, which led to the postulation of the three criteria of problematicity, consciousness, and intentionality, was later criticised by a group of researchers centred in the Nijmegen university (see Bongaerts & Poulisse 1989; Kellerman 1991; Poulisse 1990; Bialystok 1990) for its narrow focus on L2 learners and for confusing processes with products, that is mixing performance variables with underlying processes. The Nijmegen group questioned the viability of the study of CSs as an independent field and tried to embed it in the context of communication studies in general. They claim that language use is fundamentally strategic (see Kellerman & Bialystok 1997) and therefore CSs, as special cases of language use in general, are governed by the same principles which are operative in normal uses of language. Specifically, they compare CSs used by second language learners to the referential strategies used by L1 users and conclude that L2 CSs constitute a sub-set of referential strategies (Bialystok 1984). They also claim that the use of CSs is informed by the general principles of language use, for example the principles of clarity, and economy (Poulisse 1997), which are shown to govern the processes of naming and description (Carrol 1980, 1981), and the establishment of common ground (see the studies done on collaborative theory, e.g. Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs 1986; for a review see Wilkes-Gibbs 1997).

By focusing on processes underlying strategy use, the Nijmegen group impose certain conditions on taxonomies of CSs. The conditions, which they refer to as psychological plausibility, parsimony, and generalisability, account for the closed typology of CSs developed by this group and their cutting ties with the pedagogical implications of the study of CSs. Their major criticism against the existing typologies is that they base the distinctions between the categories on their realised linguistic forms (for detailed discussion of the criteria see Kellerman 1991). In practice, some of the distinctions seem to have artificially carved up categories which are actually instantiated by the same process. They propose that the open-ended taxonomies are replaced by a closed category system based on underlying processes (parsimony). The development of such a category system, they argue, would enable the field to make relations with findings in the fields of language processing, cognition, and problem-solving behaviour (psychological plausibility).

The typology of CSs developed by the Nijmegen group (see Poulisse 1990; Kellerman 1991) consists of two categories: the ‘conceptual’ and ‘code’ strategies. The conceptual strategy is further subdivided into ‘analytic’ and ‘holistic’ strategies. The claim is that ‘in those cases where a learner
resorts to compensatory strategies, there are really only two options that constitute any real
difference in the processing that underlies the resultant linguistic utterance’ (Kellerman 1991: 149).
They either manipulate the concept so that they could express it using their limited linguistic
resources available, or they could manipulate the encoding media. When the learner adopts the first
approach, he/she would either name a substitute referent that shares enough features with the target
one to be identifiable by the listener (holistic), or select and articulate properties of the intended
referent (analytic). The ‘code strategy’ entails using terms taken from languages other than the
second language in their original form or in a form modified by the use of the second language
morphological or phonological rules. Sometimes, the use of this strategy is realized in mimetic
forms of reference (ostension).

Kellerman and Bialystok (1997) provide a theoretical account for the category system of CSs
developed by the Nijmegen group by relating it to Bialystok’s model of language processing and
use (Bialystok 1990, 1991, 1994). This model consists of two processes: analysis of knowledge and
control of processing. These are general cognitive processes which operate on knowledge
representations in the long term memory. The analysis of knowledge refers to ‘the process by which
mental representations of information become increasingly structured’, and control of processing to
the selective attention paid to those aspects of incoming information which are required for its
successful processing (Kellerman and Bialystok 1997: 32-33). The success in information
processing depends on the extent to which the knowledge representations are structured and also to
the extent to which one is able to orchestrate the shifts of attention according to the ever-changing
needs of the situation. With respect to language, the knowledge representations consist of
conceptual meanings and codes. The two processing components are operations applied to the
mental representations of concepts and codes. The point is that these processes also operate when
CSs are used. Kellerman and Bialystok (1997:37) distinguish between the normal operation of the
processes and their strategic use by assuming that ‘communication strategies are called upon when
the usual balance between analysis and control is disturbed (typically through inaccessibility of
linguistic knowledge) so that one of the dimensions gain prominence’. They further add ‘what
makes CSs salient is not the fact that they are strategic (since all language use is strategic), but that
they make unusual calls upon one or both of the two processing skills in their execution’ (p. 44).

Poulisse (1993) criticises the Nijmegen group typology of CSs on the grounds that it violates its
own requirement of psychological plausibility. Basing her argument on a spreading activation
model of lexical access, Poulisse claims that the strategies involving representations of meaning and
form categorised as conceptual and code in the Nijmegen typology are not necessarily distinct.
There is no much processing difference between the activation of a semantically-related word (conceptual-holistic strategy or approximation) and the L1 translation equivalent (code strategy or transfer). The reason for this claim is that based on the assumptions made by the spreading activation model; since both the semantically-related word and the translation equivalent share all semantic features with the target word except one, they receive the same amount of activation. These two distinct categories of the Nijmegen typology are reclassified by Poulisse as one category called ‘substitution’. In addition to transfer, the code category includes the transfer of L1 words with morphological or phonological adaptations (foreignizing) and the morphological adaptation of the existing L2 words. These code strategies are classified as ‘substitution plus’ in Poulisse’s typology. This category implies that substitution has already occurred and the substituted word has then undergone modifications. The analytic subcategory is given a new name (reconceptualisation) and the status of a distinct category on the grounds that it needs more processing effort on the part of the speaker compared with substitution and substitution plus.

Kellerman and Bialystok (1997) take issue with Poulisse over her typology. They argue that as her typology rests on the distinction between single-word substitutions and multi-word descriptions, it fails to deal with cases where the two types are combined. For example, lexical explications (Tarone 1991:168), which consist of a general word plus post-modification, might either be classified as reconceptualisation or a combination of substitution and reconceptualisation. If the combination is accepted then it needs to be explained since two different strategies are used to describe the same concept. The same problem might arise in relation to exemplification, that is strategy tokens which exemplify a superordinate term. The first token might be a substitution ‘but two or more a conceptualisation on the grounds of requiring more processing effort’ (Kellerman Bialystok 1997:42-43). The two typologies reviewed above reflect different theoretical interests. Poulisse’s typology is informed by a speech production model (L1 speech production model developed by Levelt 1989, and its bilingual version by De Bot 1992) while the Nijmegen group typology was originally motivated by mental knowledge representations and was then found to match the processes of Bialystok’s cognitive model of language acquisition and use. Although both might show ‘internal consistency’ with the models from which they have been derived, their validity would be determined by their compatibility with other aspect of language acquisition and use and also their explanatory power in accounting for variables that might have an impact on the use of CSs.

As far as validity is concerned, the Nijmegen group typology has evidenced signs of consistency and explanatory power. First, the distinction between conceptual and code match the distinct
conceptual and linguistic knowledge components which have frequently mentioned in models of language processing. As mentioned by Kellerman (1991: 152) even mime, as a non-verbal communication category, can be accounted for by McNeil’s and Levy’s (1982) hypothesis that gesture and verbal utterance are generated from the same cognitive base. It is interesting to note that mime operates on both conceptual and code components of knowledge representation. It is categorised either as a code strategy when deictic reference is made (ostension) or as a conceptual strategy when the concept is repackaged through gestures (iconic mime). Second, the distinction between conceptual and code strategies matches the distinction already made between L1-based and L2-based strategies. The latter distinction is demonstrated to be sensitive to language proficiency (Bialystok 1983), and the type of task (Poulisse and Schils 1989).

2.4 The interactive perspective
As noted by Rampton (1997: 281) the early conceptualisation of CSs ‘rests on an uneasy tension’, which he characterises as the incompatible theoretical orientations of locating CSs in a psycholinguistic model of speech production (Faerch and Kasper 1983b) on the one hand, and the excessive emphasis on practical usefulness leading to the postulation of problematicity and consciousness as their defining criteria on the other. The pull of these forces has moved the study of CSs into two different directions. On the one hand, the emphasis on ‘process’ has led to the psycholinguistic conceptualisation of CSs discussed above. While on the other, the emphasis on product and its practical usefulness has led to the interactional view of CSs with multiple theoretical orientations, for example critical sociolinguistics (Rampton 1997), conversation analysis (Firth and Wagner 1997), and collaborative theory (Wilkes-Gibbs 1997). In the field of SLA, the interactional view of CSs has not yet been formalised, though invitations in this directions have been made by Tarone (1980), and Yule and Tarone (1991). The problem-oriented interactional aspects of communication, that is meaning negotiation devices, in instructional settings have been investigated under different theoretical frameworks, namely the interactional modifications and repair. Due to the different theoretical aims of these frameworks and in effect their partial focus on the negotiation process; the integration of corresponding elements under the same framework might bring about a more comprehensive picture of the negotiation process with far-reaching theoretical and pedagogical implications. In this section, the interactional view of CSs is reviewed and related to the research in interactional modifications and repair with an emphasis on the application of these research areas on teacher talk.

Tarone is credited for being the first to develop a typology of CSs (Tarone 1977), and to introduce the interactional view of CSs (Tarone 1980). She (Tarone 1981: 288) defines CSs as
[...] a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared. [...] Communication strategies viewed from this perspective may be seen as attempts to bridge the gap between the linguistic knowledge of the second-language learner, and the linguistic knowledge of the target language interlocutor in real communication situations.

She proposes the following criteria to characterise a CS.

1. a speaker desires to communicate meaning X to a listener;
2. the speaker believes the linguistic or sociolinguistic structure desired to communicate meaning X is unavailable, or is not shared with the listener; thus
3. the speaker chooses to
   a) avoid- not attempt to communicate meaning X- or
   b) attempt alternative means to communicate meaning X. The speaker stops trying alternatives when it seems clear to the speaker that there is shared meaning.

The emphasis in Tarone's definition is on the role of CSs as tools used by interlocutors in a joint negotiation of agreement on meaning. As mentioned by Tarone herself (Tarone 1981: 287), the definition is devoid of any specification of degrees of consciousness. The phrase 'seem to be shared', as part of this definition, implies that the criterion of problematicity has also been modified. The use of CSs is not necessarily linked to the manifestation of problems. The perception of a problem by each of the interlocutors might trigger meaning negotiation and in effect the use of CSs. The implication is that both interlocutors are made aware of the gap in their linguistic knowledge and both cooperate to bridge it over the negotiation process. An example which shows the role of paraphrase in the negotiation of meaning is 'word search' cited in Tarone (1977: 201). In word search, the use of paraphrase by the learner leads to several guesses by the native speaker and responses from the learner until an agreement on meaning is reached. The same applies to other categories of CSs in Tarone's typology except avoidance which does not seem to play a role in meaning negotiation. This poses problems to Tarone's typology, which was originally developed based on a psycholinguistic definition of CSs and still remains unrevised. We will return to this issue later in this chapter.

An important feature of the interactional definition is its generality which frees the concept of CSs from its learner-centred implications. The gap between the speaker's and hearer's linguistic and semantic systems is something which often occurs when the interlocutors use different dialects of the same language and to a lesser extent even when they are using the same dialect. In Tarone's (1981: 289) words:

Although each of us has an idiosyncratic semantic system, most of the time we go along in our native language assuming that we all mean the same thing by the same word, and most of the time
this approach gets us by. When gross discrepancies occur in our communication with others in our native language, we resort to communication strategies.

To account for the speakers’ attempts to boost their communication effectiveness without necessarily intending to negotiate meaning with the hearer, Tarone uses the notion ‘production strategy’; a type of language use strategy defined as ‘an attempt to use one’s linguistic system efficiently and clearly, with a minimum of effort’ (Tarone 1981: 289). The examples of production strategies, suggested by Trone, are ‘prefabricated patterns’, ‘discourse planning’, and ‘rehearsal’. CSs and PSs, as strategies of language use, are distinguished from ‘perception strategies’ defined ‘as the attempt to interpret incoming utterances efficiently, with the least effort’ (Tarone 1981:291). According to Tarone, ‘pay attention to the ends of words’ or ‘pay attention to stressed syllables’ are examples of perception strategies showing that in using these strategies hearers take advantage of redundancy in speech (p. 291).

In response to Tarone’s proposition to define CSs as negotiation devices, Faerch and Kasper (1984) argue that this view reduces CSs to appeals for assistance. To support their argument, they divide the achievement CSs into ‘cooperative’ and ‘non-cooperative’ strategies claiming that, in facing a communication problem, it is the speaker who decides whether to solve the problem him/herself using non-cooperative CSs or to ask for help from the interlocutor using cooperative achievement strategies. Faerch and Kasper classify appeal for assistance as a cooperative strategy, and the rest of the achievement strategies (e.g. paraphrase, approximation, transfer, and generalisation) as non-cooperative strategies. Scholfield (1987:221) comments that Faerch and Kasper’s classification of CSs into cooperative and non-cooperative is not satisfactory and argues that, first, in interactive talk, the non-cooperative strategies could elicit feedback from the hearer, e.g. supplying the target word- as mentioned before in relation to ‘word search’. Second, the identification of appeal for assistance as a cooperative strategy brings in the interlocutor’s contribution as an essential defining criterion of this type of CS. We can add to Scholfield’s arguments that from an interactional standpoint it is the consequence of using a strategy which is important not the strategy itself. Therefore, when a CS is used by the speaker, there are two options open to the interlocutor; either to activate his/her inferential skills to guess the meaning intended by the speaker or to ask for clarification. In both cases, the gap between the speaker’s and hearer’s linguistic and semantic systems is bridged through efforts from both sides.

As mentioned before, the interactional view of CSs has not been formalised; and therefore, it has had little impact on the current typologies of CSs. This has generated some controversial issues in relation to the definition of individual CSs and in their assignment to higher order categories. First,
there is a diversity of opinions with regard to the issue of whose point of view (the speaker’s or hearer’s) one should take in categorising CSs. From a psycholinguistic perspective, CSs are production processes; therefore, it is the speaker’s point of view which matters in the identification and classification of CSs (e.g. Poulisse 1987). However, if we consider CSs as tools in meaning negotiation, the consequence of using a strategy in terms of its effect on the hearer will logically be more important than the speaker’s point of view since the hearer’s interpretation of the speaker’s strategy determines its success or failure in communicating the intended meaning. Tarone’s definition of CSs especially her criterion I makes the distinction between a CS and a PS dependent on the speaker’s intention as to negotiate an intended meaning X or to enhance the cost-effectiveness of its production. In discussing the role of avoidance in meaning negotiation, Tarone (1981: 290-291) notes that its role depends on whether it is opted for after the speaker’s realisation that the meaning structure is not shared with the hearer (CS) or from the start to simplify the task of speaking (PS), and then concludes that it is very difficult to reach at the speaker’s intention in order to decide which strategy has been used. Even though one could determine the type of the strategy, it seems inconceivable that something which is left out of interaction could be negotiated by the interlocutors. Message abandonment, Tarone claims, is clearly a CS since in response ‘the listener often tries to fill in and suggest an alternative means of expressing what the speaker wants to say’ (p. 290). As the following examples from Bialystok (1990: 63 & 66) demonstrate, this might not be necessarily the case. In a picture identification task, the French L2 learners were supposed to describe pictures for their interlocutors so that they could select the right card showing the described picture.

1 garden hose: [The water comes out of it. It is attached to …]
2 garden hose: [It’s something that water can come out of.]

In both cases the speakers have provided the same information. The difference is that, in case 1, the speaker has embarked on a new message to add extra information and then abandoned it midstream. In both cases, Bialystok reports, the hearers selected the right cards. The selection in the second case was probably based on the first message which is similar to the message in case 1. With this interpretation of the task, it is conceivable to assume that the speaker abandoned the second message not because of facing a problem but simply because there was no point in continuing the message after the right card had been selected by the hearer. This example highlights the importance of the interlocutor’s point of view in the identification and classification of CSs.

Related to the first issue is the status of ‘appeal for assistance’ in the current typologies of CSs. Two major types of appeal for assistance have been identified. First is the implicit appeal for assistance
realised either through signals of uncertainty (hesitation phenomena, repairs and slips) or through metalinguistic comments showing uncertainty again, e.g. ‘I don’t know how to say this’ (Faerch and Kasper 1984: 56). The second is explicit appeal for assistance asking directly from the interlocutor to help. It is quite possible that in response to implicit appeals for assistance, the hearer does not supply the target item for social or pragmatic reasons. In that case, there is no difference between appeal for assistance and the other categories of achievement strategies. As argued before, in addition to this difference, the two categories are distinct in terms of the role they play in the progression of discourse. By appealing directly, the speaker stops communicating the current message to search for a word with the help of the hearer. As a result, the focus is temporarily shifted from meaning to form. While in showing implicit signals of uncertainty, the focus remains on meaning and there is no break in message communication.

The same distinction could be made in relation to receptive strategies. Rost and Ross (1991:245) divide receptive strategies into referential and inferential questioning strategies. By the former, they mean questions directed at lexical items at the local level. The latter are used to make relationships between the local and overall levels of discourse. They consider the referential questions as compensatory strategies since they ask for help with regard to the meaning of individual lexical items. It appears that there is no difference between Rost and Ross’s referential questioning strategies and the explicit appeals for assistance in the typologies of productive CSs except that they are used in different modalities. If we add Tarone’s ‘perception strategies’ mentioned earlier to the picture, it will not be difficult to perceive the correspondence between the categories of productive and receptive CSs. Perception strategies are in fact the hearer’s individual attempts to deal with comprehension problems using inferential skills applied to the discourse and situational contexts. When these strategies fail to work, the hearer might decide to opt for appeal for assistance or in Rost and Ross’s terms referential questioning strategies. The correspondence should now be clear. In reception and production, the interlocutors might opt for two types of strategies to compensate for linguistic gaps. Either they might use alternative means in speaking and perceptual inferential means in hearing or they might go for explicit appeals for assistance from the interlocutor. We should keep in mind that, in interactive talk, the first type of strategies might have the same effect on the interlocutor as the second type. In other words, they might also elicit help from the interlocutor. In using perception strategies, non-linguistic signs of uncertainty might trigger cooperation from the speaker in various forms, for example checking for comprehension or repetitions and reformulations.
A further issue is the status of the negotiation means used by native speakers in their communication with learners. These means are left unaccounted for in the discussion of learner’s typologies. Yule and Tarone (1991:167) suggest that the native speaker’s negotiation means such as clarification requests and confirmation checks are classified as appeals for assistance. This suggestion does not seem to be satisfactory to the goal of achieving a comprehensive picture of the negotiation process for a number of reasons. First, learners’ and native speakers’ negotiation categories are distinct in nature. The former are compensatory strategies in the sense that they contribute to bridging gaps in the learner’s interlanguage system in production and comprehension. While the latter are adaptive verbal means on the part of the native speaker to accommodate the learner’s limited proficiency through offering help, repairing, or negotiating the learner’s intended meaning. Second, clarification requests and confirmation checks are different in the extent to which they assign the responsibility of meaning negotiation to the learner. Putting them under the same category would mask this difference which might be a significant factor in characterising the type of interaction and the nature of the negotiation process. Third, even if the suggestion could be justified in relation to these two categories, it is not clear how to include the other categories used by native speakers such as repetitions, reformulations and comprehension checks in the typology of learners’ CSs.

In view of the reasons mentioned above and considering the fact that conflating the learners’ and native speakers’ categories of meaning negotiation would deprive the field of CSs from the insights provided by the body of research in the fields of input and interaction and repair, we would argue for an alternative categorisation which will be introduced below; once we have reviewed the notion of ‘negotiated interaction’ as conceptualised in the input and interaction framework of research, and the structure and functions of repair in classroom interaction.

2.4.1 Interactional modifications

In the field of SLA, negotiated interaction refers to the modifications which occur in conversations between native speakers and learners, teachers and learners or between more proficient and less proficient non-native speakers. The aim of these studies is to identify the differences between these types of interactions with the ones involving native speakers. The interactional modifications include a range of discourse procedures used by the proficient side of interaction to understand and being understood. The most important discourse procedures are clarification requests, confirmation checks, comprehension checks, self- and other-repetition/reformulation (cf. Long 1983b). Long

1 In a recent paper (Rababah 2003:131) refers to the native speaker category of clarification request as ‘repair initiation’.
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makes a distinction between the discourse procedures used to avoid communication problems (strategies) and those used to repair troubles after their occurrence (tactics). He classifies comprehension checks under strategies, confirmation checks and clarification requests under tactics and self- and other-repetition/reformulation under both strategies and tactics.

The interaction studies have shown that the frequency of the interactional modifications is higher in native speaker-learner and learner-learner interactions than in interaction between native speakers (Long 1983b; Scarcella and Higa 1981; Varonis and Gass 1985 among others). It is assumed that these devices indicate negotiation of meaning; therefore, their higher frequency is an indication of more negotiation of meaning when there is proficiency and/or background knowledge differential between the interlocutors. Meaning negotiation is defined by Pica (1994:494) as ‘the modification and restructuring of interaction that occurs when learners and their interlocutors anticipate, perceive, or experience difficulties in message comprehensibility. The assumption is that negotiation of meaning makes the input comprehensible and that comprehension of unfamiliar L2 input facilitates acquisition. Long (1983a: 191) advances the hypothesis that interaction with the characteristic of providing opportunities of modified interaction may be a necessary condition for language learning. Attempts have also been made to demonstrate that some of these discourse procedures have the capacity to push learners to modify their output toward greater comprehensibility (see Pica et al. 1989). In line with Swain’s ‘comprehensible output’ hypothesis (Swain 1985), the argument runs, interactional modifications provide higher opportunities for pushed output which might again facilitate acquisition. As, in this study, we are not concerned with the relationship between CSs and language learning, we will avoid going into the details of these hypotheses and the validity of their claims (for a critiques see Aston 1986). What concerns us in the study of interactional modifications is their contribution to the negotiation of an agreement on meaning in relation to the learners’ communication strategies. Thus we focus on this issue hereafter.

The distinction between input and interaction modifications was first made by Long (1980). The modifications which constitute the input to which learners are exposed are formal features such as the number of morphemes, word, or utterances; while interactional modifications are changes in the function that utterances serve in conversation (Long 1983b:127). Long makes the observation that while input and interaction modifications may often simultaneously occur in conversations between native speakers and learners, there are instances where they occur independently. The following examples from Long (1983: 128) demonstrate the point.
These examples support Long's observation. In example 1, the form of the question is modified (uninverted WH question) but the structure of discourse is not. In contrast, in example 2, it is the structure of discourse not the form of the question which has changed. The signal of non-understanding, self-repetition, and confirmation check constitute the changes to the structure of discourse which serve to establish mutual understanding between the native and non-native speaker.

The characterisation of input formal features is restricted in Long's study to individual constituents of utterances. This has led to the categorisation of utterance types (questions, statements, imperatives) as interactional features notwithstanding their difference with functional categories such as confirmation checks and clarification requests. This broad sense of function could also be seen in the identification and categorisation of strategies and tactics. In Long's list of strategies and tactics, there are certain categories (e.g. confirmation checks, clarification requests, comprehension checks) which clearly serve distinct functions in modifying discourse alongside other ones which do not seem to serve interactional modification functions. The latter include categories such as relinquish topic-control, select salient topics, use slow pace, stress key words, pause before key words (P. 132). Although these categories might have an indirect effect on meaning negotiation, their occurrence is not necessarily related to any specific predicted or realised communication problem which might call forth efforts from both interlocutors to negotiate an agreement on meaning. For this reason, we limit our discussion to the former categories.

In addition to the fuzzy line between input and interaction modifications, there are also ambiguities in the definition of interactional modifications which have led to different interpretation of the categories. First, the interactional modifications include a mixture of formally and functionally
defined categories. For example, self- and other-repetition/reformulations are defined in formal
terms in contrast with the functional definitions of categories such as confirmation checks,
clarification requests and comprehension checks. The formally-defined categories serve different
functions, some of which are similar to those of the functionally defined categories. For example,
one function of other repetition is to check interpretation of the previous speaker’s utterance. As
noted by Aston (1987:132), it is not clear on what basis such utterances should be assigned to either
category. Different codings might also result from the definition of categories. For example, the
definitions of confirmation check restricts this category to problems of hearing or understanding of
the previous speaker’s utterance; while the definition of clarification requests is more general
applying both to hearing or understanding problems, and problems caused by the content of the
previous utterance. This is the reason why Pica and Doughty (1985: 236) code the S 2’s utterance in
example (2) as a clarification request despite its difference from S 2’s question in example (1) (for a
different coding see Williams et al. 1997).

(1)
S1 She is on welfare
S2 What do you mean by welfare?

(2)
S1 This is very bad … I think she never stay home
S2 You’re opposed to that? You don’t
think that’s a good idea?

Clearly, S2’s question in the second example presents information for confirmation. However, as
for the definition of confirmation check, which restricts its application to the hearing or
understanding of the previous utterance and here in this example there is no sign of such a problem,
it is coded as a clarification request. From an interactional point of view, the coding has blurred the
distinction between clarification requests and confirmation checks, since in the first example the
interlocutor is expected to paraphrase the word ‘welfare’ in his/her original utterance, while in the
second example the interlocutor’s contribution is limited to the provision of a yes or no to confirm
or reject the offered information. These problems have not been left unnoticed by Long (1983a:183)
who comments

[…] of the little work done on FTD [Foreigner Talk Discourse] thus far, most has considered such
devices as confirmation checks, clarification requests, repetition and restatement in fairly gross
terms. Yet such moves in discourse often have multiple functions, and also multiple realisations,
choice among which is not arbitrary. […] Work by Chaudron (in press) demonstrates the potential
of finer-grained analyses of different realisations of the devices, some of which he has shown to
facilitate comprehension by the NNS better than others. [...] This looks a promising area for future research.

In line with Long’s suggestion, Pica at al. (1989) and Pica (1996) have conducted studies which examine the influence of the type of discourse procedures selected by the native speaker on the quality and quantity of the learners’ output. The main purpose of these studies was to check the validity of the claims made by Swain’s ‘comprehensible output’ hypothesis and the need for learners to focus attention on form. The interesting point about this line of research in relation to our purposes is that for the first time the native speaker’s interactional modifications are related to the learners’ contributions. However, the learners’ contributions are analysed in terms of their quantity and their morphosyntactical make-up rather than their pragmatic value in establishing mutual comprehension which is the major focus of the study of CSs. In relation to the type of interactional modification most conducive to learners’ restructuring of their utterances toward greater comprehensibility, the results show that clarification requests are more effective than confirmation checks. Pica et al. were able to demonstrate that conversational modifications provided for the learners’ need for comprehensible output and that the extent of which depended on the linguistic demands of the task in which they were involved and the non-understanding signal provided by their interlocutors.

In contrast with the above studies, which look at interaction from the side of the native speaker and its effect on the linguistic structure of the learners’ utterances, a study by Deen & Van Hout (1991) examines the structure of clarification sequences in NS-NNS interactions with respect to the quality of the interactional modifications used by native speakers and learners. The results reveal two different types of clarification sequences. NS clarifications are sequences in which the native speaker’s utterance causes understanding problems. Then the native speaker has to clarify in response to the learner’s signal of non-understanding. In NNS sequences, the communication problem is caused by the NNS’s utterance. It is then the NNS’s responsibility to clarify in response to the NS’s signal of non-understanding. The results show that learners indicate non-understanding through minimal linguistic means. On the other hand, the native speakers had a tendency to use clear and specific problem indicators. Instead of just indicating the problem source, they used confirmation checks offering their interpretation of the troublesome utterances. The native speakers and learners also differed in the type of clarifications they provided in response to signals of non-understanding. The native speakers made their clarifications more accessible using a lot of linguistic and conversational adjustments, while learners tended to answer by repetition or expansion. These
differences in the type of non-understanding signals and clarifications indicate that native speakers take up more responsibility in the clarification sequences.

As to how negotiation takes place, Varonis and Gass (1985) propose a model to account for sequences which they call 'non-understanding routines'. They define 'non-understanding routines' as 'those exchanges in which there is some overt indication that understanding between the participants has not been complete' (Varonis and Gass 1985: 73). In the horizontal progression of discourse, they describe these vertical sequences as push downs which mar the progression of discourse until communication breakdowns are resolved and the participants are enabled to pop up to the original line of discourse. The vertical sequences include two main elements; trigger and resolution. The resolution includes a reaction from the hearer which is then followed by a response from the first speaker. The non-understanding routines proposed by Varonis and Gass account for the retrospective use of conversational modifications to repair breakdowns in communication. Their model does not account for the interactional modifications which are used to avoid communication problems.

To sum up, we set off our brief review of interactional modifications by making a distinction between the use of discourse procedures to avoid communication problems and those used to repair problems which have already occurred in interaction. Bearing on Long’s studies, we introduced the discourse procedures used by native speakers in their interaction with non-native speakers and concluded that the reliability of coding is compromised by the ambiguities in the definitions of categories. It was also pointed out that the emphasis on the pedagogical utility of the interactional modifications has led to a quantitative one-sided analysis of conversational troubles in native speaker-non-native speaker interaction. In line with a suggestion made by Long, Pica and her colleague’s studies have included the NNS’s contributions to clarification sequences in their analyses with the aim of examining the effect of native speaker’s interactional modification on the quantity and linguistic structure of the NNS’s contributions. Two more studies were also introduced which have studied the structure of clarification sequences. Dean & Van Hout’s study reveals the difference in quality of the native speakers’ signals of non-understanding and their clarifications compared with those produced by the non-native speaker. Varonis and Gass’s study adds to our understanding of the structure of clarification sequences by making the point that they help the progression of discourse by repairing the communication troubles. However, as they constitute a temporary break in the horizontal flow of discourse, there might be a trade off between the need to
resolve problems of understanding at the local level and remaining involved at the overall level of discourse.

2.4.2 Repair in classroom interaction

The studies done on repair in classroom discourse have used the types of repair suggested by Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) as a starting point to find the similarities and differences in the way repair is dealt with in pedagogic discourse as compared with discourse in non-instructional settings. Their findings show that repair is much more inclusive than what is actually suggested in studies done on error correction. They also show that the types of repair depend on the type of activity and its associated discourse patterns. As pointed out before, the study of repair and CSs overlap. To discuss this overlap, we will review in some detail the categories of two studies which bear similarities to the categories of CSs. In the discussion which follows, it is to be noted that the repair categories are defined in terms of who initiated and who completed the repair rather than how the repair was accomplished which is the basis for defining the same phenomena as communication strategies.

Kasper (1985) makes two important observations about ‘trouble-sources’ or ‘repairables’. First, she observes that the trouble-sources might be identified both in teachers’ and students’ utterances and second that they may comprise both the trouble-sources which have already occurred in the discourse and those which are mentally anticipated by either of the participants. Limiting the investigation to previously demonstrated trouble-sources, she studied the different repair trajectories in two different tasks; one focusing on language forms and the other on the expression of meaning.

The teacher’s repairs on his/her utterances were motivated by either performance problems or pedagogic considerations. In form-focused interaction, the teacher’s repairs were caused by problems in expressing explanations for vocabulary items which led to multiple paraphrases in the TL or a shift to the NL as a last resort. In meaning-focused interaction, repairs on teacher’s utterances were basically motivated by pedagogic considerations. They were again self-initiated and self-completed repairs realised as lexical substitutions (for example substituting specific with general words) or substitution of whole utterances (for example the initiation moves) by paraphrases without meaning change or with meaning modification to make the content more specific. As far as the functions of these two types of repairs in meaning-focused interaction are concerned, Kasper counts two functions for lexical substitution; securing understanding and
teaching new vocabulary, and again two functions for paraphrases; to secure comprehension and assisting learners with their search for the right response to the elicitation.

With regard to repairs on learners’ utterances, other-initiated and other-completed repairs were preferred in form-focused interaction. The trouble source was often a formal error spotted by the teacher or other students and then made the focus of a pedagogically-oriented exchange in which the correction of the error was elicited from other learners or interactionally constructed by the teacher and the learners. Other-initiated and other-completed repair was also strongly represented in meaning-focused interaction. However, its structure was more like repair in non-instructional symmetric discourse. The teacher seemed to follow the norms of politeness by the use of ‘modified uptake’ (responding to the content of the student’s response and at the same time reformulating it in a more target-like form), ‘downtoned repair’ (by adding uncertainty markers), and ‘indication of violating a discourse norm’ (by using apology expressions). Content errors triggered other-initiated but self-completed repair. The teacher problematised content errors to give the learners the opportunity to correct their views of the content themselves.

There are limitations to Kasper’s analysis of repair in FL classes, which might be the function of the type of data collected for his study. According to Kasper, the foreign language (FL) had quite disparate functions for the students. They used the FL for solving the task set by the type of the classroom activity and the NL to communicate personal meaning. The absence of meaning negotiation in Kasper’s data might be due to this disparity in function which let the learners avoid communication problems in getting across personal meanings and intentions. Their problems were limited to the expression of their views on the content of the passage which was presumably shared by the participants including the teacher. Therefore, the teacher was apparently aware of what students were trying to say and as a result he corrected errors in form through modified uptake and only initiated negotiation with regard to content errors. It is possible that if students were obliged to use the FL for both functions then they would face problems in meaning expression, which might have led to the teacher’s initiation of meaning negotiation.

Van Lier (1988) also relates the type of repair and trouble-sources to the type of activity and the participants’ aims in carrying out the activity. Based on the three macro-functions of language in L2 classrooms (medium-oriented, message-oriented, and activity-oriented) which are to some extent different from the functions of language in non-instructional discourse, he makes a distinction between ‘didactic’ and ‘conversational’ repair. His contention is that the former is pedagogic in
nature mostly carried out in instructional discourse, while the latter is oriented toward problems of talk and so it is common to pedagogic and non-pedagogic discourse. He also makes a second distinction according to whether the repair is intended to provide help and support (conjunctive) or to problematise the speaker's utterance (disjunctive). According to Van Lier, the conversationalness or didacticness of the repair is not determined by the type of error but by the way the repair is done and the sequential structure it takes in terms of its impact on the discourse direction over the next turns. Three basic categories of repair which bear similarities to categories of CSs are other-initiation/self-repair, other-initiation/other-repair, and self-initiation/other-repair. The first type which deals with problems in hearing and understanding by initiating repair through 'questioning repeats' or requests for clarification might realise as conversational disjunctive repair. The second have two variants; one is realised as intra-turn repair helping the speaker with his/her current turn, the second occurs in the third turn with the repair constituting part or whole of the turn. Both could be either didactic or conversational but conjunctive in the sense that they function to assist and support the speaker. The third type differs from the other two since the trouble source is marked by the speaker either by explicit appeal for assistance or by try-marking, i.e. offering the candidate trouble-source with tentative (rising) intonation or simply abandoning the message and inviting the hearer to supply the item. Again both variants might occur in non-instructional discourse; therefore they could be considered as conversational conjunctive repair.

We can summarise the findings of the two studies discussed above as follows. First, repair in L2 classroom pedagogic discourse refers both to the correction of formal errors and the attempts to resolve communication impasses due to prospective and retrospective problems of talk originated from the asymmetrical distribution of language knowledge and skills, which might lead to faulty incomprehensible utterances or well-formed utterances which express faulty views on the presumed shared content. It should be emphasised here that due to the pedagogic nature of classroom discourse, repair in the form of error correction is exercised on quite comprehensible utterances. However, as Van Lier has rightly mentioned, even in this case repair could be accomplished in a conversational manner giving the pedagogic discourse a sense of naturalness. Second, repair might aim at helping and supporting through reformulating, modelling, and clueing or problematising the speaker's utterances to elicit repair instead of doing the repair for the speaker. Third, the trouble-sources might show up in both the teacher's and the learners' utterances. The teacher's self-initiated and self-completed repairs are either lexical substitutions modifying part of an utterance or paraphrases of the whole utterance aiming at simplification to help comprehension and/or directing
the learners to the desired response. Repairs on students’ utterances can be done by the teacher with or without the students’ marking or initiating the trouble sources.

2.5 Toward a typology of communication strategies

The aim in the previous sections was to relate the work on CSs to work on interactional modifications and repair. The common feature which relates the three frameworks of research is their focus on meaning negotiation. The difference between these frameworks of research lies in the way they conceptualise and analyse meaning negotiation in interactive talk. In work on interactional modifications, consistent with the theoretical position which postulates a relationship between input/output comprehensibility and language learning, as noted by Yule and Tarone (1991:164) ‘the focus has been on the analysis of the input to the learner, with the learner’s output either ignored as unnecessary or considered useful only as a prompt in obtaining comprehensible input’. The work on repair has focused on how the mechanisms of turn-taking in speech provide for the resolution of problems of talk. In more specific terms, the focus of the investigations is on the way repair is initiated and completed over turns at talk, therefore the aim is to specify the repair trajectories in terms of the person (speaker or hearer) who initiates and/or completes the repair and the turn in which repair is initiated. Although, in the study of repair, the analysis is focused on both the speaker and the hearer, the type of devices used to resolve problems of talk are not considered important, since here the notion of meaning negotiation is not the central issue. A further difference is the type of problems which are the target of repair trajectories. In contrast with work on CSs and interactional modifications which investigate problems in meaning communication, the problems in repair studies are related to both form and meaning. As far as the type of devices used by either interlocutor to negotiate meaning or repair problems of talk are concerned, all interactional modification devices used by the native speaker and the repair trajectories which target errors in communicating the intended meaning can potentially be considered CSs.

Earlier we raised the issue that the extension of the notion of CSs to include both interlocutors’ attempts to negotiate an agreement on meaning has not had an impact on the current typologies of CSs, which have originally been developed based on a psycholinguistic definition of CSs. They include the type of devices (alternative meaning structures) used by learners in speech production to compensate for gaps in their linguistic knowledge. The only category which is used by the learner to involve the interlocutor in the process of bridging the gap in linguistic knowledge is the appeal for assistance. In an attempt to integrate the interlocutor’s devices in meaning negotiation with the categories of CSs, a suggestion is made by Yule and Tarone (1991) to broaden the concept of
appeal for assistance to give coverage of the interactive devices. This suggestion seems to be unsatisfactory for the reasons mentioned earlier. Another way of dealing with the issue is to use the interactional modification devices to cover the interlocutor's side of interaction. This has the advantage of distinguishing between the learner's categories used to compensate for one's own problems in comprehension and production and the native speaker's categories used to accommodate the interlocutor's linguistic problems. It is also possible to make fine distinctions between different categories which have different effects on the interlocutor's comprehension and production processes. The issue which was raised before in relation to interactional modification categories was that the ambiguities in their definition and categorisation leads to different codings with the result of compromising the reliability of the coding procedures. To deal with this problem, the suggestion is that we identify the function of the categories in meaning negotiation by looking at their consequences for the interaction. We believe that this aim is achievable in the framework of CSs which enables us to describe the key moves of both interlocutors in their attempts to establish mutual understanding in negotiated interaction.

The review of the work on repair in classroom settings provides insights into the types or errors and the functions of repair types which can be of help in establishing the functions of the interactional modifications in classroom meaning negotiation. The first point is that non-native teachers might use alternative meaning structures (compensatory strategies) to compensate for both their own performance problems and for the students' lexical gaps. These compensatory devices can be used in form-focused exchanges as well as meaning-focused ones. The second point is the distinction between 'didactic' and 'conversational' repair which shows that repair is more inclusive than the notion of CSs. The potential communication strategies are the conversational repairs which deal with three different types of problems, namely problems with hearing and understanding, content problems, and problems with the form of utterances. The work on interactional modifications has largely focused on the first types of problems (though see Rulon & McCreary 1986 for content negotiation). The third type of problems constitutes a significant part of classroom interaction. In meaning-focused interaction, formal errors might cause meaning ambiguities which are often interpreted correctly and responded to appropriately with an implicit correction of the formal errors by the teacher. This type of repair also plays a potential role in meaning negotiation and therefore could be interpreted as a CS.

The review of the common features of the frameworks of research which have focused on meaning negotiation provides a basis upon which we can introduce a provisional typology of CSs, which is assumed to capture the different negotiation devices used by both interlocutors in interactive talk.
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This typology is basically developed based on theoretical considerations, though some of the conclusions upon which the categorisation is done are supported by empirical research evidence.

We have based the definition of compensatory strategies on work done by Tarone (1977) and Poulisse et al. (1984). To define the meaning negotiation strategies we have consulted Long (1983b) and Pica and Doughty (1985). In these studies, no distinction is made between repetition and reformulation. As the distinction is considered important in term of the role it play in meaning negotiation we have made that distinction and defined the categories accordingly.

In the following categorisation of CSs, distinctions are made between two types of problems, and in effect between two types of linguistic or discourse procedures used to deal with them. First are the own-performance problems which are resolved using compensatory strategies in production and comprehension. Second are the other-performance problems caused by the limited proficiency of one's interlocutor requiring devices for adaptation to these needs.

Own-performance problems (Compensatory Strategies)
The type of strategies used to deal with own-performance problems is divided into production and reception strategies. The production strategies constitute the compensatory strategies in the current typologies. Although their main function is to compensate for one’s own problems; in interactive talk, they are used as tools for meaning negotiation, especially when marked with hesitation phenomena. They are sub-divided into L2-based strategies, L1-based strategies, mime, and appeal for assistance. L2-based strategies include circumlocution, approximation, and word-coinage. L1-based strategies include code-switching, literal translation, and foreignising. The reception strategies are subdivided into perception strategies and appeal for assistance.

Other-performance problems (Non-compensatory Strategies)
The type of strategies used to deal with other-performance problems is sub-divided into compensatory strategies and meaning negotiation strategies. The compensatory strategies are subdivided into lexical explication including the two sub-categories of circumlocution, and approximation, code-switching, and mime. The meaning negotiation strategies include the interactional modifications like confirmation and comprehension checks, clarification requests, self/other reformulations and other-repetition.

It is to be noted that meaning negotiation strategies are often used by language learners in their later stages of their language learning process. However, the important point is that when they are used for compensatory purposes by learners they are labelled appeal for assistance.
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Own-performance problems (Compensatory Strategies)

Production strategies

L2-based

- Circumlocution: the description of the characteristics or elements of the subject or action instead of using the appropriate target language structure
- Approximation: the use of a substitute word which shares some of the critical semantic features with the target item
- Word coinage: making a new target language word to communicate the target item

L1-based

- Code-switching: switching to a language other than L2
- Literal translation: a word-for-word translation of an idiom, idiomatic phrase or compound word
- Foreignising: the use of an L1 word with L2 pronunciation

Mime: the use of mimetic gestures to illustrate the target concept

Appeal for assistance: to seek direct or indirect help from one's interlocutor in resolving receptive or productive problems

a) Implicit appeal for assistance: disfluency marker realised in one's speech signalling linguistic problems in production
b) Explicit appeal for assistance: giving up one's efforts to express meaning and asking the interlocutor to help

Reception strategies

- Perception strategies: the use of inferential strategies taking advantage of redundant elements in target language speech
- Appeal for assistance: admitting non-understanding, or using the meaning negotiation strategies such as repetitions, reformulations, comprehension checks, confirmation checks and clarification requests to involve the interlocutor in resolving one's own receptive problems

Other-performance problems

Compensatory strategies

- Lexical explication

- Circumlocution: using a superordinate term plus post modification describing the key semantic features of the target item or using simply a description without relating it to a superordinate term
- Approximation: the use of a substitute word which shares some of the critical semantic features with the target item
- Code switching: switching to a language other than L2

- Mime: the use of mimetic gestures to illustrate the target concept
- **Code-switching**: switching to a language other than L2

*Meaning negotiation strategies*

- **Clarification request**: all different types of expressions used to elicit clarification of the preceding utterance
- **Confirmation check**: putting forward the exact or semantic repetition of the part or whole of the preceding utterance as to check whether it has been correctly heard or understood
- **Comprehension check**: expressions designed to check whether one’s own previous utterance(s) are understood by the addressee
- **Self-reformulation**: to reformulate one’s own utterance in a simplified form to help the addressee with its comprehension
- **Self repetition**: to repeat one’s own utterance to provide more time processing for its understanding by the addressee
- **Other-reformulation**: to reformulate the previous speaker’s utterance to move it closer to correspondence with its intended meaning
- **Other-repetition**: to repeat the previous speaker’s utterance to confirm an agreement on its meaning or to use it as an indication of a problem

### 2.5.1 Theoretical Underpinnings

Under the framework of input and interaction, the research focus on interactional modifications or meaning negotiation strategies, as we have called them in the typology described above, is justified based on models of language learning and acquisition which highlight the role of the linguistic environment in this process. The frequently cited models in these studies are Krashen’s ‘input hypothesis’ (Krashen 1985); Long’s ‘interaction hypothesis’ (1980, 1981, 1983b, 1996); Swain’s ‘comprehensible output hypothesis’ (Swain 1985). As, in the study of CSs, the focus is not so much on their potential role in learning as it is on their role in meaning negotiation, models of communication in general and meaning negotiation in specific are assumed to be more appropriate in accounting for the use of these devices in interactive talk. The early works on CSs borrowed heavily from Clark and Clark’s (1977) psycholinguistic model of speech production and comprehension (for a model of this sort see Faerch and Kasper 1983b). The psycholinguistic perspective to the study of CSs has provided incentive for further attempts to account for the strategic behaviour using more sophisticated models of language processing such as Levelt’s model of language production (Levelt 1989) used by Poulisse (1990), and Bialystok’s model of cognitive processing (Bialystok 1990, 1991, 1992, 1994; Kellerman and Bialystok 1997).
Attempts to account theoretically for CSs as tools for meaning negotiation come from different sources depending on the strength of the claims made about their interactional role in communication. The weak claims have ties with the psycholinguistic models since they limit interactivity to the effects of external sources such as the presence of an interlocutor or the provision of feedback on the speaker’s strategic behaviour. A notable example is Dornyey and Kormos’s (1998) model of problem-solving behaviour mapped on Levelt’s revised model of speech production and comprehension (Levelt 1995). They identify four sources of L2 communication problems: resource deficits, processing time pressure, perceived deficiencies in one’s language output, and perceived deficiencies in the interlocutor’s performance. The first three are controlled by the speech production processes, which are accounted for in Levelt’s model. The fourth type of problems, which are external to the system, are added by Dornyey and Kormos as a result of extending the monitoring function of the system to external stimuli to account for other-repair and meaning negotiation. A possible criticism against the psycholinguistic way of bringing all problem-solving mechanisms under the same framework is that the reflexivity, which features intra-individual processes, may not be extended appropriately to inter-individual processes. The reason is that these processes are mediated by social and cultural factors which act on both interlocutors and therefore any attempt to account for them in a reflexive one-way manner may end up reducing the complexity of inter-personal communication problems.

A stronger claim about the interactional role of CSs is made by the collaborative theory (Wilkes-Gibbs 1997; Clarks & Wilkes-Gibbs 1986), which considers language use as a truly negotiative process. Speakers and listeners coordinate to build common grounds. They act upon two principles which according to Wilkes-Gibbs (1997: 239-242) are: ‘the principle of mutual responsibility’ defined as the collective responsibility of interlocutors to make sure they have understood what the current contribution means before they start the next one; and the ‘grounding process’ which refers to the act of discovering the boundaries of common ground and extending them. In the grounding process, ‘contribution’ is the basic unit. It is defined as an emergent structure which develops across turns through collective action (Wilkes-Gibbs 1997:240). When the speaker issues an utterance as a possible contribution to the interaction, the listener’s response may be needed to confirm its understanding before it is considered as part of the common ground. The main point is that contributions are the products of the actions and intentions of both sides of communication. According to the collaborative theory, all contributions are strategic acts irrespective of whether or not they undergo modifications over the acceptance process. CSs and interactional modifications are assumed to occur when contributions need to be modified due to problems in communication.
The collaborative principle applies to these mechanisms and gives them a truly interactive role, which is different from the role implied by the psycholinguistic perspective.

The tendency to generalise across individuals and putting emphasis on transactional communication locate the collaborative theory somewhere at the middle between the pure psycholinguistic perspective and the sociolinguistic one which makes even stronger claims about the role of CSs in interaction. From a critical sociolinguistic standpoint, generalising across individuals is not warranted since the socio-political structure of society gives an enormous variety to the notion of ‘roles’ in communication (Kasper and Kellerman 1997: 275). The conceptualisation of communication based on this view gives prominence to social and interpersonal meaning which is more sensitive to group membership and its associated roles. It views CSs as procedures used by the interlocutors to maintain, restore, or disrupt their perception of the social order (Rampton 1997: 300). On this basis, they might indicate solidarity when the interlocutors align themselves to similar social groups, and resistance when they draw on conflicting social values.

CSs have also been studied using the conversational analysis framework (Wagner and Firth 1997). Consistent with the basic tenet of this framework, CSs are seen as elements of the interaction whose relevancy across turns is determined by the communicative concerns of the interactants. As mentioned by Wagner and Firth (1997: 326), in contrast to the psycholinguistic definition of CSs as covert intra-individual phenomena, the interactive definition characterises them as overt elements of talk which are displayed and conjointly worked out by the participants. They are ‘flagged’ by verbal or non-verbal disruptive markers to signal the problem to the interlocutor. These markers are compared with ‘contextualisation cues’ in Gumperz’s sense (Gumperz 1982), which are acted upon by the interlocutor through activating inferential processes and in case they fail through clarification questions. From this point of view, CSs not only reflect the speaker’s alternative resources to solve a problem but they also indicate an interactive potential to call forth the interlocutor’s inferential resources.

In Tarone’s publications, there are indications of both the weak and the strong claims for the interactional role of CSs. For example, Tarone (1981: 292) seems to limit the interactional role of CSs to the impact of social factors on their use. She reports a case where the use of code switching by her subjects was affected by the hearer’s reaction. She notes that apparently when the hearer did not reject the transferred item the speaker continued using it. This was in contrast to cases where the speaker opted for code switching but then decided to stop using it. On the other hand, her
interactional definition and the attempt made to connect the framework of CSs to interactional modifications and repair frameworks of research in a later publication (Yule and Tarone 1991) evidence the truly interactional role of CSs. This might be due to the nature of her research which stands on the border of the social and cognitive territories. The psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives reflect the divide between the cognitive and social factors in interaction. The former studies the underlying cognitive processes while the latter has made it its objective to investigate the interpersonal aspects of communication. Tarone’s learner-centred research with its emphasis on transactional communication lies at the interface between cognitive and social research.

Though the interface provides great opportunities for pedagogically-oriented research on CSs, there are certain grey areas which need to be explored before progress is made in investigating CSs in naturally-occurring data in instructional settings. First, in naturally-occurring interactive data, there seems to be no reliable way of uncovering covert strategies and avoidance since they do not realise and in effect play no role in interaction. Second, the traditional methods of identifying CSs may not be appropriate for the analysis of interactive talk. We might need to use the methods and techniques of discourse analysis to identify the use of strategies and their effect on the interlocutor. Third, there are cases where compensatory strategies (own-performance problems) and non-compensatory strategies (other-performance problems) overlap, ways need to be devised through which a distinction can clearly be made between these two types of strategies.

2.5.2 Methodological considerations

The selection of a research methodology in terms of data collection and analysis depends on the perspective adopted by the researcher. The psycholinguistic studies, which have aimed at identifying and classifying CSs either in terms of the underlying processes or the realised products, have used tightly controlled elicitation tasks. These tasks pose lexical problems which the subjects have to solve using alternative meaning structures. In the picture description task, a number of photos or drawings of concrete objects are shown to the subject, who is supposed to describe them so that a native speaker who plays the role of the audience can identify or reconstruct (c.f. Bialystok 1983, Poulisse 1990). As this task poses the same problems to different subjects, it enables the researcher to make cross-comparisons and to investigate the effect of single variables such as proficiency, task, or native language on the use of CSs by the subjects. A second type of picture description task which has been used in process-oriented studies (see Poulisse 1990; Bongaerts & Poulisse 1989, Kellerman et al. 1990) includes non-conventional abstract shapes for which there are no labels available in L1 or L2. This task was first used in L1 referential studies (Krauss &
Weinheimer 1964) and then was employed in L2 to compare the strategic processes used by subjects in L1 and L2. A concept identification task was used by Paribakht (1985) to elicit descriptions of both concrete and abstract words. In this task, the subjects were provided with pictures of the concrete items and with L1 labels of the abstract ones. Telling a story based on a series of cartoon pictures is another task, which has been used to elicit the L1 and L2 versions of the same story. The comparison of the two versions enables the researcher to identify CSs. This task puts less control on the subjects and therefore its potential use for comparative studies is less than the picture description task.

To study CSs in interactive talk, researchers have used more naturalistic tasks to ensure that interaction takes place between the interlocutors. The adaptations of the matching picture task have been used to test hypotheses based on the collaborative theory. Isaacs and Clark (1987) asked interlocutors to put 16 pictures of New York City scenes into identical arrangements. The interlocutors, who played the roles of directors and matchers, conversed without being able to see each other. This task enabled the researchers to investigate how the experts (the subjects who had lived in the city for several years) and the novices (those who had not lived there) grounded the descriptions to achieve correct references. To investigate the interlocutors’ different perspectives, Wilkes-Gibbs & Kim (1991) used non-conventional abstract shapes in a referential task in which the interlocutors were supposed to match certain arrangements of 12 figures. The subjects had been biased by the researchers before doing the task toward using alternative analogies to refer to the figures. While doing the task, the matchers and directors had either the same or different perspectives toward the figures. These configurations of perspectives had different effects on the grounding process of matching the descriptions. The direction-giving task has also been used by Lloyd (1997), who provided the participants with a map of a village with a route which was available to one member of the dyad. Instead of talking through screens, the dyads were talking over the phone which gave the task a more natural flavour.

Moving toward the sociolinguistic perspective, the researchers have used ‘naturally occurring’ data for their analyses of the role of CSs in social interaction. Wagner and Firth (1997:343) define this type of data as a data-type that would have occurred regardless of the investigator’s interventions or research aspirations. In this sense the ‘naturally-occurring’ epithet can be contrasted with ‘experimental’ or ‘simulated’ data materials; that is, interactions that have been instigated by the researcher for research-related goals.
The criticism against elicitation tasks is that they put constraints on the participants' behaviour, and that in effect they lose ecological validity. These premeditated constraints which are imposed on the participants by the researcher's theoretical assumptions homogenise the data in an artificial way (see Rampton 1997: 284). In naturally-occurring data, the assumption is that the lack of constraints would give way to the participants' more diverse use of CSs.

Within the psycholinguistic framework, researchers use CSs as quantifiable variables which could be graphed and subjected to statistical analyses. This has been the basis for making relationships between the use of CSs and performance variables. As the consequence of the use of CSs on the interlocutor has not been an issue in this type of studies, the interlocutor has either been absent or given a non-participatory role. The identification of CSs has been based either on performance criteria e.g. hesitation phenomena alone or in combination with introspective and retrospective data.

The interactional definition of CSs has changed the arena and created a need for a different methodology of data collection and analysis. These implications have not been stated in detail though suggestions have been made by Tarone (1981:293) who recommends researchers to identify the second-language learner's intended meaning in a wide variety of discourse settings, and then to see how the interlocutors attempt to use their differing linguistic systems to negotiate an agreement on that meaning, i.e. use communication strategies.

For this purpose, the recommendation is that data are recorded on video-tape (if possible) and both interlocutors' utterances are transcribed. Tarone makes no references to methods of data analysis except making it clear that the results are to be related to research on discourse analysis and communicative competence. The implication is that the methods of analysis would have to be compatible with the methods and techniques used in the field of discourse analysis. As the methodological implications of the interactional definition of CSs and the methodologies which inform the sociolinguistically-oriented studies converge on the use of discourse analytic procedures in the process of analysing naturally-occurring data, these aspects are reviewed in the following two studies to represent their basic tenets.

The first study was done by Wagner and Firth (1997) using conversational analytic procedures to investigate the role of CSs in achieving mutual understanding in work place. Wagner and Firth (1997: 325-326) define CSs in interactive terms by limiting them to instances where 'the participants themselves make public in the talk itself an encoding-related problem and by so doing engage- individually or conjointly- in attempts to resolve the problem'. For them, the unit of
analysis is an episode of talk in which the use of a CS by one of the interlocutors invites a reaction from the second interlocutor either immediately in the next turn or with an interval in subsequent turns. The evidence provided by this study suggests that the speaker’s use of a CS ‘flagged’ by pauses and other markers has the capacity to ‘marshal’ the inferential capacities of the hearer who then might deploy devices such as ‘other repairs’, ‘formulations’, and ‘control checks’ to check his/her understanding against what the speaker had in mind (p. 342).

The second is a study done by Williams, Inscoe, and Tasker (1997), who adopt an interactional modification perspective to investigate the role of CSs in achieving mutual comprehension in a Chemistry Lab led by a non-native speaker teaching assistant and a group of native speakers. The units of analysis in this study are again episodes of talk revolving around one or more interrelated comprehension problems initiated either by the non-native speaker teaching assistant or by a native speaker student. In their analysis they focus on discourse moves such as ‘comprehension checks’, ‘confirmation checks’, ‘clarification requests’, and ‘other-/self-repetitions/reformulations’ deployed by both sides of communication to achieve mutual understanding.

The methodology adopted in both studies has a microanalytic aspect in the sense that the categories of analysis are identified in their interactional context and analysed as episodes of talk evolved through interaction. This is in contrast with the method used in the psycholinguistically oriented studies where the focus is on the tightly controlled speaker’s output. In Williams et al’s study, the categories used by the more proficient interlocutor such as ‘other repair’, ‘control checks’, and ‘formulations’ are negotiation mechanisms used to deal with other-performance problems in contrast with the ‘flagged’ CSs used by the less proficient speaker to deal with his/her own problems, and at the same time signal the problem to the interlocutor. In the second study, the difference between the students and their teaching assistant in terms of roles and expertise brings about special circumstances under which both sides use conversational modification devices for different purposes. The students use the negotiation devices to check their understanding of the task against the knowledge expertise of the teaching assistant; while the teaching assistant uses the same mechanisms to check the adequacy of the instructions in helping the students to understand the task. What makes the categorisation approach of these two studies different from psycholinguistically-oriented studies is the identification of the categories in terms of the function they perform in communication and the investigation of the way they are used by both sides of communication.

In this section, we reviewed the major theoretical and methodological features of the two distinct perspectives taken by investigators toward the study of CSs in an attempt to provide a basis for the
study of ESL/EFL teachers' CSs in instructional settings. Taking the interactive perspective as a starting point, we will further develop the theoretical aspects in the next section by reviewing the different categories which have so far been identified and described in teacher talk. The methodological implications will be developed further in chapters 3 and 4 which deal with the methodology of the research project and the categories of analysis respectively.

2.6 Pedagogic categories in teacher talk

The structural, functional, and discoursal features of Teacher Talk (TT), that is the language addressed to learners, have been extensively researched (for a review see Chaudron 1988). The structural features constitute phonological, morphological and syntactic aspects of teachers' utterances. The functional description of TT in studies cited in Chaudron (1988) basically includes categories defined in pedagogic terms such as ‘command’, instruct, and ‘explain’. Chaudron also reports that self-repetition has been investigated in a number of studies as a discourse modification feature of TT. These features have probably attracted attention because of their potential effect on learners' comprehension which is hypothesised to have an important effect on language acquisition.

An interest in the effect of certain features of teacher talk on the students' output has been the impetus for the study of teachers' questions which has focused on the types of questions in terms of their cognitive demand and their effect on the quantity and quality of student talk. The distinction made between ‘display’ and ‘referential’ questions has revealed important differences in the type of interaction which is generated. In using referential questions, the questioner is genuinely interested to know the answer and the answer itself is subject to negotiation; while the appropriate answer to display questions is often predetermined by the teacher and therefore it is often subjected to evaluation. Brock (1986) studied the impact of referential questions on ESL classroom discourse. She found out that the students' responses to referential questions were longer, syntactically more complex and contained more connectives. She observes that questions at the low cognitive levels of factual recall or recognition are likely to be display questions while questions calling for higher cognitive levels of evaluation and judgment are more likely to be referential questions. As for the relationship between the referential/display distinction and the open/closed one, Chaudron (1988) notes that referential questions may be either open or closed; whereas display questions would tend to be closed. Pica and Long (1986) compared the frequency of conversational adjustments defined in terms of display and referential questions in teacher talk and the native speakers' talk to non-native speakers in informal conversations. They found out that the frequency of conversational adjustments was different between the two contexts. The frequency of display questions was
significantly higher in classroom talk than the talk between native and non-native speakers. Based on this result, they conclude that the amount of negotiation of meaning that occurs in the classroom setting is much smaller. They account for the difference by arguing that the higher frequency of display questions indicates the one-way flow of information from the teacher to students.

The distinction between display and referential questions is useful in indicating a difference in the flow of information between the talk inside and outside the classroom. However, it is not revealing in terms of the functions that the features of each variety might perform in their contexts of use. Brock’s (1986) study failed to show a significant correlation between the type of questions and the frequency of conversational modification devices such as clarification requests, confirmation checks, and comprehension checks. There are also intra- and inter-teacher variations which undermine the efforts made to make generalisations about the teachers’ questions. Banbrook and Skehan (1990) provide illustrative examples which show this variation. They attribute it to the teacher’s general approach, the aims of the different phases of the lesson and the types of activities that the teacher and student are engaged in. These and other limitations of a quantitative approach to the study of teachers’ question supports Van Lier’s (1988: 224) following comment.

[...] the practice of questioning in L2 classrooms, pervasive though it is, has so far received only superficial treatment [...] An analysis must go beyond simple distinctions such as display and referential and to carefully examine the purposes and the effects of questions, not only in terms of linguistic production, but also in terms of cognitive demands and interactive purpose.

The study of teachers’ feedback to the students’ production in terms of error correction has also been motivated by a similar interest in the influence of this feature of teacher talk on not only contribution to students’ production and engagement in meaningful interaction but also for the impact it has on the students’ understanding of how the language works (Tsui 1995: 16). The questions which are asked in relation to corrective feedback are often related to the types of errors, the errors which should or should not be corrected, and the sort of strategies that teachers adopt in correcting students’ errors. It is also recommended that teachers make judicious decisions as to whether an error should or should not be corrected since it is assumed that developmental errors are impervious to correction. The question as to whether, in a fluency context, the error disrupts meaning communication or not is another factor which is proposed to be considered in the process of decision making.

Similar to teachers’ questions, the issue of error correction has also been related to meaning negotiation and the use of conversational modifications. Following Long’s (1996) claim that
negotiation strategies can constitute negative feedback, the study of error correction has adopted a new perspective which has been the impetus for a productive line of research. The basic question in this line of research is whether and to what extent the negotiation strategies are noticed as negative feedback and what contextual factors might affect their potential for this purpose. As Long’s proposal overlaps with the traditional view of negative feedback in language teaching which comprises the ‘pre-emptive’ negative feedback in the form of explanation of grammar rules and reactive negative feedback in the form of explicit error correction, the researchers have given different definitions to negotiation strategies. For example, Lyster and Ranta (1997) make a distinction between meaning negotiation strategies and the didactic strategies used for what they call ‘negotiation of form’. They suggest that the didactic strategies used for negotiation of form have a better chance to be noticed by the students as negative feedback. The categories of negotiated input proposed by Long to be used as negative feedback comprise negotiation strategies such as clarification requests, confirmation checks, and repetitions which indicate to the learner the presence of a problem with his/her output and recast as a form of other repetition which reformulates the learner’s deviant utterance. The categories that Lyster and Ranta use as substitutes for negotiation strategies are ‘elicitation of the correct form’, ‘metalinguistic clues’, clarification requests’ and ‘repetition of errors’. Drawing a line between form and meaning in relation to recast has remained inconclusive. The reason might be the different functions that recast performs and its different realisations in classroom discourse. It might realise as a semantically-contingent rephrasing that contains no additional information used to confirm and at the same time reformulate the student’s response in a more target-like form. Further, the rephrase might be embedded in the context of new information, in which case it might function as a topic continuation move. Both of these cases might be realised as confirmation checks when formulated as questions, in which case they would elicit confirmation of the given information or seek additional information respectively. The overlap between recast and confirmation check has led to the conflation of the two categories in some studies done on error correction even though the two categories perform quite distinct functions in sequentially contingent discourse (c.f. Mackey and Philp, 1998; Oliver 1995; 2000; Lyster, 1998). This might be one reason why the results of studies done on recast (c.f. Long and Robinson 1998; Mackey and Philp, 1998; Oliver, 1995, 2000; Lyster, 1998 among others) have provided inconclusive evidence for or against the role of recast as negative feedback. There is evidence suggesting that when teachers intend recast to be noticed as corrective feedback they take special linguistic and/or non-linguistic measures to highlight the error. For example, in Lyster’s study recasts which involved a reduction of the learner’s utterance accounted for three quarters of all repairs following recasts. These reduced or ‘partial recasts’ (Roberts 1995) seem to be more
noticeable as corrective feedback. Teachers might also use stress for this purpose. In other cases when recast overlaps with other signs of approval or the negotiation strategy of confirmation check, it seems less likely that teachers intend it to be noticed as corrective feedback. In this regard, Lyster (1998: 77, n. 5) notes

[...] as has been well documented in studies of parent-child interaction (e.g., Brown & Hanlon, 1970; Hirsh-Pasek et al., 1984; Penner, 1987), truth value rather than well-formedness governs approval of learner responses in these classrooms. Such indiscriminate use of signs of approval, however, indicates that teachers' purpose in using recasts may indeed not be primarily a corrective one: With regard to approval, recasts have more in common with noncorrective repetition and topic-continuation moves than with other forms of corrective feedback.'

The observation that negotiation of meaning and error correction overlap highlights the need for a descriptive interpretative approach to the study of teacher talk which focuses on the purposes and the functions of the language used by the teacher and students.

Teachers' explanations, especially vocabulary explanation, have received some research attention (see Chaudron 1977, Baker 1990). The research has focused on the structure or organisation of teachers' explanations and their impact on students' understanding so that effective ways of explaining grammatical or lexical items could be identified. Baker (1990) makes a distinction between explanations offered in response to unplanned vocabulary which are mostly learner-initiated, and the planned vocabulary offered to introduce key vocabulary items of a listening or reading text. Yee and Wagner (1984 cited in Baker 1990) provide a discursive model of vocabulary explanations which include 'explanation' as the obligatory element, and frame and restatement as optional elements preceding and following the explanation respectively. A comprehension check might also follow an explanation or a restatement as an optional element.

The term 'teacher explanation' has its roots in teaching content subjects. It deals with the way content is made accessible to students. From this viewpoint, the term 'explanation' can apply to occasions where teachers explain grammatical points or other formal or pragmatic aspects of language knowledge. However, for the following reason, it seems less appropriate to apply it to vocabulary items indiscriminately. Meaning descriptions and names are two alternative ways of making references to entities (see Carroll 1980; Krauss and Weinheimer, 1966). They differ in terms of social appropriacy which depends on the degree of familiarity of the interlocutors with the references. As such, meaning descriptions are used as substitutes for labels when there is a gap in the lexical knowledge of the speaker or hearer. The following examples demonstrate this function of lexical explications in talk between native speakers, and between the teacher and students.
In example (1) native speaker B uses a word which is not familiar to native speaker A. Speaker A’s appeal for assistance signals to speaker B that there is a comprehension problem with the word ‘child bar’. Speaker B’s description succeeds in getting across the concept.

In example (2), again the hearer (speaker S), here a student, signals a comprehension problem to the teacher (speaker R). The teacher’s description of the concept plus the sound effect and possibly the accompanied mimetic gestures help the student to recover the referent for the word ‘haunted’.

As it can be inferred from the above examples, native speakers and teachers alike use meaning descriptions to make references when names are not available to them or their interlocutors. The suggestion is that the purpose of teachers’ vocabulary explanations is better served if they are treated as CSs.

2.7 Teacher Talk and Classroom Interaction

2.7.1 Classroom interaction patterns

The study of classroom interaction patterns is motivated by the assumption that participation in social interaction is in some ways related to learning, or at least to opportunities for learning. The notion of ‘patterns of interaction’ is related to a similar notion in conversation analytic studies, namely ‘speech exchange systems’ (Sacks et al. 1974) and its associated concept ‘speech community’ (Gumperz, 1968). The notion ‘speech community’ is conceived of as a social gathering with specific role-relationships, which imposes certain restrictions on the members of the speech community in terms of participation rights and duties. Any specific speech community may have its own speech exchange systems, which may differ from the patterns of interaction of other speech communities.
Analysis of classroom interaction is intended to characterize the predominant speech exchange systems with respect to their similarities to and differences from the speech exchange systems of social interaction in non-instructional settings. Specifically the intention is to evaluate the learning potential of each pattern of interaction in terms of the level of students' participation and their degree of initiative. In this section we will focus on three different but overlapping classifications of patterns of interaction.

The first classification which we focus on is proposed by Ellis (1984: 100-132). Ellis notes that different patterns of interaction emerge as a result of a shift in the goals of interaction. He identifies three major goals described as core goals, framework goals, and social goals. Each of these goals requires its own pattern of interactive roles (different combinations of teacher, pupil, class, group) and types of address (speaker, addressee, hearer). Patterns of interaction differ in terms of the ratio of teacher/student talk, degree of student’s’ initiative and involvement, and their degree of similarity to naturalistic second language acquisition interaction routines. Core goals encompass medium-oriented, message-oriented, and activity-oriented goals. Ellis’s characterisation of the different focuses of talk in terms of the goals of interaction is as follows. The focus on medium or the language itself gives rise to the IRF discourse structure with its concomitant teacher-centred type of address and reduced negotiation of meaning between the teacher and students. Focus on message provides pupils with opportunities to contribute in interaction, and so there is more equality between the teacher and students in terms of speech quantity. Activity-oriented goals provide students with even more opportunities to initiate interaction. This can be attributed to the equality of roles experienced by teachers and students while they are doing game-like activities and tasks. Framework goals are implied in classroom management and the organization of the requirements of the lesson. This type of focus, which is repetitive and context-dependent, is characterised by its predominant use of directives. Social goals move classroom interaction closer to natural conversation in which interlocutors use language as a means of socialization.

Seedhouse (1994) has proposed a system of interaction patterns operating on the principle of ‘classroom mode’, which he defines as the point of convergence of pedagogical purposes and pattern of interaction. He suggests that there are four basic classroom modes, each with its own pedagogic purpose and pattern of interaction.

1. Real-World Target Speech Community: The purpose of this mode is to enable learners to produce patterns of interaction characteristic of the speech community they aspire to converge with.
2. Classroom as Speech Community: this mode implies that teacher and students, as a speech community, should exploit the immediate environment to maximize opportunities for interaction.

3. Task-Oriented Speech Community: In this mode, the teacher sets the scene and withdraws to let the students interact with each other to achieve the purpose of the task. Here the focus is on the completion of the task and so the question of accuracy is irrelevant.

4. Form and Accuracy Speech Community: This is the most restricted and most predictable form of interaction in which the focus is on form and accuracy.

Van Lier's (1988) classification of classroom interaction types is based on a distinction between 'topic' and 'activity'. Van Lier defines 'topic' as 'a sustained focusing of attention, through the talk and across a stretch of talk, on some single issue or set of closely related issues' and 'activity' as 'what is being done and how it is done' (pp. 148-149). His argument is that, in L2 classrooms, the interaction orientation is not always toward topic. Sometimes, the attention is focused on activity. Orientation toward activity which implies attention to the rules induces a type of predetermined and previously-agreed-upon type of interaction. Van Lier contends that in both classroom and real life interaction, topic and activity orientation are present simultaneously, though at each point in time one may predominate. What distinguishes classroom interaction from real life interaction is the status of the rules. In the former, the rules have to be stated, while in the latter they remain tacit and unspecified.

As activity- and topic-orientation are not mutually exclusive, the interaction types are defined in terms of the degree of their involvement. On this basis, the following four types of interaction are identified:

1. Talking: less topic-orientation, less activity-orientation; this type of interaction is the closest to ordinary conversation. Students collaboratively contribute to the interaction. There is no turn-allocation, or nomination.

2. Telling: More topic-orientation, less activity-orientation; the purpose is to pass information to students. There is no allocation of turns.

3. Instructing: More topic-orientation, more activity-orientation; the focus is on the provision of information by the teacher in specific ways. The teacher tries to elicit the pre-specified information from the students through question-and-answer or any other procedure in which the rule of the 'unique-response' is in effect.

4. Drilling: Less topic-orientation, more activity-orientation; the focus is on ritualistic activities, in which form and accuracy predominate meaning and information exchange.
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The above-mentioned classifications of classroom interaction patterns consider classroom interaction as the interface between the pedagogical purposes of classroom activities and the participation rights and duties of the teacher and students as the members of a certain speech community. They overlap to a large extent in terms of the type of interaction patterns they identify in language classrooms; however, they differ in terms of the principle upon which they classify interaction patterns. While Ellis takes discourse goals as his principle of classification, Seedhouse classifies patterns of interaction based on the type of language community, which determines the interactants’ participation rights and duties. The extent to which a certain classroom interaction pattern resembles real life communication depends on the pedagogical purpose of the activity in which the teacher and students are engaged. Van Lier’s classification principle is the amount of focus on activity or topic. Here, the balance between the focus on activity or topic determines the degree of resemblance of the classroom interaction patterns to real life communication.

2.7.2 Classroom interaction patterns as learning contexts

The notion of ‘context’ is often defined in term of the type of interaction. Seedhouse’s (1994, 1999) proposed interaction patterns constitute different classroom contexts with their own preferred speech exchange system and repair structure motivated by the pedagogic purposes in terms of classroom activities. He integrates the pedagogic purpose as a macro level factor with the speech exchange system and repair structure of talk as micro level categories. Seedhouse notes that this integration is the source of tension between homogeneity at the macro level (the same pedagogic purposes) and heterogeneity at the micro level (different and unique sequences of moves and exchanges). This might be the reason why different and at times conflicting patterns of interaction are often constructed within the framework of the same pedagogic purposes.

The notion of ‘context’ has also been discussed by Wells (1996) who identifies two levels of analysis corresponding with the macro and micro levels of teachers’ organisation of instruction. According to Wells, teachers’ instructional plans start with the selection of curricular units such as tasks or activities consistent with certain pedagogic goals. What is produced as a result of the execution of the teaching plan is a piece of discourse which is co-constructed by the teacher and students. It is constructed as a result of the choices made at the local level of exchange. These options include the three categories of the third turn in Sinclair and Coulthard’s (1975) model (accept/reject, evaluate, comment) plus reformulation and correction. He points out that the teacher can delegate the same functions to the students by asking them to reformulate, clarify or expand
their utterances. Wells makes the point that the options open to the teacher in the third turn can be strategically and responsively selected at the micro level of the teaching process. The selection of each of these discourse moves creates a context which has the potential to change the nature of the activity either to the favour of the achievement of pedagogic goals or to their detriment.

The claims made about the role of the participants' choices at the local level and their bearing on the contexts constructed for learning are echoed by Allwright (1983) who points out that the researchers' focus on the differences at the level of technique has failed to differentiate the effectiveness of different methods in order to support prescriptions for teacher training. He suggests that research in second language classrooms should retreat from prescription to description and from a focus on technique to a focus on classroom processes. According to this perspective, lessons are social events which are co-constructed by the participants. What teachers and students do in the classroom contribute to the creation of a pedagogical context which could either enhance or stifle effective teaching and learning.

The notion of context and different levels of decision-making in classroom discourse highlight the point that the analysis of classroom discourse processes should take into account the macro-level pedagogic purposes of the teaching activities as well as the participants' micro-level local choices in order to give a more reliable picture of the processes. Being aware of the purposes of the interaction, the participants might orient themselves in different ways toward their achievement and in effect make different choices at the local level. These choices both contribute to and indicate the type of context at work at any phase of the lesson. The insights from the notions of patterns of interaction and context provide the basis for the microanalysis of the data in order to investigate the relationship between the focus of talk and the use of CSs by teachers.

2.7.3 Teacher-fronted classroom interaction as ritual

There are a number of features to classroom interaction which facilitate communication and instruction but at the same time contribute to what is often referred to as the 'ritualistic' nature of this type of interaction. Among these features, we can refer to the 'mutual adaptation', 'formulaic expressions', and 'routines', and also the teacher's managerial role in interaction. According to Kramsch (1986:367), interaction always entails negotiating intended meanings, i.e. adjusting one's speech to the effect one intends to have on the listener. It entails anticipating the listener's response and possible misunderstandings, clarifying
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one's own and the other's intentions and arriving at the closest possible match between intended, perceived, and anticipated meanings.

Speech adjustments, as indications of anticipating possible misunderstandings and dealing with problems which normally occur in classroom discourse, are a characteristic feature of teacher talk. As noted by Malanah-Thomas (1987:7) classroom interaction is 'a constant pattern of mutual influence and adjustment'. The teachers act upon the students and in return the students’ responses modify the teachers’ next actions. Like any other spoken discourse, the development of classroom interaction depends on the participants' mutual knowledge and presuppositions which enables them to interpret each others' intentions. One important aspect of classroom discourse which makes the interpretations possible is the knowledge of the social context of schooling and the well-established teacher-student role-relationship (Cazden 1988; Hatch 1992).

In addition to the participants’ adaptation to the classroom context in general and the teacher’s adaptation to the students’ need in particular, classroom interaction is also facilitated by what Krashen and Scarchella (1978) refer to as ‘routines’ and ‘patterns’. Routines are seen as lexicalised sentences which are often memorised as unanalysable units regularly used in the context of classroom interaction. Patterns are defined as utterance frameworks with open slots. These two notions only apply to production of utterances. Bygate (1987:14-26) discusses the skills which facilitate the act of speaking in two separate sections; production and interaction skills. He uses the notion ‘formulaic expressions’, which seems to be similar to ‘routines’ in the sense used by Krashen and Scarchella, to describe the set expressions which might have more normal meanings but like idiomatic expressions some of their constituent words can not easily be changed (e.g. ‘I don't believe a word of it.’). In his category of ‘interaction skills’, Bygate refers to ‘routines’ divided into ‘informational’ and ‘interactional’ types. He characterises informational routines as the way speakers organise what they have to communicate in typical patterns, which reflect more or less typical kinds of messages used in different speech events such as story telling, telling jokes, descriptions and instructions, and interactional routines as ‘the kinds of turns typically occurring in given situations, and the order in which the components are likely to occur’ (p. 25). Thus the patterns of interaction used predominantly in ‘service encounters’, ‘interviews’ ‘classroom talk’ and the like can be branded as interactional routines. Bygates’s contention is that formulaic expressions and routines among some other production and interactional skills contribute to fluency in speaking. It appears that, in institutional types of speech such as classroom interaction, formulaic expressions and routines are more frequently used. This might be the reason underlying the teacher’s and students’ expectations in interaction which facilitate their contributions to classroom discourse.
One further factor facilitating classroom interaction is the teacher’s management and control of classroom discourse. The teacher’s control can also be seen in the way his/her agenda influences the direction of interaction. As noted by Allwright (1984) students have no specific agenda and often follow the teachers’ lead. The evidence for this claim is the students’ limited access to discourse moves other than responses. The notion of role is associated to the asymmetrical nature of classroom interaction which is attributed to the institutional authority of the teacher, his knowledge and expertise, and his developed language proficiency which gives him the upper hand in managing discourse using his discourse skills and communication strategies. The teacher’s dominant role in classroom discourse means that he not only controls the pedagogical agenda of transactional communication but he also operates the social system of interpersonal relationships (see Cazden 1988).

The above characteristics of classroom interaction may give the impression that classroom interaction is ‘ritualistic’ in the negative sense of the word. However, as noted by Pawley and Syder (1983), conversational performance demonstrates a ‘novelty scale’ in both single utterances and stretches of discourse. Speakers use lexical items to fill in the slots of grammatical patterns and use utterances with specific discourse functions to fill in exchange slots. The novelty scale implies that in both cases the grammatical patterns and exchange structures move from a fixed state to a more flexible one giving the discourse participants more choices. For example, formulaic expressions provide no lexical or grammatical choices while in formulating normal utterances the speakers have a range of choices in filling in the slots of the grammatical patterns. This notion is also echoed by McClaren (1999: 40) who notes that ‘rituals’ ‘may oscillate between randomness and formality’ and Griffin and Mehan (1981: 205), who characterise classroom discourse as ‘spontaneous improvisations on basic patterns of interaction’. Following McClaren and Griffin & Mehan, Nunn (2001:6) characterises ritualistic exchanges of teacher-fronted classroom interaction as ‘repertoires of limited choices’. Analysing teacher-fronted interaction data, he demonstrates that the discourse moves at the rank of exchange are subject to negotiation. The negotiation choice is available to participants at each point of an exchange. For instance, the teacher’s initiation move creates the ‘prospection’ of an answer. However, as can be seen in the following example, this prospection is taken over by the students’ choice of a negotiation move.

T: (showing flashcard HOW/FEEL) Yes?
S: Please tell me you catch a fish big or small?
The question which arises is what parameters underlie the movement on the ‘novelty scale’ in classroom interaction. The answer given to this question by different scholars show great similarities in spite of the differences in the viewpoints and terminology. Kramsch (1985a) locates classroom patterns of interaction on a continuum whose extreme ends are naturalistic and pedagogic discourse. The movement toward each type is the function of teacher-student role-relationship, the pedagogic aims of classroom activities, and the type of information exchanged between the teacher and the students. The movement toward pedagogic discourse is characterised with a concentration on the content to be learned and its accuracy while movement in the opposite direction is associated with concentration on fluency in language use and the acquisition of interaction skills. Kramsch (1985a: 175) distinguishes between two levels of classroom discourse. The ‘constitutive discourse’ which focuses on the language as the object of instruction and ‘regulative discourse’ which organises interaction with the groups. She notes that the latter has traditionally been managed by the teacher; however, her recommendation is that teachers transfer part of the management role to the students by encouraging them to take more control of the turn-taking system. This along some other strategies that teachers may assume such as the provision of natural feedback and building the topic in hand with the students may help in redressing the current emphasis on pedagogic discourse.

Following Sinclair and Brazil (1982), Willis (1992) makes a distinction between ‘inner’ and ‘outer’ discourse, which is somehow similar to Kramsch’s distinction between ‘constitutive’ and ‘regulative’ discourse. She characterises ‘inner discourse’ as consisting of the target forms that the teacher has selected as learning goals, and ‘outer discourse’ as ‘the language used to socialise, organise, explain and check, and generally to enable the pedagogic activities to take place (p. 163). The inner discourse can not stand by itself. For its existence it depends on the outer discourse though it could temporarily stand independent as when language use is practiced through simulation activities. Applying the two levels of discourse on Dave Willis’s (1990) types of classroom activities, Willis identifies three different patterns. First, the regular use of the dependent inner discourse characterises the ‘citation activities’ used for modelling and practicing purposes. The focus here is on accuracy in using language forms. Second, the regular use of independent inner discourse interspersed with outer discourse characterises ‘simulation activities’, whose underlying focus is again on language form though at the surface they involve in Willis’s terms ‘pseudo interaction’. Third, the regular use of the outer discourse characterises ‘replication activities’ whose
focus is on topic and information exchange rather than language form. The interesting point in this analysis is the shift from one level into another and the way teachers and students can orient themselves toward each level. Willis’s contention is that the shift is signalled through a number of devices among which we can refer to the boundary exchanges which function as explicit framing devices, the teacher’s preceding initiation and follow up moves, and paralinguistic features such as stress and intonation. According to Willis, the shift from the outer to the inner discourse is accompanied with correction of errors, supplying new words and the exemplification of the beginning of drills and practice sequences normally marked by boundary exchanges.

Willis’s characterisation of classroom interaction in terms of the distinction between ‘inner’ and ‘outer’ discourse reminds us of Van Lier’s (1998 149-152) distinction between ‘topic’ and ‘activity’ referred to earlier in this chapter (see section 2.6.2). He defines the former as the content of talk or what is talked about and the latter as the framework of talk and its form of expression. The participants may orient themselves toward topic or activity depending on their perception of the kind of activity in which they are involved and its goals. According to Van Lier, orientation toward activity manifests itself with a focus on saying things in particular ways. The implication is that in this case there are certain rules which are explicitly stated and adhered to in the course of interaction. The rules are regularly invoked and there is an emphasis on their uniqueness which puts constraints on the range of variation of talk. This orientation is also characterised by rigid turn-taking norms, which prescribe the allocation of turns in pre-specified ways. In comparison, orientation toward topic is characterised with more choices as what to say and how to say it. Turn-taking norms approach those of general conversation allowing more self-selection. The topic is negotiated among the participants, and there is less need for the rules to be explicitly stated.

What is suggested by the above characterisations is that first classroom interaction is double-level and, as mentioned by Willis (1992:162), more complex than interaction in content lessons due to the fact that language in L2 classrooms is both the subject matter of the lesson and the medium of instruction. Second, the participants’ orientation to either instruction or communication involves a different type of role-relationship and turn-taking norms. Third, the type of language used in either context can have significant implications for learning. In other words, the learning potential of classroom activities depends on the type of context constructed through the participants’ choices at the utterance and discourse level. These ideas have implications for the notion of focus of talk, as defined and operationalised in chapter 3.
2.8 Summary

The major aim of this chapter has been to review the key issues in the study of CSs and teacher talk relevant to the focus of the present study. The study of CSs has largely been interested in the investigation of learners’ lexical problems in comprehension and production. The main issues have been the definition, identification and classification of the learners’ strategies. The definitions developed for CSs were originally informed by theoretical and practical goals, which, in this respect, dealt with strategic aspects of communicative competence and their ultimate control for pedagogic reasons. Problems have been identified with the way CSs have been conceptualised and identified. The basic conceptual problem is the narrow focus of the field on learners and the identification criteria, which leave the unmarked CSs undetected. The later developments in the field have led to new perspectives informed by psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic criteria. The argument has been developed in this chapter that a pure psycholinguistic or sociolinguistic perspective may not provide a proper framework for the investigation of the dynamism of teacher talk, which is mainly used in transactional communication. The interactive perspective, identified with Tarone’s works on CSs, has been argued to be a better alternative for this purpose; however, there are certain grey areas in this perspective which form gaps in its theoretical and methodological framework. The gaps have been located in the identification and classification of learners’ and native speakers’ categories of CSs, especially with respect to the status of avoidance and appeal for assistance from an interactive perspective and the absence of the meaning negotiation devices used by native speakers in their interaction with learners in the current typologies. In response to the later issue, an alternative typology has been suggested which is based on the functional distinction between learners’ and native speakers’ categories.

The study of teacher talk has largely focused on its pedagogic functions in classroom discourse. These functions can be observed in relation to categories like teachers’ questions, and error correction strategies. Attempts have also been made to investigate the interactive aspects of teacher talk in studies focused on interaction patterns and their role in constructing contexts for learning. The interactive potential has also been related to the divide between pedagogy and communication and the way the dynamism between the two could reliably be defined and identified. Several attempts of this sort have been mentioned in this chapter by references to Willis’s distinction between ‘inner’ and ‘outer’ discourse, Van Lier’s distinction between focus on activity and topic and finally Kramsch’s distinction between ‘regulative’ and ‘constitutive’ discourse. References have also been made to the ritualistic aspects of teacher talk such as formulaic expressions and routines, which based on Bygate’s (1987) proposition are considered as production and interaction.
skills facilitating communication between teachers and students and not as unacceptable aspects of teacher talk, as suggested by the term 'ritualistic'. Based on these characterisations, it has been argued that teacher talk can assume both conversational and instructional features depending on the overall or local focus of the talk on fluency or accuracy.
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3.1 Introduction

The present research study sets out to investigate the native speaker and non-native speaker teachers’ strategic use of language in the process of making alignments with the pupils to accommodate their communicative needs in teacher-led phases of the lessons. It seeks to identify the range of strategies, and their conditions of use through a number of case studies located in the UK and Iran in three different teaching institutions. In particular, it aims to examine the extent to which the use of CSs is related to the teachers’ language background, and the type of institutions. It also aims to investigate the specific conditions which might influence the use of CSs by looking at different phases of a lesson in terms of the overall and/or local focus of talk on ‘topic’ or ‘activity’. The design and research methodology are the main topics of the present chapter. The analytic framework developed to answer the research questions is presented in chapter 4.

The sections in this chapter are organised around two major themes: the development of the framework of analysis as the aim of the exploratory pilot study; and the design and methods of data collection and analysis adopted for the main study. As an introduction to the first theme, section 3.2 touches upon the methodological issues of investigating CSs in their natural context of use followed by the research questions which guided the study in section 3.3. Section 3.4 introduces the pilot study. The contributions of the pilot study to the design and methodology of the main study in terms of the procedures of data collection and the framework of data analysis are discussed in sections 3.4.1, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, and 3.4.4. The account of the design of the main study, the teaching contexts, subjects, and procedures of data collection and transcription of data is presented in section 3.5. Section 3.6 deals with the procedures followed in the data analysis.

3.2 Methodological Framework

It has been argued that by selecting a specific methodology for research or in Robson’s (1993) terms a ‘research strategy’ we necessarily make certain assumptions about the nature of the social phenomena and the bases of knowledge (Cohen and Manion 1994; Denzin and Lincoln 1998 among others). In other words, these premises, which are referred to as the ‘ontology’ and ‘epistemology’ of a research paradigm, shape our methodological preferences for the investigation of social phenomena. For example, if we view knowledge as something objective and tangible, we would prefer to use the methods of physical sciences, that is, objective observation and measurement in our inquiries. Nonetheless, arguments have been made in favour of blending different methodologies in different phases of the research process in social sciences in general (Hammersly
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

1990) and second language acquisition in particular (Chaudron 1986, 1988). The suggestion is that a qualitative research strategy is adopted at the exploratory phases of research where the aim is to discover the conceptual categories or to refine the categories which have already been identified in very limited contexts. However, at later stages of the research process, when the refined categories enable the researcher to generate hypotheses it makes perfect sense to use a quantitative experimental or quasi-experimental research strategy.

The suggestion to blend research strategies does not necessarily violate the relationship between the paradigm premises and research methodology since the qualitative and quantitative approaches used in this sense are shaped by the postpositivistic paradigm (Denzin and Lincoln 1998). They both stress the criteria of external and internal validity and reliability. However, they use different strategies to achieve them. This is also confirmed by Lincoln and Guba (2000:169), who maintain that different methodologies could be mixed under the same research paradigm.

The quantitative and qualitative research strategies referred to above are sometimes used to refer to methods or techniques of data collection and analysis. In this sense, numerical data in the form of test scores or tallies of structured categories, which could then be subjected to descriptive or inferential statistical measurements, are labelled quantitative; while oral data, which is collected in an unstructured way and subjected to inferential methods of categorisation, is called qualitative. By analogy, blending different methods or techniques within the same methodological framework could also be considered legitimate.

In the light of the preceding discussion, we can describe the present study in terms of the research strategy and methods of data collection and analysis. In terms of research strategy, the study can be classified as descriptive/interpretative. The reason for this classification is the nature of the investigation which involves certain degrees of interpretation on the part of the researcher over the categorisation process. The research strategy encompasses both the procedures and methods of data collection and analysis. In terms of procedures, the project was designed as a case study. The decision was made based on practical and theoretical considerations. First, seeking answers to the research questions involved an in-depth study of the subjects’ oral behaviour in their natural settings. Second, more than one instance of each subject’s oral behaviour had to be observed so that the observer’s effect on the observed behaviour could be reduced. Third, the logistic demands of a large-scale study were beyond the resources available to the researcher. In fact the case study design
was a compromise between the theoretical requirements and practical limitations of an in-depth study.

In terms of the methods of data collection and analysis, the study can be classified as both quantitative and qualitative. The major source of data was the transcripts of the teacher-student interaction throughout the recorded lessons, which is considered a sort of qualitative data. The approach to data categorisation was also qualitative in the sense that the range of categories was not fixed in advance. Frequency counts and measures of descriptive statistics were used to find out the general patterns of category use among the participant teachers.

### 3.3 Research questions

The study explores the following research questions:

1. What are the different types and frequencies of CSs adopted by language teachers in teacher-led phases of their lessons?
2. What are the major functions performed by these strategies in classroom discourse?
3. Is there any relationship between the teachers' language background and their patterns of strategy use?
4. Is there any relationship between the institutions in which the teachers are performing their teaching duties and their patterns of strategy use?
5. Is there any relationship between the type and frequency of CSs used by language teachers and the focus of talk in terms of the participants' orientation toward topic and activity?
6. Is there any relationship between the different phases of a lesson and the type and frequency of CSs?

Our purpose in this study is to investigate CSs, as linguistic and discoursal devices, used by language teachers in their attempts to establish mutual understanding in a context where clarity and acceptability play a critical role in the way pedagogic aims are achieved. To investigate this phenomenon systematically, first we set out to identify the type of CSs in classroom discourse and their functions in terms of their role in resolving code-oriented and information-oriented problems. Second we will focus on the distribution of strategies among native and non-native teachers to explore the scope of this phenomenon and the possible effect of the teachers' language background and the institutional arrangements on its patterns of use. Third, the possible relationship between the use of CSs and the focus of talk in terms of the participants' orientation toward activity or topic will be explored.
Starting from the notion of CSs as an interactive process of achieving mutual understanding in contexts where meaning structures are not shared (Tarone 1980), we hope that the stated aims of the study will add to our knowledge about the process of meaning communication in language classes. A better understanding of the communication process will in turn shed light on the complex nature of communication and pedagogy reflected in theories which postulate a relationship between language learning and the input and/or output which is made comprehensible through interaction (Krashen 1980, 1982; Long 1980, 1983a; Swain 1985).

3.4 Pilot study
The research study was piloted in a community language centre in the UK. The main purpose was to refine the data collection procedures and the framework for data analysis. The exploratory aspects of this purpose stemmed from certain characteristics of the study itself which made it more like a 'naturalistic inquiry' (Robson 1993), among which we can refer to the natural setting, qualitative data and method of analysis, purposive sampling, and the emergent nature of the framework of analysis. The issues dealt with in the pilot study are reported below.

3.4.1 Data collection procedures
Classroom observation was the major source of data for the present study. Piloting of the classroom observation was done through audio and video recording of three consecutive lessons taught by two participant teachers. The fieldwork involved in the pilot classroom observation required some preparations on the part of the researcher. This had a logistical side to it, which dealt with the problem of getting hold of the equipment required for recording and getting familiar with the way they were operated. It also had a social aspect dealing with issues such as how to approach the institution and negotiate the request for cooperation.

There were also concerns about the possibility of influencing the teachers' behaviour by giving away too much information about the focus of the study and the possible changes in the behaviour of not only the teachers but also the pupils due to the presence of the researcher and the video camera in the classroom. With regard to the first concern, it was decided not to inform the teachers about the exact focus of the study. They were specifically told that the purpose of the study was to investigate certain aspects of their interaction with the students, and that because the information about those aspects at that stage was scarce the details would come with the results of the study, which would then be shared with them. To deal with the second concern, first it was decided to
make three recordings of each teacher on the assumption that observation of more than one session would contribute to the normalisation of their behaviour. Second, the teachers were assured that the video data would only be available to the researcher as a substitute for field notes. Consistent with the codes of research conduct in social sciences, proper measures were taken to ensure the teachers’ and students’ participation in the study on a voluntary basis and the preservation of their right to step out at any stage if they wished to do so. Their consent to video and audio recording and the anonymous use of excerpts from the transcripts of the lessons in future publications was also secured.

The classes were at levels 2 and 4 which were roughly equivalent to beginner and lower intermediate. On the basis of the assumption that in early stages of language learning the students’ limited language proficiency would decrease the amount of interaction between the teacher and the students, the main study was supposed to include the intermediate level. However, the beginner level was added in the pilot recording so as to explore the validity of the assumption. The number of students in the recorded classes was between 7 and 10. They were adult males and females at their early thirties.

Two normal sessions of each teacher were recorded. In the third session, the teachers conducted a task, which they selected from among several tasks developed by the researcher to be used at the beginners and intermediate levels. The reason for doing so was to introduce some degree of homogeneity in the teaching-learning activities as a basis upon which comparison of patterns of strategy use across teachers could be made. The results of the analysis done on the lessons, the normal and specially designed task, are reported below.

3.4.2 Developing the framework of analysis

As the first step in the analysis process, the pilot data was transcribed. The initial examination of the data revealed that the interaction between the teacher and the students at level 2 was much less than level 4. This result confirmed our prediction about the appropriacy of the intermediate level for the purposes of the study. That is why the data collected from level 2 were left out of the next stages of analysis. The analysis of the data collected from level 4 (lower intermediate) raised certain issues, which ultimately led to the adaptation and reformulation of the theoretical framework of CSs which had originally informed the study. The type of issues and their contribution to the adaptation and reformulation of theory are discussed below.
An initial application of the current typologies and their theoretical analyses (see chapter 2) demonstrated clear gaps in the categories typically used so far. As described in chapter 2, the interactional perspective introduced by Tarone (1980) informed the framework of analysis. For the purposes of the present study, CSs are defined as linguistic and discoursal devices used by teachers to establish mutual comprehension under the special circumstances of L2 classrooms in which the TL plays the dual role of being the vehicle of message communication and the focus of learning practices. This definition shares the main element of Tarone’s (1980:420) definition, that is, meaning negotiation in the form of ‘the mutual attempts by two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where the requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared’. Meanwhile, the present definition is more explicit in stating the type of devices and also the relationship that exists between the concept of CSs and their context of use. As was discussed in the detailed review of the interactional perspective to the study of CSs in chapter 2 section 2.4, the implications of the above definition have not had a full impact on the typologies of CSs. The compensatory strategies are limited to the linguistic devices used to compensate for lexical gaps. In spite of the suggestion referred to above about the possible links between these devices and the interactional modifications which are the main subject of the field of negotiated input, the latter are left out of the scope of CSs.

The definition of CSs developed for the present study implies a key point, which informed the analysis of data collected for the pilot study. CSs are not limited to the alternative means used to compensate for lexical gaps in comprehension and production. The discourse moves which constitute the mechanism of meaning negotiation should also be included as categories of analysis. This led us to a need to study the structure of discourse to account for the complementary role that interactional modifications play in meaning negotiation in relation to the single-utterance CSs. The following example from the data collected for the main study shows the inadequacy of the compensatory strategies ('lexical-compensatory strategies' is the term used for these strategies in chapter 4) in dealing with meaning negotiation in the sense we referred to above.

Example 3.1 [T4 L2]

S:
217 err I don’t watch TV often of course,
218 because I don’t know,
219 we can’t,
220 I don’t know what it means,
221 we can’t ah have good qualità

T:
222 you mean the quality of the programmes!
223 you don’t- you DISAPPROVE of the programmes?
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S:

224

T: 

225 = what?

S:

226 we can’t- about the getting the pro-

T:

227 [the reception is not good

228 on your television the rec:

229 where do you live?

This example demonstrates the first key point. In lines 219 and 220, the pupil abandons his message and signals an upcoming communication strategy which is an approximation in line 221. In response, the teacher uses a comprehension check which is then reformulated in line 223. As the teacher’s interpretation is rejected, he requests for clarification of the intended meaning in line 225. The pupil again uses an approximation in line 226 which succeeds in getting the teacher’s interpretation right in line 227.

The negotiation sequence starts with the pupil using a compensatory strategy. The analysis of the excerpt using the current typologies of CSs would go no further than saying that the pupil used a strategy to compensate for a gap in his lexical knowledge. Examination of the next turn reveals that in addition to its role in lexical compensation, the pupil’s strategy had a discourse value in signalling to the teacher a communication problem which is then sorted out co-operatively over the next turns. This indicates that compensatory strategies play a dual role by helping out with production problems and at the same time lining up the interlocutor’s inferential processes in establishing mutual comprehension. The analysis of the negotiation process would not be complete if we do not take the teacher’s moves into consideration. It is through the use a comprehension check and a clarification request that the teacher matches his understanding of the message with that of the student.

As the above example shows, neither the framework of interlanguage CSs nor the negotiated input by itself can capture the way meaning is negotiated by both sides. Both types are integratively involved in the above meaning negotiation episode. This example suggests that the categories of interlanguage CSs provide the substance and the categories of negotiated input the discourse mechanisms for meaning negotiation. The integration is substantiated by the fact that the teacher also offers paraphrases (‘quality of the programme’, ‘disapprove of the programme’), as compensatory strategies, embedded in his confirmation checks before he gets at the intended concept referred to as ‘reception’ in his reformulation. The example also suggests that the two types
of strategies perform different functions in meaning negotiation. The teacher uses discourse moves to negotiate the pupil’s intended meaning while the pupil uses compensatory strategies to compensate for a gap in his lexical knowledge and at the same time to negotiate his own intended meaning.

The analysis of the pilot data also showed that it was not always necessary for meaning negotiation to begin with an explicit signal of a communication problem. Very slight non-verbal hints might trigger meaning negotiation in language classrooms. Negotiation might even occur where there is no overt verbal or non-verbal signs of a problem. The following example from the pilot data, in which the teacher and pupils are talking about Martin Luther King, illustrates the points.

**Example 3.2 [T1 L1]**

S4:  
234 he became something in churches, but I

T:  
235 yeah(. )what do we call it?
236 what do we call it if you are a religious man?

SS:  
237 /preach/ (. )/preacher/

T:  
238 preacher

SS:  
239 preacher

This example demonstrates that the use of ‘self-reformulation’ (line 236) as a discourse move to negotiate meaning by the teacher is not preceded by any overt sign of problematicity. In line 234, the pupil refers to King’s career. As he does not know the exact word, he uses an approximation, ‘something’, to denote the profession. He continues his utterance apparently to say that he does not know the word but abandons his message mid-utterance. The teacher takes the opportunity to ask other pupils to provide the word. There is no verbal reaction from the pupils after the teacher’s question in line 235. However, there might have been non-verbal signs indicating a problem in understanding the question especially because of the ambiguity in finding the reference for the pronoun ‘it’, which made the teacher reformulate his question providing more context to remove the ambiguity. It might also be speculated that the teacher’s reformulation was intended to provide the pupils with more time to process the question. No matter which interpretation was right, in both cases the reformulation might have initiated meaning negotiation, though there is no explicit verbal indication of a problem. As the teacher’s move in line 237 suggests, even a reprise might play a role in meaning negotiation by specifying and acknowledging the target concept. This is evidenced by
the alternative responses provided by the students in line 237 and their unanimous response in line 239.

The above example indicates that teacher’s moves like ‘self-reformulation’ and ‘other repetition’ play a role in meaning negotiation and in effect the establishment of mutual comprehension. These moves are not accounted for in the current typologies of CSs.

A further point which arose in the process of pilot data analysis was the inadequacy of the negotiated input categories in dealing with meaning negotiation in instructional settings. Sometimes, meaning negotiation might relate to an area of knowledge over which the teacher has acquired his expertise. Teachers often initiate negotiation when the form-meaning relationship is the source of comprehension or production problems. The following example begins with a pupil’s response to the teacher’s question eliciting the words referring to the places where the funeral takes place.

**Example 3.3 [T1 L2]**

S: 322 in Korea usually in hospitals
T: 323 yeah in a hospital
S: 324 in the place that died people are put
T: 325 yeah the mortuary
S: 326 mortuary
T: 327 mortuary(.) yeah
328 and how is burial different from cremation?
329 very cheerful subjects
330 what is cremation?
331 I know that somebody knows huh
332 because I’ve heard them say it huh
SS: 333 huh
T: 334 yeah what is cremation?
S: 335 ah burn burn burn
S: 336 [burn the body after death
T: 337 yeah
338 and burial is?
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S:
339 leave the dead body under the earth

T:
340 yeah yeah basically
341 burial no burning
342 it’s body in coffin under the ground
343 cremation is burning
344 you burn the body at the crematorium

This example demonstrates the inadequacy of the traditional definition of negotiated input categories in dealing with negotiation in pedagogic contexts. By definition, these categories reflect a focus on meaning. However, as this example shows, in pedagogic contexts the focus can be for display questions dressed up as meaning negotiation categories. The pupil’s response in line 324, is a CS compensating for a lexical gap. The teacher models the word in the next turn which is then followed by the pupil’s repetition of the word, an example of a learning strategy. The teacher then initiates negotiation by asking the pupils to clarify the meaning distinction between the words ‘burial’ and ‘cremation’. Negotiation continues with the pupils’ meaning description of cremation in lines 335 and 336. The teacher then cues the meaning description of the word ‘burial’ (line 338). Again one of the pupils provides the meaning description. The teacher rounds up the negotiation sequence with repetition and reformulation of what has already been provided by the pupils.

‘Clarification request’, as a category of negotiated input is used by the hearer to indicate to the speaker a problem in comprehension. In response the speaker is expected to clarify his/her intended meaning. Of course, meaning negotiation is normally only meaning-focused; however, in pedagogic discourse, the shift of focus from meaning to form means using meaning negotiation categories to analyse moves which involve a double agenda- the immediate topic of discourse and its exploitation to introduce a check on language forms. In other words, pedagogic discourse involves the teacher’s deliberate use of clarification requests to elicit meaning structures which are already known to him or her.

A point related to the preceding one is the use of negotiated input categories when negotiation is about the content of teaching materials. In this case, the teacher is again the primary knower; therefore, any question about the content of teaching materials would be a display question. The following example illustrates the use of clarification requests in relation to the content of a listening text.

Example 3.4 [T1 L2]
SS:
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T: 282 number 6
S2: 283 yeah, which is?
S2: 284 after- a: after King was killed, there’s a demonstration against- against eh (.)
T: 285 there’s a big demonstration against
S2: 286 against what?
S2: 287 against the white huh huh
S2: 288 huh huh huh
T: 289 right(.) against white people

This example again demonstrates that negotiated input categories in pedagogic discourse are double-level moves. The underlined clarification requests in lines 283 and 286 are meaning-focused at the surface level; however, the underlying agenda is to check information, which is supposed to be known to the students. As it was illustrated by the above two examples, the investigation of negotiation in classroom discourse involves the re-interpretation of categories of negotiated input.

Categories of negotiated input in their original sense occurred in the data when negotiation was about the students’ personal feelings and experiences or matters over which there was no consensus. In the following example, the teacher and the students are talking about the arrangements for getting a driver’s license.

Example 3.5 [T1 L3]
T: 1208 right ok. good.
1209 what about in Thailand
1210 Is it the same?
S2: 1211 yeah slightly different
T: 1212 ok, how is it different then?
1213 Tell us how it’s different!
S2: 1214 you have to test err(.) colour blind blind colours
T: 1215 ah colour blindness
1216 That’s interesting

As is illustrated by this example, when the focus is on information which is only known to the students, it is more likely that the teacher’s meaning negotiation moves lead to the use of compensatory strategies by the students. This might be due to the more spontaneous interaction.
which occurs when the students are the primary knowers. The teacher asks a Thai pupil to say whether the arrangements in Thailand are the same compared with the country discussed in the previous turns. She answers that they are slightly different. As the details of the differences are not offered by her, the teacher asks for clarification in line 1213. The compensatory strategy in line 1214 constitutes part of the pupil’s answer to the teacher’s clarification request which is a referential question in this context.

With regard to categories of compensatory strategies, the examination of the pilot data showed that the teacher used them in two different contexts. First, they were used as embedded in discourse moves without being marked for pedagogic purposes. Apparently, these alternative means of expression embedded in discourse moves were used to simplify message comprehension. In the following example, the teacher uses an embedded approximation in line 47.

**Example 3.6 [T1 L2]**

T:

44 right
45 I’ll just wanna to play what she says again
46 and I want you to listen for the bit about the university
47 and the link between the connection between universities and jobs and the possible problems

The teacher uses both ‘connection’ and ‘link’ in the same utterance without calling attention to their semantic relationship. It is likely that in this context where the teacher was introducing a listening passage that the pupils were supposed to listen to, marking the relationship between the two words was thought to cause unnecessary distraction. However, the approximation may still be effective for the teacher and learners, albeit not in a focal position.

Second, these categories were used in contexts where the focus was on word-meaning relationship. The following example evidences a temporary focus on word-meaning relationship in lines 214, 215, and 216.

**Example 3.7 [T1 L2]**

T:

212 yeah(.) yeah(.) ok.
213 so, they’re using different
214 what they call them is drinking fountains
215 you know where you press it then wisssss
216 the water comes up
217 so they(.) yeah segregation,
218 yeah, that’s the first picture actually(.) ok?
219 what comes after?
In line 214, the teacher introduces ‘drinking fountain’ as a new lexical item. He then uses a
description of function to help the pupils identify the concept to which the word ‘drinking fountain’
refers. In both this case and the previous one, the teacher’s use of compensatory strategies is
potentially useful for the establishment of mutual understanding.

The insights presented and illustrated so far were the result of the close investigation of the pilot
data. This aspect of the analysis was intended to lay the ground for the development of categories
which were manipulated to provide answers to questions number 1 to 4. To summarise this section
we can formulate the insights as a set of principles forming the basis upon which the categories of
analysis are described and illustrated in chapter 4.

- The notion of ‘communication strategy’ can refer both to linguistic devices used as alternative
  meaning structures and the discourse devices used as meaning negotiation moves by both
  interlocutors to establish mutual understanding.
- The categories of interlanguage CSs and negotiated input are both involved in meaning
  negotiation; however, they perform different functions in settling the differences between the
  interlocutors’ meaning structures.
- The compensatory strategies provide the substance for meaning negotiation. In other words,
  they provide input for the listener’s inferential processes to work out the speaker’s intended
  meaning.
- On the other hand the categories of negotiated input provide the discourse mechanisms required
  for meaning negotiation to occur through turn taking. Using these mechanisms, the hearer can
  check his/her understanding of the speaker’s message or ask for clarification of the intended
  meaning when there is little or no basis for making inferences.
- As meaning negotiation normally occurs over several turns, the investigation of the role of CSs
  in establishing mutual understanding as the outcome of meaning negotiation requires the use of
discourse analytic procedures.
- The use of CSs is not necessarily linked to overt signals of problematicity. Non-verbal hints
  might trigger meaning negotiation which is often marked by the speaker’s or hearer’s use of a
  communication strategy.
- The standard categories available in the literature are inadequate in dealing with certain types of
  negotiation which might be specific to classroom contexts.
3.4.3 Context of Use

In line with questions 5 and 6, the pilot study was also aimed to investigate the possible impact of the pedagogic focus of a lesson in its entirety and its different phases on the use of CSs. The pedagogic focus is defined in terms of a number of discourse features which can potentially be used with different configurations depending on the teachers’ perception of the pedagogic aims of the teaching-learning activities as realised in their pre-active and interactive decisions taken before the teaching act and while it is under development. The assumption is that the pedagogic contexts which are constructed under different configurations of discourse features can enhance learning to the extent that they are consistent with the pedagogic aims of the activities. The discourse features are introduced and discussed in a later section in this chapter dealing with the qualitative analysis. In this section, the results of piloting a stimulated recall interview schedule, which was intended to triangulate the transcribed data with the teacher’s own account of their pre-active and interactive decisions is reported. We assumed that the information collected through the interview schedule could add to what we could potentially infer from the transcribed data. However, due to certain limitations which are discussed later in the same section we decided not to conduct the interview in the main study. The report made of the procedures and results of the piloting of the interview data is intended to clarify its contributions to our better understanding of the concept ‘pedagogic focus’ and the specifications of the discourse features which made up the basis of the qualitative analysis in the main study.

3.4.4 Stimulated recall interview

The procedures we followed in conducting the interview were based on the propositions made by Ericson and Simon (1984) and the suggestions made by Cohen (1987) and Zimmermann & Schneider (1987) about the advisability of collecting retrospective data with a delayed interval between the task and the interview when the practicalities of the situation do not allow us to collect data immediately after the task is completed. Due to the unfeasibility of collecting data immediately after the lesson, the interview was arranged in two weeks time after the first lesson was recorded. To enhance the teacher’s memories of the lesson, the video tape of the recorded session was given to the teacher. He was asked to watch it at his convenience focusing on his interaction with the pupils. During the interview, contextual information was provided through the transcript of the lesson. To minimise the researcher’s bias, measures were taken to make sure that the questions were non-directional, and that they were anchored to the lesson transcript.
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The following are the questions which constituted the core of the interview schedule.
1. To what extent did you plan for the lesson in advance?
2. To what extent did you plan the linguistic content of the oral part of your lesson?
3. How did you manage to modify your plans to suit the unexpected situations?
4. In what ways did you provide for the students' participation?
5. Did you manage to proceed according to your plans? If not, could you refer to an instance where a plan failed to work at a certain stage of the lesson?

Over the course of the interview, the teacher's answers were connected to episodes of transcribed data to cross check the validity of the responses and to activate thought processes which might modify the responses or add evidential details to them.

The whole interview was transcribed and analysed. Below are the paraphrases of a number of excerpts from the data which provide some evidence for the teacher's planning and decision-making at two different levels, and his awareness of the significance of his use of language in enhancing a symmetrical teacher-student role relationship. The excerpts of the data to which the following numbered paraphrases refer are presented in appendix 7. The discussion of samples of data intends to lay the ground for the evaluation of this instrument as a source of data for the analysis of the impact of the pedagogic focus of the lessons on the use of CSs.

1. Excerpt number 1 (appendix 7) shows the teacher's pre-active plan. His plan basically consists of an outline, covering the objectives and activities. He had selected a listening activity from a book with the title 'A Book of Days', basically because he had predicted that a topical activity would provide a good basis for free discussion, which he considered the basic aim of a fluency-based lesson.

2. Excerpt number 2 shows that the teacher had planned the lexical content of his lesson on a basic level by scanning the words to see which ones needed explanation and thinking of the best way of explaining them. However, as he had decided to build his lesson as a discussion work, his guiding principle was elicitation from the students.

3. Excerpt 3 suggests that elicitation is in nature unpredictable; however, the teacher's basic plan helped him to lead the interaction in the right direction by asking questions in a specific order. Planning for the unpredictable was something that he needed most in a fluency-based lesson.
4. Excerpt number 4 illustrates the point that an important aspect of planning is anticipation in the sense that one should be aware of the factors which might affect the plan execution and to some extent be ready to deal with the consequences by having thought of certain scenarios to be carried out in emergency cases.

5. Excerpt number 5 indicates the importance of being aware of the factors which might have an effect on classroom interaction. Awareness of these factors might help the teacher to identify the problematic areas of teaching and make decisions accordingly. The excerpt shows that the teacher was aware of the differences in proficiency level of the students as a potential problem. He knew that the more linguistically able students might dominate the interaction in free discussion. However, he decidedly let them dominate at a certain stage of the lesson because he thought their contribution was useful for the less linguistically able students.

6 & 7. These excerpts show that the teacher was aware of his role in managing and enhancing interaction as an important factor in balancing his relationship with the pupils. In these excerpts, he defines his role as a ‘chair’. He makes a distinction between giving a lecture and collaborating with the intent to construct meaning. He views his job as facilitating communication rather than lecturing.

8. This excerpt shows the teacher’s concern about the students’ willingness to participate in the discussion. To deal with this problem, he tried to build up a non-threatening atmosphere by valuing the students’ contributions. He also tried not to be didactic by playing the role of a fellow communicator instead of an evaluator.

9. This excerpt suggests that the teacher was aware of the fact that one could not enhance discussion in the real sense of the word without valuing others’ contributions, and without setting up an appropriate context for exchanging information and opinions. He was concerned not only with the language used in communication but also with the issues under discussion, because both sides are at stake in free discussion.

To summarise the points made in relation to the excerpts taken from the interview data, we can classify them according to the main themes of the interview schedule.

**Preactive decisions:** At the macro-level of planning, the teacher had thought of:

- the major aim of the lesson which he stated to be ‘fluency-based discussion’
- the teaching activity to achieve the aim (a listening text with topical content)
- the key words which needed explanation
- the best way of explaining them, for example offering easy-to-grasp synonyms or exemplifying them in situations
- to elicit the explanations from the students as far as possible
- alternative scenarios to deal with the unexpected

**Interactive decisions:** Among the micro-level interactive decisions we can refer to:
- giving direction to the discussion by asking specific questions and sequencing them based on the students' responses
- dealing with the unexpected; for example the decision to let the more able students to dominate the discussion mainly because their contributions would provide a basis for word-meaning clarification, which would benefit the less able students

**Teacher-student role-relationship:** Planning for the appropriate type of role-relationship which would suit the major aim of the lesson implied decisions about the teacher's role and the way a non-threatening environment could be built. In this respect, the teacher had decided to:
- assume the role of a chair facilitating the students' contributions
- throw the emphasis back upon the students as 'active learners' rather than 'passive participants'
- value the students' contributions through natural linguistic and non-linguistic feedback
- be less didactic in evaluating the students' contributions

The points mentioned above give indications of the teacher's preferred strategies in planning and execution of his lesson which might be useful in the analysis of the 'pedagogic focus' of a lesson. However, their validity and reliability depends on the extent to which they would contribute to the emergence of a pattern if similar data are generated across several cases. The limitations of the schedule itself and the design of the study raised doubts over the prospect of achieving a reliable picture upon which valid conclusions could be made. The starting point in generating information about the teacher's plans was the questions asked by the researcher and not the contextual information provided by the data. Although the responses were related to the lesson transcripts, the selection of an episode to exemplify a point raised in a response might be interpreted as an afterthought provided to justify the answer. This is a potential source of unreliability, which might be difficult to control. A second source of unreliability was the case study design of the research project which limited the number of cases to three in each institution. With this limited number of cases, it seemed less likely that a pattern would emerge from the analysis of interview data. The
above-mentioned limitations were compelling reasons for abandoning the idea of using the interview schedule in its present form in the main study.

However, there remained the possibility of retaining the framework but shifting the starting point to features of oral interaction reflecting the teacher’s preactive and interactive decisions and the teacher-student role relationship. The schedule modified in this way could enable us to avoid the unreliability issue raised by the subjective selection of discourse features to justify the answers given to the interview questions. Yet it was still likely that the small number of cases would act as a limiting factor decreasing the possibility of getting at reliable patterns. We also suspected that the information provided in this way could significantly add to what we could achieve from the analysis of discourse features themselves. Even if it could, the sheer quantity of the retrospective data collected in this way would be difficult to handle.

Even though the post-process observation was cancelled as a source of data in the main study, the pilot data empirically revealed the relationship between the micro and macro level decisions. It also reiterated the relationship between planning and use of language which implied the possibility of identifying the discourse features that reflected the planning and decision-making process. This formed the basis for an alternative way of operationalising the ‘pedagogic focus’ of a lesson. The core ideas leading to the alternative definition can be summarised as follows:

- Teaching activities can aim for fluency, and/or accuracy. The selection of either of the two or both entails the selection of appropriate activities in terms of topic and medium of communication.
- It is through their controlling the topic of talk and the way it is expressed that teachers facilitate the achievement of pedagogic aims.
- There is a relationship between teachers’ degree of control and the students’ contributions to classroom discourse.
- Control is exercised through the selection of appropriate initiating and feedback moves.
- ‘Elicitations’ as a major type of initiation move are realised as questions, which can potentially control the amount and type of information provided by the students.
- Feedback can be natural or didactic. The difference lies in the way the teacher views his/her relationship with the students. Didactic feedback involves an asymmetrical role-relationship leading to the evaluation of the students’ responses in terms of their form and content. While natural feedback reflects a more symmetrical role-relationship leading to the teacher’s valuing the students’ contributions by responding to their content not their form.
3.5 Main study
Given the theoretical framework informing the research questions and the results of the pilot study, we decided to conduct the main study in a University Language Centre in the UK and two private Language Institutes in Iran. The rationale behind such a choice rests upon the researcher’s assumption that the optimal level which would secure extended interaction between the teacher and the students was ideally available in these teaching institutions, and that the private Language Institutes were the only appropriate context for extensive use of the target language. In secondary schools in Iran, the target language is not used extensively. The specification of the teaching contexts, the subjects, the design of the study, procedures followed in data collection and analysis are the subjects dealt with in the sections which follow.

3.5.1 Teaching contexts: institutions and types of courses
The data for the present study were collected in two different teaching contexts: the ESL context in the UK and the EFL context in Iran. The observed classes in the UK were located in a Community Language Centre offering conversational courses as a community service and a University Language Centre which offered intensive pre-sessional courses to overseas students who had registered for degree programmes at the university; both in a large city in the northern part of the country. The classes observed in Iran were located in two private Language Institutes offering general English language courses to the public; both in Tehran. The decision to collect data from the private Language Institutes was taken on the basis of the researcher’s background experience with the EFL context in Iran, which indicated that the target language was only extensively used in these teaching institutions. The classes were either at the lower or higher intermediate. The class size varied from 7 to 10 in the Community Language Centre, 10 to 15 in the University Language Centre and 15 to 20 in the two private Language Institutes in Iran. The type of courses offered varied greatly in terms of scope, materials, presentation, and the type of activity structures. The information related to each of these elements is depicted in table 3.1.

The reported information is based on what the participant teachers recorded in response to a background questionnaire (see appendix 8) which was administered at the time of data collection. With regard to scope, the teachers were asked to estimate the emphasis given to each of the oral (listening and speaking), reading, and writing skills on a rating scale of 1 to 6, and the proportion of time spent on activities related to these skills. The teachers’ ratings of the degree of emphasis given
to language skills are mapped onto three bands reported in the table as average (A), more than average (M), and less than average (L).

Table 3.1: Course specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Context</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>Activity Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Listening &amp; Speaking</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC</td>
<td>70%(M)</td>
<td>20%(A)</td>
<td>10%(L)</td>
<td>Not fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULC</td>
<td>20%(A)</td>
<td>30%(A)</td>
<td>50%(A)</td>
<td>Not fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>40%(M)</td>
<td>40%(A)</td>
<td>20%(L)</td>
<td>Headway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>(60%)(A)</td>
<td>(30%)(M)</td>
<td>(10%)(A)</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Community Language Centre (CLC) and the University Language Centre (ULC), the range of materials used was not fixed, in the sense that they were selected from among a pool of different materials including commercial textbooks, materials produced locally, and authentic texts and audio-and video materials taken from different sources. In contrast, the teachers located in Institution A (IA) and Institution B (IB) in Iran were using set textbooks; 'Headway' in institution A and locally-produced textbooks in institution B.

The syllabuses followed in CLC and ULC and IA were skill-based; therefore the procedures used for presentation were basically in tune with the type of skills which were the focus of the classroom activities. Meanwhile, the first two institutions were different from the third in terms of the procedural guidelines they provided for the teachers. The guidelines available to teachers in CLC and ULC were basically coming from the curriculum guide which specified the aims and the type of activities; while for teachers in IA the main source of guidelines was the teacher book ('Headway' series) which specified the type of activities and the procedures in detail. Therefore, the former teachers had more space for initiative and a wider choice of materials and procedures. The teachers who taught in IB were much more restricted in terms of activities and procedures than their colleagues in IA. The guidelines they received were in the form of institutional injunctions which had to be strictly followed by the teachers who were regularly observed.
The syllabus of the course offered in IB was form-based. The course aimed at helping students to master a set of vocabulary items and structures and to memorize a set of phrases and sentences through dialogue memorisation and reading passages. Accordingly, the procedures mainly consisted of the audio-lingual techniques of presenting and practicing vocabulary and structures, dialogue memorisation, and intensive decoding of reading passages guided by questions and answers. The time proportions of oral, reading, and writing activities in this institution are put in brackets since they need to be interpreted in the context of the course aims and the teaching procedures. The percentages reported by the teachers in this institution do not refer to the focus of activities but to the modalities used in the presentation and practice of language components. For example, the time they spent on vocabulary and structure drills, dialogue memorisation, and question and answers related to reading passages are all included in the percentage reported for oral activities.

As the above description is hoped to have shown, the teaching contexts observed include a variety of course types with a wide range of activities and procedures, which are commonly in use in EFL and ESL contexts. The next section presents information about the teachers who agreed to be observed for the purposes of the present study.

3.5.2 Subjects
The subjects who volunteered to participate in the present study were 9 teachers; 3 native-speakers and 6 non-native speakers. Measures were taken to make sure that all teachers met the following criteria: (1) more than 3 years teaching experience, (2) teaching at the intermediate level, (3) for the non-native speaker teachers an advanced proficiency in the TL especially in oral skills. Table 3.2 depicts the information collected through the background questionnaire about the teachers’ teaching experience, educational background, and residence in an English-speaking country.

The majority of teachers had their educational background in TESL/TEFL. They had completed degree graduate courses in teaching English as a second or foreign language. The three teachers (T4, T6, and T8), who had their degrees in fields not related to languages, had a considerable amount of TEFL experience and all had completed pre-service and in-service training courses offered by their teaching institutions. Two of the non-native speaker teachers (T4 and T8) had spent several years in an English-speaking country.
All teachers were teaching their own regular classes at the lower/higher intermediate level. The students taught by native speaker teachers in the UK were mainly coming from countries in Asia and the Middle East to pursue an undergraduate or graduate degree at the university. The students registered in Institutions A and B in Iran were all native speakers of Persian. While they differed in terms of educational or occupational background, they all shared the utilitarian purpose of improving their target language skills to get better job-related or study-related opportunities.

Table 3.2: Background information about the EFL/ESL teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Teacher (Sex)</th>
<th>Teaching Experience (years)</th>
<th>Educational Background</th>
<th>Residence in an English-speaking Country (NNSs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLC</td>
<td>T 1 (M)</td>
<td>3-10</td>
<td>TESL</td>
<td>Native speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULC</td>
<td>T 2 (M)</td>
<td>3-10</td>
<td>TESL</td>
<td>Native Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULC</td>
<td>T 3 (M)</td>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>TESL</td>
<td>Native Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>T 4 (M)</td>
<td>3-10</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3-5 years (USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>T 5 (M)</td>
<td>3-10</td>
<td>TEFL</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>T 6 (M)</td>
<td>3-10</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>T 7 (M)</td>
<td>3-10</td>
<td>TEFL</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>T 8 (M)</td>
<td>3-10</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3-5 years (USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>T 9 (M)</td>
<td>3-10</td>
<td>TEFL</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.3 Design of the study

The present research project is designed as a case study to enable the researcher to explore the teachers’ use of CSs in the natural context of language classrooms. From this point of view, the selected case study design can be classified as ‘instrumental’ and ‘collective’ (Stake, 1995; cited in McDonough & McDonough, 1997). It is ‘instrumental’ in the sense that the cases are not important for their own sake; they are selected to help in understanding of something else. It is ‘collective’ because the data is going to be coordinated from several teachers. Due to the inferential nature of the conceptual structure underlying the research questions, the present case study can further be characterised as exploratory (c.f. Cohen & Manion, 1989). The above characterisation presupposes purposive sampling, which involves the selection of participants based on pre-specified criteria.

The design encompasses three different phases with different but interrelated purposes. The first phase was intended to pilot the framework of analysis and develop a preliminary category system,
which could then be refined and elaborated with further data collected from diverse settings and participants. This phase started with data collected from one participant teacher in a Community Language Centre. The next round of data collection was carried out in the University Language Centre with two participant teachers. And finally data was collected from six non-native speaker teachers in two different institutions in Iran. The outcome of this phase was the development of the category system which was fed into the second phase of the study.

Figure 2.1: Design of the study to investigate the use of CSs by NS and NNS teachers
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The second phase was intended to identify patterns of strategy use across lessons, teachers, and institutions. This phase involved frequency counts and measures of descriptive statistics to identify patterns of strategy use and compare them in terms of teachers’ language background (native speaker versus non-native speaker), and the teaching institutions (Institution A versus Institution B). The results of this phase revealed certain similarities and differences across individual and groups of teachers. The results were fed into the third phase of the study.

The third phase was an investigation of the possible links between the pedagogic focus of a lesson and the teachers’ patterns of strategy use. It involved an in-depth study of three cases representing the native and non-native speaker teachers and the two different institutions. The design of the study is illustrated in figure 2.1.

3.5.4 Data collection

The data collected were audio- and video-recording of two normal and one specially-designed lessons of each teacher over three consecutive sessions. The lessons varied in length covering sessions between 90 to 100 minutes resulting in 32 hours of data excluding the individual, group, or pair work periods. The practicalities of contacting the institutions and getting the students’ consent to audio- and video-recording were almost the same as what described for the pilot study. The general aim of the study was put forth in writing to the head of the institutions and then explained to the teachers, who were introduced to the researcher as volunteers to participate in the study.

The observed classes were simultaneously recorded on a video tape and two audio tapes. One tape recorder was placed on the teacher’s desk or somewhere close to the teacher at the front of the classroom. The second tape recorder was placed in a different area closer to the students so that the speech heard at the back could be recorded. The video camera was placed on a tripod at one corner at the back of the classroom. As the camera was zoomed on the teacher, there was no need for the researcher to fiddle with the equipment unless the teacher moved toward the students especially when he was supervising pair or group work, in which case the camera was reset to follow his direction.

It is to be admitted that the ‘observer’s paradox’ is an almost unavoidable problem with data collection of the kind described for the present study. As Watts (1991:13) argues, this problem must be included as a factor in the interpretation of the data but it might not be desirable to go to great
length to exclude its effect. The presence of the video camera adds to this effect especially when the
teacher or students are videoed for the first time. In this study three sessions of each teacher were
recorded to normalise the participants’ behaviour. Furthermore, as reported by the teachers, in ULC
and the two institutions in Iran, video recording of classroom sessions for teacher training purposes
was a normal procedure.

3.6 Data analysis
This section reports on the procedures followed in data analysis. Three different stages are
distinguished: the categorisation of segmented data; quantification of categories of analysis; and
microanalysis. The following sub-section is the report of the procedures followed in transcription
and segmentation of the data as a preliminary step to the three stages of data analysis.

3.6.1 Transcription procedure
The data collected for the present study comprise the audio- and video-recording of 27 lessons
taught by 9 teachers. The whole lessons were subjected to transcription using a transcribing
machine which had the facility to repeat chunks of speech as many times as necessary to get an
accurate version of each chunk and record it in the written form. The transcription of lessons went
on through different stages which corresponded the sequence of stages in data collection. The
sequence could roughly be presented as follows: the pilot data (Community Language Centre), data
collected from native speaker teachers (University Language Centre), and finally data collected
from non-native speaker teachers (Institution A and Institution B). As the transcription and analysis
went in parallel, at each stage, transcription and analysis were carried out on a lesson-by-lesson
basis, that is, after one lesson from each teacher had been transcribed and analysed, the transcription
of the second lesson started.

Various forms of transcription conventions are in use which reflect different purposes for which
transcription is carried out. For example, the transcription format proposed by Ochs (1979) to use
two pairs of columns to transcribe the parent-child talk and to record their actions is most suited to
this type of interaction in which talk and action ‘interoccur’ and the utterances of the child are not
always contingent on the parent’s utterances. In this case the proposed format produces a more
accurate representation of adult-child speech. In transcribing classroom discourse, the preferred
format is the ‘standard script’, which was originally used in conversational analytic studies. In line
with this tradition, the transcription conventions proposed by Jefferson (1978) are followed with
some modifications which are thought to be more convenient for the specific purposes of the present study. The two criteria that the researcher had in mind in adopting and modifying the transcription conventions were readability and robustness in conveying faithfully the features of talk which were critical to the definition of categories.

In standard script format, the speakers are indicated in the left margin by capital letters ‘T’ for teacher and ‘S’ for student. Where the small number of students in the class enabled the researcher to recognise them by their voice, different students are indicated by numbers added to ‘S’. Thus turns are marked by these two letters which refer to the speaker, that is, either the teacher or the student/s. Within turns, utterances are typed in separate lines marked with sequential numbers.

The orthography used in transcription is the conventional written form. In specific cases where non-standard pronunciation leads to self- or other-repair, partial phonetic transcription is used to assist the accurate interpretation of the next turn. Creative spelling is used for ‘pseudo-verbal sounds’ such as oh, ah, err, etc. Laughs are also indicated by creative spelling. A distinction is made between two levels of laugh; intensive laugh (huh huh huh), and less intensive laugh (huh).

Instances of code switching are transcribed literally. Capitalisation is used for proper names, days of the week, and months. When capital letters are followed by spaces, they represent spelled words.

The following measures are taken to reflect timing, stress, and intonation. Pauses are not measured. Broad distinctions are made between pauses which mark utterance boundaries, and pauses within utterances. The reason for identifying these two types of pauses is that the former can help us to dissect the stream of speech into utterances and the latter might indicate an upcoming communication strategy by signalling problematicity; specially when it is accompanied with hesitation phenomena. Within utterances, short pauses are indicated by a comma and long pauses by a bracketed point. Stressed words and syllables are in capitals. Full stops indicate falling intonation. Two levels of rising intonation are distinguished; the low-key rising intonation, which is indicated by an exclamation mark, and high-key rising intonation, which is indicated by a question mark.

For the sake of readability, only the beginning of an overlapped turn is indicated through indentation and a square bracket. When a turn is interrupted, its continuation is followed after an equal sign (=). Therefore, an equal sign at the beginning of a turn indicates that it is latched to the end of the previous turn by the same speaker. The full details of the transcription conventions are presented in
3.6.2 Unit of analysis

Compensatory strategies, as learner categories, are identified based on certain signs of problematicity, such as pauses, drawls, and hesitation phenomena (Faerch and Kasper 1983). In the present study, we have argued for an extended concept of CSs, which places this phenomenon in an interactive model of communication and as a result extends its scope to encompass all types of mechanisms used for negotiation. One of the methodological implications of this reorientation is to establish discourse criteria which could reliably be used in the identification process. This entails the use of discourse analytic procedures to segment the stream of transcribed speech into units which could then be classified into different categories. Crookes (1990) compares the basic structural units currently used by researchers and argues in favour of utterance as a more reliable and valid category for segmentation of transcribed data. Crookes and Rulon (1985:9) define utterance as:

a stream of speech with at least one of the following characteristics:
(1) under one intonation contour,
(2) bounded by pauses, and
(3) constituting a single semantic unit.

According to the above definition, utterance is specified in intonational, pausal, and semantic criteria. Crookes relates these criteria to the underlying physiological and psychological processes involved in speech planning and production. Bearing on research done by Cooper and Sorensen (1981), and Lieberman (1984), he contends that ‘an intonation contour is a physiologically conditioned but meaning-carrying indicator of the unity of propositional and syntactic form which originated it’ (p. 193). This equates utterance with syntactic units such as clause and sentence. However, as phonation occurs in parallel with speech planning, several syntactic units could be articulated under the same intonation contour. In Crookes’s words ‘while a clause may be the syntactic unit of an utterance (or a breath group) on one occasion, a set of clauses may be covered by one breath group or utterance on another, and a single word at yet another time’ (p. 194). The implication of this contention is that the boundaries of syntactic units coincide with utterance boundaries; however, it is through intonational criteria that one could identify the syntactic units which are articulated under the same contour. As the end of one intonational contour and the
beginning of the next one is punctuated with a pause, the pause itself could be a further criterion for
the identification of utterances. As an utterance is supposed to be a semantically unified unit, it is
plausible to consider topic change and also a change of function as still further criteria which could
be used in determining utterance boundaries.

Based on the above characterisation, we can conclude that utterance stands as a more natural
candidate for discourse segmentation since it accounts for intonation and pauses as the major
characteristics of speech production. It is also assumed that its ‘correspondence’ to speech
production processes would contribute to the validity of the instrument developed for this study
since the categories of CSs would correspond with utterances more then any other speech unit.

The following procedure was followed in the segmentation of lesson transcripts into utterances.
First the transcripts were segmented based on syntactic and semantic criteria and the perception of
pauses. Second, the segmented transcripts were then checked against the audio-tapes of the lessons
to confirm and revise the decisions made about utterance boundaries. The segmented lessons were
then subjected to the categorisation process which is reported below. It is to be admitted that
identifying utterances based on the criteria described above proved to be problematic in cases where
the identification was solely based on intonation contours. The segmentation of the stream of
speech in two stages was helpful in reducing the problematic cases; however, there seems to be no
way of avoiding the problem altogether.

3.6.3 Categorisation

The categorisation process started with the analysis of the pilot data and continued with the analysis
of the data collected in the University Language Centre. The outcome was then extended to the data
collected from the NNS teachers in two different institutions. As was explained in the discussion of
the results of the pilot data, the starting point in the categorisation process was the examination of
the ‘lexical-compensatory’ strategies which had been taken from the literature. The results
confirmed that a sub-set of these strategies were adopted by the teacher who participated in the pilot
study. They were either formulated by the teacher or co-operatively constructed by the teacher and
students over the clarification exchanges which followed.

The second major result of this stage of the analysis was that the early conceptualisation of the
communication strategy framework was too narrow to deal with all aspects of teachers’ strategic
use of language in their interaction with students. In response to this need, an exploratory data
analysis was carried out on the pilot data, which resulted in the specification of an embryonic set of strategies which were referred to as meaning negotiation strategies. These strategies were used by the teacher proactively and reactively to deal with real or predicted communication problems or to enhance communication.

The next stage of the analysis had two different but complementary aspects. First, it aimed at checking the confirmability of the categorisation of the pilot data. Second, it was expected that the confirmation process, which would necessarily entail a more in-depth exploration of the functions of the categories, might lead to modifications in the category system. The refined core of meaning negotiation strategies, which resulted from the exploratory investigation of the whole database along with the sub-set of lexical-compensatory strategies, is explained and illustrated in chapter 4. As an introduction to that detailed presentation, the working definitions of the categories of analysis is presented below (for examples illustrating the categories see appendix 3).

3.6.3.1 Categories of data analysis

I Meaning negotiation strategies

1. Confirmation check [CON CHK]

‘Confirmation checks’ are defined as questions, intonation questions, or statements followed by tag questions designed to check hearing or understanding of the previous speaker’s message, seek confirmation of models for its expression, or provide new information to check the details of the expressed message. They might also seek agreement on the current speaker’s views on what has already been expressed by the previous speaker. Confirmation checks are categorised as code-oriented or information-oriented depending on whether the focus of the question is on the information which has already been given or new information offered by the current speaker.

A. Code-oriented

Code-oriented confirmation checks are exact or modified repetitions of part or whole of the previous speaker’s utterance with rising intonation.

a) Type 1 [CON CHK COD 1]: These are genuine checks dealing with problems of hearing or understanding of the previous speaker’s utterance(s). Teachers use them to check the accuracy of message reception when background noise or obscurity in meaning expression disrupts message communication.
b) **Type 2 [CON CHK COD 2]**: These are down-graded repairs on pupils’ utterances when they contain non-target-like forms due to the pupil’s problem in meaning expression. In most cases, the pupils’ non-target-like forms are CSs adopted to avoid lexical gaps. In reaction to these forms, teachers model the target-like form with rising intonation giving the impression that the offered model is their interpretation of what the pupils have said not a form of didactic repair. They reflect the teacher’s ability to guess at what the pupils are trying to say but due to their limited proficiency are not able to express it in target-like forms.

B. **Information-oriented**

Sometimes new information or the teacher’s view about the content of the pupil’s utterance is offered for confirmation or denial.

a) **Type 1 [CON CHK INF]**: Type 1 is defined as questions used to check the information implied by or related to the previous utterance(s), simply because the pupils are expected to know the information, or because they prefer to confer the decision-making over the truth-value of the information to pupils. They are aimed at transparency in meaning expression.

b) **Type 2 [CON CHK SA]**: Type 2 is defined as confirmation checks designed to seek agreement on the teacher’s views and assumptions on different aspects of the information expressed by the pupils in previous utterance(s). They are realised as questions biased toward positive answer or agreement from the pupils. The positive orientation is signalled by the way questions are formulated, intonation contour, or even the way information content is organised. They usually realise as statements followed by tag questions, or expressions such as ‘Yes/Yeah!’, ‘Right!’, ‘Am I right?’, etc.

2. **Clarification Request [CLR REQ]**

Clarification requests are defined as questions, imperatives or even statements to elicit either new information or recoding of information already given by pupil(s). They are categorised as information-oriented or code-oriented depending on whether the focus of the query is on recoding of the information which has already been given or the elicitation of new information. In contrast to confirmation checks, clarification requests are open-ended queries demanding more interactional efforts on the part of the pupils to provide information not included in the query itself.

A. **Information-oriented [CLR REQ INF]**

Information-oriented clarification requests are probing questions asking for reasons, more details or missing information. Queries of this type occur in exchanges focusing on topics included in
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classroom teaching materials or topics brought up by the interlocutors. When the focus is on classroom teaching materials, queries might realise as ‘display questions’ intended to elicit content-based explanations from the pupils. A distinction needs to be made between informative questions, which simply elicit information, and clarification requests eliciting explanations to add to the clarity or intelligibility of the conveyed information.

B. Code-oriented

Code-oriented clarification requests are defined as queries aimed at eliciting the exact repetition or modification of pupils’ utterances due to problems in hearing or understanding. The problems might be attributed to background noise or ambiguities in meaning expression caused by the pupils’ limited language proficiency. A special type of code-oriented clarification request is realised as a display question eliciting the meaning description of problematic lexical items. The different categories of clarification requests are categories as follows.

a) Type 1 [CLR REQ COD A]: Clarification requests of this type are designed to elicit the exact or modified repetition of the pupil’s utterance due to problems in hearing or understanding the preceding utterance(s). Clarification requests of this type realise as routinised questions such as ‘Pardon me!’, ‘I am sorry!’ , ‘What!’ , ‘Ha!’ , and ‘What do you mean by ...?.

b) Type 2 [CLR REQ COD B]: This type of clarification requests is designed to elicit the meaning of lexical items from the pupils. ‘Display questions’ of this type play a significant role in communication, since they are interactive means used to initiate the process of meaning co-construction.

3. Comprehension Check [COM CHK]

Comprehension checks are queries like ‘Do you understand?’ , ‘Ok?’ ‘Do you know ...? , etc. used to check pupils’ understanding of the teacher’s instructions or to check their vocabulary knowledge to make sure that they could follow the discussions and the content of the teaching materials. Comprehension checks need to be distinguished from teachers’ routine checks such as ‘right!’ , ‘Okay!’ , ‘Ha!’ , which are habitually used at regular intervals without being necessarily meant to elicit a response from the pupils . In this study, check questions which are taken up by the pupils and/or used at transition points are coded as comprehension checks.

4. Self-reformulation [SLF REF]

Self-reformulations are paraphrases of teacher’s previous utterance(s). Sometimes, the content of the modified utterance is expanded or restricted to add to its clarity or specificity. These are
basically prospective measures taken to avoid any possibility of misunderstanding on the part of the pupils. Teachers are more likely to self-reformulate in their initiation moves where they expect a response from the pupils. They seem to be more concerned about this move simply because the pupils’ success in providing appropriate responses is contingent on their understanding of this move.

5. Other-reformulation [OTR REF]
Other-reformulation is defined as the teacher’s attempt to restate, summarise or expand the pupils’ utterances.

a) Type 1 [OTR REF REP]: Pupils’ utterances are restated when inappropriate word choice or the use of stopgaps causes ambiguities in meaning expression.

b) Type 2 [OTR REF SUM]: Sometimes, pupils’ formulation problems entail verbose speech. Pauses, repeats, false starts and the use of CSs such as circumlocution lead to lengthy talk for the expression of messages which could otherwise be expressed in a much shorter length. In this case, teachers reformulate the pupils’ lengthy speech in a shorter more refined form.

c) Type 3 [OTR REF EXP]: It is also possible that pupils’ formulation problems force them to reduce their messages in order to avoid problematic items. In such cases, the teacher might expand the reduced speech to make it more appropriate or informative.

6. Other-repetition [OTR REP]
‘Other-repetition’ refers to the pupil’s utterance partially or fully repeated by the current speaker. Other-repetitions are often complemented with comments and/or followed by topic continuation moves. As such, they are basically interpreted as signs of acceptance or confirmation of the pupils’ contributions to the topic of discourse. In contrast, repetition of pupils’ utterances with low key rising intonation are interpreted in a different way. They are used by teachers to signal problems with the students’ utterances.

7. Turn Completion [TC]
Turn completion refers to the teacher’s supplying words or expressions where the pupils abandon their messages due to problems in formulating their utterances. It follows long pauses and disfluencies on the part of the pupils. Turn completion might realise as a minimal response to appeal for assistance enabling the student to continue with his/her message or it might lead to the shift of floor to the teacher who might continue with the pupil’s message and then initiate a
different move. The teacher’s decision as to deal with the pupil’s production problem minimally or to take the floor continuing the message and then changing the topic seem to be made judiciously on the basis of certain factors influencing talk at that moment.

8. Cueing [CUE]
Cues refer to any expression dependent on the initiation move issued to assist the pupils in their search for the appropriate response. They often follow the initiation move in the same turn before the pupil’s response or in a subsequent move after his/her failed attempt to provide the expected response.

II Lexical-compensatory Strategies
1. Circumlocution
Circumlocution refer to the teacher’s attempts to communicate word meaning where a lexical gap is perceived or where one has already been signalled in one way or another. It includes lexical substitution, and/or lengthy meaning descriptions.

A. Paraphrase
Paraphrase refers to a lengthy meaning description in the form of a decontextualised dictionary-like definition and/or a contextualised description delineating the concrete behavioural aspects of the target concept in an effort to activate the visual memory in the process of concept identification.

a) Description [DES]: Description refers to the process of describing the characteristics or elements of the object or action using words known to the teacher and the pupils. The description may either substitute the appropriate word normally associated with the concept or complement it to clarify its meaning.

b) Contextualised Description [CON DES]: Contextualised description refers to the process of describing or acting out the behavioural aspects of the target concept to help pupils visualise the actions associated with the target concept as an aid to the process of concept identification and a way of enhancing the process of learning the target word.

B. Approximation [APR]
Approximation refers to the process of exploiting links between related words by substituting the target concept with a related one which might include any or a combination of the word relations referred to as synonymy, antonymy, metonymy, and hyponymy/hypernymy.
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2. Language Transfer
Language transfer refers to the speaker’s attempts to get across a concept combining the target language features with features transferred from L1, and/or his/her interlanguage. It has different varieties ranging from borrowing with zero modification (code switching), to combination of features at the phonological or morphological level (foreignizing), and lexical level (literal translation). In the data collected for the present study only the first variety has been identified and coded.

**Code Switching [COD SWT]:** When the teacher and the pupils share the same L1, it is likely that the teacher shifts to L1 specially in cases where there is a lexical void due to cultural differences, as a last resort when other means of communicating the target concept have failed, and simply where the teacher experiences difficulty in handling the lexical problem using L2-based strategies. Of course there might be social-interactive reasons for code switching which are not dealt with in this study.

3. Non-linguistic Strategies
Non-linguistic strategies refer to cases where the teacher draws on alternative mediums of expression such as mimetic gestures as well as making references to external sources of information such as mono- or bilingual dictionaries.

a) **Mime [MIM]:** Mime refers to the teacher’s use of body language or sound imitation either as a substitute to linguistic strategies or as a complement to make the concept more transparent.

b) **Appeal to Authority [APL AUT]:** Appeal to authority as a non-linguistic strategy refers to cases where the teacher decides to let the pupils look up the target word in a bilingual/monolingual dictionary. This strategy also applies to cases where the teacher himself/herself looks up a word to check aspects of its meaning about which he/she feels uncertain.

The category system, described above, was applied to one third of the transcribed data using the coding system presented in appendix 2. The coded data were then manipulated for an inter-observer agreement check. The procedure and results of this process are reported in the next section.

3.6.4 Validation of categories of analysis
The question of the validity of classroom observations is frequently raised in discussions on the methodological issues of doing research on different aspects of oral interaction in language.

‘Observation of a language classroom, whether by means of planned schemes or post hoc characterisations and discourse analysis, must undergo an evaluation of their reliability as descriptions (by means of intra- and interobserver consistency checks). However, the validity of such observational descriptions as constructs relevant to the research questions can only be fully attained if the observations and summary findings of the study are shown to hold in more general ways (external validity)’

The reliability of classroom observations is therefore the first step in the validation process. The next steps would involve the provision of evidential support for the truth of the observations (internal validity) and their potential applicability to other contexts (external validity). Following McCucheon’s (1981) propositions as a basis for validity in educational research, Chaudron stresses that validity is warranted first on the basis of the internal logic that interrelates the categories systematically. This is basically achieved when the validity of the instrument is evaluated through interobserver agreement check. The establishment of intersubjectivity through the identification of the categories by an independent observer ensures that the constructs are viable (content validity). Second, the evaluation of validity depends on the sufficiency of evidence based on appropriate documentation and analysis of the observed behaviour. Third, the empirical evidence for the observed behaviours must be shown to be consistent with other evidence related to behaviours associated with them (a form of concurrent validity). And finally the analysis must show the significance of the findings in terms of their contribution to better understanding and control of the observed behaviours in other teaching-learning contexts (generalisability).

The above criteria form the basis of the validation process in the present study. In relation to the first principle, the results of the presentation of part of the data to two independent observers are reported below. Evidence for the second principle is provided in chapters 4, which deals with the explicit definition and illustration of the categories of analysis, and chapter 5, which provides evidence for the categories interrelationships. The third principle is sought in chapter 5, which intends to provide evidence for the relationship which is assumed to exist between the observed behaviours and other phenomena shaping the focus of talk. It is hoped that the discussion which follows the presentation of the results would establish the potential utility of the observation system in better understanding and control of the target behaviours.
3.6.4.1 Interobserver agreement

There are grounds for concern about the consistency of identifying the categories of analysis constituting the observation system used in data analysis. First, as the categories are either discourse moves (meaning-negotiation strategies) or meaning structures embedded in discourse moves (lexical-compensatory strategies), the identification process involves the analysis of the interactive structure of discourse. The implication is that the identification of the discourse moves, as units of analysis, should precede their examination in search for their meanings or functions. This was the major reason why ‘utterance’ was selected and defined as the unit of analysis. The assumption was that the segmentation process would guard against the obscurity caused by other units of talk in which the coded categories would occur. For example, when strategies spread over the whole turn, the question might arise as whether to code the turn as one strategy or a combination of different strategies distinguished by the different functions performed by the individual utterances in that turn.

Second, there are complexities in interpreting and deciding among categories. The decision is partly dependent on the examination of the surrounding discourse since the interpretation of categories relies on their relationship with the preceding and upcoming discourse. It is through the uptake of an utterance which one can interpret its function. The case is made even more complex when we consider the multiple functions performed by the same utterance. For example, the teacher’s evaluation of a student’s response (‘a little bit more than that.’) also functions as an elicitation. The interpretation of the discourse functions or meaning might also depend on prosodic features of discourse. For example, the teacher’s repetition of a student’s response with low key rising intonation might mean different things among which we can refer to the expression of excitement or disbelief. This point turns us back to the issue of transcription and the extent to which the prosodic features should be reflected by transcription conventions so that reliable decisions can be made based on lesson transcripts without recourse to the actual record of the lessons.

Third, the coding reliability is also affected by the extent to which the categories are exhaustive in the sense that they capture the whole aspects of the target behaviour in a mutually exclusive way. This raises the question of overlapped categories which might be the source of classifying the same behaviour to different categories or applying the same category to distinct behaviours. Yet another source of unreliability which follows from the issue of mutual exclusivity of the categories of analysis bears on the extent to which the definitions of categories reflect their distinctive features in a clear and unambiguous way. The question of clear definitions is an important one since the
establishment of intersubjectivity as the aim of interobserver agreement check hinges on the proper treatment of this issue.

The issues mentioned above made a strong case for the interobserver reliability check, which was arranged for in two consecutive sessions attended by two observers who were invited by the researcher for this purpose. The rest of this section is the report of the procedures and the results of the observations made by the two independent observers.

The two observers were post-graduate students from the same department. Their research projects were mainly focused on classroom discourse so their familiarity with the categorisation of classroom interaction was out of question. This was the main reason why it was decided not to arrange for training before the actual coding. Another more important reason for this decision was the need to check the clarity of the definitions. As the categories had largely emerged from the data and the definitions had been developed based on the specific features of categories inferred from the data, it was crucial that the definitions be checked against independent observers’ perceptions so that decisions could be made about their clarity and their mutual exclusiveness. With training, it was suspected that the observers might form their perception based on cues received from the researcher and not from the definitions.

A sample of data was submitted to the observers. It consisted of a set of excerpts from the lessons which included a representative sample of the strategies identified and coded by the researcher. The decision to collect excerpts from the lessons was taken on the basis of an estimation of the time required to code a representative sample of strategies in continuous data. The estimated time exceeded what was normally expected from busy research students. The length of the excerpts was determined by the amount of context required to interpret accurately the type of the strategies used in each excerpt. It varied from one exchange to a sequence of interrelated exchanges.

The observers were also provided with a handout in which the categories were defined and illustrated with examples. The examples were glossed to illustrate the elements emphasised in each definition. The details, which were suspected to distract the observers from the basic elements, were excluded from the definitions. A copy of the transcription symbols was also enclosed. They were asked to transcribe the samples at their own convenience.
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After they had completed the coding and returned the handouts, the frequency of agreements (where the two observers had used the same code) and disagreements (where the two had used different codes) were tabulated on a two-dimensional matrix referred to as a 'confusion matrix' (appendix 9). The advantage of the confusion matrix was that it enabled the researcher (observer 1) and observers 2 and 3 to locate the items over which they did not agree.

The interobserver agreement was calculated as a proportion of agreement (P) following the procedures described in Robson (1993: 222-223). The results were as follows:
Meaning Negotiation Strategies: O1 and O2 = 54%  O1 and O3 = 53%
Lexical-compensatory Strategies: O1 and O2 = 78%  O1 and O3 = 76%

In a session with the observers, the points of disagreement were discussed. The discussion revealed some issues in interpretation, which were resolved with the information provided by the researcher. One source of disagreement was the context which, in some excerpts, was not sufficient to enable the observers to make accurate interpretation of the function or meaning of the discourse moves. The second source was the confusion over display and referential questions and also over information questions and clarification requests. This accounted for almost 15 to 20 percent of the difference in agreement between the researcher and the two observers. The remaining 25 to 30 percent difference was due to ambiguities in the description of the different functions performed by some of the meaning negotiation strategies. The differences in interpretation were used to establish modification and clarification of the definitions for the second round of coding.

The major source of disagreement in coding the lexical-compensatory strategies was the confusion over description and contextualised description and also the combination of approximation and description in the same move which had led to different codings by the observers. As the discussions resolved the disagreement over the majority of items in the lexical-compensatory sample, the level of agreement was considered satisfactory and thus this type was not included in the second round of coding.

A second sample of meaning negotiation strategies was set up and the problematic definitions were modified on the basis of the discussions in the first round of coding. The second sample included 12 problematic items from the previous sample and 57 new examples taken from the same lessons coded by the researcher. The observers were provided with the second sample and the handout of...
the revised definitions. They were asked to follow the same procedures as they did in the first round of coding.

The confusion matrix, set up for the second round of coding, evidenced great improvement over the first round. The proportions of agreement between the researcher and the two observers were as follows:

01 and 02 = 90%  
01 and 03 = 88%

The high proportions of agreement in the second round reflect the training effect of the discussion session and task repetition. They also suggest that the modifications made to the definitions had removed the ambiguities as potential sources of misinterpretation.

The results of the interobserver agreement check suggest that the phenomena under investigation can reliably be identified by trained observers. This gave the researcher the confidence to continue coding the whole database. The coded data were then subjected to a quantitative analysis. The procedures followed in this process are reported below.

3.6.5 Quantification of categories of analysis

A quantitative analysis was carried out on the 27 lessons which had already been transcribed, segmented and coded. The aim of the analysis was two-fold. First, the identification of the basic patterns of strategy use among native and non-native speaker teachers could reveal similarities and differences across the two groups and also across individual teachers in the same group. Second, it could also reveal similarities and differences in patterns of strategy use across the different institutions where the two groups of non-native speaker teachers were performing their teaching duties.

In line with the methodology adopted to find answers to the research questions set for the study, the quantitative analysis was limited to descriptive statistical measures such as frequency, mean, and standard deviation. The naturalistic data collected from a purposive sample and the limited number of cases in each condition were the basic design features of the study, which put obstacles in the way of using inferential statistics. The following procedures were followed in the process of quantifying and analysing the data.

1. Frequency tables were drawn up for each individual teacher in which the raw frequency of the CSs, their Standard Frequency (SF) in terms of the proportion of strategies in 100 teacher’s utterances, and their percentage as a proportion of the total number of strategies were recorded.
2. Frequency tables were drawn for the three groups of teachers (native speaker teachers, non-native speaker teachers in institution A, and non-native speaker teachers in institution B). The means of the above three measures were recorded in the tables.

3. The mean and standard deviation were calculated for the tables drawn for the three groups. The results of the comparative analysis of the patterns identified through the frequency tables described above are reported in chapter 5. The next section reports the procedures followed in the microanalysis of the contexts in which CSs are used.

3.6.6 Microanalysis

The microanalysis intended to relate the patterns of strategy use identified in the quantitative analysis to the pedagogic focus of talk in different phases of a lesson. The methodological aspects of the microanalysis which are explained below are based on the results of the pilot interview as reported in section 3.3.4, and the specifications of ‘context’ reported in chapter 2 section 2.7.2 and the characterisation of teacher-fronted interaction in chapter 2 section 2.7.3.

The results of the exploratory use of the stimulated recall interview (section 3.3.4) suggest that teachers’ use of language is influenced by their pre-active decisions in relation to task selection and the type of teaching-learning activities adopted in task execution, their interactive decisions in relation to topic and activity management, and the teachers’ perception of their role-relationship with the students. As to exercise some degree of control on the pre-active decisions, a specific task was developed to be used by the teachers in their third recorded session. The teachers were also provided with a set of tentative procedures which could be followed in task execution. The task and the suggested teaching procedures are reproduced in appendixes 5 and 6. It was assumed that the use of the same task by all participant teachers would introduce a certain degree of comparability to the data collected in the third session. The contexts constructed for learning through language use are defined in terms of certain descriptors which are assumed to be constitutive elements of the pedagogic contexts reflecting the teacher’s pre-active and interactive decisions and their perception of their role-relationship with the students.

In the sections which follow, first the case profiles are presented. Second, the task design features are explained as a basis for segmentation of the lesson taught in the third session into different phases. Third, certain features of discourse referred to as context descriptors are defined and illustrated. Fourth, the procedures followed in the microanalysis of lesson three are reported.
3.6.6.1 Case profiles

Due to logistical constraints, the microanalysis was limited to one teacher from each group, three altogether. The selection of the cases for microanalysis was done based on the results of the quantitative analysis. The basic criterion for selection was the typicality of the teachers in their groups. As explained before, the information about the teachers' background and the details of the course and the settings were collected through the teachers' answers to the questions included in a 'background questionnaire', which was administered in the three institutions at the time of data collection (see appendix 8). Thus in developing the case profiles, when we refer to 'teachers' the reference is not only to the teacher whose lesson is subjected to microanalysis but also to the other two teachers who taught in the same institution; even though their lessons were not subjected to microanalysis.

3.6.6.1.1 Teacher 3

The third lesson taught by teacher 3 was recorded in July 2001 in the pre-sessional Language Centre of a large state-funded University in the north central part of the UK. Teacher 3, a native speaker of English, can be described as an experienced teacher, who had taught English as a second language at different levels ranging from beginner to advanced for more than ten years at the time the data were collected. His qualifications included a BA degree in English language and literature, a postgraduate certificate in teacher education and certificates of in-service teacher training courses. The students were 12, 4 males and 8 females, coming from different overseas countries like Japan, China, Korea, Saudi Arabia and Libya. Their age range was between 18 and 26. Their level of English was described by the teacher as higher intermediate.

The course objective was reported to be the preparation of students to function as undergraduates or postgraduates in an academic UK environment. The placement of students in different groups was based on the results of an entry language proficiency test. There was no formal assessment during the course except oral and written feedback to students’ certain pieces of writing and their video presentations. The students’ entry to higher levels was based on the results of the English Language Proficiency Test administered at the end of the course. Some students opted for the IELTS test if that was a requirement for their entry to their degree programmes. The emphasis was reported to be on skill development with almost equal weight given to the four basic skills. Writing received a slightly more emphasis reflected in the length of time given to writing activities. The teachers reported that they spent 20% of the class time on oral activities, 30% - 40% on reading activities, and 40% - 50% on writing activities. Teaching procedures were not set by the curriculum. They
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

were mostly left to the teachers’ discretion. Teachers seemed to be selective in their use of teaching materials. They selected them from a pool of materials containing commercial textbooks, materials selected or developed by the institution and/or individual or groups of teachers depending on the course content and objectives.

The classrooms were spacious and well lit, equipped with modern audio and video facilities, overhead projector and white board. The seating arrangement gave the impression of a conference room with the students sitting round the conference table. This arrangement facilitated communication between students as well as between the teacher and students as a group or as individuals. The patterns of interaction gave the impression of a more symmetrical role relationship between the teacher and the students enhanced by the seating arrangement which potentially provided all participants equal opportunities to take part in classroom discussions.

3.6.6.1.2 Teacher 4

The lesson taught by teacher 4 was recorded in a private Language Institute in Tehran in October 2000. Teacher 4 can be described as an experienced non-native speaker teacher, who had taught English as a foreign language for more than three years at different levels ranging from beginner to higher intermediate at the time the data were collected. He did not have a background in TEFL except taking part in pre-service and in-service teacher training courses. He had majored in business and completed a post-graduate degree in business administration (M.B.A.). Before starting his career as an English teacher in Iran, he had resided in the United States for several years to study and work. He spoke the language with ease and fluency of a native speaker showing no signs of non-nativeness except in very few cases. The students were 20 male native speakers of Persian with the age range of 18 to 26. Their level of English was described as lower intermediate by the teacher.

The course objective was reported to be on oral skill development; to prepare the students to participate in oral interaction with native and non-naive speakers of English. To the effect, supposedly oral skills received more than usual emphasis. In comparison, the emphasis on skill development in writing was less than usual. In terms of the class time which went to different skills, the figures reported by the teachers were 40% allotted to listening and speaking, 40% to reading, and 20% to writing. My impression of what happened during the lessons I observed confirmed the teachers’ report. As the teaching procedures were allegedly based on the tenets of the communicative approach, there were no set institutional procedures to be strictly enacted by the teachers. It appeared that they behaved under their own impression of what constituted the framework for an approach informed by communicative principles. “Headway” (Liz & John Soars
1991) was the major source of teaching learning activities in the classes observed. Assessment consisted of two parts; mid-term formal exam plus formative assessment of students’ participation (70%), and formal end-of-the-term exam (30%).

In the classroom, there was enough space for the teacher to move around. The horse shoe shape of the seating arrangements enabled him to reach the different corners of the room and talk to individual or groups of students while they were busy doing something in pairs or groups. While presenting something to the class or conversing with them, he was either standing or sitting at his table, which was placed at the middle of the open side of the horse shoe. I had the feeling that the big open space and the high ceiling deteriorated the acoustics of the room which led the participants to put more energy in making their voices audible.

3.6.6.1.3 Teacher 7

The lesson taught by teacher 7 was recorded in a private Language Institute (This institute was different from the one mentioned with reference to teacher 4) in Tehran in October 2000. Teacher 7 had been teaching English as a foreign language at different levels ranging from beginner to higher intermediate for more than three years at the time the data were collected. He had majored in English language and literature, and completed his MA in TEFL. He had also attended several teacher training courses. The students were 20 male native speakers of Persian with the age range of 16 to 24. Their level of English was described as lower intermediate by the teacher.

The course objective was reported to be the comprehension and production of fixed expressions through dialogue memorisation and the mastery of a good range of vocabulary and structures through reading activities and structural drills. The teacher reported that the course emphasis was less than average on listening and writing, and about average on speaking and reading. In terms of the length of time spent on different activities, the figures reported were 60% on oral activities, 30% on reading activities and finally 10% on writing activities. As skill development was not mentioned as the course objective, the figures need to be interpreted in the context of what teachers considered to be oral, reading, or writing activities. Based on my observation of language classes in this institute, oral activities included memorisation of vocabulary items and their definitions, dialogue memorisation, oral summaries of reading texts followed by questions and answers, and grammar drills. Reading activities included intensive decoding of texts through guided questions, paraphrases of complex sentences, and definitions of vocabulary items and expressions not covered in the pre-reading vocabulary presentation. Silent reading was supposed to be done by the students at home following vocabulary presentation and practice in class. Writing activities were limited to completing structural drills and exercises after being practised orally in class. The teaching
procedures were set by the institution and strictly followed by the teachers. The course books were also provided by the institution. Assessment of students’ achievement of course objectives consisted of two parts; mid-term formal exam and formative assessment of students' participation in classroom activities (70%), and formal end-of-the-term exam (30%).

The students were sitting in rows of portable chair. Within the room, the space was just enough for 20 students to sit. It was difficult for the teacher to reach the back rows, as there was no space in between the rows for someone to move around. The teacher appeared to be confined to the small area in between the front row and the blackboard.

3.6.6.2 Task design features
In the third session, the teachers used two interrelated tasks with the same linguistic theme (modals of necessity, prohibition and permission) but two different topical themes (taking a short trip to a foreign country, taking a driving license) (see appendix 5). As the microanalysis is focused on the first task, the description of task steps are limited to this one only. The tasks are intended to provide opportunities for consciousness-raising through implicit and explicit focus on a number of modal auxiliaries which constitute the linguistic theme of the lesson. The sequential steps built in the first task are supposed to lead the students through an initial stage of experiencing a need for the expression of certain meaning structures in this case ‘obligation’, ‘prohibition’, and ‘permission’ to the final stage of making a relationship between these conceptual categories and the formal features used to express them in oral interaction.

In step 1, the students are told that their imaginary friend from the UK (for the learners in Iran) or their country of origin (for the learners studying English in the UK) is planning a short vacation in Iran/UK. As he/she is going to travel with a backpack, she does not have much room to pack a lot of things. Moreover, she needs to deal with Immigration and Customs upon entry. The students are then invited to have a look at the list of items she is thinking of taking with her. In step two, they are asked to work in pairs trying to help her organise the items using the four categories described and exemplified in a box. The four categories are: (a) things which are necessary and obligatory (she cannot enter Iran/UK without them); (b) things prohibited by law; (c) things which are advised; and (d) things which are not really necessary but she is permitted to bring them with her. In step 3, they are asked to add three more items to each category. And finally in step 4, they are supposed to write sentences about one or two of the items in each category explaining why they think they belong there. At a subsequent step, the students are invited to first review a box exemplifying and
explaining the use of modal auxiliaries in each category, and second look back at the sentences they had to write in the previous step checking whether they have used them correctly or not.

Figure 2.2: Sequence of steps in task implementation
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In the teacher’s manual supplemented with the task (see appendix 6), two stages are suggested to the teachers in their dealing with the task. First they might set up the task describing the situation and checking the students’ comprehension of the list of items. It is recommended that setting the scene is preceded with a few warm-up questions to focus attention and arouse curiosity and motivation. This stage could then be followed by a review of the box and the organisation of pair work for the student to decide on items which go to each category and then add three more items to each category.

At the second stage, it is suggested that teachers sum up the students’ pair work by asking them to report their suggested items. Teachers are recommended to change the oral report into discussion by asking the students to give their reasons for their decisions and then inviting the other students to express their views on the items under discussion. The writing part of the task is suggested to follow the discussion. Subsequently, teachers could review the table with the students and then invite them to check their sentences in order to make sure that they have used the right structures.

The sequential steps in task execution are depicted in figure 2.2. As the figure shows, task execution would eventually cover four phases which could be identified as: setting up 1 (to introduce the oral activity), summing up 1 (to sum up the oral discussion), setting up 2 (to set up the writing activity), summing up 2 (to sum up the results of the writing activity).

The reasons why this special task was selected for the third lesson are summarised as follows:
1. It provides abundant opportunities for teacher-fronted interaction which constitutes the locus of the teachers’ use of CSs.
2. The topical theme of the task was supposed to be interesting especially for the Iranian students who are registering in private language schools to improve their oral skills with the prospect of going abroad to seek better study- or job-related opportunities.
3. The recommended procedures closely resemble the core of teaching strategies used in diverse teaching contexts. They do not seem to demand special linguistic or professional skills on the part of the teacher. The organisational arrangements for the task to be conducted were not expected to be constrained by local circumstances since it involved only pair work and teacher-led discussion which could be conducted in a normal teaching context with the minimum of space and facilities.
4. The syllabus of the pre-intermediate courses observed and recorded includes some conceptual aspects of the modal auxiliaries which constitute the linguistic content of the task; therefore, it
was deemed more likely that the teacher and students consider the task as a natural ingredient of their course rather than something imposed by the researcher.

3.6.6.3 Context descriptors

Context descriptors are defined in terms of certain discourse features which reflect the way language is used by teachers in their interaction with students. For the purposes of the microanalysis, these features were used as measures of teacher's control over topic and activity and the students' initiative and participation in classroom discourse. The first measure, which pertained to the teachers' initiation moves, was the type of questions raised by the teacher to elicit information from the students. The second measure was the level of students' participation in classroom discourse. The third measure was the type of discourse devices, which teachers used mainly in the third turn and with much less frequency in the first turn to focus attention on activity or topic. The context descriptors and procedures used in the microanalysis are described below (for the way the context descriptors are coded in the lesson transcripts see the sample presented in appendix 4).

3.6.6.3.1 Types of question

There are at least two grounds for the assumption that questions contribute to the type of role assumed by the teacher and the students. First, it is the type of question asked which indicates whether a claim is made to the role of primary knower by the teacher or not. By asking display questions which often relate to form, the teacher, as an expert in language, assumes the role of primary knower, which gives him or her the right to evaluate the responses provided by the students. The asymmetry of role-relationship involved in situations where display questions are predominant is different from the more symmetric role-relationship assumed when no claim is made to the role of primary knower. By asking referential questions, teachers confer the role of primary knower to the students. In this case, the two-way flow of information reduces the asymmetry of role germane to instructional settings. Second, It is through the type of questions asked that teachers put constraints on the students' contributions to classroom discourse by limiting the range of choices available as the right answer and even restricting the students' access to speakership by controlling the topic.

Questions can be classified based on the length of the content of their expected answers. Closed questions, for example, limit the student’s response to a word or a phrase while open questions demand elaborate answers. Questions can also be classified according to the type of content expected from the audience. The distinction made between display and referential questions rests on
the criterion whether the answer is only known to the hearer or it is shared by both the speaker and
the audience. The different types of questions identified and coded for the purpose of analysing the
context of strategy use are defined and illustrated in what follows.

Display questions
Display questions are defined as questions whose answer is known to the speaker beforehand. The
addressee provides the answer to this type of question to display his/her knowledge and
understanding rather than supplementing information not known to the questioner. The following
element illustrates a display question asked to check whether the pupils know what ‘hiking’ means.

Example 3.8 [T3 L3]
T: 80 what’s hiking?
S: 81 walk a long time on on walk
   82 walk a long time- a long trip

Referential questions
Referential questions are genuine questions asked to bridge an information gap between the speaker
and the hearer. In response to referential questions the respondent is expected to provide new
information; information which is supposed not to be known to the questioner in advance.
In the following example, the teacher and the students are discussing the age at which people can
apply for a driving license in different countries. The teacher’s questions in lines 1101 and 1104-
1105 seek new information since it seems less likely that the teacher and the other students, who do
not come from Thailand, know the answer.

Example 3.9 [T3 L3]
T: 1100 ok. but otherwise IS the age the same?
   1101 what age do you have to be?
S:
   1102 18
T: 1103 eighteen!
   1104 You must be 18 in Thailand to drive and can you drive up to: any age!
   1105 Or is there any top limit?
S: 1106 I don’t know
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Closed questions
A closed question is a question wherein the respondent’s answer is limited to those provided by the questioner (King 1972: 158). They can take different forms according to the type of answer required by the question. In a ‘selection question’ the alternatives are provided for the respondent to choose from. While in a ‘yes/no question’ the alternative answers are not included in the question itself; however, the response is bound to be ‘yes’ or ‘no’ or an equivalent affirmative or negative.

Sometimes closed questions can realise as ‘fact-finding’ questions requiring information to be recalled or identified. For example, ‘What did you eat for breakfast?’ and ‘what time is it?’ seek for facts to be recalled and identified respectively. The question in line 574 below is a closed question since it requires the respondent to identify the amount of money required under the circumstances specified in the preceding turns.

Example 3.10 [T3 L3]
S:
572 and cash
T:
573 oh yes this where cash is coming yeah!
574 How much cash?
SS:
575 huh
S:
576 five hundred pounds

Open questions
Open questions are questions whose answer is left to the respondent. They are framed broadly; therefore, they can be answered in a number of different ways. Basically, an adequate response to an open question requires more than a word or a phrase. The question in line 543 is open. The student is free to choose any reason he considers appropriate. The length of the response is also left to the student’s discretion.

Example 3.11 [T3 L3]
T:
541 I cannot buy a camera because it’s expensive
542 and you don’t want to replace it
543 but why film?
S:
544 because I think the film in China is much cheaper.
T:
545 ah a good reason.
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Form-based questions
As a sub-category of display questions, form-based questions require the respondent to display their knowledge and understanding of the formal aspects of the target language. They are not asked because the teacher does not know the answer, but because he/she wants to check the students’ knowledge or to evaluate their attempts at an answer. The teacher’s question in line 869 below requires the student to explain the meaning of ‘should’ as a grammatical structure used in the previous utterance.

Example 3.12 [T3 L3]

T: 868 you should bring a map of the UK
    869 Explain please!
S: 870 because it is good for your travel

Content-based questions
Content-based questions require the respondent to provide informational content which might be known to the questioner (display question) or offered as new information (referential question). The teacher’s question in line 940 is a content-based display question, since the teacher, as a British citizen, knows the requirements for getting a driving license in the UK. He seeks the requirements from the students to check and evaluate the information that they might have about this topic.

Example 3.13 [T3 L3]

T: 938 [++) oh right,
    939 so to get a license what do you think you need?
    940 what would you guess you might need in the UK?
S: 941 perhaps skill to control the car.

Apart from questions, there are some other discourse devices available to teachers thereby they can control the topic of talk and the direction of discourse. They also reflect the type of knowledge which is exchanged between the teacher and the students. The next section is a report on the description and illustration of these devices.

3.6.6.3.2 Students’ level of participation
The estimation of students’ level of participation in the present study was based on a modified set of procedures introduced by Van Lier (1988). The assumption underlying the proposed model is that initiative or personal involvement in classroom discourse is expressed through the following four discourse measures.
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a) retrospective actions (self selection)
b) prospective actions (turn allocation)
c) topic management
d) activity management

The first two are concerned with turn taking through allocation of turns by the teacher or self-selection by the students. Topic management reflects the way control is exercised through introducing new topics or shifting the current topic, that is, drawing on the previous utterance but denying/disputing its proposition or request. Activity management concerns another aspect of control expressed through setting up, altering, or closing a series of sequentially related turns. Initiative or involvement could be expressed through any one or a combination of the above-mentioned ways. This forms the basis for an estimation of the level of initiative expressed by individual discourse moves which is then calculated for the total moves produced by an individual.

The following procedures were followed before coding the lesson transcripts.
1. Throughout the lesson transcripts, the sequences were identified and marked. A sequence was defined as a number of turns constituting more than one exchange dealing with the same topic. Two criteria were set for the identification of sequences. One was boundary markers or frames produced by the teacher indicating the beginning of a next sequence or the end of the current one. Topic change was the second criteria adopted as a supplementary measure in cases where boundary markers were missing.
2. Listening responses (back channels) were identified and marked since they were not going to be counted in the coding process.
3. All inserted clarification (correction) sequences were crossed out.

The following procedures were followed in coding the transcripts.
1. All exchange initiations and responses produced voluntarily were coded for being produced retrospectively, that is, through self-selection.
2. The coded turns were examined to check whether they predicted the next turn or not. If yes, they were given a second coding.
3. The coded turns were examined for the second time to check whether: (1) they made any changes in the topic; (2) they shifted the topic by challenging or denying the previous turns’ propositions; (3) they introduced sub-topics. If answer to any of these questions was positive, the turn was given a third coding.
4. The coded turns were examined again to check whether any of them marked the beginning or end of a sequence. If yes, the turn was given a fourth coding.

The following extract illustrates the coding procedure.

**Example 3.14 [T4 L3]**

S:

293 ***about the gun in America
294 every person can buy any guns?

T:

295 aha! that- it takes- it takes me at least fifteen minutes to try to- to- describe the whole situation
296 it’s not as: sim- it’s not a yes no answer
297 so it dif- not aa: so far I can tell you it differs from state to state
298 different states have different laws,
299 and then when it comes to the question whether you are a citizen or you aren’t or you are a non-citizen, okay!
300 If you are a resident or you are a visitor

S:

301 ***Did you buy a gun?

T:

302 I am a collector
303 I have sixteen pieces in my collection
304 I’m a gun collector myself

S:

305 gun?

T:

306 oh, yeah

S:

307 really gun collector!

T:

308 yeah

Ss:

309 huh huh huh

T:
310 yeah, but not here
311 aaa: hold on! hold on! not in Iran! No!

S:
312 ***you didn’t kill someone?

T:
313 no sir, fortunately not huh

Ss:
314 huh huh huh

T:
315 I did not kill anybody
316 err I have not killed anybody

S:
317 ***and animals?

T:
318 I used to haunt
319 I used to HAUNT but not anymore
320 when I was younger

S:
321 ***excuse me, what kind of guns are you interested in?

T:
322 ah oh! you’re making- making- making the question- you know- hold on to your question
323 I’ll answer it later
324 let us get to this part first,
325 I’ll answer your question later on
326 ***err all right(.) let’s view that list you made
327 ah let’s talk about the necessities first
328 what are the most important things you take with you?
329 F!

It is to be mentioned that, in the lesson transcripts, utterances were coded since it is the utterance which indicates the relationship between the present turn and the previous one or predicts its relationship to the following one. The student’s first question (utterance No. 294) is given four codings because, in addition to initiating a new exchange with a new topic, and expecting the next turn, it sets up a new sequence which expands over the next 17 turns. It is the teacher who
terminates the current sequence and begins a new one in the last turn of the extract (utterances 324-327). For the same reason, this turn, which is initiated by the teacher, has also been given four codings. The other questions by the same student (utterances 301, 312, 317, 321) are given three codings because they are self-selected utterances which introduce sub-topics expecting answers from the teacher.

The participation levels of the teacher and students were calculated separately by dividing the total number of codings obtained by either the teacher or the students to the number of the coded turns. The resultant figure indicates the average codings per self-selected turn. The average of 1 per turn for the students, as the minimum level of participation, is interpreted as volunteering to contribute to the topic introduced by the teacher. Higher levels of participation (more than 1) are indicative of topic change/shift and even sequence initiation which requires more initiative than just volunteering to respond to a teacher’s question. To include the total number of turns taken by either the teacher or students into this figure, the participation level is squared and then multiplied by the percentage of total turns to obtain an index of participation. The index has the potential to show not only the level of participation but also the different types of participation. The following procedure was followed in the quantification process.

1. The coded turns were counted and added up for the teacher and students.
2. The percentage of teacher’s and students’ coded turns was calculated.
3. The total number of codings was calculated and added up for the teacher and the students.
4. The total number of codings was divided by the total number of coded turns to calculate the average teacher’s and students’ codings.
5. The average was squared and multiplied by the percentage of turns. The resultant figure was the index showing the level of the teacher’s or students’ participation.

The types of questions, the measure of students’ level of participation in classroom discourse, and the types of discourse devices used to orient toward activity or topic constituted the analytic devices which were used in the microanalysis of lesson three. Having described the first and second measures, we now turn to the third one in the next section.

3.6.6.3.3 Topic and activity orientation devices

The devices used by teachers to control topic and activity are divided into two sets based on their contribution to the activity rules, that is, the way things are done and expressed through language in
contrast to their contribution to the topic, that is, the content of talk as opposed to the way it is expressed. The two sets of devices are presented in table 3.3.

Table 3.3: Devices reflecting the participants' orientation toward activity or topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation toward activity</th>
<th>Orientation toward topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Invocation of rules</td>
<td>1. Student-addressed responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Procedural statements and meta-talk</td>
<td>2. Building the topic at hand together with the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Routines</td>
<td>3. Message-oriented or natural feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Turn allocation by the teacher</td>
<td>4. Treating students’ responses as contributions to the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Unique response rule</td>
<td>5. Conversational repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Evaluative feedback</td>
<td>6. Including clarification of the students’ intentions and negotiation of meaning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Activity orientation

1. **Invocation of rules**: Making implicit or explicit references to the procedural or formal rules as to support the formal aspects of what is said or as to notify the students of the way something needs to be expressed.

2. **Procedural statements or meta-talk**: Stating the procedures or rules that the students are supposed to follow in doing an activity or stating the forms that they should express things in the speaking and writing.

3. **Turn allocation by the teacher**: Tight control of turn-taking through pre- or local allocation of turns.

4. **Routines**: Doing or saying things according to rules or procedures which are so established that the participants feel no need to mention them explicitly. In other words, routines are marked series of turns in which the focus of the turns are not explicitly specified or elicited by the teacher.

5. **Unique response rule**: Providing a response in pre-specified forms or according to the norms of the activity in hand.

6. **Evaluative feedback**: Evaluating the students’ responses based on pre-specified rules or norms. In their negative forms, they are basically intra-turn corrections of linguistic errors which obstruct the turn in progress or threaten its development.

B. Topic orientation

1. **Student-addressed responses**: Responses which are directed to other students not the teacher.

2. **Building the topic at hand together with the students**: Interactive development of topics with topical contribution from the students.
3. Message-oriented or natural feedback: conversational feedback valuing the informational content of the student’s response not its form.

4. Treating students’ responses as contributions to the topic: Acknowledging the students’ responses as contributions to the topic while they may not be exactly relevant. By doing this the teacher takes the students’ perception of the topic into account by treating his/her response as a valid contribution to the topic in hand.

5. Conversational repair: treating errors as pragmatic or interactional adjustments which need to be repaired interactionally. Using conversational repairs, teachers cover up their pedagogic agenda using conversational moves which are suggestive of factual or perceptual problems. Conversational repair, used in this sense, differs from the way it is defined by Van Lier (1988:188-192). He uses ‘conversational repair’ to refer to the speaker’s move used to address problems of talk in comparison with ‘didactic repair’ which is motivated pedagogically to deal with formal/structural problems.

6. Including clarification of the students’ intentions and negotiation of meaning: trying to elicit clarifications from the students instead of reading their minds or cutting them short and redirecting the question to other students.

Activity orientation

The following are illustrations of the devices showing the extent to which the teacher and students orient themselves towards rules of the activity.

1. Invocation of rules

Example 3.15 [T3 L3]

T: 374 now ( ) Four it’s ok to bring it but it isn’t really necessary
   375 Steve what did you think?
S: 376 photographs, surf board
T: 377 [can you give them the structure please?]
S: 378 yes it’s ok to bring photographs surf board and a laptop
T: 379 [use the modal please!]
   380 use the modal for better practice we could say that
   381 but we will only put it in the colloquial model
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2. Procedural statements and meta-talk

Example 3.16 [T3 L3]
T:  
91 right! If you-
92 can I have just your attention!
93 If you had a rough conversation about what is very important what's not important and so
94 on could you then look at step two?
95 Where you've got the grammatical options,
96 the language options to express the differing importance of these things,
96 Use the boxes below to help her organize the things she wants to take to the UK
97 with your partner put them in the boxes where you think they belong

3 & 4 Turn allocation by the teacher & Routines

Example 3.17 [T3 L3]
T:  
314 can you give me the structure?
315 you should! K!
S:  
316 you should take a map of the UK
T:  
317 speak up please!
S:  
318 you should take a map of the UK with you.
T:  
319 G!
S:  
320 and you should take credit card with you
T:  
321 K!
S:  
322 you should take books about the UK
T:  
323 no more!

5 Unique response rule

Example 3.18 [T3 L3]
T:  
203 D! ! Did you have anything in this category?
S:  
204 fresh fruit
T:  
205 so what would we say?
206 You! Can you express it?
S:  
207 err
T:  

208 can you express it? you!
S: 209 yes (.) you m- you must not take fresh fruit into the UK
T: 210 good you must not take fresh fruit

6 Evaluative feedback

Example 3.19 [T3 L3]
T: 888 no different shoulds ok
889 ok. things you don’t have to
890 absence of obligation P!
S: 891 you do not have to bring a laptop computer because it is very heavy to carry on. [N]
T: 892 very good yeah
893 You don’t have to
894 Something else K?

Topic orientation
The following are illustrative examples showing the devices used to orient toward topic.

1 Student-addressed responses

Example 3.20 [T3 L3]
T: 157 Ok. we will come to-
158 is- is anyone any other differences from what A and T said?
S: 159 don’t think the return ticket is must
T: 160 is not a must
S: 161 is not must should I don’t think must
S1: 162 a return ticket means you can use this ticket from your country to the UK and from the
UK back to your country
S2: 163 we think is must this situation because it’s a sort err sorry is a short vacation in the Uk
164 so because the situation we think is- is err must is obligatory
S3: 165 perhaps err before you coming- come to UK you have already get the visa from the
immigration office
166 that is- err- that is- that [+ + +] you should stay here you can stay here
2 Building the topic together with the students

Example 3.21 [T3 L3]

T: 80 what’s hiking?
S: 81 walk a long time on on walk
82 walk a long time- a long trip
T: 83 yeah!
S: 84 is like tracking?
T: 85 ah! Yes. Tracking yes it is
86 It’s walking a long way usually in the country in the mountains
87 you need good boots for that

3 Message-oriented or natural feedback

Example 3.22 [T3 L3]

S: 568 you should take a photocopy of passport
T: 569 [ah! Intelligent yeah.
569 Good idea
570 sorry I stopped you
571 go on please!
S: 572 and cash
T: 573 oh yes this where cash is coming yeah!
574 How much cash?

4 Treating students’ responses as contributions to the topic

In line 536, the teacher confirms that the student’s response is a contribution to the topic, though later (line 538 and 540) he asks the student to clarify the reason behind his suggestion, which implies his uncertainty about the validity of the response.

Example 3.23 [T3 L3]

S: 535 film
T: 536 oh add film
S: 537 and camera
T: 538 do you think you need to bring film?
S:
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539 yes
T:
540 why why bring film?

5 Conversational repair

Example 3.24 [T3 L3]
S3:
165 perhaps err before you coming- come to UK you have already get the visa from the immigration office
166 that is- err- that is- that [+] you should stay here you can stay here
167 you don’t have the return ticket,
168 before err before the- your visa expired emired you must go
T:
169 excuse me before the visa!
S3:
170 visa is expired
T:
171 Expired
S3:
172 Expired
T:
173 I think expired yes
S:
174 Expired

The teacher’s request for repetition (line 169) might be interpreted as the pragmatic failure of the student’s response. As such it provides the opportunity for self-repair. Even if the opportunity is not taken by the student, as it is the case with this example, the teacher’s correction as other repair gives the impression that the adjustments are made interactionally.

6 Clarification of the students’ intentions and negotiation of meaning

Example 3.25 [T3 L3]
S:
535 film
T:
536 add film
S:
537 and camera
T:
538 do you think you need to bring film?
S:
539 yes
T:
540 why why bring film?
S:
537s [+]
I cannot buy a camera because it's expensive and you don't want to replace it but why film?

S: because I think the film in China is much cheaper

T: ah a good reason

A good idea if coming from China where it is cheaper to bring film with you.

Yes Americans tend to do that too because it's cheaper [+ +] in Scottish place yeah [+ + +]

so really good

3.6.6.4 Microanalysis procedures

The microanalysis was informed by the following basic set of assumptions:

1. Classroom interaction patterns and in effect the contexts constructed for learning are influenced by the aims set for interaction.
2. The two basic aims of classroom discourse are accuracy in form and fluency in meaning exchanges through participating in extended discourse with the teacher or fellow students.
3. The two extreme types of discourse, that is, pedagogic and naturalistic discourse are distinguished by the degree of focus on either of the above goals. In naturalistic discourse norms are defined in fluency terms. That is why form and content errors are repaired implicitly and priority is given to self-repair. While in pedagogic discourse where the norms are defined in accuracy terms, the explicit focus on form and the didactic form of other-repair are favoured and even encouraged.
4. The two types of goals are not either-or options. In fact, they could both form the basis of teaching-learning activities. Variable degrees of emphasis can go to each type in different phases of a lesson. In other words, goals might shift depending on the participants’ perception of what constitutes the focus of an activity in each phase.
5. By definition, CSs are devices used to facilitate message communication. As in classroom discourse, the pedagogic goals of the activities put variable degrees of emphasis on message communication, it is expected that patterns of strategy use differ across teachers and lessons, and even over the phases of the same lesson.

By virtue of the above-mentioned assumptions, the microanalysis aimed at investigating the degree of emphasis given to accuracy and fluency in different phases of a lesson as a basis to explore the possible relationships between the investigated patterns and the frequency and distribution of different strategies adopted in each phase. The following methodological decisions were taken to achieve the goals of this stage of the analysis process.
As the teacher's and the students' perception of pedagogic goals are affected by situational factors, it was necessary to interpret the lessons in their own contexts with reference to indexical features of the settings in which the lessons were taught and the teachers' and students' moment by moment interactional decisions as the lessons unfolded. This insight informed the methodological decision to focus on each teacher and lesson as a specific case with the aim of sketching a profile for each case in its own terms.

1. The analysis of each specific case started with a frequency count of the types of questions and the calculation of the students' participation index. The resultant figures provided a rough measure of the overall focus of the lesson on form or meaning.

2. The next step in the analysis was to draw up a frequency table of the discourse devices used to orient toward activity or topic in different phases of the lesson. The frequency count was used as a guide to complement the results of the frequency count with excerpts from the lesson as evidence for the types of interactive decisions made by the teacher and students.

3. The analysis proceeded with the frequency count of the CSs used by the teacher over the different phases of the lesson. The frequency count in each phase was then compared with the corresponding patterns identified in the previous steps to check the possible matches between the two as evidence for the relationship between the pedagogic focus of the activities and the teachers' use of CSs.

3.7 Summary
This chapter has been concerned with the design of the empirical study undertaken in the present research project and the methods used in the analysis of the data. Due to the exploratory-descriptive nature of this study, the project piloting assumed a significant role in the development of the framework of the study. That is why a substantial part of this chapter has dealt with the contributions of the pilot study to the methods of data analysis. The pilot data included transcripts of audio-taped lessons and a stimulated recall interview with the participant teacher. The report of the results of the analysis of the lesson transcripts portrayed the inadequacies of the frameworks of analysis of the interlanguage CSs and interactional modifications in dealing with the teacher's problem-management behaviour. This aspect of the pilot study contributed to the refinement of the category system which is described in chapter 4. The report of the pilot study continued with an account of the results of the stimulated recall interview and its contributions to the development of a set of procedures used in the microanalysis of the data in the main study.
This chapter has also portrayed the subjects, the setting, the category system and the procedures followed in the data transcription and analysis. The report of the data analysis has encompassed the procedures followed in the two different but complementary analyses which have been undertaken in the main study. The first analysis is characterised as a quantitative analysis aiming at identifying patterns of the use of CSs by the teachers and the second one as a more detailed microanalysis of lesson transcripts encompassing the quantification of the context descriptors exemplified by excerpts from the lesson transcripts in an attempt to characterise the overall and local focus of the talk in constructing contexts for learning. The purpose has been reported to be the investigation of the relationship between the patterns of strategy use with the focus of talk over the different phases of a lesson.
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4.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the categories of analysis established on the basis of the theoretical and methodological framework developed for this study which is aimed at exploring the CSs and their conditions of use. Section 4.2 is a report on the identification process followed by an overview of the category system in section 4.3. The description and exemplification of the macro and micro categories is presented in sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2. Section 4.4 summarises the chapter and draws some conclusions.

4.2 Identification process

The development of categories of analysis was accomplished in three consecutive phases. In phase 1, the lessons were transcribed, and the transcripts were then segmented into utterances. In phase 2, the segmented transcripts were closely examined to see how teachers established mutual comprehension in the context of achieving the pedagogic aims of classroom activities. Broadly, the aim was to identify points where the teacher was apparently making adjustments to secure message communication. The focus was specifically on the linguistic and discoursal means which were instrumentally used as devices to make the adjustments.

The main observation made at this stage was that teachers and students were basically involved in two different processes; meaning negotiation in the course of normal message communication and lexical-compensation while focusing on individual lexical items. In spite of their difference in focus, the two had the common feature of hearer-orientation in the sense that they were primarily motivated by the students’ linguistic deficiencies in comprehension and production. In spite of this clear orientation, the devices used to make the adjustments to the limited proficiency audience also featured the problems that the teacher experienced in the process of finding the best way of adjusting discourse to facilitate communication. The former incorporated the type of interactional modification devices referred to in the literature such as comprehension checks, clarification requests, confirmation checks, repeats and recasts. The latter involved lexical substitution strategies including categories such as description and paraphrase.

In the third phase, the individual categories were checked throughout the database to refine their definitions and find out the different functions they performed in the lessons taught by different teachers. In this phase, the definitions were modified and a number of the strategies were relabelled.
to keep consistency between the categories of the present study and similar studies reported in the literature.

4.3 Category system

The following classification system presents the macro- and micro-categories of CSs. At the macro-level, a distinction is made between two sets of strategies referred to as ‘meaning negotiation’ and ‘lexical-compensatory’ strategies. Within the lexical-compensatory strategies, again a further distinction is made between circumlocution, language transfer, and non-linguistic strategies. In this section, first the macro-categories and then the micro-categories will be defined and illustrated. The illustrations will include excerpts from the data supplemented with comments which might have references to the pedagogic functions of the categories under discussion to demonstrate their contextual relevance.

I. Meaning negotiation Strategies
   A. Self-reformulation
   B. Other-reformulation
   C. Other-repetition
   D. Turn completion
   E. Cueing
   F. Confirmation check
   G. Comprehension check
   G. Clarification request

II. Lexical-compensatory Strategies (Explication)
   1. Circumlocution
      A. Paraphrase
         a) description
         b) contextualised Description
      B. Approximation
   2. Language Transfer
      Code Switching
   3. Non-linguistic Strategies
      A. Mime
      B. Appeal to authority
4.3.1 Macro-categories

CSs are defined as linguistic and discoursal devices available to interlocutors to establish mutual comprehension. The focus in this study is their use by teachers under the special circumstances of L2 classrooms in which the TL plays the dual role of being the vehicle of message communication and the focus of learning practices. Therefore, by definition, CSs could potentially incorporate both the discourse mechanisms used to make the necessary adjustments between the teacher and the students and the alternative linguistic means to compensate for lexical deficiencies. This is the basis upon which a distinction is made between meaning negotiation strategies and lexical-compensatory strategies.

As a second important element of this definition, it is assumed that CSs, which are used as part and parcel of meaning communication, can play a significant role in achieving pedagogic goals. This further implies the multifunctionality of meaning negotiation strategies, which should be taken into consideration in the process of identification and analysis of classroom data. The adjustment between the teacher and the students involves linguistic and discoursal modifications on both sides with the consequence that either side might experience problems in making the required adaptations. This means that though teachers’ CSs are primarily oriented toward the audience, that is, they are targeted to the students’ communication problems, they might also be motivated by the teacher’s problems in getting across his/her messages or in clarifying concepts while dealing with lexical items.

The first macro-category of CSs is defined as follows:

‘Meaning negotiation strategies’ are processes used to generate utterances which are concerned to check or facilitate comprehension or production of a previous or forthcoming utterance by the speaker or the listener.’

These strategies are basically adjustments made by the teacher to the structure of discourse. They can be regarded as supra-sentential categories defined in terms of either their relationship to the preceding or following utterance; or their function in meaning negotiation. Categories of the first sort are specifically defined in terms of whether the current speaker restates or completes the previous speaker’s utterance or reformulates his/her own message. The definition given to the second type is based on their role in meaning negotiation which can be stated as checking or seeking clarification of the previous speaker’s meaning or checking the hearer’s understanding of the current speaker’s meaning. As such meaning negotiation strategies are defined in terms of their
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role in discourse structure and their function in meaning negotiation. These strategies might constitute elements of the 'repair or clarification sequences' (Schegloff et al. 1977) inserted between two interrelated turns to bring the previous speaker’s meaning closer to what is intended or to facilitate the production of the next turn. The important features of the definition of meaning negotiation strategies is now illustrated in what follows. The example below shows how the teacher’s question in line 142 addresses the student’s problem in expressing his own message.

Example 4.1 [T 5 L3]

T: 140 how old is he?
S: 141 as same as old am I
T: 142 as old as you?
S: 143 yes

The teacher’s utterance in line 142 changes the structure of discourse in the sense that the feedback turn is withheld until the understanding of the previous turn is checked. As a meaning negotiation strategy, the question performs more than one function. In addition to checking message comprehension, it provides the target form for the expression of the student’s message.

The meaning negotiation strategy of ‘self-reformulation’ used in the following example simplifies the teacher’s initiation in an attempt to help the student’s comprehension process.

Example 4.2 [T 4 L3]

T: 1389 did you pick the mandatory ones? yes?
    1390 did you check the ones that are necessary?
    1391 items that are necessary?
S: 1392 [+ + +]
T: 1393 let us see which items you got

1 The strategies under discussion are marked by underlining. The relevant part is underlined within the transcribed excerpt.

2 This meaning negotiation strategy is coded as a ‘code-oriented confirmation check’ in the present study. There is overlap between ‘recast’, as conceptualised and described in the literature on corrective feedback in both L1 and L2 (for a review see Nicholas et al. 2001) and confirmation check used in its code-oriented function and also the meaning negotiation strategy of ‘other-reformulation’ described later in this chapter (for a discussion on recast see chapter 2 section 2.6).
The self-reformulation in lines 1390-1391 is again a meaning negotiation strategy because it delays the students’ response until comprehension of the teacher’s question is secured. The lexical substitutions in lines 1389-1392 (Pick – check; mandatory – necessary; ones – items) contribute to the simplification of the teacher’s question so that the students could understand it before they provide the requested response.

It should be noted that lexical substitutions, which will be introduced later as embedded ‘lexical-compensatory strategies’, happen to be used here within the context of a series of interactive check questions- an example of meaning negotiation strategies which we are concerned with at this point.

Lexical-compensatory strategies, as the second macro-category of CSs, are defined as follows: ‘Lexical-compensatory strategies’ are formulation processes used to substitute or supplement ‘meaning structures’ for which the speaker believes relevant language is not available to the interlocutor. By definition, they are alternative form-meaning structures used to compensate for either perceived gaps in the students’ lexical knowledge in which case their context of use is determined by the teacher’s knowledge assessment, or gaps which have already surfaced in the students’ performance or been acknowledged by them. As such, they might be used both prospectively to avoid potentially problematic concepts, and equally well retrospectively to compensate for signalled or acknowledged lexical problems.

The distinction between lexical-compensatory and meaning negotiation strategies is based on their difference in function and focus. Meaning negotiation strategies, as discourse processes, change the structure of discourse in the sense that they constitute moves which are normally added to the structure of discourse at crisis points where actual or predicted problems are considered as threats to the normal course of message communication. In this sense, they are discourse detours taken by the interlocutors to keep the conversation going in the face of problems which might be located in the comprehension or production of either of the interactants. In contrast, lexical-compensatory strategies as formulation processes refer to alternative means of expression used again at crisis points where lexical gaps might disrupt the comprehension or production of a specific message. They are used by students as stopgaps either to achieve the goal of communicating a message or to avoid or abandon it or perhaps to appeal to the interlocutor for help. Teachers might use them mainly to compensate for the students’ lexical gaps, though in specific cases they might use them as a last resort when they
experience difficulties in adjusting to the communicative needs of their limited proficiency audience. They are used by teachers as substitutes or supplements to the target word in an unmarked form as not to distract the attention from message communication or in a marked form in contexts where the process of compensating for lexical gaps is made the focus of several exchanges in an effort to establish the word-meaning relationship cooperatively by the students before the normal course of classroom discussion could be restored. The following example illustrates the unmarked prospective use of a lexical-compensatory strategy by the teacher.

**Example 4.3 [T 5 L3]**

T:

842 gifts are not necessary
843 what else?

S:

844 souvenirs

T:

845 souvenirs
846 yes presents
847 and what other things you think are prohibited by law?

The lexical substitution in line 846 is part of the third turn by which the teacher accepts the student’s response. Its use as a complement to the repetition of the student’s response seems to be prospective; that is, motivated by the teacher’s assessment of the students’ lexical knowledge since there is no indication of a problem prior to its use.

In comparison, the teacher’s lexical meaning description (lines 104-108) below in a marked context where the focus is on lexical compensation seems to be a retrospective measure taken in reaction to a lexical problem which has already surfaced in the student’s statement in line 100.

**Example 4.4 [T 1 L1]**

S2:

100 March is a month

T:

101 March is the month with capital ‘m’ but not with the small ‘m’

S2:

102 walk together

T:

103 yeah (;) a march
104 in politics, if I don’t like something, ok?
105 I say that everybody is equal, OK?
106 I don’t like racism
107 so, if I go on march it means that a lot people together walk (;) right?
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108 and hold placards () ok?
109 ah a march is a demonstration () demonstration

The clue in line 101 helps the student to activate the concept and provide a description which is then made the focus of an extended definition by the teacher in an effort to make it more transparent.

Within the broad category of ‘lexical-compensatory’ strategies, distinctions are made between ‘circumlocution’, ‘language transfer’ and ‘non-linguistic’ strategies. This distinction is based on the type of ‘approach’ adopted (Tarone 1977; Faerch & Kasper 1983b), or the different ‘sources’ (Bialystok 1990; Paribakht 1985) drawn upon by the interlocutors to manage communication problems. The interlocutors might use their knowledge of L2 or transfer L1 or L3 structures to solve communication problems. They might also draw upon non-linguistic mediums of expression like visual images and ‘gesticulation’. If none of these sources prove useful, interlocutors might refer to an authoritative source of information such as a bilingual or monolingual dictionary.

4.3.2 Micro-categories

4.3.2.1 Meaning negotiation strategies

Meaning negotiation strategies were defined earlier as interactional devices available to the teacher to establish mutual comprehension through (a) addressing students’ problems in hearing or understanding his/her previous or current utterances (b) addressing students’ problems in expressing their intended meanings. The latter implies that the teacher’s use of meaning negotiation strategies might also be motivated by his or her own problems in interpreting the students’ non-target-like utterances.

The definition of individual subcategories of meaning negotiation strategies is based either on their relationship to the preceding utterance or their role in meaning negotiation. In using the categories of the first type, which include ‘self- and other-reformulation’ and ‘turn completion’, the teacher assumes a rather didactic role in meaning negotiation by assisting the students in comprehending/producing messages. While in using the second type, consisting of ‘confirmation check’, ‘comprehension check’, ‘clarification request’, and ‘cues’, he avoids giving direct assistance so as to let them free to assume a more active role in dealing with their own problems in comprehension and production.

A. Self-reformulation

‘Self-reformulation’ is defined as a teacher’s move repeating his/her original utterance with certain
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lexico-grammatical modifications intended to simplify input and extend the students’ processing time. The reformulation of elicitations entails changing an open question to a closed one or simplifying the surface structure of the question without changing its type. Reformulation of statements includes lexical substitutions and/or syntactic restructuring. In brief, reformulation of teachers’ own utterances involves changes in the surface form of the utterances and not their functions. Self-reformulation is different from ‘self-repair’ and ‘restructuring’ in which the teacher abandons his current message midstream to repair an item or restructure the whole message. Apart from realisation criteria (reformulation of the whole utterance instead of its parts), they are distinguished from repair and restructuring by their orientation. Self-reformulation is oriented toward the audience making adjustments to assist the hearers’ understanding while self-repair is speaker-oriented in the sense that it compensates for the linguistic deficiencies of the speaker not the hearer. In the following example, the underlined part of line 236 is an extension on the teacher’s original question.

Example 4.5 [T 1 L1]

T: 232 [yeah(.) he became
233 what did he become?
S4: 234 he became something in churches, but I
T: 235 yeah(. )what do we call it?
236 what do we call it if you are a religious man?

The extension provides more information. This might seem redundant but redundancy can be crucial to student’s comprehension since it can help compensate for their limited proficiency and the constraints of their working memory.

B. Other-reformulation

Other-reformulation is defined as a teacher’s move restating, summarising, or expanding the students’ utterances. The modifications take three different forms; repetition with lexical substitution, syntactic restructuring with or without lexical substitutions to expand, or summarise the utterance in an effort to say the same thing from a different perspective.

Students’ utterances are restated when inappropriate word choice or the use of stopgaps causes ambiguities in meaning expression. Sometimes, students’ formulation problems entail verbose speech. Pauses, repeats, false starts and the use of CSs such as circumlocution lead to lengthy talk for the expression of messages, which could otherwise be expressed in a much shorter length. In
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this case, teachers reformulate the students' lengthy speech in a shorter more refined form. It is also possible that students' formulation problems force them to reduce their messages in order to avoid problematic items. In such cases, the teacher might expand the reduced speech to make it more appropriate or informative.

The diverse forms and functions of other-reformulation in the context of language classrooms reflects the teachers' privileged position in controlling discourse topics, which enables them to make reasonable guesses at what students are trying to say. Therefore, they can use this category in more varied forms and for more diverse purposes. This adds a pedagogic element to the communicative function of 'other-reformulation' in classroom discourse. The teacher's other-reformulation in line 52 below summarises what the student was trying to say and at the same time might provide a model for its expression.

Example 4.6 [T 1 L1]
T:  
   50 well yeah how do you know? ha? 
S3:  
   51 I like- in the TV- yesterday I look like in the TV 
T:  
   52 ha, you saw him in the television (.) yesterday, ok 
S3:  
   53 [yeah (.) yesterday (. ) yeah 

The other-reformulation in line 170 below illustrates that this strategy can perform a specific function in repairing non-target-like forms in student's utterances.

Example 4.7 [T 4 L3]
T:  
   166 oh, you run faster than the dog 
S:  
   167 because of [ + + + ] 
T:  
   168 because of the? 
S:  
   169 because of being worried 
T:  
   170 aha! you get- you get scared 
S:  
   171 [because of(.) err scared yes 
T:  
   172 being scared you run fast 
   173 you get away from the dog 
   174 how often do dogs attack you?
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Ss:

175 huh huh huh

The teacher's 'get scared' is a substitute for 'being worried' in the preceding turn, used inappropriately by the student.

C. Other-repetition

Other-repetition refers to the teacher's partial or full repetition of the student's utterance. It performs two different functions. With falling intonation, it acts as a conversational continuant confirming the student's utterance. In contrast, with low-key rising intonation, it signals to the student that there is a problem with his/her utterance which needs to be dealt with before the interaction can proceed. In their first function, other-repetitions are often accompanied with modality particles like 'yes', 'no', 'well', 'oh', etc. These particles tell the students how the content of the previous utterance was taken up by the teacher. This provides a basis for comments, and clarifications, which often follow the repetitions. The following example demonstrates how the teacher's repetition of part of the student's utterance specifies the information relevant to the clarification question.

Example 4.8 [T 4 L3]

S:

236 Germany too
237 when I was fourteen years old

T:

238 fourteen
239 would you remember the trip?

In their second function, other-repetitions help the interlocutors avoid clarification side sequences which might distract attention from the main topic of discourse. When other repetitions indicate problems with content, they can also be interpreted as implicit requests for clarification. The following example illustrates the point.

Example 4.9 [UJ L3]

S:

676 I think you should take some snack from your country

T:

677 take a snack!

S:

678 yes huh perhaps you can't get used of the foreign foods

T:

679 yeah maybe for a short visit, you've got to be realistic yeah
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The student’s response to the teacher’s other repetition indicates that it is interpreted as a request for clarification.

D. Turn completion

Turn completion occurs when the teacher provides words or expressions in response to the student’s direct or indirect appeals for assistance or just after a long pause or other type of hesitation phenomena showing that the student is experiencing problems finishing the current message. It is to be noted that other-reformulation and turn completion overlap in the sense that both are used to assist the students in formulating their messages. The difference lies in the fact that the former is used when the student’s attempts succeed in producing a complete message though in less than perfect forms, while the latter is used to supply an item which the student has failed to retrieve from memory. The following two examples show the way this strategy is used.

Example 4.10 [T 1 L1]

T:  
268 ok, number 1  
269 what's happening in number 1?  
270 what's  
S4:  
271 he gives a famous speech  
272 I cannot remember  
T:  
273 I have a dream  
274 right. yeah, and after that  
S4:  
275 number 5

In line 272 above, the student signals an indirect appeal for assistance saying ‘I cannot remember’. In response, the teacher supplies the missing item.

E. Cueing

Cues consist of any teacher’s move dependent on his/her earlier initiation move intended to prompt the desired response or signal to the student to modify the response already produced. They are used when the initiation fails to elicit the desired response or elicit a response which partially communicates the message. Cues share the feature of dependency on the initiation move with self-reformulation; however, cues are distinct in terms of the function they play in meaning negotiation. Self-reformulation assists the students in comprehending the initiation, while cues are intended to simplify the process of searching for the right message to be formulated in response to the initiation
move. In the following example, the teacher's cue in line 300 guides the student to find a second item which is not mentioned in his response in line 299.

**Example 4.12 [UJ L3]**

T:  
296 but not just pirate copies  
297 That's what I wanted to sum up  
298 we mentioned other  

S:  
299 and CDs with forbidden content  

T:  
300 ah and CDs or  

S:  
301 tapes  

T:  
302 yeah tapes with forbidden content such as pornography  
303 Specific yeah  
304 Anything else which is prohibited?

The teacher’s cue both signals to the student that the information provided in his response was not adequate and at the same time seeks the missing information from him. It gives him a second chance to provide the item which he actually knew what it was, but failed to incorporate in his original response.

**F. Confirmation checks**

Confirmation checks have originally been described as any move by the current speaker designed to check hearing and/or understanding of the previous speaker’s utterance (Long 1980; Pica and Doughty 1985). Confirmation checks used for this purpose are always echoing questions involving repetition of all or part of the preceding utterance. In the context of the present study, confirmation checks are defined as questions which provide information to be confirmed or denied about the form and/or content of the preceding oral discourse or the classroom written materials. This modifies the preceding definition taken from the literature on conversational adjustments in the sense that first, it extends the domain of confirmation checks to the whole preceding oral and written discourse; and second, it includes both content-oriented and code-oriented questions.

Code-oriented confirmation checks are reformulation or repetition of part or whole of the previous speaker’s utterance with rising intonation, while content-oriented confirmation checks are questions which provide information expected to be expressed by the preceding speaker(s) about the nominated topic. The extension of confirmation checks to content-oriented questions is consistent with the specific role of classroom discourse in simplifying the students’ interactive task
and supporting them in the expression of messages whose demands exceed their limited language proficiency. When the student’s contribution to the development of the topic in hand is less likely to be realised without difficulty, the teacher might provide the expected information in the form of a confirmation check. Confirmation checks help in dissecting the information into manageable chunks to be processed and expressed in a step-wise manner. The underlined utterance in the following example is a form-oriented confirmation check.

Example 4.13 [T 5 L3]
S:
1204 must be 18 and you enter the driving school to learn how to drive
1205 you must pass the exam or the testing
1206 for practice you must know the law or the information of them
T:
1207 ah the rules of the road?
S:
1208 yes the roads

As can be inferred from the above example, ‘form-oriented confirmation check’ and ‘other reformulation’ (examples 4.6 and 4.7) share the feature of reformulating the student’s non-target-like utterance in a target-like form; however, they differ in the function they perform in discourse terms. The former seeks confirmation of the reformulated utterance giving the impression that the teacher is in doubt of his interpretation of the student’s response while the latter offers it as a model expecting no further response from the student.

Content-oriented confirmation checks, as in the following example, provide information related to the student’s nominated topic.

Example 4.14 [T 5 L3]
T:
43 as usual,
44 you were absent yesterday right?
S:
45 yes
T:
46 what for?
47 Were you busy?
Ss:
48 /an accident/
T:
49 you had an accident?
S:
50 yes
T:
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51 the car hit you? or-
S: 52 no I was in the car last year
T: 53 [you were in your own car?
54 You were in your own car
S: 55 yes
T: 56 so you hit you hit someone else’s car or someone-
S: 57 we had accident each other

The answer to the confirmation checks in lines 49, 51, and 53 is limited to ‘yes’ or ‘no’; however, we should bear in mind that in some cases confirmation checks of this kind might give the students’, who have difficulty expressing themselves in detail, a sense of success just because they simplify their task in contributing to the on-going discussion.

Content-oriented confirmation checks can also realise as statements followed by tag questions or questions biased toward a positive answer or confirmation from the students. This type of confirmation check has the effect of providing space for the students’ participation in classroom interaction even when the teacher is expressing his own views about the information exchanged in interaction. In the following example, a suggestion is made by the students that the imaginary friend change his/her pounds into rials (Iranian currency) before entering Iran. The teacher view on this suggestion in line 647 is presented in the form of a confirmation check seeking the agreement of the students.

Example 4.15 [T4 L3]

S: 642 I think they haven’t rial in England
T: 643 they do(.) they do have rials in England,
644 but listen(.) be realistic
645 your friend is coming to Iran,
646 he is English,
647 do you recommend him to go and change his pounds into rial and bring it to Tehran?
S: 648 no
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G. Clarification requests

Clarification requests have originally been defined as any move consisting of a question, imperative, or statement by a native speaker designed to elicit clarification of the interlocutor’s preceding utterance(s) (Long, 1983b: 137). For the purpose of the present study, a clarification request is defined as a query designed to elicit from the student clarification of his/her utterance providing new information or reformulating the given information in target-like form. This definition again extends the scope of clarification requests to include, in addition to the clarification of the preceding utterance, queries about the whole of the preceding oral and written discourse. They further extend the scope to include, in addition to requests for reformulation of the given information, questions demanding new information which might contribute to more transparent meaning communication. In contrast to confirmation checks, clarification requests are open-ended queries demanding more interactional efforts on the part of the students by delegating the task of providing new information or reformulation of the given information to them.

In line 17 below, the question is a request for the clarification of the term ‘family’ in the preceding utterance.

Example 4.16 [T 4 L3]

S:  
  16 my family

T:  
  17 your fam- what do you mean by my family?

S:  
  18 mother brother and- [+ + +]

T:  
  19 oh! yeah, yeah

In this case, the teacher’s clarification request specifies an ambiguity in the student’s utterance and asks him to reformulate it in more explicit terms.

The underlined question in the following example is a content-oriented clarification request asking for new information.

Example 4.17 [T 5 L3]

S:  
  1161 yes arguments
  1162 and there are a lot of difficulties
  1163 like that after that we entered the err police station and they asked us to give them the documents

T:  

CHAPTER 4 CATEGORIES OF DATA ANALYSIS

In line 1163, the student’s use of ‘document’ in the definite form implies that the information is shared. Here, the teacher’s clarification request casts doubt on the given status of the information by asking the student to restate it as new information.

Due to the pedagogic nature of classroom discourse, sometimes teachers might ask students to clarify the meaning of specific terms used in the preceding discourse. In contrast with the varieties discussed above, this special version of clarification request is a display question posed to check the students’ language knowledge by asking them to provide meaning descriptions for vocabulary items which are assumed to cause comprehension problems. It performs both a communicative and pedagogic function by securing comprehension and teaching vocabulary.

The clarification request in line 603 below is a display question eliciting the meaning description of an expression which is assumed to be unfamiliar to some of the students.

Example 4.18 [T 4 L2]

S:
600 entertain
T:
601 entertains, and laugh
602 a laugh a minute,
603 what is the title of this programme mean?
604 Tell you- what does the title tell you?
605 a laugh a minute,
606 how do you interpret this?
S:
607 comedy
T:
608 oh! no, it’s a comedy
609 ah the obvious is- it’s a comedy programme
610 then what does it mean?
611 a laugh a minute?
S:
612 after one minute
T:
613 every minute, you get a laugh
614 err number seven please? Yes?

The student’s answer to the teacher’s question in line 603 is about the type of the programme and not the meaning of the expression. The teacher restates the question in line 610 to reiterate his
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intention. This time, the student offers a meaning description which is then reformulated by the teacher to express it in a more refined form.

H. Comprehension checks

Comprehension checks such as ‘Do you understand?’, ‘Ok?’, etc are moves which are used to check the student’s comprehension of the teacher’s utterance(s). The domain of comprehension checks is also extended to include not only the content of the preceding utterance(s), but also the content of the lesson as referred to by the teacher or the students. For example, the question in line 580 checks the students’ understanding of an expression used in the teaching materials.

Example 4.19 [T 4 L2]

S: 'A'
T: 'A' means the music programme very good (. )
      that was: Top Twenty
      do you know what Top Twenty is?

In contrast the comprehension check in line 479 below asks about the students’ understanding of the teacher’s instructions to the task.

Example 4.20 [T 4 L2]

T: err let us do the part on page nine
   this is a:: description of different type of TV programmes, all right
   British television I would say
   what kind of programme are they?
   match them with one of the words below
   and mark it like this
   as you can see there are:
   how many numbers do we have?
   There are actually twelve boxes, all right
   and there are twelve letters- boxes numbered from one to twelve
   letter A to L
   match the right type of- to the: in each box
   example is given, e
   rr number one description is: boxing from the Albert Hall and racing from York, right?
   what kind of a programme is that?
   They say D
   D reads- is a sport programme, all right?
   so get into pairs, that:
   do you know what to do with this?
Ss:
In discussing the sub-categories of meaning negotiation strategies, we referred to the multifunctionality of these categories. Specifically, we referred to the repair function of categories of ‘other reformulation’ and ‘comprehension check’. So as not to confuse repair as it is used in conversational analytic studies with the way it is used in this study, it might be useful to clarify the distinction. From a conversation analytic perspective, repair refers both to ‘error replacement’ and to problems in hearing and speaking (Van Lier 1988). Since the study of CSs is targeted to the ‘intended meaning’ and the way it is negotiated, only repair types which are intended to achieve agreement on meaning are categorised as CSs in the present study.

The term ‘other-reformulation’ is preferred to ‘other-repair’ since it is more inclusive in the sense that it covers the appropriation of student’s utterances for other purposes. In addition, by using ‘other-reformulation’ which is defined in formal terms, we can avoid the confusion between form and function.

It is worth noting that the way repair is initiated and executed either by self or other depends on the types of meaning negotiation strategies used by the teacher. For example, in using ‘other-reformulation’, the teacher both initiates and executes repair on the student’s non-target-like utterance in the same turn. In using a confirmation check or a clarification request, the teacher initiates the repair which is then completed in the next turn by the student’s response. The main difference between other-reformulation and confirmation check is that in the case of ‘other-reformulation’, repair is achieved didactically, that is, the student is not given any chance to contribute in the repair process. While in using a ‘confirmation check’ the teacher offers the repair as his/her interpretation of the student’s utterance, thereby giving the student the opportunity to contribute by confirming or rejecting the offered interpretation. Compared with confirmation check, other-reformulation might be more a characteristic of classroom discourse in which the special role-relationship between the teacher and the students make didactic repair more acceptable than naturalistic discourse.

The discussion continues in the next section with a focus on the sub-categories of lexical-compensatory strategies.
4.3.2.2 Lexical-compensatory/concept identification strategies

The focus of the second set of micro-categories is on the students’ lexical gaps in comprehension. Recall that these categories consist of alternative means of expression, not interactive moves. They do often occur within interactive moves.

Circumlocution

Circumlocution was originally used to refer to ‘lengthy description’ of the target concept, that is, its dissection into constituent parts. Varadi (1983) and Bialystok (1983) made a distinction between circumlocution and description, but others (e.g. Tarone 1977; Færch & Kasper 1983b; Willems 1987; and Paribakht 1985) found it more useful to combine these two categories. In more recent studies, researchers have conflated description and categories of semantic contiguity/approximation (Laskin-Gasparo 1996; Jourdain 2000). The general approach in description and approximation is the same, since in both cases, the speaker gets round the target concept using substitutes in the form of a single word or expression or a lengthy description. The same cognitive process is assumed to underlie both of these strategies. Description and approximation are considered to be the realisations of the ‘analytic’ and ‘holistic’ underlying processes respectively, both variants of the ‘conceptual’ macro-category in the Nijmegen group system (Kellerman & Bialystok 1997; Kellerman, Bongaerts and Poulisse1987; Poulisse 1990). I use circumlocution as an umbrella term to include both ‘lengthy descriptions’ that I call ‘paraphrases’ and instances of lexical substitution or ‘approximations’.

A. Paraphrase

I use ‘paraphrase’ as a cover term instead of ‘description’ to make certain finer distinctions in the latter category. ‘Paraphrase’ can realise in two different forms; ‘description’, and ‘contextualised description’. The latter has emerged from the data collected for the present study. It seems that this category has a pedagogic orientation, and primarily used in instructional contexts, where the concept identification process needs to be facilitated.

a) Description

Description refers to the process of describing the characteristics or elements of the object or action using words known to the speaker and the hearer/s. The description may either substitute the appropriate word normally associated with that concept or complement it to clarify its meaning. Descriptions have many of the qualities of dictionary-like definitions abstracting the term from its...
context of use to give it a generic meaning. In the following example, the underlined lines are instances of description.

**Example 4.21 [T 4 I.2]**

T:
537 no, heroin dealer
538 dealer...heroin is the drug
539 we have drug dealers

S:
540 the kind of drug

T:
541 no, the dealer is the person who sells, that sells the stuff
542 he sells the stuff
543 he's a dealer, a drug dealer
544 and you use this in other businesses too
545 like he is a car dealer
546 a used car dealer
547 somebody who buys and sells used cars
548 number: four
549 am I right?

Ss:
550 /yes/

*b) Contextualised description*

In contrast with description, a contextualised description reflects the teacher’s attempts to make connections between the generic meaning of a lexical item and its context of use by predicating it linguistically to a known agent for example him/herself, the addressee, or an unknown hypothetical agent. The underlined lines in the following example include a contextualised description.

**Example 4.22 [T 1 I.1]**

T:
333 careful
334 no, it’s precocious
335 it means if you have(.) ah, a lot to say for yourself
336 it’s the opposite of shy(.) ok?
337 If you are precocious it means that you have a lot of ideas
338 and you want to tell people your ideas
339 you make a lot of noise
340 you are very lively
341 quite cheeky(.) sometimes
342 he was a very precocious child
343 a lot of American children are precocious

The following example shows how the teacher extends the contextualisation of the target concept beyond a simple definition to include subsidiary information included as part of the script of a
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scene in which the target concept plays a constitutive role. These extended contextualised
descriptions provide a more concrete context for the target concept, and as a result are more likely
to be recovered by the students through visualisation of the described scene.

Example 4.23 [UJ L2]

T:
532 yeah, hospitable
533 it looks like hospital but it’s got a few more word-letters, hospitable.
534 if somebody is hospitable they- they invite you to their house and give
535 are good to guests
S:
536 hospitable

T:
537 hospitable, yeah
538 people who will be very good to guests and invite people and
539 yeah, you go to their house and they say oh! come in and have a meal
540 sit down
541 do you want to stay? Err

B. Approximation

‘Approximation’ refers to the process of exploiting links between related lexical items by
substituting the target concept with a related one. The links can be made in four different directions
often referred to as ‘synonymy’, ‘antonymy’, ‘metonymy’, and ‘hyponymy/hypernymy’. Obviously,
synonymy and antonymy refer to the substitution of synonyms and antonyms for the target item. By
using a hyponym, one uses a less inclusive term denoting a subcategory of a more general class.
Hypernymy refers to the use of superordinate terms denoting higher more general categories. A
metonym is a related word, which shares enough semantic features in common with the target item
to be recoverable by the audience. The related word may differ from the target word in terms of
generality/specificity, formality/informality, or part-whole relationship. The following excerpts
contain examples showing antonym (example 4.24), synonymy (example 4.25), and metonymy
(example 4.26).

Example 4.24 [T 1 L1]

T:
333 careful
334 no, it’s precocious
335 it means if you have (.) ah, a lot to say for yourself
336 it’s the opposite of shy (.) ok?
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Example 4.25 [T 5 L3]
S:
844 souvenirs
T:
845 souvenirs
846 yes presents
847 and what other things you think are prohibited by law?

Example 4.26 [T 1 L1]
S2:
99 March is a month
T:
100 March is the month with capital ‘m’ but not with the small ‘m’
S2:
101 walk together
T:
102 yeah (.) a march
103 in politics, if I don’t like something. ok?
104 I say that everybody is equal, OK?
105 I don’t like racism
106 so, if I go on march it means that a lot people together walk (.) right?
107 and hold placards (.) ok?
108 ah a march is a demonstration (.) demonstration

The terminological diversity between the two major varieties of English, that is British and American, is often manipulated as a source of cross-referencing to help students’ concept identification through the links made between corresponding terms taken from British and American English. As these lexical variations are used synonymously by second language learners and teachers, especially in foreign language contexts, we can include them among the subcategories of lexical substitution or approximation. In the following example, the teacher links ‘preacher’ as the target word to ‘vicar’ as its correspondent British variation, perhaps because the overseas students studying here in the UK might know the word.

Example 4.27 [T 1 L1]
T:
35 yeah (.) yeah, it’s like a- what we call. I suppose. we call them a vicar over here
36 you know there were the dark collars and there were the white collars, ok?
37 but a preacher is an American religious man
38 err (.) so it was a Christian preacher, right?
39 ah in America
40 is he still alive?
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2. Language transfer

‘Language transfer’, referred to as ‘borrowing’ (Tarone 1981), or ‘interlingual transfer’ (Faerch & Kasper 1980), is an L1-based strategy (Bialystok & Frolich 1980). When learners face lexical gaps in production, they might combine features from the interlanguage and L1. ‘Interlingual transfer’ has different varieties ranging from borrowing with zero modification (‘language switch’) to combination of features at the phonological or morphological level (foreignizing) and lexical level (literal translation). In the present study, ‘language transfer’ refers to teachers’ shifts to L1 for communicative/pedagogic reasons.

Code switching

When the teacher and students share the same L1, it is likely that they switch to their L1 in special cases for communicative/pedagogic purposes. The following example includes instances of code-switching by both the teacher and the students.

Example 4.28 [T 4 L3]

S: 465 most of people carry a tin of cheese with lavash (a kind of Iranian bread) and rice and
466 oh! yes, don’t forget lavash and cheese
467 that’s a must
Ss: 468 huh huh huh
T: 469 if you’re travelling abroad don’t forget lavash and cheese!
S: 470 barbari! (a kind of Iranian bread)
T: 471 barbari too!
Ss: 472 huh huh huh

Obviously, the reason for code-switching in the above excerpt is lexical void. ‘barbari’ and ‘lavash’ as cultural items could not be translated into English. However, pragmatically speaking, both the teacher and the students use code-switching as a source of humour by dissociating themselves from the group of people who take large quantities of bread and cheese on long journeys abroad to save money not paying for their meals. Code switching in this sense is a contextualisation cue used by the speaker to help the listener infer the intended meaning. In Wagner and Firth’s terms (1997: 333) the interlocutors ‘negotiate both meaning and identities’ by adopting code switching as a CS.
3. Non-linguistic strategies

I use the term ‘non-linguistic strategies’ in its traditional sense of drawing on alternative mediums of expression such as mimetic gestures as well as making references to external sources of information such as mono- and bilingual dictionaries.

a) Mime

‘Mime’ comprises mimetic gestures and sound imitation to clarify meaning. It can either replace the verbal output or accompany it. Sometimes teachers adopt this strategy to add a dramatic effect to the description of the target concept. Although, in instructional settings, teachers can use other visual sources such as pictures to complement or substitute the linguistic sources, only mime has been identified in the database of the present study. The following example includes an instance of miming used by the teacher to help the students identify the concept of ‘flick knife’.

Example 4.29 [T 1 L3]

S: 697 knives are not allowed?
T: 698 knife is not ok
699 do you know what sort of a knife is!
700 (mime the action) you know what sort of a knife is!
701 if you click and the blade comes (sound of clicking)
SS:
702 huh
S: 703 you are stabbing huh
T:
704 no I’m not stabbing huh
705 this type of knife you must not bring in to the UK
706 it’s called a flick knife and if I have if this the knife(.) ok!
707 But this is not sharp this is not the sharp bit as a knife and I go press the button and (clicking sound) and the sharp knife comes out

b) Appeal to authority

‘Appeal to authority’ as a non-linguistic strategy refers to cases where the teacher decides to let students refer to a bilingual/monolingual dictionary. This strategy also applies to cases where the teacher himself/herself looks up a word to check some aspects of its meaning about which he/she feels uncertain. Examples 4.30 and 4.31 illustrate the former and the latter strategies respectively.

Example 4.30 [T 1 L1]

S1: 378 very careful
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T:
379 no, the opposite
380 quite the opposite
381 well, I'll let you have a look for precocious
382 what was the other thing?
383 top of the class

Example 4.31 [T 4 L3]
S: 1105 please spell alibi
T: 1106 I think it is with one here
1107 let me check (The teacher checks the word in his digital dictionary)
1108 yeah, I said they might come by with all kinds of alibi to refuse accepting it
1109 yes I'm right
1110 alibi means an excuse, all right?
1111 a strong excuse
1112 a very good excuse, alibi

Example 4.31 suggests that the student’s question about the word ‘alibi’, used by the teacher in the preceding turn, raised doubts in the teacher’s mind, which made him look it up in his digital dictionary.

Having described the subcategories of lexical-compensatory strategies, I will now focus on their context of use and their relationship with meaning negotiation strategies. Examination of their context of use indicates that they are basically used in two different contexts. First, lexical-compensatory strategies are used in a set of interrelated exchanges which form a pedagogic sequence in which the focus is on establishing word-meaning relationships. They reflect a temporary shift to form since the teacher and the students are involved in a discussion about language constituents; in this case vocabulary items. The pedagogic sequences are inserted in the flow of discourse when lexical gaps are realised in one way or another or when the teacher suspects that certain lexical items might cause problems in students’ comprehension. In the following example, a pedagogic sequence follows the students’ signal of non-understanding in line 326 caused by the teacher’s use of the word ‘posh’ in the preceding turn.

Example 4.32 [UJ L2]
S: 317 but, I must wear something nice to Disc
318 it’s the rule
T: 319 well, it’s not the rule
S: 320 yes
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T: 321 because it is difficult to say what is nice and what is not nice, isn’t it?
322 so, I want to look good and must wear something nice.
323 so, that would be because I want to look good
324 but men have to wear shirt and tie to go into a posh restaurant
325 that’s the rule
Ss:
326 /posh restaurant/?
T:
327 it’s like a smart restaurant or expensive
S:
328 oh, expensive
T:
329 yeah, often- sometimes I do say
S:
330 high class
T:
331 yes, or they think they are, but
Ss:
332 huh huh huh
T:
333 yeah, if they say you might have to wear a shirt and tie
334 or sometimes in a night-club or restaurant they say no jeans or no trainers
335 so, none of you could go maybe

As the above example shows, the flow of discourse comes to a halt when a lexical gap is indicated. The concept identification process, which follows, spans over several exchanges to help the students recover the concept before they return to the original line of discourse.

The second context, in which lexical-compensatory strategies are used, is characterised by an absence of the marked focus on lexical compensation. They are embedded in utterances which constitute exchanges whose primary focus is not on word-meaning relationship. In this context, they seem to be instrumental in achieving the purposes for which the utterances are used rather than interfering with them by shifting the focus of discourse temporarily on form. Examination of the data shows that three of the sub-categories of lexical-compensatory strategies, that is, ‘approximation’, code switching’ and ‘mime’ can be used in this context. Example 4.28 which was introduced earlier can be referred to again as an illustration of ‘code switching’ embedded in non-pedagogic discourse moves.

Below is a further example illustrating mime as an embedded strategy. Here, the teacher is trying to explain a grammatical concept. Focusing on the sentence in line 116, she explains why it is suggested that too much stuff should not be put in the backpack. She prefers to mime the way a
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backpacker with a heavy backpack might walk instead of using a term like ‘staggering’ which might cause comprehension problems with the consequence of distracting the students’ attention from the grammatical concept.

Example 4.33 [UJ L1]
T:
112 no. so, you would like a sort of talk like this
113 too heavy so you can have to say I think we shouldn’t
114 or I don’t think we should, yeah
115 so, I don’t think we should put too much in our backpacks because you’re about to carry it all
116 have you ever carried a very very heavy backpack?
117 and you feel like walking like this (miming the action)
118 and if you sit down you can’t get up again
119 a sort of like a turtle on its back

The following is another example in point. It shows approximation as an embedded strategy.

Example 4.34 [T 4 L3]
S: 680 cash!
T: 681 you can say cash, money
682 cash is a good one
683 what else?
684 In box one!
S: 986 insurance documents

In the first context, where lexical-compensatory strategies are used in pedagogic sequences, the meaning of lexical items is often co-constructed by both the teacher and the students. Similar to any other interactive situation, the co-construction of meaning is facilitated by teacher’s use of meaning negotiation strategies. The following example shows how meaning negotiation strategies provide the interactive framework through which lexical gaps are dealt with through the use of lexical-compensatory strategies by both the teacher and the students. The focus of this episode is on a specific lexical item brought up by one of the students.

Example 4.35 [T 1 L1]
S4: 166 assassinate Luther King
T: 167 yeah
168 what does assassinate mean?
S: 169 to kill
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T:
170 to kill
171 a little bit more than that
S1:
172 execute without( ) without
S4:
173 [by expert
T:
174 ah( ) yeah( ) it’s killing by an expert usually for a political reason
175 so, if you like it’s a political killing
176 so, we say that Martin Luther King was assassinated, ok?
177 but we don’t say he was killed
178 because we believe that it was for a political reason that he was killed
179 it’s a political murder( ) right?

The teacher’s use of a clarification request in line 168, the other-repetition and clue in lines 170 and 171, and further the reformulation of the student’s responses in line 172 provide an interactive framework through which the meaning of the lexical item is negotiated. The process of concept identification through negotiation implies that the students and the teacher both opt for lexical-compensatory strategies. For example, the student’s approximation in line 169 and the jointly constructed description by two other students in lines 172 and 173 provide the basis for a more extended contextualised description by the teacher in lines 174-179.

Using meaning negotiation strategies, teachers take a facilitatory role in their interaction with students. In other words, they opt for these strategies to simplify input, which might be too far ahead of the students’ current level of interlanguage. When the input focus is on a specific lexical item as is the case with example 4.35, meaning negotiation strategies are used as means to build the concept description on elicited bits of information from the students. The end result is concept modification or substitution, basically achieved through lexical-compensatory strategies.

Based on our discussion so far, we can conclude that the teachers’ arsenal of CSs include both sets of strategies described in this section. They are used in an integrative manner to deal with different sorts of communication problems. When the focus is on teaching vocabulary, meaning negotiation strategies provide an interactive framework through which concepts are clarified by the use of lexical-compensatory strategies. In interactions aimed at achieving other purposes, again both types of strategies are employed; however, here the lexical-compensatory strategies are no longer the focus of the interactive exchanges. They are basically employed as means to facilitate comprehension as a prerequisite to the achievement of the specific focus of the exchanges.
4.4 The functions of CSs in classroom interaction

Having defined and illustrated the categories of analysis, we now focus on their specific communicative and pedagogic functions in classroom discourse. In terms of communication, the overall purposes for which CSs are used are characterised as macro-functions and the immediate purposes as micro-functions. The pedagogic function is thought to be involved in their use as double-level moves to communicate meaning and at the same time provide learning materials for the students. This section deals with these functions in turn.

'Problem-orientation' as a defining characteristic of CSs underlies the distinction made between the use of CSs as prospective and retrospective measures to avoid communication problems and deal with breakdowns when they occur. This distinction is generally recognised in talk between native speakers, native speakers and non-native speakers and learners. In the context of talk between native speakers, Schegloff and Sacks (1973:236) describe 'locatory' and 'reparatory' procedures. They mention confirmation checks and comprehension checks as locatory mechanism used to find the problems, and clarification requests as reparatory mechanism to repair problems which have already been located in the course of talk. Varonis and Gass (1985) make a similar distinction between potential and actual problems dealt with through non-understanding routines. In classroom discourse, potential threats to message communication are taken more seriously. There are at least three main reasons for this state of affairs: first, teacher talk is addressed to multiple recipients with different background knowledge and proficiency levels, which puts message communication at risk, and second, there are intra-personal and inter-personal constraints, which make it difficult for the students to signal non-understanding, third, due to their role as discourse managers, teachers take up more responsibility in making messages comprehensible to the students.

We have already referred to the prospective and retrospective use of lexical-compensatory strategies. The prospective use of this type of strategies was demonstrated to occur when the teachers introduced concepts for which the labels were perceived to be not available to the students and retrospective use when they used them to deal with lexical problems which had already occurred in interaction. The same distinction can also be made in the way meaning negotiation strategies have been used by the participant teachers. The use of certain meaning negotiation strategies such as self-reformulation, cues, comprehension checks, other-repetitions with low-key rising intonation and the code-oriented subcategories of confirmation checks and clarification requests can be interpreted as prospective since they serve either to avoid communication problems
or locate those which need to be repaired before interaction can proceed. In contrast, the use of other-reformulation and turn completion seem to be retrospective, since they serve the purpose of dealing with problems which have already realised in interaction.

The use of certain types of meaning negotiation strategies suggests that they serve the purpose of sustaining interaction until the interlocutors can agree on the topic or the level of explicitness of the expressed messages. The strategies used to serve this purpose, which can be classified as the third macro-function of CSs, are the information-oriented subcategories of clarification requests and confirmation checks and the topic-incorporation use of other-repetitions. Sustaining conversation, in the sense used in our classification of macro-functions, is different from the way it is defined in meaning negotiation studies. In meaning negotiation studies (see Varonis and Gass 1985b; Scarcella and Higa 1981), ‘conversational continuants’ are defined as devices used by the hearer to encourage or prompt the speaker to continue. In this sense, they are also characterised as ‘listening responses’ (Van Lier 1988), which are used to show approval, attention, and understanding. When listening responses are used by teachers, they are signs of approval and therefore function as prompts encouraging the students to continue. As such they do not play a role in meaning negotiation, and therefore they are not CSs.

The following example demonstrates how the teacher’s repetition of part of the student’s utterance contributes to the progression of interaction.

Example 4.36 [T 4 L3]

S:  
237 Germany too,  
238 when I was fourteen years old

T:  
239 [fourteen  
240 would you remember the trip?

The repetition of ‘fourteen’ is a reference back to the previous utterance to specify the key information bit relevant to the question which is going to follow. This provides a link which facilitates the progression of interaction. The repeated part can be said to play the role of an advance organiser increasing the expectability of the answer to the question. The following is another example showing the role of ‘other-repetition’, ‘clarification request’, and ‘confirmation check’ in sustaining conversation until a better understanding of the student’s intended meaning is achieved.
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Example 4.37 [UJ L3]
S: 676 think you should take some snack from your country
T: 677 take a snack!
S: 678 yes huh perhaps you can’t get used to the foreign foods.
T: 679 yeah maybe for a short visit, you’ve got to be realistic yeah. Because?
S: 680 I don’t know
T: 681 make you feel better?
S: 682 yes you feel better
683 and sometimes specially you carry some chocolate
684 it can give you some energy

The teacher’s repetition of part of the student’s utterance with low-key rising intonation (line 677), which indicates surprise, elicits a response from the student which clarifies the reason for her suggestion. Following a positive comment to the student’s clarification, the teacher again asks for more clarification (line 679). In response to the student’s expression of not knowing the reason, he suggests a possible reason (line 681), which is accepted by the student who then adds a reason of his own to it.

Based on our description of the functions of CSs in classroom discourse, we can conclude that CSs play a significant role in facilitating communication between the teacher and students. As language is both the object and medium of instruction in L2 classrooms, any effort to facilitate communication might contribute to the achievement of pedagogic goals and ultimately to learning.

The code-oriented sub-category of meaning negotiation strategies can realise as double-level moves contributing to mutual comprehension and at the same time providing learning material for the students. This reflects the communicative and instructional role of teacher talk which leads to different layers of meaning in classroom discourse. Breen and Candlin (1980) refer to these layers as ‘metacommunication’, ‘communication as learning’, and ‘communication about learning’. In the following example, at least three layers can be identified. The teacher and the student are talking about a series of pictures reflecting the content of a reading passage.

Example 4.38 [T 1 L1]
S4:
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At the surface layer, they are communicating to negotiate their understanding of the content of the reading passage, that is, communication-as-learning. The student offers his description of what is going on in the picture and the teacher accepts the way it is described. There is a second layer to this communication, which deals with the pedagogic aim of interaction. This aim can be summarised as the identification and description of the key concepts in the reading text. It seems that both the teacher and the student are aware of this goal. The student first identifies the key concept (segregation) and then tries to define it (lexical-compensatory strategy). In this layer, the teacher’s acceptance which is complemented with his repetition of the key concept provides feedback to the pedagogic aim of the exchange. There is still a further layer to this communication which deals with the student’s problem in finding the right word to express his intended meaning (line 204). In spite of the student’s success in getting across his message using an achievement strategy, the teacher not only offers the right word (drinking fountain) but he also describes its meaning. Had this exchange occurred outside the classroom, there would have been no need for the reformulation of the student’s utterance to substitute ‘water tap’ with ‘drinking fountain’. However, inside the classroom, where interaction is oriented toward pedagogic aims, even the student’s achievement strategy is interpreted as appeal for assistance.

In the following example, there are again two layers to the communication of meaning. In the surface layer, the student contributes to the on-going discussion and the teacher accepts the information provided as relevant to the topic by repeating it and providing positive evaluation. The second layer deals with a communication problem. The student’s utterance shows a lexical gap which is filled with circumlocution. In spite of the student’s success in communicating her message, the teacher substitutes the student’s circumlocution with the target expression (pay a fine). The teacher’s utterance performs a metacommunicative function acknowledging the student’s
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lexical problem and at the same time responding to that problem by modelling the target expression.

**Example 4.39 [T 1 L3]**

S5:  
1303 yeah you get a written card and you have to pay  
T:  
1304 oh you have to pay a fine ok right

The implication of the double-level nature of the teacher’s utterance in the above example is that CSs are tools in the teacher’s hand to deal with problems of talk consistent with the pedagogic orientation of the classroom context. CSs play a double role in classroom discourse. They contribute to meaning- ideational and interpersonal- communication, and at the same time to the communication of pedagogic messages.

As was demonstrated by the above examples, L2 classroom discourse interaction operates on a number of levels. The basic problem with categorisation is that we have to translate the utterances into only one action on one level. In the present study, I have tried to overcome this problem by doing a microanalysis whose procedures explained in chapter 3.

**4.5 Summary**

This chapter has laid out the data-based category system developed in the first stage of data analysis. The presentation started off with an overview of the system by introducing a distinction between the two major types of CSs referred to above as ‘lexical-compensatory’ and ‘meaning negotiation’ strategies. Within lexical-compensatory strategies, a distinction is made between two major sub-types, which make up the basic elements of the teacher’s explanation of the meaning of lexical items. To explain lexical meanings, the teachers either used substitute words or analysed the concepts to which the target words referred by naming their characteristic features in descriptive statements. The descriptive statements either characterised the concept out of context using abstract terms or forged concrete ties between the concept and its context of use. The use of an authoritative source such as a monolingual dictionary and mimetic gestures to complement word meaning descriptions were the other two strategies used by the teachers. A further sub-category of lexical-compensatory strategies is code switching, which was used to convey cultural items for which target language words were not available.
CHAPTER 4  CATEGORIES OF DATA ANALYSIS

Within meaning negotiation strategies, the sub-types introduced in this chapter are confirmation checks, clarification requests, comprehension checks, self/other reformulations, other-repetitions, turn completions, and cues. Due to their dual function in negotiation of meaning and content, clarification requests and confirmation checks are classified further down to code-oriented and information-oriented categories. In their code-oriented function, clarification requests and confirmation checks are used to avoid and/or resolve meaning ambiguities caused by disparities between form and meaning. While in their information-oriented function, they are used to resolve issues related to message content. Teachers used other-reformulation to do three different activities: A) providing alternatives for the forms used by the students to express their intended meanings, 2) summarising the gist of the students' utterances, or 1) putting their utterances in extended contexts. The description and illustration of the different categories and subcategories of CSs form the basis for the application of the system to the whole database in order to investigate the basic trends in the use of CSs by native and non-native speaker teachers in different institutions. The procedures followed in conducting the quantification process and its results constitute the main themes of the next chapter.
CHAPTER 5 QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter reports the results of a descriptive quantitative analysis of the data. The aim of the analysis is to give a macroscopic view of the data in terms of general and specific patterns of strategy use across teachers and institutions in which the data were collected. The results of the frequency counts abstracted from the data pave the way for a more detailed qualitative analysis oriented toward a contextualisation of the patterns of strategy use in the following chapter.

The quantitative analysis carried out in this chapter is informed by the following research questions:
1. What are the different types and frequencies of CSs adopted by language teachers in teacher-led phases of their lessons?
2. What are the major functions performed by these strategies in classroom discourse?
3. Is there any relationship between the teachers’ language background and their patterns of strategy use?
4. Is there any relationship between the institutions in which the teachers are performing their teaching duties and their patterns of strategy use?

The description of the database and the procedures followed in the quantitative analysis have already been reported in chapter 3. However, it is worth noting that the database constitutes 27 lessons taught by three NS teachers and six NNS teachers, three lessons each. The analysis of the data is limited to measures of descriptive statistics for the basic reason that inferential statistics is considered inappropriate due to the small sample size and the low frequency of strategies. The analysis deals with the overall frequency of CSs and the proportions of teacher talk across lessons and teachers in the first phase and with the patterns of distribution of CSs across teachers’ groupings based on their language background and the teaching institutions in the second phase.

Section 5.2 reports the overall level of strategy use and the proportions of teacher talk across lessons and teachers. Section 5.3 sums up the specific patterns of strategy use identified among groups of teachers, that is, NSs and NNSs, and the type of institutions. Section 5.4 summarises the results and draws up some conclusions.

5.2 Overall level of strategy use
In the first stage of analysis, the teachers are compared in terms of the total frequencies of CSs. The purpose is to give an overall picture of the use of CSs by all teachers irrespective of their
language background and teaching institutions. The results of this comparison are then complemented with the proportions of teacher talk to give an indication of the degree of homogeneity of the patterns of interaction among teachers. Table 5.1 shows the means and standard deviations of the total frequencies of CSs across the teachers and the three lessons.

Table 5.1: Comparison of frequency of all CSs across teachers and lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequencies calculated per 100 teacher's utterances

We first look at the mean and SD of the frequencies of CSs across teachers (the bottom rows). At least four observations can be made on the basis of these figures. First, the means show a similar level of strategy use across the three lessons. Second, they also indicate that the strategies constitute almost 20% of teacher talk in the database, that is one utterance in five. Third, with the SD of 3.4 versus 8.5 and 7.6, lesson 3 has generated the least amount of variation among teachers. This might be the result of the controlling factor of the use of the same task in this lesson by all teachers. Four, based on the teachers’ means and SDs across the three lessons (the two right-hand side columns), we can identify three levels of strategy use and two levels of variation. The teachers with high means are T1, T4, and T5, with middle means T2, T7, and T8, and finally with low means T3, T6, T9. With regard to the SDs, we can distinguish between T1, T3, T5, T7 with relatively high SDs, and T2, T4, T6, T8, T9 with low ones, indicating high and low levels of variations respectively.

As the CSs quantified in table 5.1 are a composite of two different types of strategies, that is meaning negotiation strategies and lexical-compensatory strategies and these two types may have different distributions, we next break down the CSs into these types to check the patterns of overall level of strategy use of each type in its own terms. Table 5.2 presents the frequencies of meaning negotiation strategies across teachers.

Looking at the means and standard deviations of the total standard frequencies across teachers (the bottom rows), we can see that the variation generated in lesson 3 is less than the other two
lessons (3.2 versus 5.8 and 5.9). Lesson 3 also shows a substantial increase in the mean frequency of strategies which could again be attributed to the impact of the task used in this lesson on the frequency of meaning negotiation strategies. The mean and standard deviations across the three lessons (the two right-hand side columns) suggest two levels of strategy use and again two levels of variation. The higher means go to T 1, T 2, T 4, T 5, T 8, the lower ones to T 3, T 6, T 7, and T9. A low level of variation across the three lessons can be inferred from the SDs of T 2, T 4, T 5, T 7, T 9, and a high level of variation from the SDs of T 1, T 3, T 6, and T 8. With teachers 8 and 1, the variation is mainly between one of the normal lessons and the other two. While with teach T 3 and T 6, the difference lies between the normal lessons and lesson 3.

Table 5.2: Comparison of frequencies of meaning negotiation strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breaking down the data in table 5.2 into the three groups in table 5.3, we can identify more clearly the patterns presented with regard to the teachers who have behaved differently in terms of consistency across the three lessons.

Table 5.3: comparison of frequencies of meaning negotiation strategies across groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>17.15</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In group 1, the high level of variation of strategy use is due to the low frequency of strategies used by T3 in lesson 2 (6.5 versus 19.8 and 14.7) and the high frequency of strategies used by T1 in lesson 1 (22.5, 14.3, 11.4). In group 2, the higher SDs in lessons 1 and 2 (9.0, 6.4) are due to the low frequency of strategies used by T6 in both lessons. In contrast, the higher SD in lesson 2 of group 3 is mainly the result of the higher frequency of strategies used by T8 compared with the other two teachers.

Shifting to lexical-compensatory strategies in table 5.4, we now look at the means and standard deviations of the proportions of lexical-compensation strategies used in individual lessons across teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that the overall level of strategy use is much smaller in lesson 3 compared with lessons 1 and 2. (1.8 versus 3.3 and 5.2). This result seems to demonstrate the negative impact of lesson 3 on the use of lexical-compensatory strategies. The standard deviations show that although the task in lesson 3 has reduced the overall level of strategy use, it has produced more homogeneity among teachers (SDs of 0.9 versus 3.6 and 3.2).

Looking at the means across the lessons in the penultimate right-hand side column, we can see that the highest means go to T1, T5, T7, T9 and the lowest to T2, T3, T4, T6, T8. From the SDs across the lessons (the last right-hand side column), we can infer that T1, T5, T7, and T9 show the highest variation (SDs of 3.0, 3.7, 5.3, 4.1). This seems to be the result of the higher frequency of strategies used in one lesson compared with the other two. The standard deviations of the rest of the teachers are much more balanced (0.5-2.3). Across teachers, the means of the
three lessons show that again teachers 1, 3, 6, and 8 have behaved differently from their colleagues in the same group.

To further explore the differences between the teachers, the information presented in table 5.4 was broken down into groups. Table 5.5 reports the information across the three groups.

**Table 5.5: Distribution of lexical-compensatory strategies across groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the means of group 1 across the three lessons (the penultimate column), the teachers' overall level of strategy use shows little similarity. T1's mean is very high while T3's mean is very low. In group 2, T6's level of strategy use looks different from the other two teachers. The overall level of strategy use by this teacher is lower than his colleagues across the three lessons. In group 3, it is T8 whose low overall level of strategy use makes him different from his colleagues in the same group. If we compare the teachers' behaviour in their groups with regard to meaning negotiation strategies (figure 5.3) and lexical-compensatory strategies (figure 5.5), we can see that in both cases teachers 1, 3, 6, and 8 have behaved differently from their colleagues in the same group.

Comparing teachers in relation to their level of strategy use and their consistency across the three lessons, the information presented in tables 5.1, 5.2, and 5.4 is reproduced in table 5.6. Using this information, we can group teachers into 3 levels of strategy users. The high level users are those who have used one or both types of strategies with high frequencies. This is reflected by the frequencies of each type of strategies in tables 5.2 and 5.4 and the merged
frequencies in Table 5.1. The medium users have used one type of strategies with high frequencies. The merged frequencies for this group is medium. The low level users, who have low merged frequencies, have used one or both types of strategies with very low frequencies.

**Table 5.6:** Teachers' level of strategy use across the three lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Table 5.1</th>
<th>Table 5.2</th>
<th>Table 5.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T4</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T6</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T9</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interlocutors' patterns of the use of CSs as tools to facilitate communication are influenced by their patterns of interaction. Teacher Talking Time is often taken as an indication of the asymmetrical role-relationship between the teacher and students, which underlies IRF as the basic pattern of classroom interaction. To investigate this measure, TTT was calculated in terms of the proportion of utterances produced by the teachers in the teacher-led phases of their lessons. The group and pair work periods have not been included in this measurement. The results are reported in Table 5.7.

**Table 5.7:** Comparison of distribution of percentages of teacher talk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Lesson L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mean    | 72%       | 74%| 71%| 5.1  | 8.7  | 5.3  |

The mean of teacher talk across teachers (the bottom rows) shows that the utterances produced by the teachers constitute slightly more than two thirds of the total utterances (72%, 74%, 71%). This is consistent with the IRF pattern of interaction as described below. Out of the three moves in the IRF pattern (Initiation, Response, and Feedback/Follow up), two moves are produced by the teacher. If this pattern were used, it would not be surprising that the teachers have produced
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more than 66% of the total utterances. This is the case in 25 out of the 27 lessons. The standard deviation figures indicate a fairly homogenous pattern of interaction across teachers. The slight variation might be due to the modification of the interaction pattern by certain factors which might be dependent on individual style or the type of teaching learning activities which constitute a specific lesson. For example, the students’ self-initiated exchanges or contributions from a number of students to the same teacher’s initiation move breaks the closed IRF cycle and as a result increases the students’ share of discourse. Depending on the teaching learning activity, the teacher might use the initiation move to explain or instruct for quite long periods of time before he or she initiates interaction with the students. This inevitably increases the teacher’s proportion of utterances.

5.3 Patterns of strategy use
In the second stage of the analysis, the results of the frequency counts conducted on the transcripts of the lessons taught by group 1 were compared with those of groups 2 and 3. The purpose was to find out the similarities and differences of patterns of strategy use between native speaker teachers (group 1) with non-native speaker teachers (groups 2 and 3). To do the comparison, the mean relative frequency and percentage of individual strategies in each set (meaning negotiation and lexical compensatory strategies) across the three lessons was calculated for each individual teacher. The mean relative frequency and percentage of each individual teacher was then made the basis for the calculation of the mean of the relative frequency and percentage of strategies across the three teachers in each group.

Table 5.8 and its associated graph (figure 5.1) show the distribution of meaning negotiation strategies in terms of the mean of relative frequencies and their percentages across the three groups.

**Table 5.8: Frequencies of meaning negotiation strategies across the three groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 1,2,3</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M. N. Strategies</strong></td>
<td><strong>SF</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>SF</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLR REQ</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON CHK</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM CHK</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLF REF</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REF</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REP</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T C</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUE</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequencies calculated per 100 teacher's utterances
Percentages expressed as a proportion of the total frequency of strategies
Figure 5.1: Comparison of the frequency of meaning negotiation strategies across groups

Before the presentation of the results, it should be pointed out that although the standard frequencies of strategies, that is the frequency of strategies in 100 teachers' utterances, appear to be low; the extensive size of the database (27 lessons) means that the patterns reported in this chapter are based on a high number of occurrences of strategies. In average, teacher talk in each lesson varied between 300 to 1200 utterances. With an average total standard frequency of 16, the teachers used almost 2700 meaning negotiation strategies, 300 each. Based on these figures, we can estimate that in average teachers used 100 meaning negotiation strategies in each lesson.

The first and most salient result of the comparison of the three groups is the close resemblance of the percentages of the categories of meaning negotiation strategies. That is, the various meaning negotiation strategies have been used with similar proportions across the three groups. Other-reformulation and other-repetition with 36% to 43% (average 39%) are the most frequent categories in teacher talk across the three groups. The next categories in descending order are clarification request and confirmation check with 29% to 31% (average 30%). The third are self-reformulation and comprehension check with 21% to 25% (average 23%). The least frequent categories are turn completion and cue with 6% to 10% (average 8%).

The first pair of strategies, other-reformulation and other-repetition, is the teacher's modifications of the students' responses. They perform a retrospective repairing function and also serve as conversational continuants to establish and develop the topic in the process of cooperative construction of meaning in which the teacher plays the leading role. The second pair, clarification request and confirmation check, is more cooperative in nature, since in providing or modifying information, more responsibility is given to the students. The students are also given the role of the primary knower in confirming or rejecting the modifications offered by the teacher. The third pair, self-reformulation and comprehension check, has a truly preventive role since they are used by the teacher to simplify his/her own utterances and check
the students’ understanding. The last pair, turn completion and cue, reflects the teacher’s efforts to help out in the process of searching for or completing a response by the students.

Redistributing the categories in terms of the degree of responsibility which goes either to the teacher or the students in avoiding or dealing with communication problems, the results show an overall distribution of responsibility in favour of the teacher. In using self- and other-repetition/reformulation, comprehension checks, turn completions and cues, which constitute 70% of the total number of meaning negotiation strategies, it is the teacher who simplifies the input to avoid problems, helps out in the production of utterances and finally repairs or confirms the students’ utterances. Clarification requests and confirmation checks which reflect the students’ active role in the problem-management process constitute 30% of the total frequency of strategies. Although this figure suggests a diminished role for the students in managing problems, their role in establishing mutual understanding and maintaining conversation by opting for compensatory strategies is significant.

Within the patterns described above across the three groups, there are, however, substantial differences between the groups of teachers in terms of the total standard frequencies of strategies. The difference is most in evidence in the totals represented in table 5.8 between group 3 and the other two groups (13.2 versus 18.7 and 16.6). As the data represented in table 5.8 and the graph in figure 5.1 show, group 3’s standard frequencies of meaning negotiation strategies are lower than for the other two groups in all types of strategies except the two categories of comprehension check (1.0 versus 0.5 and 0.4) and turn completion (0.7 versus 0.5 and 0.3). The very small differences between the standard frequencies of groups 1 and 2 is due to group 2’s relatively higher frequencies of other-repetition (4.8 versus 3.6), other-reformulation (3.2 versus 2.6), confirmation checks (2.2 versus 1.8), and cues (1.0 versus 0.6).

We now briefly consider the breakdown of these figures in more detail in table 5.9. Here we consider whether the strategies are used to focus on information or code for clarification requests and confirmation checks and in terms of repair and restructuring for other-reformulation. A comparison of the percentages of these subcategories demonstrates differences between groups 3 and groups 1 and 2 on the one hand and between groups 1 and 2 on the other. All three groups have used code-oriented clarification requests more than the information-oriented variants; however, the proportions of the former are relatively higher with regard to groups 3 compared with groups 1 and 2 (80% versus 67% and 58%). On this analysis, group 3 is more oriented towards code. Looking at sub-categories of confirmation checks, we can see that the proportion of information-oriented subcategories is higher than code-oriented ones in groups 1 and 2; while the reverse in group 3. In other words, in comparison with groups 1 and 2,
group 3 teachers have opted for more code-oriented than information-oriented confirmation checks (66%, 39%, 28%).

Table 5.9: Frequencies of the subcategories of meaning negotiation strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lesson 1, 2, 3</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. N. Strategies</td>
<td>ST. F.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>ST. F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLR REQ</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLR REQ (INF)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLR REQ (COD)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON CHK</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON CHK (INF)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON CHK (COD)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REF</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REF (REP)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REF (RES)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the figures related to both clarification requests and confirmation checks show, across the three groups, code-orientation is stronger with regard to group 3 than group 1 and 2, with group 2 teachers being roughly in between. The same pattern can be detected with the subcategories of other reformulation. The repair function of other reformulation is relatively higher in groups 3 than groups 1, with group 2 being in between but closer to group 1 (63% versus 39% and 48%). The results suggest that NNS teachers in group 3 and to a lesser extent group 2 have opted for meaning-negotiation strategies to resolve code-related meaning ambiguities more than the NS teachers in group 1.

To investigate the impact of the use of the same task by all teachers on their variance, a similar analysis was conducted on lesson three, in which a specially-designed task was used by all teachers (table 5.10). The intention was that this would offset the diversity of teaching materials and activities as a possible source of variation in strategy use.

Table 5.10: Frequencies of meaning negotiation strategies in lesson 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. N. Strategies</td>
<td>ST. F.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>ST. F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLR REQ</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON CHK</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM CHK</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLF REF</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REF</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REP</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T C</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUE</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Underlining signals an increase in the underlined figure when it is compared with the corresponding figure in table 5.8.
The underlined figures in table 5.10 are all higher than the corresponding figures in table 5.8. As the underlined figures cover the majority of the categories in groups 1 and 3 and slightly less than half of them in group 2, and as these figures have contributed to the means in table 5.8, we can reasonably conclude that the task used in lessons 3 has had the effect of increasing the use of meaning negotiation strategies by the teachers. However, in spite of the increase in the level of strategy use, the distribution of strategies has not changed; nor has the aggregate percentage of other-repetition, other-reformulation, comprehension check, self-reformulation, turn completion, and cue versus the aggregate percentage of clarification request and confirmation check (70% versus 30%), which reflect the higher degree of responsibility taken up by the teacher in resolving communication problems. This result indicates that the effect of the task on the level of strategy use (19.8 versus 16.6) has not had any significant influence on the patterns of their distribution identified across the three lessons.

We now consider the distribution of the subcategories for these figures in table 5.11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. N. Strategies</td>
<td>ST. F.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>ST. F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLR REQ</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLR REQ (INF)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLR REQ (COD)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON CHK</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON CHK (INF)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON CHK (COD)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REF</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REF (REP)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REF (RFM)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of the distribution of the percentages of strategies across the three lessons presented in table 5.9 and their distribution in lesson 3 (table 5.11) shows that the proportions of information-oriented clarification requests have slightly increased, but the patterns of their distribution across the three groups has remained unchanged (45%, 42%, 21% versus 43%, 33%, 20% in table 5.9). The same pattern of slight overall increase in the information-oriented type (except for group 1) can also be observed in relation to confirmation checks (69%, 64%, 47% versus 71%, 61%, 34% in table 5.9). This pattern has also repeated itself in relation to the restructuring type of other-reformulations (61%, 54%, 39% versus 61%, 52%, 37% in table 5.9). In spite of the similar rank order across groups, the gap between groups 1 and 2 in relation to the information-oriented subcategory of clarification requests and confirmation checks and the restructuring subcategory of other-reformulation reported above has decreased (3% versus 10%; 5% versus 10%; 7% versus 9% respectively). These results suggest that the task used in
lesson 3 has had very little impact on the functions performed by meaning negotiation strategies and their overall patterns of use. However, it has reduced the variation among teachers and reduced the gap between groups 1 and 2. Overall, these figures confirm more strongly the observation made earlier about the tendency of group 2 to resemble group 1, and that of group 3 to remain distinct.

Now, we turn to examine the lexical-compensatory strategies first across the three lessons and then for lesson 3. The summary data of the lexical-compensatory strategies across the three lessons are reported in table 5.12 and its associated graph in figure 5.2.

Table 5.12: Comparison of frequencies of lexical-compensatory strategies across groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L-C Strategies</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON DES</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR (EMB)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD SWT</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIM</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APL AUT</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.2: Comparison of frequencies of lexical-compensatory strategies across groups

As can be seen from the total standard frequencies in table 5.12, altogether groups 2 and 3 have used lexical-compensatory strategies more frequently than group 1 (4.6, 4.6 versus 3.6).

Comparison of the percentages of individual strategies across the three groups demonstrates that the most frequent strategies are description and contextualised descriptions (group 1: 39%, 26%; group 2: 54%, 12%; group 3: 46%, 11%). The aggregate figure for these two categories are 65%, 66%, 57% respectively. The second in terms of frequency in the rank order are approximation and embedded approximation (group 1: 16%, 13%; group 2: 25%, 3%; group 3: 27%, 13%). The aggregate figures are 29%, 28%, 40% respectively. The remaining three
categories, that is, code switching, mime, and appeal to authority constitute 2% to 6% of the total proportions. These figures indicate that description and approximation were the major tools used by the teachers for lexical compensation. The most notable across-group differences are: first, the higher frequency of approximations used by group 3 compared with groups 1 and 2 (40% versus 29% and 28%), and second, the higher frequency of contextualised descriptions used by group 1 compared with groups 2 and 3 (26% versus 12% and 11%).

Groups 1 and 2 evidence similarity in the total proportions of the description and approximation categories (group 1: 65%, 29% versus group 2: 66%, 28%); however, the balance of the proportions of the two variants of these two categories differs between the two groups. The proportions of contextualised description and embedded approximation used by group 2 are much smaller than those used by group 1 (group 2: 12% and 3% versus group 1: 26% and 13%). The above-mentioned similarities and differences are also reflected by the standard frequency of lexical-compensatory strategies depicted in figure 5.12. That is, the total frequency of the lexical-compensatory strategies used by the NNS teachers is higher. Further, they have used more approximations and less contextualised descriptions than the NS teachers.

To study the effects of the different teaching materials and activities, a similar analysis was performed on lesson 3 as for the meaning negotiation strategies. Table 5.13 shows the distribution of the standard frequencies and proportions of lexical-compensatory strategies in lesson 3. As can be seen from the results, in lesson 3, group 1 have used more lexical-compensatory strategies than groups 2 and 3 (2.3 versus 1.4 and 1.6). However as in table 5.12, more than 90% of the total proportion goes to description/contextualised description and approximation/embedded approximation. Of the total of 90%, more than 60% goes to description and contextualised description.

### Table 5.13: Distribution of lexical-compensatory strategies across groups in lesson 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L-C strategies</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON DES</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR (EMB)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD SWT</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIM</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APL AUT</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results suggest that teachers relied more on description and contextualised description than approximation and embedded approximation in dealing with lexical problems not only in lesson
3 but also across the three lessons. Overall, the proportions of individual categories have been influenced by the type of task used in lesson 3. However, the patterns of strategy distribution have remained unchanged.

In contrast, the inconsistent use of the categories of code switching, mime, and appeal for assistance across the three groups suggests that these categories are more sensitive to context variables. The inconsistency is more evidently observed in group 3 where mime has not been used in lesson 3 and code switching and appeal to authority across all three lessons. Obviously, the use of the category of code switching is also limited to non-native speakers in groups 2 and 3. Comparison of the percentages of mime and code switching in lesson 3 with the same percentages across the three lessons depicted in table 5.12 shows an increase in the proportion of mime across groups 1 and 2 (9%, 7%, versus 3%, 1%) and an increase in the proportion of code switching in group 2 (7% versus 4%). This result might indicate the effects of the teaching activities on the frequency of these categories.

5.4 Summary
This chapter has been concerned with the frequency distribution of categories of CSs in the data as a whole and in relation to different groupings of teachers based on their language background and teaching institutions. The aim has been twofold: first to find out how frequently and with what patterns of distribution the different types of CSs have been used by the teachers, and second to find out whether the frequency and patterns of distribution of CSs have been influenced by the teachers’ language background and the curricular arrangements of the teaching institutions. A further associated purpose was to explore the question of whether the standardisation of the lessons across teachers would help to reveal the distinctive patterns across the groups of teachers, and to help reflect on the impact of the task used for this purpose on the use of CSs. The assumption was that the task would provide a similar context across the different teachers, which would in effect make the differences between them more transparent. Accordingly, two main quantitative analyses have been undertaken. The first analysis was based on the comparison of the individual teacher’s total standard frequencies across the three lessons to find out the variation of the level of strategy use across teachers and lessons. The second analysis was based on the groups’ mean standard frequencies and the percentages of strategies first across the three lessons and then in lesson 3. In these analyses, inferential statistics have not been used because of the low frequencies and small number of participants.

The results reveal that both major types of CSs have been used by all teachers with broadly similar patterns of distribution. The distribution of meaning negotiation strategies lends itself to a new categorisation based on the functions performed by this type of strategies. The first
category which encompasses the set of meaning negotiation strategies constituting 70% of the total frequency reflects the teachers’ propensity to adapt the discourse to the students’ needs. They comprise the retrospective measures (other reformulation/repetition), the prospective measures (self-reformulation and comprehension check) and the measures taken to help out the students in their production of utterances (turn completion and cue). By adopting this group of strategies, teachers take up more responsibility by avoiding problems, repairing problems which have already occurred, and helping out the students in their production. They are also used to repeat or restructure the students’ utterances in an effort to establish the topics on which they can agree and use as the basis for sustaining conversation. The teachers’ self-adaptation is consistent with their roles as instructors and discourse managers. This is also in line with the findings of research on NS-NNS interaction in non-instructional settings, which also shows that the interlocutor with the higher level of proficiency often takes up more responsibility in managing the interaction (see Bremer et al. 1996).

Comparing the patterns of distribution of meaning negotiation strategies across the three lessons with their distribution in lesson 3 evidenced a very slight change. The impact of the task on the teachers’ strategy use was found to be on the overall level of strategy use which showed an increase in lesson 3. This result suggests that the teachers responded to the task demands by stepping up their level of strategy use but they did not change their overall strategic decisions, which involved taking up more responsibility in managing communication problems and confer this responsibility on the students in limited cases, where they thought they were ready to modify their utterances to make them more comprehensible. This imbalance in the division of the interaction labour in teacher-fronted interaction raises the issue of teacher-student role relationship and the pedagogic orientation of classroom discourse. We will pick up these issues in the discussion chapter.

As for the impact of the standardisation of the lessons across teachers on the use of CSs, the results showed that the use of the task in lesson 3 decreased the variations across teachers. The SD of lesson 3 was much smaller than SDs of lessons 1 and 2 in relation to both types of strategies (meaning negotiation strategies: 3.2 versus 5.9 and 5.8, lexical-compensatory strategies: 0.9 versus 3.6 and 3.2). It also had a significant effect on the overall level of strategy use which realised as an increase in the total frequency of meaning negotiation strategies and a decrease in the total frequency of lexical-compensatory strategies. In relation to the effect of the task on group differences, the results showed that the task decreased the gap between groups 1 and 2. It slightly increased the total frequency of the strategies used by group 3 but it did not have a significant effect on the difference between this group and the other two groups. We can argue that the task in lesson 3 has served to bring out the tendency of group 2 to resemble group
1 more closely and the tendency of group 3 to remain distinct. The possible reasons for this tendency will be discussed in chapter 7.

The frequency of clarification requests and confirmation checks broken down into their functions in solving problems related to code and/or content revealed that the code-oriented function was more frequent in relation to the former and less frequent in relation to the latter. The code-oriented function was the result of merging the two separate functions of using the categories of clarification requests and confirmation checks to deal with hearing and understanding problems, and to elicit repair from the students. In relation to clarification requests, it also included the function of seeking lexical-meaning clarifications. The repair function constituted a tiny percent of the frequency. Based on this observation, we can conclude that the teachers used these two categories mostly to elicit content clarification and to deal with problems of hearing and understanding. Additionally, clarification requests were also used to elicit lexical meaning clarification. This expected result can be accounted for by considering the definition of CSs which limit the repair function to cases where formal errors disrupt meaning communication. Even in these cases using other-reformulation is more economical; however, the teachers' decision to use these two categories for repair purposes might have been based on their assessment of the context and the ability of the students themselves to repair their utterances. We will return to the issue of the relationship between CSs and repair in the discussion chapter.

With regard to lexical-compensatory strategies, the results showed that circumlocution (description, approximation, contextualised description, embedded approximation) was consistently used by all teachers in more than 90% of the cases where a lexical-compensatory strategy was required. The description types of this strategy were used more frequently than the approximation types. The categories of mime, appeal to authority and code switching were very few in the data and were used by some teachers in one or two lessons. The inconsistency in the use of these strategies and the almost exclusive use of circumlocution by the teachers open up the question of style and the pedagogic utility of the teachers' use of lexical-compensatory strategies in classroom interaction. We will discuss these issues in chapter 7.

Comparing teachers in terms of their overall level of strategy use, the data revealed a considerable amount of variation across teachers in the same group. The most notable sources of variation were T 3 (group 1), T 6 (group 2), and T 8 (group 3). In groups 2 and 3, where the teachers carried out their duties under homogenous curricular arrangements in terms of teaching materials and teaching activities, the different behaviour of teachers 6 and 8 in terms of overall level of strategy use can be attributed to their personal style in interaction with the students.
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However, in group 1, the different level of strategy use by T3 might partly be related to the different focus of his normal lessons compared with those of teachers 2 and 1. The focus of the normal lessons taught by T3 was on grammar. While, in their normal lessons, teachers 2 and 1 were focusing on reading/writing and listening/speaking respectively. Overall the difference might have partly been generated by the teachers’ adaptation to the different needs of the students. The issue of the impact of the different focuses of the activities is dealt with in chapter 6.

As to the impact of language background on the patterns of strategy use, the analysis revealed very few differences between the native speaker and non-native speaker teachers. The differences were limited to a preference among native speaker teachers first for the information-oriented clarification requests and confirmation checks and the restructuring function of other-reformulations, and second for the contextualised description as a variant of the circumlocution strategy. This first difference may not very easily be attributed to language background, since there are indications of the possible influence of other variables on the frequency of this function of clarification requests and confirmation checks. As for the second difference, although the native speakers’ proficiency might have been responsible for the tendency for more experimentation with the language, there is the possibility of the effect of the teaching activities on the function of CSs. We will return to these issues in the discussion chapter.

With regard to the curricular arrangement of the teaching institutions, as explained in chapter 3, institution B (group 3) was to a large extent different from institution A (group 2) and the institutions where the native speakers were teaching (group 1). The institutions of groups 2 and 1 had more in common, since the teachers in these institutions adhered to the core principles of the communicative approach which provided more space for the interaction between the teacher and the students. The results revealed a substantial difference in terms of the level of strategy use and the frequency of the different functions of strategies between group 3 and the other two groups, which evidenced minor differences. The results showed that the teachers in group 3 had relied more on the code-oriented functions of clarification requests and confirmation checks and also more on the repair function of other-reformulation than its restructuring function. They had also relied more on approximation than description in their use of lexical-compensatory strategies. Their overall level of strategy use was also much smaller than groups 1 and 2. These differences open up the question of teaching style and contextual factors. These issues will also be picked up in the discussion chapter.

To sum up, the results of this stage of analysis revealed consistency in the patterns of distribution of both types of strategies across groups. This result, which suggests that the
patterns of strategy use may not be dependent on contextual factors such as language background or teaching institutions, provides some empirical evidence for the validity of the category system developed and used in this study. However, the intra- and inter-group differences in the level of strategy use and certain functions of CSs raises questions about the possible influence of the contextual factors referred to above on the teachers' use of CSs. These questions can not be answered convincingly without examining the transcripts of the lessons focusing on the micro level of interaction. The microanalysis of the transcripts of a selected number of lessons is the subject of chapter 6.
CHAPTER 6 MICROANALYSIS

6.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the microanalysis done on one section of the third lesson taught by three participant teachers. The analysis is guided by the following research questions and informed by the theoretical background discussed in chapter two.

1. Is there any relationship between the type and frequency of CSs used by language teachers and the focus of talk in terms of the participants' orientation toward topic and activity?
2. Is there any relationship between the different phases of a lesson and the type and frequency of CSs?

Consistent with the methodological framework developed in chapter three, the analysis will focus on three different but interrelated aspects of classroom discourse in order to characterise the pedagogical focus of each phase of the lesson. Two measures which have traditionally been used to characterise the quality and quantity of the teacher and student talk are used to give an overall picture of the type of interaction in the analysed lessons. These measures are first, the proportions of teachers' question types, and the frequency distribution of the teacher's and students' utterances in the different phases of the lesson. The purpose of this aspect of the analysis is to examine the balance of the focus on form and meaning as reflected by the types of questions and their impact on the ratio of teacher-student talk. The second measure is the indexes of teacher control and student participation, using a procedure which combines teacher's control of turn-taking and topic and activity initiation and change with the students' participation in terms of self-selection and initiation of exchanges and sequences to introduce new topics or change the current ones. The analysis of these two aspects of the teacher-student interaction, as complementary measures, informs the second part of the analysis which takes the form of case studies.

The case studies start with the reproduction of information presented earlier in the overview analysis to highlight each teacher's overall picture as the basis upon which the analysis of the third measure is developed. This measure deals again with the balance of the focus of talk on meaning and form at the local level of exchanges through certain discourse devices, which are thought to characterise the teacher’s orientation toward ‘activity’ or ‘topic’. The report of the frequency distribution is illustrated with examples from the lessons to portray how the teacher’s dual orientation is realised in interaction.
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The final stage of the analysis is a report of the frequency distribution of CSs over the steps and phases of the lesson. The purpose is to see whether there is a relationship, first between the local and overall focus of the talk on form/meaning and the use of CSs, and second between the phases of the lessons and focus of the talk on the one hand and the use of CSs on the other. The analysis of the frequency distribution of CSs excludes lexical-compensatory strategies since the frequency of this type was so low that the emergence of a meaningful pattern seemed less likely. The frequency of the meaning negotiation strategies, however, was higher and offered a more promising outlook for the purposes of the microanalysis. In all stages of the analysis, the quantification of the various measures described above involves descriptive statistics due to the small sample size, which rules out the use of inferential statistics.

The three participant teachers, one native and two non-natives, whose transcripts of the third lessons are subjected to microanalysis, come from three different teaching institutions. The selection of one case from each teaching setting was due to practical reasons. It was not logistically possible to include all participant teachers in the microanalysis. The decision to select the third teaching session for microanalysis was taken on the grounds that all teachers did the same lesson in this session to make it comparable. The grammar practice task used in this session consisted of two different activities with the same teaching points. As the two thematically related activities were complete teaching units in discourse and pedagogic terms, the analysis was limited to the first activity.

6.2 Overview of the talk of the three teachers

This section provides an overview of the talk of the three teachers. Section 6.2.1 reports the overall distribution of talk between the teacher and the students in the whole lesson followed by a breakdown of the distribution over the phases and steps of the lesson in section 6.2.2. Section 6.2.3 is a report of the frequency distribution of the teachers' question types.

6.2.1 Overall distribution of the talk of the three teachers

The length of the lesson in terms of the total number of utterances and proportions gives an indication of the amount of interaction the task generated in each class and the level of students' contributions to the interaction. This information is reported in table 6.1. As the figures show, the level of interaction generated in T 4's and T 3's classes is substantially higher than in T 7's class. The proportions of students' contributions to the lesson taught by teacher 3 and 4 are similar in
spite of the difference in the length of the lessons. The big gap is between T 7 and the other two teachers both in the length of the lessons and the students' contributions.

**Table 6.1: Overall distribution of teacher’s and students’ utterances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T 3</th>
<th>T 4</th>
<th>T 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s utterances</td>
<td>(626)</td>
<td>(913)</td>
<td>(370)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ utterances</td>
<td>(256)</td>
<td>(435)</td>
<td>(80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(882)</td>
<td>(1348)</td>
<td>(450)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6.2.2 Phases and steps of the lesson**

The teachers organised the segments of the lesson in two phases based on the steps outlined in the task materials (see appendixes 5 and 6). Each phase involved two episodes of teacher-led talk separated by pair work periods organised to give the students an opportunity to work on the task in privacy before they reported the results to the whole class. The phases of the lessons are distinguished by the different nature of the activities the students were involved in during the pair work periods, which shaped to some extent the orientation of the teacher-led episodes. Over the first period, the students were supposed to rank a number of items in order of importance using the four meaning categories as a reference point and think about the reasons behind their choices. Over the second period they were asked to reformulate the sentences they had been using in the first part, using the target structures explained by the teacher. Therefore, by its design, the task pushed the participants to orient toward topic in the first phase and toward activity in the second phase of the lesson. Each phase of the lesson consists of two episodes of talk referred to as ‘setting up’ and ‘summing up’. Table 6.2 displays the teacher’s and students’ share of utterances in the two phases of the lesson.

**Table 6.2: Proportions of teachers’ utterances in different phases of lesson segments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T 3</th>
<th>T 4</th>
<th>T 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting up 1</td>
<td>(82)</td>
<td>(293)</td>
<td>(141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summing up 1</td>
<td>(437)</td>
<td>(324)</td>
<td>(91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up 2</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>(173)</td>
<td>(95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summing up 2</td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>(161)</td>
<td>(43)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of the proportions of teacher talk over the lesson phases indicates that the proportion of talk produced by the teachers over the setting up episodes of phase 1 and phase 2 was more than in the summing up episodes. The exception is teacher 4 whose proportions over the first phase evidence no difference between the setting up and summing up episodes (66% versus 65%). It also
shows that the proportion of talk produced by teacher 3 and teacher 4 over the second phase was significantly higher than that of the first phase. The question arises whether the higher proportions of teacher talk over the setting up episodes and over both episodes of the second phase of the lesson reflect the different patterns of interaction in which teachers and students were involved. The reasons behind the lack of difference between teacher 4’s proportions over setting up 1 and summing up 1 and between teacher 7’s proportions over both episodes of phase 1 and phase 2 will be explored later in the sections dealing with the profiles of individual teachers.

The overview analysis proceeds in the next section with a focus on the teachers’ questions and measures of students’ and teachers’ participation in classroom discourse.

6.2.3 Types of questions of the three teachers

In this section, referential and open-ended questions are compared with display and closed questions respectively (for definitions and examples of the types of questions see chapter 3). The purpose is to undertake an initial comparison of the question types across the three teachers, as a first impression of the quality of talk. All questions raised by teachers in the lesson segments were identified and coded first as referential or display, and subsequently as either open-ended or closed. The questions were coded for the third time as either content- or form-oriented. The frequencies and percentages of the type of questions are displayed in table 6.3. Comparing the proportions of referential and content-oriented on the one hand and the proportion of display and form-oriented questions on the other, we can conclude that the referential/display distinction reliably predict the orientation of the questions toward form or meaning. The small differences between the figures (Teachers 3 and 7) can be accounted for by the observation that though all referential questions are content-based, very few content-based questions are of the display type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T 3</th>
<th>T 4</th>
<th>T 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referential/Display</td>
<td>44%, 56%</td>
<td>82%, 18%</td>
<td>2%, 98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content/form</td>
<td>46%, 54%</td>
<td>82%, 18%</td>
<td>5%, 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open/Closed</td>
<td>14%, 86%</td>
<td>12%, 88%</td>
<td>0%, 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 It is to be admitted that, in identifying and coding the question types, the researcher had to deal with the two conceptual problems highlighted by Banbrook and Skehan (1989), that is the problem of what constitutes a question and how to assign a question to display and referential categories. The strategy adopted in this study was the close examination of the discourse context in which questions had been used by the teachers in the process of their identification and assignment to different categories.
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The open/closed distinction does not seem to be connected to either of the two measures across these three teachers; perhaps because it controls the quantity of the response and not its content. The teachers are consistently distinguished along the lines of the referential/display and content-and form-oriented distinctions. Teacher 4’s and teacher 7’s questioning behaviour is quite the opposite. While teacher 4’s majority of questions were referential and content-oriented; display and form-oriented questions constituted the majority of questions asked by teacher 7. Teacher 4’s questions are almost equally distributed showing little difference between the percentage of referential and content-oriented questions on the one hand and the display and form-oriented questions on the other. On the other hand, all three teachers asked for more closed than open questions. Comparing the relationship between the open/closed categories and the other two pairs across the three teachers, we can observe a strong positive correlation in relation to teacher 7, a strong negative correlation in relation to teacher 4, and an absence of correlation in relation to teacher 3. This picture suggests that although teachers may differ quite substantially in terms of the proportions of referential and display or content- and form-oriented questions, they appear to have in common the tendency to use more closed questions than open ones. This might account for the close correspondence between the proportions of teacher talk especially between teachers 3 and 4 in spite of their different proportions of display and referential questions.

6.2.4 Students’ level of participation

In this section, the analysis aims at measuring the students’ level of participation to complement what we have already found out through the analysis of the types of questions and the distribution of the teacher and student talk. The findings of this aspect of discourse will give indications of the level of active participation as compared with contributions in response to the teacher’s allocated turns. As explained in chapter 3 section 3.5.6.3.2, the level of student participation was determined in terms of the following four qualities of turn criteria: self-selection, turn prospectiveness, topic-initiation, and sequence initiation and termination. The teacher’s and students’ turns were examined based on these criteria and coded accordingly. Utterances were given codings based on the number of criteria they satisfied. The procedure used in counting the codings and calculating the participation level and index of participation were presented in chapter 3 section 3.5.6.3.2. The procedure is replicated below.

1. The coded turns were counted and added up for the teacher and students to produce the ‘Total Coded Turns’ (‘TCT’ in the table columns 1 and 2).
CHAPTER 6 MICROANALYSIS

2. The percentages of the teacher’s and students’ coded turns were calculated (‘% of TCT’ in the table columns 3 and 4).

3. The total number of codings was calculated and added up for the teacher and the students to produce the ‘Total Number of Codings’ (TNC in the table columns 5 and 6).

4. The total number of codings was divided by the total number of coded turns to yield the ‘Participation Level’ (‘PL’ in the table columns 7 and 8).

5. The participation level was squared and multiplied by the percentage of turns. The resultant figure is the ‘Participation Index’ showing the level of the teacher’s or students’ participation (‘PI’ in the table columns 9 and 10).

The results of the quantification process are shown in table 6.4. The question is to what extent the students’ contributions, which have already been reported in the form of the frequency and proportion of utterances, are the result of their active participation through volunteered responses and topic initiation and change.

| Table 6.4: Comparison of level of participation among teachers and students |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------|----------|----------------|--------|----------------|
| TCT % of TCT | TNC | PL | PI |
| Teacher 3 | 149 | 101 | 59 | 41 | 380 | 137 | 2.55 | 1.35 | 364 | 74.7 |
| Teacher 4 | 182 | 221 | 45 | 55 | 478 | 379 | 2.62 | 1.71 | 308.9 | 160.8 |
| Teacher 7 | 79 | 47 | 63 | 37 | 205 | 71 | 2.59 | 0.85 | 422.7 | 34.7 |

As was expected, the teachers’ level of participation is generally much higher than the students’; however, the difference varies greatly across teachers. For example, if we look at the last two columns we can see that the participation index of teacher 4 is twice as much as that of the students; while for teachers 3 and 7 the participation indexes are five and twelve times higher respectively. This suggests that teacher 7 may have exercised the highest level of control and teacher 4 the lowest. Teacher 3 takes a middle position with regard to index of participation. By implication, the rank of students’ figures is the reverse, suggesting an inverse correlation between the level of control exercised by the teacher and the extent of the students’ initiative. According to these measures, the students taught by teacher 4 show the highest levels of initiative as compared with students taught by teacher 3 and teacher 7, who occupy the second and third rank order positions.
If we compare the indexes of participation of the students in T3 and T4 classes with their proportions of utterances reported in table 6.1 (29% versus 32%) we can conclude from table 6.4 that although the students in these two classes had similar levels of contributions their active participation defined in terms of their volunteered responses and attempts to initiate or change topics differed. Students in teacher 4's class initiated more exchanges than the teacher himself (221 versus 182). Volunteered responses to teacher's initiations are normally lower than the total number of turns initiated by the teacher. In this case where the total number of coded turns initiated by the students exceeds that of the teacher, the implication is that students initiated sequences through introducing new topics or new exchanges introducing sub-topics. The number of four-coding and three-coding turns (turns which included utterances initiating exchanges and sequences respectively) was checked to validate the expectation. The figures were 13 and 24 respectively showing that 13 new sequences and 24 dependent exchanges introducing sub-topics were initiated by the students. The corresponding figures were 0 and 2 for the students taught by teacher 3. The same figures were true for teacher 7.

The results of the first phase of analysis reported so far give us a rough picture of the overall quality of the talk in different phases of the lesson in relation to the three participant teachers. This provides a basis upon which the profiles of individual teachers will be developed and presented in the next section. The case profiles are intended to provide a more detailed account of the local and overall focus of talk. This is then used as a context for the analyses of the patterns of CSs of the teachers. Then, in what follows, we study each of the three teachers.

6.3 Case study reports

In the previous section, the analysis focused on the types of questions asked by the teachers over the course of task execution and the teachers' and students' indexes of participation as gross measures of the focus of talk on meaning or form. The presentation of the profile of the individual cases in this section makes use of the indexes of orientation toward activity or topic. These are used as potentially more refined measures of the local and overall focus of talk. The question is whether the orientation of discourse toward the instructional and/or conversational interaction creates different contexts for fluency and/or accuracy practise. The purpose is to study the impact of the local and overall focus of talk or the type of discourse in different phases of the lesson on the teacher's use of CSs.
As explained in chapter 3 (section 3.5.6.3.3), various discourse devices are used by teachers to orient themselves to formal and procedural aspects of talk (activity) or to the content of talk (topic). The discourse devices were classified into two different sets according to their contribution to activity or topic orientation (see chapter 3 section 3.6.6.3.2). These devices are listed below:

**Activity**
- (A1) invocation of rules (initiation/feedback)
- (A2) procedural statements and meta-talk (initiation)
- (A3) routines (initiation)
- (A4) turn allocation by the teacher (initiation)
- (A5) unique response rule (feedback)
- (A6) evaluative feedback

**Topic**
- (T1) student-addressed responses (response)
- (T2) building the topic at hand together with the students (initiation)
- (T3) message-oriented or natural feedback
- (T4) treating students' responses as contributions to the topic (feedback)
- (T5) conversational repair (feedback)
- (T6) including clarification of the students' intentions and negotiation of meaning (initiation)

The above discourse devices are applied in the analysis that follows teacher by teacher in order to explore the extent to which each teacher uses an instructional or conversational type of interaction.

To provide a profile for each participant teacher, we start with the reproduced information from the overview analysis followed by the presentation of the distribution of the activity and topic orientation devices over the lesson phases and steps illustrated with examples from the lessons. These specifications form the background against which the patterns of distribution of meaning negotiation strategies are investigated.

### 6.3.1 Teacher 3

Comparing the teachers' proportions of referential and display questions reported in table 6.3, we observed a well balanced mixture of these measures in relation to teacher 3. This information is reproduced in table 6.5.

The figures indicate a close relationship between content orientation and referential questions on the one hand and form orientation and display questions on the other. The even distribution of T3's question types was also reflected in the student-teacher indexes of participation reported in table 6.4. The ratio of 1 to 5 (74.7 versus 364) for this teacher was higher than T7 (1 to 12) but lower than T4 (1 to 2). Remembering the observation that teachers 4 and 7 were extreme cases in
relation to the use of referential and display questions, the middle position of T 3 in relation to both measures confirms the relationship between the frequency of referential questions and of the students' participation.

Table 6.5: Type of questions asked by teacher 3 (lesson 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of question</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
<th>Type of question</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referential</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>Display</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content-oriented</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>Form-oriented</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we have already explained, there is likely to be a relationship between the type of questions and the students' level of contributions to interaction. We explored this relationship by comparing the proportions of referential and display questions (table 6.3) with the proportions of students' utterances (table 6.1). To examine how the students' contributions to the interaction were distributed over the lesson phases and steps, we broke down the information reported in table 6.1 to lesson phases and steps in table 6.2. This information in relation to T 3 is reproduced in table 6.6.

Table 6.6: Percentages of utterances produced by the teacher and the students (Teacher 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher's Utterances</th>
<th>Students' Utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting up 1</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summing up 1</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up 2</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summing up 2</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures in table 6.6 show a higher proportion of teacher talk in the setting up steps compared with the summing up steps (77%, 98% versus 67%, 79% respectively). This pattern may be due to the different proportions of the question types and in effect the different focuses of talk and the shift of the orientation of discourse between instruction and conversation over the lesson phases and steps.

To explore further the local focus of the talk on form/meaning, we now turn to T 3's use of discourse devices to orient toward activity or topic over the different phases of the lesson. The results of the analysis are reported in table 6.7. To start with, we focus on phase 1 (setting up 1 &
summing up 1) compared with phase 2 (setting up 2 and summing up 2). The total frequency and percentage of activity (A) and topic (T) orientation devices show that, in phase 1, the participants oriented toward both activity and topic (10:14/59:94) though topic orientation was clearly more frequent than activity orientation here and throughout the first phase; while in phase 2 they almost exclusively oriented toward activity (6:0/31:4).

Table 6.7: Distribution of T 3’s discourse devices in lesson phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting up 1</th>
<th>Summing up 1</th>
<th>Setting up 2</th>
<th>Summing up 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 1</td>
<td>T1 0</td>
<td>A1 3</td>
<td>T1 6</td>
<td>A1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 8</td>
<td>T2 7</td>
<td>A2 4</td>
<td>T2 14</td>
<td>A2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 0</td>
<td>T3 3</td>
<td>A3 9</td>
<td>T3 39</td>
<td>A3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 1</td>
<td>T4 3</td>
<td>A4 23</td>
<td>T4 10</td>
<td>A4 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 0</td>
<td>T5 1</td>
<td>A5 13</td>
<td>T5 10</td>
<td>A5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 0</td>
<td>T6 0</td>
<td>A6 7</td>
<td>T6 15</td>
<td>A6 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T) 10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(%)12.19</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>21.51</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percentages are calculated as a proportion of the teacher’s total utterances

The results suggest that the talk in the second phase was basically instructional and focused on activity; while in the first phase a mixture of conversational and instructional talk was used. In spite of the different frequencies of the orientations over the two phases of the lesson, the small difference between their total frequencies (106 versus 112 at the foot of the right hand columns) reflects the results of the analysis done on types of questions and participation indexes, which showed T 3’s well balanced proportions of question types and his middle position in relation to participation indexes in comparison with the other two teachers. Overall, that is, T 3 seems to show a balance between the two. But this is the result of quite distinct patterns in the different phases.

To examine how the orientation toward activity and topic was achieved in turn-by-turn interaction between the teacher and the students, we now present illustrative examples from different steps of the lesson taught by T 3. Turning to activity orientation in the setting up steps of phases 1 and 2 (columns 1, 2 and 5, 6), the most frequent interaction device used in both phases is ‘procedural statement or meta-talk’ (A2). This is consistent with the goals of the interaction in this step, which is mainly ‘medium-oriented’ dealing with formal and procedural aspects of talk.
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The following example from the second phase shows the use of this device in focusing attention on activity.

Example 6.1 [T 3 L3]

S:  828 we use must to show something is required by law
T:  829 right so an official or may say an external obligation on you often by law [A2]
     830 ok! let’s go on to the second group
     831 T! have you got an example of something you must not or cannot! [A2]

The first coded utterance (line 829) is an example of meta-talk explaining the meaning of ‘must’ as a modal auxiliary. The second one (line 831) is a procedural statement, focusing attention on another category of meaning linked to ‘must’ or ‘cannot’.

Shifting to topic orientation devices in the same steps (table 6.7 columns 2 and 6), we can see that a number of topic orientation devices were used in setting up 1 but not in setting up 2. Scrutiny of the lesson transcript suggests that this was due to some instances of interactive concept clarification when the teacher and students dealt with some unfamiliar vocabulary items over setting up 1. T2 (building the topic at hand with the students) may reflect the teacher’s willingness to involve the students in concept clarification. T3 (message-oriented or natural feedback) and T4 (treating students’ responses as contributions to the topic) are used by the teacher in response to the students’ contributions to concept clarification. The following example shows the use of two of the above devices by this teacher.

Example 6.2 [T 3 L3]

T:  56 what’s a surfboard? [T2]
S:  57 equipment for surfing
T:  58 ah it could- yeah equipment the err not a tool [T3]
     59 I think we would say equipment
     60 a piece of equipment
     61 what is it exactly?
     62 how do you describe it? [T2]

As is evidenced by the above example, topic-orientation devices used in setting up 1 basically occurred in the context of medium-oriented talk, where the meaning of unfamiliar vocabulary items was interactively negotiated. So in setting up 1 and 2, we find that teacher 3 oriented the talk toward activity to explain what the students were supposed to do in the pair work periods following
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the setting up steps. Topic orientation was absent in setting up 2, and in setting up 1 it had the role of facilitating the students’ involvement in concept clarification.

We now turn to the summing up steps of the two phases. Starting first with summing up 1, we can see that in contrast with setting up 1, where some activity and topic orientation devices were not used at all (A3, A5, A6, T1, T6), in summing up 1, all the different types of devices from both sets were used. The most frequent devices on the activity side are A4 ‘turn allocation by the teacher’ (23) and A5 ‘the unique response rule’ (13). The following example shows three of the activity orientation devices used in this step.

Example 6.3 [T 3 L3]

T:
  205 D! !! Did you have anything in this category? [A4]
S:
  206 fresh fruit
T:
  207 so what would we say? [A5]
  208 You! Can you express it? [A4]
S:
  209 err
T:
  210 can you express it you! [A4]
S:
  211 yes (.) you m- you must not take fresh fruit into the UK
T:
  212 good you must not take fresh fruit [A6]

In summing up 1, the most frequent device on the topic side is T3 (message-oriented or natural feedback) (39). T1, T2, T4, T5, and T6 were also used with high frequencies ranging from 6 to 15. The frequencies suggest that teacher 3 used the initiation move to involve the students in classroom discussions (T2), and to ask clarification of their intention and to negotiate meaning (T6). The frequency of the topic-orientation devices which functioned as feedback also suggests that the teacher employed them to focus attention on meaning in an effort to sustain conversation (T3, T4, and T5). The total number of the topic-oriented feedback types adds up to 59 (T3, T4, T5). If we compare this figure with the low frequency figure for the evaluative feedback used in this step (A6 = 7), we can conclude that the feedback provided by the teacher was much more oriented toward message than the form of the students’ utterances. The following example contains some of the topic orientation devices discussed before.

181
Example 6.4 [T3L3]
S:
657 you should take an electric dictionary.
T:
658 electric dictionary! [T5]
S:
659 electronic
T:
660 electronic I think it is
S:
661 electronic
T:
662 electronic, it’s got a chip [++]
663 electric means it just works with electricity just like me
Ss:
664 huh
T:
665 but electronic means got a memory which I don’t have
Ss:
666 huh
T:
667 *why?
668 *why should you take an electronic dictionary?
670 Not just a dictionary
S:
671 it’s light
T:
672 true lighter than the book good point [T3]

Conversational repair (T5) fits message-oriented talk in the above example. The repair being accomplished, the teacher asks for intention clarification (lines 667-669) and then provides natural feedback to the student’s response (line 672). Based on the frequency distribution of the topic and activity orientation devices; we can conclude that, in summing up 1, the orientation toward topic was predominant. This suggests that the teacher and students were mostly involved in message communication, though in other parts of the transcription their interaction was interspersed with occasional shifts to focus on form to provide opportunities for accuracy practice.

Turing to the second step of the second phase (summing up 2), we can see that the major difference of this step with summing up 1 is that all topic orientation devices are absent except T3 while the figure of activity orientation devices remains high. The most frequently used activity orientation devices are A4 (turn allocation) (14) and A6 (evaluative feedback) (10). The other two devices,
used with lower frequencies, are A1 (5) and A2 (3). The following example illustrates the use of A4 and A6 in the second phase.

**Example 6.5 [T 3 L3]**

T:
   836 err E have you got a negative here? [A4]
S:
   837 you must not bring pirated copies to the UK because
T:
   838 [good [A6]
S:
   839 because it is not allowed by the law
T:
   840 very good because it is not allowed by the law yes. [A6]
   841 And you must not
   842 Has anyone used you cannot in the same situation
   843 G! have you got you cannot? [A4]
   844 Just for practice

The teacher’s references to form (lines 836, 841, 842, 843), his turn allocations (lines 836, 843), and evaluative feedback (838, 840) all contribute to the focus of talk which is on form in this example.

As the frequency of activity orientation devices suggests, the above example is typical of the focus of this talk in the second phase. In very few instances, the focus temporarily shifts to content. It may be the nature of the activity which makes form the legitimate focus of talk. The students were supposed to write grammatically correct sentences to show their understanding of the form meaning relationships discussed and to some extent practised in the first phase of the lesson. In this phase, the teacher then nominated individual students to recite their sentences, which were then evaluated in accuracy terms.

The first phase was different. There, the teacher and the students oriented themselves to topic while they were involved in a discussion over the classification of the suggested items and the students’ reasons for putting the items in different meaning categories based on their perception of their degree of necessity. It is true that they also oriented themselves toward activity when they focused on form-meaning relationships. However, the shift to ‘medium-oriented’ talk was transitory providing short bursts of accuracy practice in the midst of ‘message-oriented’ talk. Overall then, the analysis suggests that teacher 3’s talk contributed to the construction of contexts for both fluency and accuracy practice in the first phase and for accuracy practice in the second phase.
We now turn to consider the teacher's use of CSs against this background. As CSs are defined in functional terms as devices used to enhance communication and to prevent or repair breakdowns in communication, the question is whether there is a relationship between the degree of focus on meaning and the type and frequency of CSs. Logically, the type and frequency may differ in different phases of the lesson, since the aims of interaction in each phase may demand a different degree of focus on form or meaning. To study this question, we look at the patterns of CSs in each phase of the lesson to see whether they match this reasoning. The type and frequency of CSs adopted by teacher 3 in different phases of the lesson are depicted in table 6.8.

Table 6.8: Meaning negotiation strategies adopted by T 3 in different phases of lesson 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Setting up 1</th>
<th>Summing up 1</th>
<th>Setting up 2</th>
<th>Summing up 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLR REQ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON CHK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM CHK</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLF REF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per 100</td>
<td>21.95</td>
<td>24.25</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, the frequency of CSs used in the first phase is almost twice as much as in the second phase (21-24 per 100 utterances compared with 8-11 per 100 utterances). Remembering the patterns of distribution of topic and activity orientation over the two phases of the lesson in table 6.7 and the analysis of examples from the data which showed that in the first phase the focus was on both accuracy and fluency but in the second phase only on accuracy, it may not be difficult to make a relationship between the focus of talk and the use of CSs. The very small number of strategies used in phase 2 compared with phase 1 (4, 9 versus 18, 106) shows that the orientation
toward activity, which is characterized with a focus on accuracy practice is associated with a
decreased frequency of CSs. It is interesting to note that the majority of strategies are used in
summing up 1 (106), which constituted the bulk of the lesson. Although this result reflects the
length of this step, it also confirms the results of the previous analysis, which showed that the
opportunities for fluency practice were provided most frequently in this step. This conclusion is
also supported by the distribution of CSs in this step which includes all types of CSs.

Though CSs are used with similar frequencies in the two steps of each phase, their distribution
differs. Scrutiny of the data suggests that, in setting up 1, the code-oriented clarification requests
were used to elicit meaning clarification of unfamiliar lexical items from the students. In this
context they were used to avoid communication breakdowns. Along with clarification requests,
comprehension checks and self-reformulations were also used, which again played a prospective
role in avoiding communication breakdowns. This is basically in line with the aims of the
interaction which can be described as sharing information with the students.

The types of CSs used in the second step in phase 1 evidence more variation covering all categories
compared with only five categories used in phase 1. Clarification requests and confirmation checks
were basically used in meaning negotiation and clarification of students’ intentions. Other-
reformulations, turn completions and cues provided help for the students, when it was needed in
production. Comprehension checks were also used to avoid communication breakdown. The
composition of strategies reflects the interaction aim which was exchanging information as well as
sharing information with the students. In contrast, the type of CSs used in the second phase shows
no element of extended meaning negotiation. The CSs used in the second step were prospective
measures like comprehension checks and self-reformulations used to avoid breakdowns in
communication, and retrospective measures like other-reformulations and cueing to assist students’
formulation of their intended meanings.

This analysis suggests that the frequency and composition of strategies used in different phases of
lesson 3 is related to the patterns identified through microanalysis. The lower frequency of strategic
moves in the second phase and their small range, possibly because of the absence of meaning
negotiation is what we might expect to happen in instructional talk when focus is on form. In
contrast, their higher frequency and variation in the first phase, which led to more extended
functions, especially in relation to negotiation of meaning, justifies the conclusion made before that
this phase included a balanced mixture of focus on meaning and form.
To summarize, the analysis reveals a balanced distribution of the referential and display questions which was accompanied with a moderate level of student's participation in comparison with that of the students in T 4's and T 7's classes. This result suggests an even distribution of focus on form and meaning. However, the examination of the topic and activity discourse devices demonstrated that the focus of the talk varied over the two phases of the lesson. In phase 1, it was the message-oriented talk which was predominant. The shift of focus to form in this phase was temporary giving the impression that it played the role of a reminder to the participants to use the opportunities for accuracy practice. The distribution of CSs over the lesson phases was shown to be consistent with the overall picture drawn by the microanalysis of the local and overall focus of the talk. The overall frequency of CSs used over the first phase was significantly higher than their frequency over the second phase. Further, the extended distribution of the different functions of CSs over the first phase was in sharp contrast with the almost exclusive prospective function over the second phase.

6.3.2 Teacher 4

As we have seen in table 6.3 and also with reference to the information reproduced in table 6.9, in comparison with the other two teachers, the balance of the percentages of the referential and display questions asked by teacher 4 is more heavily tilted toward a referential focus. The teacher's more frequent use of referential questions mirrors his orientation toward content rather than form displayed by percentages of content-oriented versus form-oriented questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.9: Type of questions asked by teacher 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content-oriented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As was shown in relation to T3, with a higher percentage of referential questions we expect a higher level of participation from the students. This expectation was confirmed by the teacher's and students' participation indexes (308.9 versus 160.8), which showed that the level of student participation in teacher 4's class was much higher than students' indexes of participation in the other two teachers' classes, that is the ratio of student-teacher participation for T 4's class was 1 to 2 while the ratio was 1 to 5 for teacher 3 and 1 to 12 for teacher 7.
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The percentages of teacher’s and students’ utterances in different phases of the lesson are reproduced in table 6.10. What these figures show is that the students contributed to the interaction more in the first phase than the second. This might reflect the different focuses of talk on meaning and form over the two phases of the lesson. The figures of the second phase also show a clear distinction between setting up and summing up steps which might also be an indication of a different balance of the focus of talk on form and meaning.

Table 6.10: Percentages of teacher’s and the students’ utterances (Teacher 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher’s utterances</th>
<th>Students’ utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting up 1</td>
<td>(293) 66%</td>
<td>(151) 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summing up 1</td>
<td>(324) 65%</td>
<td>(169) 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up 2</td>
<td>(173) 82%</td>
<td>(39) 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summing up 2</td>
<td>(161) 72%</td>
<td>(64) 28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To investigate the local and overall focus of talk, we now turn to the results of the analysis of activity and topic orientation devices depicted in table 6.7. The results are displayed in table 6.11.

Table 6.11: Distribution of T 4’s discourse devices in lesson phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Setting up 1</th>
<th>Summing up 1</th>
<th>Setting up 2</th>
<th>Summing up 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 0</td>
<td>T1 1</td>
<td>A1 1</td>
<td>T1 3</td>
<td>A1 0</td>
<td>T1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 3</td>
<td>T2 7</td>
<td>A2 1</td>
<td>T2 6</td>
<td>A2 9</td>
<td>T2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 0</td>
<td>T3 22</td>
<td>A3 0</td>
<td>T3 23</td>
<td>A3 0</td>
<td>T3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 0</td>
<td>T4 0</td>
<td>A4 1</td>
<td>T4 6</td>
<td>A4 0</td>
<td>T4 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 0</td>
<td>T5 8</td>
<td>A5 0</td>
<td>T5 11</td>
<td>A5 1</td>
<td>T5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 11</td>
<td>T6 3</td>
<td>A6 6</td>
<td>T6 13</td>
<td>A6 3</td>
<td>T6 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF (Standard Frequency) calculated in 100 teacher’s utterances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To start with, we first look at the total frequencies and percentages of the discourse devices over both phases of the lesson. The results show that the teacher’s orientation was pre-eminently on topic in summing up 1 (9:62) and on activity in summing up 2 (27:8). The same pattern can be detected in setting up 1 (14:41) and setting up 2 (13:4). The pattern suggests a dichotomy between the first and second phases of the lesson, which may be related to the design of the task and of the lesson. As discussed before, over the first phase, the areas of meaning are highlighted by the
teacher to give the students an opportunity to formulate the meaning categories using their own interlanguage resources. Though focus on form-meaning relationships might naturally occur when the participants are discussing the meaning categories, it is not a feature of the task design to introduce or practice the relationships at this stage. It is at the second phase that attentional resources are channelled toward form-meaning relationships through an activity which requires an explicit focus on the target forms used to formulate meaning.

These results then suggest that form-focused talk and accuracy focus were largely limited to the second phase of the lesson. Over the first phase, the talk was predominantly conversational providing opportunities for fluency practice. As the first phase constitutes the bulk of the lesson, it is not surprising that across the whole lesson the talk the teacher and students were most involved in was on the conversational side of the interaction continuum than on its instructional side. This is demonstrated by the big difference between the total and standard frequencies of the activity and topic orientation devices (63:6.62 versus 115:12.9 at the foot of the last two columns in table 6.11).

Looking at table 6.11 in more detail, in the setting up steps of phase 1 and phase 2 (columns 1, 2 and 5, 6), we can see that only two activity orientation devices, that is, ‘procedural statement and meta-talk’ (A2) and ‘evaluative feedback’ (A6) are used in both steps with different frequencies (3:11 and 9:3 respectively). In setting up 1, the highest frequency goes to A6 (11) while in setting up 2 the category with the highest frequency is A2 (9). This might be due to the teacher’s and students’ overall orientation toward topic in phase 1 and their greater orientation toward activity in phase 2. The frequency of discourse devices on the T side of these steps suggests this conclusion more strongly, since topic orientation devices were used with greater variation and a slightly higher frequency than the activity orientation devices in setting up 1, but they were absent altogether in setting up 2.

To investigate further the dichotomy between the participants’ orientation toward activity and topic or the focus of talk on form and meaning, we now look to see the extent to which the context of use of the two activity orientation devices reflects the different focuses of talk. Examination of ‘evaluative feedback’ (A6) shows that in setting up 1 it performs an ‘editing’ role correcting the students’ utterances in message-oriented talk. So as not to distract attention from meaning, this type of feedback is realized in the least obtrusive form, that is, reformulation of the erroneous utterance often without formal explanations. While in setting up 2 it performs more of an evaluative role assessing the students’ utterances in accuracy terms. The following example from setting up 1
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shows how the student's utterances are edited by the teacher. The teacher's relevant utterances are marked by the code A6.

Example 6.6 [T4L3]

T: 140 a friend?
S: 141 yes
T: 142 how long have you known him or her?
S: 143 err () I know him err
T: 144 I've known him [A6]
S: 145 I've- I have known him from when we go to err school
T: 146 since we went to school [A6]
S: 147 yes since we went to school

The above example is taken from an episode of message-oriented talk in which the teacher asks the students warm up questions about their friends abroad. The teacher's editing utterances (lines 144 and 146) assist the student in formulating his utterance, thereby facilitating the completion of his turn. There are no explicit signs of evaluation which otherwise might have delayed or even stopped the completion of the turn by the student. In contrast the teacher's feedback (line 995) in the following example from setting up 2 provides explicit evaluation of the form of the student's response in the preceding turn (line 994).

Example 6.7 [T4L3]

T: 987 [give me a prohibition one
S: 988 a prohibition one for?
T: 989 you mustn’t!
Ss: 990 you mustn’t/
T: 991 bring a gun
Ss: 992 [ + + ]
T: 993 because?
S: 994 it's against the law
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T:
995 it’s against the law, very good! right? [A6]
The teacher’s prompts and clues (lines 991, 993) assist the formulation of the sentence in a pre-
specified form by the students. It is the production of the sentence in the pre-specified form which
is evaluated by the teacher in line 995.

The second activity orientation device, that is ‘procedural statements and meta-talk’, again
indicates the difference between the focus of talk on meaning in the first phase and its focus on
form in the second phase. As the following example from setting up 1 shows, the orientation
toward activity is realised in the form of procedural statements explaining what the student are
supposed to do in each step (line 285).

Example 6.8 [T 4 L3]
T:
282 let me ask you something
  283 what is it- what is important to have and to take with you when you go on a trip abroad!
  overseas?
Ss:
284[+ + +]
T:
285 ah, set- get together make a list of the things that are important when you go abroad [A2]
S:
286 the most important thing is money
T:
287 thank you very much
288 take it as the first clue

As evidenced by example 6.8, the procedural statements (line 285) do not distract attention from
meaning. In comparison, the meta-talk used in setting up 2 is intended to call attention to form. The
following example illustrates the point (lines 1065-1071).

Example 6.9 [T 4 L3]
T:
1064 excellent! Must not cannot
1065 * and specially in this situation they write it like can- cannot together
1066 * and they read it [cana:] not can not
1067 * bring fresh fruit into Iran right?
1068 * cannot, you mustn’t you must not
1069 * these are the negative
1070 * these are the prohibitions, right?

190
1071 *you must not mustn’t or cannot or can’t to show something is prohibited, and absolutely not permitted again(.) often by law [A2]

1072 let’s go for the next item

1073 item F please?

In example 6.9, the teacher’s meta-statements (the starred lines coded with A2) are specially designed to focus attention on form as a pre-condition for the successful production of the sentences the students are supposed to write after the instructions.

We now turn to the topic-orientation devices of teacher 4 in the first and second phases of the lesson. The frequency and distribution of these devices show great differences between the two phases (41:62 versus 4:8 in table 6.11). They were used more frequently (41:62) and with an extended range in the first phase, and with a much lower frequency (4:8) and a limited range in the second phase. The devices used more frequently in both steps of phase 1, but much less frequently and only in one step in phase 2, are T5, T6, and T2. These devices contribute to the students’ involvement in interaction with the teacher, thus providing more opportunities for meaning negotiation. As such, their higher frequency and greater range over phase 1 may reflect the extended focus on meaning in this phase compared with phase 2. The following example shows the use of T6 (including clarification of the student’s intention and negotiation of meaning) and T5 (conversational repair) in setting up 1.

**Example 6.10 [T 4 L3]**

S:
401 what’s it?
402 a notebook you have, your own computer
403 we take and change it [+ + +]

T:
404 in a computer? [T6]

S:
405 the own computer
406 the little computer

T:
409 oh! laptop computer [T5]
410 laptop computer, laptop

In the context of suggesting items that the imaginary friend should bring with him/her, the student puts forward the ‘laptop computer’, but as he does not know the right word, he first appeals for assistance (line 401), and then provides an extended definition, which is taken wrongly by the
teacher. Assuming that the student is talking about something in a computer, he asks him about his intention (line 404). The student’s more transparent definition clarifies the intention, which is then responded to by the teacher in a natural way (line 409). Example 6.11 shows the use of T2 (building the topic at hand together with the students) over summing up 1 (lines 775 and 781).

Example 6.11 [T 4 L3]
S:  
774 medicine
T:  
775 medicine is prohibited in Iran? [T2]
Ss:  
776 /no /
S:  
777 some of them, like drugs
S:  
778 needs the Ministry of health(.) permit
T:  
779 permit
S:  
780 ministry of IRAN, from Iran
T:  
781 why medicines needs permission [T2]
782 this is personal

In reaction to the student’s nominated topic, the teacher raises questions (lines 775 and 781) which involve the other students including the student who suggested the item in building the topic at hand. It is likely that the teacher knew the laws regulating medicines in Iran; however, his avoiding to react didactically imposing his own perspective provides an opportunity for the students to contribute to topic development.

The most frequently used topic-orientation device used in both phases of the lesson is T3 (message-oriented or natural feedback). However, the frequency of this device in phase 2 is much lower than in the first phase, which might be an indication of the extended focus on meaning in the first phase and the extended focus on form in the second. Example 6.12 shows the teacher’s natural feedback to the student’s utterance in phase 1 (lines 179 and 181).

Example 6.12 [T4L3]
T:  
178 every morning and afternoon you used to go to bar
179 nice, what does she do there? [T3]
S:  
180 she has her own bars
T:  
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The teacher's expressions of excitement (line 181) reflect his propensity to provide feedback, which looks natural so as to encourage the students to contribute more in classroom discussions. As the figures in table 6.11 and the above examples taken from both phases of the lesson show, the orientation toward activity was clearly evident in the second phase of the lesson, where the teacher set up the writing activity explaining the target forms in relation to the meaning categories and then summed up the activity asking the students to report their sentences, which he evaluated in accuracy terms. Over both steps in phase 1 (setting up 1 and summing up 1), the orientation was primarily on topic. The very few instances of activity orientation were limited to brief corrective feedback and some procedural statements. As mentioned before, the instances of orientation toward activity did not usually divert attention from meaning. When they did, it was very brief and temporary. These observations warrant the conclusion that, apart from short periods, especially in the second phase of the lesson, the focus was on meaning and the talk was mostly conversational. Instructional talk had a minor role to play over the first phase of the lesson. In such a context, fluency practice can be expected to take more space than accuracy practice.

The results of the microanalysis enabled us to draw a picture of the way meaning and form were integrated by teacher 4 in constructing a context for learning. Now we shift our attention to the use of CSs to see how far the patterns of strategy use relate to the patterns identified through microanalysis of the lesson transcript. The frequency and distribution of CSs adopted by teacher 4 are depicted in table 6.12.

Looking at the percentages of strategies used in the phases of the lesson, as with T3 we can see that the frequency of strategies is much higher in the first phase than the second phase (23.89, 30.55 versus 11.56, 11.18). The frequency of strategies in summing up 1 is more than five times as much as the corresponding figure in summing up 2 and three times as much in setting up 1 as in setting up 2. In contrast, the distribution in the first phase shows little difference, that is between setting up 1 and summing up 1. The only difference between setting up 1 and summing up 1 is the absence of 'comprehension checks' in the second step and the tiny difference in the frequency of individual strategies used in each step. This may reflect the similarity of talk orientation across steps. The difference between the two steps may be attributed to the episodes of talk in the setting up step in which the teacher tried to set the scene for what the students were supposed to do in pairs. The students were less involved in interaction with the teacher in these episodes. This added
to the length of teacher talk and as a result decreased the standard frequency of the strategies in this step compared with the second one (summing up 1).

Table 6.12: Meaning negotiation strategies adopted by T 4 in different phases of lesson 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Setting up 1</th>
<th>Summing up 1</th>
<th>Setting up 2</th>
<th>Summing up 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLR REQ</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON CHK</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM CHK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLF REF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REF</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REP</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per 100</td>
<td>23.89</td>
<td>30.55</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>11.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to the frequency of strategies used in the first phase, the figures show a higher frequency of retrospective CSs such as ‘other-reformulation’ and ‘other repetition’ as compared with the prospective ones such as ‘comprehension check’ and ‘self-reformulation’ (22:22 and 17:31 versus 2:0 and 5:5 respectively). ‘Clarification request’ and ‘confirmation check’ were also used with similar frequencies (11:20 and 11:17 respectively). The frequency of these devices was divided evenly between their ‘form-oriented’ and information-oriented’ types. In comparison, over the second phase, there is no much difference between the frequency of self-reformulation as a prospective measure and that of other-reformulation/repetition as retrospective measures (5:6 versus 2:4 and 5:4 respectively). ‘Clarification requests’ and ‘confirmation checks’ were absent from setting up 2. Examination of the few confirmation checks in summing up 2 shows that they were used when the focus on form was temporarily diverted to meaning either by the students or the teacher himself. In the following example, the student is reporting the sentence he has written
using the target structures. Instead of evaluating the sentence in accuracy terms, in line 1334, the teacher reacts to the sentence meaning, thereby diverting attention from form.

Example 6.13 [T 4 L3]

T:
1326 it’s not!
1327 it’s where- err maybe you can find something somewhere,
1328 it’s not like that
1329 all right, very well
1330 we don’t have to, the sentences with don’t have to?
S:
1331 yes(.) you don’t have to take an umbrella with yourself because you can buy it in Iran
T:
1332 you can!
1333 thank you very much!
1334 can’t you lend yours?
1335 can’t you lend me yours?
S:
1336 we can’t
S:
1337 you can use mine
T:
1338 you can use mine
1339 I- I have an extra one

The teacher’s confirmation check (line 1334) seeks agreement on a point raised about the content of the student’s sentence (line 1331).

As a summary to our report of T 4’s use of CSs in the two phases of the lesson, the following points have been made. First, the frequency and distribution of CSs may be related to the overall and local focus of talk. In the first phase, where the participants oriented themselves to topic, all variety of CSs (prospective, retrospective) were used. The teacher used CSs prospectively to simplify input, and retrospectively to filter and repair students’ output. He also used CSs to negotiate meaning and intention with the students. While in the second phase, where the participants oriented themselves to activity, the frequency and distribution of CSs were more limited. The strategies used in this phase were self- and other-reformulation, other-repetition and very few confirmation checks in the summing up step. This distribution of strategies and scrutiny of the lesson transcript indicate that meaning negotiation or intention occurred in very few cases, where the focus was temporarily diverted to meaning by the teacher or the students. The prospective use of CSs was more evident in this phase as was indicated by the more frequent use of self-reformulation and cues.
Second, the observations made about the patterns of CS use has been shown to complement the results of the microanalysis. The microanalysis revealed that T 4's orientation toward topic in the first phase was related to the use of a variety of talk which was characterized as conversational in comparison with the instructional variety used in the second phase, where the participants oriented toward activity. This is understandable: it is in the context of conversational talk that meaning is at stake and participants should try harder to ensure mutual comprehension. There is also a greater risk of misunderstanding and confusion over meaning, which need to be rectified co-operatively. The students' less pre-planned contributions to interaction in conversational talk also runs the risk of producing erroneous or unacceptable sentences or even to pause too long or stop midstream due to insufficient linguistic resources. All these situations can be expected to make greater demands on both sides, which necessitate the use of a variety of CSs. Therefore, the higher frequency and more extended distribution of CSs in the first phase may be interpreted as an indication of the focus of talk on meaning and the use of a variety of talk which was closer to natural discourse.

6.3.3 Teacher 7
Consistent with the presentation structure of the previous case profiles, we start the microanalysis of the lesson taught by teacher 7 by first looking at the percentages of the different types of questions presented originally in table 6.3 and reproduced below in table 6.13. The percentage of referential questions constitutes only 2% of all the questions asked by teacher 7. The tiny percentage of referential questions suggests the disproportionate reliance on form rather than meaning.

The impact of the focus on form or meaning on students' participation and the percentage of teacher and student talk was indicated before in relation to T 3 and T 4. To explain this tendency, we can argue that too much reliance on display questions impedes students' lengthy responses and their initiation of new topics. The point that needs to be highlighted here is that the high frequency of display and form-oriented questions and the absence of open questions may be related to the big gap between the students and the teacher indexes of participation (34.7 versus 422.7). For a comparison of indexes of student-teacher participation of all three cases see table 6.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.13: Type of questions asked by teacher 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content-oriented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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To check the impact of patterns of participation on the teacher’s and students’ proportion of classroom talk, we look at the information reproduced in table 6.14. The similar figures across phase 1 and phase 2 reflect the similar structure of discourse across the steps. This may be a further sign of form-focused interaction since the control exercised by the teacher in managing discourse makes its structure more predictable than message-focused interaction, in which turn contingency is more likely to defy homogeneity of discourse structure.

Table 6.14: Percentages of utterances produced by the teacher and the students (T 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher’s Utterances</th>
<th>Students’ Utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting up 1</td>
<td>(141) 92%</td>
<td>(12) 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summing up 1</td>
<td>(91) 69%</td>
<td>(40) 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up 2</td>
<td>(95) 91%</td>
<td>(9) 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summing up 2</td>
<td>(43) 69%</td>
<td>(19) 31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turning to the analysis of activity and topic orientation devices, table 6.15 shows the total frequencies and the percentages of these measures in both phases of the lesson.

Table 6.15: Distribution of T 7’s discourse devices in lesson phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Setting up 1</th>
<th>Summing up 1</th>
<th>Setting up 2</th>
<th>Summing up 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 1</td>
<td>T1 0</td>
<td>A1 0</td>
<td>T1 0</td>
<td>A1 0</td>
<td>A1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 6</td>
<td>T2 1</td>
<td>A2 3</td>
<td>T2 1</td>
<td>A2 9</td>
<td>A2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 6</td>
<td>T3 0</td>
<td>A3 1</td>
<td>T3 1</td>
<td>A3 1</td>
<td>A3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 0</td>
<td>T4 0</td>
<td>A4 0</td>
<td>T4 0</td>
<td>A4 0</td>
<td>A4 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 0</td>
<td>T5 0</td>
<td>A5 9</td>
<td>T5 1</td>
<td>A5 0</td>
<td>A5 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 1</td>
<td>T6 0</td>
<td>A6 8</td>
<td>T6 0</td>
<td>A6 1</td>
<td>A6 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF 8.69</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SF (Standard Frequency) expressed in 100 teacher’s utterances

We can see that overall topic-orientation devices were scarcely used: in phase 2 they were not used at all, and in the first phase their frequency is negligible. The results suggest that the teacher and students overwhelmingly oriented themselves toward activity in both phases of the lesson. It is notable that, in comparison with the other two teachers, the overall frequencies of the discourse devices used by this teacher are relatively low (72, 4).

Focusing on setting up 1, we note that activity orientation in this step is marked by the high frequency of A2 (procedural statements and meta-talk) and A3 (routines).

Procedural statements (A2) were used instrumentally to set the scene for the activity. To check students’ knowledge of vocabulary or to ensure their attention in following the descriptions, the
teacher used the ‘ski jump’ intonation technique as a routine to elicit a chorus response from the students. The following example illustrates the use of the above-mentioned discourse devices.

**Example 6.14 [T7 L3]**

T:
3 if you didn’t write this homework for the next class please, do it okay?
4 err close your books please okay? [A2]
5 take this
6 err there are two pieces of paper yes?
7 In front of you,
8 at the beginning of this piece of paper you can see there is an opening task yes?
9 The beginning of the steps
10 look at step one and see what is going to happen
11 a friend of yours from the UK, is planning a short vacation in Iran
12 UK United? [A3]

Ss:
13 kingdom/
14 kingdom
15 as he is a UK citizen he will have to deal with yes?
16 Manage immigration and customs
17 immigration? [A3]

In setting the scene for the task the teacher calls the attention of the students (line 4) to the handout and then starts reading the instructions. He uses the ‘ski jump’ elicitation technique (lines 12 and 17) throughout the episode of talk in setting up 1 to check comprehension and keep the attention fixed on the instructions. The teacher’s sticking to the handout as the major source of information and jumping into the task without any warm up introduction can be interpreted as an orientation toward activity rather than topic.

In summing up 1, the discourse devices used most frequently are A5 (unique response rule) and A6 (evaluative feedback), perhaps because the students were involved in reporting their suggested categorisation of items, which were checked and evaluated by the teacher. The following example shows the teacher’s evaluative feedback to the student’s suggested item.

**Example 6.15 [T7 L3]**

S:
253 water
T:
254 water!
Ss:
255 huh
T:
256 we can’t find water in this country? [A6]
257 How about number two?
The teacher’s evaluative feedback (line 256) pre-empts any justification for the suggested item which otherwise could have been elicited from the student. The unique response rule is illustrated by the following example (line 200).

**Example 6.16 [T7 L3]**

T:
197 number three or you may say number four okay?
198 how about a credit card?
Ss:
199 /number four/
T:
200 it is exactly number? [A5]
Ss:
201 four
T:
202 four yes number four

The teacher asks the students about the category to which ‘credit card’ should go. He re-elicits the suggested category and then confirms it as the correct answer. It is to be noted that ‘credit card’ was a controversial item, which agreement proved to be difficult in the other two classes. However, in this class, it is likely that the teacher’s implied stance of there being one correct answer (line 200) forestalled any expression of disagreement.

Turning to setting up 2, table 6.15 shows that activity orientation was basically realised through A2 (procedural statements and meta-talk). This was partly due to the nature of the activity the teacher was trying to prepare the students to do. They were supposed to refer back to the sentences they had been producing to that point and check them against the target forms laid out in a table that the teacher was trying to explain before they started to do the assigned job. The following example shows the final part of the teacher’s explanations.

**Example 6.17 [T7 L3]**

T:
395 *So we have some categories yes?
396 *The first one necessary have to have got to and must
397 *number two prohibition or prohibited mustn’t and can’t
398 *number three permission can [A2]
399 number four?
400 Number four?
In his first turn and part of the second turn (lines 402-404), the teacher explains the target forms through meta-talk. He then states what the students are supposed to do using the structural explanations as a reference point. The point is that, in this step, the teacher’s lead leaves little space for the students’ participation.

Following the sequence of steps, we now look at summing up 2. In this step, A4 (turn allocation by the teacher) and A6 (evaluative feedback) were the most frequent discourse devices used by the teacher to orient toward activity. In contrast with the previous steps, in which responses were elicited in chorus, in this step individual students were nominated to report the sentences they had written with reference to the target structures laid out in the table. The students’ sentences were then evaluated in accuracy terms. The following example illustrates the teacher’s turn allocation and evaluative feedback.

Example 6.18 [T7 L3]

S:
   440 err you mustn’t have CDs or tapes because some music in Iran is not allowed
T:
   441 [very good yes!]
   442 you mustn’t have CDs or tapes because some kinds of music are not allowed yes! Okay! [A6]
   443 yes you!
S:
   442 you should you should carry a book about Iran
T:
   443 yes you? [A6] [A4]

The teacher’s evaluative feedback in line 441 includes praise and reiterative repetition of the student response, while in line 443 he just confirms the accuracy of the response without praising
and/or repetition. These different degrees of positive evaluation might have different interpretations on the part of the students; however, the point is that activity orientation is central to the discourse.

To sum up, the results of the microanalysis of T 7’s lesson, we conclude that orientation toward activity was the norm over both phases of the lesson. The very few scattered instances of topic orientation seemed to be insufficient to produce any lasting effect on the focus of the talk and its direction. The variety of talk can best be described as ‘instructional’ with IRF as the basic pattern of interaction throughout the lesson.

To consider the relationship between the overall and local focus of talk and patterns of CSs, we now focus on T 7’s use of CSs against this background (Table 6.16).

**Table 6.16: Meaning negotiation strategies adopted by T 7 in different phases of lesson 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting up 1</th>
<th>Summing up 1</th>
<th>Setting up 2</th>
<th>Summing up 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLR REQ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON CHK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM CHK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLF REF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per 100</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>7.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequency of CSs in 100 teacher’s utterances shows very little variation across the phases and their associated steps (8.07, 9.52, 7.21, 8.89 respectively). As would naturally be expected, there are some differences in frequencies between the various steps. Strategies tended to be used more frequently in the latter steps due to the nature of the activity, which demanded a more interactive style of discourse. However, the differences are very small.
As far as the types of strategies are concerned, frequencies are too low here to have much significance. However, bearing this in mind, we can see that clarification requests and confirmation checks have only been used in the first phase. The functions performed by these strategies are likely to have diminished potential, given the constraints put on meaning communication by the heavy focus on activity rather than topic. For example, the clarification requests used in setting up were asked by the teacher to elicit definitions for vocabulary items, thought to be unfamiliar to some of the students. As such, they functioned as display questions used to gauge knowledge of vocabulary rather than as referential questions used to seek meaning clarification per se. They seem to be constrained even more by the teacher’s tendency to confirm the students’ responses without including their perspective in the final form of the definition.

The following example illustrates the point.

**Example 6.19 [T 7 L3]**

T:  
63 yes okay fresh fruit you know  
64 an international drivers’ license  
65 books about Iran  
66 a return airline ticket of course  
67 a map of Iran  
68 a laptop computer  
69 laptop?  
Ss:  
70 /like books/  
T:  
71 a small computer  
72 yes you can put them on your feet while you are in an airplane and you can work with your computer  
73 laptop small movable portable computer

Although the teacher confirms the students’ response in line 72, he does not relate it to his own definition. For example, by saying ‘a small computer’, he breaks the possible connection between his definition in the next line (line 72) and the students’ suggested approximation in line 70.

The teacher also used confirmation checks to seek agreement of the students on his own expressed opinions. Consider lines 175-176 in the following example.

**Example 6.20 [T 7 L3]**

T:  
169 number four yes!  
170 Okay what about fresh fruit?  
Ss:  
171 /number 4/
T: 172 four yes  
   173 who said number two?  
Ss:  
   174 huh  
T: 175 for example you bring for example a box of bananas  
   176 they just ask you not to bring it to the country?  
S:  
   177 because the other side [+++]
T:  
   178 okay wait  
   179 next one an international drivers’ license?  

Discoursally, the teacher imposes his own perspective on the student by seeking agreement (line 175-176) and then changing the topic (line 179) after instructing the student to keep silence and wait (line 178).

A similar tendency can be detected in the use of other-reformulation. The teacher used this strategy to put what the students said in a different form or to put it in an extended context. Using this strategy, the teacher avoided building on what the students said, giving the impression that there was always a better version for what they said, and that it was his responsibility to provide it. The following example illustrates ‘other reformulation’ in line 350.

Example 6.21 [T 7 L3]
S:  
   349 you don’t have to take a credit card to Iran because it’s not useful in Iran  
T:  
   350 yes it’s not used so much in Iran yes?  
   351 You?  

In his reformulation of the student’s response, the teacher expands the second part of the student’s utterance substituting ‘not useful’ with ‘not used so much’. The confirmation of the student’s response which precedes the reformulation, and the seeking of confirmation from the students, which follows it as a sign of its confirmation are potentially confusing to the students, since they send different and even contradictory signals.

Having in mind the apparently prescriptive nature of other reformulation used in this lesson and taking into account the point that comprehension check and self-reformulation can be used in both accuracy and fluency contexts, and also the lower frequency of CSs used by teacher 7 compared with the other two teachers, we can conclude that the patterns of CSs match the type of context that emerged through the microanalysis. The use of an instructional variety of talk and too much
emphasis on accuracy put constraints on the exchange of meaning between the teacher and the students. This can justify the lower frequency of strategies and their limited role in meaning negotiation.

6.4 Summary

The microanalysis of lesson 3 reported in this chapter has investigated the relationship between the teachers’ use of CSs and the overall and local focus of talk on form or meaning in two different phases of the lesson. The task, which was used in this lesson consisted of two different but interrelated activities. As part of the task design features, the first activity was described as focusing on an area of meaning for which the target structures were either not available to the students or if available had not been fully automatised. It was assumed that the need to express the meaning structures would force the students to use alternative means over the first phase of the lesson, which would then be channelled toward the target structures in the second phase. As there is often no perfect match between what is planned, and what actually happens when activities are carried out, the assumption was that the configurations of focus on form and meaning would differ within the same lesson and across lessons. To achieve a reasonably reliable measure of the focus of talk over the two phases of the lesson, we used a number of devices as measures of the overall focus of the talk (types of questions and students’ level of participation) and of its local focus (discourse devices indicating the participants’ orientation toward activity or topic).

The analysis of the two phases of the lesson in terms of the overall focus of talk showed that the majority of questions used by teacher 4 were referential and content-oriented; while teacher 7 employed these questions in very few cases. Teacher 4 had a ‘middle’ position by employing a balanced number of referential and display questions. The same pattern was identified in relation to the students’ level of participation. The students in teacher 4’s class had the highest level of participation compared with the students in teacher 7’s class having the lowest level of participation, and T 3’s students, who were at the middle. A similar picture emerged as a result of the analysis of discourse devices which focused on the local focus of talk. The local analysis enabled us to examine the two steps (setting up and summing up), which constituted each phase of the lesson, and at a later stage certain sequences and exchanges in each step.

The analysis has shown that the distinction between the first and second phases of the lesson was clear-cut in relation to teachers 3 and 4. Both teachers oriented toward ‘activity’ over the second phase of the lesson. However, over the first phase, a mixture of topic and activity orientation characterised the lesson taught by teacher 3, and an exclusive topic orientation was the major characteristic of the lesson taught by teacher 4. There was no major difference between the phases
of the lesson taught by teacher 7. At the level of steps, again the topic/activity orientation was the factor which distinguished between setting up and summing up steps of each phase. A higher degree of activity orientation was detected in the setting up step and a higher degree of topic orientation over the summing up step. This pattern was more evident in relation to teachers 3 and 4.

Finally, we studied the use of CSs by the three teachers against this background.

As we have argued before, the talk shares more features with naturalistic discourse in topic-oriented phases of a lesson and more features with pedagogic discourse in the phases which are characterised with activity-orientation. It has further been argued that the shift of talk toward naturalistic discourse provides more opportunities for fluency practice, and a shift toward pedagogic discourse more opportunities for accuracy practice. The hypothesis was that as naturalistic discourse provides more opportunities for the students' participation and this in effect involves higher levels of improvisation on the part of both the teacher and the students, CSs will be used more extensively when the talk approached this type of discourse. The results of the microanalysis in terms of topic focus and higher use of strategies support this hypothesis. This along with the analysis of activity focus and lower overall participation associated with the lower strategy use of T 7 supports the relationship between the pedagogic aims of the teaching-learning activities and the type and frequency of CSs used by the teacher and the students. In relation to the overall frequencies, the information reproduced in table 6.17 shows a much higher overall frequency of CSs over the first phase compared with that of the second phase for teachers 3 and 4.

| Table 6.17: Teachers' overall frequency of CS use over phases and steps |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|            | Setting up 1 | Summing up 1 | Setting up 2 | Summing up 2 |
| T 3        | 21.95       | 24.25       | 8.16        | 11.11       |
| T 4        | 23.89       | 30.55       | 11.56       | 11.18       |
| T 7        | 8.07        | 9.52        | 7.21        | 8.89        |

Frequencies reflect the number of CSs in 100 teachers’ utterances

This result reflects the different aims of the two phases, as they are interpreted by these two teachers. T 7's negligible difference between the frequencies of CSs across the two phases was shown to be related to his orientation toward activity throughout the lesson. This is also reflected in his much lower overall frequencies across the phases and steps of the lesson.

The overall frequencies of strategies used by T 3 and T 4 in the first phase of the lesson (21.95, 24.25 and 23.89, and 30.55 respectively) are high and very high compared with the overall
frequencies of these teachers for the whole lesson (21.8, 21.6 in table 6.18). As we can see, if we compare the figures in table 6.17 and 6.18, the figures of T3 and T4 for both steps of phase 1 are even higher than any of the overall scores for any of the teachers on lessons 1, 2 and 3 (table 6.18). In contrast, teacher 7’s figures in the four steps are much lower than the overall figure of the whole lesson for this teacher (8.07, 9.52 versus 14.8). This remains a mystery. What the comparison of the above figures shows for certain is that there can be considerable variation in strategy use across different phases of a given lesson. The implication of these variations for classroom data analysis are discussed in chapter 7.

Table 6.18: Overall frequencies of CSs across the three lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total SF (L1)</th>
<th>Total SF (L2)</th>
<th>Total SF (L3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SF: Standard Frequency  L: Lesson

The distribution of CSs suggested that, in the setting up steps, where the teachers adopted a presentational style to set the scene and share the information which the students required to do the subsequent activity, CSs had a prospective role to play in simplifying input and checking comprehension. The strategies, which were more frequently used in this context, were self-reformulation, and comprehension check. In the summing up step of phase 1, where the focus was on information exchange, CSs played both a prospective and retrospective role. There were also instances of sustained negotiation where the teacher and students became involved in two-way interaction to resolve incomplete or inaccurate messages using clarification requests and confirmation checks. Consistent with the pedagogic aims of the summing up step of the second phase, where the accuracy of students’ production was the major focus, the use of CSs was limited to simplifying input (prospective function) and repetition or reformulation of students’ utterances (retrospective function). The one-way flow of information ruled out the use of CSs for sustained negotiation.
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T 3 and T 4 had much in common in the way they used their language to vary the focus of talk consistent with the pedagogic aims of each phase of the lesson. Their awareness of the pedagogic aims was reflected in the overall and local focus of their talk and also in their employment of the appropriate strategic devices to achieve mutual understanding. In contrast, teacher 7’s use of language maintained a consistent focus on activity all through the lesson irrespective of the differences in the pedagogic aims, as the lesson progressed. This suggests a different interpretation of the pedagogic aims by T 7, which made form and accuracy the ultimate goals of all classroom activities. T 7’s orientation toward activity put constraints on the students’ contributions to classroom discourse and in effect the negotiation of meaning between the teacher and the students. It was demonstrated that this tendency reduced the overall level of CSs use, and their composition and distribution. The type of CSs was limited to prospective and retrospective measures, which were distributed evenly over the steps and phases reflecting the uniformity in the patterns of interaction.

Overall the results of the micro-analysis revealed a strong relationship between the use of CSs and the pedagogic aims of the lesson as represented by patterns of focus on activity or topic. The focus on activity was associated with the use of form-focused display questions and a reduced level of students’ participation in classroom discourse. On the other hand, the focus on topic was closely related to the use of meaning-focused referential questions and an enhanced level of participation on the part of the students. Depending on the degree of orientation toward either direction, the talk assumed characteristics which moved it closer either to pedagogic discourse with its predictable patterns of interaction or natural conversation whose patterns of interaction are less predictable. The implications of this analysis and the findings it has generated are discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 7  

DISCUSSION

7.1 Introduction

This chapter summarises the findings and draws some conclusions which are discussed in the light of the aims of the research study. It also directs attention to: 1) the contributions of the findings to the body of knowledge in the fields of CSs and classroom discourse, 2) the limitations of the study in terms of the adopted methodology, and 3) the implications the results might have for classroom pedagogy and teacher training.

Consistent with the methodology adopted for the present study, the investigation involved both qualitative and quantitative methods of analysis in three different stages referred to earlier as categorisation, quantification, and microanalysis. The analyses were guided by the following research questions.

1. What are the different types and frequencies of CSs adopted by language teachers in teacher-led phases of their lessons?
2. What are the major functions performed by these strategies in classroom discourse?
3. Is there any relationship between the teachers' language background and their patterns of strategy use?
4. Is there any relationship between the institutions in which the teachers are performing their teaching duties and their patterns of strategy use?
5. Is there any relationship between the type and frequency of CSs used by language teachers and the focus of talk in terms of the participants' orientation toward topic and activity?
6. Is there any relationship between the different phases of a lesson and the type and frequency of CSs?

The first stage of analysis generated the category system which was applied to the database in the subsequent stages of analysis. The second stage provided answers to questions 1, 2, 3 and 4, and the third stage to questions 5 and 6.

The summary of the findings of each stage of analysis are presented in section 7.2, followed by the interpretation and discussion of the findings in section 7.3. The implications of the results for the theory and practice of L2 teaching and learning are reported in section 7.4. Section 7.5 reports on the implications of the study for the methodology of investigating TT, and finally sections 7.6 and 7.7 deal with the limitations of the study and some suggestions for further research respectively.
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The summary of results in relation to questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 is based on a quantitative analysis of the transcripts of twenty nine lessons, taken from a representative sample of nine ESL/EFL teachers, three native speaker teachers, and six non-natives. The analysis was limited to measures of descriptive statistics including standard frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations to examine the major patterns of strategy use. The summary of results in relation to questions 5 and 6 are based on the microanalysis of the transcripts of the first part of lesson 3 taught by three teachers representing each of the three groups involved in the study.

7.2 Summary of results

In general, the quantitative analysis has shown that CSs are widely used by all the teachers in their classroom talk, opening an interesting and potentially valuable new window on the study of teacher talk; it has also shown that the full range of CSs are used, and that they are used in a range of different ways. We will suggest below that this provides a potentially valuable way of approaching teacher talk in the second/foreign language classroom.

Research question 1 asked for the different types and frequencies of strategies used by the participant teachers in teacher-led phases of their lessons. We found that all teachers used both ‘lexical-compensatory’ and ‘meaning negotiation’ strategies. The analysis revealed that the most frequent (more than 90%) subcategories of lexical-compensatory strategies, which were used by all teachers, were variants of the circumlocution strategy. Within the sub-categories of circumlocution, descriptions and contextualised descriptions were more frequently used than approximations and embedded approximations. The less frequent ones (less than 10%), which were used by some teachers and not by others, were code switching, mime, and appeal to authority. The analysis also showed that almost 70% of the total frequency of meaning negotiation strategies consisted of the sub-categories of other-repetition, other-reformulation, self-reformulation, comprehension checks, turn completion and cues. The basic feature of these subcategories was their use by the teachers to accommodate to the students’ current linguistic needs. The remaining 30% consisted of clarification requests and confirmation checks used to involve the students in meaning negotiation through cooperative efforts to resolve problems of communication. This result was broadly expected since extended meaning negotiation in the sense of repairing communication breakdown in a cooperative manner using confirmation checks and clarification requests has been shown to be much less frequent in language classrooms than in natural conversation (e.g. Long and Sato 1983; Pica and Long 1986). However, the proportion of certain individual strategies was contrary to our expectation. The possible reason for the expected and unexpected aspects of this result will be discussed later.
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Research question 2 was related to research question 1, and asked for the different functions that the CSs performed in the lessons analysed. The answer to this question was partly reflected in the description of the category system reported in chapter 4 and partly in the results of the quantitative analysis in chapter 5. Our data-based interpretation of the functions of CSs (see chapter 4) was that they performed three different macro-functions, which were summarised as: (1) the prospective use of CSs to anticipate and avoid communication problems, (2) the retrospective use to repair problems of talk, and (3) the conversational maintenance use to sustain conversation. The macro-functions have not been empirically investigated in this study. In contrast, the micro-functions of CSs, which were divided into code-oriented and information-oriented functions, have been subjected to quantitative analysis (see chapter 5). The focus of the former was on problems of hearing and understanding caused by formal deficiencies or noise in the channel of communication. The latter focused on content clarification to increase transparency in meaning expression and at the same time sustaining conversation with the students. The application of the category system to the whole database revealed the following general patterns of the micro-functions of CSs. The code-oriented function of clarification requests was more frequent than its information-oriented function across the three groups of teachers. In contrast, the orientation of confirmation checks was more frequently toward information. In other words, where teachers were asking for clarification, this was generally about code problems, whereas where they were asking for confirmation, this was generally concerned with information.

Research question 3 asked about the possible relationship between the patterns of strategy use and the teachers' language background. Question 4 was related to question 3 and asked about the relationship between the patterns of strategy use and curricular arrangements of the teaching institutions. The results for question 3 with regard to meaning negotiation strategies reported that there were no important differences between the group of native speaker teachers (group 1) and one group of non-native speaker teachers (group 2). In contrast, a substantial difference was revealed by the results between the second group of non-native teachers (group 3) and the other two groups. The main difference was located in the total standard frequency of meaning negotiation strategies, which was much smaller for group 3 than groups 1 and 2, both in lesson 3 and in the three lessons together. In both cases, the frequency of individual categories used by group 3 was smaller than that of groups 1 and 2 for all categories except comprehension checks and turn completions. The percentage of code-oriented functions of clarification requests, confirmation checks and other-reformulations were much higher for group 3 compared with the other two groups. The interesting points about these results are: first, the similar behaviour of group 1 (native speakers) and group 2 (non-native speakers) in terms of the patterns of strategy use, which seems to rule out 'language background' as an important variable in strategy
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selection or their frequency; second, the different behaviour of group 3 (non-native speakers) compared with groups 1 and 2 which brings in the role of contextual factors in terms of institutional curricular arrangements as a candidate variable affecting the frequency but not the type of strategies used by the teachers. We will pick up these issues later in this chapter.

In relation to lexical-compensatory strategies, the results showed no systematic differences between the groups. The only difference was the higher frequency of contextualised description used by group 1 compared with groups 2 and 3 across the three lessons and also in lesson three. Another difference was the use of mime by groups 1 and 2 and its absence in group 3. As, in comparison with meaning negotiation strategies, lexical-compensatory strategies are more responsive to students' needs in their interaction with the lesson content, the absence of a meaningful pattern, which could be related to language background or institutional curricular arrangements, was broadly expected. However, there were qualitative differences in the way these strategies were used by individual and groups of teachers, which will be discussed later.

The results in relation to questions 5 and 6 were reported in chapter 6. The application of the framework developed to investigate the phases of the lesson in terms of the overall and local focus of the talk and its impact on the type and frequency of CSs on the first part of lesson 3 showed that the focus of the first phase was overwhelmingly on topic and that of the second phase on activity, suggesting the construction of two different contexts with probably different opportunities for language-related practice. The talk over the topic-oriented phase seems more likely to have provided opportunities for fluency practice, since it shared more features with naturalistic discourse. While, the higher frequency of the features of pedagogic discourse in the talk over the activity-oriented phase might have produced more opportunities for accuracy practice.

The contrast between the two phases of the lesson in terms of the focus of talk and the type of language was reflected in the type and frequency of strategies used in each phase. The comparison of the frequency and distribution of CSs over the two phases of the lesson suggested that the talk over the activity-oriented phase put constraints on the use of CSs. The constraining effect of this type of talk on meaning negotiation was in evidence in the second phase of the lesson across the three teachers and in both phases in relation to teacher 7.

The considerable variation over the phases of the lesson in relation to teacher 3 and teacher 4 and their higher frequency of strategies over the topic-oriented phase, which exceeded the overall score for the whole lesson and even the overall scores of the rest of the teachers, stresses the fact that the overall scores, which represent the mean frequencies, disguise potentially
significant variation within the language of each teacher on specific lessons. In particular, this variation suggests that the patterns of teacher talk can vary in important ways depending on the phase of the lesson. This assumes even more importance when we compare Teacher 7’s scores over the two phases with his overall score for the whole lesson. In this case the overall score of the whole lesson is higher than the scores of its parts. In the discussion which follows, we will focus on the significance of these findings in the light of the issues raised in the fields of CSs and classroom discourse.

7.3 Discussion
The discussion is organised into the following three sub-sections. Section 7.3.1 discusses the issues surrounding the categorisation stage of analysis such as the types and functions of the identified categories. Section 7.3.2 deals with the frequency and the different patterns of strategy use identified in the quantitative analysis. The issues related to the use of CSs in relation to the focus of talk and the different phases of the lesson are discussed in section 7.3.3

7.3.1 Categorisation
We start with the categorisation stage of the analysis, and in particular with the issues related to the type of strategies (research question 1) and their functions (research question 2). With regard to the types of strategies, we have made a distinction between lexical-compensatory and meaning negotiation strategies. In our analysis we regarded them as distinct types of strategies and reported the results of each type separately. The reason was that they performed different functions and were used in different contexts. In terms of discourse functions, lexical-compensatory strategies, as alternative meaning structures, do not modify the structure of discourse while meaning negotiation strategies, as discourse moves, are contingent on the preceding and following discourse moves. In communication terms, meaning negotiation strategies do not divert attention from the topic under discussion while lexical-compensatory strategies often call attention to a specific lexical item which the interlocutors need to agree on its meaning before they can shift again to the discourse topic.

Lexical-compensatory strategies were used either as non-embedded to expose the relationship between the meaning description and the target item or as embedded to substitute the target word without exposing such a relationship. As was explained in chapter 4, one major difference between the two forms was that the non-embedded strategies were used in form-focused exchanges where the attention was temporarily shifted to lexical meaning explanation. The use of embedded strategies did not have such an effect on the flow of discourse. In most cases the non-embedded strategies seemed to be prompted by the teacher based on their perception of the
students' needs. The context of use of these strategies suggests that in addition to their function in clarifying the meaning of lexical items which might cause understanding problems for the students, they may play a significant pedagogic role in teaching new vocabulary items. In contrast, the non-embedded strategies seemed to be used locally in response to perceived understanding problems. This might be the reason why teachers did not stop the flow of discourse to embark on meaning description in form-focused exchanges.

The context of use of non-embedded strategies is similar to explicit appeal for assistance as learner categories. Both are used in form-focused exchanges (for the discussion on the distinction between explicit and implicit appeal for assistance see review of literature section 2.4. Their difference lies in the specific focus of the search, which is on meaning description when lexical-compensatory strategies are used by teachers and on lexical items when they are used by students. The distinction between embedded and non-embedded lexical-compensatory strategies is an important one, since it reflects a distinction in their context of use, which might be important for vocabulary instruction and learning. The distinction between lexical-compensatory strategies which are used in response to teacher-prompted lexical items and those used in response to the demands of the interactive discourse may also be important, since it suggests that teachers can use CSs both in a planned form for prompted lexical problems and in an improvised form for lexical gaps causing problems in interaction.

The examination of the data showed that only approximation and code switching were used as embedded lexical-compensatory strategies. The reason might be that only these two categories can stand as components of the discourse moves in which they are embedded. The rest of the categories, for example descriptions or appeal to authority, do not lend themselves to embedding. Code switching was exclusively used as an embedded strategy to convey concepts for which target words were not available for cultural reasons. The teachers seemed to avoid code-switching for other purposes, e.g. using it as a last resort, as if they observed a rule in private language institutes which banned them from switching to L1. Based on our scrutiny of the data, we can also report that the students' code switching was rare in the data, suggesting that the teachers' exclusive use of the target language had its effect on the students. They seemed to make every effort to communicate in English even when they did not have access to the linguistic structures they needed to convey their meanings, in which case they resorted to compensatory strategies.

With respect to the functions performed by meaning negotiation strategies in the data, the categorisation of these strategies revealed three different roles that they seemed to play in managing communication problems in interaction. We have referred to these roles as the
'macro-functions' of meaning negotiation strategies. The first macro-function is the prospective use of CSs, which is achieved through the teachers' reformulating their own utterances, cueing the elicitation of responses from the students and diagnosing problems using other-repetition with low-key rising intonation, clarification requests or confirmation checks. The prospective function seems to be directed toward the comprehension of the teacher's input and the production of the students' output. The former is achieved through self-reformulations. In natural conversations, reformulations are used as meta-comments to summarise the main points of talk or to make the intentions behind previous utterances explicit; both to achieve current communicative goals (see Heritage & Watson 1980). However, in transactional communication between the teacher and the students, their use is mainly motivated by the immediate demands of communication, which necessitate the facilitation both of one's own understanding and of being understood by others. The ability to reformulate one's own utterances in response to verbal and non-verbal signals of non-understanding is part of the native speakers' communication skills. In language classrooms, this strategy, however, assumes a pedagogic role in addition to its communicative role in talk between native speakers. This role makes it a significant aspect of teacher talk, which deserves conscious attention if it is going to be used effectively to achieve the pedagogic and/or communicative goals of classroom interaction. The use of the other strategies mentioned above as prospective measures was less frequent possibly because their use was contingent on the problems in the students' utterances. Using these strategies, teachers not only signalled but also diagnosed problems by signalling their location in the students' utterances. The diagnostic function of these strategies is a significant aspect which increases the students' success in repairing their utterances.

The second macro-function is the retrospective use of CSs which is achieved through other-reformulation, and turn completion. Using other-reformulations, the teachers picked up the students' fragmented utterances and delivered them back in a target-like form to confirm the students' contributions and at the same time provide learning materials by demonstrating how the intended meaning is to be expressed in an appropriate well-formed manner. There is overlap between teachers' other-reformulations and what Seedhouse (1999) calls 'embedded correction', defined as repair embedded in the context of a conversational move whose function is one of confirmation and agreement. However, other-reformulation is more inclusive since, in addition to repair, it includes expansions, which put the student's utterance in an extended context, and summarising, which refers to the expression of the same meaning from an alternative point of view. The significance of other-reformulation as a CS in teacher talk is not only because of its role in meaning communication but also because of its pedagogic role as a major feedback type in classroom discourse. Due to its double-function, the instrumental use of other-reformulation can help achieving success in communication, and at the same time
contribute to learning by providing linguistic material when it is needed by the students to express their intended meanings. Turn completions were used to supply lexical items when they were needed by the students. This strategy might also be potentially influential in learning vocabulary items for the same reason. Being aware of a problem in their production, the students are likely to be more attentive to the target word provided by the teacher. There is a difference between turn completion as a CS and ‘latching’ which, in Walsh’s (2002: 16) terms, is the teachers’ rushed moves to advance the discussion by filling in the gaps without giving the students a chance to complete the formulations of their utterances. Turn completions are offered in response to students’ message abandonment.

The third macro-function seems to occur when CSs are used to maintain conversation. This function is performed by other-repetition, and the information-oriented subcategories of clarification requests and confirmation checks. It reflects the teacher’s attempts to keep the students involved in classroom interaction. One way of achieving this purpose is to incorporate the students’ utterances which are provided in response to the teacher’s elicitation moves in the on-going discussion on a topic and make them the basis for further elicitations. The second way, which is oriented toward the students’ contributions, elicits more details of a topic of interest in an attempt to develop it with more contributions from the students.

For the following obvious reasons, it is expected that teachers would be more inclined to use other-repetition far more frequently than clarification requests and confirmation checks as conversational continuants. First, other-repetitions help the teacher keep control of his leading role in advancing discourse by nominating and developing topics. Second, this strategy is less demanding since it anchors the discussion on the students’ utterances but it does not require them to produce further information. Third it is an economical way of handling the topics, since it helps the teacher avoid being side-tracked by background questions or comments from the students. In contrast, the information-oriented clarification requests and confirmation checks are more demanding on the part of both the teacher and the students. By allowing the students to develop their own topics, the teachers run the risk of facing unexpected problems, which will need extra efforts to be resolved. The linguistic demands of these strategies might also cause problems for the students themselves by exposing the limits of their linguistic knowledge.

Comparing the teachers’ CSs (meaning negotiation and lexical-compensatory strategies) with the learners’ CSs (compensatory strategies as described in the review of literature), we can identify a fundamental difference between the two in terms of their functions for the two groups. While the former are generally used to adapt among other things to one’s interlocutors’ needs, the latter are more likely to be used to compensate for one’s own problems. Teachers use
lexical-compensatory and meaning negotiation strategies for both purposes. However, the use of CSs for adaptation purposes is expected to be more heavily represented in the data than their use for compensatory purposes. In contrast, due to the constraints imposed by the setting, the students are expected to use CSs more often for compensatory rather than adaptation purposes.

7.3.2 Quantitative analysis

Shifting to quantification and first to the frequency of CSs in the data (research question 1), we found that the strategies used primarily to adapt to the students' communicative needs constituted 70% of the meaning negotiation strategies. This finding indicates the degree of responsibility that the teacher takes to avoid communication problems and to work with the students to solve them when they have occurred. This raises the issue of the asymmetrical nature of the talk between the teacher and the students due to their difference in proficiency. In situations where a proficiency differential exists, it is more likely that the more proficient speaker takes up more responsibility in managing discourse by taking more preventive measures and initiating more repair work than the less proficient speaker. The success of this type of interaction is largely determined by the measures taken by the more proficient speaker. In the classroom context, the institutional role of the teacher as 'instructor' suggests a managerial role for him/her in leading the discourse toward set goals. This factor might have also contributed to the above ratio. This role adds a pedagogic significance to the teacher's effort to ensure the success of communication since success creates a motivating learning environment.

The finding that 30% of the frequency of strategic moves went to clarification requests and confirmation checks indicates that the teachers moved beyond adaptation to involve the students in extended meaning negotiation, though on a limited scale. Compared with the studies done in language classrooms using the interactional modifications framework (e.g. Pica and Doughty 1985), this figure is inflated. This can be attributed to the fact that we have extended these two categories to include functions such as content and lexical meaning clarification in addition to their function in solving problems of meaning and understanding. Although content clarification, as a function of confirmation checks, have not been included in the studies done on meaning negotiation, we consider it a significant aspect of this strategy; since it reflects the teacher's and students' extended efforts to agree on intended propositions whose expression seems to be problematic due to the students' limited proficiency. A case can also be made for the significance of clarification requests used for lexical meaning clarification. This use of clarification requests demonstrates the teacher's and students' efforts to agree on the meaning of
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lexical items which are often prompted by the teacher due to their significance in understanding oral or written texts.

Using clarification requests and confirmation checks, the teachers transferred part of the responsibility of meaning clarification to the students. The lower frequency of these strategies compared with other measures which reflect the teachers’ efforts to clarify meaning might be explained by the fact that putting the students on the spot in language classes is a risky job since there is always the possibility that the addressed student may not be able or willing to do the required clarification. This may cause embarrassment, which might deter the student from further participation in classroom interaction. The teachers’ sensitivity to affective factors might limit the use of these measures. For example, the teacher may use them in special cases where they can make sure the students are at least willing to make a try or where they can not make reasonable guesses about the students’ intentions. The incidence of the latter case is very limited since teachers as discourse managers control the topics in interaction and as a result are able to make reasonable guesses as to what the students are trying to tell them in most of the cases (see Pica et al. 1989).

In relation to the strategies used for adaptation purposes, the high percentage of other-repetition and other reformulations was very much expected. By definition, other-repetitions are used as topic incorporation moves to enable the teachers both to acknowledge/confirm the students’ contributions and to incorporate them into their topic continuation moves. They are also used as an economical way of signalling problems, which are then repaired cooperatively. By repeating a student’s utterance, the teacher provides feedback to the student whose utterance has been repeated and at the same time confirms it as a possible candidate contributing to the on-going discussion. Taking other-repetition and other-reformulation together, we can explain the role of these teachers’ moves by analogy with filtration to separate those utterances which can contribute to the topic as they stand and those which need modification before their entry is approved. There is still another aspect to the use of these two categories which reflects the teacher’s control over the progression of discourse. The importance of this aspect can be explained by the type of teacher-student role relationship, which puts the teacher in the lead position and the students as responsive agents on the receiving end. In view of these reasons and the fact that these constitute the two major feedback types in classroom discourse, it is perhaps not surprising that they have assumed the highest level of frequency in the data.

Considering the results of other studies (e.g. Pica and Long 1986), which have shown that teachers use comprehension checks more than clarification requests and confirmation checks, the low frequency of comprehension checks in the data collected for the present study was
unexpected. One possible explanation for this result is the way we have operationalised this category. Consistent with our view that CSs are identified based on their effect on the interlocutor; we did not rely just on the form of a discourse move in determining its function. Our decision in the coding process was based on the interlocutor’s response to the move. On this basis, most of the teachers’ moves which resembled comprehension checks in terms of their form (e.g. ‘Right?’ ‘Ok?’) were not coded unless there was sufficient evidence to show that the teachers expected a response and the response was provided by the students. Examining the data based on these criteria, we found that some teachers used comprehension checks frequently as fillers without any specifiable function such as to raise the expectation of a response on the part of the students. Another possible explanation is that in groups 1 and 2, as the results of the microanalysis have shown in relation to teacher 3 (group 1) and teacher 4 (group 2), referential questions were used with higher frequencies than display questions. The flow of information from the students to the teacher when referential questions were asked may have decreased the frequency of comprehension checks. This possibility is supported by comparing the frequency of comprehension checks adopted by group 3 with those of groups 1 and 2 (chapter 5 tables 5.1 and 5.10).

One interesting result is the frequency of self-reformulation which is comparably high across the three groups. In studies done on meaning negotiation (e.g. Long 1980, 1983b), self-reformulations have not been distinguished from self-repetitions. In this study, we have made this distinction to exclude self-repetitions as CSs on the grounds that a decision as to whether a teacher’s repetition of his utterances was intended to simplify input by giving the students more processing time, or acting as a filler to provide more time to the speaker proved to be problematic without having access to sources of data other than the transcription of the lessons. This distinction has enabled us to demonstrate that reformulation, as a way of increasing the transparency in meaning communication, was frequently used by the teachers. In most cases, the reformulations were done on teachers’ elicitation moves which were realised in the form of open-ended questions. In their reformulations, teachers simplified either the linguistic form of the question, by substituting some lexical items or syntactic structures, or its content, by changing the open-ended question to a closed one. Self-reformulations seemed to be motivated by the need for a response to the elicitation move when the response was not provided by the students in the first place. On this basis, they were used as prospective measures to facilitate the elicitation process by assisting the students in their comprehension of the teachers’ questions.

The low frequency of turn completions and cues across the three groups is another finding, which can be explained by the specific conditions under which these strategies were used. By definition, turn completions are provided in response to students’ message abandonment, which
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is typically due to their failure to access words or expressions to convey their intended meanings. These instances occurred very rarely in the data. The reason might be the students' unwillingness to take risks when providing answers to questions or initiate exchanges. They are more likely to avoid answering questions or initiating exchanges unless they are sure that they can formulate their utterances. The same reasons might explain the low frequency of cues since this strategy is also used when students provide responses which are deficient in content terms. The risk-avoiding factor, which seems more likely to be at work in classroom contexts, can account for the low frequency of both of these strategies.

With respect to lexical-compensatory strategies, the high level of the frequency of circumlocution was expected. One reason may have been the teachers' levels of proficiency, which enabled them to rely on L2-based instead of L1-based compensatory strategies. Previous research on the relationship between proficiency and the use of compensatory strategies (see Bialystok and Frolich 1980; Jourdin 2000) suggests that advanced non-native speakers, much like native speakers, opt for circumlocution in lexical compensation. This tendency is enhanced in language classrooms, where, due to pedagogic purposes, the L1-based strategies, which are less effective in meaning communication, are considered inappropriate not only for communicative reasons due to their inefficiency in establishing mutual agreement on meaning but also for the pedagogic reason of depriving students from L2 comprehensible input. The informal observation that code switching was only used to compensate for lexical items which had no L2 equivalents for cultural reasons, and not as a last resort, provides some evidence for this explanation. The teachers' last resort seemed to be the use of appeal for authority, which was only used twice in the data by a NS teacher and a NNS teacher. The NS teacher (T 1) opted for this strategy in his first lesson after his several circumlocutions in different occasions over the course of the lesson had not succeeded to convey the meaning of a lexical item to at least one of the students. The NNS teacher (T 4) used this strategy in his third lesson when he seemed to have uncertainties about certain aspects of his circumlocution in response to a lexical item which had been prompted by one of the students.

In spite of the pedagogical significance of visual clues in communicating meaning and enhancing the visibility of the input, 'mime', as a visual lexical-compensatory strategy, was only used by groups 1 and 2 with very small frequencies. One reason for this result might be the course level. At the intermediate level, the classroom discourse tends to be more displaced than the elementary level at which the focus is more on here-and-now topics. Abstract lexical items for which mime is not an appropriate option are more likely to occur in displaced discourse than concrete discourse of the elementary level. The differences in frequency of this strategy across teachers and its absence in some classes might be accounted for by the classroom atmosphere.
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created by the type of teacher-student relationship. For example, the majority of mime instances in the NS teachers’ data occurred in classes led by teacher 1 in a Community Language Centre. In these classes, the atmosphere was less formal and more relaxed compared with classes led by the other two NS teachers in the University Language Centre. We might also speculate that the teacher’s type of personality might have also been operative in the use of this strategy. The implication of this possibility is that teachers might have different perceptions of the quality of being theatrical in their classroom behaviour.

Within circumlocution, description and contextualised descriptions occurred more frequently than approximation and embedded approximation. Approximation seems to be more economical in conveying meaning. This may be the reason why teachers opted for this strategy when they decided to simplify their utterances without shifting attention from the topic in hand to lexical meaning description. In these circumstances, they embedded approximations in their utterances. Consider the underlined embedded approximation in the following example.

Example 7.1 [T5 L2]

T:
302 have you ever lifted raised any restrictions in your life?

However, they seemed to have preferred either to use descriptions, or to combine approximations with descriptions as non-embedded strategies, perhaps to avoid the ambiguities the use of approximations by themselves may cause in meaning expression due to the loss of some aspects of meaning. In the following example, consider the underlined non-embedded descriptions and approximations provided by the teacher in an effort to clarify the meaning of an abstract concept.

Example 7.2 [T1 L1]

T:
334 careful
335 no, it’s precocious
336 it means if you have(...) ah, a lot to say for yourself
337 it’s the opposite of shy(... ok?
338 If you are precocious it means that you have a lot of ideas
339 and you want to tell people your ideas
340 you make a lot of noise
341 you are very lively
342 quite cheeky sometimes.
343 he was a very precocious child
344 a lot of American children are precocious

The interesting aspect of using descriptions for lexical compensation was the finding that a special variety of description which we have referred to as ‘contextualised description’ complemented the use of this strategy especially when the concept was complex and the description by itself did not seem to be conspicuous enough in conveying the meaning.
Pedagogic reasons might also have motivated the use of this strategy. By using contextualised descriptions, teachers can relate the concept to the students' experiences to make them more concrete and as a result easier to be recovered by the students. The likely effect of relating concepts to the students' background knowledge is the enhancement of the visibility of the word-meaning relationship and as a result an increase in the possibility of its being noticed and possibly learned by the students.

With respect to the micro-functions, the findings revealed the higher frequency of the code-oriented subcategory of clarification requests. The reason for this might be the definition of this subcategory, which encompassed two specific functions, which dealt with hearing and understanding problems and with eliciting lexical meaning clarification. In contrast, in relation to confirmation checks, the finding was that the information-oriented type was more frequent in the data. Two reasons seem to be responsible for the relatively higher proportion of information-oriented to code-oriented confirmation checks. First, the code-oriented confirmation checks were only used to diagnose problems which needed repair. It is helpful to recall that CSs used for repair purposes occurred where the orientation of talk was toward meaning communication. As there were two other options (other-repetition and other-reformulation) for the teachers to do repair on the students' utterances, and as they seemed to prefer to use these options, the frequency of confirmation checks used for this purpose was very low. Second, due to their basic preference to take more responsibility in communication, teachers were more likely to offer the required information instead of eliciting it from the students. The restructuring function of other-reformulation, which was specifically used to summarise or expand the students' fragmented utterances in an effort to make them more transparent in meaning expression, was more frequent than the repair function. This result might be explained by the observation that using this strategy for repair purposes was only limited to errors which caused problems with meaning communication.

With respect to question numbers 3 and 4, the results of the quantitative analysis were presented in two different sets in chapter 5; first the patterns identified in all three lessons and then those identified in lesson 3. As the patterns of lesson 3 turned out to be more reliable for purposes of discussion of individual and group trends, as evidenced by the decrease in variation among teachers and the sharper group differences, we base our discussion on the patterns identified in this lesson. Meanwhile, as appropriate, we will also bring in the differences between the results of the three lessons and those of lesson 3 in this section.
The finding that there were no important differences between NS teachers and NNS teachers (group 1 and group 2) and that the real differences were detected between group 3 (NNS teachers) and the other two groups can be accounted for by the well-established empirical finding that there is no substantial difference between the strategic choices of native speakers and non-native speakers with regard to the use of compensatory strategies (e.g. Paribakht 1985; Rost and Ross 1991; Jourdin 2000). The argument is that strategic competence, which has already been developed in L1, is available to L2 speakers at all levels (see Paribakht 1985). The main difference between native speakers and non-native speakers lies not in their strategic competence but in their access to sources of linguistic knowledge which are drawn upon through strategic competence. Therefore, if L2 speakers do have comparable access to linguistic knowledge as native speakers do, no differences are expected to exist between the strategic decisions of the two groups. Although this argument is put forward in relation to compensatory strategies, it can well apply to meaning negotiation strategies since these strategies, as discourse measures employed in managing communication problems, are also assumed to be controlled by strategic competence.

We can explain the difference between one group of NNS teachers and the other two groups to some extent by the effect of ‘task’ on the use of CSs, which is again a well-established empirical finding (see Poulisse and Schils 1989; Selinker and Douglass 1985). Irrespective of their language background, speakers seem to draw on the same conversational principles in their strategic choices as they do in communication in general. The point is that these principles are responsive to contextual factors, among which task is one of the most prominent. In language classrooms, the major sources of tasks are the teaching materials. In the context of the present study, (as was explained in chapter 3) the teaching materials used by teachers were commercial textbooks in relation to group 2 and commercial textbooks plus materials compiled by the institution in cooperation with teachers in respect to group 1, both sets of materials based on the tenets of the communicative approach. In contrast, the teaching materials used by group 3 were prepared and supplied by the institution based on the basic principles of the audio-lingual approach. The teachers and students in this group were involved in types of activities (e.g. drills and exercises) which generated very few opportunities for genuine interaction. The ritualistic type of interaction probably increased the predictability of the teacher’s and students’ moves and may have resulted in the fewer opportunities for students to initiate and change topics. The predictability element gave rise to an apparently trouble-free type of interaction which hardly left space for improvisation. This would explain why the
overall level of strategy use by teachers in group 3 was very much lower than that of the other two groups.

A prominent feature of interaction in group 3 was its focus on activity rather than topic. This was mainly a function of the teaching-learning activities which can be characterised in Willis’s (1990) term as 'citations'. This type of activities required more frequent explicit framing on the part of the teacher. This feature can explain the higher frequency of the activity orientation devices, which was associated with a low overall frequency of CSs, and the higher frequency of the code-oriented subcategories of clarification requests, confirmation checks and the repair sub-category of other-reformulation. It may also account for the finding that group 3’s use of lexical-compensatory strategies was comparable with the other two groups. The use of this type of strategies in pedagogic exchanges is consistent with the orientation of the teacher-student interaction in group 3 in general. The major consequence of this orientation is the very low level of content negotiation in classes taught by the teachers in group 3.

The impact of contextual factors on the use of CSs was also evidenced by the finding that the use of the same task in lesson 3 across the three groups had the effect of increasing the use of meaning negotiation strategies. The major feature of this task was its potential for generating a more student-centred interaction which relied on contributions from the students. In more specific terms, a major part of the content of the lesson was supposed to be produced by the students (for a detailed description of task design features see chapter 3). The increase in the overall use of meaning negotiation strategies in this lesson may be the result of a corresponding increase in the level of students’ participation, which was induced by the task design features. It should be noted that any increase in the level of students’ participation in lesson 3 is a matter of speculation since this aspect has not been empirically investigated. The smaller amount of variability in the use of strategies across teachers in this lesson provides further support for the strong relationship between the type of task and the use of CSs.

The finding that, in contrast with meaning negotiation strategies, the overall frequency of lexical-compensatory strategies has dropped in lesson 3, can be explained by the nature of the activities in which the teacher and students were involved in this lesson. As explained before, the content of the task used in this lesson was mainly produced as a result of interaction between the teacher and the students. The task input data posed fewer lexical problems than the normal lessons. Moreover, as in their interacting with the teacher, the students were in control of their contributions to the content of the lesson, there were fewer cases where the teachers’
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intervention was necessary for lexical compensation purposes. In the normal lessons, reading and listening texts constituted the major part of the content of the lessons, and these texts normally generated lots of lexical problems that the teachers had to compensate for in order to make themselves understood by the students. In contrast with meaning negotiation strategies, which are produced in response to the exigencies of the interaction itself, the need for the use of lexical-compensatory strategies is to some extent the function of the students' needs and the type of input data that the teachers have to share with the students. This might explain the low frequency of this type of strategies. In fact their frequency is so low that it is hard to lend much importance to any meaningful differences between the groups.

As the teachers are normally in control of the content of their lessons especially when they use textbooks as teaching materials, they are able to predict some of the problems which might arise as a result of their interaction with the students. This element of predictability provides opportunities for them to plan how to share the content with the students and what alternative forms to use to establish mutual comprehension. This element may explain the difference in the teachers' approach to lexical compensation. Some teachers will probably have compensated for the lexical items as they surfaced in the interaction. It may have been the case then that for these teachers lexical compensation was an integral part of their efforts to ensure comprehensibility in their interaction with the students (e.g. T1, T2, T3, T4, and T8). This approach would have reduced the frequency of lexical-compensatory strategies. In contrast, a second group of teachers may have put more emphasis on the planned aspect of their lessons, predicting problems before they occurred in interaction. This anticipation of lexical problems would have increased the frequency of compensatory strategies for these teachers (T5, T6, T7, and T9). These distinct approaches might help explain the difference between teachers whose use of lexical-compensatory strategies is balanced across lessons and those whose use shows substantial increase over one of the normal lessons. In lesson 3 where the larger part of the content of the lesson was produced as a result of interaction between the teacher and students, the teachers' behaviour showed little variation evidenced by the SD of this lesson which is much smaller than those of the other lessons (0.9 versus 3.6 and 3.2). This result also supports the explanation based on the distinct approaches to lexical compensation.

7.3.3 Microanalysis

With respect to questions 5 and 6, the results of the analysis done on the third lesson of three teachers to investigate the relationship between the type and frequency of CSs and the focus of talk over the phases of the lesson revealed that the contexts constructed in the topic-oriented phase of the lesson proved more favourable for the use of CSs. In contrast, the contexts
associated with activity-orientation had a negative effect on the frequency and distribution of CSs. There are two aspects to the analysis of the contexts in the phases of the lesson. The first aspect deals with the pedagogic aims of each phase and the way they are interpreted by the teachers. With regard to this aspect, the design of the task provided opportunities for different focuses of talk over the different phases and steps of the lesson. This element, which was associated with a difference in the pedagogic aims of the activities in each phase was interpreted differently by the teachers. Teacher 3 and teacher 4 were rather similar in their interpretation, which matched the design of the task. Teacher 7's interpretation was different, showing no distinction between the two phases. This result raises the issue of the variability of the focus of talk and its relationship to the pedagogic aims of the teaching-learning activities on the one hand and the different potentiality of each type of focus in constructing contexts which could be more or less favourable to meaning negotiation as reflected by the frequency and distribution of CSs on the other. The pedagogic implications of this conclusion are discussed in section 7.4.

The second aspect deals with the methodological aspects of the analysis of teacher talk. The results showed a great variability over the phases and steps of the lesson. The variability which took the form of fluctuation in the frequency and distribution of CSs suggests that the overall frequency for the whole lesson does not represent the true picture of the teachers' strategy use. A higher or a lower overall frequency might hide lower or higher frequencies of strategies elsewhere in the data. The argument here is that, in the study of CSs, the overall scores need to be complemented with more detailed analysis of the pedagogic aims of the different phases of the lessons so that any variability in strategy use can be detected and taken into account in the overall analysis of the whole lessons. This argument undermines to some extent detailed comparisons of teachers, or predictions about their behaviours, based on overall scores. The implications of this argument for the methodology of classroom data analysis are discussed in section 7.5.

To bring the different strands of arguments together, we can start with the categorisation stage, which generated the category system. The identification process, which assumed a functional orientation, led to two sets of categories. The discussion on the next stages of analysis is hoped to have demonstrated that the identified categories are potentially reliable tools in the analysis of teacher talk. Their reliability and coverage, which extends to a wide range of teachers' problem-solving behaviour, can prove useful in highlighting some important aspects of teacher talk, which deserve much more attention than they have so far received from the research community. The frequency count of the categories in the second stage of analysis revealed certain relationships between the categories in the form of patterns of strategy use, which were argued to reflect the nature of classroom interaction as a specific genre of institutionalised
discourse. In terms of group differences, the mean frequencies for the groups seemed to rule out language background as an important factor influencing the type or frequency of strategies. Task-related effects seemed to be the more influential factors in this respect. This result was reiterated more by the results of the microanalysis which demonstrated the influence of the teaching-learning activities in different phases of the lesson as realised by the overall and local focus of talk in interaction. The results also revealed substantial variation in the patterns of strategy use in the phases of the lesson not mirrored by the overall frequency scores. The next section deals with the theoretical implications of the results for the study of teachers' CSs.

7.4 Theoretical Implications

7.4.1 The analysis of teachers' strategies

The empirical findings of the present study enable us to argue for an extended concept of CSs which moves beyond the learners' categories to deal with their own performance problems. It includes the more proficient speakers' categories to adapt his/her use of language to the interlocutor's needs. As was explained in detail in the review of literature (section 2.4 and 2.5), this extended notion of CSs was implied by its interactional definition (Tarone 1980). However, the conclusion was that its implications for the categorisation of CSs had not been formulated. The findings of this study contribute to the formulation of how these two types of categories, which have so far been dealt with under different frameworks of study, can be integrated under the same framework. There are certain issues in this integration which we referred to in our review of literature. First, it was the question of how to categorise the learner's and native speaker's CSs. Yule's and Tarone's (1991:167) suggested solution to rename the native speaker's categories as appeal for assistance was argued to be inadequate for the reasons explained in the review of literature (section 2.4). The results of the study suggest that, in spite of the similarities between the learners' and native speakers'/teachers' categories, they perform different functions. Learners mainly use CSs to compensate for their own performance problems; while native speakers'/teachers' use of CSs reflects their adaptations to the learners' needs. As demonstrated by the results, this distinction, which reflects a general trend in strategy use, does not rule out the possibility of the use of both types of strategies by teachers/native speakers for compensatory purposes. The distinction in the functions of learners' and native speakers'/teachers' categories supports our suggestion to develop an alternative categorisation in which the distinction between appeal for assistance as a learner category and interactional modifications as native speakers' categories is maintained. The data-based categorisation of the teacher's CSs (see chapter 4) provides a basis upon which the current typologies of CSs can be extended to account for the interactional definition of CSs.
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A major issue in classroom communication and instruction is the distribution of power between the teacher and students. In institutionalised discourse, where the participants' role relationship brings about certain well-defined rights and duties in managing discourse, any attempt for its restructuring, as argued by Pica (1987: 12), 'could reverse the status relationship in the classroom and thereby place the student in a position of power and authority over their teacher'.

This unwitting consequence of the students' use of the categories of meaning negotiation suggests that it is not just the communicative relevancy of the discourse moves which determines their use by the participants. They are also regulated by certain socio-cultural rules, which are observed by the participants due to their awareness of the repercussions created when they are ignored. This argument supports the distinction made between the learners' and native speakers' categories.

In spite of the difference in the functions performed by the categories of CSs used by the teacher and those used by the students, an argument can be made for their intimate relationship on the grounds that the teacher's use of language to a large extent determines the major elements of the context for the students' participation in classroom interaction. The results of the microanalysis clearly showed that the students' participation level was largely dependent on the discourse properties of the teacher's language. The major reason for this rather deterministic effect is the nature of the dominant role of the teacher as discourse manager and instructor in establishing and maintaining patterns of interaction, which seems to have a facilitating or constraining effect on students' opportunities to participate in classroom interaction. As an example of this effect we can refer to the role that referential questions can play in promoting meaningful communication. Although the effect of the use of meaning negotiation strategies by the teacher on the students' use of compensatory strategies has not been empirically investigated in this study, based on scrutiny of the data and logical argumentation we can speculate that the use of meaning negotiation strategies specially the use of clarification requests, confirmation checks and other-repetitions which function as signals of non-understanding can trigger the use of lexical-compensatory strategies by the students.

If we accept the existence of a relationship between the teacher's use of language and the students' level of participation and their use of lexical-compensatory strategies, an interesting question to ask is how the properties of input are reflected in the properties of output and how their relationship can be improved. The results of the microanalysis were revealing in this respect. First, this relationship is partly determined by the pedagogic aims of the teaching-learning activities. It was shown that the two different contexts (form and accuracy versus fluency) in the two phases of the same lesson had different configurations of the overall and local focus of talk on activity and topic. These activity/topic configurations were characterised
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by different combinations of discourse processes which were mainly determined by the input properties. It was the teachers' (T 3 and T4) use of language consistent with the pedagogic aims of each phase which provided more opportunities for the students' participation level and an enhanced level of the overall use of CSs and their more varied distribution. Second, the relationship between the input properties and the pedagogic aims of each phase is complicated by the teachers' interpretation of the pedagogic aims and their knowledge of the discourse processes and their ability to use them in optimal combinations. The discourse processes which characterised the teachers' initiation and feedback moves were the referential and display questions and the two sets of mechanisms to orient toward topic or activity. The contention is that teachers' awareness not only of the pedagogic aims of different phases of their lessons but also of the discourse processes which might be employed to enhance the interaction types relevant to the aims of each phase might be the answer to the above question.

Another theoretical ground where the results of the present study may have implication for is the micro-functions of CSs. We have identified code-orientation and information-orientation as the two distinct micro-functions for clarification requests, confirmation checks, and other-reformulations. Code-orientation covers the problems of hearing or understanding or in Aston's (1987) term 'accessibility' problems. In such cases, the teacher either models the formulation of the student's intended meaning in the form of other-reformulation or confirmation check, which suggests that the teacher has been able to make sense of the utterance or at least make guesses about its message, or he may ask for clarification, which indicates the inaccessibility of the student's utterance. Of course, there might be cases where the teacher feigns non-understanding to give the student an opportunity for self-repair.

The modelling function has similarities with what adults do with the child's utterances as reported in Gaies (1977). They use modelling as a communication strategy, first to expand the child's fragments, and second to provide the appropriate lexical item when the child does not know the name for something in a picture. In this study, the teachers modelled appropriate words- in response to the students' inappropriate word choice which created ambiguities in meaning expression, and also in response to their use of circumlocution as an alternative meaning structure to convey their intended meanings. They also used other-reformulation for the same purpose through expanding, summarising or restructuring the students' fragmented utterances.

In identifying the modelling function of CSs, we have drawn on the literature on repair (see Schegloff et al. 1977), where a distinction is made between repair in the sense of resolving problems of talk by producing alternative references for what a speaker has originally produced,
and error correction in the sense of producing substitutes for linguistic items which are thought to be erroneous according to the norms of the target language. This might be due to the native speakers' tendency not to go for outright correction in normal talk. According to Jefferson (1987: 88), outright correction creates side sequences which hold up the progression of discourse to focus attention on the correction of errors. Instead of creating side sequences by outright correction, native speakers prefer to embed the repair in the next sequentially relevant turn as not to create disruption in the progress of conversation.

In classroom interaction, outright correction often occurs in intra-turn position. In this respect, Van Lier (1988: 207-8) notes

[I]t appears that certain types of repair need to be done in appropriate slots, in separate turns, while others are done within the turn in which the trouble occurs. The former generally deals with problems of hearing and understanding the talk, and with matters relating to content, whereas the latter deal with 'helping out' with speaking problems, and occur immediately after the trouble spot, without waiting for the turn to end.

Based on scrutiny of the data and the finding that other-reformulations and confirmation checks as third turn moves have, at least to some extent, been used as CSs to focus on meaning, we can support Van Lier's observation. Meanwhile, we would prefer to add that in exchanges which are not focused on meaning, teachers are likely to use the third turn for error correction. Evidently, these third-turn reformulations, which are aimed at moving the students' utterances to more target-like forms, are not CSs for the obvious reason that they do not play a role in meaning negotiation. The study has claimed that the distinctions made between reformulations used as CSs and those used for error correction on the one hand and between code- and information-orientated functions of formulations as CSs are contributions to the functional analysis of classroom discourse.

It can also be argued that the findings have implications for the theoretical account of the relationship between communication and learning as suggested by the different theoretical models presented to account for this relationship. As an example, we can refer to Bialystok's (Bialystok 1985, 1990, 1991; Kellerman and Bialystok 1997) model of language learning and use. This model is characterised by two distinct but interrelated processes; analysis of knowledge and control of processing. The processes are assumed to be responsible for language use; however, as they lead to changes in mental representations, they play a role in language learning. Drawing on insights from enunciation theory, Grandcolas and Soule-Susbielles (1986:289) make a similar distinction between two levels of discourse; the level of simulation, in which participants act as if the situation was real and the level of enunciation in which participants, as learners, are trying to internalise the language system with the help of the
teacher. The implication of Bialystok’s distinction between processes and Grandcolas and Soule-Susbielles’s distinction between the discourse levels is that the internalisation process seems to be guided by the discourse processes of meaning communication. Therefore, it is important that the pedagogic messages are implicitly exchanged in the context of meaning communication. The following example from Grandcolas and Soule-Susbielles (1986: 299) shows that the explicit pedagogic messages may not be noticed by the learners and in effect may not contribute to learning.

L1: I don’t like classical music because I can’t dance to a tune on it
T: Well, you say I can’t dance— that’s all
L1: I can’t dance, that’s all

Although the student has modified his original utterance it seems less likely that the teacher’s pedagogic message has been successfully communicated, since the teacher and the student appear not to be in tune with regard to the level of communication.

The miscommunication reflected by the above example is also echoed by Schachter (1984: 172) who notes

The most obvious source of negative data, explicit correction, is also the least serious in terms of the intelligibility factor and thus, one might argue, is the least efficacious as a source of negative input. The explicit correction [...] is meant to convey the message that the conversational partner knows exactly what message was transmitted by the learner but is unwilling to accept it in the form in which it was transmitted.

Schachter’s view is consistent with the above theoretical stance developed in this thesis. The findings enabled us to demonstrate that some CSs were used by teachers as double-level moves which, according to the above theoretical argumentation, might have allowed the pedagogic messages to be communicated more efficiently. The implication is that, in addition to their role in communication, CSs have a significant pedagogic role to play in classroom interaction.

The communicative and pedagogic role of CSs in teacher talk discussed above moves beyond its conventional functions investigated through the type of questions, the ratio of teacher-student talk, or the extent of IRF exchange structures. The use of the target language to communicate in L2 classrooms gives both sides immense problems, which make the use of CSs an inescapable aspect of teacher talk. In addition to their role in facilitating interaction through teachers’ adaptation to the students’ linguistic needs, the effective use of CSs can provide learning material which can ultimately contribute to the process of L2 learning in instructional contexts.
The relationship between the use of CSs and the broader orientations of teacher talk toward activity or topic was shown to be related to the different levels of classroom communication. The prevalence of each level in a specific part of a lesson depends on the pedagogic aims of the teaching-learning activities. The shift of focus is achieved through the use of language in specific ways by teachers. Their awareness of the pedagogic aims and their ability to change the focus of talk play an important role in the way pedagogic aims are achieved. The implication is that there is an intimate relationship between pedagogy and communication in language classrooms, and that CSs play different functions in communication and in effect in the achievement of pedagogic goals. In addition to the variations identified in the same lesson, there were also differences between the normal lessons (lessons 1 and 2) and lessons 3. The use of the specially-designed task in lessons 3 reduced the variation in strategy use among teachers and made the differences between groups of teachers more conspicuous. This is another indication that the use of CSs is influenced by the lesson activities and their concomitant focuses of the talk. All these provide support for the argument that, as communication and instruction go hand-in-hand in language classrooms, the study of CSs needs to be linked to the broader orientations of teacher talk.

The variation among the teachers in the same group and between the three teachers representing the 3 groups as was shown by the results of the quantitative analysis and the microanalysis respectively suggest that at least part of the variation might be the outcome of the individual teacher’s interaction style and the students’ different needs. As these variables have not been controlled in this study, the extent to which they have influenced the variation can not be estimated. However, their contribution to the variation needs to be acknowledged.

Finally, an interesting theoretical issue is raised by the finding that NS teachers and NNS teachers can be very similar in their use of CSs. This is a significant result given the fact that it has frequently been argued (e.g. Kramsch 1995b; Pennycook 1994) that CLT may be placing too much of a strain on NNS teachers. This may be the case for some teachers, but on the basis of the evidence from this study it looks as though we can’t generalise simply on the basis of whether a teacher is NS or NNS. This might lead toward a consideration of the need for more research into the broader issue of NNS teachers’ language proficiency.

In this section we have explained some of the theoretical implications that the results of this study might have for the way CSs are conceptualised in the field. First, we argued for an extended notion of CSs which encompassed both the learners’ and native speakers'/teachers’ categories. It was further argued that although these two types of categories perform different functions for the two user groups they are complementary in the sense that the use of certain
meaning negotiation strategies by teachers can trigger the use of compensatory strategies by students. An argument was also developed for the theoretical implications of the functional distinction between code- and information-orientation functions of meaning negotiation strategies. The code-oriented categories were explained as related to the modelling function, which we had identified by drawing on the distinction made between repair and error correction in repair studies. It was then argued that the theoretical stance in this study on the use of double-level moves was consistent with the models of learning and use which make a relationship between the processes of the use of language in the context of meaning communication and learning.

7.4.2 Pedagogical implications

In this section, the pedagogical implications of the teachers' use of CSs are discussed with respect to the potentiality of teacher-fronted interaction to sustain meaning communication and the role of CSs in this type of interaction. The discussion also focuses on the different ways through which teachers' awareness of these roles might be helpful in enhancing the more effective use of strategies in meaning negotiation. The question is also raised as to whether the use of CSs by language teachers might contribute to the learners' learning processes.

The findings of this study raises a number of interesting questions about current pedagogical practices, which with further research might lead to much clearer pedagogical implications. First is the issue of communication skills and strategies which speakers in general and language teachers in particular need to develop. In his discussion on knowledge and skills involved in oral communication, Bygate (1987: 26-35) defines negotiation as 'the skill of communicating ideas clearly'. Negotiation, he maintains, has two different aspects: first selection of the appropriate level of explicitness; and second negotiation of meaning to make sure understanding has occurred. The second aspect involves the use of strategies of communication in its broadest sense which includes the use of paraphrase, metaphor and vocabulary choice to vary the degree of precision, and the use of conversational modifications. His contention is that these are very useful skills not only for learners but also for native speakers. As this study has focused on the identification and description of the devices used by teachers to negotiate meaning for compensatory purposes and to ensure mutual understanding, the question can be raised as to whether teachers’ awareness of these strategies would be helpful in achieving the pedagogic aims of classroom interaction. Although the relationship between communication and learning has not been yet established, it has frequently been argued that replicating natural acquisition experiences (e.g. Ellis 1992) might facilitate the acquisition process. In more specific terms, raising the awareness of teachers about the type of skills and strategies which contribute to
meaning communication in language classrooms might, on the basis of the above argument, be helpful in achieving pedagogic aims.

With regard to lexical-compensatory strategies, as the data in this study demonstrate, in classes where the target language is solely used, teachers are pushed to use different means including circumlocution and mimetic gestures and even appealing to authority to compensate for students' lexical gaps and their own difficulties in adapting to students' needs. This inevitably plays an important role in motivating the students to do so when they are caught in situations where they do not have access to the words they need to communicate their messages. As noted by Berry-bravo (1993:375) those students who have not been trained in using circumlocution or who have not been exposed to its use, may find it extremely difficult to perform in classes which are run solely through the target language. These observations support the view that raising awareness about teachers' CSs might benefit the students in their efforts to learn the language through instruction. The use of circumlocution can be made more effective if it is constructed interactively with contributions from the students, since interactively-constructed meaning descriptions would relate more easily to the students' background knowledge and experiences. They would also guard against over- or under-description.

With regard to meaning negotiation strategies, there are certain aspects which we assume might be relevant to the issues of teachers' communicative knowledge and skills. One aspect pertains to the current views held on teacher-led interaction and its capacity to provide learners' with opportunities to be involved in genuine communication. There are a number of features which seem to place constraints on genuine communication, among which we can refer to the high frequency of display questions and its implication that classroom interaction involves one-way flow of information (Pica and Long 1986), the prevalence of the IRF pattern of interaction, and the low frequency of meaning negotiation (e.g. Long and Sato 1983). Although these views might reflect certain general aspects of classroom interaction, they cover inter- and intra-teacher variation and also discourage further investigations, which might lead to uncovering the factors which influence this type of interaction. The results of this study, which show that teachers can use meaning negotiation strategies with considerable frequency, and that the frequency of this type of strategies is influenced by the overall orientation of their talk, imply that teacher-fronted interaction can potentially give way to recurrent meaning negotiation between the teacher and the students. Further, it implies that the constraints on meaning negotiation are influenced by the overall focus of teacher talk, as a function of the teacher's general approach, the type of activity, and the specific aims of the different phases of the lesson. In general, we can conclude that this type of interaction, which happens to be prevalent in language teaching all over the world, deserves not only the research community's closer look but more importantly the practitioners'
awareness of its communicative capacity and the type of pedagogic choices which are available when they are engaged in interaction with the students and the type of communication skills and strategies which they require in this type of interaction.

A second aspect is related to the gap which can currently be observed between pedagogy and communication. This gap is basically fed by the methodologists' guidelines which put emphasis on pedagogy to the detriment of communication. The results of this study suggest that a substantial part of the teachers' arsenal in their communication with students is primarily oriented toward successful communication. Raising the teachers' awareness of CSs might contribute to the efforts made to give communication the emphasis it deserves in second language classrooms.

The issue of communication in language classrooms is related to the aims of classroom activities and the orientation of talk. When orientation is toward activity, it is more likely that the talk assumes features of pedagogic discourse with its reduced social and communicative value. In this type of talk, it is more likely that students take what Breen (1987:26) calls 'survival orientation' which involves the students' superficial involvement since they do not need to identify with the process to be able to proceed. This is in contrast with topic-orientation which brings talk close to naturalistic discourse. Topic-orientation requires the students' attentiveness and their real involvement in interaction. Following Stevick (1976, 1980, 1981), Varonis and Gass (1985) claim that involvement facilitates acquisition in that it 'charges' the input and allows it to 'penetrate deeply'. We have already demonstrated the relationship between topic-orientation and the use of CSs. Based on the above-mentioned speculative arguments, we might be able to raise the issue of the benefits that teachers' awareness of the overall orientation of their talk and the use of CSs might have in bridging the gap between communication and pedagogy and in effect the construction of contexts which might be more conducive to learning.

A third aspect might be the documentation of the strategic aspect of teacher talk, which can enhance teachers' awareness of CSs. The issue which has been raised by several studies is that the general guidelines to teachers as to adopt procedures which generate teacher-student interaction have not produced the expected results. For example the studies done by Nunan (1987) and Brock (1986) show that the so-called communicative activities are reduced to drills and exercises basically because teachers use the traditional patterns of classroom interaction. One reason for the teachers' retreat to these patterns might be that interactional skills specifications, which can assist them in their facing the challenges of the communicative language pedagogy, have not been properly documented. As noted by Burns (1990: 36) the
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Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) ‘has largely operated in a vacuum of explicit linguistic description’. Raising the teachers’ awareness of classroom interactional skills, including the devices used in managing communication problems, is likely to set the basis for their active experimentation and ultimately finding ways of employing these devices in more effective ways.

Last but not the least is the function performed by CSs in meaning negotiation. If we take the frequency of CSs as an indication that the teacher and students are involved in meaning negotiation, the question which arises is how teachers can enhance meaning-oriented exchanges in language classrooms. One way might be the selection of tasks which lend themselves more to communicative procedures and provide more opportunities for experimentation with the language and improvisation in the way it is used by both the teacher and the students. The use of tasks implies that the input data from the teaching materials has to be reduced in favour of more contributions from the teacher and students to the content of the L2 lessons. This is in contrast with the detailed recipes of the so-called ‘teacher-proof’ textbooks for classroom activities which often put constraints on what the teacher and students can achieve through interaction.

To sum up this section, we started with the issue of awareness-raising with regard to the type of skills and strategies which were assumed to have a role to play in meaning negotiation and in achieving pedagogic goals through interaction. In more specific terms, we argued that lexical-compensatory strategies could be used as models for students, especially in classes where the target language is solely used. The use of meaning negotiation strategies was taken as an indication of the potentiality of teacher-fronted talk for meaning negotiation. The teachers’ awareness of the different factors which might influence this potentiality was thought to benefit the participants in classroom interaction. It was also pointed out that their enhanced awareness of these factors might contribute to bridging the current gap between pedagogy and communication. We also raised the possibility that topic-orientation might enhance students’ genuine involvement in interaction as a source of ‘charged’ input, which seems to be more beneficial for the students. We also alluded to the contributions that the study of CSs might make to the documentation of communication skills, which was argued to be helpful for teachers in their facing the challenges of ELT. Finally it was suggested that the use of pedagogic tasks can step up the level of meaningful teacher-student interaction and in effect their level of experimentation with the language.

7.5 Methodological implications

There are certain aspects to the methodology used in this study which can be regarded as relatively original contributions to the methodology of investigating classroom interaction. The
prominent aspect is the integration of the conversational adjustments and compensatory strategies under the same framework. This was an attempt to apply the idea first introduced by Yule and Tarone (1991) in a large-scale empirical study. The integration led to the functional analysis of teacher talk to produce a typology of teachers’ CSs including both lexical-compensatory and meaning negotiation strategies. The ‘functional’ aspect involved the use of discourse analytic procedures in the identification process. The use of these procedures was in response to the demands of the integration of two different types of categories, which to some extent performed different functions in dealing with communication problems.

The second aspect is the use of the framework of CSs to study teacher talk. The study of this type of talk has largely focused on its pedagogic functions (see Chaudron 1988) in classroom discourse. This seems a bit unusual in view of the fact that the target language is both the subject of instruction and the medium of communication in L2 classrooms. The implication of this observation is that classroom discourse in general and teacher talk in particular are multi-functional. A balanced approach to the study of teacher talk, which is expected to focus on both pedagogy and communication, demands the use of methodologies which can deal with the different interwoven layers of meaning. The methodology used in this study can be considered a first step in this direction.

The third aspect pertains to the methodological procedures followed in this study, which involved the use of a task to homogenise the type of activities across all participant teachers as a prerequisite for the analysis of teacher talk in phases and sub-phases of a lesson. Although the idea to use tasks in the study of classroom interaction is not an original one (see review of literature section 2.5.2), the selection of a task with specific design features which could allow the phases to emerge unambiguously and could be used as a normal lesson across three different instructional settings and across nine individual teachers is an original aspect of the design of the present study, which could potentially be of use to comparative studies of classroom interaction.

In more general terms, the methodological procedures used in categorisation of the teachers’ problem-management behaviour in this study can be considered as an attempt to address the first of the following two issues, which according to Brumfit and Mitchell (1990), have remained unresolved in the field of language acquisition. The first issue is the identification of appropriate units of analysis to classify and categorise the behaviours observed in the language classroom, and the second one is how to get access to the intentions, plans or strategies which underlie the observed behaviour. The category system developed in this study identifies and classifies an aspect of teacher talk which has received little attention in the studies aimed at
investigating this phenomenon in classroom-based research. In relation to the second problem, the categories give some indications of the underlying strategies; however these indications need to be validated through methodological procedures which would allow the categories to be tested against the teachers’ perception of this aspect of their verbal behaviour.

In this section, we have referred to some of the design features of the present study which we think are to some extent original in the sense that they have been used with major modifications to match the demands of the present study in methodological terms. These aspects can be summarised as first the application of Yule’s and Tarone’s idea of combining meaning negotiation and lexical-compensatory strategies in an empirical study; second, the use of CSs to study teacher talk; and third, the attempt to use a pedagogic task to analyse teacher talk in phases and sub-phases of a lesson.

7.6 Limitations of the study

Due to the following limitations, the results of this study should be interpreted with caution. The first limitation stems from the fact that CSs are studied only in the intermediate level classes. It is to be empirically established whether replicating the study at lower or higher level courses would produce similar results. As the teachers’ use of CSs is a function of their adaptation to students’ needs, we might expect that a change in the level of courses might bring about certain modifications in the frequency and distribution of CSs. There is a second side to the question of proficiency level which is related to the teachers rather than the students. The non-native speaker teachers who participated in this study were among the best in terms of language proficiency; first, because they were teaching in private language institutes, where teacher recruitment is based on highly competitive language proficiency screening procedures, and second, because they were volunteers, which means they were confident of their language abilities and teaching skills. However, among these highly selected teachers, there were still signs of differences in language ability which might have affected the results. The effect of controlling for language proficiency and professional skills in terms of teaching experience is again an empirical question, which can increase our insight into the way the use of CSs by teachers is influenced by their level of language proficiency and professional skills.

The second limitation is our decision not to include the teachers’ and students’ perceptions of the use of CSs in our interpretation of the results. This was basically due to the exploratory nature of the study, which limited our outlook before the data analysis (for a detailed review of the reasons why we did not indulge in a stimulated recall interview with the teachers see chapter 3). However, the results of this study provide a good basis for further studies investigating the role of the teachers’ and/or the students’ perception of CSs in the way they handle
communication problems. As mentioned before, this would also contribute to the construct validation of the categories of analysis. Such a study would further answer the question of the extent to which these strategies are adopted consciously or with prior planning by teachers.

The third limitation brings us back to the interactive definition of CSs and the fact that agreement on meaning is the result of mutual attempts from both sides of communication. Although in our identification of the teachers' CSs we have paid close attention to the students' part of the transcription, we have not included the students' CSs in the analysis of the data. This has left the question of the relationship between the teacher's and the students' CSs unanswered. The incorporation of the students' part in the overall picture would provide answers to this important question. It would also shed light on the students' level of participation and their use of CSs. The reason why we did not indulge ourselves in the study of the students' CSs was basically due to our focus which was on the development and validation of a category system to analyse teacher talk. With this focus, the analysis of the students' side of interaction was considered beyond the scope of the present study.

7.7 Suggestions for further research
In our discussion of the limitations of the study we mentioned issues which we thought were relevant to the study of CSs in classroom interaction, but due to the design of the study we had not addressed them systematically. These issues are presented in this section to provide ideas for further research. Given that we have not included the perceptions of the teachers in the analysis of their use of CSs, we suggest the following research questions: (1) To what extent are the teachers aware of the strategies they use to ensure mutual understanding? (2) If yes, when and why do they use the strategies and to what extent are they able to plan for them in advance? Considering the fact that we have not included the students' CSs in our analysis of the data, the following research question is also suggested: (3) What is the nature of the relationship between the teachers' and students' use of CSs in language classrooms?

The following questions can also be suggested in relation to the effect of the teachers' level of language proficiency and teaching experience on their use of CSs, and also the impact of the course level on the teacher's and students' use of CSs: (4) Is there any relationship between the teachers’ level of language proficiency and their use of CSs? (5) Is there any relationship between the teachers’ teaching experience and their use of CSs? (6) What is the impact of the course level on the teachers’ use of CSs? (7) What is the impact of the course level on the students’ use of CSs? These questions are a matter of further research.
CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

The theme of communication strategies is relevant to any situation where people are engaged in communicating messages, since the speakers' and hearers' understanding of the topic of talk do not often coincide. Of course this theme takes much more importance when communication is between people who are not native speakers of their language of communication. As witnessed by all who have either attended foreign language classrooms or have lived for some time in a foreign country, communication in a second language is not always a pleasant experience. In some cases it might even be torturous creating a lot of distress and tension for non-native speakers. To use an analogy, we can compare the process of communicating in a foreign language to an exploratory expedition to an unknown territory. We feel uncomfortable in a situation like this probably because we are afraid of the risks involved in moving forward. We know that we need to be prepared to face the challenges which are ahead in every corner of the way. The risk element causes uncertainties, which deprives us of the self-confidence we need to survive. If we look deep into the roots of our uncertainties, we can see that in most cases we feel less flexible in dealing with unexpected situations simply because we do not know how to deal with a situation which requires us to behave in a different way- a way of behaviour which is different from what we have got used to in normal situations. In using a foreign language, we have called these alternative ways of behaviour communication strategies. The point is that the more we feel at home with using communication strategies, the more comfortable we will be in our communication using a foreign language.

Taking the concept of CSs as the main theme of the present study, following Yule and Tarone (1991) we have attempted in chapters 2 and 3 to extend this concept to include meaning negotiation with the intention to develop an analytical framework with sets of categories operationalised over several stages in chapter 4. In our attempts to extend the concept of CSs, we have applied this concept to teachers since we believe that this has the potential for throwing a fresh perspective to teacher talk- the talk of not only the NS teachers but also NNS teachers- in not just language but content classrooms. Studying teacher talk from this new perspective in both normal and specially-designed tasks, we have been able to demonstrate that both NS and NNS teachers use CSs in their talk with students with substantial but different frequencies, which was shown to be the function of their focus of talk in different phases of their lessons. They used the strategies with a range of different functions, which included the macro-functions of avoiding and dealing with communication problems as well as sustaining communication. The categories of
meaning negotiation strategies were basically used in response to problems of hearing or understanding; however, there were certain categories such as clarification requests and confirmation checks which were also used to negotiate the message content. On the whole, the results of the study give insights into the teachers' interactive adaptations to students' linguistic needs over the process of instruction.

The results of the study have raised certain theoretical and practical issues which were discussed in chapter 7. These issues suggest that, in using CSs, teachers not only facilitate communication with the students and provide models for them to follow, but they also assist their own acquisition of fluency in communication skills which they require both inside and outside the classroom. This is specially the case in foreign language classrooms, where both the teacher and the students are learners of the target language. There are two aspects to a situation where both sides of communication are non-native speakers of the language they speak. First, the use of communication strategies takes up more urgency, since both sides feel uncomfortable in using the target language. Second, communication strategies are not only a matter of help in facilitating communication but also a case for learning since practice in using communication strategies leads to more flexibility and as a result higher levels of fluency in using the target language. Acquiring fluency in using lexical-compensatory strategies can be an asset for both teachers and students in their communication with native speakers outside the classroom. No matter how long one has lived in a foreign country, the possibility that they are caught up with a situation where access to certain words proves difficult are so high that inflexibility in using lexical-compensatory strategies might be a source of frequent embarrassment and disappointment for them.

In teaching content subjects, the fact that teachers use their native language as the medium of instruction does not mean that communication strategies are less important. In fact, they assume the same importance in this context simply because teachers of content subjects are involved in bridging the gap between their understanding of the subject with that of the students. This would also require the use of communication strategies to bridge the gap or in Widdowson's (1983) terms make it possible for the two different 'worlds' to 'converge'. It is not unusual to hear complaints from teachers about their students' inability to understand them. They attribute this to the students' cognitive abilities to process the concepts. This might be true in some situations but it is also possible that the lack of understanding is caused by communication problems. In teaching content subjects as well as language teaching, teacher talk functions as an interface between the teacher's and the students' understanding. One major feature of this interface is the
communication strategies that teachers can use as tools to ensure mutual understanding. Instructional strategies constitute the second major feature of the interface. The two-way relationship between these twin aspects of teacher talk suggests that instructional strategies can be a hindrance or help in the way communicative goals are achieved. On this basis, it seems reasonable to conclude that for instructional strategies to succeed teachers need to pay close attention to their demands on communication and the strategies which might be necessary for its success.

In spite of their significance, communication strategies have not received the research attention they deserve. One aim of this study is to promote this theme in instructional and research contexts so that they could form part of the agenda of both researchers and practitioners. So much has been said about instructional strategies by people who approach instruction from different angles. They include teacher trainers, methodologists, curriculum planners, policy makers, material designers, and so many others. The heavy weight given to this theme is not comparable to the theme of communication strategies. This has happened contrary to the fact that communication strategies are as important as, if not more important than, the instructional strategies adopted by teachers. One reason for this state of affairs might be that the major part of instruction is carried out in teachers’ and learners’ native language and that mutual understanding in this situation is taken for granted. The latest developments in language studies have given valuable insights into the immense difficulties which might arise even when people are communicating in their native language. These insights can support not only the case made for the use of communication strategies by language teachers in this study but also to their use by teachers of content subjects.

The lack of due attention to communication issues in the research arena can also be seen in the area of teacher training. Teacher training programmes, including both pre- and in-service, are full of courses which deal with theory and practice of instruction. The communication issues are either left out of the teacher training curricula or if included they are limited to introductory courses in classroom discourse. What seems to be necessary is training in classroom interaction and the sort of skills and strategies that it involves. This may not be feasible at the moment due to the absence of a theoretical basis, which can support such efforts; however, in the long run with further studies focused on teachers’ problem-management behaviour in different settings with different types of students at different levels of proficiency, it would be possible to accumulate enough insights to enable the course designers to provide training for teachers in this important aspect of classroom communication.
To conclude this chapter and the thesis, we can make the following point about the design of the present study in the light of the above general remarks about the use of communication strategies in L2 and content classrooms. The design of the study involved the collection of naturally-occurring data in three different settings with both native and non-native participants. These aspects of the design enabled us to investigate the use of communication strategies in their natural context of use. The results provided partial answers to the questions raised about contexts where CSs were used. Definitive answers to these and similar questions will be provided by future research.
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APPENDIX 1: Transcription conventions

T teacher
S generic student
S1, S2, S3, etc. identified students
Ss several or all students together
/yes//ok/ overlapping, simultaneous students’ responses, and comments
= indicating the continuation of an interrupted turn
() a long pause
? high-key rising intonation
! low-key rising intonation
. sentence final falling intonation (without space)
, low-rising intonation indicating continuation
;:, ;:: one or more colons indicating lengthening the preceding vowel
UPPERCASE contrastively stressed syllables or stressed words
[ ] onset of overlapped or simultaneous speech
[+ + +] unintelligible word or segment
( writes on the board) comments about the transcript or the non-verbal information
no- an abrupt cut-off with level pitch
[si:m] phonetic transcription
(huh) short laugh
(huh huh huh) intensive laugh
VICAR spelled word

V I C A R
APPENDIX 2: Coding scheme

Meaning Negotiation Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarification Request CLR REQ</td>
<td>INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information-oriented COD a</td>
<td>INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code-oriented (problems with hearing and understanding) COD b</td>
<td>INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation Check CON CHQ</td>
<td>INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information-oriented COD</td>
<td>INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information-oriented Seeking Agreement SA</td>
<td>COD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code-oriented (hearing and understanding) COD</td>
<td>COD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension Check COM CHQ</td>
<td>COD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reformulation SLF REF</td>
<td>COD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-reformulation OTR REF</td>
<td>COD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairing REP</td>
<td>COD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarising SUM</td>
<td>COD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding EXP</td>
<td>COD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-repetition OTR REP</td>
<td>COD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn completion TC</td>
<td>COD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuing CUE</td>
<td>COD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lexical-compensatory Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description DES</td>
<td>INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualised Description CON DES</td>
<td>INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximation APR</td>
<td>INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded Approximation EMB APR</td>
<td>INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Switching COD SWT</td>
<td>INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mime MIM</td>
<td>INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal to Authority APL AUT</td>
<td>INF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3: A sample of communication strategies

Confirmation Check (Code-oriented)
S: 1135 I should have take, when we err reduce the water for body what is() what is?
T: 1136 reduce the water of the body,
1137 sweating? [CON CHK COD]

Confirmation Check (Information-oriented)
S: 1628 international drivers’ license, you wouldn’t have passed the exam
T: 1629 in Iran? [CON CHK INF]
S: 1630 yes

Confirmation Check (Seeking Agreement)
S: 1403 medical examinations?
T: 1404 medical examinations(.)
1405 probably, yeah I think it is mandatory,
1406 I think you need a medical exam, don’t we? [CON CHK SA]
SS: 1407 /no/yes/

Clarification Request (Information-oriented)
S: 67 my relatives
T: 68 who are they? [CLR REQ INF]
S: 69 my uncle in the united States, and my aunts in the United United States too, and Canada and Switzerland, Sweden

Clarification Request (Code-Oriented A)
S: 747 some computer sheets
T: 748 some computer sheets?
749 what do you mean by computer sheets? [CLR REQ COD A]
S: 750 chips

Clarification Request (Code-Oriented B)
S:
886 fiction

T:
887 fiction
888 what does it mean [CLR REQ COD B]
889 what does fiction mean?

SS:
890 unreal story

[KS L2]

Comprehension Check

S:
568 DJ

T:
569 DJ,
570 you know that the disc jockey? [COM CHK]

S:
571 [what is disc jockey?

[KS L2]

Self-reformulation

T:
228 no- no, the question was, have you ever travelled?
229 have you travelled to any country? [SLF REF]

S:
230 Japan, Italy, German

[KS L3]

Other-reformulation (Repair)

S:
216 perhaps fruit err fruit have the- err pest or other err other chemist- chemisted err poison poison materials

T:
217 oh toxins! [OTR REF MOD]

S:
218 toxins

[UJ L3]

Other-reformulation (Summarising)

S:
165 I run faster than them,

T:
166 oh, you run faster than the dog,

S:
167 because of [+ + +]

T:
168 because of the?

S:
169 because of being worried

T:
170 aha! you get- you get scared,

S:
171 [because of(.) err scared yes

T:
172 being scared you run fast, [OTR REF SUM]
173 you get away from the dog.
how often do dogs attack you?

[KS L2]

Other-reformulation (Expanding)
S:
301 tapes
T:
302 ah tapes with forbidden content such as pornography. [OTR REF EXP]
303 Specific yeah.
304 Anything else which is prohibited?
[UJ L3]

Other-repetition
S:
180 she has her own bars
181 she has her own bar, very good! vow! very interesting[OTR REP]
[KS L3]
S:
655 you should take an electric dictionary.
T:
656 electric dictionary! [OTR REP]
S:
657 electronic
T:
658 electronic I think it is
S:
659 electronic
[UJ L3]

Turn Completion
S:
804 as we said sexual:
T:
805 [sexually explicit magazines, yes [T C]
[KS L3]

Cueing
S:
820 you must take a: tourist visa
821 must take a visa actually
T:
822 and the reason or explanation! [CUE]
S:
823 yeah because you must show it to the immigration personnel
[UJ L3]

Description
S:
551 sometimes you can get disease
T:
552 sometimes yes sometimes no yeah!
553 diseases are sometimes contagious which means that other people can *catch* your disease [DES]

[BM L3]

**Contextualised Description**

S3:  
597 we have to take them to the pets  
598 the name of the place I don’t know huh they control and they get the certificate  

T:  
599 yeah [writes on the board] do you know what this is! [COM CHK]  
600 Quarantine is you have to put your animal into what they call quarantine  
601 quarantine is you take it to a place ok!  
602 You have a dog they take it to a place and they check the dog and may check the dog for disease [CON DES]

[BM L3]

**Approximation**

S:  
544 disable is not disease  

T:  
545 a disabled is different isn’t it? [CON CHK SA]  
546 err disease for example measles or chicken pox slow pox err disease for dogs is rabies ok! [APR]  
547 which is why you need to put animals in quarantine

[BM L3]

**Mime**

T:  
1082 right ok!: what I want you to do is in your groups  
1083 if you look at exercise two ok?  
1084 All I want you to do is to work with your partner or partners  
1085 and I’d like you to look at the bullet points  
1086 you know what bullet points are? [COM CHK]  
1087 Yeah [miming the sound of rifle] ok? [MIM]  
1088 And I want you to decide which of the bullet points are necessary  
1089 important words err if you want to get a drivers’ license ok?

[BM L3]

**Code Switching**

T:  
422 both(.) may be not, but you can if you want to(.)  
423 am I right?  
424 you can take some computer software, but then I think you have to take it to the Ershsad (Ministry of Culture and Islamic Guidance) before they- they- they inspect and label it for you [COD SWT]

[KS L3]

**Appeal to Authority**

S:  
1109 please spell alibi  

T:  
1108 I think it is with one here,  
1109 let me check (checks with the digital dictionary) [APL AUT]  
1110 yeah, I said they might come by with all kinds of alibi to refuse accepting it,  
1111 yes I’m right,
alibi means an excuse, all right?
a strong excuse,
a very good excuse, alibi

[KS L3]
APPENDIX 4: A coded excerpt from lesson 3 using the microanalysis coding scheme

T:
130 ****right ok [A 6]
131 what’s a lap? [DIS, FOR, CL]
S1:
132 *(miming)
T:
133 yeah, this is your lap [A 6]
134 so you see people on trains err people with very small computers very expensive
actually laptops err but nice
S:
135 **it cost a thousand pound
T:
136 yeah, I think so [T 3]
137 I think they’re very expensive but they look very nice
138 I think if I’ve got one I wouldn’t actually travel with it
139 it would be dangerous ok, then
140 ****Err let’s see
141 Err hiking boots H? DIS, FOR, CL] [A 4] [T 2]
142 Hiking boots?
S3:
143 *I think this is just for [+ +]
144 it’s like a shoe
T:
145 yeah, these are shoes used for walking [A 6]
146 Hiking is walking often climbing.
147 ****How many people go hiking? [REF, CON, CL]
148 Anybody doing hiking?
S3:
149 *[I used to go because I think there is no mountain huh
T:
150 no mountains! [T 3]
S:
151 yeah
T:
152 no mountains in Britain? [T 3]
S:
153 yeah
T:
154 maybe not mountains actually,
155 but in Scotland actually I think perhaps is.
156 But the lake district lots of places you can go with hiking boots (. ) Ok!
157 ****Credit card? [DIS, FOR, CL] [T 2]
S:
158 *credit card is that card for
159 you can spend money and then after that the money you pay back
T:
160 ok, right a credit card is one you can pay for everything you buy and then err pay later
[A6]
S3:
161 *you don’t need to pay some money
T:
162 right, ok! Yes [A 6]
163 it’s substitute for money isn’t it?

259
164 Ok credit cards.
165 Lots of people get into trouble with credit cards.

SS:
  166 huh

T:
  167 yeah? [REF, CON, CL]
  168 **Did you get into trouble with credit cards?
  169 ****Ok! Umbrella is an easy one.
  170 H what's the meaning of this word? [DIS, FOR, CL] [A 4] [T 2]

S3:
  171 we know huh

SS:
  172 huh

S3:
  173 *it has got a handle

T:
  174 [yeah [A 6]

S3:
  175 and long surface to prote- to err no() keep safe from raining huh

T:
  176 **yeah what's the word what's the word we are going to use? [DIS, FOR, CL] [A 6]

S3:
  177 protect? [DIS, FOR, CL] [A 6]

T:
  178 protect yeah protecting from rain or prevent rain ok [A 6]
  179 ****Err photographs of hometown have you heard that? [REF, CON, CL] [T 2]
  180 **A hometown A? [DIS, FOR, CL] [A 4]

S2:
  181 hometown (saying it to himself)

T:
  182 **what's your hometown? [REF, CON, CL] [A 4]
  183 Where's your hometown?

S3:
  184 Tehran

T:
  185 Tehran you hometown is Tehran
  186 **A! where is your hometown? [REF, CON, CL] [A 4]

S2:
  187 Tehran

T:
  188 ok, Tehran [A 6]
  189 **S! where is your home? [REF, CON, CL]
  190 **You are from the same hometown? [REF, CON, CL]

S:
  191 Bangkok

T:
  192 Ok () Right [A 6]

S3:
  193 ****why do we need photographs?

T:
  194 I don't know
  195 Don't worry about that
  196 ****Ok, err international drivers' license? S? [DIS, FOR, CL] [A 4]

S:
  197 it's [+ + +] we can use for() driving in any place in the world
T: 198 ok, yeah [A 6]
199 A driving license is like a passport to drive but it’s international
200 ***err H?
201 Tourist visa? [DIS, FOR, CL] [A 4] [T 2]
S3: 202 I think possibly we need it
T: 203 Ok? [REF, CON, CL]
S3: 204 we can’t go into any country without it
T: 205 **what is a visa then? [DIS, FOR, CL]
206 What- What do you mean?
207 Is- is it card?
S3: 208 I think no huh.
T: 209 huh =
S3: 210 [++]
S: 211 *there is a card! Huh
SS: 212 huh
T: 213 it’s a card but not maybe not for credit [T 3]
214 ***go on and what do you say? [DIS, FOR, CL] [A 4]
S: 215 I think it’s like a long card we can’t go to the any country without it
T: 216 Right () as a tourist, not staying [A 6]
217 **Has anybody have a tourist visa? [REF, CON, CL]
SS: 218 no! huh huh
T: 219 it’s ok, I’m not [++] [T 3]
SS: 220 huh
T: 221 it’s not gonna be used don’t worry. Ok!
222 ***Err I think the other items there are quite straightforward aren’t they? [REF, FOR, CL]
223 I’m not going to ask you what fresh fruit is
224 I am sure that you know what fresh fruit is.
S3: 225 ***if we get pass- British passport we can get visa for other countries or?
T: 226 if you have a British passport! =
S: 227 [yes
T: 228 = and you’ve got a visa from another country!
S: 229 visa card huh
T: 230 a visa card?
S: 231 no visa card huh
T: 232 you need a visa to travel to other countries? =
S: 233
T: 234 = if you have a British passport! I think so.
   235 I am not an expert, you know?
S: 236 *it's easy to apply for visa if you apply English
T: 237 yeah, I think if you have a British passport I think it'S: [T 3]
APPENDIX 5: The tasks used in lesson three

Task A

Step 1
A friend of yours from your country of origin is planning a short vacation in the UK. As she is not a British citizen, she will have to deal with Immigration and Customs when she enters the UK. She doesn’t have much room to pack a lot of things because she’s planning to travel with just a backpack. Here are some of the things she is thinking of taking with her:

| a passport | a map of the UK | an umbrella |
| a surfboard | a laptop computer | hiking boots |
| fresh fruit | a credit card | |
| an international driving license | a tourist visa | |
| books about the UK | photographs of his/her hometown | |
| a return airline ticket | tapes and CDs | |

Step 2
Use the boxes below to help her organise the things she wants to take to the UK. Work with a partner and put them in the boxes where you think they belong.

1 It’s necessary and obligatory: You can’t enter the UK without this:
   You must take this with you.

2 It’s prohibited by law:
   You must not take this into the UK.

3 It’s a good idea to bring this:
   You should take this with you.

4 It’s OK to bring this, but it isn’t really necessary:
   You don’t have to take this.

Step 3
Can you and your partner add any other things to this list? Try to think of at least three more items and put them in the appropriate boxes.

1 Adapted from Riggenbach and Samuda (1997)
2 Of course your friend could be a ‘he’
3 In the version of the task used in Iran, the imagined friend’s destination was changed from the UK to Iran.
Step 4
With your partner, write sentences about one or two items in each box, explaining why you think they belong there.

Modals of Necessity, Prohibition, and Permission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a) You **must** have a passport.  
Or                               | Use *must*, *have to*, or *have got to* to show something is necessary and obligatory (something that is strongly required, often by law). |
| b) You **have to** have a passport.  
Or                               | Use *must*, *have to*, or *have got to* to show something is necessary and obligatory (something that is strongly required, often by law). |
| c) You **have got to** have a passport. | Use *must*, *have to*, or *have got to* to show something is necessary and obligatory (something that is strongly required, often by law). |
| d) You **must not** (mustn’t) bring fresh fruit into the UK.  
  e) You **cannot** (can’t) bring fresh fruit. | Use *must not* (mustn’t) or *cannot* (can’t) to show something is prohibited and absolutely not permitted (often by law). |
| f) You **can** bring a surfboard. | Use *can* to show that something is permitted. |
| g) You **should** bring a credit card. | Use *should* to show something is a good idea. |
| h) You **don’t have to** bring a surfboard. | Use *do not* (don’t) *have to* to show something is permitted, but not necessary. You can do this if you want to, but you are not required to. |

Look back at the sentences you wrote in Step 4. Did you use *must*, *have to*, *have got to*, *should*, *can*, *can’t*, *mustn’t*, and *don’t have to*? If you did, check to see that you used them correctly. If you didn’t use them, rewrite the sentences.

**Example:** He must have a valid passport - it is required by law.

**Task B**

**Step 1**
Work with a partner and decide which of the following are necessary and obligatory to do if you want to get a driving license in your country.

- Know how to drive
- Practice before the test
- Take an eye test
- Take a written test
- Have a medical examination
- Have a passport or birth certificate as ID
- Pass a driving test
- Have a certificate of secondary education (GCSE)
- Own a car
- Have an international driver's license

**Step 2**
Do you know how to get a driving license in the UK? What do you have to do to get a license here? In what ways is it different here? Talk to your partner and find out what he/she knows. Be ready to report on your findings.
Appendix 6: Suggested procedures in conducting the tasks in lesson three

As the tasks are going to be used in different classes with different teachers, the following stages are suggested for the lesson to ensure the use of the same procedures in doing the tasks in different classes.

Task A

Setting up 1 (warm up)
This can be an introduction to the task telling the students what they are supposed to do, and checking whether they know the items they are going to classify or not. As a warm up, we can start this stage with some questions asking whether they have a friend in another country and whether they have ever travelled abroad. We can further ask them what they think they might need to take with them when they intend to travel abroad. The questions and answers, which are basically intended to focus the attention on the task topic, can then be followed by the instructions to the task itself. We can do this by reading the instructions and then checking the items in the box one by one. Then we can explain the four categories and ask the students to come into a decision in pairs about what they think should go in each box. The students should think of at least two more items to be added to each category.

Summing up 1
The summing up phase can be an oral report by the students. We can change the oral report into a discussion by asking the students to give their reasons and then inviting the other students to express their views on the items under discussion.

Setting up 2
We can ask the students to work on step 4 writing sentences for at least 2 items in each box explaining why they think they should go there.
We can then review the table on page 3 and ask the students to turn back to the sentences they have written in step 4 correcting them in case they have not used the modals correctly.

Summing up 2
The summing up can be an oral report of the sentences they have corrected.

Task B

Setting up 1
We can start with some questions about how to get a driving license, and then review the bulleted items. We then ask the students to consult their partners coming into a decision about the steps they think are necessary for getting a driving license in Iran.
Summing up 1
We can sum up this exercise by asking the students to report their decisions orally. This can also be changed into a discussion by asking the students to give reasons for their decisions and then inviting the other students to express their views on the decisions made.

Setting up 2
This step is intended to generate a discussion on getting a driving license in a foreign country such as the UK. We can first ask the students to talk to their partners coming into a decision about what they think are the necessary steps in getting a driving license in the UK.

Summing up 2
We can have a summing up to this task asking the students to report their decisions.

Differences between the procedures to be followed in getting a driving license in the UK and in Iran
UK
- Applying for a provisional driving license
- The candidate's eye sight is checked by the tester not by a physician
- Paying a fixed amount of money as the fee for registration, the written test, and the driving test (If someone fails either of the two tests he/she should pay the fee again.)
- The driving test takes at least 45 minutes
- The candidates can take the driving test using their own cars
- The candidates are permitted to drive after they have received their provisional driving license. However, they are supposed to put a special sign on their car and they should also be supervised by someone who has already got his/her driving license.
APPENDIX 7: Stimulated recall interview with teacher 1

Excerpt 1
I would say that I have a basic outline, for example with Martin Luther King I had a tape so I had- and knew there was something that was going to involve a particular activity, and was going to be a listening activity. But I also knew that it’s part of the lesson, that would almost certainly being some issues that would arise, that would lead to some fluency based discussion work. So really what I tried to do was to introduce it, to have a notion of what it might be a public speaking, and to introduce the idea of speech, to have something which I actually taken from a textbook which involved a sort of cloze type activity really, and hopefully the last part of the session would be a freer practice, and discussion session which I was not going to do in a formal way, in the form of a formal debate. I was just going to let it run, and to see how it went basically, and hopefully I could try and stimulate some discussion.

Excerpt 2
Obviously I’d scanned the word in advance, and what I would do is I would have an idea in mind as to the best way to explain that. Now this is particularly important given this, because a lot of it was abstract language. You know if you’re talking about ‘racial discrimination’, you know what is ‘discrimination’, it’s- you know what I mean. So I thought I might introduce the word ‘prejudice’, which might- if you like uses a slightly more recognizable synonym. So in other words I would- a sort of give an easier-to-grasp synonym for that, or perhaps give an example of a situation which illustrates ‘racial prejudice’. So I had- it’s not on the spot in the sense that I haven’t thought in advance as to how I’m going to explain, but obviously will also depend. If you’re going to elicit, it may well be that one of them can explain it, which perhaps happened I think. In terms of some of the vocabulary items I elicited from them, and err if any clarification is needed then I would then step in, but I’m more than happy to have a student give a good definition, or example, or a synonym, or something like that err until I get across the message, but obviously it has got to be the flexibility. But I have in my mind the best way to explain a particular word. I also have in my mind which words I think they ganna go, and know which words I think might need clarification.

Excerpt 3
I mean I also asking questions which are designed to elicit, but I’m also directing them in terms of- you know ‘Was Martin Luther King black or white?’ So I’ve also got in mind that this is the direction in which I wanted to go as well I want to bring out the fact that he was a black American, because that would feed into the discussion later on, so I’ve got half a mind on err where we are going, in terms of what I want them to take forward from the opening bit you know. So I guess I’ve got luckily a genuine area, in the sense that this is what I want you to know about Martin Luther King. So it is not just tell me anything about him, because I am not interested in the issue side, I am interested in the fact that he was a black American who was assassinated in a racist society.

Excerpt 4
I was going to exploit the tape err but really just broad outlines, brought rush strokes really, which err then after the lesson kicked off. We would see how it went, because for example if they hadn’t gone for the discussion it would have mean, they hadn’t been interested in the issue, which bored them, it turned out then. I had something that I thought. Well I might have had to err read direct, or to try and err pour a little bit more in than I had to put in myself in terms of. So I did have a notion that it might not take off, but I did actually think that it was quite topical, because on the day we did it, I think it was the anniversary of the shooting of ‘King’.

Excerpt 5
The problem comes with that, when you get certain students, that certain students always do err dominating, and you’ve got in that class the two Korean lads, who were by a long way most linguistically able, who seemed to be the prime move in the beginning of this session.
conscious at that, but I also let that one go, because so long as people are warming up, and it's a student-students are actually contributing. In fact I am happier for them to put the background rather than me, if they do it. I'm happy to take a back seat, because as we have seen, if we get there that's OK. When the students are doing it, they are involved. It's the same with 'boycott', again err ah 'if you boycott something' and I expect someone to jump in, and it's like a sort of one finishes a sentence if you like. 'If you boycott something', in others words 'what do you do', and here the student says 'don't do'. 'Right for example British Beef' an example, and then 'the Germans and the French they boycotted British beef', so what does it mean, make it explicit. 'They don't import it.', 'Right they don't import it they stop buying.' So I suppose I'm trying to help them toward 'importing', for those students who don't know.

Excerpt 6
My role in it would not be more than a sort of almost like a chair, you know an Informal chair, where I could try and encourage people to make contributions, and to let them run with it, which is in fact as I remember is what happened.

Excerpt 7
I would think it's certainly part of a conscious strategy, that instead of me going in for example and saying 'Right,' 'OK.' 'Today we ganna talk about Martin Luther King.' Martin Luther King was a preacher. 'He was assassinated bloody five years ago in Memphis Tennessee.' 'He fought for.' I mean there is no point in that, because they know some of this already, and I think that-and it's actually a good way of warming up, and providing a background towards this. So they can see err they are actually having an input right from the start, and it's not just me going in. It's not a lecture or me explaining to them about Martin Luther King, because they know a lot already. My job is to facilitate, and try to make it easier, to try and. But it's not a lecturing job. I think this is something that I noticed very much in terms of the way in which vocabulary stuff started here.

Excerpt 8
Yeah, I think the idea is that. I mean basically err listening and speaking being the focus. you have to make sure that the environment is right, that people don't feel intimidated, that people feel they can work toward something, without having to fear other people slapping them down, or the teacher intimidating them in some way. So I think that err in terms of, I mean if you can do it by body language, you can do it by not saying, that's not good enough you know. In other words, it's keep going, and valuing the contribution, so if you like it's always trying to throw the emphasis back upon the student, as an active learner rather than a passive participant. So other way happens. It's very rare I'll be very didactic. Because I think that if you are too didactic, that's the sort of the empty vessel theory, that you pour in the knowledge into the empty pass student, which is not right, and especially with speaking and listening. But with all the skills I think you have to activate, make them active, and I think the strategies here- the decision to elicit vocabulary, to get the background is both warm up, but it also makes them active participants right at the beginning of the session.

Excerpt 9
Yeah I think it's and again it's the same reason, it's the 'Value the contribution.', but not allow a contribution which I think is going to. I suppose in a language. Because you've got not only got your- the linguistic side of it, you've got, actually got the issues you're talking about, so you know this sort of situation, this sort of lesson, throughout of that sort of thing, because you think well it is about people's opinions, and people's views, and people ganna have different views, so I guess I'd apply the same rule to people's opinions, I mean I have my own strong opinions myself, but you would still in order to encourage talk which is what I am for. You would still have to value a contribution, or at least take on board a contribution before trying to suggest very tactfully that it's not perhaps the most appropriate view.
APPENDIX 8: Background questionnaire

Dear Colleague
As background information about you, your institution, and the teaching and assessment procedures you use in your classes may contribute to understanding those aspects of teacher talk, which constitute the focus of this research project, your help in providing accurate information is highly appreciated. Of course, your identity will be kept strictly confidential, and will not be disclosed to anyone without your prior consent. I am very grateful to you for your valuable help.

Personal Background Information

Name: ...........................................
Name of the institution in which you are teaching ................................

Please tick box as appropriate.
English is your: □ Mother tongue □ 2nd language □ Foreign language

Your teaching experience: □ Less than 3 years □ Between 3 and 10 years □ More than 10 years

The level of your current course being observed by the researcher:
□ Beginner □ False beginner □ Lower intermediate □ Higher intermediate □ Advanced

The levels of the courses you have taught as part of your previous teaching experience:
□ Beginner □ False beginner □ Lower intermediate □ Higher intermediate □ Advanced

Educational background:
Please tick more than one as appropriate.
□ General Certificate in Secondary Education (GCSE O-level)
□ BA in English Language/Literature
□ BA in other subjects. Please specify ............................
Did your BA programme include any teacher training courses? □ Yes □ No
□ Post-graduate Degree Course in Teacher Education
□ Diploma in Teaching English as a Second/Foreign Language
□ In-service Teacher Training Courses

The number of hours you teach English per week 

Institutional Background Information

The average number of students in your class being observed 

270
Please tick more than one, where appropriate.

Teaching aids:

☐ Blackboard  ☐ White board  ☐ Over Head Projector  ☐ Tape-recorder  ☐ TV and Video  ☐ Computer facilities

Does your institution provide for extra-curricular programmes (such as visits to museums or other places of interest) planned to enhance English language teaching and learning?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Has your institution provided you with a curriculum guide/syllabus for the course you are teaching?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

The teaching materials you are using in your classes are selected by:

☐ You  ☐ Your institution  ☐ Ministry of Education  ☐ You and Colleagues Jointly

Please tick more than one, where appropriate.

If you select your teaching materials, which of the following can best indicate the type of the materials you use?

☐ Textbooks published or authorised by the Ministry of Education  ☐ Commercial textbooks  ☐ Authentic materials  ☐ Your Own Materials  ☐ Your Institution’s Materials

If you use textbooks, are they supplemented with audio-video materials?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Tick more than one as appropriate.

In using authentic materials, indicate if you use any of the following combinations of authentic materials with other kinds of materials.

☐ Authentic texts taken from newspapers or other published materials plus authentic audio-visual materials taken from TV programmes and/or video releases  ☐ Authentic texts plus commercial language teaching audio-visual materials  ☐ Texts designed for language teaching plus authentic audio-visual materials

Background Information about Teaching and Assessment Procedures

Please indicate the weight given to each of the basic language skills in your current course by circling the appropriate number.

Key:

0 = not at all  3 = average  6 = the only one that counts

Listening  0 1 2 3 4 5 6

Speaking  0 1 2 3 4 5 6

271
What percentage of your class time goes to each of the following activities per typical week?

☐ % Oral activities (listening and speaking)
☐ % Reading activities
☐ % Writing activities

Do you use pair work and group work in your class? ☐ Yes ☐ No

*Again 'per typical week/fortnight'*

If yes, what percentage of your class time goes to these types of activities per typical week?

☐ %

Could you summarise the course objectives for the course being observed?

How do you assess student achievement? Please explain.
a) Formative informal assessment (i.e. interim class tests)

b) Summative formal assessment (i.e. end of course tests)

What are the most important teaching procedures that you usually use in teaching this course?
APPENDIX 9: Interobserver agreement check

Confusion matrix 1: rate of agreement between observer 1 (the researcher) and observer 2 in the first round of coding meaning negotiation strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ob. 2</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ob. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confusion matrix 2: rate of agreement between observer 1 (the researcher) and observer 3 in the first round of coding meaning negotiation strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ob. 3</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ob. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Confusion matrix 3: rate of agreement between observer 1 (the researcher) and observer 2 in the second round of coding meaning negotiation strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ob. 3</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ob. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confusion matrix 4: rate of agreement between observer 1 (the researcher) and observer 3 in the second round of coding meaning negotiation strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ob. 3</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ob. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Confusion matrix 5: rate of agreement between observer 1 and observer 2 in coding lexical-compensatory strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ob. 1</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confusion matrix 6: rate of agreement between observer 1 and observer 3 in coding lexical-compensatory strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ob. 1</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 10: Frequency distribution of teachers’ CSs in lessons 1, 2, and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. N. Ss</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLR REQ</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON CHK</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM CHK</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLF REF</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REF</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REP</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES CON</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. C. Ss</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON DES</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR (EMB)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD SWT</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIM</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APL AUT</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. N. Ss</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLR REQ</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON CHK</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM CHK</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLF REF</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REF</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REP</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES CON</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. C. Ss</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON DES</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR (EMB)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD SWT</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIM</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APL AUT</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson 1</td>
<td>Lesson 2</td>
<td>Lesson 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M. N. Ss</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLR REQ</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON CHK</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM CHK</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLF REF</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REF</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REP</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES CON</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                | Lesson 1 | Lesson 2 | Lesson 3 |
| **L. C. Ss**   |          |          |          |
| DES            | 3.5      | 2.0      | 1.5      |
|                | 36%      | 33%      | 41%      |
| CON DES        | 2.9      | 2.9      | 0.5      |
|                | 30%      | 48%      | 13%      |
| APR            | 2.0      | 0.6      | 0.6      |
|                | 21%      | 10%      | 16%      |
| APR (EMB)      | 0.6      | 0.6      | 0.6      |
|                | 6%       | 10%      | 16%      |
| COD SWT        | 0.0      | 0.0      | 0.0      |
|                | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       |
| MIM            | 0.3      | 0.0      | 0.6      |
|                | 3%       | 0%       | 16%      |
| APL AUT        | 0.3      | 0.0      | 0.0      |
|                | 3%       | 0%       | 0%       |
| Total          | 9.6      | 6.0      | 3.6      |
|                | 100%     | 100%     | 100%     |

|                | Lesson 1 | Lesson 2 | Lesson 3 |
| **M. N. Ss**   |          |          |          |
| CLR REQ        | 2.3      | 3.1      | 3.6      |
|                | 13%      | 15%      | 17%      |
| CON CHK        | 1.7      | 1.4      | 3.9      |
|                | 9%       | 7%       | 18%      |
| COM CHK        | 0.1      | 0.4      | 0.2      |
|                | 1%       | 2%       | 1%       |
| SLF REF        | 2.5      | 4.5      | 2.4      |
|                | 14%      | 22%      | 11%      |
| OTR REF        | 5.0      | 4.9      | 4.7      |
|                | 28%      | 24%      | 22%      |
| OTR REP        | 5.7      | 4.2      | 5.5      |
|                | 32%      | 20%      | 26%      |
| MES CON        | 0.4      | 1.1      | 0.7      |
|                | 2%       | 5%       | 3%       |
| CL             | 0.1      | 0.9      | 0.6      |
|                | 1%       | 4%       | 0%       |
| Total          | 17.7     | 20.6     | 21.6     |
|                | 100%     | 100%     | 97%      |

<p>|                | Lesson 1 | Lesson 2 | Lesson 3 |
| <strong>L. C. Ss</strong>   |          |          |          |
| DES            | 1.8      | 2.3      | 0.4      |
|                | 45%      | 44%      | 23%      |
| CON DES        | 0.7      | 0.7      | 0.4      |
|                | 17%      | 13%      | 23%      |
| APR            | 0.8      | 1.7      | 0.4      |
|                | 19%      | 31%      | 19%      |
| APR (EMB)      | 0.3      | 0.2      | 0.1      |
|                | 7%       | 3%       | 8%       |
| COD SWT        | 0.2      | 0.3      | 0.3      |
|                | 5%       | 6%       | 15%      |
| MIM            | 0.2      | 0.0      | 0.1      |
|                | 5%       | 0%       | 8%       |
| APL AUT        | 0.1      | 0.2      | 0.1      |
|                | 2%       | 3%       | 4%       |
| Total          | 4.0      | 5.3      | 1.9      |
|                | 100%     | 100%     | 100%     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M. N. Ss</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLR REQ</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON CHK</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM CHK</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLF REF</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REF</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REP</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES CON</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L. C. Ss</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON DES</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR (EMB)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD SWT</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIM</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APL AUT</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M. N. Ss</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLR REQ</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON CHK</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM CHK</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLF REF</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REF</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REP</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES CON</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L. C. Ss</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON DES</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR (EMB)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD SWT</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIM</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APL AUT</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. N. Ss</td>
<td>Lesson 1</td>
<td>Lesson 2</td>
<td>Lesson 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLR REQ</td>
<td>1.6 16%</td>
<td>4.5 39%</td>
<td>1.0 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON CHK</td>
<td>0.8 8%</td>
<td>0.3 3%</td>
<td>1.0 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM CHK</td>
<td>0.5 5%</td>
<td>0.6 6%</td>
<td>1.9 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLF REF</td>
<td>2.4 24%</td>
<td>2.1 18%</td>
<td>2.1 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REF</td>
<td>2.1 21%</td>
<td>1.4 13%</td>
<td>2.7 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REP</td>
<td>1.9 18%</td>
<td>2.1 18%</td>
<td>4.7 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES CON</td>
<td>0.8 8%</td>
<td>0.5 4%</td>
<td>0.2 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
<td>1.2 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10.1 100%</td>
<td>11.6 100%</td>
<td>14.8 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L. C. Ss</th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>0.3 20%</td>
<td>3.9 35%</td>
<td>1.6 62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON DES</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
<td>1.9 17%</td>
<td>0.2 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>0.3 20%</td>
<td>2.9 26%</td>
<td>0.6 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR (EMB)</td>
<td>0.5 40%</td>
<td>2.2 20%</td>
<td>0.2 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD SWT</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIM</td>
<td>0.3 20%</td>
<td>0.2 1%</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APL AUT</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1.3 100%</td>
<td>11.1 100%</td>
<td>2.7 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M. N. Ss</th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLR REQ</td>
<td>3.7 28%</td>
<td>4.8 26%</td>
<td>4.2 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON CHK</td>
<td>5.0 38%</td>
<td>1.4 8%</td>
<td>1.3 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM CHK</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
<td>0.3 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLF REF</td>
<td>1.7 13%</td>
<td>3.1 17%</td>
<td>4.3 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REF</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
<td>2.8 15%</td>
<td>1.1 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REP</td>
<td>1.7 13%</td>
<td>5.1 27%</td>
<td>5.2 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES CON</td>
<td>0.8 6%</td>
<td>0.3 2%</td>
<td>0.6 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>0.4 3%</td>
<td>1.1 6%</td>
<td>1.5 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13.2 100%</td>
<td>18.8 100%</td>
<td>18.4 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L. C. Ss</th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>0.4 100%</td>
<td>2.0 64%</td>
<td>0.5 36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON DES</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
<td>0.3 9%</td>
<td>0.3 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
<td>0.6 18%</td>
<td>0.1 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR (EMB)</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
<td>0.3 9%</td>
<td>0.3 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD SWT</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
<td>0.3 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIM</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APL AUT</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
<td>0.0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0.4 100%</td>
<td>3.1 100%</td>
<td>1.4 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

279
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M. N. Ss</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLR REQ</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON CHK</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM CHK</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLF REF</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REF</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTR REP</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES CON</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L. C. Ss</th>
<th>Per 100</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Per 100</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Per 100</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON DES</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR (EMB)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD SWT</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIM</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APL AUT</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>