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ABSTRACT

The dissertation in hand scrutinizes classroom interaction as a jointly constructed process. That is, the foremost target behind conducting this study is to uncover the way classroom language interaction is achieved throughout the construction of some components in teacher talk and learners’ language. This study is set up on the ground of research so far conducted, that ascertains the significance of getting learners involved into sustained courses of meaning negotiation throughout addressing questions to trigger the learners’ will to produce output, and addressing valuable feedback. Hence, offering feedback should occur without distorting the flow of oral communication and the necessity of the learners’ involvement in taking turns and responding to adjacency pairs. Theoretical issues connected with the arrangement of oral interaction mechanism are covered. With reference to its practical part, third year university students studying English as a foreign language in the English Department at Mohamed Saddik Ben Yahia University; Jijel, Algeria are involved next to the inclusion of third year university teachers of oral expression. The dissertation is based on the hypothesis that the more teachers of Oral expression drag their students in the construction of discourse, the more interactive process would be and thereby more successful. The study is subdivided into two foremost parts using qualitative research; first, it exposes theoretical issues associated with classroom interaction. In the practical side, questionnaires are used to collect data; oral expression lessons are observed and recorded, and transcripts are produced throughout the implementation of Conversation Analysis method. The results showed that interaction is more persistent in accordance with the types of questions, directed feedback and learners’ taking turns. Moreover, the results demonstrate that the structure of classroom interactional mechanism is characterized by the Initiation-Response-Follow up pattern. Pedagogical recommendations are offered by the end along with propositions for future fields of research.
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I. Background of the Study

In actual fact, one of the greatest challenges in ESL/EFL classroom is the development of students' advanced speaking. Subject in which most confident students dominate the discussion and most reticent students quickly withdraw is not a healthy environment for SL/FL learning. Hence, the best environment in language learning classroom is the one in which every student does not only have the opportunity to speak and interact but also feels a real need to do so.

Walsh (2006, p.32) considers the nature of SLA/FLA as a social context in the same way as any other real world one. In any language lesson classroom, interaction is of crucial value for language learning and teaching as well. To him, provided the teacher understands how the process of interaction takes place in classroom, learning opportunities will be facilitated to learners (Walsh, 2002) and that is why teachers should be knowledgeable and well-informed about the significance of teacher talk and the process of interaction and their relationship with learning.

Actually, the nexus between SLA/FLA and interaction is so strong as it was supported by many scholars working in this research literature among whom is Ellis (1990) who considers that interaction is at the core of SLA. Complying with his view point, Allwright (1984) believes that successful teaching is highly correlated to successful management of interaction (cited in Walsh, 2006). Johnson (1995) also argues in the following quotation that language acquisition is, indeed, interconnected to the good perception and understanding of interactional course by teachers and learners as well. "The teacher plays a critical role in understanding; establishing and maintaining patterns of communication that will foster to the great extent, both classroom learning and second language acquisition." (p. 90). Hence, the scholar emphasizes teacher’s role in communication process.
Both Ellis and Van Lier (1996) accord with the perspective claiming that language learning does not arise through interaction but in interaction (cited in Walsh, 2006). Hence, teachers will increase and promote their students' language learning providing they understand better the process of interaction. Teachers also need to have this process as a key element in their teaching. According to Ellis (1998, p. 145) the fact of making interaction a rich process and an effective one is the role assigned to the teacher for he is the one expected to initiate, manage, and keep conversation and communication going. That is, it is the teacher who plays the crucial role in making classroom interaction significant and worthy without neglecting the noteworthy part played by learners in this intricate process. From her part, Swain (1988) sees that learners need to practise; in producing *comprehensible output* using all the language resource they have already acquired (cited in Hedge, 2000). She considers that while interacting, learners are practising the TL and this leads to fluency. Swain (1985) introduced her *Output Hypothesis* (1995, 2005) in which she sheds light on the significance of dialogues that usually take place between students and teachers, (cited in Hall & Verplaetse, 2000). Swain claims that throughout these dialogues, language acquisition is promoted. Similarly, Long introduced his *Interactive Hypothesis* (1996) after adjusting it to take into consideration the role that negotiation of meaning and interaction play in enabling students to understand their teacher's feedback. (cited in Walsh, 2006)

One of the elements which make interaction problematic to SLA/FLA teachers in terms of practice and implementation is the fact that it is a challenging request. It requires time and resources to enhance the process of interaction between the teacher and students in classroom setting. Theoretically speaking, in teaching oral discussion class; which is not an easy matter, either the teacher or students bring up a given topic which would be later discussed by the whole class. Yet, practically speaking; this is not always true; mainly
because most oral discussion classes are dominated and controlled by either teachers or self-assured and confident learners. This automatically leads to the withdrawal of those introvert and reserved learners from discussion. “Unfortunately, this oral class ends up by a boring question and answer exchange between the teacher and few students” as stated by Folse (1996, p. 4)

The fact of being exposed to situations in which students are expected to interact during oral communication subjects, some learners may find themselves unable to interact and produce chunks of language in some given situations. Accordingly, they may strive to make themselves as much understood as possible by their colleagues and teacher. They do this throughout using diverse strategies as speaking in a low pace, repeating in clarifying their view points throughout paraphrasing. It is worth mentioning that when learners paraphrase; try to elucidate their outlook; repeat and so forth, so this process is recognised as negotiation of meaning. The latter aims at making output clearer enough to their interlocutors.

Moreover, in learning a language; more particularly a foreign one, students are stimulated to communicate in classroom setting using a variety of strategies as the social ones besides their reliance on the negotiation of meaning. According to Oxford (1990), these social strategies are very imperative and important in any language learning classroom. One of these adopted strategies is asking questions; which is a medium of social interaction and communication. The benefit of asking questions is that learners are given the chance of having a clear idea of what is being discussed as topics in classroom. Besides, communicating orally with peers increases learners' involvement, commitment, motivation and interest in the TL.

Another foremost social strategy adopted by students when interacting orally is cooperation with classmates while assigned to do a cooperative task as conducting
projects, interviews, workshops or exposés...etc. It is widely agreed upon the fact that cooperative learning is greatly beneficial for it augments self-confidence and satisfaction among learners, "great and more rapid achievement, more respect for the teacher ..." (Oxford, 1990, p. 146). Using cooperative strategies in an interactive language classroom enhances learning motivation. Oxford ascertains that many language opportunities; more feedback about language errors can facilitate the process of learning. Very often, EFL university students are set to perform some tasks collectively in small groups as presenting exposes; storytelling; role playing...etc and this is a kind of cooperative learning. As defined by Woolfolk, cooperative learning is "Arrangement in which students work in mixed ability groups and are rewarded on the basis of the success of the group (Woolfolk, 2004, p.492)

What is aimed by pointing out to collaborative or cooperative learning is that it enhances interaction in language learning as claimed by Vygotsky (1978). In his theory and with the support of his followers, he highlights the importance of social interaction and communication in language learning mainly due to the fact that interaction enhances students' reasoning, comprehension and critical thinking. While interacting; students are in a way or another developing their communication skills as well as language ones so as to become good and fluent speakers of the TL.

It is generally assumed that talking and speaking one's mind and ideas throughout collaborating, debating and discussing diverse topics and issues in classroom setting improve students' linguistic knowledge and/or conceptual knowledge. Interaction develops learners' performance in speaking a SL/FL, since they are given the chance to develop their speaking and listening skills in OE classes. EFL teachers are generally engaged with their students in discussions, debates, dialogues and conversations to bring about interaction. What should be kept in mind is the fact that interaction requires the engagement of
students in conversations which are about situations where they interact with their teacher and classmates and this is called *instructional conversation*. Woolfolk (2004) explains: “in instructional conversations, the teacher's goal is to keep everyone cognitively engaged in a substantive discussion." (p. 334)

Furthermore, dialogues are means used by SL/FL teachers; more specifically those teaching OE, intending to ameliorate their students' oral communication performance in classroom. Hence, in relying on dialogues to teach oral communication, teachers' job is not merely restricted to lecturing from the front of classroom while students jot down notes. According to Looney (2008, p.119), dialogue is also a way to explore the process of learning and learners' feelings about motivation for learning. In recent research literature on effective teaching, a great emphasis is given to dialogic teaching; where the teacher tries to draw in his students in dialogues in an effective way so as to upsurge their thinking and learning skills. Once students are involved in dialogues; they are supposed to interact orally using all what they know about the TL to express their view points. They may surprise their teacher of being creative in their way of speaking, reasoning and interacting with their peers. When the teacher depends on the dialogic way in his teaching, so he tries to elicit his students' ideas, encourage them listening to their colleagues. He has also to stimulate them to speak and arouse their thinking by asking genuine questions provoking them to interact verbally. Students then are supposed and expected to provide contributions of their own by being actively responding. Accordingly, the class transforms to be open to free discussion and challenging to them.

Nevertheless, things are not very often as they are supposed to be in oral communication classes. That is why to many EFL teachers, teaching OE is a tough and a demanding task simply because debates and discussion fail. And what leads to this failure is that students refuse to express their view points in front of the whole class. This,
according to Harmer (2001), very often, happens when they lack the language to express their thoughts or feel unconfident about the language they might use (p.272). To avoid this uneasy and uncomfortable situations, the teacher should encourage his students to ask questions; participate, take turns and asks stimulating questions that arouse their eagerness to speak. He has to make it clear to them how important and significant is the fact of discussing in the process of learning. In addition to this, oral communication class should be an environment where teachers and learners as well should work collectively when dealing with language tasks. They ought to work in a reciprocal way throughout listening to one another in a respectful way, consider and value every one's contribution while interacting. Even though they disagree with one another, this should run in a deferential manner.

According to what has been stated by some of teachers teaching at English Department of Jijel University and according to one’s past experience as students at the English Department of Sétif University, the oral expression class is not as exciting and pleasing as it is supposed to be. That is, for most teachers of OE class, interaction is not an easy thing to be achieved and practised in reality. Simply because many students favour keeping silent and withdrawing from the processed discussion in classroom rather than interacting, cooperating and negotiating with their classmates and colleagues. Additionally, those self-assured and confident students spend most of time discussing with their teachers who find themselves indulged in conversations with very few number of students for they unconsciously neglect the other learners. That is why for some students; especially those left apart during conversations, feel that oral expression is not more than a dull and a monotonous lecture they are obliged to attend. Yet, this fact may become really problematic; for a large number of students who are about to graduate find themselves unable to interact with colleagues and teachers because they have not experienced this
process during the OE class. A class, which is almost the only one where students are not considered as passive recipient for they are welcomed to interact. Oral Expression class is also a class where teachers cooperate with them rather than merely lecturing as it is the case of grammar or written expression teaching classes.

II. Aim of the Study

This study points towards examining how communication takes place between teachers of OE and their students and between peers in classroom at the English Department of Jijel University. That is to say, how learners do debate; negotiate; interact and cooperate in their learning during oral expression sessions. The focal target behind this piece of research is to find out, on the one hand, to what extent our teachers stimulate their learners to interact and communicate verbally with them. What types of questions they utilize to get their students involved in processes of negotiation of meaning and how they offer repair to their learners’ erroneous part of output. On the other hand, this study aims at knowing how students respond to their teachers and peers, how they take turns and perform move exchanges throughout adjacency pairs. Additionally, the dissertation in hand also strives for observing the methods processed, so forth, by teachers to arouse students' interaction, what the ways teachers use to initiate debates and conversations. Another major concern taken in consideration is to perceive whether teachers depend greatly on dialogic and cooperative learning or they are just sticking to the traditional way of language teaching. What is meant by traditional way of teaching here is the case in which teachers speak more, impose their viewpoints on their students and a great deal of time allocated to students' interaction is unfortunately taken by teachers. Furthermore, the study in hand is also deeply interested in knowing whether teachers are the only ones who initiate interaction and the moves of exchanges or it is a chance given to students as well.

At last, this study aims at offering pedagogical implications that help our colleagues
as teachers to consider components of their talk for they are decisive in enhancing learners’ willingness to interact, participate and get involved in effective dialogues. What is more, the dissertation in hand attempts to expose some focal issues that learners will have to follow in EFL classrooms as long as they seek achieving language fluency. It is hoped that the inquiry’ findings would be experimented through further and future research associated with the scope of interactive classroom discourse analysis. In brief, this piece of research tries to unveil and clarify factors leading to the non reaction and passivity of learners during oral expression sessions so as to motivate EFL students to communicate more effectively in classroom.

III. Research Questions

Any conducted study is driven by researcher’ attempt to address a set of questions. S/he endeavours to unveil issues that may not be observed at first glance, they have impact on the issue under investigation, however. With reference to the topic of this research; that is about classroom interaction and the effect of the latter on improving learners’ oral communication skills, the following questions are raised:

1. How can teachers and learners gain a closer understanding of the process of interaction?
2. To what extent do teachers of oral expression module give the chance to their learners to express themselves freely in classroom?
3. To what extent are learners responding and interacting with their teachers and peers?
4. What are the types of topics that are generally negotiated between the teacher and learners?
5. Who initiates discussion inside classroom? Is it always the teacher or learners?
6. Does teacher assign group works and workshops to his/her learners? And if it is the case, how are works discussed? And are students permitted to evaluate their peers’ works or not?
7. Does the fact of interacting continuously lead to motivation and self-confidence in students?

IV. Assumptions and Hypothesis

All participants in any FL classroom setting; namely teachers and learners, strive for achieving fluency and accuracy as far as the use of that language is concerned. Achieving such ambitious target requires participants to be interactive and involved in the construction of instructive discourse; that is called Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC) which is defined:

Teacher's and learners’ ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning. It puts interaction firmly at the centre of teaching and learning and argues that by improving their CIC, both teachers and learners will improve learning and opportunities for learning.

Walsh (2011, p. 158)

Accordingly, the above assumption can be followed further by the subsequent concepts:

1. Participants in EFL are conscious of the value of getting dragged into the process of interaction.

2. Negotiating meaning in language classroom enhances learners’ CIC.

3. Oral proficiency is strongly allied with teachers’ and learners’ knowledge about the components of their discourse.

Hence, the focal target behind managing this study is to consider how teachers and learners as well construct classroom discourse. That is, it goes all out observing participants’ involvement in interactive processes as negotiation of meaning. It also strives to scrutinize whether there is any correlation between the components of teacher talk,
language learners and successful interaction or not. The dissertation tries also to unveil whether interaction leads to oral proficiency as it assumed to be so far or not. In view of that, we hypothesize that the more teachers are conscious of the value of their questioning strategies’ choices and feedback, manage and process interaction in a good way, the more successful their attempt of pushing forward their learners’ will to interact is. Thus, the more teachers try to stimulate every single student to negotiate with them and with his peers and create speaking opportunities for them, the more they create healthy environment for their learners. And the more students feel at ease in class, the more they do better and progress positively in their oral communication skill as they will also be enthusiastic to express their viewpoints overtly throughput taking more turns and risks to interact and perform move exchanges with their interlocutors. To put it more concretely, the following is the study’s focal hypothesis:

If participants in classroom; teacher and learners, knew how to manage their discourse appropriately i.e., as asking good questions and feedback from the part of teachers and responding by taking turns from the part of learners, successful interaction and oral fluency would be achieved.

V. Research Methods and Tools

As defined by Murray (2002) research methodology refers to the theoretical paradigm or framework in which the researcher is working, adopting either a quantitative or qualitative paradigm in his frame work; building up his assumptions on solid arguments, including the choice of research questions or hypotheses. Polit et al (2001, p. 223) also state that research methodology stands for the techniques used to arrange a study and to gather and analyse data all along the research process.

Since the topic in question is to enquire into whether teachers create or hinder communication and interaction through classroom management and since the nature of the
research and data to be collected are the criteria to decide the method to be adopted, hence the most appropriate method to be followed up in conducting this type of studies is the descriptive design. For the nature of the research hypothesis and enquiry determine the type of the research method. Choosing the descriptive method is to explore and describe what is really going on in classroom context i.e. describing events and the course of interaction as they are happening in their immediate genuine context.

In essence the nature of the topic under study; that is interaction, requires the use of a descriptive paradigm that relies more on qualitative research. Undeniably, language classroom was widely investigated hitherto. It was approached form diverse perspectives; linguistically, socially and ethnographically speaking. Yet, the most recent used method to study this intricate process is Conversation Analysis (CA) for it is acknowledged to be efficient regarding the study of move of exchanges between participants in classroom. CA is deemed to be powerful in terms of catching classroom interactional mechanism as a dual managed process. Therefore, the study in hand is to apply CA in the analysis of classroom discourse. Selecting CA than any other method implies the eschewing of the insertion of numbers and calculated data. Qualitative data are to be derived from questionnaires displayed for teachers and students as well, as it relies on the use recordings; in the form of filmed lessons that are of paramount value to analyze chunks of classroom discourse.

VI. The Structure of the Study

As far as the organisation of this study is concerned, it is structured in four foremost chapters. In Chapter One light is shed on a review literature of classroom DA with its diverse connected issues and definitions of intricate concepts taken in the field of classroom discourse and methods used so far to analyze it.
The Second Chapter reviews theoretical issues associated with classroom interaction as negotiation of meaning, input and output and their nexus with the perfection of learners’ oral performance in using EFL. It also considers components making up teacher talk and learners’ language and some arguments about the effective tasks assigned in language classroom to bettering communicative oral skills.

Chapter Three; that is practical in nature, treats data collected from both teacher and learners' questionnaires and from classroom observation recordings. It also analyses how teachers and learners interact throughout language in classroom settings.

Chapter Four interprets data got from questionnaires and records and relying on the parameters of analysis; namely, teachers’ questions, feedback, learners’ turn taking system and adjacency pairs. This chapter also exposes pedagogical recommendations, for teachers and learners; that may serve them to improve classroom interaction. Recommendations are given in the light of the practical side of the dissertation. The chapter ends up with revealing limitations encountered in conducting the study, and suggesting further spheres of future research.
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Introduction

Understanding classroom events and the construction of discourse requires knowing what is meant by discourse beforehand. Chapter one sheds light on some basic concepts associated with classroom discourse; starting by reviewing the different definitions given to the concept of discourse. In actual fact, it is highly important to the reader of this work to have a well-defined concept about discourse and Discourse Analysis before covering and dealing with the notion of Classroom Discourse. Thus, it is not feasible and practical to define Classroom Discourse without having a clear understanding of what is discourse. Especially that this chapter is primarily devoted to put in plain words the notion of Classroom Discourse. Moreover, some features of the latter are unveiled in the scope of this chapter and at its end; diverse methods of analysing Classroom Discourse are exposed.

1.1. Definition of Discourse

According to Schiffrin (1994) (cited in Celce–Murcia & Olshtain, 2000) if discourse is to be defined; thus two foremost definitions can be given to it. With reference to the first definition; which is a formal one, discourse is a unit of language being consistent and coherent, comprising more than one sentence. Concerning the other assigned definition, Schiffrin terms discourse in an informal clarification. To her discourse is the language in use. Yet, going beyond the two previously exposed definitions; Celce–Murcia and Olshtain propose an alternative definition to the concept of discourse in the following quotation “A piece of discourse is an instance of spoken or written language that has describable internal relationships of form and meaning (e.g., words, structures, cohesion) that relates coherently to an external communication function or purpose or a given audience/ interlocutor.” (p.4). Both scholars previously mentioned stress the role of contextual, social, as well as cultural clues in
determining the function of any piece of discourse. To them any production of either written or spoken discourse is a clear sign of the existence of communicative interaction among interlocutors in a given context.

Some may confuse or find it difficult to make a clear sharp distinction between the concepts of language and discourse. Yet, the distinction lying between them as stated by Rymes (2008, p.12) is that discourse is language in use. Putting it differently, to her language is decontextualized, contrariwise to discourse whose principal feature is contextuality. The same pattern of language can serve infinitely diverse functions provided it is used in different situations.

In the words of Richards & Schmidt (1992); discourse can be defined as a general term for language use. That is, discourse is the language that is produced as an outcome of an act of communication. It generally stands for larger units of language than clause, phrase; sentence. Hence, it can be a paragraph or a set of paragraphs; a piece of conversation or even a word.

It is noteworthy mentioning that communicating in one’s native language is a process that can be acquired constantly by NS. As far as learners of a SL or a FL are concerned, things do not seem to be alike, however. That is, when dealing with a TL; learners are supposed to change and readjust their native language strategies so as to cope with the new language in question, comprising its culture. It goes without saying that when interacting with language; whether the native or the target one, learners involved in this intrinsic process do, indeed, make use of diverse skills such as listening, speaking; writing … etc, and then switching on from one skill to another. Putting it differently, when communicating with language, the co-participants' roles change from listening to one another to speaking and interacting verbally.
with interlocutors. So the language being produced by learners in this course of action is simply ‘*discourse*’, in which learners being dragged in this process put to use the different chunks of language they know, including phonological, grammatical and lexical knowledge of that language. Provided they accomplish their language interaction, successful communication will be reached.

1.2. *Discourse Analysis*

In terms of discourse studies, both the spoken and written discourse can be identified, analysed and investigated. This is better recognised as DA. In the investigation on language classroom interaction, it is highly required to shed light on the discipline of DA. In doing this the reader of this research would find it easy to grasp and understand the points that are to be discussed in this chapter and the forthcoming ones.

Indeed, DA researchers investigate the language being used as long as this latter intends the frame of one sentence. As an area of study, DA started to gain attention in the late of 1960’s and 1970’s. At that time; DA was known in terms of ‘*text linguistics*’ and ‘*discourse analysis*’. Concerning ‘text linguistics’, it aimed at studying texts that are written in diverse spheres and genres. As far as DA is concerned, it involved more social and cognitive standpoints on the uses of language and communication exchange, not limited to the study of merely the spoken language but the written one as well. According to Bussmann (1996), discourse analysis can be used interchangeably with the term 'text analysis'. It is interested in scrutinizing the texts’ well-formedeness in terms of coherence, cohesion, deductive rules i.e., speech acts (p. 321). Putting it briefly, text analysis is chiefly concerned with the study of discourse grammar and linguistic matters. On the other hand, DA slanted towards clarifying the character of discourse, its construction and interpretation from a psycholinguistic,
cognitive and a social perspective. Being so, DA has become to be used as an umbrella term that refers to a new cross-disciplinary field drawing from the study of other outstanding disciplines such as anthropology, sociolinguistics, cognitive sciences, language philosophy, sociology of language, psycholinguistics, rhetoric and text linguistics (Van Dijk, 1985) (cited in Bussmann, 1996).

Indeed, different contributions brought by linguistics focussing on a variety of perspectives have really led to what is now acknowledged to be ‘discourse analysis’. For instance, in his attempt to study language in extended texts and to find out the nexus between the texts and their social situation, Harris is acknowledged to be the first linguist who published an article entitled ‘Discourse Analysis’ (1952) (cited in McCarthy, 1991). The contribution of Hymes has also influenced greatly the research conducted in DA sphere, mainly because he treated speech in terms of its social setting. That is, his frame work on speech and others’ works as Austin (1962); Searl (1969); Grice (1975) (cited in McCarthy, 1991, p. 5) with their philosophical study of language and in considering it as a set of social actions; they come out with their influential and outstanding ‘speech act theory ‘and the formulation of conversational maxims.’, for instance, Searl; who is acknowledged to be an eminent pioneer in the field of DA, derives most of his ideas from Austin (1975) (cited in Tanaka, 2004) whose basic perspectives of analysing discourse is in terms of speech acts. Pragmatic researchers, from their part, have also contributed and influenced the analysis of discourse, for they examined meaning in its real context. It is noteworthy to mention that Halliday; with his study that resulted in his well-developed functional approach to language, has tremendously taken part in the development of the British DA. Halliday has pointed out in his study that language as a whole system has a social function, where speech is structured in
accordance with its thematic and informational occurrence. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) (cited in McCarthy, 1991, p. 5) originated a well-defined pattern to describe talk that is between teachers and students in a classroom context. Other pieces of research have been conducted on discursive analysis to shed light on diverse social contexts; for instance, interaction between doctors and patients; debates and business negotiations; monologues... etc.

As concerns the American DA, it was more directed towards the observation of people’s groups in terms of linguistics communication. That is, it has an ethnographic dimension attempting to scrutinize interaction among individuals belonging to various and diverse groups in genuine social contexts. American discourse analysts are interested in observing how social events are taking place throughout the use of language such as storytelling, greeting rituals... etc in different cultural and social settings. It is highly significant to note that according to American discursive research, Conversation Analysis can be implemented within the scope of DA. The former is more concerned with the behavioural conducts of participants in talk rather than the analysis of language structure model. Among those American scholars who were interested in analysing conversations are Goffman (1976; 1979), Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) (cited in McCarthy, 1991). They have introduced foremost contributions in conversational studies in terms of spoken interaction. On the other hand, Labov has taken part in developing CA but from a sociolinguistic dimensional perspective. In his studies, Labov tried to shed light on oral storytelling. In doing so, he has paved the way for many researchers interested in narrative discourse. To put it briefly, in its history, American discourse analysis has provided a large variety of DA. It is not limited mainly to the study of language discourse, it rather widened its scope to deal with social constraints that are faced within ethnographic groups and which hamper communication. Text
grammarians have also contributed to the development of written DA scope. Additionally, Prague school linguists have also affected, to a great extent, the elaboration of DA literature. They have treated more the links between grammar and discourse; focussing on the structuring of information within discourse.

What should be kept in mind is that DA is trying to afford a bridge between the grammatical forms and their functions. That is to say, one cannot separate the field of DA from the study of grammar and phonology. DA is not limited mainly to the study of patterns of language as the grammatical or the phonological ones isolated. Instead it tries to interpret their occurrence in accordance with the contexts so as to have a well-defined interpretation to their use. To put it more concretely, a linguistic form maybe interpreted differently provided it is used in a different context. What makes the speaker expressing different meaning is simply the immediate context in which he uses language throughout using different intonation or tone contour; as it is better known.

Discourse analysts are interested in analysing language being used in different social situations and spoken interactions such as phone calls, buying things in shops, job interviews; doctor-patient talk, classroom talk... etc. In doing so, they are trying to capture how spoken interaction occurs in these situations; for certainly each of them has its own formula as well as conventions that people involved in one of these situations should follow. Hence, being indulged in one of the previously mentioned situations, as the classroom one for instance, the participants in the classroom context should play and construct different roles and relationships, achieve specific and well-defined purposes. Hence, discourse analysts’ role is to provide rigorous explanations to the whole context so as to have an accurate description by the end. Yet, it is obvious, then, that we can no longer separate the language forms (grammar,
phonology, lexis...etc) from the discourse function; for after all, language teaching requires primarily the use of language patterns all along their adequate functions to gradually master its use.

Something is noteworthy is that researchers working in DA attempt also to focus on the analysis of the naturally produced language rather than the invented one. Putting it differently, one of the keystone principles on which discourse analysts base their research on is examining language in its real and genuine context; language by which the speakers accomplish a set of actions and interactions. Accordingly, discourse analysts argue that the speakers’ choice of linguistic patterns is strongly connected and associated with the immediate context in which language is produced.

To sum up, DA can be defined as a self-discipline which is interested in describing and analysing language used beyond the level of a single sentence. Taking into consideration the social context surrounding it, besides the cultural feature that characterizes it and most of time affects its use.

1.3. Advantages of Classroom Discourse Analysis

As a matter of fact, the significance of analysing discourse; especially the classroom one, enables researchers to investigate and inspect classroom interaction. Additionally, when handling a discourse analysis on language classroom, one can have a clear insight of what is taking place in it. Classroom is considered as a social context where both the teacher and learners are using language to communicate, as it is stated by Kumaravativelu (1999) (cited in McKay, 2006, p.105): "Classroom discourse analysts can look at classroom event as a social event and the classroom as a minisociety with its own rules and regulations, routines and rituals. Their focus is the experience of teachers and learners within this minisociety".
Confirming Kumaravadivelu’s view points, Ellis & Barkhuizen (2005) consider classroom interaction as social events that comprise the participation of individuals in a classroom context whereby language is used not merely in isolated sentences.

Furthermore, it is strongly argued that CD enhances mutual understanding between teachers and learners in the classroom context. Besides the fact that when having a well-defined concept about CD, academic achievement is believed to improve, for it permits to teachers to have an intrinsic knowledge which is necessary for them to analyse the process of both teaching and learning. Rymes (2008, p.5) argues that DA reinforces understanding between teachers and learners, for the former will have the opportunity to look closely at their talk; how interaction takes place among students throughout role playing, turn taking. As it also gives to teachers the chance to analyse and observe how topics are introduced in classroom and how social relationships are built-in a classroom context. In brief, DA gives a detailed and a comprehensive overview on teacher/learner and learner/learner interaction in terms of considering classroom as a social context or a linguistic one.

The value of having a good command and control of discourse pattern analysis may simply bring solutions to the problematic situations which most teachers might face in their classes. For instance, they may be confused when asked a question and receive no response, as they may find it difficult to stimulate and motivate those silent and uncommunicative students. According to Rymes (2008) : "by recording, viewing , transcribing and analysing instances of talk in classroom, CD researchers have shown how differences in communication styles that lead to such lapses are often interpreted by teachers and testing mechanisms as deficit-emblems of lack of intelligence, drive or ability. However, a closer look at discourse patterns usually reveals communication rather than deficit.” (p.6)
Classroom is, indeed, the outstanding place where language learners, especially Second or Foreign Language ones learn the language through different classroom activities. It is widely argued that interaction taking place in classroom; either interaction between students and teachers or among students is significantly needed to create a healthy learning environment. It is through CD and oral communication that SL/FL learning occurs.

1.4. Features of Classroom Discourse

Classroom Discourse; which is by definition the language used by both teachers and learners to communicate in the classroom context, is the principal medium through which the processes of teaching and learning take place.

As concerns CD; the role played by the teacher in classroom is debatable. According to Walsh (2006), the role that is played by the teacher is central in classroom. He considers that the teacher plays a foremost task in classroom. In a way or another he rejects the position defended by the CLT and TBLL that emphasize the centrality of learner in performing group and pair works assigned in classroom. Walsh (2006) regards that even in a learner-centred approach, still the role of the teacher is significantly critical, since he is the one supposed to manage and direct the tasks assigned to students in classroom as group and pair works. In view of the fact that teacher’s predominant function in the classroom, Walsh considers that the components of the CD that is controlled, for the most part, by the teacher are the following ‘control of patterns of communication; elicitation techniques; repair strategies and modifying speech to learners’ (Walsh, 2006,p.3)

It is worth mentioning that as concerns language teaching, things do not seem to be alike when bringing up the teaching of other content-based subjects i.e., subjects where priority is given to the content (message) rather than the language transmitted to learners, as it
is the case of teaching history, mathematics...etc. To put it differently, Long (1983) and Willis (1992) (cited in Nizegorodcew, 2007) consider that language; as the linguistic form used, is most of time the same aim to be achieved by the end of a lesson. Long confirms this by maintaining that language is both the vehicle and object of instruction. Willis goes along with Long’s position in considering that language is, after all, used as a medium of reaching a linguistic final objective of a given lesson. He says:” Language is both the focus of activity, the central objective of the lesson, as well as the instrument for achieving it”. Additionally, in the words of Thornbury (2000) (cited in Walsh, 2006), he emphasizes the same previously exposed point of view:

> Language classroom are language classrooms [original emphasis], and for the teacher to monopolise control of the discourse through, for example, asking only display question- while possibly appropriate to the culture of geography as maths classes, would seem to deny language learners access to the most need- opportunities for language use. (p.3)

Indeed, the teaching of English as SL or a FL as well is a demanding and intrinsic as a process. Given the fact, that communicating in a SL/ FL classroom context is featured by its complex quality and nature, teachers are, accordingly, recommended to have a well-elaborated and thorough knowledge about the characteristics of second language CD. In having a good command of CD in SL/FL classroom settings, teachers would certainly lessen the faced troubles they tackle such as misunderstandings, the difference in backgrounds, the variation between the first language and the target one. Classroom Discourse smoothes, to a great extent, the process of TL teaching.

In actual fact, many conducted investigations have exposed a variety of CD features, among which is the review introduced by Spada and Lightbown (1993) (cited in Hinkel,
Both scholars have identified that the discourse in SL teaching in a communicative classroom context, does certainly differ from that of a non-communicative language teaching as the traditional learning modes. In a communicative-oriented language classroom, the teacher does not emphasize on accuracy and correction over communication. He does not correct errors in the same way as does a teacher in a conventional method of language classroom; where grammar correctness is stressed on. Other recent researches, as the one conducted by Dornyer and Malderez (1997); Foster (1998) and Rampton (1999) (cited in Walsh, 2006), they all question whether peer interaction does really contribute to promote SLA and learning as it was suggested so far. Rampton argues that learner-learner interaction is not as beneficial as it is actually assumed to be. Rampton (1999) clarifies: “Some of the data we have looked at itself provides grounds for doubting any assumption that peer group rituals automatically push acquisition forwards” (cited in Walsh, 2006). Concurring with the previously mentioned point of view, Mitchell and Martin (1997) (cited in Walsh, 2006) believe that the role that should be played in SL teaching classroom needs to be actually revisited. That is to say, they deny the views laying emphasis on peer interaction in promoting SL learning. Instead, they argue that the teacher is the ultimate driving force that pushes SL/FL learning forward. From their perspective, the teacher’s role is much more complicated than the one suggesting that he is merely to organise practice activities.

In his examination, Walsh (2006) outlines and introduces the most eminent features of second language CD that are worth to be explained in this chapter. In what follows, these features are exposed, so as to have a good insight on each.

1.4.1. Control of Patterns of Communication

As stated previously, the first classroom feature that characterises CD is the control of
patterns of communication by the teacher. With reference to SL/FL teaching, most of the time communication is retained by the teacher (Johnson, p. 1995.). Ellis & Fotos (1999) are of the same opinion as Johnson in this standpoint. The former believes that the language teacher is the one who is in charge of hampering or boosting interaction and oral communication and accordingly learning opportunities for his learners (p. 228). Being of the same position as the previously mentioned scholars, Breen (1998) (cited in Walsh, 2006) argues that SL classroom settings and events are, for the most part, orchestrated and arranged by the teacher. Tsui (1995) argues, from her part too, that very often, teachers take over the patterns of interaction in class and this is crystal clear when she says: “As we can see, teacher talk not only takes up the largest portion of talk but also determines the topic of talk and who talks. It is, therefore, a very important component of classroom interaction.” (p. 13). Her view is sustained in her data collected and presented in the following extract, taking place in ESL classroom.

T: Christmas is coming. What are you going to do? (pause) Christmas

Coming. Do you like Christmas?

Ss: Yes... No.

T: So what are you going to do?

S: I’ll write-

T: Yes, Alex, can you tell me?

S: I’ll write some Christmas cards.

T: You’ll write some Christmas cards. To who? Girlfriends?

S: (laughs)

T: To your friends, right...

(1995, p.13)

When classroom discourse is analysed, it is represented into small sequences that are recognised as ‘moves’. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) (cited in Hall and Verplaetse, 2000) offered a typology of CD structure that is IRF. They explain that moves that are in classroom
frequently involve the interactional- initiation- response- follow up (IRF) structure in a language lesson. Generally, it is the teacher who initiates interaction (I) and already predicts his learners’ response (R). Then, he follows up (F) by providing an evaluation to the previously given response; a kind of a feedback on the given answers. To have a clearer idea about this IRF/ IRE structure, here is an extract presented in the work of Walsh (1987)

T: Two things to establish for the writer at the beginning of the story.
One situation situation. What’s the situation Douglas? Have you read the story Douglas?
(R) S: No, sir
(F) T: Ah that won’t help then will it who’s read the story what is the situation at the beginning Michael? Is it Michael?

(cited in Walsh, 2006)

Thus it is obvious, from the already exposed extract, that interaction is, on the whole, controlled by the teacher. Students barely respond to the already asked question. Chaudron (1988) claims that two thirds of classroom speech is dominated by the teacher in a SL learning context. It is noteworthy to explain the factors that contribute to make the IRF/ IRE prevailing in a second as well as a FL learning classroom. The simplest reason is that the initiation of the discourse from the part of the teacher, and having on the other hand the expected response from the part of the students, are very usual behaviours in the routines of language learning classroom, that both students and teacher are accustomed to experiencing. Another imperative factor that makes IRF predominant in classroom speech is that teachers; as being a keystone component in enhancing and facilitating SL/FL learning in the classroom, favour helping their students ‘ feel good’ and comfortable after answering a given question (s). When evaluating and offering feedback to learners’ response, the latter would certainly feel a kind of reassurance and self-confidence and would, by no room of discussion, increase their degree of
interaction with the teacher. Additionally, most of the time, teachers still prefer being the ones who maintain and represent the chief power in the class. According to Ellis (1999) teachers do also take control of CD for they prefer to keep their students’ oral interaction limited to the objectives of the language activity, that is they prefer that their student’ oral produced language conforms to the goals of the task instead of being diverged. At last but not least, in a SL/FL teaching context, very often, teachers face the problem of time constraints that hamper advance in the CD and, therefore, they rather like better the question and response structure.

Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) (cited in Mc Carthy, 1991), all along their study, have strongly argued that CD has an internal structure that is organized as the following pattern: (1) the teacher initiates and provokes the students to interact by asking about something (‘what’s that?’), (2) a pupil answers (‘An axe’) and (3) the teacher acknowledges the answer and comments on it (‘It’s an axe, yes’). The pattern of (1), (2); and (3) is then, repeated (Mc Carthy, 1991,p.14). The process mentioned beforehand is called ‘exchange’ by Sinclair and Coulthard. They state that this exchange comprises three parts: Initiation; Response and Evaluation or Feedback. Each exchange is known as move. As called by Sinclair and Coulthard, the first move is the ‘opening move’, the second is an ‘an answering move’, while the last move is, as previously said ‘response and follow up’.

Regardless of the fact that IRE/ IRF is a wide common dominant structure in SL/FL CD; nevertheless, it was argued and put into question. Kasper (2001) believes that when IRF characterizes language classroom, it negatively affects the contribution of students for it provides slight opportunities for them to interact spontaneously in classroom (cited in Thornbury & Slade, 2006, p. 241). It assumes that learners would, undoubtedly, do better in oral communication and would achieve and take part in classroom speech. Cazden (1986),
who has the same perspective as Kasper, considers that SL classroom context is characterized by the almost ascendancy of interaction patterns by the teacher (cited in Walsh, 2006). They do so by dominating not merely the speech, but even the topic and discussion that take place in classroom. Additionally, it is the teacher who usually selects who and when interaction occurs, assuming so far the inequality in the relationships existing between teachers and their learners. In addition to Cazden, Kasper, Johnson (1995) as well agrees that the teacher is the one who does control both the content and the structure of classroom communication. In the light of her words, Johnson argues that learners’ participation in oral communication is definitely shaped by the teacher (p.54)

Something should, on the other hand, be highlighted is the fact that teachers’ role is not merely limited to providing linguistic components of the TL to his students. More importantly and, pedagogically speaking, learners need more psychological assistance, support and backing up from their teacher. For the reason that when they feel this kind of sincere encouragement from the part of their teacher, this would certainly push them forward to use more the TL; whether a second or a foreign one. Having the self-confidence and insurance of being supported by their teachers, students would, with no room of discussion, take more risks to interact, communicate, negotiate, question and even argue their viewpoints in the classroom setting. Put it differently, notwithstanding the criticism that is given to IRF conventional discourse which is featured by the teacher’s manipulation of speech in oral communication, s/he, in a way or another, facilitates and paves the way for his/her students to interact more when s/he provides feedback on his/her learners’ contribution. Kumaravadivelu (2006) believes that the fact of facilitating his students’ participation, helping them say what they think about is definitely going to lessen many problems in communication and encourage
students to interact more using the TL. (p.39)

1.4.2. Elicitation Techniques

The second prominent and prevailing feature that typifies CD is the teacher’s use of some elicitation systems while interacting with his students. These techniques are, indeed, very usually common in the SL/FL classroom routines. In his examination to teacher’s types of questions that are generally asked by teachers, Chaudron (1988, p.127) notices, after examining many studies devoted to shed light on teacher’s questioning behaviour, that they ask questions that demand very short responses from the part of students. Little referential questions are, in fact, asked by Second and Foreign language teachers and, hence, very limited and natural responses are produced by learners. According to Nunun (1993) teachers should have a good knowledge about the methodology of how to ask questions on their learners. To him, teachers should know and determine the pedagogic goals behind their questions directed to their learners. That is, provided the teacher wishes to ask questions that are asked on the content, so he is to ask display questions. Whereas, if the pedagogical goal of the teacher behind asking his questions is to provide his students interaction and draw them into prolonged conversation, so it would be better to ask referential ones.

In another outstanding review conducted by Wintergest (1993) (cited in Walsh, 2006) perceives that many teachers fail to ask ‘why questions’ or questions that drag out learners in longer conversations. All along her observation, she remarked that the ‘why questions’ are asked and teachers make more use of them, with regard to the age as well as the level of students; who are targeted to debate, discuss orally in classrooms. She identifies that only 2.5% of the whole questions asked in classroom are ‘wh questions’. In her findings, she argues that the strategies chosen by the teacher to ask questions are very decisive and of paramount
importance in learners’ participation. From their part, Long and Sato (1983) (cited in Johnson, 2006) confirm the value and the significance of involving students; especially English NNS in CD, by soliciting them for responding to questions. By asking questions, the teacher is, in a way or another, helping his learners and aiding them to express themselves throughout using the TL. Supporting their ideas, Musemerci (1996) presented in a conducted study that the length and complexity of the utterances of learners are determined more by the teacher’s asked questions (cited in Walsh, 2006). The effects of questions’ types on classroom interaction is to be discussed in deep in the forthcoming chapter; for this part of the chapter is devoted to expose some of the most recurrent features of classroom discourse in general according to many scholars’ perspectives.

1.4.3. Repair

The third feature that characterises CD and which according to Van Lier (1988) (cited in Ellis& Barkhuizen, 2005) is what is called ‘repair’ or ‘error correction’. Repair has always been a debatable issue in the midst of scholars. In the following quotation, Van ller explains better why repair has always been a controversial issue in CD:

One camp says that correction should be avoided or eliminated altogether, since it raises the affective filter and disrupts communication...

The other camp says that consistent error correction is necessary if we are to avoid the learner’s interlanguage fossilizing into some form of pidgin. For adherents to each camp, the other camp engages in other fossiliphobia or pidgin-breeding.

So it is definitely clear that repair, which is considered to be as one of the most notorious features of CD, is seen from different angles and perspectives. Some scholars and practitioners as teachers think that repair does, indeed, hinder communication and hamper
learners from going forward in their oral proficiency in the TL. On the other hand, others as Seedhouse (1994) consider that repair is of an overriding significance for SL adult learners. They need to be immediately corrected if ever they make errors in their oral interaction, and it is not at all an embarrassing matter, as it is claimed to be. Willis (1997) is of the same position as Seedhouse in believing that error correction or repair is a keystone factor that enhances language learning (cited in Walsh, 2006). According to Van Lier (1988) regardless of the position of teachers towards the implementation of repair, the latter should be structured in accordance with the pedagogical goals (cited in Ellis& Barkhuizen; 2005). In other words, teachers have to determine, from the outset, what are their objectives. I.e., do they favour content and message correctness or rather language accuracy? In short, repair should be previously pedagogically planned by teachers, likewise elicitation techniques that were previously discussed and exposed.

Something is worthy to be mentioned is that repair; as a very dominant feature in CD; is most of the time provided by the teacher. Learners as well might repair for each other, however. They may well adopt some strategies of self-repair to correct their wrong produced oral contributions after noticing them. (Allwright& Bailey, 1991). In the chapter that follows repair and its types is to be discussed.

1.4.4. Modifying Speech to Learners

Indeed, modifying speech to learners is another feature that marks classroom discourse. It is quite sure that TL students can really progress provided the teacher modifies his speech to them. Simply because the fact of adjusting speech in classroom does, to a great extent, lead to comprehension. According to Krashen (1985) (cited in Richards &Schmidt, 1992), learners should understand and grasp the language produced in the classroom. To him, comprehensible
input is a necessary condition in SLA. Hence, this issue i.e., the relationship between interaction and input is to be later discussed in the coming chapter.

In SL/FL classroom, teachers very often reduce their rate of speech by slowing it down to fit with the proficiency’s level of their learners. Additionally, teachers also adjust their vocabulary throughout simplifying their lexis. (Ellis, 1990). Upholding Krashen’s position, Lynch (1996) emphasises the necessity of modifying speech to learners; for they do really experience difficulties in understanding the speech produced by the teacher. To Lynch as long as teachers do not adapt their verbal communication; for instance their simplification of the speech delivery, it would certainly be difficult for them to comprehend what they are listening to especially if they are not advanced level learners. This is clearly understood in the following quotation stated by Anderson and Lynch (1988): “The listener has the opportunity to indicate understanding or non-understanding and to intervene when clarification is needed during communication” (cited in Richards and Renandya, 2002). Moreover, it is worth to note that SL/FL teachers are likely to be the only model representing the target language; so it is highly significant for them to facilitate the students’ exposure to that language.

Owing to the important role that teachers play in the context of SL/FL classroom, many pieces of research have been carried out; among which is the study conducted by Pica Yong and Doughty’s (1987)(cited in Walsh, 2006). The latter recapitulates the findings of their investigation by concluding that those learners who interact more with their teachers in the classroom setting do perform better in listening comprehension tests than those who do not thanks to the practice performed in the classroom. From his part, Chaudron (1988) summarizes that speech is modified in four points: modification is done on the grammar level. Simplification is made on the teacher’ selection of uncomplicated vocabulary items.
Adaptation is carried out on the teacher’s pronunciation. Lastly meaning is supplemented by the use of gestures and facial expressions.

To put it simply; Ellis (1990) recapitulates the most given CD features by concluding from many conducted classroom pieces of research that in most SL/FL classroom settings, teachers do, in fact, take control of interaction that takes place, by dominating most of moves. They are also the ones who frequently open and close the interactional exchanges. CD is dominated by Second and Foreign language teachers for they generally elicit while their learners merely respond and then again evaluate their learners’ contributions.

1.5. Distinction between Classroom Interaction and Classroom Discourse

It is of great magnitude to point out that Classroom Discourse differs from classroom interaction in terms of their theoretical roots and methodological frameworks. On the one hand, CD investigation seeks to demonstrate how everyday life is constituted in and through the linguistic and discourse choices of participants in a classroom context. That is how teachers and their learners as well make use of linguistic forms to get in touch with one another. CD undertakes also the task of shedding light on how language use shapes and is shaped by processes, practices and content demands of the curriculum.

On the other hand, interaction analysis seeks to examine the strategies and behaviours adopted by students and teachers as well. That is to say, classroom interaction, on the words of Richards and Schmidt (1992), is the patterns of verbal and non verbal communication and the types of social correlation that happen in classroom.

According to a review presented by Green and Dixon (2007) classroom IA research transcends to 1920 in the work and investigations conducted by social psycholinguists and sociologists (cited in Rex& Breen, 2008). It was included in these spheres, for classroom
interaction was considered as a set of behaviours and language is the tool that reveals how social relationships are built inside classroom settings. For instance, by examining classroom interaction, it would be effortless to explore whether the teacher is authoritative or rather democratic in his classroom. By time going on, classroom interaction has been widely inspected by researchers working in diverse fields and areas of studies as linguistics, child language, CA, ethnography of communication, psycholinguistics...etc. As concerns researchers implicated in analysing some educational issues, classroom interaction is studied to expose how knowledge is constructed in classroom setting; how language symbolizes power relationships.

1.6. Classroom Observation Research

In actual fact, classroom observation has a long history in education. It has always been believed that handling classroom observation is worthy to achieve academic, professional qualifications; whether in the teaching process or the learning one.

Classroom researchers examine chiefly classroom events so as to comprehend in a closer look what is going on there. During 1960’s there has been an increase and a crucial awareness about conducting classroom observation and make it part of teacher training so as to achieve better academic results. Broadly speaking, classroom observation research inspects both teacher and learners’ behaviours, whether observable or unobservable ones. It gained attention especially in the realm of SLA as a prime tool for academic research.

It is worth noting that classroom observation can be direct, indirect and even subjective by the use of data collection participants’ diaries, questionnaires and interviews. Classroom observation research, thus, can rely on qualitative as well as quantitative approach to research design. Hence, we have to note that recording classroom events and lessons via audio and
videotapes, which would be later on transcribed for analysis, is one of the fundamental and central traditions of classroom observation.

Indeed, classroom observation has grown and gained a huge interest in the educational realm, more specifically, since the introduction of ‘interaction analysis’ Flanders system’. At that point, IA was of a great magnitude and was considered as an intrinsic tool to shed light on the characteristics of language classroom. Later on, other models and approaches have been proposed to observe classroom events from different perspectives. That is; at the outset, classroom observation research has given an extreme value to the use of categories to describe classroom events. Yet, by time going on, classroom research attention has been drawn to the use of mentalist research techniques to account for teachers and learners’ experience all along their language classroom events. Some of the techniques used are: diary studies, think aloud techniques...etc. Researchers may restrict their scope to the use of predetermined categories.

There is no room of discussion that by conducting classroom observation, teachers, educationalists and practitioners interested in the educational ambit would gain a better understating about the complex nature of classroom life. As they would also grasp how the process of both teaching and learning are processed in the classroom setting. Indeed; classroom research allowed the teacher to have a deeper insight on the major faced problem. Simultaneously, it offers solutions or at least proposes a variety of remedies to them and this is thanks to the immediate observation in classroom setting that facilitates, to great extent, unveiling the causes of these encountered troubles. For instance, provided a teacher wants to know why he is facing problems to stimulate his learners to interact, speak more, communicate with him or with their peers, so he is to approach what is taking place closely by investigation every aspect of the teaching process and the learning one. This investigation is
taken for granted to help overcoming the faced obstacles.

1.7. Methods to Analyzing Classroom Discourse

As a matter of fact, it is highly important to refer to the available methods that are used to study oral discourse in classroom settings before experiencing this analysis. Putting it differently, researchers concerned with analysing discourse in classroom have alternative approaches to perform their investigation; especially the study which is concentrating on the TL classroom. In exposing the available methods, things would be easier to grasp and understand how the interactive process of interaction takes place in classroom between teachers and students. Indeed; describing CD is of extreme value and this was acknowledged by Kumaravadivelu (1999)

What actually happens there [in the classroom] largely determines the degree to which desired learning outcomes are realised. The task systematically observing, analysing and understanding classroom aims and events therefore becomes central to any serious educational enterprise.

(cited in Walsh, 2006)

1.7. 1. Interaction Analysis

Interaction analysis is one of the prominent methods used to analyse CD. According to Richards& Schmidt (1992), IA is defined as “any of several procedures for measuring and describing the behaviour of students and teachers in classroom”(p.264). It aims at describing what is occurring in classroom, as it also attempts to evaluate teaching. IA, as a method, strives also for highlighting the relationship that is between teaching and learning. Moreover, in conducting an IA process, teachers-trainees would have a clear insight about the process of teaching. It is worth to mention that in IA study, researchers observe every sort of behaviour
happening in classroom. In addition, researchers using IA analyze types of activities that both teachers and learners accomplish and then they classify them by using a classification scheme. In other words, IA makes use of some types of coding systems to scrutinize the verbal communication patterns that go on in classroom milieu. In fact, these coding systems are implemented so as to determine that type of classroom interaction which best promotes and improves Second/Foreign learning. Furthermore, and as stated by McKay (2006, p.139), coding schemes that are used in a classroom IA helps teachers to know whether they have used effective patterns of communication when interacting with their learners, it is only throughout the use of coding schemes that teachers would acquire the mastery of a variety of communicative patterns in their classrooms.

Ellis& Barkhuizen (2005) state that ‘Interaction Analysis’ is the category systems that are implemented to code features of CD; such as the system of Moskowitz 1967 (p.166). These systems describe and exemplify functional features of interaction that take place in the classroom context such as teacher’s explanation. To them, classroom interaction analysis involves the use of an observation instrument or schemes. With reference to the work of Kumaravadivelu (1999) (cited in Kumaravadivelu, 2006) in which he affirms that these coding schemes are” consisting of a finite set of preselected and predetermined categories for describing certain verbal behaviours of teachers and students as they interact in second language classroom”. So, by definition, a coding system is basically a set of tools and instruments designed primarily to record what is taking place in the TL classroom. These records are of great worth to set up classroom profiles that introduce a rigorous scientific analysis of CD. In the educational field there are over 200 coding systems. From his part Chaudron (1988) points out that there are around twenty six available systems attempting to
analysing interaction in the SL classroom context. As maintained by McKay (2008), coding schemes associated with Classroom Discourse do vary. Some of them are very comprehensive aiming at describing and portraying patterns of communication which are performed in classroom. This type of coding schemes is called ‘genetic coding schemes’. While ‘limited coding schemes’ are those schemes which are more specialized; covering and coping with mainly moves implemented to fulfil a definite type of classroom interaction; for instance group works.

Regardless of the systems and instruments used by researchers and observers, they have some common features such as the use of ticking boxes; making marks, the observer’s recording of the observed things in classroom in regular or inconsistent time intervals. Additionally, these utilized instruments are of great help to compare between researchers ‘findings as they facilitate the fact of generalisation. Moreover, all these instruments were designed for the purpose of drawing the attention of teachers to some facts that are likely be unseen to them and hence can be deduced and found out by using IA models.

While McKay (2008, p.90) distinguishes between these observational instruments by classifying them into generic and limited coding system, Walsh (2006, p. 44) categorizes them into system-based or ad hoc. So we consider that it is of a great value to analyse these systems introduced by both scholars and others, for this fact would certainly give a comprehensive and an all-embracing view about the methods used to scrutinize classroom interaction.

To start with McKay’s classification of interaction analysis coding systems, namely what he calls ‘Generic Coding Schemes’, and which are also recognised as ‘System-based approaches’, reveals that generic coding schemes do vary depending on the following:

-The procedure of recording
Some observers may choose to record and register a specific, definite behaviour whenever it happens in classroom setting. Meanwhile other researchers would prefer to stick to recording, coding what is taking place in classroom context at a given and an already defined period of time for instance, recording every minute.

- Multiple Coding

They are complex in their nature mainly because in using these codes, the researcher may make use of more than a single code to highlight a specific behaviour. To put it simply a behaviour might be coded by a pedagogical function as teacher explanation, as it may be also coded in terms of modality, being verbal or non verbal.

1.7.1.1. COLT’ Scheme

Among the salient generic coding system that is widely used is the Communication Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT). It is an observational used system to code, classify and examine classroom language. As a system it was devised by Allen, Frohlish and Spada (1984) (cited in Ellis& Barkhuizen, 2005). COLT is a scheme that was, as stated before, generated during the 1980’s as part of a large scale of a project research conducted on the achieved progress of language proficiency. Putting it differently, a group of Canadian researchers wanted to know to what extent instruction affects and determines language learners’ learning outcomes. Hence, an observational phase in classroom was extremely required, and the latter is certainly done by the use of a specific classroom settings. It is noteworthy that this scheme was designed in an era where communicative language teachers and teaching was highly supported. Thus, this scheme was primarily created to assess and determine in which way a communicative language teacher contribute in his learners’ progress in oral proficiency. To put it plainly, COLT was more concerned with highlighting the
communicative features of a classroom. The COLT system or scheme is categorized into two keystone parts. While the first part deals with the activities and the tasks being accomplished in classroom, part two is slanted towards portraying the communicative features of the exchange in classroom. For a better explanation and description of the scheme, we consider that we would better explain and exemplify the already mentioned part. As concerns part one, the researcher is to code some of categories which are exhibited in appendix (1) inserted in the dissertation in hand.

As concerns the second part of the COLT scheme, as referred to formerly, is much more occupied with portraying and demonstrating communicative features taking place within any assigned activity or task to students or learners, (to have a good insight about this part of the scheme, have a look on the second part of Appendix 1)

In its vigorous and robust side, COLT is said to be a good scheme for it comprises categories that enable any classroom based research on interaction to display and show signs of features of a communicative classroom. That is to say, COLT which has direct links to the communicative method of language teaching is of crucial benefits for those who would like to determine whether a classroom is said to be communicative or reserved. This is due to its predetermined and preselected categories that are established for the sake of portraying certain verbal behaviours of all participants; teachers as well as learners, while they interact in the classroom. (For more details, two excerpts are inserted in Appendix 1 to demonstrate concretely how COLT scheme works)

To recapitulate what has previously been said about COLT, the latter is explicated in the words of Kumaravadivelu (1999) “COLT is aimed to capture differences in the communicative orientation of classroom instruction [...] and to examine their effects on
learning outcomes” (cited in Walsh, 2006). As a whole scheme; it comprises 73 categories which are all devised to make it possible for the observer to link between language use and the implemented teaching method i.e., make a bridge between them. As we said earlier, this observational instrument is basically devised and originated from language communicative methodology; seeking to determine how instructional differences affect learning outcomes.

The COLT scheme was categorized into two chief parts. Part A is directed towards describing classroom organisation, tasks implemented materials and level of learners’ involvement in classroom interaction. Part B is concerned with the observation of both teacher and learners’ verbal interaction so as to check whether there exists information gap, sustained speech, referential or display questions...etc. Hence, COLT scheme, by no room of discussion and even with the criticism it received, remains one of the most sophisticated and elaborated schemes applied in SL classrooms for it draws on quantitative as well as qualitative analysis modes and systems. It is worth mentioning that this scheme was later elaborated by Spada and Forhlish in 1995 and presented in a revised version.

1.7.1.2. Bellack’s Model

The second approach of interaction analysis, which is a system-based one or a generic code scheme, is the one framed by Bellack et al (1966) (cited in Walsh, 2006). It is considered to be one of the earliest system-based and structured observation schemes. It was designed by Bellack all along the collaboration of some of his colleagues in 1966; based on the interaction of 16 teachers and 345 learners. Bellack and his colleagues classified a number of pedagogical moves into common teaching sequence; summarising it as follows: Structure, Solicit, Respond and React cycle, for instance, the following extract shows better this coding scheme:

T We’re going to look today at ways to improve your writing

STRUCTURE
Would you like to tell me one of the mistakes that you made?  
S The type of the verb  
T The verb, it means there’s a problem with the verb

We have to draw emphasis on the fact that Bellack’s coding scheme was recognized to be beneficial after 10 years of its formulation, for it helped Sinclair and Coulthard to design their own discourse model in 1975. As it also contributed and was one of the reasons that led Brown to improve and expand the four moves into seven during the 1980’s. Bellack’s model is recognized and better known by initiation, response, feedback (IRF); which has already been discussed in section 1.4. IRF/ IRE is still believed by many practitioners on classroom interaction to be as the most conventional structure. Given another term, IRF is called ‘the essential teaching exchange’ by Edwards and Westgate (1994:124) (cited in Walsh, 2006) Even though IRF was criticized for it is said to be too much teacher-centered, it is acknowledged to present and introduce a comprehensive depiction of the process of students and teachers’ interaction. That is to say, one of the critics given to IRF exhibits that students are too reluctant and their interaction remains too limited, but when the chance to interacting and expressing their views by their teachers, student’s discourse would certainly be considerable compared to the one suggested by IRF.

1.7.1.3. Flanders (1970): Flanders’ Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC)

FIAC, as Bellack’s coding scheme; is one of the earliest observation systems that was generated to examine interaction in classroom (Tsui, 1995). As a system-based classroom observation instrument, it is different from the already discussed scheme (Bellack’s one). Meanwhile the process of teaching is taking place in the classroom context, the observation as well as description occur in real time. The particularity of this process is that the presence of an observer examining interaction in classroom has been assumed to have
effects on the latter. Additionally, if the researcher wants to use this scheme, he is to have training first of all so that his obtained findings would be compared and reliable for other researchers working on the same issue.

One of the critics addressed to FIAC is that it focused on observing language classroom, while in fact it has been devised to scrutinize content classrooms (Appendix 2 shows an example of the use and practice of the FIAC model). Moreover, FIAC is also criticized for it focuses more on teacher talk and gives little concentration to students or pupils’ talk. Saying it otherwise, in using the FIAC instrument for observation, the researcher finds himself biased towards scrutinizing teacher talk and gives a minor interest to learners’ one owing to the fact that it is classified into mainly two ways as portrayed in the appendices’ section. Also what makes the implementation of the FIAC system put into question is the fact that it may not be adequate for accounting and coding interaction in SL/FL and content classroom; especially the contemporary one, where roles are allocated fairly between all classroom participants. That is to say, today’s language classroom is not merely a place where the teacher is the only one supposed to take the major roles in the class. On the contrary, learners are assigned to fulfill some intrinsic roles and tasks i.e., there is a kind of equality and fairness in allotting roles to both teachers and students.

In brief, FIAC is believed proposing categories which are subjective, difficult to prove, confirm and label data precisely.

1.7.1.4. Moskowitz (1971) FLINT Scheme

As a matter of fact, this scheme was an extension to the work or the system presented by Flanders previously explained. Moskowitz made the Flanders system more sophisticated by adding and devising twenty two category instruments that would fit better FL classrooms. The
brought innovation by these categories is that they account for some of the methodological considerations and implementations which were not taken into account formerly; for instance the utilization of choral and vocal drills, exercises and teacher’ drawings on tape recorders. Since FLINT scheme is a complex one, Moskowitz recommends that the observer is to master the Flanders system beforehand using the former, for the FLINT is a modified version of Flanders coding scheme.

1.7.1.5. Shortcomings and Limitations of the Systematic Observation

In fact, system based or generic code schemes have been widely criticized by many researchers in the field of classroom-based interaction analysis studies for many reasons which are considered worth to be summarized in this section.

Indeed, system-based interactional approaches to SL classroom discourse, as many researchers acknowledged (Nunun, 1989; Wallace, 1998; Kumaravadivelu, 1999) (cited in Walsh, 2006) provide a partial and an incomplete picture of what is going on in classroom. They do so for their users depend mainly on what is measured. Kumaravadivelu (1999) summarizes these shortcomings in four main points (cited in Ellis& Barkhuizen, 2005).

First, system-based schemes concentrate particularly on the product of both teachers and learners’ verbal behaviour and neglect learning outcomes and process. The same remark was given by Delamont and Hamilton (1976) when they pointed out that observers who make use of these system-based approaches do really miss out phenomena which are not observable as the mental activities behind actions (cited in Tsui, 1995). They are simply more concerned with and interested in coding solely observable actions; that is to say, what teachers and learners actually do. Hence, they cannot catch on and notice other intricate processes taking place simultaneously, such as learners’ interaction with one another, for instance.
Second; Kumaravadivelu (2006) says that in using these generic coding schemes, the observer then depends too much, and in a negative way, on quantitative measurements. Consequently, he loses the communicative target, which unfortunately can be neither noticed, nor reduced to the use of numerical codification. Putting it differently, Kumaravadivelu, along with Tsui (1995, p. 108) disapprove the use of system-based instruments, owing to the fact that in using them, the observer overstates on analyzing quantitative data and fails to perceive foremost findings and information that can be derived solely by a qualitative data analysis.

Third, Kumaravadivelu considers these systems to be unidirectional in the sense that the information flow generally comes from the person observing to the person being observed. That is to say, it is the observer; whether a supervisor or a teacher educator, to the teacher in the class, no kind of interaction is assumed to be between the two parts (the observer and the teacher).

Fourth, to Kumaravadivelu, generic or systematic approaches to analyze interaction in SL classroom are unidimensional. That is, the observation being conducted is largely confined and restricted to the observer’s perspective and viewpoint. In a way or another, the observer is acknowledged to be the only dimension through which we can perceive interactional behaviours in classrooms. The same objection given by Kumaravadivelu is assumed by Long (1983) (as cited in Walsh, 2006). The latter considers that the observer who uses these schemes in his recording is likely to be central on himself. He is the one who codes and interprets without taking into consideration the participants’ interpretation.

Another criticism given to the use of system-based approaches is that these categories made classroom discourse; including interaction, a monotonous and a dull process that is
structured in a chronological, sequential process. To put it simply, the observer does not overlap the sequential manner on which discourse is based and which is described as such: (T > Ss > T > Ss and so forth), believing that this is the assumption that always and with no exception characterizes the interactional process in classroom. But this is not always the truth and as stated by Edwards and Westage (1994) there are other events which may not make the previously mentioned structure always be the same in SL classroom. Asserting that both teachers and learners as well may interrupt, start in false ways, repeat, hesitate, overlap and all these really happen and are common in TL classroom (cited in Walsh, 2006). In believing in this assumption, the observer does dismiss the complexity of classroom discourse by confining it to conventional coding categories, where roles of both students and teachers are allocated in previously structured way. This makes discourse less spontaneous and this is absolutely not the case.

Another attributed objection to the practice of generic or systematic approaches is that the observer depends on predetermined categories. Depending solely on these categories makes the coder’s analysis and investigation constrained and confined to these coding schemes. This would certainly hamper teachers, more specifically, consider and grasp the complex nature of CD. In addition to the fact that the observer may misrepresent and distort the data for he may attempt to make the information fit with the categories in his hand. Thus his findings are likely to be doubtful.

From his part Mohen (1979,p. 12) (cited in Tsui, 1995) has pointed out that the system based approaches to interaction in SL/FL classroom make no bridge between actions and events. Saying it otherwise, the observer fails at providing a linkage and association of code events with their immediate direct context since he is to follow already presupposed
categories. Seedhouse (1996) also emphasizes this point in clarifying that the used coding systems do indeed fail to take into account context and evaluate all varieties of TL classroom interaction from a single perspective and according to a single set of criteria (as cited in Walsh, 2006). It is highly worth mentioning that the status of the observer, as an outsider, may not let him comprehend the discourse and talk being shared by learners and their teacher, or even the one among learners themselves. His status also prevents him from accessing their shared meanings and probably this distorts the feasibility of his investigation.

One point is also considerable to be referred to and was pointed out by Chaudron (1988) is that observers may fail to agree on how to record what to observe. Putting it differently, there has been no accord on the method of recording the events of interaction in classroom and this, by no room of discussion, deprives the research from being valid, reliable. And it even put the selected coding scheme into question, that is to say, it was appropriate as a choice to code or not.

Next to all the other formerly mentioned scholars who have given arguments against the use of generic coding schemes, Brown and Rogers (2002) (cited in Mc Kay, 2008) offer a variety of criticism to them. The first one is that the exposure and the use of just one or two schemes would not certainly give a good deal of insight into the range of schemes available (around 200 ones). Besides, to be a good coder and master the observation instruments, they are to be trained to use the coding scheme categories. Both scholars confirm also that using these schemes, data transcription and analysis is going to be a tedious, tiresome, long and a dull procedure. They also mentioned in the summary of system-based structure that the fact of having numerous coding categories (over 200 as mentioned beforehand) makes things really difficult to compare the findings of other given studies. Finally, experience as well as research
literature concerned with teaching and learning issues have so far proved that there exists no absolute, perfect method of teaching. Hence, it would be almost impossible to suggest and recommend any scheme all along its analyzed findings to ameliorate SL/FL classroom interaction.

Being based on the shortcomings of the generic or structured-based coding schemes, an alternative type of coding instruments was highly needed. Less structured coding schemes; as many researchers thought, would be more practical, a kind of tailor-made instruments would better fit and cope with classroom observation contexts. Instead of being indulged in the use of structured coding schemes, with their diverse and sometimes elusive categories, researchers can just stick to designing a coding scheme that deals mainly with a single aspect of classroom interaction, for instance, ‘teachers’ error correction strategies’, or the type of teacher’s asked questions. This alternative needed coding scheme is what is known as ‘limited coding schemes’, or ‘Ad hoc observation instruments’; as termed by Wallace (1998) (cited in Walsh, 2006).

1.7.1.6. Limited Coding Systems (Ad hoc Approaches to Interaction Analysis)

Contrariwise to systematic or generic instruments to interaction analysis, as Ad hoc or Limited Coding schemes is, as it name implies, less broad compared to previously discussed coding schemes. That is to say, in using limited coding systems to analyzing classroom interaction, the coder, or the observer is to base his observation on specific, definite and single problem or phenomenon or area of interest. With limited coding instruments, the generated categories are designed to examine a specific classroom activity. Ad hoc approaches to interaction analysis provide guided categories. In using limited coding instruments, the generated categories are designed to examine a specific classroom activity. In terms of
practice, a group of practitioners may gather with the help of an outsider or simply a colleague. They gather to devise a specific instrument addressing a definite pedagogic classroom phenomenon.

The potency that is acknowledged to the use of these coding schemes is the fact that they help, to a great extent, the observer to understand and fully master all the aspects and the phenomena on the issue in question. Researchers deal with the topic under investigation in a deep and a profound way that allow them having a far-reaching and inclusive insight on it. Moreover, the use of these *Ad hoc* coding instruments affords the less experienced practitioners and novice teachers spending long periods of studying aspects of a given phenomenon. Saying it otherwise, limited coding schemes offer to those trainee-teachers an all-inclusive view about any issue which has been studied for they don’t have to acquire long experience in classroom teaching to treat that issue. In addition, *Ad hoc* systems provide in details all aspects of interaction in classroom. Indeed, *Ad hoc systems* contrast with the use of structured instruments in the sense that the latter are likely to miss and fail to spot the tiny components associated with classroom interaction. The systematic instruments are broad, unlimited, and indefinite that they may well not catch up everything under study.

So far, this chapter highlights and scrutinizes in which way Ad hoc approaches differ from the structured ones, discussion turns now to expose some used coding schemes, based principally on limited coding instrument principals.

1.7.1. 7. **Goldstein and Conrad’s limited System (1990)**

In framing and designing this coding scheme, Goldstein and Conrad tried to know, all along their survey about writing conferences, whether ESL writing conferences ensure students input or not and to what extent meaning is negotiated in ESL writing conferences. As
they also attempted to conclude how the relationship between the discourse produced in the conference and successful revisions of the following draft is. Overall conclusion came with after attending several writing conferences is that there are seven basic categories characterizing an ESL writing conference. So as to have a good insight about this system’ categories, appendix 3 explains them plainly.

In doing their survey, both scholars could understand better the interaction of students in a writing conference by examining their roles. They also deduced that students’ input differs greatly from a student to another. The more students interacted, negotiated the meaning with their teacher, the more they may succeed in revising their essays and written drafts. To put it simply, Goldstein and Conrad clarified that those students and learners, who interact more with their teacher while revising their written tasks, are the ones who succeed better and achieve good scores. Success in revising the assigned written tasks is also associated with the role that is played by the teacher. That is to say, as long as the teacher plays his role appropriately by adjusting his style to the students’ discourse style and by stimulating them more to produce input, certainly this negotiation of meaning is to lead to more successful student revisions.

What is significant in their study is that they offer a good insight about the roles played by both teachers and learners as well in writing conferences. They did so throughout designing fine-tuned coding system summarized in the appendices’ section. The basic conclusion that is drawn on from their survey is that the negotiation of meaning is highly momentous in revising students’ essays. It is noteworthy that when the researcher; as a classroom observer, selects a unique and a definite microcosm of interaction, he is by no room of discussion, able to design a finely-tuned coding scheme. The latter would help him better using a generic coding scheme.
It is then very clear that in using an *Ad hoc* approach to analyzing classroom interaction, the researcher, first of all, bases his coding scheme on interaction being observed. Then he is to outline and design the coding categories which are to be developed from the data in his hand, as if the researcher is in an inductive process. Whereas in using generic coding schemes, the researcher engages in a deductive process throughout working on pre-determined and pre-existing categories.

1.7.1.8. Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk: SETT(2001)

This limited coding scheme is introduced by Walsh (2001) (cited in Walsh, 2006), focusing on a specific aspect of classroom interaction that is teacher’ talk. The aim of this coding scheme instrument is to understand the relationship and the nexus that lies between the use of language, interaction and opportunities of learning. As a means of illustration to the use of this coding scheme, Walsh focuses on *scaffolding* and then coded it in three categories considered as strategies: (1) reformulation, (2) extension and (3) modeling.

*Reformulation*: takes place when the teacher rephrases his learners’ contribution.

*Extension*: is used when the teacher attempts at widening his learners’ input.

*Modeling*: this strategy is used when the teacher seeks at providing and illustrating to his learners by using examples.

For a better explanation, we inserted an extract in the appendices section (appendix 5) to explain and demonstrate better the SETT categories coding scheme.

Summing up what has been said; we have already concluded then that *Ad hoc* coding schemes do, definitely provide a clear, complete and simple clarification of a given feature of the discourse generated while interacting in classroom. *Limited coding* schemes are also rigorous for they permit for their users to different aspects associated with the issue being
investigated. That is to say, provided the researcher is conducting a study on TT for instance, so he is to highlight and point out all the strategies adopted in his talk in the form of categories generated after observation and not beforehand.

So far, It has been dealt with the first method to analyzing classroom discourse that is, interaction analysis. Discussion now turns to introduce the second available method implemented by classroom interaction analysts which is, namely: Discourse analysis.

1.7.2. Discourse Analysis to Analyzing Classroom Discourse

At the beginning of this chapter, we have defined the domain of Discourse Analysis from different scholars’ perspective. Brown & Yule (1983) consider; as all the other researchers mentioned hitherto; the analysis of discourse is necessarily of language in use. From their viewpoint, one cannot analyze discourse without reference to the context and function. This is clearly obvious when they say: “the discourse analyst is committed to investigation of what that language is used for.” (p.1)

Yet, the concern here is not to deepen in investigating DA as being an umbrella term and as a debatable, vast interdisciplinary domain, but it is to focus and shed light on classroom DA since our piece of research is associated with classroom discourse. The latter is defined by Richards & Schmidt (1991) as:

The type of language used in classroom situations classroom discourse is often different in form and function from language used in other situations because of the particular social roles students and teachers have in classrooms and the kinds of activities they usually carry out there.

(p.73-74)

From her part, Rymes (2008) summarizes the concept of classroom DA as:

Classroom discourse analysis could be paraphrased as looking at language
in use in a classroom context (with the understanding that this context is influenced also by multiple social contexts beyond and within the classroom) to understand how context and talk are influencing each other” I would add, “for the purpose of improving future classroom interaction and positively affecting social outcomes in contexts beyond the classroom.

(p.17)

Rymes (2008) emphasizes that teachers and language researchers on pedagogical issues are aware of the role of context on discourse. Hence, we should be able to change some features of talk which are likely to inhibit or retrain learners and students’ full participation and interaction in classroom.

As far as the methods used to analyzing CD are concerned, it is acknowledged that the most eminent approach applied to analyze classroom interaction via using discourse analysis is the one designed by Sinclair and Coulthard. Though; their model was explicated previously, we are here to talk about it in a deeper way to understand how this model was applied in the examination of classroom interaction.

1.7. 2.1. Discourse Analysis Model (1975)

Also recognized as the ‘Birmingham model’, the latter is one of the prominent approaches to the study of spoken discourse. Developed in the University of Birmingham during 1970’s, where researchers were interested in understanding and portraying the structure of discourse in classrooms. As a model, it is believed that it is relatively simple and simultaneously powerful. This model is strongly linked to the study of speech acts which was flourishing at that time. That is to say, Sinclair and Coulthard follow a structural functional linguistic route to analysis. It compiled a list of twenty two speech acts representing the verbal behaviours of both teachers and students participating in primary classroom communication.
The outcome of their model is that they outlined a descriptive system encompassing a discourse hierarchy. Putting it otherwise; Sinclair and Coulthard, all along their survey conducted in native speaker school language classroom, concluded that language classroom is put into rigid pattern. They reckon that language which is produced in classroom is structured in a very fixed form; for a better display to this structure, as claimed by Sinclair and Coulthard, an extract is inserted in appendices part (Appendix 5) to help readers have a better understanding about it.

As previously stated; the Birmingham scholars concluded that classroom discourse is structured in a hierarchical form which is as follows:

- Lesson
- Transaction
- Exchange
- Move
- Act

In their model, both scholars observed and focused on the spoken CD so as to reflect and exemplify the basic functions of classroom interaction embodied in a system, which is in itself structured in a hierarchical way. What is meant by a hierarchical way is that any lesson is, indeed, prearranged from the larger unit to the smallest one, i.e., the lesson, as the largest unit. Whereas, act is the smallest one, representing speech acts, considering classroom interaction to be principally devised in five rank scales (previously mentioned: lesson; transaction, exchange; move; act). Yet, these five rank scales are necessarily related, for instance, transactions are expressed in terms of exchange. That is transaction can be structured in the form of exchange. Exchange consists of a question, an answer, a comment and as a whole this exchange demonstrates what is known as transaction. Exchange itself consists of moves which can be a question, an answer or a comment. In their clarification of move,
Sinclair and Coulthard distinguished three types of opening moves, as mentioned beforehand. They are opening moves, answering moves and follow up moves, or as Brazil and Sinclair (1986) (cited in Mc Carthy, 1991) prefer calling Initiation, Response and Follow up.

So it is then clear how the structure of classroom discourse is hierarchically shaped in the form of units or scale units which are fundamentally connected from Sinclair and Coulthard’s viewpoint. It is significantly important to refer to some of the main limitations and shortcomings of the Birmingham Model. It is completely true that Sinclair and Coulthard’s model is crucially useful in terms of analyzing patterns of interaction in which the produced talk in classroom is relatively and firmly structured. Yet, when one comes to apply this model to interaction analysis, things do not seem to be as simply suggested by both scholars for some complications in discourse start to emerge in the CD. Saying it otherwise, there are some situations in which the researcher; as an observer, or a coder is not able to apply the Birmingham model. Especially, when dealing with classroom situations in which the discourse flow is not as outlined and tightly structured as proposed by Sinclair and Coulthard; that is the IRF structure.

Additionally, Sinclair and Coulthard model is basically derived from data recorded in a traditional primary school classroom during 1960’s; a period in which classroom discourse in general exhibits a kind of power relationship between both the teacher and learners. Nonetheless, if we are to tackle the analysis of today’s language classroom as it is supposed to be, the application of this model would be almost unfeasible. That is, regardless of the fact that Sinclair and Coulthard model has concretely contributed in helping scholars, teachers and practitioners comprehend and have a good insight on CD, but it is, in fact, inappropriate to display and demonstrate today’s language classroom context. It is so since emphasis is no
more drawn on power relationships in classrooms. In nowadays’ classroom, equality and partnership in the teaching and learning process are stressed indeed. It is evident that the contemporary language classroom, especially SL/FL one, is not as the one prevailing during the 1960’s era, where Sinclair and Coulthard devised their system. They differ in the sense that classroom context is no more a teacher-centered; it is rather a learner-centered one. The learner is supposed to communicate more, take turns, interact, and respond instead of the teacher’s monopolization of discourse.

Moreover, another major point on which the Birmingham model was widely criticized is that it stresses on language functions. In other words, it is a function-oriented model, in the sense that one language classroom discourse rank is acts summarized into three foremost acts prevailing in language classroom setting. They are: Elicitation, Directive, and Informative. Concerning the function of the first act; elicitation, it is to apply for linguistic interaction, while the function of the directive act is to request a non linguistic response such as listening mainly. The informative act function is to transmit information, express opinions as a confirmation that either the teacher or learner is listening. Basing classroom discourse on definite and rigid acts symbolizing some specific functions is really a problematic issue since most of time it is difficult to determine the function of acts accomplished either by the teacher or learners. Mainly because one needs to know the context in which the act is performed, who, to whom, how and why it is performed. And it would be priceless if we think that language function can be easily limited to the previously suggested functions as given by Sinclair and Coulthard. A single statement can bear diverse functional interpretations that one might be biased to determine the intended one at a given point. For instance, this interrogative statement: ‘What time is it?’ if asked in classroom, it might be interpreted in terms of different
function, it could be understood as a request for information, a prompt, or an expression of boredom. In brief, Sinclair and Coulthard model, which was in essence a linguistic approach, aimed at describing the structure of verbal interaction in classrooms throughout using grammar. As an outcome of their system, the scholars deduced that any language classroom interaction can be described in terms of a hierarchical set of ranks in which each unit consists of smaller units. However, the modal has given too much attention to the description of CD structure and the function it plays and neglected, to great extent, the participants of that discourse. That is to say, it shed light on the discourse product rather than the discourse process in which participants as teachers and learners are involved.

Bringing to a close what the chapter introduced so far about approaches to classroom discourse analysis; we concluded that these approaches are either descriptive or prescriptive in essence. They address naturally spoken speech produced in classroom in a categorical way and interpreting it in reference to discourse hierarchy and link it to a functional perspective. What makes the use of DA approaches to interaction analysis problematic is the fact that they failed, to a great extent, in accounting some imperative factors and issues related to classroom interaction as role relationship among learners and teachers and among learners themselves. Additionally, DA approaches considered participants as individuals rather than collective mass, as groups for instance. That is, there was, in effect, very little discussion about the complex nature of the relationship that lies between students, teachers and context as well. These approaches have neither dealt with how the power relationships influence interaction, nor with the fact of how learning and speaking opportunities offered to learners in the classroom affect students’ performance. Furthermore, one of the other criticisms which are directed to discourse analysis models is that they neither refer to the context in which the
lesson process is taking place, nor they clarify the link between the language use and pedagogic purpose.

1.7. 3. Conversation Analysis Methods to Analyzing Classroom Discourse

Indeed, it is worthy to be mentioned that CA, compared to DA and IA approaches, is a research tradition stemming from ethno-methodology that analyses the social organization of natural conversation. In its broad sense; CA is concerned with explaining how meanings and pragmatic functions are transmitted in mundane conversations. As it is also interested in explaining how talk is organized, and how turn taking is sequenced. It arose from the ideas of the sociologist Harvey Sacks during 1960’s and 1970’s which were later published in 1992. In brief, CA, as a discipline, is the meeting point of sociology and linguistics. (Tanaka, 2004, p. 5)

In principle, CA, which advocates an ethnographic observation methodology, came as a response to systematic observation previously discussed. It neither examines large number classroom, nor seeks data that would fit predetermined categories. Quite the reverse, CA is an open-ended approach deriving its categories from the obtained data and this makes it an empirically-based approach. Moreover, CA gives a prime magnitude to the context with intention to uncover and find out the complex nature of classroom setting which is featured by a complex interrelationship linking the elements in the context. Saying it otherwise, in using a CD model, the researcher is to study social organization order of the discourse despite the fact that language is the focal point to analyze. He does so by using some techniques including minute analysis of talk to unveil the recurrent patterns. Yet, he is also to exclude some external features as the social identities of the participants, their age, gender and social status. We should mention that in using an ethnographic classroom observation, the analysts first of all asks and elicits information from participants via using interviews, diaries, questionnaires.
Then he watches and observes what is actually taking place. Hence, this makes CA natural for it examines what is being accomplished by participants in the course of events. Lazarton (2002) summarizes the basic principles of CA methodology as follows:

- Using authentic, recorded data, which researchers carefully transcribed;
- using unmotivated looking rather than pretested research questions;
- employing ‘the turn’ as the unit of analysis;
- analysing single cases, deviant cases, and collections thereof;
- disregarding ethnographic and demographic particulars of the context and participants, eschewing the coding and qualification of the data. (p.37-38)

So in brief, a conversation analyst is to examine authentic classroom interaction so as to get recorded data. The latter should not be coded and quantified, however. That is, as an approach it is different from the previously discussed approaches to analysing classroom interaction in the sense that it is not totally quantitative, nor static for social interaction, but rather qualitative. What is meant by static is that whether conversation analysis is in classroom context or elsewhere, it is constructed in different causes and procedures based on turn taking, openings; closures…etc. In addition, what makes CA distinguished from a number of approaches to study the spoken language, whether inside or outside classroom context, is that it has its own theoretical assumptions, methodological principles and analytic techniques as well. In comparison with DA approaches which were primarily concerned with speaker, CA considers talk; that is its central interest of investigation, as a jointly accomplished activity by both the speaker and the listener. CA, hence, aims at revealing the structures of naturally occurring interaction by depending on detailed transcripts of audio or video recordings so as to explain how interaction is organized.

As far as classroom context is concerned, CA scholars try to portray how meaning is
mutually shared, constructed and negotiated by participants as learners and teachers. That is to say, CA as applied in the classroom setting, is an attempt to scrutinize both teacher and learner talk in order to optimise negotiation of meaning in classroom context. We have to note that recently there has been a great awareness of the necessity of studying how negotiation of meaning, turn taking…etc are taking place between teachers and learners in SL/FL teaching and learning contexts. In Foreign language classroom, CA is, indeed, a tool to uncover the problems of handling discourse among learners. Moreover, CA is acknowledged to promote the mechanism of interaction among participants. Thanks to the fact that CA emphasizes micro details of interaction and the inclusion of some of the nonverbal features, the researcher can easily discover why participants in classroom context fail pragmatically speaking. This is achieved by interpreting from the recorded data rather than prescribing or imposing predetermined structural or functional categories as it is the case of IA approaches and DA ones.

We have, thus far, explained though briefly some basic principles and assumptions on which CA is based. Nunun (1992) clarifies that in adopting a Conversation Analysis; the researcher has to eschew the use of elicited or invented sample of language and would rather depend on more naturalistic occurring one and so is the case of a researcher who adopts an IA approach. Yet, depending on an elicited language to analyze is acceptable for a discourse analyst. Moreover, the mode of language that is investigated differs. That is, a discourse analyst scrutinizes both written as well as the oral discourse, contrariwise to interaction analyst and conversation analyst who inspect exclusively the oral one. Additionally, a discourse analyst may bring a predetermined set of categories all along his analysis, whereas the conversation and interaction analyst do not. They instead interpret the produced discursive
language. At last but not least, in their origin of investigation, the three approaches differ, in the sense that a discourse analyst is more concerned with linguistic matters as the grammaticality of utterances, coherence, well-formededness of discourse and the linguistic speech acts being produced as greeting, apologizing...etc. While a conversation analyst deals with the management of turn-taking, repair strategies, adjacency pairs...etc since, in its origin, CA stems from sociological studies.

**Conclusion**

The focal target of this chapter was to; first of all, define notions which are deemed to be crucial in grasping the concept of classroom discourse. Next to exposing some of the most common and recurrent methods used to analyze CD, the chapter started by reviewing approaches that were initially used in classroom research to scrutinize CD; that is ‘Discourse Analysis’, and then moving to ‘Interaction Analysis’ models. The latter were in fact generated as a response of the former method i.e., *Discourse Analysis*. At last, the chapter put into plain words some of the basic principles on which *Conversation Analysis* rely on its observation to classroom interaction. Indeed, it is the need of getting closer to how the process of interaction took place that stimulated researchers generating diverse methods; from purely linguistic, ethnographic to psychological ones. Having a clear perspective about the way language classroom is investigated is necessary to see the effects of components of participants’ language on the course of interaction. In considering classroom discourse analysis with its diverse methods, the task of deciding about the method to be used in our data analysis would be easy.
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Introduction

Classroom Interaction was widely considered and investigated for more than fifty years by researchers working on language acquisition; more particularly, second language acquisition and foreign language acquisition ones. Yet, the relationship that might lie between learning opportunities and interaction is not fully explicated so far as stated by Walsh (2011, p. 1) in the sense there are many perspectives on the issue of Classroom Discourse and interaction. They all strive to investigate classroom events and consider the effects of the latter on learners’ involvement and participation. So much of the focus of chapter two is devoted to highlight issues related to the role of interaction in promoting second and foreign language acquisition; more specifically oral proficiency, since the latter is the focal and central theme of the research in hand. The chapter Takes into consideration some imperative theories provided on the topic of Second and Foreign language interaction. Chapter two as well tackles some crucial components of both teachers’ talk and learners’ language which are deemed to be of paramount importance to enhance TL acquisition. At last, it provides an explanation of the forms of learners’ participation in generating classroom discourse.

2.1. Classroom Interaction and Second/ Foreign Language Acquisition

Hedge (2000) states that there might be four basic areas of investigation and debate that draw the attention of scholars and researchers on SLA/FLA to the nature of input to which learners are exposed; how learners process this input; the role of interaction in classroom SLA/FLA; and the role of error in the language learning process.

Indeed, interaction is a topic which was and is still highly dealt with by researchers on SLA area in the two last decades. What is meant by interaction is that communication which takes place between individuals involved in a process of negotiation of meaning in a classroom context so as to skip the fact of breakdown or failure in communication (Ellis,
1999) (cited in Moss & Ross-Feldman, 2003). Yet, regardless of the dense literature provided on the effect of classroom interaction on language learning, one should keep in mind that it is exceedingly imperative for practitioners and teachers to have a good insight on the dynamics of classroom communication. In doing so, and by assimilating how this process of communication and interaction happens and increases, this will certainly lead teachers to create a suitable environment for learning a SL/FL. As concerns the area of SLA studies; they all try to enlighten how the process of interaction takes place in classroom, how it enhances; what the factors that may impede it are. Yet, while reading the available literature on classroom interaction, it is very likely to notice that the issue of interaction is commonly interrelated to other intriguing domains as pedagogy, DA, communication, repair; feedback, error treatment and correction…etc. This interconnection between interaction and the previously mentioned pedagogical issues is due to the complex and convoluted nature of interaction that has widely been a focus for analysis by SL/FL researchers, pedagogists and practitioners in the field of education.

Hall & Verplaetse (2000) refer that the topic of classroom interaction in SLA is dealt with from different and diverse angles over the past twenty years (p.1). That is classroom interaction was initially treated in the literature devoted to report FT and NNS in the classroom context. Something is also noteworthy is that in the past two decades, focus is no more given to the teaching of a given language skill as grammar, vocabulary…etc. Rather, there is a more tendency towards teaching the FL in a more holistic way for this would certainly lead to a communicative proficiency, using the TL as a means of interaction.

Walsh (2006) argues that provided teachers; who are important participants in the classroom language learning; assimilate and have a good awareness about the relationship between their talk (teacher talk); interaction and learning opportunities, so the process of
teaching and learning a SL/FL would be certainly enhanced and facilitated (p.22). Putting it differently, when teachers comprehend that there is a strong nexus between TT, interaction and the augmentation of their learners’ learning opportunities; undoubtedly they would afford many efforts in the teaching process as this understanding would definitely promote learning. From his part, Ellis (1990) considers interaction a pivotal and fundamental factor to SLA/FLA. He assumes that the interaction that comes about between teachers and learners is significantly worthy. Ellis (1980) (cited in Chaudron, 1988) speculates that SL/FL learners are admitted to practice more in the TL and can be highly motivated to learn and engage in rigorous communication as long as they have greater opportunities to speak. Indeed, provided the teacher manages interaction in classroom in a successful way; so both the processes of teaching and learning will be positively optimized and prolific. Johnson (1995) is also one of those scholars who advocate the role played by teachers to promote interaction that leads to achieving the chances of a good SL learning and acquisition. This is clearly advocated when she says: “The teacher plays a critical role in understanding; establishing and maintaining patterns of communication that will foster, to the greatest extent; both classroom learning and second language acquisition” (p.190). Additionally, the researcher also believes that interaction that takes place between students and learners in the classroom context can have a tremendous impact on the way learners use the TL and the whole learning process.

In claiming about teachers’ understanding of the classroom interactive processes and in stressing that it is of a great magnitude to maximize communication and learners’ oral proficiency and performance in classroom, simply means that teachers are supposed to have a handle on those patterns and aspects associated with classroom interaction. For instance, input, peer interaction; negotiation of meaning, turn taking….etc which are to be discussed in the forthcoming sections of this chapter. Furthermore, interaction; as a rich
classroom process, occurs when participants involved in this intricate course understand its nature and the roles which are to be played and allocated in the midst of this process. That is to say, interaction would be enhanced when both teachers and learners as well play their roles appropriately and; when necessarily, in the classroom. Put it differently, successful SLA/FLA will be achieved as long as participants get involved in the construction of language CD. In brief, classroom communication is achieved through verbal interaction and participants’ valuing of their role along the interactional process.

In a review revealing the importance of interaction in SL development, Hall & Verplaetse (2000) conclude that classroom interaction is dealt with in four ways. Firstly, learners are acknowledged to develop social, communicative and academic skills via classroom language interaction. Secondly, while interacting with their peers; their teacher, language learners are assumed to have the opportunity to co-construct their own knowledge about the TL. Put it simply, learners are allowed to notice their progress and achievement in learning that language and they are admitted to play a vital role instead of being passive consumers and recipient in the learning process. Thirdly, being involved in an interactional process with their peers, language learners are, indeed, acquiring and developing the sense of membership with the group. This fact facilitates, to a great extent, the process of SL/FL learning and acquisition for what is known as language anxiety would certainly decrease provided learners feel that their contribution is valuable and significant, especially in group interaction. Moreover; it would also help them to be socialized in the context of classroom community.

Hence, interaction; as commonly associated with SL/FL learning development, enables learners to progress in terms of verbal communicative competence throughout being exposed to TL. Ellis (1990) confirms this standpoint when he explained that any SL learning must in some way result from the processes of interaction learners take part in and
are involved in. All along Ellis and the other researchers on classroom interaction, Chaudron (1988) postulates that only through interaction that three intrinsic objectives can be achieved. Firstly, language learners can decompose that TL structures and understand the conveyed messages’ meaning from classroom discourse. Secondly, the acquired TL structures will be incorporated by learners into their own speech. Thirdly, learners would consider the course of classroom learning meaningful when they communicate jointly with their peers and teacher.

From her part, Gass (2003) (cited in Gass & Selinker, 2008) considers that interaction in classroom is at the heart of SL learning in the sense that it plays a part of developing it. This perspective is justified in considering that throughout interaction; learners are in a way or another trying to decode messages which are conveyed in the use of this language. This skill of decoding what is said in a SL/FL would lead language learners to infer from the surrounding context. Albeit this produced language in that context is full of unidentified linguistic items, learners will try to deduce what is uttered. Putting it differently, it is through the process of interaction that SL/FL learners can develop many strategies and competencies to deduce, infer the meaning of even unknown linguistic items which do not make part of the linguistic knowledge they have on the TL. Moreover, being involved in the process of interaction in a SL/FL classroom, learners would; by no room of discussion, develop their language performance as enthusiastically developed by Swain and Long in their works, as this chapter explains afterwards.

Consisted with the views of the scholars exposed so far, Mackey (1999) (cited in Gass & Selinker, 2008) argues that there is a strong connection between interaction and SL development. The researcher acknowledges this fact following a study she carried out in a SL classroom; in which students were engaged in performing some tasks that are said to be communicative. The tasks were aimed at developing the students’ use of questions.
Mackey noticed that those learners, involved in an interactional course all along their practice of the targeted structure, performed better. According to Mackey’s derived remarks, the development of those students who take more turns to practise the language was more quite perceived compared to those learners who did not benefit from the offered opportunities of interacting with their peers and teacher as well. The modest development of less interactive learners was clearly displayed for they are reluctant to interact as the others.

Mehan (1997) (cited in Johnson, 1995) also assumes that it is something highly needed to understand the dynamics of classroom communication learning which is strongly allied with how learners talk and act in classroom. Mehan views that communicating in classroom is essential for it gives learners the chance to understand not merely the culture of the TL but also to benefit linguistically from their classroom experiences. This would automatically develop their oral proficiency in using that language.

In point of fact, Tsui (1995) assumes that classroom interaction is highly valuable in classroom language, whether it is first, SL or a FL. She argues that classroom interaction is indispensable; particularly in SL/FL for it is both the subject of study and the medium through which learning process takes place. It is worth mentioning that learners of a TL in classroom context are actually developing many skills while interacting. Put it differently, being dragged in conversations and dialogues all along accomplishing communicative tasks, listening to teacher’s explanations and instructions, expressing one’s point of views in arguing, answering asked questions…etc, learners are, in truth, learning the TL. As they also grasp language structure and functions and then they put what they are acquiring into practice by using it in classroom with their peers and teacher. Van Lier (1988:77-78) acknowledges that the study of classroom language interaction is, definitely, very crucial and central to the study of classroom learning. His view is overtly stated when he says:
If the keys to learning are exposure to input and meaningful interaction with other speakers, we must find out what input and interaction the classroom can provide….we must study in detail the use of language in the classroom in order to see if and how learning comes about through the different ways of interacting in the classroom.

(cited in Johnson, 1995,p.11)

Moreover, meanwhile a learner of SL/FL interacts overtly with his teacher and peers, he is, in effect, learning to do conversations and out of this, certainly, he is developing his competencies on the syntactic structures of the TL. Ellis (2008) views that interaction and input do not merely develop language learning/ acquisition, he rather argues that they affect, to a great extent, the route as well as the rate of SLA. That is; when being involved in the process of classroom interaction, learners are, on the one hand, offered the chance to internalize ready-made chunks of speech which would serve them whilst participating in routinized interactions. Learners are acquiring a kind of formulaic speech that promotes their interlanguage system and enables their internal mechanism working on while interacting. On the other hand, interaction and input are also believed to enhance the rate SLA, in the sense that the more learners are interacting verbally in classroom context and communicating, the more they become adroit and skillful in managing conversations. This is likely to happen for learners might master and control the topic of conversations with its content and selection. Furthermore, as being dragged in conversations with teacher and peers, the learner is then exposed to a range of speech acts. So he has the chance to listen and simultaneously produce the language needed to perform specific and diverse language functions. Accordingly, his oral performance will positively mature as a result of interaction. Put it differently, learners are, in actual fact, exposed to high quantity of directives and instructions in the form of input with its diverse facets, whether they are in the form of questions, requests for clarification, paraphrasing…etc. Hence, this fact facilitates greatly TL acquisition for in interacting, substantial
opportunities are accessible for them to make errors which are necessary for learning any language successfully.

As regards the issue of the complex relationship between classroom interaction and SLA, it has been dealt with in terms of two fundamental trends. That is, according to Ellis (1990, p. 95) there is what he calls the ‘reception-based theories’ of classroom interaction whose basic principle is centered on the idea that interaction takes part in SLA via learners’ comprehension and reception of the SL. As concerns the second trend that is recognized as ‘production-based theories’, it considers that SLA is strongly linked to learners’ attempt at producing the TL. Indeed, the former are well-presented throughout the theory of Krashen as well as Long’s one. Whereas the latter are more assimilated with Swain’s output theory. We have to highlight that these theories are very crucial for the understanding of the role and even the relationship between classroom interaction and language acquisition; whether it is a second or a foreign one. Accordingly, it would be impossible to tackle the issue of the role of classroom interaction and SLA/FLA without exposing the previously mentioned theories. These theories are of imperative value in comprehending the nexus and the correlation between oral proficiency and verbal interaction amongst classroom participants. That is, we consider that it is very necessary to cope with these theories for they help us as well as the readers of this dissertation to determine how scholars view the role of interaction in SLA/FLA. Before explaining the first theory, it is necessary to define the concept of input.

2.2. Input

As a term, input is defined in language learning as the language that learners hear or receive and from which they can learn (Richards & Schmidt, 1992, p.261)

In fact, input as an issue was and is still widely discussed by researchers working on SLA and FLA. That is to say, one major branches of TL acquisition which is interested
in the identification of the learning processes sheds light on the role that input plays in developing classroom interaction. What should be noted is that theorists who framed their work on the role of interaction in SLA/FLA differ in the way they treated the value of input in enhancing classroom interaction. Yet, many scholars’ as Ellis (1984), Krashen (1982) (cited in Hall& Verplaetse, 2000) do strongly argue that the generation of language input by means of classroom interaction is believed to favour language acquisition. Input is seen not merely as a social and pedagogical aim; it is rather a medium through which a great deal proportion of the TL is learnt. Wells (1985) (cited in Ellis, 2008) argues that likewise first language acquisition process; in which children take from two to five years achieving a full grammatical competences, learners of the SL/FL do also need to be exposed to the same massive amount of input of the TL.

Indeed, input that is processed through conversational interaction is considered to be the driving force pushing language development forward; especially in oral performance. Having this strong impetus in the learning process of the TL, input was investigated by many theorists as Krashen, for instance, whose basic principles are introduced in his theory ‘Comprehensible Input Hypothesis’.

**2.3. Comprehensible Input Hypothesis (1981)**

As stated beforehand, Krashen’s theory is probably the most eminent and well-known ‘reception-based’ theory. Krashen tries to put in plain words that language acquisition can take place when learners comprehend the input they are exposed to either by linking it to the immediate context surrounding it, or as an outcome of simplifying it (Johnson; 1995)

Krashen maintains that language acquisition can be achieved when learners are exposed to language input whose structure is beyond their current level of language competence. This is recognized as ‘i+ 1 hypothesis’, while the I stands for the actual level
of learners’ language expertise, the 1 symbolizes language function and linguistic forms which are beyond their level. What is actually meant by Krashen’s theory is that teachers whose speech might be a source of the input provided for students, must be acquainted with his learners’ level in language proficiency. And then they try to provide a more slightly complex input so that the latter can be understood and comprehensible to them. In doing so, teachers are, in reality, creating opportunities for their learners to interact verbally and communicate more to understand and assimilate the input they are exposed to and this is how Krashen explains the link between input and classroom interaction. He considers that the more students interact, the more input becomes graspable. If the latter is assimilated, SLA will be achieved owing to the fact that learners are given the chance to practise and use the TL. Hence, Krashen gives a prime value to social interaction in the processes of language acquisition; especially in SL/FL classroom for the latter is a rich source of comprehensible input. That is to say, Krashen argues that the exposure to comprehensible TL input is in itself sufficient to trigger acquisition (Richards & Renandya, 2002). Additionally, Krashen accentuates that input that is not comprehensible to learners is not expected to cause learning to take place.

One of the points on which Krashen’s theory was widely criticized by many other theorists as Mc Laughlin (1987), Mitchell and Myles (1998) (cited in Byram, 2000) for the fact that there is absolutely no mechanism for defining exactly the current level of an individual learner. Besides, it is also problematic to decide on what should be provided to learners as input which is slightly further their current level.

Albeit Krashen’s theory was put into question and revisited for its basic principles were imprecise, yet it is considered to be one of the most influential theories in SLA. Its strength lies on the fact that Krashen credits that the more students are exposed to comprehensible input; input that they can process and assimilate, the more they interact in
classroom using the TL. And this interaction would activate and stimulate SLA. In brief, Krashen’s theory assumes the central role of input in the TL acquisition (Gass, 1997,p. 87). Widdowson also (1990, p.23) acknowledges that teachers are to provide comprehensible input, as defined by Krashen. To Widdowson, learners acquire a particular language by receiving comprehended input. The same scholar views that regardless of the type of the input exposed to learners; they are in need to lower their affective filter so as to facilitate this input to flow in. He considers Krashen’s theory missing out this aspect and he views that learners are, accordingly, conceived as passive recipient of that input. Johnson (1995, p. 83) also considers that in presenting his hypothesis, Krashen overstates the role played by comprehensible input which focuses on meaning rather than form. Nevertheless, Johnson also credits output as indirectly taking part in the acquisition of the TL, believing that participating in the significant processes of interaction and taking control of conversation leads to building conversational skills necessary for SLA/FLA.

Additionally, researchers as Foaerch & Kapser (1986) and Mc Laughtin (1987) (cited in Johnson, 1995, p. 83) put into question Krashen’s theory, for they reckon that as a theory it is poorly empirically grounded. To them, Krashen’s theory gives a handful explanation to the process of SLA. Ellis & Barkhuizen (2005) also claim that Krashen’s idea that considers comprehension enhances acquisition was put into question. Contrariwise to what Krashen suggests; Pica &, Young and Doughty (1987) (cited in Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005) view that comprehension can be achieved when input is intentionally derived and modified rather than when being pre-modified as Krashen highlights. Gass and Selinker (2008) argue as well that one of the intriguing points discussed by Krashen is that he explained how learners of a TL moves from one point of acquisition i.e. the natural orders of acquisition. According to Krashen SLs and FLs ones are acquired “by understanding messages or by receiving comprehensible input” (Krashen,
1985) (cited in Gass & Selinker, 2008). Additionally, Krashen claims that the process of SLA is not different from first language acquisition in the sense that people do not learn languages by talking about them and their grammatical system but by making use of them...etc.

Indeed, what should be kept in mind is that regardless of the criticism given to Krashen’s theory, there is no doubt that his new perspectives have given new directions to issues associated with SLA and FLA research (de Bot et al., 2005, p. 38). Johnson (2004) admits that thanks to Krashen’s Input Hypothesis the role of input in enhancing interaction issue had been initiated in the field of TL acquisition. His hypothesis is acknowledged to trigger the research on the role of grammar instruction in SLA. Besides, Krashen hypothesis discusses the process by which input is converted into output.

So far, we have exposed the first ‘reception-based theory’ of classroom interaction; Krashen Input Hypothesis. The second theory that is considered worth mentioning is ‘Long Interaction Hypothesis’.

2.4. Long’s Interaction Hypothesis (1981; 1996)

One should keep in mind that ‘Interaction Hypothesis’ is closely related to Krashen ‘Input Hypothesis’ in the sense that Long has taken up the concept of Krashen about the value of input comprehension in enhancing SLA. Saying it other words, likewise Krashen, Long believes that SLA/FLA is to occur when learners can access to comprehensible input. Long as well concur with Krashen’s idea about the necessity of lowering the affective filter in the midst of the process of learning the new language. Both scholars are in accord on the point that provided the offered input is comprehended and learners’ motivation is available, the newly targeted language will be acquired and processed as an internal mechanism. Long, from his part, puts the accent on the significance of interaction in making the input comprehended. In the Interaction Hypothesis, with its different versions
(1981, 1983a, 1983b, 1996), he tried to expose the way in which the structure of interaction itself could be modified to make input more comprehensible for NNS, giving more prominence to negotiation of meaning in the SL development and comprehension. Yet, one of the major points distinguishing Krashen’s theory from Long’s one is that the latter believes that intentionally modified input is more beneficial for acquisition than the pre-modified input as suggested by Krashen. Some scholars as Pica, Young & Doughty (1987) (cited in Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005) put into question the central role of negotiation of meaning as claimed by Long in the process of SLA. Accordingly, Long updated his Interaction Hypothesis (IH) in 1996 to elucidate that the negotiation of meaning is to facilitate SLA. Hence, some other factors are, indeed, of empirical value to achieve this acquisition such as noticing and selective attention. In including other factors than negotiation of meaning, Long concurs with Schmidt who considers these factors worthy to process the provided input into intake.

Long also confirms that interaction is of crucial value for SLA. It is the basic element which proves the development of the process as well as the product of learners’ interlanguage. He considers the amount and kind of verbal interaction are, certainly, important factors in SLA. Long claims that this verbal interaction results in interactional features which are said to promote SLA.

According to Long, to optimize interaction, it is necessary to develop, on the one hand, the quality as well as the quantity of input offered to language learners. On the other hand, it is also important to develop production; known as output, which is the language produced by learners. Conversational interaction also develops feedback that is the conversational reaction generated out of the production of other language learners. Long considers conversational interaction in SLA as the core for the development of language and not merely a medium to practise the TL. Moreover, Long (1981) claims that in
modifying speech, the NS in classroom or the competent interlocutors as teachers, do facilitate the route of TL acquisition for their learners. This is clearly stated in Long’s own words (1981):” current knowledge suggests they [the interactive modifications] are found in all cases of the successful acquisition of a full version of SL” (cited in Hall & Verplaetse, 2000)

In his research, Long confirms that NNS conversations are characterized by the dominance of some forms as confirmation checks, comprehension checks and clarification requests that we would clarify briefly in the coming sections. Considering these conversational modifications crucial to make the input exposed to learners comprehensible (Swain& Suzuki, 2008). That is, SLA is facilitated as long as the interactional adjustments are present. Hence, if these interactional features manifest in classroom discourse, this means that negotiation of meaning is taking place. He also points out that in the process of negotiating meaning, the NS or the competent interlocutor; as teacher, asks different types of questions. But the most predominant ones are those questions whose answers are already known or suggested by the teacher. As maintained by Long, there exist two types of negotiation of meaning: negotiation that is aiming at escaping conversation ambiguities and negotiation targeted to repair discourse when trouble occurs.

One of the keystone perspective defended by Long in his IH is that in the process of negotiation of meaning, learners need to pay attention and to be involved in this procedure so as to make communication between interlocutors successful. That is, he reckons that along with selective attention, the good processing of the TL, besides the fact of receiving corrective feedback, SL/FL would be facilitated for they are all crucial elements that smooth the progress of TL acquisition. Especially when speaking about that language vocabulary, morphology, syntax. He credits that TL learning takes place during the process of interaction, more precisely in the negotiation of meaning which he regards to be as the
preliminary step in the process of the TL learning. (Gass, 1997). Gass is of the same mind as Long on the fact that language learning is likely to occur during the process of interaction. Gass clearly states her view in saying: “Attention, accomplished in part through negotiation is one of the crucial mechanisms in this process.” (Gass, 1997, p.132).

Something is noteworthy is that Long acknowledges that processed interaction through negotiation of meaning facilitates acquisition but it does not cause it to take place. For as Pica claims (1996) (cited in Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005) there are other factors leading to language acquisition and not merely negotiation of meaning and interaction. In the late version of his hypothesis (1996), Long highlights the value of cognitive processing aspect of SLA as noticing and negative feedback (cited in Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005).

Long (1996) considers negotiation of meaning at the heart of SLA for it allows learners to provide each other with comprehensible input (Walsh, 2006). It also generates feedback throughout the production of output. Hence, in doing so learners have the chance to achieve self-correction; self-evaluation and enhance their ability to reconstruct the structure of utterances to make themselves comprehended. Besides, in going further in a process of negotiation of meaning, learners can have access to new vocabulary items of the TL. It also improves the quality of their interlanguage. Negotiation of meaning; as an intriguing and recommended process, makes learners do their best to make their output clarified as it also raises learners’ attention. Putting it differently, when negotiating meaning, learners make efforts to modify or restructure interaction to their interlocutors so as to overcome difficulties that may arise and hinder the comprehension of input. According to Long, input can be made comprehensible in three ways: by simplifying input; using linguistic and extra linguistic context and by modifying the conversation structure.

In his late modified version of IH, which was in 1996, Long gives a better account about the way meaning negotiation can assist language learning throughout segmenting
messages into linguistic units. Furthermore, he hypothesizes that there are two ways in which interaction contributes to language acquisition. Firstly, interaction can be optimized with the provision of ‘negative feedback’. The latter is a kind of input offered to SL/FL learners as a result of their contribution using the TL. This kind of feedback is more offered to evaluate the correctness of the grammatical structure of learners’ output. Negative evidence can be demonstrated in the process of ‘recast’, where learners’ incorrect utterances are replaced by correct ones. To Long (1996), recast is focal in enhancing negotiation of meaning in SLA/FLA (Ellis & Fotos, 1999, p.9). The second element that was considered by Long in the modified version of IH is the prime function of output in SLA. That is to say, Long takes three chief elements in consideration in the late version of his hypothesis: the value of comprehensible input, negative feedback and modified output. Besides considering learners’ internal capacities and attention…etc. Richards and Renandya (2002, p.101) also agree with Long’s perspective on the role of the negotiation of meaning which is likely more beneficial and useful in pushing forward the route of language development. Simply because negotiating meaning helps learners approach comprehension thanks to paraphrasing and their detection of several lexical and grammatical structures of the TL. Put it differently, Long views that the more interlocutors, especially NS and NNS negotiate meaning through interactive modification, the less difficult and tough the process of acquisition would be compared to the case in which interlocutors simplify input (Chaudron. 1988). In brief, all the previously mentioned concepts of Long are summarized in the following quotation:


Negotiation for meaning and especially negotiation work that triggers interactional adjustments by the NS or more competent interlocutor, facilitates acquisition because it connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and out in productive ways it is proposed that environmental contributions to acquisition are mediated by selective attention and learner’s developing second language
processing capacity, and that these resources are brought together most usefully although not exclusively; during negotiation for meaning. Negative feedback obtained during negotiation work or elsewhere may be facilitative of L2 development, at least for vocabulary, morphology and language specific syntax, and essential for learning certain specifiable L1-L2 contrasts.

(Doughty & Long 2003, p.414)

Thus far, we dealt with ‘reception-based theories’ to classroom interaction; in what follows ‘production-based’ ones are exposed to get a complete concept about the diverse perspectives provided on the issue of classroom interaction. The following is Swain’s viewpoint which is considerably somehow different from the ones exposed beforehand.

2.5. Swain Output Hypothesis (1985 - 1995)

Indeed, one of the criticism addressed to Long IH is suggested by Swain (1985; 1995) (cited in Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). Swain highlights that Long claims strongly that acquisition arises entirely through access to comprehensible input. She argues that comprehensible output also plays a key role in SLA/FLA. The scholar criticized both Krashen and Long’s hypotheses. As concerns Krashen’s theory, Swain considers that IH fails to admit the value of comprehensive output. Especially when Krashen rejected the concept that language production by learners pushes forward SLA/FLA.

Actually, Swain views that output is crucial in several ways. For instance, when a kind of communication breakdown occurs between interlocutions in the classroom, so learners would do their best to make themselves comprehended using different means and strategies to convey messages precisely, coherently and appropriately (Ellis 1985) (cited in Ellis, 1990). Additionally, Swain views that while producing output, learners are offered the chance to test out hypotheses they make about the TL; including its syntactic structure, vocabulary…etc. Larsen Freeman (1976) Chaudron (1988) as well as Swain (1985) concur
that hitherto input is important, yet, it is still insufficient for SLA/ FLA to take place (cited in Chaudron, 1988, p.158).

In her output hypothesis (1985), Swain does not neglect the significance of input in enhancing the TL acquisition. But she stresses the fact that learners must be offered the chance to produce the TL so as to become fluent speakers. She convincingly believes that when trying to produce comprehensive output, SL learners develop their linguistic abilities during the process of interaction. Something is worth mentioning is that Swain reckons that to make it possible for learners to produce language, they need to clarify what they say and know the form of what they say (Johnson, 1995, p. 84). We have to maintain that Swain emphasizes that language production cannot take place in isolation, but in social interaction. To her this is the only way enabling learners practise the TL.

Swain tries to explain that output; which is the act of producing language by learners, makes part of the process of language learning next to some other factors. Contrariwise to Long and Krashen who put much emphasis on input and its relationship with acquisition, Swain tries to highlight the effect of output on SLA. Saying it otherwise, during the early 1980’s considerable amount of SLA literature was dominated by the concept of output and SLA. Swain (1985) strongly opposes Krashen’s argument that comprehensible input was the only true cause of second language acquisition (as cited in Hinkel, 2005). She also reckons that Long’s hypothesis which stresses the role of input is also insufficient and this is clear when she says:

the meaning of negotiating meaning needs to be extended beyond the usual sense of simply getting one’s message across. Simply getting one’s message across can and does occur with grammatically deviant forms and sociolinguistically inappropriate language. Negotiating meaning needs to incorporate the notion of being pushed toward the delivery of a message that is not only conveyed precisely, coherently and appropriately. Being pushed in output is a concept parallel to that
of the i+1 of comprehensible input.

(Swain 2005, p. 473)

Thus far, the chapter dealt with Swain’s perspective towards Krashen and Long’s hypotheses. According to Swain, language production, namely output, is a kind of TL production that leads to and enhances learners’ fluency. Additionally, she considers that output has the function of enhancing noticing as it has a triggering function. To put it more simply, while language learners try to produce TL, whether in written or oral form, they may simultaneously notice that they have a problem of not knowing how to say the idea or the meaning they want to convey due to lack of vocabulary items or the ignorance of the syntactic structure…etc. In these cases, learners become conscious of their linguistic actual knowledge. Moreover, they will also try to focus their attention more on the things they ignore about the TL. Swain argues that output is significant in SLA/FLA learning for it pushes learners to process language more deeply; throughout making mental effort, more than they do in input processing. For in trying to produce TL, learners can identify what they can and cannot do. Schmidt and Frota (1986) (cited in Swain, 2000) agree with Swain about the function of output in increasing noticing. In presenting ‘notice the gap principle’, learners can remark the form of the TL. They also notice that TL is different from their interlanguage. This is, by far, a preliminary step towards good language acquisition. In the sense that while observing the existence of a hole in their interlanguage, learners are then going to use different strategies to fill in these gapes using dictionaries grammar books, asking for help from their peers or teachers or trying to concentrate more on the input to get what they want. To Swain, noticing the gap in their knowledge about the TL, and while producing this latter, learners are actually making hypotheses about it and testing them simultaneously. Especially when they receive negative feedback from the part of their teacher; students then will do all their best to modify their output, so as to make it fit the TL structures (Swain, 2000). Another function of output; as suggested by Swain, is that
thanks to output, learners can reflect consciously about language forms. Saying it otherwise, when learners are involved in the process of negotiating meaning, they do certainly encounter grammar problems. In this case, they have the chance to learn new things about the grammar of that language. To sum up, Swain’s perspective on the function of output in developing TL acquisition is stated by Muranoi (2007) who goes over the main points of Swain’s output hypothesis, he says: “output practice that leads learners to notice gaps in their interlanguage system, test their existing knowledge, reflect consciously on their own language, and process language syntactically is expected to be the most beneficial for SL development.” (p.59)

Debot et al (1996) (cited in Muranoi, 2007) wrote an article commenting Swain’s output hypothesis. The researcher concurs with Swain on the necessity of practising the TL. That is, Debot as well think that producing output enhances fluency and this is very crucial in TL development as suggested by Swain. It is important mainly for it develops the speed delivery, as it also develops learners’ attention skills. From their part, Hall &Verplaetse (2000) regard the fact of being exposed to comprehensible input as a factor alone is not sufficient. For SL/FL learners are in need to produce output so as to push forward the wheels of their TL in classroom. According to them, IH as suggested by Krashen and the output as exposed by Swain should not be put on rival position. On the contrary they do, indeed, complement each other. They explain this by claiming that on the one hand, learners need to be exposed to input which is comprehensible and little beyond their current knowledge about the TL for after all input is the model of the TL. On the other hand, learners should interact verbally because this is an opportunity for them to produce the targeted language. It also assists them to be fluent speakers of the language into question. That fluency is to be achieved, of course, after accuracy which is enhanced and triggered by output production as stated before.
Yet we have to keep in mind that producing output is not a trouble-free task and certainly it needs huge efforts and will from the part of learners. Hence, the teacher should assist them while trying to interact verbally by involving them as much possible as he can in the process of negotiating the meaning. He can even do this by pushing them to make their output comprehensible and express their intention accurately (Vanden Branders, 1997) (cited in Muranoi, 2007)

As far as the kind of output which should be generated by SL/FL learners, Swain believes that students are preferred to initiate by themselves output production rather than responding. That is to say, SL learners need to participate and interact actively; they should not be restricted by interlocutors in the discourse. In fact, the more students feel free to initiate participation, take turn, take risk, and choose the topic, the more their verbal interaction would be beneficial and richer. From their part Brown (1991) and Mc Laughlin (1987) (cited in Hall& Verplaetse, 2000) agree with Swain on the concept that interaction means practice opportunities, and practice leads to fluency.

In the latest modified version of the Output Hypothesis (1995, 2005) (cited in Walsh, 2006), Swain reckons and adopts a Sociocultural view emphasizing the significance of dialogues in which students and teacher are involved. We have to note that the strength of Swain’s hypothesis, according to the critics it received, is that though she puts emphasis on the comprehensible output and its role in developing SLA, she recognizes that learners need to negotiate meaning as advocated by Long. In doing this only, they learn how to refine, restructure their contribution to make themselves understood by their interlocutors. She believes that to have a better comprehension of classroom communication, researchers need to unfold the dialogues reformed by teachers and their learners or between learners and learners. In the latest version of her hypothesis, she tries to highlight the dialogic nature of language learning; rejecting the fact of
restricting one’s research mainly to TL output or input. In adopting this sociocultural perspective, Swain approaches Vygotskian concept considering dialogic learning more significant than input in terms of language development. Owing to the foremost importance of Vygotsky’s standpoint on language acquisition, it was widely taken into account by researchers on the field of SLA /FLA. Accordingly, it is worth to expose it in the subsequent section; for in a way or another, it has many things to do with language classroom and interaction.

2.6. Vygotsky’s Sociocultural Theory (1978)

Vygotsky; the Russian semiotician and psychologist, is the one who formulated the basic concepts of sociocultural theory. One of the foremost concepts of Vygotsky is that human beings are social by nature and their cognitive development takes place in the process of social interaction. That is to say, an individual, whether a child or a novice, can learn many things about his culture and society throughout participating in experiences with other individuals. Broadly speaking, Vygotsky claims that any individual’s development appears on two planes; the social plane which is the interpsychological and the psychological one; that is the intrapsychological. Vygotsky tries to explain the process of development by highlighting that the latter goes on throughout an interpsychological phase. In the midst of interpsychological process that learning occurs between a child or a novice and a more capable peer (s) and then this development transforms to be more independent i.e., intrapsychological phase. The cognitive aspect of every individual starts to work on in the second phase of learning.

As concerns SL/FL development, the Sociocultural theory lays much emphasis on the social nature of language. That is language learners, whether they are first, second or foreign language ones, interact with more expert individuals in terms of language as teacher. This occurs in context of social interactions which leads conclusively into
understanding. In considering the basic concept of the sociocultural theory, it is clearly understood that language learners are viewed as active proponents in the process of language learning. They construct their own knowledge and meaning throughout collectively interacting verbally with one another. Indeed, Vygotsky accentuates that language is the tool through which the novice interprets and regulates the world he lives in; as such the individual mind is mediated. To put it more simply, language is considered to be the tool that the individual uses to engage in social and cognitive activity.

Something is noteworthy is that both Krashen and Vygotsky focus on the importance of social interaction for both learning and language acquisition. Saying it otherwise, teachers can create opportunities for their students to take part in classroom by adjusting their own language as well as the cognitive tasks introduced to them. Yet, to achieve the high level of learners’ oral performance using the TL, interaction is the backbone element or factor needed. This is clearly understood when Vygotsky says: “Rather, development occurs as the result of meaningful verbal interaction, that is, of dialogic relationships between novices and experts in the environment, be they parents, older peers or teachers” (Vygotsky, 1962, 1978) (cited in Schinke-Llano, 1995).

As mentioned before, Vygotsky concepts are not, indeed, directed to SLA/FLA. Hence, as they are widely taken into consideration by scholars in psychology, linguistics and even education, they were also applied in SL/FL classrooms. The basic concept of Vygotsky attracting SLA/FLA scholars is the one of ‘zone of proximal development’. The latter is defined by Vygotsky (1978) as: “It is the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential guidance with more capable peers.” (cited in Hall and Verplaetse, 2000). To put it in plain words, likewise a child, a novice of a SL/FL depends too much at the outset of his language development on other individuals i.e., the intrapsychological phase. All along his growth,
he gradually becomes less dependent on the other expert individuals. This can take place rapidly if the individual is afforded with assistance by experts throughout engaging with the novice in dialogic interaction. As long as this assistance is appropriately given to SLA/FLA speakers, they can certainly move from the interpsychological phase to the intrapsychological one. They can acquire more skills and be capable of expressing themselves using the TL by regulating themselves.

Vygotsky, as a sociocultural theorist, stresses the fact that learning is a social activity more than being an individual one. In that process of learning, learners, in fact, play a key role. That is to say; learners collaborate during social interaction to achieve that development. In doing so, learners internalize knowledge about the TL during the process of interaction, by interacting verbally with more advanced individuals as teachers or peers. We have to highlight that the assistance offered to SL learners by more experts should neither be too far beyond their actual knowledge about the TL so as to ensure access to the structure of that language. Nor it should be too easy to enhance learners’ mental abilities. Indeed, in learning a language, first, second or foreign one, teachers should not teach that language as an object. They should rather enable their learners participate in dialogic activities using that language as a tool to enhance their oral performance (Lantolf, 2005).

So far, this part of chapter two highlighted some basic perceptions associated with the topic of investigation in hand. Even though, at first glance, some conceptions might seem to be too much enthusiastic and ambitious that it is difficult to be realized in TL classroom backgrounds. Thus a great deal of research devoted on first, SLA/FLA development stress that Vygotskian’ concepts are not that thorny and intricate to be practised in the teaching process. Indeed, Vygotskian’ concepts are not merely theoretical assumptions; they are rather proved to be decidedly effective and preferential to be applied in the teaching of any language; first, second or even a foreign one (Schinke – Llano, 1995,
To put it more concretely, scholars working on SLA such as Lantolf and Aljarfch (1993) (cited in Lantolf, 2000) ascertain that in SL classroom they have examined that learners could progress in their oral performance. Moreover, learners were able to move from other-regulation- phase to self- regulation one in which they achieve language performance. Additionally, Lightbrown and Spada (1999, p.44) (cited in Lantolf, 2005) assume, on the light of Sociocultural theory, that SL learners advance to higher levels of linguistic knowledge in collaborating and interacting with speakers of the SL who are more knowledgeable than they are. Unlike Chomskyan linguistics situating SLA as a process taking place in the mind of the individual rather than happening amidst a social interactive activity, Sociocultural theorist as Firth , Wagne , Lantolf (cited in Ellis& Fotos, 1999, p.16 ) situate SLA/FLA outside the head of the learners. These scholars view learners as active proponents through their participation and vital involvement in the leaning process.

So far, this chapter sheds light on issues associated with interaction in SLA/FLA, as input, output and how scholars view the topic of interaction and its relationship with the TL development. Now, the chapter should have room to expose some other concepts strongly allied with classroom language; for after all, the focus of this study is to unveil issues related to language classroom and interaction. Definitely, classroom comprises participants who are teachers and learners and their talk results in classroom discourse and interaction. Hence, it is momentous to explore their talk both explicitly in this chapter to unveil the nature of classroom interaction.

2.7. Teacher Talk

According to Allwright & Bailey (1991, p. 139) numerous observations conducted in different SLA/FLA classes explicitly demonstrate that teachers perform between one half an three quarters of the talking performed in classrooms. Ellis (1990, p. 79) is also of the same mind as the scholars mentioned earlier, for he views that classroom interaction is
mostly controlled by teachers. He explains this in considering that teachers dominate classroom for they are viewed to be older than their learners. Moreover, they suppose to know more than their students as far as the TL is concerned and they consider themselves the ones who are responsible of managing classroom interaction. They further order classroom interaction, control turn taking, and the topic of discourse though unconsciously. They do this throughout asking questions during their class.

The question that might be asked by the readers of the dissertation in hand is why should we deal with teacher talk? The answer which we can suggest is that there is a concrete relationship between TT and the degree as well as the quantity of students’ interaction in classroom. Say it differently, Chaudron (1988) claims that the more teachers devote large amount of time to explain and manage instructions, the less learners will produce output and interact. Yet, in what follows, the chapter sheds light on the most striking characteristics of TT. Namely, questions, feedback and error treatment.

2.7.1. Teachers’ Questions

It is believed that asking questions is one of the most strikingly used techniques by teachers in SLA/FLA classrooms (Richards & Lockhart, 1994, p. 185). As noted beforehand in the previous chapter, teachers use most of the time questions in classroom as an attempt to make their students more involved in the discourse. They may use them to check their students’ grasping of what is being said and done. Questions, as assumed by SLA/FLA researchers, play a keystone role in enhancing it, in the sense that teachers can keep their learners taking part in the discourse generated in classroom. Additionally, they can be also used to make input more comprehensible and relevant. In fact, the good question to be raised is not why do teachers use questions meanwhile interacting with their learners? But what type of questions do they use in that process? And what are the formed types to be used by SL/FL teachers to promote the quality and the quantity as well of their learners’
output production. Nassaji and Wells (2000) (cited in Knapp & Seidlhofer, 2009, p. 428) view that the types of question the teacher asks and the way he formulates them is of a tremendous value for they affect the way learners talk. Regarding the most used questions in SL/FL classroom, referential and display questions, open and closed ones and clarification requests are exercised:

- **Display questions**: are those questions the teacher asks to his learners. He already knows the answer; but he asks them for an attempt to display language skill or knowledge.

- **Referential questions**: are questions whose answers are not known by the teacher. For instance, questions demanding opinions and personal facts. That is they require long and more complex answers.

  According to Byram (2000), good questions should be addressed to include as much learners as possible. Taking into consideration time allocation, pace and sequential question. A good teacher is the one who is aware that learners differ in terms of cognitive abilities. Thus, he can understand that his students’ responses would not be alike.

- **Open and closed question**: As far as open questions are concerned, they are those questions permitting a number of possible answers. They are also known as reasoning questions. Closed questions are those questions designed to have only one acceptable answer.

  With regards to SL/FL classroom, Long and Sato (1983) (cited in Ellis, 1990) found that 79% of the questions addressed to TL learners are close ones. Yet, it is assumed that referential and open questions are hypothesized to enhance learner’ productivity. Hence, if this takes place, a good context of communication between students and teacher will be set
2.7.2. Feedback

Once the teacher asks his question, learners are supposed to interact and respond to his questions, and once given the answers, the teacher is expected to comment on his learners’ contribution, by showing his understanding, his agreement…etc and this comment is known as feedback; which is very common in TT. Researchers classify the latter into two types: positive and corrective/negative feedback.

2.7.2.1. Positive Feedback

So as stated earlier, feedback is by definition comments or other information learners receive from their teacher about their success on learning tasks or tests. Indeed, feedback to learners’ performance is one of the most important aspects of teaching. As a concept, feedback is labeled in many terms by language acquisition researchers. These terms are very often used interchangeably.

In fact, feedback can be either positive or negative. Yet, its role is not merely to value students’ performance in the TL; it does also motivate students and create a stimulating environment in classroom. Teacher’s feedback can be either on the content or form of students’ oral performance. Additionally, students of any language prefer receiving feedback on their oral performance over their errors ignored (Lyster, 2007). Something is noteworthy is that feedback is not merely a medium to inform students how well they have performed. Its function is further than this; it increases highly motivation among learners. The offered feedback on students’ spoken language can be either on the form or on content. As concerns positive feedback, there are some strategies adopted by teachers in a SL/FL classroom next to providing acknowledgements or acceptance of learners’ oral contribution. These strategies are embodied in the form of repetition, i.e., where the teacher repeats the correct given answer of his student. Rephrasing is another strategy
taken up by teachers. In using it; teachers accept their students’ oral performance and add other new information, utterances or structures.

2.7.2.2. Corrective Feedback

As far as negative feedback or corrective feedback, as labeled by some scholars, is concerned, it is provided by teachers to reform learners’ utterances which were problematic (Dekeyser, 2007, p. 123). Saying it otherwise, negative feedback informs of failure in learners’ output. It is, definitely, a response to learners’ errors. It is noteworthy to say that for SL/FL learners should notice the gap between their actual interlanguage and the structure of the TL as suggested by Schmidt. This can be achieved in case the teacher of the TL would provide negative feedback for his learners throughout recasts which are considered as a form of negative feedback. Additionally, in doing so, the teacher enhances some of their metalinguistic abilities such as ‘noticing’ and attention on the one hand, as it increases their opportunities to produce comprehensible output (Lyster, 2007, p. 117). Ellis (1997) and Long (1983, 1996) (cited in Ellis, 2001) consider corrective feedback as the preliminary step towards the process of a negotiated interaction in the SL classroom. In the sense that while using the TL, some communication breakdowns take place in the dyadic conversation. Henceforth, the teacher makes use of some forms of negative feedback as comprehension checks and requests for clarification.

Previously, in this chapter, the significance of comprehensive input and classroom interaction is discussed. Hence, output production in the TL has a considerable role as well to achieve accuracy. So as to approach the latter, learners are in need to focus on the form of the TL by receiving negative feedback; with all its diverse types whenever an error is produced. Hence, in case learners make errors, the teacher initiates a correction move. And to benefit from this process, he is advised to encourage his learners to achieve a self-repair all along the procedure of interacting with him. In adopting the route of giving negative
feedback; the teacher stimulates and pushes his learners to produce comprehensible output. Something is noteworthy is that feedback can be either explicit or implicit depending on intended function. It has to do with the intention of the teacher; whether he gives priority to correcting overtly or implicitly the error produced by learners. Yet, if the teacher corrects the error implicitly, so he is to do it by repeating the ill-formed utterance or making use of clarification requests, for instance. In their study on feedback, Lyster and Ranta (1997) distinguish six types of offered feedback. It is almost the same classification provided by De Keyser (2007) and Ellis (2001).

1. **Explicit feedback**: As explained before, it takes place when the teacher provides the correct form after referring back to his learners’ ill-formed structure.

2. **Clarification requests**: Questions that the teacher directs to his learners for what they produced was misunderstood or ill-formed and thereby a reformulation of the produced oral utterance (s) is required.

3. **Elicitation**: as a strategy, it is used by the teacher to elicit the correct form by asking learner to complete sentences, or asking question, or asking them for reformulation.

4. **Metalinguistic feedback**: Can be in the form of comments, added information or questions that are linked to the well-formedness of the learner’s produced utterance; without commenting on the errors being produced.

5. **Repetition**: When the teacher decides to repeat the erroneous utterance.

6. **Recast**: As stated earlier; recast is the most common used form of feedback in SL/FL classroom. By definition, recast is reformulation of a learners’ incorrect or ill formed utterance that still upholds the original meaning of the utterance. That is, in using a recast move, the teacher reformulates the incorrect utterance of the student minus the error. As a matter of fact, recast is the most common used technique by teachers of the TL, more particularly in communicative contexts. They make use of it mainly for they cause less
learners’ anxiety. Besides, in addressing recasts to learners, it is likely that the flow of communication will not be disrupted, accordingly, interaction might well be maintained.

Recasts and repetition techniques are recognized as implicit forms of feedback. It is up to learners to identify and notice the error which has been produced. Whereas, clarification requests, metalinguistic clues and elicitation or prompts, which are also recognized as *negotiation of form techniques, or form focus moves*, are explicit. The teacher makes use of them to draw his learners’ attention to the ill-formed utterance or word without correcting it. They are effective for they make learners reprocessing their output and reproducing a correct one.

Gass & Selinker (2008, p. 339), Ellis (2001) as well, consent that corrective feedback functions as an attention getting device. That is to say, as long as SL/FL learners are not provided constantly with feedback in case errors are made, fossilization will occur. To Ellis, learners do notice, compare and integrate along the process of SL/FLA. According to them, corrective feedback helps learners to draw conclusions about their previously formulated hypotheses about the TL. Yet, what might be problematic is that probably learners cannot notice that an error has been committed.

Due to its magnitude as an issue in SLA and FLA, its effects in the process of the target language acquisition is still debatable, however. Feedback has been dealt with intensively in literature produced on SLA and even FLA. Hence, feedback more specifically corrective one, is by no room of discussion, a very intricate process and a complex decision-making procedure. To put it in plain words, in providing corrective feedback for students, the teacher should take many things in consideration and it should not be made randomly. Whenever an error is committed, the teacher is expected to, firstly identify its type; whether grammatical, phonological or a lexical one. Then, he is to decide whether to correct or not. Then, he ought to know how, when and who to repair it. In
offering feedback, the teacher should not dismiss learners’ cognitive reality. In addition, to provide an effective feedback, the teacher is advised to have a good insight on his learners’ characters, and language proficiency as well. In doing so, the teacher would undoubtedly provide a fruitful feedback which can be noticed. Conclusively, errors can be even treated by learners themselves.

2.8. Turn Taking System

It goes without saying that interaction in any language classroom, as a process, does not occur at random. It is a jointly constructed and organized process by participants. Conversation analysts are to uncover the interactional organization prevailing in the classroom discourse such as turn taking system and adjacency pairs.

Indeed, it is highly important to embrace, though succinctly; the issue of turn-taking in this chapter. One cannot tackle the topic of classroom conversation and interaction without reference to turn-taking system. Thanks to this system, learners of any target language acquire an interactional competence which would enhance their oral proficiency as suggested by Wong & Waring (2010, p. 14). Moreover, this piece of research is devoted to account what is taking place in language classroom. So as to have a crystal clear idea about classroom discourse and to have the ability to analyze it; it is required to have a comprehensible concept about the organization of that system.

Turn-taking system, is by definition “the means by which teachers, students take, hold and relinquish the speaking floor” as suggested by Bruthiaux et al. (2005, p. 201). Wong & Waring (2010, p. 9) argue that without turns, there would be no interaction in classroom. They consider learning how to get along conversations; throughout playing roles and allocating turns, is at the heart of communicating using a SL and FL. As a system, turn-taking is, indeed, an intricate process for many factors. For instance, the
variance of the concept of turn taking from one culture to another, the length of silence period prevailing in the CD, the disparity of language competency among participants...etc.

As a matter of fact, turn taking, as a very dominant aspect of classroom discourse, has widely been investigated in SLA/FLA studies. One of the best revealing researches on this issue is the one conducted by Sacks et al (1974) (cited in Ellis, 1997). The latter identified a set of rules governing American English conversations and were later on served in the study of classroom discourse. One of these rules is that only a speaker speaks at a given time. Moreover, other rules are about the way participants change their speech throughout negotiation. When being dragged in a classroom conversation; the speaker might select the next speaker by nominating his name or by performing the first part of the adjacency pair; as asking a question necessitating a response for instance. One of the most prevailing characteristics of turn-taking system is self regulation competition or initiative. That is, very often, classroom participants, definitely, compete to take part in the ongoing conversations.

Yet, it should be noted that turn taking system in natural and ordinary everyday conversations is distinguished from the one in classroom context. According to researches on conversations in classroom settings, turns tend to be centralized at the teacher. Besides, they go in accordance with the predetermined and planned lesson. In being so, certainly, there would be a little chance of having small talk in classroom. For turns very frequently flow in a strictly organized structure leading to a less turn by turn negotiation, self – initiation and competition among learners. This has been strongly confirmed by Lørscher (1986) (cited in Ellis; 1990) in his research on turn-taking system. He remarked that compared to natural everyday discourse, turns are very simple in terms of structure; far from being cooperatively constructed and even not stimulating negotiation. Additionally, they are habitually controlled by the teacher. Saying it plainly, the teacher is the one who
allocates turns; as he is also the one who selects who to speak and when to interrupt or stop a learner. In his conclusion; Lörscher (1986) explains that the way turns are allocated and distributed reflects obviously the degree of communication in classroom context. Moreover, turn allocation also reveals the nature of schools, as a public institution; more importantly, the teaching-learning process. Van Lier (1989) (cited in Ellis, 1997) considers that the turn taking system is influenced by the teacher perception of his/ her roles. That is to say, provided the teacher, be it a SL or a FL one, regards himself a ‘knower’ who is there to transmit knowledge about the TL, so turns will be strictly organized and regulated. Whereas, as long as he recognizes that he is merely a ‘facilitator’ of self-directed SLA/FLA, turns will be negotiated.

Tsui (1995), from her part, argues that classroom interaction is determined largely by turn allocation behaviour of the teacher and turn taking behaviour of the students. She points out that allocating turns to all students is one of the most striving and challenging tasks to be achieved by SL/FL teachers. As concerns turn taking behaviours adopted by students, things do really differ, in the way that taking turns might be solicited by the teacher. Turns might be also initiated by students themselves throughout initiating turns by asking questions, answering them, or making requests. Yet, there are some factors that might well make the contribution of students in a SL/FL classroom different such as learners’ personalities, characters, motivation, and cultural factors...etc.

As concerns turn taking organization, Seedhouse (2004, p.27) depicts it in a well explained way by clarifying the structure of turn taking system according to the study of Sacks et al (1974) (cited in Seedhouse, 2004). Turn taking is, indeed, governed by a mechanism that is termed as a local management system. A system in which participants can make decisions instead of having pre-allocated turns. The most relevant rules governing turn taking are summarized as follows:
1. Only a given speaker or participant can speak at a given time.

2. The speaker can select the following speaker by nominating him or by performing a first part of the adjacency pairs.

3. The speaker can alternatively allow the following speaker to self select and in this case there would be a competition to take turn.

(p. 28)

Moreover; turn taking, as a fundamental interactional exchange characterizing ordinary conversations, has been described by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) (cited in Seedhouse, 2004) from two dimensions: a linguistics dimension and sociological one. As concerns the linguistic one, it describes the turn construction units (TCUs) which are the basic building blocks of turns. They range from a single word as ‘yes’ to a full sentence. They can be lexical, clausal, phrasal and sentential and they are negotiated during the interactional process. Once the turn is accomplished, there would be a transition of turns to other participants. To put in plainly, According to this model, turn-taking occurs at the point defined as the transition relevance place which is at the completion of a turn constructional unit. Turn constructional units are characterized by syntactic, prosodic and pragmatic aspects that are interdependent when speaker-change occurs. The focus here is not to deepen in the linguistic dimension of turn taking system, what we are more interested in is the sociological component of turns. The latter has to do with the way transitions are organized among participants.

So far, we have exposed, though succinctly, the basic rules governing turn taking system in general. Discussion turns now to tackle the issue of turn taking in accordance with SL/FL classroom discourse. Something is worthy to be mentioned is that the first researcher within classroom research to take up Sacks et al.’s (1974) study was Alexander McHoul who published the article: ‘The Organization of Turns at Formal Talk in the
Classroom’ (McHoul 1978) (cited in Seedhouse, 2004). Nonetheless, we have to clarify that in his study on the mechanism of turn-taking system; McHoul did not analyze it in English as SL/FL classroom. He rather depended on recordings from an English comprehensive school where focus was not on the language itself. His analysis of turn-taking system stems from a formal talk in classroom, where most of the discourse was retained by the teacher. And the participants’ exchanges were just allocated in terms of institutional roles of teacher and student. From there, McHoul described the most relevant rules of formal classroom interaction. Yet, McHoul’s study has been put into question for the way he described the structure of turn taking maybe relevant solely to a traditional teacher-fronted classroom interaction context. His report does not relatively account for the variety of classroom talks and discourse. McHoul has described, but very narrowly, the rules of turn taking where learners or students neither self select themselves to initiate a turn of interaction, nor select other peers to speak next. For the teacher controls almost all the discourse of interaction and it is only him who has the right to allocate turns. McHoul has paved the way for other CA researchers to analyze the organization of turn taking system in SL/FL classroom such as Seedhouse (2004) and Markee (2000) (cited in Seedhouse, 2004). Seedhouse, for instance, has concluded that the organization of the turn taking system is linked to the pedagogical activities (form-and-accuracy, meaning-and-fluency, tasks, and procedural contexts). Put it more concretely, turn taking changes according to the pedagogical aim set previously by the teacher.

We have to draw the reader’s attention that according to conversation analysts, speakers tend to follow the principle of “no gaps/no overlaps” (Sacks et al., 1974) (cited in Seedhouse, 2004). Transitions from one turn to the next occur in two ways. The first way is seen to be soft characterized by pauses and synchronization between participants. The
second, which is non soft, is featured by overlaps and mutual interruptions. It takes place when speakers tend to talk simultaneously changing the interactive rhythm.

As far as turn allocation is concerned, Tsui (1996) confirms that allocating turns to learners is a very intricate process. She confirms that most of target language teachers allocate turns in an uneven way just to avoid not getting responses from their learners. That is to say, to avoid long pauses and silence which might arise when asking a question, teachers tend to ask the brighter students or those opting to give answers instead of allocating turns in a fair way to other learners. Additionally, Tsui makes it clear that in behaving so, those shy and reluctant students might feel neglected. The more they feel retiring, the less willing they will be to express their minds and participate in class.

Discussion now is directed to cover the second interactional mechanism in CD that is ‘adjacency pairs’, for one cannot undertake the issue of classroom interaction without reference to it.

2.9. Adjacency Pairs

In conversations, whether they are held in or outside classroom context; some pairs of utterances in talk depend on other pairs. To illustrate; a question requires an answer and an answer presupposes a question asked beforehand. When a person greets someone else, the participant in the discourse is supposed to respond to the utterance by greeting too. Another example given about the performance of adjacency pairs is when a speaker performs an utterance whose function is to apologize; the listener has to respond by an utterance expressing acceptance. Accordingly, the utterance expressing apology and the one holding the acceptance are recognized to be adjacency pairs. Some adjacency first pair parts require the same second pair parts, as it is the case when someone says ‘hello’ the listener responds by repeating the same word ‘hello’. Some other adjacency pairs require diverse and different second pair parts, however.
As far as language classroom conversations are concerned, learners need to have clear ideas about these turns of adjacency pairs so as to be able to engage in English spoken discourse. That is to say, being fluent speakers of English language; more specifically foreign ones, students are required to produce second pair pairs as a response to the first pair part generated by the teacher or other students. It is only in achieving the skill of going on in a sequence of interaction via adjacency pairs that learners might interact easily and appropriately using the target language in conversations.

In terms of constructing a second pair part, Koester (2010) summarizes that there are two options to do so: (a) a preferred one, when the cointeractant accepts, complies and agrees with what is stated with the first pair part. For instance, if the interactant in the first part offers, invites or suggests, thus the cointeractant in the discourse accepts and agrees with him. Alternative (b) is a dispreferred pair part, it would occur when the cointeractant rejects, refuses and declines with what is stated in the first pair part. As concerns the ‘preferred pair part’, it is characterized by its shortness, simplicity in terms of structure, directness and produced without hesitation. Whereas, the dispreferred parts, they are longer, more complex, featured by the use of discourse markers (well, oh), token agreement (for instance; yes, but…etc), hesitation, pausing and hedges (I don’t know, I mean you know…. ) and lastly the inclusion of accounts and explanation…etc.

Indeed, it is worth noting that any conversation analyst is supposed to come closer to adjacency pairs for they uncover whether learner do have conversational skills permitting them to be involved in a process of meaning negotiation and interaction or not. Thus, adjacency pairs and turn taking analysis are at the heart of classroom CA. They are both mechanisms which embody the sequence organization of classroom interaction. Saying it otherwise, it is through adjacency pairs and turn taking systems that interactants can make their utterances understood and the cointeractants are able to interpret them and
then respond accordingly. They are the mechanisms that analysts rely on to scrutinize the flow of classroom interaction. According to Seedhouse (2004, p. 17), adjacency pairs are considered then to be building blocks interactants use as a mechanism to display understanding to one another’s turn. To simplify it, mainly throughout adjacency pairs that interactants as teachers and students show understanding of the taken turn. Furthermore, Ellis & Barkhuizen (2005) elucidate that in unveiling classroom talk which is embedded in turn by turn interaction would give the researcher a good insight about not only the way learners use language to interact, but rather about how they learn language while interacting. This can be achieved throughout the analysis of turn taking and adjacency pairs systems.

Hitherto, the chapter exposes interaction as a process that takes place between the teacher and his learners. Now the focus is devoted to explain briefly interaction occurring between learners themselves. It is necessary to tackle this point for it helps better comprehending how communication takes place among learners. Moreover, it facilitates catching how this type of interaction affects the course of language acquisition, enhances it and even creates opportunities for learners to communicate more using the targeted language.

2.10. Forms of Participation in Classroom Discourse

Indeed, participating in a SL/FL classroom context is not an easy task for there are plenty of factors determining learners’ interaction in classroom. For instance, topics discussed, the way discussion is held, the availability of motivation in the classroom environment…etc. Another factor which is a decisive one in determining the quality as well as the quantity of learners’ interaction is the affective filter that leads to language anxiety. Allwright and Bailey (1991) state that SL/FL language teachers ought to create a healthy and a stimulating environment for language learning. According to them, it is
likely that there are some students who will refrain from interacting orally with their teacher and peers as long as they feel anxious. It is acknowledged and well documented that when learners feel at ease and comfortable in the language classroom context, they will be more open to interact, argue, take turns and risks and initiate exchanges. Learners can do all this owing to the fact that their affective filter is low as suggested by Krashen (1985) (cited in Ellis, 2008). The more students have self-confidence, self-esteem and are motivated to learn the language, the more their affective filter is decreased and the less difficult SL learning would be. Teachers’ personality, the use of soft tones and speech are also other factors affecting learners’ interaction. That is teachers can help their learners gain more confidence to speak by using soft tones, showing their readiness to listen to them attentively and valuing their contributions.

In fact, learners’ participation in classroom; especially in oral tasks, can be in many forms: teacher- learner interaction, learner- learner interaction, peer or group interaction…etc. Put it differently, interaction can be seen in pair tasks, where two peers interact together using the TL to argue, to play roles…etc as they can also be set to work and interact in small groups. Yet, one should keep in mind that it is the type of the assigned task which determines the kind of students’ interaction and the form of their oral participation.

Johnson (1995, p.114) argues that learners-learners interaction might be more beneficial than teacher- learner interaction in terms of educational success. Several studies such as Slavin (1980), Sharan (1980) and Webb (1982) (cited in Johnson, 1995) have proved that cooperative learning is of great value for it helps students advance in their language proficiency. It develops their communicative competencies and enhances their cognitive awareness about the structure of the TL. Moreover, it increases their learning styles and strategies and pushes them take more risk to participate using it. Johnson
stresses that interaction which takes place between learners in pairs or in groups has to be well managed by the teacher otherwise it would bring no benefits in the advancement of TL performance. That is, group/peer interaction would be of a paramount significant if it is managed appropriately by the teacher. Saying it otherwise, the teacher has to set and plan adequate goals so as to stimulate peer or group interaction before giving it to his learners.

From his part, Ellis (1997) suggests that learners will benefit while interacting in small group work in the sense that they will have more opportunities to negotiate meaning, more chances to speak using the SL/FL as a medium of transmitting their ideas. They will also have the possibility to construct the discourse collaboratively which is in itself a very motivating factor pushing learners forward to interact. Ellis& Fotos (1999, p. 205) also suggest that when given the chance of controlling the discourse in small group discussions, learners will develop better their language proficiency. Mainly in doing so, they are simultaneously negotiating meaning. Tsui (1995, p. 21) has the same perspective as Ellis; in stressing the fact that learners do engage in genuine communication when being given the chance to interact in small group tasks. Provided learners of the target language are given the chance to participate and interact in language tasks via small groups, they will produce coherent discourse instead of isolated short sentences. That is, in setting them to work cooperatively to solve tasks, play roles, SL or FL teachers are in a way or another improving their learners’ discourse competence rather than linguistic one. Besides the fact that they are helping their learners to decrease their language anxiety.

Varonis& Gass (1985) (cited in Chaudron, 1988), after presenting five studies of adult ESL learners, argue that learners interact more, take more turns, and feel more free to negotiate for meaning when being involved in groups. Nizegorodcew (2007) clarifies that learners’ participation used to be strictly limited and controlled by the teacher in traditional SL and FL classroom, for the latter favours accuracy over communication. Learners used
to answer the directed teacher’s questions and they could barely initiate a classroom exchange. Contrariwise to traditional language classroom contexts, learners are stimulated to participate orally as much as possible in oral tasks such as role plays in modern communicative language classroom settings. Yet, regardless of the fact that most SL/FL classrooms support students’ oral participation in classroom discourse construction, there are learners who remain reluctant and opt for keeping silent rather than expressing their minds for many reasons. For instance, they may feel that their language proficiency is low compared to the other participants. One of the solutions offered to this situation which is frequently faced by teachers is to arrange group oral tasks. To Majer (2003) (cited in Nizegorodcew, 2007) in setting learners do oral tasks in group work, they will take more initiative and risks to talk and interact with their colleagues.

In an article published by Pica and Doughty (1986) (cited in Ondarra, 1997), they compared learners’ production in peer groups with that in teacher-fronted classroom discussion. They found out that in the former context, learners’ comprehension is greater in terms of vocabulary items. Learners were also able to generate long, complex utterances with their peers compared to those students in teacher fronted classroom setting. The former were able to negotiate more meaning. In being involved in the process of meaning negotiation; both researchers argue that learners are indeed developing more their interactional discourse. So giving that impetus to the value of learners’ participation in the construction of classroom interactive discourse; several researchers started to investigate the value of learner-learner interaction.

**Conclusion**

The focal target behind this chapter was to put in the picture some of the basic theories that studied classroom interaction and its affiliation with SL/FL classroom learning process. Every theory provided on the issue explained classroom interaction from
different angles. Some suggested that input is very imperative in the course of oral communication, while others maintain that output is at the heart of the TL acquisition. Others have a different standpoint in the sense that they view language acquisition taking place amidst the course of social interaction with other advanced participants as teachers and peers as well. Some components of TT as questions, feedback and others of learners’ language as turn taking and adjacency pairs were revealed in this chapter as well. The latter concludes with exposing some forms of learners’ participation and the role of tasks allocated to them in managing interaction. Indeed, all issues dealt with in this chapter facilitates for us understanding how communicative skills are acquired when being engaged in conversations. It also helps in analyzing chunks of classroom discourse; which is the central concern of the coming chapter.
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Introduction

Having an impetus to solve many encountered problems in SL/FL learning classroom, qualitative research is highly recommended and needed. It helps researchers to come closer to phenomena that are crucial in understanding the process of interaction in classroom context. Hence, in what follows, the chapter discusses the adopted method in this study. That is, focus is devoted to clarify the research methodology through which we worked on in this piece of research and a short depiction of the population as well as the context of the research. The chapter also provides a short portrayal of the way data were collected. It ends with an analysis of the got findings from teachers and learners’ questionnaires.

3.1. Rationale

In fact, it is the nature of the topic of research which determines the adopted research methodology by the researcher. Being so, and in depending on description in this work, the most suitable methodology to rely on is the qualitative one. The justification provided for the reliance on such a type of research methodology is that the study in hand depends more on descriptive data which are far from being statistical, scored or measured. Additionally, the dissertation is more interested in presenting a holistic and a natural picture of the topic being investigated i.e., classroom interaction. Its aim is far from depending on predetermined categories. In accordance with what is stated by Mackey & Gass (2005), the qualitative methodology is the best adopted one when the researcher depends on description in his research.

Indeed, the first chapter analyzed in depth the various methods available to analyze language classroom discourse and interaction as well. Therefore, adopting a qualitative research is the most reliable one to fit in with the topic of this piece of research. Putting it plainly, the focus of this study is neither to prescribe, nor to experiment. Yet, its interest is
to observe and interpret findings and phenomena associated with the topic in question. Accordingly, the most relevant method to be used is Conversation Analysis since the latter requires observation of the elements under investigation, and then interpreting the findings.

The selection of CA as a method of data analysis rather than a DA method or an IA one; as explained before, is due to the fact that CA is the most fitting to the topic dealt with in this study. In adopting a CA to analyze classroom interaction, it is supposed to deal with oral discourse. Furthermore, what makes CA approach different from the DA one is that the analysts are not supposed to appeal to the participants’ intent. That is, in bringing into play a CA approach, the study is not interested in explicating participants’ intentions behind their use of some given linguistic patterns and their internal aspect. It is just concerned with the provided talk and more precisely the systematic properties of the sequential organization of talk. Indeed, the most imperative question the research is supposed to answer in utilizing CA is ‘why this now?’ throughout exposing participants’ turns and their organization in the natural context. Saying it otherwise, we are supposed to deal with oral discourse generated from classroom participants by transcribing authentic data collected from a genuine classroom context. This is achieved throughout using turns as the basic unit of analysis.

Indeed, the selection of CA rather than any other qualitative research approaches as the ethnographic one, for instance, means that the study is not concerned with the sociological, ethnographic or demographic details of the participants in the course of observation. These details might be aspects as gender, class...etc. CA is not as well supposed to code data in the form of statistics. For as stated earlier, conversation analysts are expected to eschew the coding and the quantification of data.

As a methodology of research, the dissertation in hand has the tendency to rely on CA rather than making use of an IA method. For in using the latter, the analyst might miss
out some aspects that are of crucial value in the discourse of classroom interaction. To put it more concretely, if the use of an IA model is opted for, it may not be able to catch everything related to that important process taking place between learners while interacting together. Moreover, we will also be obliged to focus only on the observable phenomena associated with mainly the interaction occurring between the teacher and his learners throughout drawing on coding schemes. In applying one of the IA methods, the researcher can get confused for he might be more concerned with the quantification of data rather than giving prior value to the process of communication among all participants under observation. As it is necessary to emphasize that it is not feasible to exercise an IA to this topic of investigation because IA methods are more confined to two parts that are: the teacher and the learners. However, the concern of this study is not restricted to this scope merely, for it is attracted by observing how interaction comes about between learners too. Moreover, novice researchers in the field of classroom interaction might be biased by the coding schemes in using IA methods, since the analyst should design his coding schemes and then interpret them afterwards. Indeed, we are not yet ripen in the field of classroom interaction to be able to generate and interpret data because there are no criteria on which researchers agree upon to be valid as universal coding schemes.

The preference of using CA method rather than a DA one is justified because the latter fails to account for interaction that arises between learners. Besides, DA methods have more linguistic tendency than interactional one in their system of analysis. To be more precise, in essence, DA methods to analyze classroom interaction are so confined to the linguistic description of the produced utterance by both the teacher and learners. DA analysts describe utterances’ functions and neglect the participants under investigation. Certainly, it is not the ultimate aim of this piece of research to scrutinize mainly the
linguistic utterances generated by classroom participants; the appeal is broader and more ambitious than this.

Hence, we consider that the most relevant method to be used in the observation of classroom interaction is CA one. The application of the latter in the data analysis gives more chance to observe interaction as a process rather than a product to be summarized in statistical data. Moreover, the reliance on CA paves the way for the researcher to catch everything that might affect learners’ interaction with their teacher and their peers as well. Instead of limiting the scope of analysis to a single type of interaction i.e., teacher-students interaction or the learner-learner one, CA helps examining classroom interaction as holistic process. The focus aims at seeing how the intricate process of interaction takes place in the discourse of teacher as well as learners’ one. In view of that, the most relevant method fitting in with the targeted attempt of the dissertation in hand is the conversation analysis one.

The chapter now is to address the description of the population involved in the study. Since the chapter opts for a CA to analyze data, and in essence CA is considered to be a qualitative method, what follows is a detailed description of method used in collecting the data.

3.2. Method

Before portraying the procedure of the data analysis, it is required to depict plainly participants drawn up in this piece of research as well as the context surrounding it.

3.2.1. Description of Participants

As a matter fact, we have decided to conduct this piece of research with third year LMD system students of Jijel University. This selection is, indeed, justified for the work in hand strives to enquire how the course of interaction is processed in oral expression module classes. It is considered that most students enrolled in third year LMD system are
about to graduating. They are supposed to be competent enough to get involved and engaged in classroom conversations. Additionally, they are assumed to have ample knowledge about the grammatical, semantic structures of English language since they have been exposed to it for three years and it is also the ultimate language they use in their course of learning. In fact, this review is not to hypothesize their language proficiency. The purpose is to examine how they; as FL learners of English language, interact with their teacher and with each other. That is to say, the target is to perceive how learners’ discourse as well as teacher’s one is arranged to bring about classroom interaction and how discourse enhances it.

To have a broader insight about how interaction occurs in oral expression module sessions, and how this intricate process contributes to the oral proficiency of learners, some sessions have been attended with two teachers. The attempt of doing so is to have a comprehensive idea about the context of teaching OE module. The latter is believed to be the ultimate subject where learners have the chance to interact verbally with each other and with their teacher in classroom. The attempt to observe two classroom contexts is not to make a comparative study; it is rather to have a comprehensive concept about the discourse used by teachers in that module and responses in LL. On the one hand, the study’s aim behind observing two different teachers interacting with their learners is to gain more information about teachers’ discourse. The way they stimulate their students to speak more and the strategies they adopt to arrange peer interaction and collaboration inside their classes. On the other hand, it is believe that fact of being present with two different groups who are taught by different teachers would help in seeing whether interaction differs from one group to another. And if it does, what are the parameters determining learners’ interaction inside classroom?
On the topic of the population involved in this piece of research, third year English LMD system learners are selected. They are hypothesized to be mature enough in terms of their oral performance since they have been exposed mainly to English as the language of their learning process in university. That is, English language is the language through which third year students learn about content modules as civilization, literatures, ESP…etc. Concurrently, it is the language used to acquire knowledge related to language forms as grammar, phonetics, written expression…etc. That is why we are captivated to conduct the study with third year learners. The focal tendency is to observe how the process of interaction takes place among the whole participants who are about to graduate from university. Luckily, third year English teachers of oral expression module and students as well welcomed the proposition to conduct this study with them.

The two groups selected to be surveyed are not very big in terms of size for they were about twenty five students in each group. It is noteworthy to mention that almost all of them were girls because there was just a single male in each group. Gender, in truth, is not a concern of CA researchers. Moreover, oral expression module is not taught in ordinary classroom, but in laboratories where every student is sitting in front of a PC and has a headphone that s/he makes use of when necessary. Students then are sat in vertical and horizontal rows, where they are all in front of the board and the podium.

The timing allocated for OE module is actually three hours per week, taught twice a week. That is, half an hour per session. In fact, all along the attendance of the courses, it was remarked that teachers of OE module in Jijel English Department expose their learners to listen to short dialogues, conversations including new English idiomatic expressions and phrasal verbs. Then they explain them to their learners and then set them to make use of the new acquired expressions in meaningful examples. By the end, the teacher assigns tasks to his students. Tasks are individual or pair works. In fact, the objective of these tasks
is to let students practise the new acquired expressions in dialogues and conversations. The teacher might invite students to get to the podium so as to expose their works. This is, in general, the ritual that teachers in that department teach oral expression module. Occasionally; the teacher suggests a given topic to be discussed in classroom, then he asks for the outlook of students and welcomes them to exchange ideas throughout holding classroom debates.

3.2.2. Implemented Materials

The nature of the study, the necessity of making part of some lessons and the observation of participants imply the use of a camcorder; a simple ‘Sony’ camera is used to perform the action of recording. Before starting to record data, the permission was asked for to attend one session at least without bringing the camcorder so as not to shock students and avoid making them feel panic and uncomfortable. Indeed, this is what really took place with the accord of both teachers, whom in their turn asked for students’ acceptance. Fortunately, students welcomed and more than expected our presence with them. It is worthy to clarify that the target behind attending a session without filming is to give the participants in the classroom setting; teachers and students as well, an idea about one’s intention in conducting the study. In fact, throughout observation, the study seeks to examine the course of classroom interaction. Nonetheless, the type of observation opted for is to be passive participant, that is to say, observer as an outsider. It is preferred that the presence of the researcher in such types of inquiry is to be passive so as to avoid being unobtrusive as much as possible without interacting with the participants. In effect, it is clear that the presence of the analyst as an observer is likely to distort the nature scene of the classroom events. That is why we try to work to minimize as much as possible the feeling of uneasiness that could rise among classroom participants. This can be achieved throughout attending a lecture with them without using the camcorder and by introducing
ourselves in a very soft way in the sense that both teachers explain to them the necessity of being with them.

One of the most valuable advantages that classroom researchers gain from observation is that they can have clear hints about classroom setting. Additionally, it gives them more access to the context surrounding language teaching. In attending two sessions before starting to film, it was possible at least to perceive the population being observed: teachers and learners. Additionally classroom observation is considered to be advantageous for remarks about matters related to classroom setting can be caught. The use of a camcorder is indispensable for in selecting CA to explore classroom discourse there is no better used medium than a videotaping to have the chance of examining for several times the utterances produced. After all, these utterances embody classroom oral interaction.

After giving an overview about the context as well as the population targeted in this study, what follows gives a short account about the way data are collected.

3.2.3. Data Collection Procedures

The data of the dissertation in hand complies of two questionnaires to reinforce the got data from the videotapes; for, indeed, questionnaires are reliable tools that facilitate the process of analysis.

3.2.3.1. Teachers’ Questionnaire

In actual fact, it is advantageous to use questionnaires for both teachers and learners. In administering and distributing questionnaires to all teachers of OE module in Jijel English Department, not merely those of third year, attempting to ask some questions related to the way they teach oral expression module. Moreover, the study also strives to enquire about teachers’ attitudes towards the teaching of that module. Questionnaires also solicit them to answer questions related to their students’ oral interaction in classroom, topics dealt with during sessions...etc.
3.2.3.2. Learners’ Questionnaire

All third year students were handed out questionnaires, not merely the two groups observed. Questions associated with students’ attitudes regarding the process of learning in oral expression module were taken up, the way of interacting with their teacher and their opinion about the teaching of this module. The questionnaire also aimed at knowing students’ perspective about the strategy of arranging discussions, conversations and topics tackled during OE sessions. Moreover, the questionnaire also invited them to say their minds on the method their teacher adopt to interact with them.

It is noteworthy to mention that the restricted or closed form item questionnaire is implemented as a tool of data collected from both teachers and learners. The restricted or the structured form questionnaires are believed to help better in the analysis of data than open format ones. The former type of questionnaire also improves the reliability and consistency of the data.

The selection of questionnaire as a tool of the research in question is for the sake of having some preliminary information from the population targeted in this study. Then their answers are later on put into question and verification. That is to say, before starting the observational phase, it was attempted to address some questions to both teachers and students related to the topic of interaction in OE module. Hence, to check the validity of the answers given, the camcorder is used to film and catch every single event happening in classroom. Doing so, in fact, is more reliable than depending merely on notes taking.

So far, the chapter puts in plain words the tools relied on in this dissertation: handed out questionnaires and observation achieved throughout filming. In effect, the overall attended sessions were five: two of them without being recorded, and in which notes on the setting and participants were taken down. The three other sessions are recorded. It was hoped, in fact, to get four recorded sessions; two from each teacher. Yet,
two sessions with a teacher was picked out, whereas a single one was filmed with the other teacher.

3.2.4. Data Analysis Procedures

Before starting the analysis of data, it is required to interpret the answers got from both teachers’ and learners’ questionnaires and then give a rough idea about the parameters exercised in the study of classroom discourse. This would permit getting a well-organized way of analysis. The parameters of investigation were not selected randomly; they are rather derived from the literature read and gone through in the theoretical part of the dissertation. So as to have a detailed description of classroom discourse, the chapter starts by going through firstly teacher’s discourse and then move on to tackle learners’ one. In doing so, the analysis of the corpus would be lucid.

It is worth to elucidate to the readers of the dissertation in hand that the concern of the study is not to prescribe how teachers’ discourse ought to be. It is rather to describe it as it is in its real immediate and natural context. Thus, the observation is on issues related to TT as exposed in the previous chapters. That is, observation deals with elicitation techniques used by the teacher more precisely questions and feedback, with all their forms. It also tackles the way teacher addresses repair to his learners’ errors. Once the analysis of TT is performed throughout investigating their questions and feedback, light is shed then on LL in the course of interaction. To be organized in the study of learners’ language, the analysis tackles the latter using two parameters: turn taking system and adjacency pairs. Thus, the coming section is to be subdivided into two parts. In the first part, questionnaires are interpreted. Then in the second part, analysis of teacher’s discourse and learners’ language is provided. Yet, it should be clarified that the analysis is to deal with the discourse generated by both teachers observed in classroom setting. One of them is named teacher (A) and the second one is identified as teacher (B) so as to facilitate for the reader
of the work having deeper insight about their discourse, its patterns and interpretation as well.

3.2.4.1. Discussion of Findings in Learners’ Questionnaire

In fact, seventy five questionnaires were handed out to third year English language students who are specialized in SL (Science du Language). By the end, we could get a total of sixty four questionnaires back. As stated earlier, the intention of the study in using a questionnaire in data collection is to see whether the yielded information provided by students would correspond to the real context in classroom with its immediate events or not.

The first question addressed to students was to know whether they appreciated attending oral expression module sessions, fifty five among sixty four; that is a percentage of 85% answered they did while nine (14%) said they did not. Indeed, learners’ motivation is one of the factors deciding for their willingness to take part in classroom. The number of students who responded positively indicates that students did appreciate attending oral expression class. As concerns the second question which was about how students feel during their presence in OE sessions, forty four among sixty four (68%) said that they felt so comfortable and self confident to speak and communicate. Seventeen (26%) reckoned that they felt shy and reluctant to express their minds about what was said in classroom, three of them (4%) acknowledged that they felt so bored and were not interested in what was stated. So, it is very evident that the majority of learners claimed feeling at ease while communicating. Definitely, this helps enhancing their sense of relaxation and decreasing their affective filter and when this happens, learners would take more risks to speak. The third question which was a closed one, students were asked if they were given the chance to suggest topics of discussion or not, thirty four (53%) have opted for the ‘yes’ answer, twenty eight (43%) answered no, while two (3%) did not provide any answer to the
question. What is remarkable here is that students’ answers are close, yet the majority admitted that their teachers give them the chance of opting for given topics to be negotiated in class. Undoubtedly, when learners are interested in topics that correspond with their needs, they will be provoked more to speak. Thus, if topics are not motivating, they will withdraw gradually from conversations and keep silent. As far as the fourth question is concerned, we wanted to know if teachers give the opportunity for their students to express their view points. In fact, thirty four students (53%) claimed that their teacher did so all the time, eighteen of them (28%) declared that their teacher often permitted for them to express their minds freely, eleven (17%) stated that this happened sometimes and merely a student (1%) replied that his teacher never gave him that chance. As a matter of fact, to be free in expressing their minds and not inhibited will definitely affect learners’ attitudes positively. Putting it differently, when teachers respect their learners’ viewpoints and not impose theirs on them, learners would recognize that their opinions are worth and would not hesitate to take part in the processed discourse.

The answers got from the fifth question, in which we asked learners how they reacted in case they disagreed with their teacher’s perspective: forty six students among sixty four (71%) answered that they tried to negotiate with him so as to clarify their opinion and convince him. Sixteen students (25%) replied that in cases where this took place, they just kept silent and listened to him, while the two other students (3%) did not respond. The fact of having seventy one percent admitting they strived to express their opinions to convince their teacher is a positive thing. It is regarded so in the sense that students will automatically go through an interactional procedure. The sixth asked question attempted to see students’ opinions about the way topics were discussed during OE module. Forty eight students (75%) said they did, while sixteen (25%) admitted they did not like the way topics were negotiated. In asking this question it was attempted to know
their perspectives regarding topics negotiated during classes, for the selection of topics is imperative in arousing their curiosity to speak. Indeed, teachers should not expect students to take turns and compete to interact if the way of exposing topics does not appeal to their needs and interest. In the seventh question students were requested to clarify whether their teacher took control of the discussion. Surprisingly fifty five of them (86%) selected ‘yes’ as an answer, eight replied by ‘no’ (13%) and a single student (1%) did not tick on any box. Having a percentage of eighty six out of one hundred percent is, indeed, a considerable rate. Students are, then, conscious about the fact that their teachers control classroom discourse. Yet, this may affect badly the course of their interaction for they recognize that their chance of persisting in speaking is after all controlled by their teacher. Subsequently, this may lead to their withdrawal and disinclination in interacting. In question eight, we wanted to know if learners were given the chance to comment on their peers’ contributions. Sixty of them (94%) answered by ‘yes’, two answered ‘no’ (3%) and two students provided no answer (3%). In regards to the got positive answers, the majority of learners claimed that teachers authorize them to intervene to express opinions about other peers’ statements. And if this is true, interaction would certainly be reinforced among peers and classroom would be an inspiring environment for discussion. As far as the ninth question is concerned, students were asked what their teacher did in case a student made a grammar or a pronunciation mistake. Thirty seven among sixty four (58%) admitted that the teacher stopped him immediately and corrected the committed error. Twenty (31%) said that the teacher let the student carry on his speech and then provided a correction for the mistake, while four (6%) claimed that the teacher neither interrupted the student, nor corrected for him and three (4%) of them refused to provide an answer. In fact, the results speak for themselves; the majority of students stated that immediate repair about mispronunciation was offered by their teachers. Other students reported that repair was
delayed. Deciding about correcting students’ errors is, by no room of discussion, a crucial decision to be taken from teachers, as it may boost or shrink the route of interaction.

Question ten was targeted to know whether learners used to engage with their peers in dialogues and conversations or not. Forty seven among sixty four (74%) ticked on the ‘yes’ box, while seventeen (26%) ticked on the ‘no’ one. Again, learners’ responses were positive concerning the issue of getting involved in dialogues with peers. Hence, in case this really corresponds to the actual events in classroom, learners are stated to benefit greatly from their collaboration together to construct classroom discourse. They would benefit from this type of interaction throughout getting more confidence and learning from one another as it has already been exposed in the second chapter. With regards to question eleven, it was directed to recognize students’ perspective about the value of oral communication during OE classes. Twenty eight learners among sixty four (43%) considered that the latter is worthy in enhancing self-confidence. Four of them (6%) thought that oral communication is not necessary, while thirty eight (59%) of them stated that it developed their English language proficiency. It is true that the gotten percentage from that question is not precise for there were some students who selected two answers. Most students opted for the first and the third choices for their answers, whereas very few of them selected the second answer. This means that, in general, third year learners value and recognize that participation has positive effects, thinking that it increases their self confidence and oral skills. Question twelve addressed to students was aimed at knowing their opinions regarding their teacher’s way of teaching OE module. Indeed, sixteen among sixty four (25%) believed that their teacher was teaching in a traditional way since he spoke more than they did, whereas the rest forty eight (75%) saw that he was teaching in a cooperative way for he invited all of them to take part in classroom discussions. Getting seventy five percent as a response to this question is surprising for it does not conform to
the result yielded from the seventh question, in which we asked students whether their teachers take control of classroom discourse, 86% said they believed so. That is to say, on the one hand 86% of them viewed that teachers took control of discourse and on the other hand 75% reckoned that their teacher was teaching in a cooperative way for he asked them all the time to share ideas. Nevertheless, there is a kind of contradiction in their responses, for teachers cannot teach in a cooperative way and at the same time take control of the classroom. The thirteenth question aims at knowing how students considered topics discussed. Students had three choices to select, twenty five of them (39%) answered that they found them very interesting and stimulating to interact. Thirty seven students (57%) viewed that they are ordinary topics, the rest two students (3%) reckoned that they were boring and did not provoke them to speak. According to the results derived from this question, the majority of students considered the discussed topics ordinary and acceptable. In actual fact, this question was targeted to see whether students are interested in issues exposed during OE classes. Definitely, the more topics are inspiring, the more interactive students will be. In the penultimate question inserted in questionnaires, students were requested to tell about their reaction when one of their peers took part in expressing his opinion about a given issue. Forty seven of a total of sixty four students (73%) answered they felt willing and encouraged to exchange ideas with him, eight of them (12%) admitted that they did not enjoy sharing and taking part in the conversation while nine of them (14%) stated that they wanted to express their opinions but they felt shy and afraid to say what they thought. In having a big number of students claiming that they appreciated exchanging ideas with their teacher is an ambitious fact. Accordingly, we expect that OE class is an environment where a great number of students compete to take turns. At last but not least, in the fifteenth question, learners were asked if they felt ready to engage with a native English language speaker or not. Thirty three among sixty four said ‘yes’ (51%)
while twenty four (37%) selected ‘no’ as an answer and the rest seven students (11%) did not tick in any box. In view of these results, more than half students admitted that they were ready enough to talk to a NS. This reveals that they felt quite self-assured and ready to do so. (Learners’ questionnaire is inserted in appendixes section. Appendix 5)

So far, this chapter has gone through learners’ questionnaire and its interpretation to make use of the result in the final analysis of findings. The focus now is to be directed to cover teachers’ questionnaires and interpret their answers so as to see the correlation between their answers and their actual behaviours in classroom. In brief, this helps in coming closer to the tiny details which are considered essential in boosting beneficial interaction.

3.2.4.2. Discussion of Findings in Teachers’ Questionnaire

As far as teacher’s questionnaire is concerned, eighteen questions were posed and answered by six teachers. The first question raised was to know if they had ever been teachers of this module. Five among six said they did while one stated that he never experienced being a teacher of OE. This question, in fact, is a decisive one for it is expected that the more teachers are experienced in teaching this module, the more insight they would have about the strategies of getting learners engaged in classroom interaction and negotiation of meaning process. The second question was about teachers’ attitudes towards teaching this subject. More precisely, teachers were requested to say to what extent they liked being teachers of oral expression. All of them confirmed they did very much. Again, it is an imperative question, for the more teachers appreciate the subject they are teaching, the more they strive to succeed in it and do their best to make classroom setting a stimulating environment which incites students to interact. The third question, which was subdivided into three parts, was asked to know teachers’ perspective about the different types of interaction (interaction of students with their peers, with them as teachers
and with the input material). A single teacher among six viewed that interaction with the teacher is very important, four among six considered it important and the last one believed that it is less important. None opted for the option of ‘not important’. According to these results, it is evident that teachers are conscious of the value of teachers’ interaction with learners. As far as interaction with peers is concerned, two teachers reckoned that it is very important. Two of them declared that it is important and the last two considered it less important, and no one of them opted for the option of ‘not important’. The third and the last part of question four, four teachers among six believed that learners’ interaction with input materials is very important, while the other two teachers claimed that it is important. No teacher considered this type of interaction less or not important. Agreeing on the importance of students’ interaction with the selected exposed input denotes that teachers are aware that one of the things determining the amount of learners’ interaction is the input to which they are exposed. Putting it more concretely, the more input is stimulating and conforming to students’ needs, the more interactive they are. In fact, the fourth question is a revealing one for it requested teachers to give their opinion about the status of students in class. The question was a closed one; teachers were supposed to say whether their learners are passive and reluctant in communicating and expressing their minds or not. Five among six teachers ticked on the box of ‘no’, while one considered his students reluctant. In the fifth question, we asked teachers to tick on the box they saw appropriate to say to what extent they tried to involve their students in conversations and dialogues. Four of them ticked on all the time (in every session) box, two of them selected ‘often’ as an answer. No teacher ticked on ‘sometimes’ and ‘never’ boxes. Hence, according to the answers given by teachers means that they recognized that dragging learners into dialogues and conversation is of paramount importance to develop their students’ interactional and communicative competencies.
With reference to the sixth question, teachers were requested to say whether they try to stimulate and encourage shy students to interact and speak in their classes or not. All of them replied positively by choosing the answer ‘yes’. This means that all teachers claimed to strive for making the timid learners take part in conversations. Hence, there is no room of discussion that this fact is imperative to help them getting rid of their shyness and taking initiative and turns to speak. For the more they do the more they will engage in negotiation of meaning process. The seventh question inserted in the questionnaire has to do with the extent teachers paved the way for their learners to learn cooperatively in their classes. The question was to know if they favoured their learners to comment on their peers’ output or not. One of them acknowledged that he did not whereas the rest fifth chose ‘yes ‘as an answer. Consistent with their answers, and if this is what really occurs in their classes means that interaction is not a monotonous and a dull process that goes on always in a dyadic form (between the teacher and learners). But it can be in cooperative way, in the sense that learners are given the chance to comment, offer feedback, criticize and praise other peers’ contributions. It goes without saying that whenever cooperation really takes place in any classroom context in which oral communication is the target to be achieved, a stimulating environment will be established. An environment which provokes learners to speak more, take more turns and risks expressing their minds using the TL. In fact, the intention behind asking the eighth question was to see how teachers considered themselves when a discussion is held. They were asked if they had ever intervened when learners were discussing, debating and arguing together. All the sixth teachers ticked on ‘yes’ box. As exposed in the previous chapter, it is the teacher’s conception about his role in classroom that determines the way he takes part in the classroom discourse construction. Saying it otherwise, the more teachers view themselves as the only source of information, the more they will control classroom discourse. Yet, if they view themselves as partners
and facilitators, they will pave the way for their student to learn from each other. Throughout addressing question nine, we wanted to know if it was always the same students who interact in classroom in class or not. Three teachers have said ‘yes’ while the other three answered by ‘no’. The attempt behind asking that question was to see whether teachers are aware of the fact that some students tend to speak more than others or not.

Question ten, indeed, demanded teachers to self-evaluate their attitudes towards the task of teaching OE. The question asked was directed to know if they had ever felt they were controlling CD and giving less chance of speaking to their learners. Two teachers among six acknowledged they did, whereas the other fourth denied it. With reference to the eleventh question, teachers were solicited to inform us about who proposed topics dealt with in oral expression class. A teacher said it was his students who did, while four of them said sometimes they did and other times it was their students. Indeed, two teachers ticked on two boxes. One of them said it was his students and other times it was him as the teacher. The second teacher said it was him and other times it was either him or his students. This question is a revealing one, for there is no room of discussion, that the type of topics suggested in OE class contribute in stimulating or inhibiting learners’ output. In addressing that question, we noticed that it was only a teacher who said he gave his students to select topics to be negotiated. Questions twelve has to do with the type of materials learners are exposed to as input. Some teachers chose two answers among three. For a better explanation, five teachers said they used oral materials, two others stated that they made use of written materials; two others replied they relied on audiovisual and visual materials. The thirteenth question was about the type of tasks teacher assigned to heir learners. Four teachers told us they relied on pair works, while the fifth stated he gave them small projects and group and individual works. The last teacher ticked on the three boxes that are small projects, pair works and individual works. In actual fact, this question
targeted to know whether teachers set their learners to perform tasks that might well enhance learners’ interaction with their peers or not. The fourteenth asked question was associated with feedback for teachers were asked what the most important thing was for them meanwhile their learners present their works in front of the whole class. The sixth teachers answered that they prioritized oral communication fluency as pronunciation and no one of them gave importance to grammar correctness and creativity. So, it is quite evident that teachers stress on language fluency instead of creativity, and grammar mistakes. Yet, in the section in which the study deals with feedback, it was reckoned that teachers’ over correction of pronunciation may lead to communication breakdown.

The fifteenth question inserted in teacher’s questionnaire required teachers to tell about their feeling about the way they taught OE module. Two of them said that they felt satisfied and convinced. Three replied that they felt willing to change the way they proceeded their lessons and a single teacher opted for ‘never satisfied’ as a response to this question. In fact, it is worth noting that teaching OE module is by far a demanding task for it is not easy to engage students always in conversations and keep the course of interaction going on. Thus, as some teachers emphasized that getting satisfaction is not that easy. In the sixteenth question teachers were requested to tell about their learners’ attitudes towards the attendance of their classes. All teachers said that they felt their students willing to attend this class. It is crystal clear that when students feel fascinated and interested in attending it, this motivation, especially if it is well-exploited by teachers, would certainly create a suitable environment to interact and speak. Question seventeen was about CD, teachers were asked if they had an idea about it all the six teachers ticked on ‘yes’. In saying that they knew about CD, this implies that teachers are acquainted with the mechanisms of classroom interaction and they are familiar with TT and LL. If it is the case, teachers will manage adequately their class to optimize interaction owing to their
knowledge about CD compared to those who do not. To end with teacher’s questionnaire, the last question requested teachers to add comments, opinions or suggestions. Three of the six teachers preferred not to insert anything in the blank left, while three of them did. The first teacher said that teaching students to think in English would help in making them spontaneous. What we could get from this comment is that the more learners are familiar with English language with its holistic system; the syntactic, the pragmatic, the phonological one, the less difficult they would find in interacting. The second teacher wrote “as a matter of fact, oral expression is a very interesting module to teach and it is by no means so unless there is an interaction between the teacher and students and among students themselves. Other factors are included as well.” According to the comment noted, the teacher is quite aware that interaction is not merely restricted to the teacher and students, for he added interaction among learners themselves. He also acknowledged that there are other factors determining classroom interaction. The third teacher said:’ creativity plays a key role as well. I have noticed that creative students exhibit better oral communicational skills than less creative students.’ According to his comment, creativity is another factor determining the quality of interaction, in the sense that creative learners are more interactants than others who are not. Yet, the term creativity here is an ambiguous one, for creativity might be in the use of language as it may also be in ideas or performance in role plays.

3.2. 5. Analyzing Teacher Talk

In what follows, an analysis of components compiling TT is provided to enable us understand its effect on the interactional course. As stated beforehand, two parameters are used to study TT; questions and feedback. Some excerpts are presented to explicate the analysis, starting by coming closer to questions and then feedback.
3.2.5.1. Questions

Before starting to analyze teacher (A) questions, it is highly important to remind again the readers of the dissertation that during the two attended sessions, the teacher was dealing with a PDF book named: “All Clear”. It is about the use of idiomatic expressions since this is the actual ritual of teaching OE class to third year students. At the onset of the session recorded, the teacher asked them to have a look on the page shown on the screen of their PCs. Students have already seen it in the previous session. So, the teacher asked students to remind him about its content. Then a student took the floor to answer that it was about an interview between a hopeless man and a reporter. In doing so, the teacher tried to remind them about the topic of the dialogue. Then, he addressed a question to his student. In fact, it was a display question; that is a question whose answer is already known to him. This is clearly evident in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 1.1

1. T: so, you said that how did you know that it’s really a hopeless man? because of =
2. LL: because (2)
3. T: yes.
4. L1: because of the way he looks.
5. T: OK the way he looks.
7. T: his clothes?
8. L3: expression of his face.
9. T: expressions [
10. LL: facial expressions]
11. T: facial expression ok? or expressions as you like (.) then? (3.0)
12. LL: facial expressions.
13. T: facial expressions. OK?
Just after that he asked them to examine the expressions already used in the interview. They were written in bold type below the picture, and then he asked them to try to guess their meaning without using dictionaries. Students started to guess, after being given eight minutes, and jot down notes on their notebooks. Then the teacher addressed a display question, but at the same time it can be considered as an open one since several answers can be given to it.

**Excerpt 1.2.**

1. T: ↓let’s begin↓OK, who wants to tell me what IS the first idiomatic expression? and then the meaning ok, so number one yes please?
2. L1: The neck of the woods.
3. T: ah what kind of say (.) meaning would you give to such an expression?
4. L1: I understand it as a miserable area.
5. T: OK, the others?
6. T: Yes
7. L2: This place.
8. T: This place.
10. T: an unpleasant place.
11. L4: empty place.
12. T: empty place.
13. L5: an isolated area.
15. L6: the area where he lives.
16. T: the area where he lives.
17. L7: we are not expected to be here.
18. T: we are not expected to be here. someone else? are there any other explanations?

   yes (.) that’s all? ok. well we will see afterwards ok?

   As far as excerpt 1.1 is concerned, it is very apparent that the teacher made use of a display question since the answer is already known to him. In asking that question, the teacher could get very short answers from the part of his learners, as it is obvious in the
extract, such as “because of the way he looks” in the move in lines (5,7, 9,11, 15)” His clothes”, “facial expressions”…etc. The nature of this asked question did not provoke students to generate longer utterances. With reference to excerpt 2, the same type of question was directed to learners; that is a display question too. Because the teacher asked his learners to give the meaning they grasp from the given idiomatic expression. It is also very plain that learners’ answers were considerably concise; composed of not more than a single utterance. It is considered that this is so due to the type of question addressed by the teacher. Saying it otherwise, students’ oral contribution was so limited as a result of teacher’s question which is a display one and does not stimulate further oral interaction.

Afterward asking his students about the meaning they got from the given idiomatic expressions, he collected their answers and then asked them to confirm their given answers throughout reading the exposed dialogues on the screen of their PCs. Then he set two groups, each composed of two students to play out the dialogue. Just after this, the teacher exposed learners to another exercise in which the previous expressions were explained. All along this, he asked them to correct their previously given answers. Each idiomatic expression was used in a very short dialogue whose meaning is deduced from the context provided. Once they figure out the correct meaning; the teacher requested them to write similar examples in which they made use of the new acquired expressions. The following excerpt illustrates the way he demanded learners to give examples.

**Excerpt 1.3.**

1. T: ok, the second meaning is? (.)
2. LL: to continue.
3. T: would you please give me an example about the (3.0) just very short
   s::xy example about how to (2.5) we generally (3 ) one
   continues to live by hh (9.0).
   this is said maybe maybe said about dead PEOPLE. OK[
4. LL: yes
5. T: yes ((to nominate a student to answer)). do you have an example?
6. L1: de Saussures’ theories has lived on for centuries.
7. T: yes, ok. Someone else?
8. L2: michael jackson is dead but because of his music° he will live on°.
9. T: ok. because of his music he will live on ok. so because of his music michael jackson is going live on.

As it is very apparent in Excerpt 1.3 the teacher asked his learners to write very short examples in which they drew on the newly acquired expression ‘live on’. Thus, students provided very short sentences as requested by their teacher. So, what is remarkable then is that learners’ oral contribution is relatively correlated to the type of question solicited by the teacher. That is, they had been requested to give short sentences and they did so.

As a matter of fact, the selection of the following piece of classroom talk is intended to demonstrate that the only question asked by the end of this extract was also a display question. When asking them to nominate how they call the situation where people make false opinions on other, it is remarked that he did not even give them the floor to answer. He rather provided directly the answer after asking the question as it is apparent in the move in line 17.

Excerpt 1.4.
1. L1: some people think that people in my native country speak more than they work, but they are dead wrong.
2. LL: ((laughter))
3. T: yes.
4. L2: Sometimes it a
5. T: . hh yes, please and then I’ll go to you.
6. L3: some people think that people in my native country are illiterate and uneducated but they are dead wrong.
7. T: dead wrong (4.2) these are(¸)
9. L3: I don’t know which one, but they think that we are illiterate, we don’t have houses [ 
10. LL: ((learners talk together))]
11. T: so many things, so many things yes (falling down intonation)
12. LL4: especially we are not civilized.
13. T: yes yes yes
14. L5: The notion of living in Africa.
15. LL: yeah (.) yes.
16. L3: we are still living on camels
17. T: [what do we call this in english when someone (2.6) for example
   thinks something about someone he doesn’t know. this is a PREJ
19. T: prejudice yes
   prejudice OK.

Moreover, it is noticed that learners were not given the sufficient time to express themselves freely. That is to say, every student nominated to answer was given very limited time to interact. Or when starting to generate longer statements, s/he is interrupted by either the teacher or other students as the excerpt exemplifies.

In chapter two, the types of questions generally asked by SLA/FL teachers in a TL classroom context are exposed. It has been said then that it is the type of the teacher’s addressed question which determines the quality as well as the quantity of learners’ oral discourse. Hence, in the following extract it is perceived that teacher's directed question stimulated them greatly to speak and interact, to the extent that almost all of them wanted to take the floor. In fact, learners were assigned to make use of the expression ‘dead wrong’ into meaningful examples.

**Excerpt 1.5.**

1. L1: some people think that wo ((hesitation)) women are obliged to put on the veils but they are dead wrong.
2. T: they are dead wrong. what do you think?
3.L1: yes.
4.T: some people think that women are obliged to put on the veil.
5.L2: no.
6.T: they are totally or (4.3) wrong.
7.L2: she is totally (here)
8.LL: she is dead wrong ((laughter))
9.L3: she is dead wrong.
10.L4: yeah.
11.L4: she is dead wrong not the people.
12.T: she is wrong not the people.
13.L1: how? ((laughter))
14.T: heh?
15. LL: ((talking together))
16. L5: they are dead wrong.
17.T: ((coughing))
18.T: they are dead wrong?
19.L1: you are not obliged to put on the veil?
20.LL6: absolutely.
21.LL: no.
22. T: you are not obliged?
23. L5: no.
24.L1: I’m speaking about the European communities. [
25.LL: communities.
26.L1: that think that ((hesitation)) womens are (4.4) obliged to put the veils.
   that is why they (2.0) they are trying to
27.T: don’t you think that women are obliged to put [?
28.LL: of course.
   yeah
   yes (( students talked together))
29. T:] In our religion, yes OF COURSE (emphasize)
   you are obliged to put the (overlap)
30.L1: but I ((hesitation)) my parents don’t oblige me to put the[?
31.LL: but you have to put
32. T: yes?
33. L1: yes, I have I have to put ((laughter))
34. T: ok
35. T: ((coughing))

now ? things are clear things are clear
Let’s move to the second one before.

What could be observed in examining the preceding given extract is that almost all students were willing to express their minds and to interact. Surprisingly, this question rose learners’ motivation to speak. The query was so inspiring that students talked together and everyone wanted to be given the turn to answer and comment on students’ examples. Yet, the moves in the excerpt show that at each time a student started to interact verbally and generate longer sentences, s/he is overlapped by other students or by the teacher himself. Indeed; this prevents him/her from composing longer sentences to explain plainly his/her view.

From the start to finish, it is evident that almost all questions asked by the teacher were display ones, in the sense that he wanted to check his learners’ understanding about the given idiomatic expressions. In doing so, it is something justified for the pedagogical objective of the task implies such type of questions. Then he proceeded in asking his questions with the same way. That is, he addressed to them a display question to verify their comprehension of every single expression. And then he asked them to make use of it into meaningful utterances. Therefore, on the one hand, the oral performance of his students was, somehow, limited and not enough in terms of quantity and even quality if compared with what they are supposed to do as third year students. On the other hand, classroom interaction was held in a mechanical way; addressing a question, and then nominating a learner to answer. Yet; it is worth emphasizing here that when it is said it is mechanical does not mean that teacher-learner interaction falls on the IRF/IRE moves for
it was observed that other learners took the floor to evaluate their peers from time to time. This led to the generation of a kind of classroom interaction among learners: learner-learner. Putting it differently, interaction was not all the time strictly bound between the teacher and learners.

It is important to draw readers’ attention that in the cases where the teacher opted for the use of open questions, which allow for opinion, speculation and the putting up of arguments, he could have more students willing to interact orally. This is the case of the question asked in the last excerpt; all learners then were very enthusiastic to go on in their answers. To be more precise, it is deduced from the analysis, that when asked display questions, students’ generated discourse was considerably too brief and sentences were so simple in terms of their linguistics structure and the vocabulary items used. Hence, when asked an open and referential question, their utterances were longer and their insistence to elucidate their opinion was more emphatic.

Thus far, the analysis looked through the types of questions, generally, used by teacher (A), discussion is to deal with teacher’s (B) questions, as clarified at the start of this section. Indeed, including another teacher’s questions is to have a broader insight on the types as well as the way questions are asked in classrooms, for the importance of the latter in determining classroom interaction.

As a matter of fact, before going through the analysis of teacher’s (B) questions, it is important to jog the memory of the dissertation’ readers that we had the chance to make a recording of two sessions with him. In doing so, we could have a varied insight about his talk compared with teacher’s (A) one. As we could also have the opportunity of obtaining more data about his discourse as well as learners’ one. During the two sessions attended with teacher (B), it was noticed that like teacher (A), teacher (B) is relying on the ‘All Clear’ book to teach oral expression subject. As regards the first session, he initiated the
session by setting his students to listen to a dialogue using their headphones and then answer listening comprehension questions. In fact, they were ‘yes/no questions’; which are classified as closed questions. Just after that, he collected answers from them, each student was giving his answer was supposed to justify his choice. Once the teacher collected the answers he set three groups to play out the dialogue. The thing that really caught one’s attention is the fact that it was the teacher who took the floor to explain the idiomatic expressions available in the dialogue such as: ‘bored to death, spark out, buckle down, be on the edge of something and fool around’...etc. We observed that at each time a new idiomatic expression was introduced, the teacher asked learners about the meaning. Yet, he immediately answers himself rather than educing the meaning from them. The following excerpt explains better what was formerly mentioned.

**Excerpt 1.6.**

1. T: I BUCKLED (2)
2. LL: buckle down
3. T: DOWN so I buckled down look if you want to look for this meaning it’s better to begin with I buckled? up Ok
   (5.2)
   so I buckled up ((hesitation)) i::::t has to do with the literal meaning of what. hh fastening[
4. L1: your belt]
5. T: your belt when you are (2.2) in a –
6. LL: car
7. T: car for example[
8. LL: yes]
9. T: and THEN the other meanings buckle down [
10. LL2: ( )
11. T: it’s almost ? close to it
12. L2: that
13. T: but here it means not because you are travelling but because you want to WORK
you want to do something seriously RIGHT so when we say
I buckle down means
what? I ( ) things
14. LL: seriously
15.T: seriously.

From the extract above, it is noted that the teacher addressed no question to his students. He took the floor to explain the meaning of the idiomatic expression without involving them in the process of meaning negotiation. That is, in this piece of talk the teacher did not ask any question, he just started to clarify the expression as explained in the move in line 3. And when even one of his students (L1) seemed knowing its meaning and tried to take the turn to give her explanation in line 4, she was not given the turn to do so. The teacher was just going on explaining without trying to engage students in an interactional process as it is evident in lines 5, 7, 9, 11 and 13. Students were not dragged out into the process of meaning negotiation with their teacher; for as it is apparent from the excerpt, the latter monopolized and took control of the discourse.

Once the teacher finished clarifying the meaning of the idiomatic expression, he asked them a question selected from the exercise. The question targeted to stimulate learners to practise the newly learnt expression throughout using them into meaningful examples of their own. The first expression learners were assigned to exercise was ‘bored to death’. The teacher proposed some situations to students and then gave them seven minutes to perform the task. Later then, he selected some students to read their examples. In the following excerpt; we were attracted by the way teacher and students interacted together. For, contrariwise to what it was observed during the opening of the session, there was a more interactional intention from both parts. i.e. students and teacher.

**Excerpt 1.7.**

1. T: Ok we said that the idiom the idiom bored to death.
can be used to express the ( ) in different situations?

2. LL: yes

3. T: among the situations is a Movie

4. T: yes what’s the example.

(6.0)

5. T: yes please ((giving the turn for a student to speak))

6. L1: I have been bored to death when I was watching a movie what a sorry.

   its end was not interesting and the players were not famous ones

   the a.hh ((hesitation)) the actors [

7. L2: the actors

8. T: the actors were?

9. LL; were not famous ones]

10. L1: were not famous one

11. T: were not famous one.

   what does it mean.

   does it mean that when ((hesitation)) you have to watch—

12. L2: not necessarily ((laugh)

13. T: because of that? the actors in them?


15. T: HAVE you ever experienced the fact that a film°is boring°

   (3.0)

16. T: and what happened.who has—

17. L2: change the channel

18. L3: change the channel

19. LL: change the channel

20. T: You change

21. LL: ((speak together)) ( )

22. T: so now you[

23. LL: ((speak together)) ( )

24. T: now you have alternatives [

25. LL: ((speak together)) ( ]

26. T: yes because you have alternatives

27. L2: you ((hesitation)) your brother wants to to[
28. L4: yes you *are obliged*]
29. L2: your brother wants to[  
30. L4: you feel obliged]
31. L2: he wants continue watching the movie.[  
32. T: Yes what are the signs of a boring movie (falling down intonation
   (3.0)
   features (guess)
33. L5: the action °movies°  
34.LLs: no ((laughter))
35. L5: I don’t like them  
36. T: so it’s because there are no actions on it.  
37. LLs: ((no talk together laughter))
38. T: what makes makes [  
39. LL: the story  
   the story  
40. T: what makes[  
41. LL: ((   ))]
42. T: what(.)a film *boring*,  
43. LL: the story  
   the film stories the stories  
44. T: yes: (( nominating a student to talk))
45. L6: the story ‘s start[  
46. T: The story.]  
   (3.0)  
47. L6: yes  
48. T: what do you mean by the story ?  
   what are stories that are boring and interesting .  
49. L: laughter  
50. L6: happy stories?  
51. L6: yes laughs  
52. T: So what source o…(interrupted /overlap)  
53. L7: FBI……. (interrupted)  
54.T: ( ) interesting
55. T: yes ((allocating the turn to a student))
56. L8: .hh films that contain suspense
57. T: films °that contain suspense°
58. T: yes certainly because when you say spark the interest usually there are there
      is something that you want to KNOW?[ 
59. LL: Yes]
60. T: to discover[ 
61. LL: to discover]
62.T: there is problem that you want to solve
      so suspense films ((hesitation)) su:::suspenseful films are not boring
      they’re interesting.
63. L9: films where are a lot of ru::: ruins
64. T: lot of ?
65. LL: ruins
66. T: destruction you mean.
67. L9: yes[ 
68. LL: yeah
69. T: I ((hesitation)) call ( ) then
70. LL: ((laughter))
71.T: there is a lot of destruction
      (3.2)
72. T: even if you destroy human beings.or destruction
      of buildings and caps
      ( ) so lots of () so ((hesitation)) ( )
      destruct human beings ( )
      KIDDING?
      a lot of kidding
73. LL: yes
74. T: so does it spark your interest.(2) a film of action
      where human beings are killed
75. L5: maybe it attracts boy’s interest
76. LL: ((laughtet))
77. T: so it does not interest (overlap/ interrupted)
78. L5: girls
79. T: so wh (hesitation)) what does interest a:::a girl.
80. LL: ghosts.
81. LLs: romance
   ((laughter))
82. T: sorry?
83. L2: but I hate romantic stories.
84. LL: ((laughter))
85. T: so romantic stories are not interesting.
86. L2: honestly YES
87. LL: yeah
88. L2: yes they are always boring hh ((hesitation)) the same[ 
89. LL: ((talk together)) scenario
   the same ( ) no
90. T: ok
91. LL: the same …. ( )
92.T: yes, what is interesting to you girls?
93. LL: social life
94. T: what do you mean by social life?
   (2.5) a::: ((hesitation)) real stories?
   not too ( )
95. LL: yes.
96. T: it means sad stories.
97. LL: no
   ( )
98. L5: ( )
99. T: it means the themes ok the themes developed in this film
   yes please (( allocating the turn to the student))
100. L1: I prefer watching films which contains new ideas.
101. T: films which contain new ideas?
    Scientific ones
102. LL: yes
    no ((talk together))
103. T: not necessarily. scientific
104. L10: I prefer legendary films
   (3.0)
105. T: legendary
106. L10: yes
   ()
107. T: films
   So these are not SCIENTIFIC they are only imaginary
   ok like what.
   like (2.0)
108. L10: ( )Harry Potter[
109. T: ( )
   ok so you don’t want to face reality
110. L10: ((laughter))
111. T: good
   Indeed, the excerpt is too long, but when we came to analyze the moves of interaction, we could not divide it up into smaller excerpts. The selection of this excerpt was for the reason that it exemplifies in a good way how the teacher was able to involve a considerable number of students to interact with him. It could not be broken up into smaller pieces of talk because the whole interactional procedure was taking place in the form of a classroom debate not a unidirectional process. The excerpt is characterized by its interactional discourse for many times learners talked together and overlapped each other as it is apparent in lines. 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 41, 88, 89, 102. Along these moves, we could barely pick up their output. In the previous selected extract, ten students have been drawn in the process of negotiation of meaning. When the student was nominated by the teacher to read his/her example, s/he was asked to clarify his/her example. In doing so, the teacher succeeded at making his students generate a longer and a more complex utterance using the TL. In terms of questions addressed to students, eleven ones were asked by the teacher: nine were open questions asked by ‘wh’ words such as why, who and what, while
two questions were closed ones. In line 11 and 15 the teacher asked two closed questions or as they are known ‘yes and no question’. The one in line 11, was answered in a short utterance (not necessarily) as the question implies a short answer. Whereas, the second closed question in line 15 was not answered by students, for the reason that he did not address it to a given student. Besides the fact that he did not give them sufficient time to respond immediately after asking a closed question, he responded to it by himself. With reference to the open questions he addressed to his students, such as the one asked in line 42, the teacher asked ‘what makes a film boring? so as to try to elicit as much information as possible from his student. In Asking this question, it is noticed that the majority of students were willing to interact and take part in the oral discussion, that they started to speak together to respond to the asked question. Moreover, in line 92, the teacher inquired about what interested girls. Before selecting a student to answer, it is observed that almost all learners in the classroom were stimulated to answer, that they were talking concurrently. Their answers were barely heard for this question provoked girls to interact. The student who was nominated to answer was ready to generate longer utterances and go on in her oral performance if she was not interrupted by her peers and then her teacher, as it is marked in line 88. Before overlap, she was about to explaining her view about the romantic stories she disliked watching. She was doing so in using very correct language and she seemed very self-confident and willing to keep on providing output.

Hence, it could be figured out in looking closer at this conversation that learners’ output was longer in terms of utterances’ length when they were assigned to answer open and referential questions. As argued in chapter two in which the type of teacher’s questions are discussed; scholars consent that the more TL teacher addresses open and referential questions, the more the degree of interaction enhances and improves. And the more
students are pushed forward to produce well-constructed and complex utterances for they would be engaged in the process of meaning negotiation.

As far as the second session attended with teacher (B) is concerned, things were so much alike to the first recorded session. Saying it differently, in the second session the teacher had processed almost in the same way the lecture. He set his students to produce examples where they made use of the remaining idiomatic expressions exposed in the dialogues to which they had listened in the previous session. The following excerpt, the learner managed to go further in the negotiation of meaning procedure.

**Excerpt 1.8.**

1. T: right. what we want you to do is to give us three things at the same time they would be three cases that really happened (4.5)
2. L1: really happened
3. T: YES please ((nominating a student to speak))
4. L2: what bores me to death is watching the Algerian series and spending the weekend[5. T: ok now you are using the present ( ) let’s now change the question now maybe it is not free ( ) it is well for you (.) so what are the two or the three things that (3.0) that bored you to death? so use it in the present form.
6. L2: yes, and also to spend the weekend by myself in the campus –
7. T. sorry ?
8. L2: hh spend the weekend in the CAMPUS (guess) university campus by myself
9. T: yeah
10. L2: It’s boring.
11. T: so this is a good case SPENDING weekend alone in the campus so that’s boring? why? can you tell me.
12. L2: (.) you know there is ( ) nothing to do I mean no TV(.) no no
   no [13. Ls: no space]
14. L2: I just spend weekend sleeping
15. T: Lazy student.
16. LL: ((laughter))

According to the presented excerpt, he succeeded to keep the student expressing her view throughout the question used in line 5. He relied on a referential question for he wanted to elicit information from the student about things that bored her to death. Indeed, the target of the question was to encourage her to put into practice the idiomatic expression into a significant example. After providing her output, the teacher asked for more clarification by using another question in line 11. ‘Can you tell me?’ In addressing this question to her, the student was striving to explain her previously given answer. Even though she was interrupted by her peers as it is apparent in line 12, she took again the floor and carried on interacting orally as it is revealed in line 14. In this extract the leaner performed eight turns whereas the teacher played seven ones. This proves that the teacher’s two raised questions inspired her to speak and elucidate her view point to her teacher and to the whole class. The teacher wanted her to go on in her oral performance that is why he asked her for clarifying her idea.

It is worth noting that in the overall, the asked questions by teacher (B) were in fact either referential or open question. Teacher (B) made more use of referential and open questions to induce his learners to speak rather than relying on closed and display ones. Additionally, after examining the two recorded sessions, it was realized that in many occasions teacher (B) could ask a chain of questions from a given oral response produced by his students. That is, once students interacted with their teacher throughout answering a given question, he tried many times to drag them in a course of a negotiation of meaning by addressing other questions. The following excerpt is a good illustration of what was just stated previously:

**Excerpt 1.9.**
1. T: other students
(9.5)
nothing is is [
2. L1: sir ((asking for the floor to interact))
3. T: yeah ((giving the turn to a student to speak))
04. L1: One of the things which I have studied in the school eh secondary school is biology
05. T: biology?
06. L1: yeah biology which sparked my interest hh biology and things which are related to
   genetics DNA and things like that
07. T: yeah
08. L1: yeah
09. T: good hh why eh tell us why why they sparked your interest
   Because you wanted to know you wanted to know yourself how you are made really
10. L1: absolutely
11. T: absolutely
12. L1: yes
13. T: good now was there ANYTHING that eh bored you[
14. L1: philosophy]
15. T: philosophy ok so you all don’t l don’t like philosophy
16. LL: (( talk together))
   I love it
   I like it
17. T: you like it ((addressing to the student))
18. L2: sir (.) sir (.) sir
19. T: yeah ((giving her the turn to speak))
20. L1: at that time it bored me but now I’ve a collection of philosophical books
21. T: good but w w :::hy at that time it bored you?
22. L1: I I didn’t know I don’t know what is it .how how to deal with the
   questions why I am I am I obliged to study such subject and[
23. T: so it was new for you and it was ( ) and it wasn’t[
24. L1: yeah yeah]
25. T: and it wasn’t clear
26. L1: yes
27. T: and there are a lot of new ideas so you couldn’t you could not (overlap)
28. LL: but now it’s it’s really interesting
29. T: yes now and rather philosophy as we say is as we say mother of
      sciences ?because in each science or when you come you come to study
      the science itself so you have to use philosophy
      good

In this conversation, the teacher was interacting with his students throughout asking them whether they had ever felt interested in a given subject. As examined in line 2, the learner asked for the turn to speak and after being given the floor she could produce a well-constructed sentence. In truth, the student felt so at ease while interacting that she was so spontaneous in her answer (line 4). The good point is that the teacher responded to her by repeating the word ‘biology’ with a rising up intonation as if he was asking her to keep going in explaining and producing output. The student reacted to teacher’s enquirey by going on in speaking as it is shown in line 6. In his attempt to elicit more output from her, he addressed another referential question in line 9 for the teacher did not know why the student was attracted by ‘biology’ subject. Yet, instead of letting her justify her previous answer, he anticipated things and controlled again the course of interaction in a moment where the learner was so excited, ready and willing to argue. In line 13, the teacher asked her again another question. The latter was a closed one for it required a monosyllable response; that is a very short answer. Subsequently, she replied by a single word ‘philosophy’ as the question implied. After commenting on her answer, the student took again the floor to produce output in line 20. Her answer led the teacher to pose another referential question in line 21. Thus, this referential question addressed in line 22 pushed the learner forward to justify again her perspective and she did so as exhibited in line 22. In the midst of her output generation, she was overlapped by her teacher who took the turn
to talk instead of her; this is well identified in line 23. The student had the floor again to speak after overlapping her teacher in the turn in line 28.

Up to now, types of questions used by teachers have been the focus of analysis, highlighting their effect on learners’ oral performance and interaction or to be more precise oral output. Now, the second parameter of analyzing TT is undertaken; that is Feedback.

### 3.2.5.2. Feedback

Discussion now turns to analyze the ways adopted by teachers involved in the study to provide feedback for their learners. In fact, the issue of feedback was covered, though succinctly, in chapter two which exposes the different types of feedback utilized by teachers of SL/FL direct to their students. It is highly noteworthy to mention that feedback is of a paramount value as far as FL teaching and learning is concerned. Indeed, as a pedagogical topic, feedback is a thorny issue in the sense that teachers should take many things into consideration before addressing feedback to their learners’ output. These things are related to the objectives set for tasks assigned to the students. The question of offering feedback is after all a decision that is to be adequately made by teachers in classroom. In giving priority to oral communication, teachers may ignore the over correction of students’ errors such as the grammatical and pronunciation’ ones. Yet, if the main concern of the task is to enhance learners’ linguistic abilities or language performance before communication, teachers may provide feedback whenever an error is committed. Hence, according to the literature read about feedback, still researchers do neither concur on a given way of correcting errors, nor on the best strategies adopted to repair their learners’ mistakes. But the most point agreed upon is that in a way or another feedback may alter learners’ interaction, especially when the process of repair is achieved throughout the process of meaning negotiation.
As far as teacher’s feedback is concerned, the analysis is processed in the same way as done with questions. To clarify more, teacher’s (A) way of providing his learners with feedback is exposed and the study scrutinizes teacher’ (B) way of offering repair. In doing this, it is expected that the readers of the dissertation in hand can understand better the effect of teacher’s feedback on classroom interaction. As they can also have an idea about the role that feedback plays to enhance learners’ output and their involvement in negotiated interaction throughout the extracts of classroom talk presented afterward. In doing this, it will be easy to capture to what extent this process of interaction boosts learners’ motivation and will to speak more using the TL.

Indeed, all along the attended session with teacher (A), it was strikingly remarked that most students were interacting in a very comfortable way. They were taking part in the discussion held in a very open way. As it was deduced that students did not make a lot of grammar mistakes. Whenever an error was committed, the teacher either overlooked it or repaired it in a very implicit way but not immediately. Feedback is, in fact, not offered mainly in case an error is committed; for positive feedback is also given to learners. The latter is offered as a way of supporting and making them feel that their oral output is worth and significant. The following excerpt is a better exemplification of the way the teacher offered positive feedback.

**Excerpt 2.1.**

1. T: let’s begin. Ok. who wants to tell me what IS the first idiomatic expression?
   and then the meaning ok, so number one yes please?
2. L1: The neck of the woods.
3. T: ah what kind of say meaning would you give to such an expression?
4. L1: I understand it as a miserable area.
5. T: ok, the others?
6. T: yes
7. L2: this place.
8. T: this place.
10. T: an unpleasant place.
11. L4: empty place.
12. T: empty place.
13. L5: an isolated area.
15. L5: the area where he lives.
16. T: the area where he lives.
17. L6: we are not expected to be here.
18. T: we are not expected to be here. someone else? are there any other explanations?

In point of fact, the same excerpt in our study of teacher’s (A) questions is used again in the analysis for it is a good classroom piece of talk demonstrating the way the teacher gives positive feedback on his students’ output. For instance in line 8, he repeated the answer presented by the student and so did he in lines 10, 12, 14, 16. As suggested in chapter two, the teacher may depend on positive feedback to support his learners’ oral contribution, this feedback is of different types; one of its most recurrent and used technique is repetition of learners’ answers. Here, it should be noted that teacher (A) drew on this type of feedback immensely when students answered a given question. Putting it more concretely, at each time teacher (A) addressed a question and got responses, he very frequently repeated it. In doing so, he tried to make them feel that their answers are valuable and worth. In a way or another, he made them feel more self-assured to express their minds using the TL, instead of feeling shy, reserved and passive to participate in the held discussion.

When the clarification of the role of feedback was undertaken along with its connection with enhancing learners’ oral performance in SL/FL classroom, it was said then that positive feedback is one the most used strategies adopted by teachers in their
classroom talk. Positive feedback is claimed to boost learners’ sense of confidence and simultaneously it decreases their language anxiety which is very common in FL classroom. In providing it, the teacher may repeat his students’ output when the latter is relevant. Next to repetition, he may rephrase their speech as a way of offering positive evidence. The following excerpt is good illustration of the way the teacher reformulated his students’ oral output.

**Excerpt 2.2.**

1. T: ok since there are no (2.0) let’s move to the
   (4.5)  
2. T: the other one is.  
3. LL: moving up the lather  
4. LL: moving up the lather  
5. T: move up the la ((hesitation)) lather ok do you ( ) first ?  
6. LL: yes  
7. T: ok.  
   (5.0)  
8.T: hh just ok you ((gives the turn to the student who asked for it))  
9.L1: moving up the lather? may mean progressing  
   or improving  
10. T: ok.[  
11. L2: sir ((asking for turn to speak))]  
12. T: why why did you get the idea of (2) progressing for example  
13. L1: because ((hesitation)) in a lather people move up[  
14. L2: ( ) go to the top  
15. LL: (guess) ((talking together))  
16 L1: level ( ) from to a higher one  
17. T: yeah from something which is low to something which is high progressing yes.

In the excerpt above, the learner explained how she understood the idiomatic expression ’moving up the lather’ in line 9. Then, teacher’s next move was in the form of an acknowledgement or acceptance that is he made use of ‘yes’. Yet, the teacher performed
another move which is offering positive feedback on his learner’s answer. Saying it otherwise, the teacher in the previous extract commented on the output of his student by presenting two moves of positive feedback. The first one was in the form of acceptance. The second move embodies another offered comment in the form of positive feedback in line 17; in which the teacher reproduced the output of the learner throughout rephrasing it. In doing this, he attempted to make the student feel secured and self-assured about her try to explain the sense of the idiomatic expression. It is essential to clarify that before teacher (A) provided the second move of positive feedback in line 17, he sought to engage the student in a meaning negotiation procedure. He tried to make her explain more what she said earlier by addressing her a referential question as it is evident in line 12.

During the two sessions attended with teacher (A), we were fascinated with the way he offered positive feedback to his learners whenever they generated output using English. He relied, to a great extent, on drawing on positive feedback at each time students interacted with him. He did not hesitate to reformulate, agree, accept or rephrase their output. In commenting continuously on their oral output, learners felt so relaxed to produce utterances and even go on in a process of explicating output when asked by their teacher.

In the subsequent conversation, the teacher seemed to be very impressed by the oral performance of his student that he asked him to say again his utterance. Here the teacher has already assigned his students to use the idiomatic expression ‘lean on’ into meaningful examples.

**Excerpt 2.3.**

1. T: hh yes PLEASE ((allocating the turn for a student to speak))
2. L1: I’m just going to say what leona ricci said
3. T: ok ((laughter))
4. L1: Lean on me when you are not strong. I will help you to carry on.
5. T: ok?
6. L1: yeah
7. L2: to live on
8. T: it’s the (.) you sing poetries
9. LL: ( )
10. L1: to carry on
11. T: john lenon?
12. L1: no no no no leona ricci
13. T: ah leona ricci that’s the singer the famous singer the American singer yeah
        would you please Repeat for your friends they WANT to (2.5)[
14. L1: lean on me [
15. T: ]to appreciate somehow[
16. L1:] lean on me [
17. T: lean on me
18. L1: ]when you are not strong. I’ll ? he:::lp you carry on ((the student says is in a melodic tone))
19. L: ((laughter))
20. T: you want to sing? no problem ((laughs))

It is true that the oral output produced by the student is not his own. Yet, the way he performed it and interacted with the teacher was so spontaneous. The student felt so comfortable in interacting with the teacher that he even started to sing. This simply proves how self-confident and self-possessed he felt, that he found no difficulty while performing orally his contribution. After enquiring about the singer, the teacher offered positive feedback in the form of clarification in line 13 by explaining to others who is the singer to whom the student was referring. Moreover, he also asked him to say again the utterance for he as well as students’ peers appreciated it greatly. In setting him to utter the example once more, and in repeating after the student, the teacher was, in actual fact, performing a move of positive feedback. In doing so, the teacher tried to value his student’s oral output next to
the way he performed it. When the learner started to repeat in line 16, the teacher’s move in line 17 performed a move of positive feedback i.e., repetition.

In coming to scrutinize the way teacher (A) provided his learners with negative or corrective feedback, it could barely be found some extracts or conversations in which he corrected for them. That is, in the investigation of the way the teacher repairs his students’ errors and the effect of this correction on the course of their interaction, we could not have sufficient pieces of talk in which the process of repair took place in classroom context. Indeed; the following excerpt is one of the fewest cases where he repairs inductively and implicitly the error of his student.

**Excerpt 2.4.**

1. T: YES someone else.
2. L1: sir ((asking for the turn to speak))
3. T: yeah
4. L1: .hh if Hasni hears you singing his song [ 
5. LL: ((laughter))]
6. L1: ((laughter)) he would turn over in his grieve
7. T: OK laughter
8. L2: Sir ? could you PLEASE repeat?
9. T: If Hasni listened to me OK say (hesitation) singing his songs (1.0)
    he would turn over in his grieve
    you know (lengthened ) that I sing very well ?
10. LL: ((laughter))

In the extract above, the teacher has, in reality, addressed two types of corrective feedback in a single move as it is noticeable in line 9. In line 4; student’s output comprised two errors: the first one was a grammatical one, for the student misused the tense of the first verb. That is, instead of using the past simple with the verb (hear), since it is conditional type two, she used the present simple. The second committed error was a vocabulary one; she used the verb ‘hear’ instead of the verb ‘listen’. So, the move in line 9
is about a corrective feedback in the form of recast. The teacher repaired implicitly the
misused word and tense in the learners’ output, in a way that he neither referred to the
mistake, nor asked the student to reformulate her utterance. He just rectified it by his own
instead of trying to go on in an interactional process that could lead at the end to student’
self-repair.

It goes without saying that before offering feedback; the teacher should initially
determine and define the objective behind the task he assigns to them. That is, as long as
he gives priority to language form, so errors have to be repaired, whereas in case he
stresses on communication, so he is to avoid the overcorrection of the committed mistakes
so as to keep oral communication goes on. In attending teacher (A), it was observed that
learners’ output does not contain a very high proportion of errors. This was confirmed
throughout viewing for many times the recorded data. Something else could be detected all
along observing CD is that even in cases where students made errors, the teacher very
rarely corrected for them. That is, he just let discussion went on. Maybe in doing this, he
was avoiding oral communication breakdown that might well take place if he interrupted
the student to repair his error. To illustrate better, the following extract is a good example
where the teacher ignored the correction of the learner’s error.

**Excerpt 2.1.5.**

1. T: yes. ((giving the turn to a the student to speak))
2. L1: some people ((hesitation)) in my native country think that (1.0)
   some people think that people in my native country are still live in good conditions
   but they are dead wrong.
3. T: they are dead wrong .
4. T: yes please ((giving the turn for the student to speak))
   In learner’s turn exemplified in line 2, an error was performed. In fact, it is a
   grammatical one. Instead of using the progressive tense with the verb ‘live’, she used the
present simple, for she inserted the auxiliary to be. In the turn in line 3, the teacher neither corrected the error, nor reformulated it inductively. He just continued collecting examples from the other students as it is shown in line 4. Indeed, this is not the only case where learners’ errors were not repaired by the teacher. Yet, this is not the focal point of this investigation; it is rather aimed at putting it into plain words how teacher (A) dealt with his learners’ errors so as to get a closer idea about how the process of addressing feedback affected their oral performance.

Contrariwise to teacher (A), teacher (B) relied too much on the use of corrective feedback in his talk. That is, during the three sessions attended with teacher (B), we noticed that he interrupted very often his learners when they were producing their oral output to repair their errors.

The analysis is going to cover teacher’s (B) talk; more precisely techniques he exercised to present feedback to his students. Interestingly, teacher (B) as well did not hesitate to comment positively on his learners’ output and agree with their perspectives, in a way that he tried to encourage them to speak and interact more. He attempted to show his approval of their oral contribution, this is very perceptible in the extracts introduced below:

**Excerpt 2.6.**

1. T: hh a boy and hh a girl discussed about classes ok.and they have
   shown some interest (3.0) they are they what.
   BORED[
2. LL: yes
3. T: the questions are.why Jane. JANE was bored
   was she?
4. LL: yes
5. T: why was she bored in her class?
6. T: yes please. (giving the turn to a student to speak)
7. L1: Jane was bored in her class because there is no discussion there is ONLY
lectures.

8. T: good?
(8.5)

9. T: yes please? ((giving the turn to another student))

10. L2: she said that the professor hh does not know how to spark the students’ interest.

11. T: good?

12. L3: in addition to that the students don’t ask questions

13. T: who who ((hesitation))doesn’t ask questions?

14. L3: the students

15. T: the students also.

WHY can you tell me WHY they didn’t ask questions?

16. L3: because hh the teacher do not doesn’t know how to spark their interest

17. T: that’s it.it’s because exactly the the teacher did not or does not give

them any opportunity to to ask questions[

18. LL: yeah]

19. T: right so that’s why he was bored in class there is no[

20. LL: discussion]

21. T: discussion there is no freedom for participation for interaction

22. LL: yeah

23.T: and so .hh the class becomes how? becomes[

24. LL: boring]

25. T: BORING

The extract above is taken from the first session recorded with teacher (B). Before he posed his first listening comprehension question in line 1, he had set his students to listen to a dialogue and then initiated collecting their answers. As perceived, the teacher allocated the turn to the first student to answer in line 6, and then the latter responded in line 7. The teacher afterward performed a move of feedback in line 8. To be more precise, the move in turn 8 was a positive feedback in the form of approval ‘good’. As clarified earlier, when the teacher shows acceptance, agreement and acknowledgement about the correctness of his learner’s output, be it on the form or content; it is considered as a type of positive
feedback. In line 12 teacher (B) also addressed a positive feedback move to the second learners’ answer exhibited in line 11 by accepting it throughout the use of the word ‘good’ to express his approval about the given responses. Once more, when the third learner took the turn to answer the already asked question in line 13, the teacher preferred to prolong the conversation before offering feedback. He wanted to confirm about the rightness of the student’s answer by asking her another question in line 15. Thus, he succeeded at making the student produce more output to justify her previous given answer as displayed in line 17.

In the conversation which follows, the teacher asked his students to read the sentences in the activity, which were about listening comprehension. Then he asked them to say whether the statements are ‘true’ or ‘false’. He emphasized that at each time they gave their reply, they were supposed to give good reasons about their choice. In the next extract, we catch sight about the way the teacher reacted to his learners’ responses.

**Excerpt 2.1.8.**

1. T: two
   yes please ((allocates the turn to the student to speak))
2. L1: jane’s professor does most of the talking
   true?
3. T: that’s true?[  
4. L1: because she said she just walks in and lectures]
5. T: yes because in the DIALOGUE it is SAID that SHE
6. L1: hh she just WALKS IN and lectures.
7. T: walks in and lectures (1.0) it means that there is no [  
8. LL: discussion]
9. T: discussion
   (3.0)
10. T: hh three?
11. L2: Steve is going to take class with Jane’s professor the next semester
we don’t know it is not mentioned.
12. T: yes that’s it. it’s not mentioned there is nothing that relates
to this meaning in dialogue. and SO we DON’t know and four
13. T: yes ((allocating the turn to a student to talk))
14. L3:.hh STEVE was LAZY at the BEGINING of the SEMESTER.
   It’s true[
15. T: that’s true?
16. L3: °because eh he said ° eh I remember at the beginning of the semester I was fooling
around and not taking anything in school very seriously ( ° )
17. T: that’s it. and particularly the idiom FOOLING AROUND fool around so it
   means you don’t take things seriously[
18. LL: seriously
19. T: ok do NOTHING in PARTICULAR special you DO NOT concentrate on anything
   It is true that in the previous excerpt, learners were just set to answer listening
comprehension questions. But if we look closer and deeper into the moves of the
conversation, one can observe that the teacher tried to engage every student was interacting
with him in a course of meaning negotiation. He did so by requiring for clarification and
justification about every single response given. In line 2, the learner gave the sentence and
then claimed that it was a correct one. The teacher then provided a positive feedback
throughout agreeing with her. Next, the same student went on in taking the floor to justify
her answer as it is clear in line 4. In the moves in lines 5 and 7, the teacher addressed
positive feedback to the same student by repeating her answer and rephrasing it. In line 11,
the second learner who had been given the turn to speak replied the asked question and
then she was offered another type of positive feedback in line 12 throughout
acknowledging first in saying (that’s it) and then repeating the given response. As concerns
the last student selected to give the answer in line 14, we noticed that she carried on
producing output in line 16. Yet again, the teacher did not hesitate presenting two moves of
positive feedback to support the correctness in the student’s output in lines 17, 19 by admitting that her answers were true.

All through the observation of teacher’s (B) classroom talk, it is remarked that he relied too much on explicit corrective feedback while commenting on his learners’ output compared to teacher (A). Again it is worthy to point out that the attempt in reminding the readers of the work in hand is far from making a comparison between their talk. The targeted interest is rather to elucidate how the adopted feedback may change the course of learners’ interaction. Focus now is to concentrate on the way teacher (B) addressed negative or corrective feedback to his students. For achieving this aim, some extracts are selected to be analyzed. They were, in fact, selected from both recorded sessions. The following extract is a good illustration in which the teacher performs feedback acts in the middle of his students’ performance of a dialogue.

**Excerpt 2.9.**

1. T: now it’s time to read again. it’s your turn to conversations
   so who’s Jane or Jan it’s[dzen] not [dzein] ((then he nominates a student)) .hh be careful? I don’t want robotic english.
2. LL: ((laughter))
3. T: so eh then Jan and you are[
4. L1: steve]
5. T: steve
6. L2: emm this coffee is really strong ((the student starts to read from the book))
7. L1: I like it that way[
8. T: is very.
   or really]
9. L2: is REALLY strong[
10. T: is
11. LL: really
12. T: that’s it]
13. L2: yes is really strong
14. L1: I like it that way
15. L2: so do I all during my best hh ((hesitation)) last class I was thinking about coming here and could almost taste a coffee
16. L1: it sounds like it wasn’t too exciting .
17. L2: I was bored to death. I’m in that I’m:::m((hesitation)) I’m in that class because it’s a requirement so I have to stick it [au] hh out the problem is that the professor doesn’t know [nau] how to spark [ 
18. T: doesn’t (. ((expecting the strident to say again the word))
19. LL: know [nau]
20. T: know[nau].
21. L2: doesn’t KNOW[nau] how to spark our interest she just walks in her lectures. there is no discussion
22. L1: what’s a drag. don’t people ask questions?
23. L2: oh yeah. once in a blue moon. but I always see awful ( ) that people people doodling [daunlin] and can’t tell[ 
24. T: people
25. LL: doodling [dudlin]
27. L2: yes and they can’t tell their minds and wondering. do you have any classes like that?
28. L1: I’ve only one big a lecture class world history class. the professor’s the best. it’s so interesting I’m always on the EDGE of my SIT and when we have discussion it’s always filled with electricity Though the extract exposed above is not a genuine output generated by students, for the teacher set them to play out a dialogue that included some idiomatic expressions.
Yet, the teacher always took the turn to offer negative feedback whenever the student made an error. Putting it differently, the teacher overlapped and interrupted the student while reading so as to repair her error. The types of errors committed by the student in the previous excerpt are about pronunciation ones. To put it more concretely, the learner in turn in line 6 mispronounced the word ‘really’, so the teacher took the turn to offer corrective feedback: more precisely an elicitation technique. The latter is another type of
corrective feedback in which the teacher may ask learners to complete sentences, to answer questions or simply to reformulate the ill-formed part of their output. So the teacher relied on elicitation by asking the student to reformulate the ill-pronounced word ‘really’ as it is apparent in the move in lines 9. Afterwards, the learners took again the turn in line 11 to self-repair the mispronounced word. Once again, the same learner utters the word ‘know’ in a wrong way for instead of using the diphthong [ɔu], she used [au], then in line 18 the teacher took the turn to ask her for reformulation, subsequently, she repaired her pronunciation in line 21. The student in line 23 made another error in pronouncing the word doodling, so the teacher interrupted her to address to her a corrective feedback by asking her to pronounce again the word as it is exhibited in line 24. In the analysis, it is perceived that the student got so shy for the fact of being interrupted for several times by her teacher to be corrected that she was not really excited to carry on playing out the dialogue as she was at the outset. At least this is what we could remark in looking into her facial expressions and the pitch of her voice which was barely heard and low compared to its pitch of her initial oral performance.

Teacher (B) also took turns to perform negative feedback when a learner made a grammar mistake. That is, he neither closed the eyes to any grammar mistake committed by students, nor delayed its correction or repair. In the following conversation, the teacher took the turn to offer corrective feedback as we are going to examine.

**Excerpt 2.10.**

1. T: hh another or the last example is someone who talks ((hesitation)) too too much
2. LL: too much
3. T: SO this is someone who is?
4: LL: talkative
5. T: is it interesting.to[
6. LL: no no]
7. T: to be friend with someone to be friend with someone who is talkative.
8. LL: no
9. T: no. so it’s BORING[ 10. LL: yes
11. T: have you ever been bored by someone who. "who talks too much" 12. LL: yes ((talk together))
14. LL: sir ((asking for the turn to speak))
15. T: .hh ((allocating the turn for her to speak))
16. L: when someone beside me starts to talk too much I bore to death[
17. T: I? was.] 18. LL: I was
19. L: ah yes I was bored to death especially when I want to study in peace for example and he starts talking too much
20. T: so this is not bor:::ing yes this can be boring but in fact it’s annoying hh annoying this annoying you
21. L: disturbing you
22. yes it’s ((hesitation)) it’s trouble troublesome this case of hh annoyance not boring

In line 15 the teacher allocated the turn to the student to express her mind and to give her example. The latter took the turn to interact as it is apparent in line 16. Then, she made a grammar error, for she was supposed to insert the verb to be before the adjective ‘bored’. Indeed, she was immediately interrupted by her teacher who took the turn to repair her mistake. By far, the form of corrective feedback the teacher addressed to her is an elicitation technique which is an explicit strategy for he asked her to reformulate the ill-formed part of the utterance and so she did in line 19. In fact, we have to emphasize here that the fact of being interrupted to be corrected did not affect the way the learner interacted. That is; she kept on producing output as if she was not at all overlapped.

The following extract selected from the second session, teacher (B) asked students to match some sentences given in an exercise to get meaningful ones. As perceived in the
conversation, the student who had been allocated to interact was interrupted for several times by the teacher for she performed grammatical errors. Here is the excerpt:

**Excerpt 2.11.**

1. T: finally the (2.0) last item (5.5)
   
   yes please ((allocating the turn to a student to speak))
2. L1: your kids hh you [u] kids are fooling around[  
3. T: no no no
4. LL: your [u:r]
5. L1: ah your [u:r] kids are fooling around since you [ ]
6. T: no[
7. L2: you have been
8. T: we have since here. and with since we use which tense?
9. LL: past perfect
10. T: no no it’s not the past perfect here.
11. LL: **Present** perfect
   
   Present perfect
12. T: **Present**?perfect.
13. L1: Have been home now it’s time to **sit down** to do your homework.
14. T: repeat please because it’s not clear your hh you kids you
15. L1: you kids are fooling around since have been home now it’s time to sit down and do you homework.
16. T: have been fooling **around** ok fooling around since you’ve been home and now it’s time to sit down and do your homework
good.

Starting to examine the second move in which the student was reading the sentence in line 2, she mistook in the selection of the pronoun. That is, instead of using the subject pronoun ‘you’ she made use of the possessive’s one ‘our’. Without delay, she was interrupted and in a direct tough way by the teacher who responded by saying no as it is exhibited in line 3 using a sharp intonation in his turn of speech. Just after that, the student noticed her error and repaired it by replacing the pronoun. So, in the total of sixteen moves,
the teacher performed four moves (in lines 3, 6, 10 and 14) to offer corrective feedback. In fact, the fourth moves in which the teacher took the task to achieve correction by his own were direct ones.

Walsh (2002) says: “there is certain logic in keeping error correction to a minimum in oral fluency practice activities in order to reduce interruption and ‘maintain the flow’”. Definitely, we do acknowledge that Walsh is absolutely right in saying this for in the following excerpt; it is evident that the incessant disruption of teacher (B) to correct the mispronounced words and utterances affected negatively her way of interaction. The whole course of correction led to communication breakdown between the teacher and the learner.

Excerpt 2.12.

1. L1: sir (asking for the turn to speak)
   ((the teacher allocate the turn for her to interact))
2. L1: an awful. lots of people want to get [
3. T: hh sorry would you please repeat?]  
4. L1: an awful [auful] [     
5. T: awful [O:fæl]]
6. L1: awful [O:fæl] a lot of people want to get[  
7. T: no it’s not e [ə] lot [læt] it’s lot [IDt] ok you’ve to articulate lot]
8. L1: lot of people want to get it (guess)  
   I hope everybody is curious ((seemed very shy to carry on speaking))
9. T: I hope everyone is curious. next

As it is obvious in the short conversation above, the teacher overlapped the student for many times. From a total of nine moves, he offered corrective feedback in four moves. It is true that the learner was not producing her own output; for she was just giving an answer throughout reading a sentence from the task assigned to them. Yet, it is considered a type of interaction. The teacher’s continuous interruption of the student while she was speaking made her almost unwilling to speak more. In the move shown in line 2, and after being given the turn to speak, the student started to utter her utterance. Nevertheless, she
was cut short by the teacher who overlapped her and broke down the course of her output production. In behaving as such, the teacher’s attempted to give her direct corrective feedback by asking her to reformulate the mispronounced word ‘awful’ and so did she in line 4. Yet again, in line 7, the teacher interrupted the same learner after she resumed speaking in line 6 for she uttered the word ‘lot’ in an ill way. In fact, the teacher addressed a direct corrective feedback to repair the ill- pronounced word. After that, it is remarked that the student could go on, but in a very difficult way, in uttering the remaining utterance that we could barely hear what she was saying.

As maintained by Seedhouse (1997) (cited in Walsh, 2011) after conducting his study, language learners prefer ‘maximum economy’ when being corrected. He justifies this perspective in claiming that the more teachers repair shortly learners’ errors, the less communication breakdown will take place. In the viewed and analyzed data, it is noticed that teacher’s overcorrection of students’ errors was making them hesitated and shy to take part in the classroom discourse.

Thus far, the study tried to shed light on the TT involved in our study; attempting to elucidate the way both teachers addressed questions and feedback. As it also strives for discovering how the two components of their talk affected the course of interaction. In what follows, CD is dealt with from another angle; that is learners’ discourse. In investigating learners’ language, it would be trouble-free to detect to what extent the later is interactive and communicative.

3.2.6. Analyzing Learners’ Language

Before starting proceeding in the examination of learners’ discourse, we should beforehand jog the memory of the dissertation’ readers that the classroom extracts we will go through in our analysis are selected from the three sessions we have already recorded. Once more, we have to point out that our target is far from making a comparison between
the two classroom contexts. It is rather to have a variety of pieces of classroom conversations to be scrutinized.

Definitely, the selection of investigating LL using turn taking system and adjacency pairs is justified. Saying it otherwise, any CA aiming at studying LL and involvement in CD has to inevitably comprise turn taking, sequence organization and repair as introduced by Ellis & Barkhuizen (2005, p.201). That is to say, in principle, any moment of interaction can be studied with the help of these concepts so as to achieve local organization of sequences. Yet, it will not be possible to deal with all these conceptions within the scope of this section due to space. That is why the study in hand has to cover turn taking system and adjacency pairs so as to confirm whether learners are good interactants in using the TL and they are apt enough, as third year university students, to go longer in conversations using English language as medium of communication or not.

3.2.6.1. Turn Taking System

Five excerpts from the filmed OE sessions are selected. Two of them are taken from the first classroom context observed; that is the one of teacher’s (A) and the three other extracts are selected form teacher’ (B) classroom context. The following two excerpts stem from the first classroom setting.

Before initiating going in depth into the analysis of the selected excerpts from the first classroom context, it is worthy to mention that the whole session was about learning idiomatic expressions. For many times teacher (A) set students to do tasks where they predicted the meanings of some given expressions, complete sentences or say ‘true’ or ‘false’. Other times, they were assigned to give examples in which they made use of the newly acquired expressions. In proceeding interaction in this ritual, this implied the teacher to allocate turns to his students. And it was in very few occasions where learners took turns voluntarily to interact without waiting for the floor to be given by the teacher. That is, they
did barely self-initiate and select themselves to speak. The coming extract illustrates what is denoted so far.

Excerpt 3.1.

1. T: someone else, let’s go to expression number three
   ((a student asks for the floor))
2. T: yes please. ((the teacher allocates the turn to the L1 to speak))
3. L1: hh dead wrong, may mean totally wrong.
4. L: totally wrong
5. L: yes
6. T:TOTALLY wrong.(.) do you all agree on
   ((a student asks for the turn)
7. LL: yes
8. T: yes yes please? ((giving the turn to her))
10. T: completely mistaken
11. L3: totally wrong
12. T: totally wrong
13. L4: Completely wrong.
14. T: Completely wrong(.) you all agree that completely or totally mistaken or wrong.

As shown in the excerpt above, the flow of speech or interaction goes in a very strictly organized way. Learners were explaining the idiomatic expression using very limited and simple utterances. This is evident from the oral performance of learners in lines:(3,9,11,13). Thus, it was remarked that there is a small deal of talk in this piece of classroom discourse for it is the aim of the task which decides for the quality and the quantity of students’ generated output of the TL. As explained in chapter two, the structure of turn taking system exhibited in turns vary from a lexical, clausal, phrasal and sentential depending on the interactional process taking place between participants. For instance, the turn taken by the first learner in line 3 is in the form of a clause, the one in line 5 is a lexical one (yes), whereas the turn taken in line 11 has a phrasal construction. Moreover,
speech exchange demonstrated in the excerpt indicates that once the turn is accomplished by a speaker (as it is the case in line 3) the transition of relevance place takes place when someone else takes the turn next (as it is clear in line 4). In the moves noted in lines (4, 5, 9, 11, 13) the transition of turns among participants is soft for there is a kind of pauses and synchronization between speakers. That is to say, no overlap occurred. This leads us to conclude that the speech exchange in this extract is very rigid, for the system organization of turns is strictly organized. To explain more, before taking the floor to interact, learners asked, first of all, to be given the turn by their teacher. Hence, on the one hand, this made interaction far from being cooperatively constructed among learners. On the other hand, since no negotiation of meaning is held between interactants in this conversation, learners’ output is so limited.

Here is another excerpt selected from the first classroom context; an extract in which many students wanted to have the floor to speak.

**Excerpt 3.2.**

1. L1: Some people think that people in my native country speak more than they work, but they are dead wrong.
2. LL: ((laughter))
3. T: yes.
4. L2: sometimes it a[
5. T: hh yes, please and then I’ll go to you]
6. L3: Some people think that people in my native country are illiterate and uneducated but they are dead wrong.
7. T: dead wrong (4.2) these are
8. LL: the egyptians the egyptians
9. L3: I don’t know which one, but they think that we are illiterate, we don’t have houses[
10. LL: ( )

   ((inaudible words because learners talk together simultaneously))
11. T: so many things, so many things yes.
12. L4: especially we are not civilized.
14. L5: the notion of living in Africa.
15. LL: yeah yes.
16. L3: we are still living on camels [ 
17. T: what do we call this in English when someone (2) for example thinks something
    about someone he doesn’t know this is a Prej [ 
18. LL: prejudice.
19. T:] prejudice yes ok so we have to say DOWN to prejudices ok. <one has not to (.)
    think in such a way >
   →20. L6: sir?
21. T: yes?
   →22. L6: hh years (.) three years before we have friends hh we had friends from germany
       (( turning to talk to her friend to confirm))
23. T: ((laughter))
   →25. L6: ‘(guess) and we were exchanging [læt3:z] from the internet[
26. T: heh ((asking her to go on)))
   →27. L6: so they were (.) they were (.) saying to us how about the elephants? the lions?[ 
28. L7: yes yeah<]
   →29. L6: >because they <were thinking that we are living with the lions?
30. T: yeah really? (.) so she she she is talking about her experience ok by the internet↓
    chatting with people and generally when we chat we discover so many 
31. LL: ((inaudible words because students were talking together)) 
32. T: yeah yeah things that you have this way or this way you are not ok?
    (( using gestures to explain ))
33. L6: they were surprised 
34. T: that’s why (.) ok she she was talking about her experience 
35. L8: sir ((asking for the floor)) 
36. T: yeah?
37. L8: you know also about their cultures 
38.T: yeah.(guess) know about other people’s cultures ok? someone else?
The above extract is a good one for it gives a crystal clear insight about the way students take turns. In the whole excerpt five students had the floor to produce full utterances. Even though the form of interaction in the above shown extract was also so rigid for it falls in the same flow. It is always restricted between learners and their teacher (in the form of a dyadic course of interaction). Yet, the remarkable thing is that students did not wait for the allocation of turns from their teacher, they rather wanted to speak. To illustrate better, if we come closer to the move exhibited in line 6, we will see that the student *self initiated herself* to interact and so is the case of students in the moves shown in lines (9, 12, 20 and 35). They all asked the teacher to give them the right to speak for they were all willing to express their minds. Additionally, learners’ output is simple in terms of structure; there is no cooperation among them during the flow of interaction. In the move in line (22), turn constructional unit, which is sentential in form, starts. She took four turns to produce her output, as demonstrated in lines (25, 27, 29, 33), to explain her experience. Indeed, she found some difficulty to do so at the beginning of her oral output production (as it is clear in lines 22 and 25) for there was a kind of hesitation. Nonetheless, she managed to carry on in the other moves in an easier way. The student tried to keep her interaction up in line (33). Yet, the turn transition relevant place was non soft for she was interrupted by her teacher in the move represented in line (32). Hence, she could not put an end to her idea. Once more, another student self selects herself to take the floor to speak in line (35) and she produced her output in line (37).

What is to be tackled next is the analysis of learners’ language in the second classroom setting examined with teacher (B). The observation of LL is approached in the same way done with the previous classroom context. That is; three excerpts are inserted and analysed to get an obvious concept about learners’ taking turn and the way the latter affected the course of classroom interaction.
Excerpt 3.3.

1. L1: It dawned on me
2. LL: it dawned one someone ((students gave the idiomatic expression to the teacher from the handouts))
3. T: it dawned on me (.) so it means [ 
4. L1: come suddenly to (guess) °our minds°
5. T: ] sorry?
6. L2: something that comes suddenly (.) she said
   (2.0)
7. T: it dawned on me.
8. L1: I said to hh about something [ 
9. T: downed here what is the word or the key word. it’s[
10. LL: it’s dawned
dawn[ 
11. L1: from dawn on[ 
12. T: it’s [daun] or [Dn]? 
13. L1: [Dn]
14. LL: [Dn]
   [daun]
15. T: it’s [Dn] so it’s [Dn] so [Dn] means so then the key word is dawned on me
   Idiomatically means. I RE(.) ((waiting for the students to complete))
   (.)
16. L2; suddenly ( )
17. T: ↑ I realized ok. I suddenly realized ok
18. LL: ( ) (( students talk together))
19. T: and usually> if we take the lietarl ‘(guess) we want to get closer to get the meaning <
   ( ) so we have what we have[
20. L1: ]the first time[
21. T:] so ( ) free minds
22. L1: ‘(guess)
23. T: ( ) we can think the minds are free from other thoughts and we can think rightly we can think clearly and we can can realize what we haven’t realized before?

In the excerpt in hand, the student (L1) tried many times to take the turn to explain the idiomatic expression ‘dawn on somebody’. She was interrupted for many times, however. For instance; in line 4 the transition of the turn from the teacher to the student was non soft. The student wanted to have the floor and she had it by overlapping the turn of the teacher. In line 5; the teacher seemed not to hear what she produced as an output. This made her somehow hesitant to carry on speaking. Thus, one of her peers tried to transmit her message to the teacher by saying again what she said as shown in line 6. Yet, the student took again the turn in line 8. She would be ready to keep speaking up if she were not once more interrupted by her teacher as it is apparent in line 9. Thus, in this case the transition of turns was non soft. The student could not finish her explanation and even when she wanted to take the floor for the last time in line 20, the teacher took the turn in a non soft transition relevance place. To end with this extract, it is quite necessary to note that the learner was self-confident, determined and self-assured to explain the idiomatic expression without even waiting for the allocation of turn from her teacher. In spite of that, she could neither finish producing her output, nor engage in a course of meaning negotiation due to the continuous overlap moves performed by the teacher.

Before opting for the analysis of other classroom pieces of talk from the second session filmed, it is necessary to say that in the first session classroom discourse was almost controlled by the teacher that very rarely students got dragged into conversations with their teacher. Contrariwise to the case of the first session, learners were given more chances to interact in the second one. The coming exposed extracts exhibit the discursive and interactive learners’ language.

**Excerpt 3.4.**

1. T: silence is mortal (.) it’s deadly (6.0)
2. L1: someone (guess) ((inaudible words for the low pitch the student was speaking)) a show ( ) ((inaudible words))
3. T: a show?
4. L1: yeah
5. T: have you ever been, in party that’s boring?((addressing the question to all students))
7. T: wedding? Ok (guess) this is explain express yourself.
8. L2: once we [
9. T: it was Boring? it wasn’t
10. L2:] yeah very boring.
11. T: ok. tell tell us why?
12. L2: mom ‘was discussing with other women, and me I was alone I[
13. T: what what haven’t you left then?
14. L2:] I can’t leave mom there.
15. T: ok. so then you were obliged to stick it as ‘(guess) you cannot you could not leave your MOM °so this is one case?°(.) are there other cases

In this classroom conversation student (L2) succeeded to interact with her teacher who continuously addressed to her questions. Firstly, as it is evident in line 6 the student self-selected herself to speak after the teacher had asked the question to the whole class. With reference to the TCUs, it was phrasal in form (in a wedding). She would be ready to go on producing her output in line 8 if she were not overlapped by her teacher in line 7 attempting to induce her to explain more. Then again, she took the floor to speak as shown in line 8. Yet, she was once more interrupted and she could lastly finish her sentence in line 12. In fact, the transition relevance place was non-soft for the teacher interrupted her another time by the question he asked. Then, the transition of the turn was soft in line 14, for there was a kind of synchronization between both participants (the student and the teacher). Thus, the floor was given again to her. The most remarkable point is that every time the student wanted to prolong in producing output, she was interrupted by the teacher. From a total of nine moves of exchanges (from 6-15), the learner took five turns to speak.
Additionally, the course of interaction in the above excerpt is a dyadic one for it involved mainly the student (L2) and the teacher. Let us inspect the last chosen extract.

**Excerpt 3.5.**

1. T: ok. what else?
2. L1: hh people who ((laughter)) I like people who are knowledgeable? honest.and (. ) do not lie.
3. T: yes. so all the things that we like (guess).
5. T: you hate liars?
6. LL: liars
7. L1: liars and traitors (. ) cheats
8. T: is there >anyone here <( . ) who likes liars?
9. LL: no
   ((laughter))
10. L2: he must be a liar?
11. LL: laughter
12. T: even liars do not like liars themselves.
   yes ((giving the turn to the only male student in classroom to speak for he raised his hand))
   I think you are the exception here.
13. LL: ((laughter))
14. L1: ALWAYS
15. L3: I just enjoy them.
16. T: you enjoy them! ((laughs))
17. LL: laughter
18. T: you think that enjoying is not liking!
20. T: I think that (. ) that there is no (guess) great difference enjoying something ((students are talking simultaneously)) is liking something , if you do not like something? you cannot enjoy it!
22. L3: maybe I don’t know.
23. T: so you don’t know (.) so you know we have said that liars don’t like liars you have made the exception. good.

Indeed, the student who took the floor in line 2 was so at ease while interacting with her teacher. She was producing correct output in a very spontaneous way and laughing simultaneously. Moreover, the transition of turns from the teacher to the student (L1) was in a soft way. That is, once learners completed the turn constructional unit (as in lines: 2, 3, 4), the transition relevance place occurred in a soft way (when the teacher or other peers take the floor). To put it more simply; during the whole move exchanges there was no overlap, no interruption from the part of the teacher. Students were given the floor to speak and finish their output as it is exhibited in lines (2, 4, 7, 10, 14, 15, 22). In the performed moves in lines (10 and 14), learners self-select themselves willingly to speak without waiting for the allocation of turns from their teacher. In doing this, the course of interaction was not as rigid as it is the case of most of the conversations analyzed previously. In terms of learners’ output, their turn constructional units range from a single word as ‘yes’ as in the move in line (19), lexical as in lines (14,21), phrasal in line (7) and sentential as it is exhibited in lines (2,4,15,22) to a full sentence. Yet, despite trying to get the learner involved in a process of meaning negotiation from the part of the teacher, the student’ output was so limited and unwilling to produce more output as introduced in lines (15, 22).

To recapitulate, learners’ language is of a paramount value in boosting their interactional competencies. That is, the more they take turns and risks to talk and generate output, the more they get involved in a process of meaning negotiation. And the less tough and difficult they will perform orally. In what follows, the study comes closer to the way learners involved in this piece of research get engaged in classroom discourse throughout
performing adjacency pairs sequences. That is, what comes in this part of chapter, LL is scrutinized using the second parameter; namely adjacency pairs.

### 3.2.6.2. Adjacency Pairs

In the same way the analysis of turn taking is approached, the chapter is to shed light on the adjacency pairs, as an imperative organizational aspect of classroom conversation. It is salient to stress that adjacency pairs reveal moment by moment interaction that is why it is highly crucial to use them as a second parameter for analyzing LL. Four excerpts are explored, two from each classroom contexts. In doing this, we will have a comprehensive vision about this system and its effects on the course of students’ interaction. The first excerpt is selected from the first classroom context.

**Excerpt 4.1:**

1. T: yes? sentence number one (.) try to give me a completion (.) appropriate completion. (. )yes aicha please ((allocating the turn for the student to talk for she asked for the floor)) → 2. L1: some people think that people in my native ‘(guess) native country are jobless.↑ but they are dead wrong.
3. L2: Jobless!
4. T: so >some people think that people in my native country are jobless< but they are dead wrong. what do you think of her first (1.5) she has said most people think (.) most people think that in my country in my native country people are jobless. (2) are they really dead wrong?
5. L 3: sir ((raising his hand to be given the floor))
6. LL: ( )
→ 7. L3: (guess) jobless.they are not dead wrong.
8. T: hh so
9. LL: not all people
    not all some
    not all some
10. T: not all most most of. anyway thank you yes.
In respect of adjacency pairs in this extract, the major pattern is question and answer pairs, like those in lines: 2, 7. That is to say, in the previous exposed piece of conversation, all move exchanges were in the form of questions and answers. With reference to the first adjacency pair part exhibited in line 1, the teacher asked his students to complete the given sentence. The student in line 2 performs the second adjacency pair part by responding to her teacher and completing the sentence. After repeating again the example of the first student, the teacher performed another first adjacency pair which is in the form of a closed question shown in line 4. Responsively, the learner in line 7 executed the second pair part. In fact, the latter might be a dispreferred pair; in the sense that the student disagreed with what his peer had previously said.

In effect, all along the observation of the recorded session in teacher (B) classroom context, move exchanges between participants seem to be very alike. In most classroom conversations, the teacher asked them to provide example inserting the idiomatic expressions. All in all, adjacency pairs in this classroom context were almost of the same patterns taking the form of question and answer. Giving that fact; it was a little bit difficult to expose other patterns of adjacency pairs for the non availability of a variety of other forms. The following extract is another piece of talk that is worth to be analyzed.

**Excerpt 4.2:**

1. T: and then finally finally that’s wishful]
2. LL: thinking[ ((students talk together to complete the teacher’s phrase))]
3. T: thinking.
4. L1: that will be the day.
5. T: that will be the day.
6. LL: laughter.
7. yes.
7.T: So this is. what about that will be the day? It was an expression we
8.LL: yes
we dealt with (( students talk together ))
9. T: we saw ( . ) ok
10. LL: second year
   first year
   first semester
11. T: what was for ( . ) what the meaning of that will be the day ?
12. LL: ( ) (( students talk together ))
13. L2: that will never happen.
14. T: that will never happen . do you think that the last expression —
15. L3: no !
16. T: no ? ok ? any one h::as (2) yes who has said no yes fatima ok express your your say ( )
17. L3: that wishful thinking for me I understand it °as good idea° .
18. T: ok ? she understood it as a good idea ok[
19. L: it means they hope to ]
20. T: something positive rather than negative

The teacher asked students to give their explanation to the expression ‘wishful thinking’ in the move displayed in line 1. So, this was the first adjacency pair part summarized in the form of an indirect question for he was approximately about to ask the question about its meaning but the student anticipated this by providing the answer. In doing this, she performed the second adjacency pair part shown in line 4. Again in line 11, the teacher executed another first adjacency pair part. It was in the form of a question inquiring about the meaning of the expression given by the student ‘that will be the day’. The second adjacency pair part was produced by the learner in line 13 throughout answering the posed question. The third adjacency pair in the conversation above was initiated once more by the teacher who took the turn to ask his students whether the explanation provided by their peer in line 13 was correct or not. Yet, there was an abrupt cut off by the learner in line 14. The latter performed the second pair part in an anticipated way; that is before the teacher finished his question. In fact, the second adjacency pair part
in line 14 is a *dispreferred* one because the student rejected what had been stated in line 13. This abrupt performed interruption by the student paved the way for a very short process of negotiation of meaning. That is, when the student disagreed with the explanation of her peer, the teacher asked to explain her viewpoint and this is what happened lastly as perceived in line 16. Then the student took the turn to elucidate the meaning of the idiomatic expression in line 17.

On the whole, and after viewing the recorded sessions for several times, the yielded conclusion is that almost all adjacency pairs were of ‘*question and answer*’ form. Maybe this is due to the fact that the set objective for the assigned tasks implied on students to give explanation to the idiomatic expressions.

After dealing with two extracts selected from the first classroom context, now the focus is to cover adjacency pair system in the second classroom context. In doing this, the study ends with a variety of data related to the general form of the adjacency pair parts to see their effects on the flow of interaction. Thus, the role of these parts in optimizing learners’ mastery of interactional competencies is then detected. Excerpt three is taken from the first session recorded.

**Excerpt 4.3**

1. T: hh another or the last example is someone who *talked* (.)
2. LL: too much ((students talk together))
3. T: too much too much. ↑ so this someone who is ((waiting for the student to say the adjective))
4. LL: *talkative*
5. T: talkative is it interesting? (.)
6. LL: no.
7. T: to to be friend (.) to be friend of someone who is talkative
8. LL: no.
9. T: no. so it’s *boring*? (.)
10. LL: yes
11. T: have you ever been bored by someone °who talks too much°
12. LL: yes
14. L1: sir (( asking for the turn to speak))
   (4) ((then the teacher gives her the floor))
15. L1: hh when someone beside me starts talking too much I bored to death—
16. T: I?(.) was.
17. L1: ah yes I was bored to death especially when I want to study in peace °for example° (.)
   and he is beside me talking too much.
18. T: so this is not bo::r yes it can be boring but in fact it’s annoying this is annoying
19. L2: disturbing you
20. T: it’s trou: troublesome (. ) this case of hh annoyance not boredom (. ) who knows someone
   who is boring because he is talkative.[
21. L1: I do (. ) yes I know (guess) who is very talkative an:::d each morning each morning
   comes good morning how are you? what’s that? what this? ↑((the student is playing the
   role here by changing her pitch))
   (( she laughs)) each morning
22. L: (   )
23. T: does it bored you?
24. L2: yes it DOES (. ) the person asks too many questions.
25. T: ok so usually when we are talkative we are curious at the same time so we ask too much question and (. ) we most of the time we don’t feel (. ) we don’t feel ready to answer the questions but there is insistence (guess) [
26. LL: (   ) (( students talk together))
27. L2: and and at very beginning of the day’
28. L1: yeah (guess)
29. T: and also when we are when we are talkative°(   ) more questions° (   ) what do we do.
30. LL: (   ) (( students talk together))
In that extract all the first pair parts of the adjacency pairs were performed by the teacher who all the time asked questions to learners who responded to him. In line 5, 9, 11, the teacher asked questions. Accordingly, students performed the second adjacency pair parts that were in a preferred form for they answered using a single word either ‘yes’ or ‘no’ as it is prevalent in lines 6, 8 and 10. Hence, it is worthy to state that the second adjacency pairs were not produced by a single student. That is, learners attempted to speak together, except for the one in line 15 where she took the floor to respond to the question and her output went beyond a single word. Once more in line 20, the teacher performed the first adjacency pair part by addressing another question through which he wished to get more responses and interactants. The student in line 21 was so good at her interaction with the teacher that she answered first the question in a very spontaneous way. Her second adjacency pair part provoked the teacher to ask her another question as seen line 24. This paved the way for a dyadic interactional process between the teacher and the student; a process that started in line 20 and ended in line 27.

Almost all the examples viewed in this session were also in the form of ‘question/answer’ pairs. As stated earlier this is the objective of tasks selected by teacher that perhaps reduced the chance of having a variety of conversations and pieces of talk.

**Excerpt 4.4**

1. T: other cases or other
   yes please (( giving the floor for a students who asked for the turn to speak))
2. L1: eh I’m in the edge of my sit when I watch the action’s movies hh(.) because—
3. T: no no no we are speaking about a case a real case °now look any one has had an experience. It’s an experience(.) of being on the edge of that sit(.) at some kind of show. movie or type ‘(guess) describe now this case
4. L1: yes. eh I was in the edge of my sit when—
5. T: ON.
6. L1: on the edge of my si::t when I was watching a movi::e an action[
7. T: what was that movie exactly.
8. L1: an action movie
9. T: what was that.
10. L: ‘(guess)
    (3.5)
11. L1: [temInato:r] ((the student pronounces it in a French pronunciation))
12. T: [t3:.mI.neIta] (( implicit repair through which he corrected for her the pronunciation))
13. L1: yes
    (3) hh [
14. T: you were scared maybe?
15. L1: yes.
16. T: scared?
17. L1: yes
18. T: scared or on the edge interested?
19. L1: both
20. T: both?
21. L1: yes
22. it’s very (. ) it’s an amazing movie and I liked it so much.
23. T: how how did you realize that it was interesting you? that you were really interested (. ) in it.
    (5.0)
24. L1: because I liked action.
25. T: yes but were you able to to go to sleep before the end of the film?
26. L1: yes yes
27. T: ok so you was not interested in this case?
29. T: so if you were able to go to sleep meaning you have left the movie.[
30. L2: you are not on the edge of spark.]
31. T: you were not you are not on the edge (. ) maybe you have not understood the question< you have answered before finishing the question. You were interested right?
32. L1: yes
33. T: you were on the edge of you sit right? so then my question now (. ) have you slept
or did you sleep before the end of the film? (3.0) before the end?
34. L1: no maybe after in hours or (.) until[
35. T: did you wait until the film finish?

One of the most striking points noticed in this conversation is that the teacher tried, to the maximum, to involve the student in a process of interaction. Yet, the student was so reluctant to go on producing output. And when she was performing second adjacency pair parts, she did it in a preferred way, in the sense that she summarized her answers in a single word as it is seen in lines 13, 15, 17, 21, 26, 32. Except for the move in line 34 in which the same student executed a second adjacency pair part which is in a dispreferred way reflecting her perspective. We have to stress again that all the adjacency pairs were in the form of ‘question and answer’ type.

Hitherto, the study attempted to expose some extracts to view how learners get involved in classroom pieces of conversation with their peers and with teacher. The attempt is approached throughout the most commonly used mechanisms of interaction that are ‘turn taking system’ and ‘adjacency pairs’. Moreover, the study attempted, so far, to go deeper in the analysis of TT by analyzing some excerpts taken from classroom context.

Before analyzing pieces of conversations taken from both classroom settings, the outset of this chapter was devoted to interpret the answers given by teachers and learners as well. In actual fact, learners’ and teachers’ questionnaire results, extracts from TT and LL are used in the following section to see the correlation between findings of CD investigation and the ones gotten from questionnaires.

3.3. Discussion of the Results

Undoubtedly, this section is, by far, the most intriguing one; for it is the part of the research in hand in which all questions are expected to be answered. Accordingly, and to
achieve this, the study considers data analysis. That is to say, it is an imperative thing to go through conversations studied beforehand. The latter are keystone parts confirming or refuting the answers provided by teachers and learners in questionnaires. In what follows, an interpretation of data gotten from classroom is provided on the light of the literature review of the dissertation’s theoretical part. The interpretation is first about revisiting TT and then it looks carefully into LL. This interpretation serves in considering and putting into questions answers given in participants’ questionnaires.

3.3.1. Teacher Talk

The discussion of findings got from the analysis of teachers’ talk initiates by scrutinizing types of questions both teachers made use of during the interactional process. Then, it sheds light on the strategies teachers depended on to repair their students’ errors. Subsequently, the study highlights components of LL; namely turn taking system and adjacency pairs. Conclusively, we attempt to view and consider the effects of the four parameters on the course of verbal communication in CD.

3.3.1.1. Adopted Types of Questions

The inspection of five sessions gave us a broad and a comprehensive insight about the way teachers asked questions during oral expression class. Hence, the most striking point perceived is that a great deal of addressed questions by both teachers was ‘display questions’. They also relied greatly on ‘close questions’ which require ‘yes’ and ‘no’ items. According to the literature read and exposed so far, one of the most intriguing factors determining the quality and the quantity of learners’ output is types of questions. In selecting closed and display ones, students’ responses are expected to be short and simple in terms of structure. While referential and open questions imply long responses and complex ones in which student may agree, disagree, argue, inform…etc.
If truth is to be told, teacher (B) made more use of open questions compared to teacher (A). Once more, we have to emphasize that noting this remark is not to have a comparative study. Hence, it is just to see the effect of the types of question utilized on learners’ oral contributions. Teacher’ (B) reliance on referential questions paved the way for him to drag his interactants into negotiation of meaning process that resulted often in a persistent course of interaction. These questions provoked them to use examples, state facts, talk about their personal experiences and communicate their perspectives to their teacher and peers as well. Their utterances were longer compared to the ones produced as responses to closed and display questions. As far as teacher (A) is concerned, most of the questions he addressed to his students were closed ones; as a consequence, his students’ output was limited, humble in its syntactic and semantic structure.

Additionally, throughout attending some OE sessions, it was perceived that almost all asked questions were about the idiomatic expressions. Teachers exposed the new idioms to their learners and sometimes ask them about their meanings. Once they are known, they set them to exercise their use into meaningful examples. Needless to say that it is the objective of the assigned tasks that implied on teachers to ask closed questions; for they ask their students whether they were acquainted with the given idiomatic expression or not. Subsequently, learners most of the time, answered using yes or no pairs. In other occasions, they explained very briefly the idiom in question. In actual fact, it cannot be expected from the part of learners to go on in communicating orally with their teacher or peers unless questions incite long answers.

Yet, in truth, students were more stimulated and enthusiastic to speak further when their teachers solicited them to express their minds, clarify their opinions and narrate their experiences using the idiomatic expression. They were willing to take part in the discourse
being constructed to the point that they were competing to take the floor and be allowed to speak.

On the light of what is suggested by Hall& Verplaetse (2000, p. 156), the function of teachers’ questions is, indeed, a window through which more access is gained to understand how questions are used as tools to rouse learners’ eagerness to generate output. Researchers reckon that the posed questions in FL classroom can either intensify classroom interaction or trim learners’ participation in classroom. This is absolutely true for as they reckon, questions are a decisive factor controlling learners’ interaction. With reference to the status of learners in this study, they were so communicative and interactant when they were exposed to open and referential questions compared to cases in which they were solicited to respond to closed ones.

In what follows, we state the results and give remarks about what was detected about the second component of TT analyzed beforehand in this chapter.

3.3.1.2. Repair’s Impact on Classroom Interaction

Allwright & Bailey (1991,p. 179) suggest that if teachers want to let communication goes on with their students, there is no better way than offering positive affective feedback. Otherwise learners may receive such discouraging signals leading them to stop or decline their will to interact using the TL. Moreover, Bailey& Nunan (1996, p. 272) consider that in oral tasks learners are in need of many factors to keep on performing orally such as humour, patience and above all positive feedback. The latter gives them a kind of relief that decreases their affective filter and at the same time makes them feel self-assured to express themselves. On the words stated by Richards & Lockhart (1994,p.188): “feedback may serve not only to let learners know how they have performed but also to increase motivation and create a supportive classroom climate”. Conclusively, the effect
of positive feedback has significantly been proved to be worth utilized by SL and FL teachers due to the positive effects it has on learners’ oral performance.

All what is articulated above is just the same conclusion recognized in this study. That is, both teachers did not, in actual fact, hesitate to show their acknowledgment, approval and acceptance of their students’ comments or answers. Both teachers showed their appreciation throughout repeating their learners’ given utterances. Indeed, it could not be noticed during the observational phase and in viewing for several times the recorded sessions, that teachers’ reliance on positive feedback made students feel so at ease while producing their output. Especially, when teachers nodded, smiled and used smooth facial expressions to express their acceptance about what was stated by their learners. In many cases, we have remarked that some learners were somehow shy and even uncertain to finish their utterances. However, when they noticed their teachers’ gestures, they were encouraged to terminate their output.

With regards to the second type of teacher’s feedback; that is corrective one, many points are credible to be mentioned. According to Swain (1985) and Lyster (1994) (cited in Housen & Pierrard, 2006), meaningful interaction in a FL classroom did not pave the way for learners to achieve high levels of accuracy. To them, learners need to notice the gap between their interlanguage and the TL to produce comprehensible output. To achieve this, teachers are advised to rely on negative or corrective feedback in the form of recast that is plainly explicated in the former chapter. Corrective feedback as a pedagogical issue has received a great deal of investigation among scholars of SLA/FLA. Regardless of the diverse opinions given about the way it should be addressed to repair students’ errors, it is seen as a starting point of a meaning negotiation. To put it more concretely, whenever an error is committed by learners, negotiated interaction has to take place between them and teachers. That is, interactional modifications such as comprehension checks, clarification
requests can be performed to get the error repaired and solve problems of misunderstanding and even avoid communication breakdown. Moreover, as explained earlier, corrective feedback is a driving force enabling FL learners confirm or refute hypotheses they are making about the structure of the TL. Interactive learners are simultaneously using an interlanguage based on some hypotheses and while producing output, feedback is the criterion they rely on to get confirmed or corrected by their teacher. Yet, addressing corrective feedback is a very thorny, complicated as a topic and problematic to FL teachers. It is so, for it is a decision that has to be taken but not randomly and arbitrarily. It depends on teacher’s set objective beforehand; whether his target is to prioritise language accuracy or communication.

In fact, teacher (A) neither corrected his students’ errors immediately, nor explicitly. During the whole situations in which errors were produced by learners, teacher (A) never stopped the student to drag his/her attention to the committed error. He rather let him/her carry on his/her oral performance and then initiated a process of recast by himself by reformulating the mis-constructed part of the sentence or the mispronounced word. The teacher did not exercise the different strategies used to repair errors; strategies such as explicit feedback, clarification requests, elicitations, metalinguistic feedback and repetition. He constantly made use of recast. Nevertheless, relying mainly on recast as a strategy to deal with learners’ errors did not always bring the expected results. Results such as making the student notice the produced error and then corrected it implicitly by the teacher. This idea stems from the literature we have read about recast, for instance Lyster and Ranta (1997) argue that it is strongly debatable that learners always perceive that they performed an error which was repaired by their teacher. It is important then not to overemphasize the strength of recasts, for we remarked that those learners whose output was erroneous did not say again their output in a correct way after being corrected
throughout moves of recast. Accordingly, no confirmation is really definite about learners’ awareness of the production of errors. As it is also not sure that learners can be conscious that these errors were fixed by their teachers. It is true that learners’ output did not contain a lot of language mistakes, yet, the ones performed were not treated by learners throughout a process of self repair. The latter could be a beneficial process for learners in the sense that they first recognize the type of error they did and then repair it. This never took place in teacher’ (A) classroom context; in all the cases where they performed errors, it was always the teacher who repaired it instead of urging them to self repair.

Definitely, we agree with the argument presented by Lyster (2007,p. 116) about the possibility of learners’ non-perception of their erroneous output. As a means of illustration, it is discerned, during analyzing interaction in teacher’ (A) classroom context, that a student has produced a sentence in which she used the modal verb *might*. Then, she conjugated the verb in the present simple by adding an’s’ to the verb after the modal. She was not corrected by her teacher. Consequently, she continued making the same mistake at each time she used a modal verb. Nonetheless, learners, whose language is investigated in the scope of this dissertation, were third year ones. Most of them were about to graduate from university. This implies that the student should recognize that the verb after modals is to be in stem form. The fact of making the same wrong grammar mistake means that she does not know it. Hence, teacher’s dismissal of correcting her error resulted in the student’s persistence of making the same error.

Having considered the interpretation of results got from teacher’s (A) way of offering repair, it is also reasonable to look at the second language classroom context observed in this study. Indeed, both teachers’ behaviours are quite the reverse, for contrariwise to teacher (A), teacher (B) did not overlook any committed error without being immediately repaired. He did not save any effort to refer back to the mistake in his
learners’ output. He did not, in actual fact, make use of recasts for most of the time he relied heavily on ‘explicit feedback’, in the sense that he, firstly, indicated the ill-formed part of output and then corrected it. In other occasions, he used clarification requests techniques as questions to make his learners reformulate their output correctly. In few occasions, he repeated the erroneous part of learners’ output.

Undoubtedly, in addressing repeatedly and explicitly feedback to learners’ output may lead to communication breakdown among interactants. This is what was detected in teacher (B) classroom context. In an excerpt already inserted and analyzed in teacher’s (B) talk, we noticed that a learner committed many pronunciation errors. In every occasion, the teacher offered explicit feedback, the student felt so shy and hesitant to go on in her oral performance. This was so apparent according to the decreasing level of her tone for she felt so embarrassed to keep on speaking. Moreover, in some occasions, teacher’s way of addressing negative feedback was somehow tough. Moreover, he also took considerable time to correct and give comments and extra information that sometimes led to distorting the flow of oral communication among them. Something was perceived is that the teacher addressed comments on the way some student performed orally during their role plays. That is, while learners were taking turns to play out dialogues, he did not serve his effort to criticize their speech. For instance, one of the students was reading in a very enthusiastic way that she was, in fact, speeding up while reading; the teacher then expressed his disapproval towards this. Hence, the student got shy that she could find nothing to say further.

Most of errors committed by learners in this classroom context were pronunciation ones and occasionally there were some grammatical errors. In fact, regardless of how debatable is the effect of corrective feedback, the fact of repairing pronunciation errors is appreciated for in neglecting them, fossilization is likely to take place. Learners may
continue pronouncing these words in the same wrong way. Yet, error correction had to be approached in an inductive and less lengthy way, for in repairing intensively and continuously students’ errors led to communication breakdown. As it sometimes resulted in students’ unwillingness to finish what they were uttering. The teacher performed many moves of corrective feedback that when he asked them to give other examples in which they solicited to use an idiomatic expression, a terrible silence of more than four minutes took place by the end of the second recorded session. The only justification that can be given to this situation was the previous heavy process of corrective feedback performed by the teacher.

After exposing the result got throughout the analysis of TT effects on the course of interaction. Findings derived from LL are worth to be interpreted in what follows.

3.3.2.1. Learners’ Turn Taking System

On the whole, the most notable thing deduced after analyzing learners’ language is that it was not as ripen as expected to be. Contrariwise to what is expected from third year English students, their actual oral performance is characterized by being simple in terms of its syntactical and semantic structure. Their produced utterances were so short and the vocabulary items exercised in their output were relatively associated with the idiomatic expressions to which they were exposed.

Students’ turn taking is, generally, typified by its rigidity in the sense that it is very limited in terms of its TCUs and blocks. Besides, very often teachers took control of turns’ allocation. Saying it plainly, most of the time, both teachers dominated classroom discourse. This left a very limited room for their learners to self initiate discussion and negotiation. In many occasions, it was the teacher who usually opened move exchanges of the interactional processes. In claiming that teachers took over the management of the discourse is, in reality, justified for they were the ones who frequently performed the
moves of nominating the next speaker to take the floor to speak. Such a fact, made conversations and interactional exchange moves seemed to fall in a strict and rigid form. Accordingly, learners were less active than they should be as third year English language students. Additionally, it was perceived that interaction of students with their teacher was less genuine and spontaneous than it ought to be, for the latter fell in the same structure. Putting it differently, the teacher nominated the learner to speak after the latter asked for the turn. Next, he offered feedback and then transition relevance place took place for the teacher closed the move so as to open a new one by nominating another student to speak.

Hence, on the whole, classroom interaction fell into the IRF/IRE form. In other words, very often, teachers addressed questions to their learners and collected answers which were, in their turn, followed by feedback and evaluation. This was the general mode of their move exchanges. Yet, it was in very few occasions that students took turns to ask questions about their peers’ generated output or comment on them by using feedback. This fact, made interaction seemed to be very strict and extremely bounded between mainly teachers and learners. Ohta explains: “Overall, in the classroom corpus, peers interaction increases accuracy rather than reducing it, because learners catch their own and each others’ errors during the interactive process” (2001,p.124). Accordingly, it is very apparent that peer interaction has been acknowledged to be of paramount value in SLA/FLA classrooms, and this kind of interaction was not very dominant in the classrooms observed.

In breaking the general structure of interactional process; that is by taking the turns in a non soft way and overlapping their teachers’ turn or peers’ ones, made conversations seem to be spontaneous. Overlapping and taking turns in a non soft way gave the impression that classroom conversations are not strictly instructional controlled by the drive of pedagogical objectives set for the assigned tasks. Hence, this is, by far, the most sought thing in an oral expression class. Something is worth to be stated is that learners
who were eloquent and skilled in their English oral performance in both classroom contexts were the most ones who asked for turns to speak. They were all the time willing to take part. Their self assurance and high self-esteem was a factor paving the way for them to take turns in a non soft way without waiting for teacher’s turn allocation. Daring and audacious students enjoyed taking risks to speak and overlap the speech of their teacher and peers compared to their peers who were less assured. Moreover, even their outcome was more complex and elaborated than the one of those who seemed to be reserved and shy to take turns. Shy and introverted learners produced very limited output; simple words and considerably short sentences; they made more pauses and hesitated sometimes in prolonging in courses of meaning negotiation.

Furthermore, the analysis of both teachers and learners’ chunks of speech facilitated the task of having a broad perspective about learners’ language. Among the most conclusion came with, after observing their turn taking system, was that in many occasions students were overlapped by their teachers. Subsequently, this led to the alteration of the course of interaction, in the sense that sometimes learners lost the flow of ideas they wanted to transmit to the other participants. Once interrupted, some of them could difficultly restore the course of their output production after being interrupted in the midst of their speech delivery.

One of the other things that captivate one’s attention is that interaction which took place in both classroom contexts scrutinized was dyadic in form. That is, interaction fell in the same strict pattern. Putting it more concretely, students did hardly ever get involved in collaborative constructed interaction with their peers; for they usually interacted with their teachers. Collaboration among learners in both classroom contexts was in cases in which students were assigned to perform role plays, as dialogues. Learners were exchanging turns to perform oral dialogues which they either wrote as a practice of the newly acquired
idiomatic expressions or they simply read from’ ALL Clear’ book. However, still exchange among peers was not as expected to be. It was hypothesized that learners of third year English language were apt enough to interact with one another and prolong in sustained conversations. The results did not confirm this expectation, however. It is due to teachers’ control of classroom discourse which might well leave little room for learners to take turns to speak and fewer opportunities to interact together. Ohta conforms this deduction when he says: “teacher talk should not take the major proportion of a class hour, otherwise you are probably not giving students enough opportunities to talk” (2001, p. 99). Hence, what could be deduced all along our observation is that the more teachers controlled discourse, the less interactant students were. Teachers’ withdrawal from discourse’ generation resulted in the variety of learners’ turns taking.

In brief, these are the most striking results drawn on students’ turn taking system. Now focus is directed to describe the outcome we could bring to an end about learners’ adjacency pairs system in both classrooms.

**3.3.2.2. Students’ Performance of Adjacency Pairs**

As concerns the adjacency pairs performed in both classroom contexts, we remarked that they were generally in the form of ‘question/answer pairs’. If truth is to be told, we noticed that students were just producing simple utterances in which they made use of the newly acquired idioms. That is to say, almost all the process of interaction in both classroom settings occurred within the question and answer patterns. There were, in very few occasions, some other types of adjacency pairs. According to Chaudron (1988), classroom research has shown that formal classroom conversations are generally constrained by pre-allocated turns, where instructor-dominated question/answer routines drive classroom activities.
Viewing the repeated occurrence of instances in collected data for many times allowed us to have a deep analysis of the way in which classroom speech event was organized and how participants played roles in comprehending adjacency pair turns. Among the most noticeable deduction achieved is that it was all the time teachers who performed the first adjacency pair parts. It is acknowledged that there is a considerable difference between everyday conversations and the ones taking place in formal classroom settings; more specifically FL classrooms. This is advocated by Kumpulainen and Wray:” it should not be forgotten that there is a difference between everyday and school-based interactions” (2001, p.16). In claiming this, they tried to elucidate that classroom conversations are intentionally oriented towards learning. Moreover, in both classroom contexts, it was merely in a single case where a student performed the first part of the adjacency pairs. It was always teachers who took the turn to perform the first part; that was almost strictly confined to questions and then students executed the second parts in the form of answers. Logically speaking, tasks assigned by teachers imply the quality of interaction in language classroom. We cannot expect a high produced learners’ outcome when they are supposed to fill in the gaps, use expressions in short utterances…etc. In such types of tasks, learners’ output was strongly linked to the first pair part, for instance, when they are asked a questions, they are supposed to answer and this was what most of the time took place in both classes. Learners did not argue, disagree, refuse…etc as the diverse types of second pair parts due to the nature of allocated tasks. Hence, when they were asked to justify their answers or whenever the teacher requested a clarification, most learners were ready to take turns to do so.

Conclusion

To have a good insight about the process of classroom interaction, the chapter in hand used two tools of data collection; questionnaires which were handed out to teachers
of oral expression module and third year university students. Subsequently, observation was held using a camcorder to scrutinize the nature of conversations taking place in classroom contexts. The method on which data analysis was conducted was ‘Conversation Analysis’; the latter paved the way for us to go through both teacher talk and learners’ language. Teachers and learners’ discourse was investigated depending on diverse components to see their effects on the course of oral performance. This was accomplished by splitting chunks of CD into extracts to unveil how communication is performed. All along the analysis, it was found that on the one hand, teachers talk embodied in their strategies of questioning and feedback affected learners’ interaction. On the other hand, learners’ participation in taking turns was, to a great extent, not sufficient as it ought to be. The moves they carried out to generate adjacency pairs were so moderate and humble that classroom interaction was almost rigid and not cooperatively constructed. We do acknowledge that interaction is not easy as a procedure; teachers and learners as well need to do their best to make it a successful one. In what comes in the subsequent chapter, some further observations and pedagogical implications are introduced to help for bettering the quality of oral performance in classrooms.
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The focal target of the whole study is to come closer to classroom interaction, to unveil phenomena that might not be seen at first sight and have strong impact on the direction of oral communication, however. Starting by directing efforts to scrutinize findings derived from teacher talk and the chapter highlights results appearing in learners’ language. Then the chapter moves on to contemplate the correlation between the yielded data in the questionnaires got back from students and the actual remarks presumed during classes’ attendance. Hence, the chapter introduces some pedagogical and instructive recommendations for teachers and learners working on to develop oral skills; using notes gained from the analysis of discourse and the literature read hitherto about the issue under investigation.

4.1. Discussion of the Keystone Findings

The yielded information from the use of a CA methodology applied to the analysis of the classroom discourse paved the way for us to see to what extent the participants’ given information via the handed questionnaires are relevant to the actual events occurring in classroom setting. Indeed, many questions introduced in the questionnaires have been already inductively answered in the data analysis and in the results ‘section. Here, it is valuable to consider again the got responses from teachers and students’ questionnaires for the reason of perceiving the correlation between the given answers and the observed data.

Indeed, it was remarked that both teachers were enjoying the fact of sharing with their students their experiences and knowledge. Both teachers showed their enthusiasm to teaching OE class and their readiness to create opportunities for their learners to benefit from oral expression sessions. Moreover, teachers considered that their interaction with their students is very imperative. Hence, this justifies why classroom interaction was more limited between teachers and students. Peers’ interaction was nearly absent in both
classroom settings, except when they were set to perform dialogues and role plays. Though teachers considered peer interaction valuable according to their responses in questionnaires. Both teachers, whose language was put into investigation, had the tendency to limit the track of classroom interaction turning around them and their students. They devoted a handful effort to enhance collaboration among their learners during output production. Consistent with the replies provided in the questionnaires, teachers stressed that students’ interaction with the input material is important as well. Thus, it was remarked that this was true for teachers kept creating speaking opportunities for their students throughout making them interacting with the ‘All clear ‘book’ displayed on their PCs and containing activities about idiomatic expressions. Hence, the basic gate of initiating classroom interaction was from the input material. That is to say, it was from the tasks in that book which opened the process of classroom interaction. Students either made use of the expressions into meaningful examples. They listened to authentic dialogues where idioms are used and then answer listening comprehension questions or they sometimes write similar dialogues.

In responding to the question in which teachers were requested to provide their perspective about the status of their students, almost all teachers considered their students not reluctant. If truth is to be told and in accordance with the data got from the videotapes and the sessions recorded, it could be noticed that not all students took part in classroom discourse construction. Indeed, classroom interaction was quite limited to those students who were audacious enough, who seemed to be self-assured to take more risks, play more roles. Those students got more chances to interact compared to their peers. Regarding shy students, they were somehow reluctant and hesitant to participate, to comment on their peers’ output and even respond to their teachers’ questions. In cases, where teachers allocated the turn for them to speak, they did in very restricted and modest utterances in
comparison with their colleagues’ ones. Their embarrassment to speak was sometimes felt; their low tones, slow pace of their produced utterances and even their facial expressions revealed their hesitation to interact. Seeing some of their peers comfortable while contributing in classroom with the teacher and other learners might well be one of the reasons that restrained them from speaking. That is, during observation, it was perceived plainly that not all students seemed as active as their teachers claimed, for there were still some students who did not at all participate in oral class. Their shyness or their feeling of inferiority towards their active participant peers, who were more eloquent and daring in communicating in classroom, deprived them from having the same chance of speaking. One of the other points that captivated one’s attention also was that those active participants succeeded in monopolizing the allocated room of speech to all learners in classroom. They asked more than others for turns to speak; subsequently teachers gave them the floor to express themselves. This fact attracted one’s attention, for teachers; especially teacher (B) seemed to unconsciously address his speech to the same three or four students. Those were all the time asking for the turn that it became a kind of a circled and recurrent process limited to them and their teacher. Accordingly, the rest of students were less interactive, somehow withdrawn from the classroom discussion. Richards and Lockhart confirm that this is quite common in SL/FL classrooms:

> despite a teacher's best intentions, teachers sometimes interact with some students in the class more frequently than others. Although teachers generally try to treat students fairly and give every student in the class an equal opportunity to participate in the lesson, it is often hard to avoid interacting with some students more than others. This creates what is referred to a teacher’s action zone.

According to them, teachers may tend to interact more with approximate students to them than those who are seating further and their eyes focus more on those interactive students than the rest of students. Indeed, this is quite sure; at least during the sessions that were attended. Teacher B might well not recognise this fact; this justified his tendency to interact with some learners more than others. Yet, one could see how passive some students became in seeing the discourse held between their teacher and a given definite group of expressive students. Pertaining to the answered question in the questionnaire, teachers reported that they tried to draw shy and the silent learners to speak; yet this was not always the case in the actual recorded classroom events.

Cooperation among learners is not very present in both classroom settings examined in the scope of this study. Indeed, when LL was investigated throughout the analysis of some chunks of their conversations, it was clear then that students did not comment frequently on their peers’ produced output. That is, they did not offer feedback on the oral performance of their colleagues. Contrariwise to what was expected beforehand, third year students did not express their opinions on what others said owing to many factors, such as the type of tasks they were performing in classroom. That is, students were set to practise the newly acquired idiomatic expression in meaningful examples that, most of the time, were drawn from their real experiences. This did not provoke the interest of learners to add commentaries on their oral output. Yet, in the handful occasions in which there was interaction between learners in the form of offering feedback on each others’ contribution, learners’ utterances were so simple and considerably short. Almost no extrapolation was generated from the output of each other since this class is likely to be the major one in which learners were given a great deal of freedom to speak.
It is worthy to state that both teachers were, indeed, unconsciously controlling discourse. In plenty of cases, they strived to drag their students into a process of interaction. Hence, they sometimes failed owing to the type of questions they addressed on the one hand. Other times, students’ reluctance to go on speaking, the type of the assigned tasks contributed, on the other hand, to teachers’ failure to construct longer processes of interaction. Nonetheless, if teachers want to achieve a high degree of learners’ interaction, the first thing to be considered is to leave a substantial room of speech for them. That is to say, pushing learners forward to speak and interact verbally using the TL is at the heart of language acquisition. Thus, the more teachers control discourse, the less interactive their students will be.

With reference to topics dealt with and discussed in OE class, they were all anchored in the use of the idiomatic expressions though teachers said that there is a kind of variance in the discussed topics. Maybe the fewest attended sessions did not allow us to have a broader view about the type of topics framed in class, the way they are negotiated and who are the providers of these topics. During the fifth observed sessions, the same route of presenting the lesson was processed; a route spinning around the use of idiomatic expressions. The same point is said about the material utilized to teach OE class. That is from responses got from questionnaires, teachers reported that they relied on different types of materials. Yet, it was observed that they depended on visual materials, in which texts, dialogues and drawings are used to include the idioms. As they also made use of oral materials, to set them listen to dialogues in connection with the use of the idiomatic expressions.

In fact, one of the captivating points during the observational phase is that not all the present students felt so at ease once they were in class. That is, some students’ facial expressions revealed that they felt bored or shy to take part in classroom debates. That is
why some of them were reluctant to collaborate with their teacher and peers in conversations. This raises the following question: what are factors that led to boredom or lack of enthusiasm to speak? It was guessed that topics did not appeal to their needs. However, most students stated that they were given the chance to propose issues for discussion. Unfortunately, this could not be perceived during the sessions observed. Moreover, learners stated that their teachers often gave them the opportunity to express their minds. Indeed, this is true, though teachers controlled the discourse in some occasions; they welcomed the intervention of their students. From their turn, the majority of learners stated that whenever they disagreed with their teacher on a given viewpoint, they tried to take the turn to speak so as to convince him with their perspective. During the attendance of five sessions, this was not detected for the reason that the type of tasks were about the use of idioms. Very limited room of debate was launched between students and teachers.

The greatest number of students reckoned that their teachers took control of the discourse in class. In admitting this, learners confirmed the remark given in this study. Regardless of teachers’ efforts to leave sufficient space for their learners to speak, it was very obvious that both teachers controlled discourse that even their learners could note it. Furthermore, students confirmed that they engaged with their peers in dialogues and conversations. This is was relatively true, in the sense that they were asked to make use of the expressions into dialogues in the form of pair works. Additionally, third year students were quite aware about the value of producing output during oral expression class and this is very important to achieve oral fluency. Yet, interactive students were almost the same during all sessions; they were those self-confident learners who took the floor more than others in classroom.
The majority of learners viewed that their teachers are relying on cooperation to teach OE class; for they incited them to give their views. If truth is to be told, teachers under investigation proved their readiness to listen to their students, they welcomed their examples and contribution. Still, it was not enough for they unconsciously left very limited room for discussion to their students in controlling discourse, took more time than they should to comment and interact. Besides, the majority of students evaluated the suggested topics to be ordinary. This might justifies why some students in classroom preferred to withdraw from conversations by keeping silent. They were not attracted by the negotiated topics. According to the answers provided in their questionnaires, learners informed that they felt willing to exchange ideas and comment on their peers’ intervention. However, this fact was almost absent in both classroom settings. Actually, every student performed his outcome and then received feedback directly from his teacher not from his peers. At least this is the conclusion inferred by the end of the observation. Finally, having a percentage of thirty seven of students, who were not still ready to go on in conversations and dialogues with English NS, elucidates that a considerable number of students needed to work on enhancing their confidence in using English as a language of communication in and outside classroom context. They need to free themselves from the barrier of keeping silent in cases on which they were requested to convey their concepts and thoughts using English language.

The attempt of the study was not to restrict its interest to TT or LL; the research rather focused to handle the analysis of both talks instead of confining it to a single part. In doing so, the attempt was to understand how the mechanism of classroom interaction occurs as a jointly constructed process by participants. This piece of research strived to know how teachers can gain a closer understanding of the process of interaction. Indeed, so as to achieve such a striving aim, it is considered that classroom interaction is not a simple
process as it seems to be. Provided teachers are acquainted with the mechanism of classroom interaction and the strategies which have to be adopted, they will certainly boost their learners’ willingness to produce output using the TL. It is believed that teachers, more specifically those teaching OE class, are advised to know what may enhance oral communication inside their classes. Richards and Nunan (1990) state:

Possible insights into the process of investigation include the point that description of process of investigation, not judgment about it, is important; that much can be gained by studying the interaction for patterns and patterns can sometimes be easily recognized by coding the interaction through an observation system; that teaching and changes in teaching behaviour require the teacher to make decisions, and these decisions can be made by investigation plus common sense.

(p. 22).

We do agree with Richards and Nunan (1990) because when teachers investigate their own classes, they put into question their way of teaching. They come closer to the patterns constructing classroom interaction and study it. Additionally, obstacles faced in while communicating with their learners using the SL/FL will be overcome. Teachers need to investigate their talk, to analyze every single pattern that makes their language so as to be able to grasp facts associated with interaction. Saying it otherwise, teachers need to revisit their way of questioning as they also need to control the way they address their learners’ errors. Simply, the two mentioned components are of paramount importance to gain more fruitful result from their teaching oral expression class. The latter, definitely, requires teachers to be highly reflective. Teachers need to grasp plainly insights on their talk for the latter can either obstruct or construct their learners’ participation. They can either maximize or minimize learning opportunities. Teachers, in brief, are requested to recognize the link between their talk, interactional adjustments and learning opportunities.
From their part, learners have to assume responsibility towards their learning process, by taking more risks and turns to speak. They need to go on in longer conversations and generate more output using to practice things they learn about TL. Learners need to be familiar with the basic principles of responding to interlocutors while being involved in dialogues and conversations. That is, they are required to comprehend how adjacency pairs system work in English language to be eloquent speakers. Needless to say that, the more students are audacious in taking the floor to speak, the more their oral performance will develop. Even psychologically speaking they are hypothesized to gain more confidence while interacting orally.

So far, many things have been stated about the attitude of both teachers enrolled in this piece of investigation during the analysis of their talk. The latter paved the way for getting a crystal clear idea about the effect of teachers’ perspective about teaching such a demanding class on classroom interaction. During all the attended sessions in both classroom settings, it was obvious that teachers tried to do all their best to incite their learners to react and orally communicate. They did not, in actual fact, save any efforts to stimulate them to participate throughout inviting them to practise the idioms they newly introduced. Regardless of the way they used to drag students into courses of interactive processes, it was very evident that both teachers showed their enthusiasm to listen to their students.

Despite the fact that both teachers tried to involve their students in classroom debates; they very often controlled the discourse. In reviewing for several times the videotaped lessons and in coming closer to the analysis of their talk, we could notice that teachers spoke more than they were supposed to do. They generated more output compared to their students and the space of talk allocated for their learners in class was most of the time less than the one taken by teachers. Stimulating learners to develop their oral skill is,
by no room of discussion, a very tricky process. In fact, it is not an easy matter to get all students react. Many elements are to be taken into consideration such as the types of questions they address to their learners; whether they are provoking questions or not. Questioning is one of the decisive parameters affecting the course of classroom interaction. On the one hand, asking open and referential questions, students are hypothesized to produce longer utterances and complex ones, using diverse strategies to communicate their ideas to their interlocutors. Hence, their output is deemed and even expected to be considerably moderate and simple in structure whenever they are solicited to answer closed or display questions. On the other hand, when teachers intervened to offer feedback; be it a positive or a negative, they influenced the oral contribution of students. According to our short experience in the observation of both teachers’ way of offering feedback, it could be deduced that the latter played a keystone role in learners’ oral production. One of the aspects that helped learners went on interacting with their teachers was the feeling that they were doing well in their contribution. A feeling that was fostered by the appraisal and agreement they got from their teacher’s positive feedback. That is to say, it was noticed that confident students seemed to feel relaxed and willing to participate in the construction of CD after their teachers offered positive feedback. Indeed, it is true that our knowledge is not yet ripened in TT analysis, because the attempt of this study is limited to deal with merely two of its aspects; questions and feedback. Nevertheless, we are quite mindful that corrective feedback has an imperative result on the increase or reduction of students’ oral output production. Indeed, corrective feedback is surely a thorny issue that scholars have not yet agreed on a given way of doing it. Corrective feedback is, after all, a decision to be taken by teachers in a very soft and intelligent way. It has to be so to keep the flow of interaction going on and simultaneously ensuring that the committed errors are repaired.
Concerning learners’ reaction with their teachers and peers, it could noticeably be identified that the role of students was medium and even passive compared to what it ought to be. They were expected to be more audacious and daring in taking turns and asking for the floor to interact in classroom. As the analysis of some excerpts exhibited, some students did not show their enthusiasm to keep on talking and being involved in conversations with their teachers despite his efforts to drag them into longer processes of interaction. The only justification given to this passive attitude of some students is their shyness to express themselves in the presence of an observer. Indeed, seeing a stranger who is there to scrutinize the whole events in classroom, including their own behaviours and language, using a camcorder, is not easily assimilated by students.

The fact of being viewed and filmed by a stranger in the midst of their interaction may lead to students’ anxiety. The latter can emerge due to the rise of their affective filter. Major (2008) puts it plainly that too much pressure is likely to disrupt performance and affective filter that prevents clear thinking. (p. 64). The same researcher claims that public speaking is one of the motives leading to classroom anguish. He even goes on explaining that students’ affective filter may augment by the fear of making errors while speaking loudly, next to the worry of being mocked at by their peers. In truth, students enrolled in this study are mature enough in terms of age and the use of English language. For many of them, it was the last year in university studies. They were grown up learners that they exceeded the phase of making fun of each others’ oral contributions. Hence, most students who were taking turns and responding to their teachers were almost the same; while others kept silent, reserved and withdrawn from classroom interaction.

Yet, this was not the case of all students for there were, as stated earlier, some who insisted on speaking and producing oral output. There were some learners who strived and competed to get the floor that sometimes they did not even wait for the allocation of turns.
They were trying to impose themselves in the construction of the discourse. They were confident and self-possessed learners that our presence did not affect their oral performance at all.

It is worthy to highlight, though briefly, remarks about peers’ interaction. The latter was considerably so tiny, for students did not considerably interact with each other as they were supposed to do. If truth is to be told, cooperation among students was not highly implemented in both classroom contexts. According to Alatis (1994), students must take responsibility for their learning process and product. The researcher clearly stated that:

All participants in the classroom are experts in conversational style, methods and reactions. The key to the foreign – or second language classroom is to guide and to unlock the door to potential interaction with both native and nonnative speakers of the language. After all; what is behind that door maybe a clue to real communication.

(p. 399).

As far as we are concerned, we do strongly agree with Atlatis, for it is considered that in the process of their communication together, FL learners learn to acquire more skills and strategies to produce output. As revealed in the previous chapters, practice that leads to generation of output is a very required motive for SL/FL to achieve oral proficiency. However, Cooperation among third year students took place only when their teachers set them to write dialogues including the new idiomatic expressions.

As far as the types of topics negotiated between teachers and students are concerned, teachers stated that they strived to assign their students to perform varied types of works. Teacher said that these works are of different forms as role plays, dialogues, exposes…etc. Yet, during the sessions attended, it was perceived that all tasks stemmed from ‘All clear’ book whose content is about the use of the idiomatic expressions. Interaction among learners and with their teachers was turning around these idioms.
Though teachers revealed about the mixture of issues exposed in oral expression class, all assigned tasks were about newly introduced idioms. Possibly, the few numbers of the attended sessions likely deprived one from the chance to spot the diversity of topics discussed as suggested by teachers.

With respect to the question raised about who the initiator of classroom discussions is, it was remarked that it was always teachers who took the task of setting the interactive course off. They did so by choosing a task form the ‘All Clear’ book or ask a given question, most of time associated with idioms. Then, verbal contact could be launched in classroom. In reality, the attention behind asking such a question is to know to what extent students were given the chance of proposing topics for negotiation. When learners are exposed to interesting topics that concur with their needs and of their choice, their will to interact will be higher compared to cases where teachers impose given issues on them.

The type of tasks assigned in OE class is definitely a decisive parameter determining the quality as well as the quantity of students’ interaction. Tasks are the driving force and the engine which enables learners’ generate output; the more the latter are stimulating and inspiring, the more students are active to prove and practise their oral proficiency. In both classroom settings, all tasks were taken from the book. They were all centred on the same objective which was about the use of idioms. Indeed, in the handed questionnaires, teachers of OE subject affirmed that tasks they assigned to their learners were diverse and varied; as individual, pair and group works. What could be taken in, all through observation, was not as such, however. Students were either set to perform individual works as generating utterances including idiomatic expressions or pair works as dialogues. In brief, no assortment of tasks; as stated by teachers, were perceived. In the words of Green et al (2002), when learners do not choose the topic of discussion in ESL/EFL classroom, or they are not engaged in observing and evaluating their peers or
themselves, they might consider their participation in the classroom discussion not worthy.

Green et al (2002) put it plainly:

The learners’ perception may be that there is no real reason why to participate actively in the classroom. As a result, learners cognitive engagement with the task and motivation to develop the topic to any significant degree, are likely to be poor.

(p.225).

We do strongly agree with their perspective, when learners feel that the issue does not attract their attention and provoke them to talk; they will prefer to set aside in class instead of participating orally. Learners were not providing feedback to the oral performance and output generated by their peers. Feedback was offered mainly by teachers. In many occasions, this made the process of interaction looks like a mechanical procedure involving some students and their teacher.

Learners’ continuous interaction led to the feeling of self-confidence and motivation. Indeed, those students who spoke more and strived to have more turns and take risks in classroom seemed to be very assertive compared to introverted and reserved peers. The former category of students felt more comfortable to generate output and communicate using English language. They were so relaxed and spontaneous while participating in the construction of discourse. Many features demonstrated their relaxation, for instance, their facial expressions, laughter with their peers and teachers, their sense of humour...etc. Contrariwise to them, timid and bashful learners barely produced output. And when they opted for speaking, their formed utterances were simple; characterized by their shortness. Sometimes, some of them seemed to be in rush to finish their utterances regardless of teachers’ striving to drag them into longer courses of interaction. Self-confident students were so eager to speak that sometimes they monopolized discussion. If those students were given more chances, definitely they would spend a long time performing orally.
Eventually, the attempt, so far, was directed to provide answers to questions addressed in the dissertation. Indeed, it is crucial to state plainly that both teachers involved in the study strove to open rooms for discussion with their learners. Yet, some facts deprived them from achieving high levels of interaction, as types of questions they posed to their students. On the whole, both teachers succeeded, in some occasions, to stimulate their learners to produce longer output. Their enthusiasm to push forward the wheel of students’ oral performance was so clear throughout their continuous questions, positive feedback they gave to encourage them to speak more. Their readiness to listen to each student, their determination to create opportunities for speaking and giving their opinions, their sense of humour and laughter showed that teachers were enjoying the fact of teaching oral class. Admittedly, they were trying to create an exciting environment for their learners but still they were controlling the space of speaking allocated for students meanwhile some others uttered no single word during the entire attended sessions. Certainly, learners have a great deal of responsibility to better and improve their oral communication skill. All in all, it is worth to stress that hypothesizing the connection between the good management of classroom interaction and learners’ oral proficiency is definitely confirmed and validated. That is, the more teachers mastered components of their talk, the more fruitful their efforts were.

In the preceding part of this chapter, the study interpreted results on the light of the events which took place in both classroom settings. Focus now is directed to provide some pedagogical recommendations that we presume are valuable for OE teachers and even students. That is, the study recommends ideas which help teachers manage the course of interaction and learners’ oral skills.

4.2. Pedagogical Recommendations

To have a well organised part of this section, we opted for organizing it into small
sections, they are as follow:

4.2.1. Managing Teacher’ Questions

In using conversation analysis, broad insight on the components of both teachers and students’ language was gained. It was viewed that the first parameter of analysis i.e., questions had a crucial impact on the course of verbal exchange moves between participants. It could be perceived clearly that the type of questions teachers solicited in their class is the motive determining students’ generated output. In cases where learners were required to answer open and referential questions, they performed better orally. Additionally, when teachers derived their questions from students’ responses, they succeeded greatly to make them speaking further for students showed their readiness to say more, to take more turns and communicate with their teachers.

Ellis (1990) stresses that questions are considered to be one of the interactional features characterizing teacher talk. Long and Sato (1983) (cited in Ellis 1990.p. 78) reveal, after conducting a study, that 79% of the solicited questions are closed and display questions. But in NS interaction with NNS, this type of questions is infrequent. From their part Nassaji and Wells (2000) confirm that when addressing questions suggesting issues of negotiation are likely to lead to richer learners’ oral contributions compared to cases when they are exposed to closed information questions (cited in Ellis 2003,p. 274). Nassaji and Wells clarify that the general form of teacher’s interaction in classroom i.e., the ‘IRF’ is a critical motive to decide about the course and the quality of classroom interaction. That is to say, both scholars consider that if learners’ oral contributions are evaluated, so the discourse is said to be pedagogical. Whereas if teachers manage to use their evaluation move to extend learners’ responses and try to make a bridge between what has been already stated and what will follow, then the discourse is said to be conversational. Indeed; throughout the analysis we can concur with scholars’ perspective. When the teacher
generated questions from responses of their learners, they succeeded better in dragging them into longer conversations. In brief, teachers should free themselves from the form of IRF/IRE, throughout making efforts to fuel learners going longer in their oral performance. In relying so much on IRE/IRF; as a pattern of interaction, very limited room for negotiation of meaning is left to students. In actual fact, negotiation of meaning which is set at the heart of acquiring TL in classroom setting is exceedingly requisite for it enables learners confirm or refute hypotheses presumed about its structure. The value of negotiation of meaning is the direct outcome of questioning as sustained by Richards & Renandya (2002) who put it concretely: “In the process of negotiating with the speaker of the target language, the learners receive the kind of input needed to facilitate learning.” (p.20)

As far as SLA/FLA is concerned, questions are very imperative to enhance the course of acquisition (Richards & Lockhart 1996, p.185); therefore questioning is acknowledged to be a skill that teachers should strive to acquire. Convergent or closed questions require short responses from the part of learners. Hence, they create handful opportunities for students to practise the TL. Unlike display/ closed or convergent questions, divergent, open or referential questions are said to serve generating conversations and communication in ESL/EFL classrooms. Something is noteworthy to be mentioned, is that teachers also have the tendency to direct their questions to some given students in language classroom; students who are self-possessed and are more proficient compared to their peers. Yet, it goes without saying that learners of a FL are of different levels in terms of answering questions as asserted by Richards &Lockhart (1996, p. 188) and as perceived in both classroom contexts. In a view of that, teachers are advised to take notice of this fact instead of counting on the audacious and talented students mainly to
create discourse. They have to create equal chances of language practice for all students rather than letting some monopolize discourse.

In asking questions, teachers are required to wait for given time before soliciting answers from their students. In truth, both teachers, whose talk has been put into questions, were giving sufficient time for their learners to respond to the asked question. This permitted learners to think and construct output and then communicate it to their interlocutors. Providing learners are not given adequate time for answering questions and then they are allocated by their teachers to respond, this might well make them feel perplexed and confused. Communication breakdown as well is likely to occur.

Indeed, likewise first language learners, SL/FL ones need to feel they are in a safe environment in which they are given time to talk and feel ready enough to take risks and engage into processes of negotiation of meaning. It is this healthy and suitable environment in which learners are involved in that will inspire them to produce output. Provided learners feel relaxed and unperturbed, they will be immersed in classroom as active participants. Needless to argue, that many factors may decide on students’ interaction in classroom such as teachers’ facial expressions, their tones, their readiness to listen to their students. Even feedback plays a keystone to create that exciting environment.

4.2.2. Feedback Management

Feedback, as stated by Mackay (2007, p. 91) and investigated in SLA/FLA research, brings interactional benefits when addressed to learners’ utterances. Feedback, according to Mackay, is the evidence for learners about how much successful they were in their utterances’ production. Allwright& Bailey (1991, p. 94) highlight that positive feedback is highly required in SL/FL classroom for it helps learners to get encouraging affective signals about their oral production using the TL. Yet, it should not be exaggerated to the extent that learners cannot perceive their erroneous part of their output.
Positive feedback, with its diverse forms, has an effective effect on the psychological side of learners’ perception on the process of FLA. According to the observed data in both classroom events, it was remarked that when teachers provided their learners with positive feedback and depending on nodding and facial expressions to show their agreement about what was uttered by, encouraged them greatly in the persistence of outcome production. It is as well believed that teachers of any FL are advised to apply the use of positive feedback as a mandatory component of their talk. It fosters learners’ self-assurance and triggers their will to interact more and decreases their fear and anxiety that are very frequent in FL classroom. Indeed, Learners might feel neglected and deem their oral contribution to be worthless provided the teacher does not respond to their responses.

Ohta (2001, p.129) stresses that today’s TL teaching strives to promote language acquisition through learners’ participation. However, no concurrence has been established about the way errors should be treated. It is still debatable that corrective feedback should be offered immediately, delayed or ignored totally, implicit or explicit. Yet, one of the most points agreed upon is that learners of a SL/FL are making hypotheses about the structure of this language while interacting verbally. Theses hypotheses developed in their interlanguage are then confirmed or disconfirmed as a result of feedback. Provided learners opt for withdrawing from the interactional process occurring in classroom, they will undeniably deprive themselves from the chance of practising the language appropriately. Corrective feedback is said to be efficient when learners identify the erroneous utterances, henceforth errors will be eliminated from further produced output. Moreover, if errors are not repaired, fossilisation might take place.

So far, the study deepened in exposing issues related to the value and the significance of feedback in the development of learners’ oral proficiency. In doing so, the chapter tried to highlight how worthy is feedback to the development of TL acquisition.
Indeed, regardless of the strategies teachers decide to address their learners’ error: from explicit corrective feedback as reformulation, to the explicit one as recast for instance. Nonetheless, it is considered that learners’ errors have to be repaired instead of being left uncorrected. It is true that one of the most challenging and demanding tasks teachers of a FL are faced with is the selection of the best strategies to perform this pedagogical action. Chances are, what makes the process of feedback a thorny one is that teachers might be undecided about which type of feedback is the best to utilize to correct committed errors. Yet, this pedagogical objective has not to be done at random. On the words of Ohta (2009, p. 131):” questions about corrective feedback include concerns about how and when errors should be treated (or ignored), and questions about the extent to which the corrective feedback is attended to and can be used by students in the language learning setting.” This simply explicates the difficulty of repairing errors.

With reference to the classroom settings whose discourse has been investigated, we noticed that teacher (A) did not rely too much on the use of feedback moves with its diverse forms. On the one hand, it was true that learners in his classroom were not committing many grammar errors. In those cases where they mistook, they were not offered an explicit move of corrective feedback or negative evidence. It was demonstrated in extracts of analysis that the teacher rarely corrected overtly for his learners. All along the attendance of the teacher’ (A) sessions, it was observed that he neither made use of metalinguistic feedback as adding comments associated with ill-constructed utterance in learners’ output, nor made use of clarification requests. He had the tendency to rely more on the use of recasts as an implicit way of repair.

In those cases when learners committed language mistakes, for instance, the use of ‘s’ after the modal verbs, teacher (A) did not take the floor to correct for his learners. Subsequently, learners went on making the same grammar and pronunciation mistakes.
Teacher (A) left these errors unrepaired. Chances are, he did this for the reason of maintaining the course of interaction going on and avoiding communication breakdown. Yet, we consider that, cognitively speaking, his students did not pay attention to the fact that there was an incorrect part of their output, for they perceived no signal about its erroneous part from their teacher. These mistakes may be fossilised in students’ language and this is not a healthy sign of TL acquisition. As referred to earlier, teacher (A) focused on the implementation of recast to adjust his learners’ output. Again, we have to accentuate that many factors are included to make corrective implicit feedback; namely recast, successful, such as learners’ attention. Learners may not even notice that an error was done in their oral performance while interacting. Hence, they may continue making the same mistake. According to Gass and Selinker (2008, p. 335), the complete reliance on recasts to modify students’ mistakes is not taken for granted. They clarified that so forth scholars, who conducted studies on the value of recast in SL/FL classroom, are different in terms of the achieved results. Some could prove that recasts are positive and functional in the treatment of learners’ errors, whereas others could not see its efficiency in the correction of learners’ errors. Gass& Selinker (2008) reveal in one of the studies proving that recast is not as it is always proclaimed to be efficient. Gass and Selinker quote:

Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam (2006) looked at metalinguistic explanation (explicit feedback) and recasts (implicit feedback), finding that on tests of both explicit and implicit knowledge the metalinguistic explanation group outperformed the recast group, most likely due to recognition of the overtly corrective nature of metalinguistic feedback. Explicit feedback benefited both implicit and explicit knowledge.

(2008, p. 337)

The intention behind exposing scholars’ diverse perspectives about recasts is by reason of catching teachers’ attention to its effects. Teachers, who prioritize
communication over learners’ language grammar, lexical and pronunciation correctness, are advised not to stick mainly to the use of implicit feedback as recasts. Learners might not be able to identify that an error was committed and then repaired by the teacher. Moreover, it has been proved, throughout the analysis of LL and TT, that counting mainly on the application of recasts is not always taken for granted to be efficient. That is, when teacher (A) made use of recasts and repeated learners’ utterances correctly, students continued making the same mistakes without altering them. To illustrate, when learners in this classroom context made mistakes of using the inappropriate tense, for instance, and were not corrected by teacher (A), the same errors recurred again. It is considered that third year students should not keep on making the same grammar mistakes. They should know a lot about the structure of the TL because they were about to graduating. It is high time they paid attention to some of the language forms and structures. We do acknowledge that OE class is the only space in third year LMD’ syllabus in which students are given freedom to interact and speak; for the other subjects are all content ones. Oral expression is the main subject where students practise the use of English and that is why they need to be corrected whenever they make serious mistakes to avoid fossilization. Regardless of teacher’s target; whether he puts emphasis on communication or not, still there are some errors which should not be skipped and need to be immediately repaired.

The study strives to elucidate that there are some cases where the ignorance of error correction may lead to fossilisation. The latter concept is defined by Brown (1987,p. 186) (cited in Allwright & Bailey, 1991):” In other words, learning correctly consists of internalising appropriate forms of the TL, while fossilisation is the consistent use of recognisably erroneous forms.” According to Allwright and Bailey (1991, p. 93) the source of TL is still debatable as an issue but many scholars take it for granted that feedback is strongly associated with the concept of fossilisation. Feedback, to scholars as Vigil and
Oller (1976) (cited in Allwright & Bailey, 1991), may occur into two facets; cognitive one, in which learners are provided with information about the structure of the TL and affective feedback that has to do with emotional signals shown to learners as responses to their utterances. On the one hand, Vigil and Oller consider that students need to be offered cognitive feedback to correct their errors so as to avoid being trapped in fossilisation. On the other hand, they consider that to avoid communication breakdown; teachers are to rely on the affective feedback. The latter is about positive evidence to give them signals that their oral contribution is worth and valuable.

With reference to the way teacher (B) dealt with his students’ errors, he relied heavily on the use of corrective feedback to the extent that he, in many occasions, blocked the course of interaction. Teacher (B); contrariwise to teacher (A), did not let any committed error passed over without being adjusted. In fact, teacher (B) did not afford any effort to repair his learners’ pronunciation and grammar errors. When learners mistook grammatically, lexically or phonetically, the teacher did not delay the move of feedback for he immediately corrected the committed. Moreover, teacher (B) persisted in correcting every single performed error. He frequently uses explicit corrective feedback as clarification requests; asking the learner who was taking the floor to speak to rephrase his utterance to make it correct. He also used metalinguistic feedback or direct elicitations. Teacher (B) focused mainly on the use of overt, explicit strategies of negative feedback. That is, he referred to the erroneous part and then asked students to reformulate them to have correctly constructed oral output. He did, in very rare occasions, exercised the use of recasts or other techniques of implicit corrective feedback.

Once again, it is worth to clarify that one’s attempts is far from criticising teacher’s own decisions of dealing with his learners’ errors. The study’s aim is rather to try portraying some evident events derived from his talk analysis and the impacts of these
on the maintenance of the flow of communication in classroom. Indeed, the study reveals that the total ignorance of treating students’ errors may lead to fossilisation. Nonetheless, one has to stress that errors have to be treated in a way that should not lead to communication breakdown. Putting it otherwise, teachers of oral expression class should intervene in a well-planned and strategic way to correct learners’ errors so as to avoid breaking down their students’ output generation. It is taken for granted that when students are interrupted constantly to be corrected; they will definitely withdraw gradually from the held conversation until they will keep silent. In fact, this is what has been confirmed in attending teacher’s (B) sessions, with his continuous interruption of students’ verbal participation for the sake of repairing their mistakes. Students’ tendency to keep silent was so clear throughout the falling down of their voices’ tone and their facial expressions revealing their sense of boredom, embarrassment and shyness. Tsui (1996, p. 155) acknowledges after conducting a survey on EFL classes that among the factors inhibiting learners from expressing themselves and conveying their ideas is their fear of being subjected to negative evaluation from the part of their teachers. This concept students have in mind is one of the most stressful sources preventing them, unconsciously, form taking part in interactive verbal communication. This feeling of anxiety while being in a FL classroom leads them to panic, fear and even reticence. Liu (2007), in a study conducted on factors leading to language anxiety in EFL classroom, ascertains that corrective feedback is among the factors that set in motion the sensation of anxiety among FL learners inside classrooms. Accordingly, teachers are advised to implement feedback as an instructional and pedagogical tool to repair his learners’ grammar, pronunciation and lexis errors in a way that should neither fracture the flow of conversations, nor create negative feelings inside his students as embarrassment, shyness, self-under esteem, ridicule...etc. Hence, provided learners experience these negative feelings, their willingness and enthusiasm to
speak more will soon vanish and decrease. Indeed, this justified the dead silence that was highly spread by the end of teacher’s (B) last recorded session. When he took the floor incessantly to correct all the committed errors, they suddenly kept silent. It is, definitely, an intricate process to decide when, how and what to correct for, after all, feedback is an instructive decision making. In prioritising instruction than communication, form than content, the teacher is required to determine the way and the type of feedback to apply amidst the process of interaction in a sense that he does not impede learners from going on speaking.

Something is noteworthy as well is that both teachers enrolled in this survey did not all the time set their students to perform ‘self-repair’. They very often took the turn to achieve the rectification of the erroneous part of their output. On the light of Allwright and Bailey’ words, students’ self repair is highly needed, they reckon: “Put another way, we want our learners to be able to self-initiate self-repairs. We should, therefore, allow both time and opportunity in our classrooms for self-repairs whether it is self- or other initiated.” (1991, p. 107). It is concurred that when students are given the opportunity to set off a process of self repair of their own errors, they will certainly get accustomed to doing it. They will also be dragged into a negotiation of meaning route, which is proved beforehand, to be a very necessary procedure to achieve oral proficiency and it is set at the heart of TL acquisition. It was true that teacher (B) gave impetus to the correction of errors. Nevertheless, most of the time, he took too much time to correct errors throughout explaining grammar and pronunciation points related to the mistake. Hence, sometimes the thread of communication got lost. Whereas, in those occasions, when teachers strived to engage their students into an initiated self–repair practice, they succeeded greatly to go longer in a process of negotiating the meaning. The more learners got dragged in this process to clarify their output, the more they strived to clarify their ideas and transmit them
using correct formed utterances, in a way that made them practise the language. Admittedly, we have to state that still a handful of research has been conducted on the significance of self-repair. Conversely, Ohta (2001, p. 136) stresses that self-correction is relevant to corrective feedback and is a sign that reveals learners’ ability to noticing. As long as they initiate and are apt to self-repair their errors, definitely, they will develop their linguistic knowledge about the TL and interact comfortably using it.

4.2.3. Arranging Turn Taking System and Adjacency Pairs

Much of the Focus now is to comprise some points which are considered worth to be denoted; points associated with learners’ language. Indeed, learners; principally adult ones, share the responsibility to develop their competencies, as linguistic ones throughout practising the TL in classroom, testing, confirming and refuting hypotheses made about the construction of some given language forms. Their familiarity with language pragmatics with its diverse complexities develops as well. Moreover, other competencies are developed simultaneously in the course of verbal interaction when students take part in classroom interaction; competences as communicative and social skills. Learners are in need to participate in the construction of classroom discourse, in the sense that they are highly required to create opportunities for themselves to take part in the negotiated discussion. Seliger (1977) (cited in Ellis 1990, p; 128) confirmed that there is a strong positive correlation between learners’ participation and the increase of learning opportunities. Hence, the more learners are old in age, the more aware and mature they are supposed to understand the necessity of being involved in the process of language acquisition. In another study Slimani (1987) came out with the result that those proficient learners interacted more than the less one. Proficient learners admitted that much of the things they acquired on the target TL was in the midst of their classroom verbal participation (cited in Allwright& Bailey 1991, p. 133). Yet, there are some factors shaping
the quality and quantity of participation in classroom as cultural traits’ impact on the partners of students’ interaction. Put it differently, learners might be affected by the surrounding cultural context to which they belong, to the extent that they find it odd and tough to get engaged in communicative processes with peers and teacher as well. For instance, FL teachers, who are teaching such subjects as OE class, must not consider their students’ reticence as deficiency and passivity for their silence might be justified. And they should instead try to get rid of the constraints preventing learners from speaking. They can encourage and provide their students with the necessary psychological support to feel safe enough to take risks and turns. Hence, teachers should soften the tone of their voices and make use of facial expressions and telling jokes...etc to create a healthy environment for learning.

If truth is to be told about the nature of learners’ interaction in classroom; we have to spell out that on the whole interaction in both classroom contexts was characterized by being restricted to the IRF/IRE structure. It was always the teachers who initiated the conversation and then got the responses from his students to finish by evaluating and providing feedback on their output. This leads to the conclusion that conversations are strictly restricted between teachers and students, very little collaboration or cooperation was held among learners themselves. Indeed, real life conversations are different from the ones processed in FL classroom. In real life interlocutors take turns in a less structured way than did those involved in a classroom context. What made dialogic and conversational interactive processes appeared to be less genuine in both classroom settings is the fact that learners seldom asked for the turn to open discussion by asking a question to teachers and peers as well. According to Poole (2008, p. 201) IRE/REF is the fundamental trait characterizing teachers’ fronted classroom. She also stresses that the last move is a decisive factor that controls learners’ participation. The researcher elucidates that turn taking
system occurs in three ways. The first one is in nomination when the teacher calls on a student to speak. The second way is the invitation to bid which occurs when the teacher gives the right to a learners to reply. The last way is the invitation to reply; when the teacher welcomes any student to take the floor to interact; that is he gives them the freedom to keep on speaking. Poole explains that the first two allocation procedures are, in fact, recurrent in teacher-fronted classroom; whereas the last one is more frequent in classroom where teachers are mainly recognised to be facilitators and partners in classroom. We consider that when learners are free and willing to take the floor without being allocated or nominated to do so, more genuine conversations can be held.

We are also mindful that turn allocation and turn taking have to be arranged according to the nature of the task assigned to TL learners. Hence, learners attending sessions of such module are expected to be freer in taking turns to interact with their peers than they do in any other subjects. This class is the only subject where students are given the chance to play out roles and dialogues using their own generated output. Thus, learners are advised to free themselves from the constraint and structured IRE/IRF form to be more at ease in the course of interaction. They can achieve this throughout taking turns in a more deliberate way instead of waiting for the teacher to nominate or allocate turns to them. They are rather advised to express themselves in classroom by getting more chances to practise the language throughout performing more turns of exchanges. From their part, teachers have to avoid overlapping recurrently their students in the midst of their course of verbal production. This might well affect negatively the will of students to speak, as it may decrease their readiness to go on further in conversations and end in communication breakdowns. Learners do better when they feel that their teachers are interested in listening to their contribution. The fact of being interrupted constantly and prevented from finishing what they want to convey can be perceived as a sign of lack of interest from the part of
their teacher and hence lead to reticence and non interest in going on further in output production. In brief, learners of TL ought to get rid of their fear to speak inside classroom especially if they are university students specialized in English as a FL. In taking turns to interact, learners’ errors can be perceived and repaired; either by initiating a self repair or repair performed by their peers or teacher. Instead of limiting themselves to the rigid structure that typifies traditional classroom setting, they are rather recommended to take risks to comment, ask and respond to what is said. Taking turns is deemed to be a constructive form from two dimensions. The first dimension is a psychological one; in the sense that it enhances learners’ self-assertion to talk and frees them from feeling anxious in classroom. As concerns the second dimension, which is a pedagogical one, it develops their linguistic performance as revealed so far by scholars working on the value of output generation. Indeed, to achieve oral proficiency, and to make conversations and dialogues in classroom sound more authentic, less rigid and instructional, learners need to self initiate moves of exchanges, self select themselves as next speakers or even select who would the next speakers be. This can be realized if learners are adults and well directed by the teacher. They can manage to sustain and build blocks of conversations in classroom, instead of sticking to IRF structure which is said to be more instructional than interactional as a process.

Turn taking; as a system, is organized under structured patterns called ‘adjacency pairs’, in mastering the conventions governing these blocks of turns, learners will definitely be fluent speakers as reckoned by Celcie-Murcia& Olshtain (2000, p. 10). According to them, oral proficiency and linguistic competence are strongly associated with the maintenance of the construction of adjacency pairs. In a comparison they made, both scholars demonstrate that unlike FL learners, NS know how to manage the flow of speech by knowing the transition relevance place of turns. They also know when and how to take
turns to interact and above all how to avoid long pauses that might distort the flow of communication. They consider that mastering how to construct and respond to the structure of adjacency pairs is at the heart of achieving fluency of the TL. When learners are acquainted with the diverse forms of adjacency pairs as question/answer, requesting/agreeing/disagreeing, greeting/responding...etc, many communicative skills will be certainly acquired. Accordingly, teachers are advised to teach learners the two parts of exchanges throughout exposing these blocks of interaction to facilitate for them verbal communication and lessen the duration of silence that might arise. Silence may take place when learners are unable to take the floor to respond to a given pair part for they cannot grasp the first part of adjacency pairs. Consequently, they find themselves incapable of going further in chain of the flow of communication. Thus, most of time dialogues end in dead silence in classroom, and then a kind of language anxiety and frustration among learners will be felt. Moreover, teachers might find it a tiresome task to overcome such situations in an oral expression class. Mastering how to perform parts of adjacency pairs is said to develop learners pragmatically, semantically and linguistically speaking. That is, it is throughout taking turns and performing parts of the adjacency pairs system that students of the TL need to be exposed. In doing so, they will have enough information about the pragmatic and the linguistic knowledge needed to enable them being successful in the management of conversation. As for us, we strongly believe that this might be achieved throughout practice; listening and speaking tasks are worthy for they develop their acquaintance with parts of these pairs in diverse real situations exhibited in authentic materials. Additionally, learners involved in the study were just performing the second part of the adjacency pairs such as responding to questions asked by the teacher. It was in a single occasion in which one of students took the floor to perform the first part of the adjacency pairs by addressing a question to her teacher. This habitual structure of
interaction; IRF/IRE made of conversations; or better considered as mini dialogues, seemed to be too much small and resulted in a handful amount of output generated by students. In addition to this, keeping the same track of conversations, in which learners were responding to questions, made of them more pedagogic and instructive than interactional. Students need to get involved in diverse pieces of conversations in which they ought to ask questions in their turns, respond, agree, disagree, ask for, accept, refuse, apologise... etc instead of merely answering questions.

4.2.4. Content

As for the content taught in oral expression class, it is worthy to state that during the sessions we were involved in to record and observe classroom events; teachers depended on ‘All Clear’ book. It is reckoned that exposing learners to these idioms is of a valuable worth, for one is quite conscious that idioms are frequently used in real life situations by NS. Hitherto, it is supposed that third year students are in need to practise the language form with its diverse complexities and pragmatic facets instead of being limited to idioms. This has been argued by Celcie-Murcia & Olshtain (2000) when they state:

> learners of a second or a foreign language need to be exposed
to a variety of situations in which exchanges take place, but above all, non-native speakers need to possess communication strategies that can facilitate and make adjustments in incomplete or failing interaction.”

(p. 174)

Learners are called for negotiating the processed output instead of making merely practice about the learnt idioms. Maintaining the flow of oral communication, according to Celcie-Murcia and Olshtain, requires learners to master some components of the TL as the vocabulary items needed in given situations, the use of discourse connectors, the knowledge about how to open and close phrases in the midst of conversation ...etc. Put it
differently, focusing mainly on the use of idioms is not taken for granted to offer students enough opportunities to be exposed to the diverse aspects of the FL.

Indeed, it is not sufficient to arrange the whole sessions of OE class to teach idioms. Teachers ought to play the role of facilitators and partners to create a healthy environment for their learners instead of controlling the flow of discourse as it is the case when they explain the use of idioms. In actual fact, Marcaro (1997.p, 135) reckons after a study he conducted that the majority of learners do better in pair and group works than in individual works. Students involved in Marcaro’s study reported in interviews that they felt more comfortable and less anxious when assigned to perform tasks inciting them to collaborate with their peers. It is true that the selection of the way the task should be allotted is decided by the teacher and the decision of the latter is determined by its type. Giving priority to form focus tasks differs from those in which content is prioritized. Yet, we consider that learners might perceive many language forms when involved with their peers in tasks more than they do with their teachers. Swain (1998) confirms this in saying that while engaging in collaborative tasks, learners develop a ‘meta-talk’ in which they use language to reflect on language use. She explains that when learners strive to produce language, they would notice the gap in their interlanguage to express what they want to say. She considers that in attempting to test their hypothesis formed in their interlanguage, they would certainly notice the gap and then fill it in with the availability of some other factors as noticing and attention. Consistent with Swain’s perspective, Byram (2000.p, 70) supposes that collaborative or cooperative learning enhances learners’ autonomy in classroom, as it increases learners’ sense of responsibility towards the learning process. Needless to say, Learners from their part are advised to assume their responsibility in the course of the TL acquisition, by collaborating with their peers. It is strongly believed that when being involved in collaborative tasks, learners are better empowered to have to, a
great extent, some control over discourse. As they will definitely have to assume responsibility over the process of learning instead of being passive receivers in a class in which they are supposed to manage its course by their interaction. Moreover, weak learners may feel better and learn more while interacting verbally with their peers for their affective filter is decreased compared it to cases when they interact with their teacher. Moreover, fluent-tongued learners might develop their understanding of the input while explaining it to their peers. From his part, Ellis (1994) reveals that researchers working on TL learners claim that in implementing pair or group works and classroom discussions; teachers in a way or another are decreasing the IRF customary discourse structure. This leads to considerable improvement in learners’ language quantity and quality as well. This is highlighted in the words of Ellis:”It seems reasonable to conclude that interaction between learners can provide the interactional conditions which have been hypothesized more readily than can be interaction involving teachers”. (cited in Thornbury & Slade, 2006,p, 308). Interactional conditions, according to Ellis, are repair and negotiation of meaning that researchers consider are more prevalent in learner-learner’s interaction than teacher-learners’ one.

In truth, third year university students enrolled in this study seemed to be capable of being more autonomous if they were given further opportunities to work in pairs and in groups to perform role plays, dialogues, discussions, exposes...etc. It is considered that students might be able to show their best in OE class, since their knowledge about the FL is considerably ripen. Therefore, teachers could invest more this privilege they had to stimulate their learners to produce more output and develop their communicative strategies. Teachers should push forward their learners and invest their will to interact and their positive motivation to help them overcome their fear and anxiety and to boost their self-confidence in respect of FL production. In doing this, the wheel of acquisition can be
accelerated. It is true that in plenty of occasions both teachers in the study strived to make their class a suitable environment for their learners to speak freely. Yet, they ought to vary the allocated tasks for learners. In other words, instead of limiting the content of their module to ‘All clear’ idioms, they could set their students to interact together by preparing group works and pair ones. Works going hand in hand with learners’ needs, for learners have to be motivated, eager and excited to perform the task rather than be bored and forced to get done with it that OE module class might be a source of boredom, silence and anxiety.

4.3. Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Further Research

Needless to say that any study conducted in classroom research might be exposed to some limitations. It is reckoned that the study’s limitations can be summarized in four points. Firstly, one is quite conscious that choosing a descriptive design for any research has some drawbacks that likely contributed in hampering the observation. This work depended on an observational method whose nature requires the selection of the status of a passive observer to be adopted. That is, in choosing this method, we were obliged to admit one’ status as classroom researchers to participants. The participants being observed; teachers and students, definitely, were probably unconsciously affected by one’s presence to observe them using a camcorder. This could possibly lead to the creation of a less genuine situation, for instance, the changing that may occur on their behaviours. Moreover, the analysis of classroom discourse necessitates the observation of several sessions and the inclusion of numerous diverse classroom setting to have a variety about teaching practices and learning strategies targeted to perform oral proficiency. Unfortunately, owing to time constraints, we could not have the chance to record more sessions and we did not have the opportunity to analyze more than two teachers’ talk. Indeed, it is acknowledged that it would be preferred if we tested the correlation between oral output production and oral
proficiency. That is to say, it was wished to make part of an oral test to see whether those students, who have self-esteem and who are audacious enough to take turns and make part of the construction of discourse, do better in oral tests than those who are shy and less confident. At last but not least, due to time constraints, we were not able to go deeper in proposing the type of tasks and materials that teachers can rely on to teach oral expression class. We wished to have sufficient time to propose some types of tasks which can help teachers pushing forward their learners to generate output. Something is noteworthy is that this research is more directed to cover language classroom discourse than materials to be implemented to develop oral proficiency. Yet, this can be one of the most intriguing future studies to be carried out in the same realm of investigation.

The study in hand tried to unveil some key components and driving forces regarded as optimising or weakening elements of classroom interaction; components derived from both TT and LL. Yet, this dissertation might be a preliminary step for further research, since there are some questions needed to be examined in details to better teaching oral communication skills, the learning and achieving oral proficiency and fluency. Some of these spheres that can be scrutinized in further research on the same topic investigated in the scope of this study might be:

- Proposing ways helping teachers develop their questioning strategies when teaching OE subject. Teachers need getting trained to sustain longer conversations and be able to create a chain of questions generated from learners produced output. That is; how we can make teachers of such module be self reflective about the strategy of their questioning.

- Investigating the effect of diverse types of feedback and its effects on the course of classroom interaction. More specifically, self-initiated repair and its nexus with oral performance. How teachers can make use of their students errors to be starting
points of meaning and even form negotiation. Researcher might also put into question the value of recast and its role in dragging learners’ attention to perceive their errors. As they may work on repair and how teachers can enhance their learners’ awareness about committed errors and correct them without distorting the flow of communication.

- As teachers and even learners of English as a FL, research on turn taking system is highly needed. Researchers might facilitate learners’ involvement by exposing how turns could be taken and exchanged, opened and closed in a context where the IRF is not the unique structure of discourse. Learners may ignore when and how they should take turns, and how should the relevant place be known. In ignoring such imperative steps, learners’ interaction is condemned to be purely instructive; far from being communicative and may even be regarded as a fiasco for all participants in classroom. So in conducting research on the ritual of turn taking system, many problems would, by no room of discussion, be solved.

- Learners need to know how to respond to adjacency pairs. So, if research is conducted to see how teachers can get their students acquainted with ways native speakers keep up in conversations, learners might do better in their oral performance and avoid being confused to respond to first or second parts of pairs.

- Classroom management is one of the most decisive parameters determining the quality and even the quantity of learners’ interaction in classroom. We; as English language teachers, ought to know all the facets of classroom management for the latter is believed to be an outstanding factor affecting learning opportunities as sustained by Hall (2011.p, 22). Classroom management is, indeed, an umbrella concept that covers a wide range of aspects of classroom. These can be about learners and teachers’ roles, behaviours and their nexus with learning
opportunities, how lessons might be planned, the way students are grouped to perform given tasks, the handling of equipment and aids...etc. Hence, all these are worth to be further investigated.

- Indeed, research is also needed to highlight and inform teachers about types of activities and their effect in enhancing or decreasing the course of interaction. Knowing the appropriate tasks to be allotted would facilitate, and to great extent, teachers’ task in teaching classes giving impetus to oral proficiency. It is considered that research should be further conducted to distinguish between tasks focussing on form or instruction and those directed to develop oral performance.

- One of the other facts detected in this review is that teachers’ personality plays an imperative role to stimulate learners to go on further speaking. So this opens the gate for further study to see whether teachers’ behaviours, personality, gestures, tone...etc have any relation with students’ motivation to produce output.

- So far, a great deal of literature has been provided about the correlation between dialogic and collaborative learning in SL/FL classroom and oral proficiency. Further classroom research is needed to verify the efficacy of collaboration and learners’ involvement in classroom contexts where English is considered to be a FL.

**Conclusion**

This chapter tried to offer pedagogical recommendations hypothesized to be useful for both teachers and learners striving to develop oral proficiency. Proposing these pieces of advice stems from findings which could be got from the practical side of the study. Analysing in deep components that compile teachers talk helped us to see how the latter can affect the course of classroom interaction. Hence, the chapter put forward some measures and considerations to be taken from teachers of the oral expression module; such
as strategies of questioning and their types, next to the attitudes they are advised to adopt while addressing their learners’ errors. As for learners’ language, it was claimed that students play a keystone role to develop their oral communication strategies. For this reason, the study attempted to explain that learners are required to be responsible in the process of learning English as a FL. So as to progress and achieve fluency in speaking, they need to practise their language and endeavour to produce output that is advocated to be a focal element to acquire the TL. Assuming responsibility, in this context, means that learners have to take more turns, and react further to adjacency pair parts, instead of keeping silent and waiting for teachers’ allocation of turns. To conclude, the analysis reveals that once teachers addressed the appropriate questions, knew how to adequately repair errors and when learners from their part took turns and knew how to open and close turns framed in adjacency pairs structure, interactional process was successful. Teachers and learner could manage more genuine and spontaneous conversations that were very alike to the native speakers’ ones. The chapter ended by stating some limitations encountered in this research and then suggesting some other realms for further research. Realms that are guessed to be crucial for being investigated because they will facilitate greatly achieving oral performance and the teaching of oral expression class.
GENERAL CONCLUSION

Learning a foreign language is, by no room of discussion, a very tricky process that requires the gathering of many factors within classroom context. Interaction is, undeniably, highly requisite to help learners learn language appropriately and perfect their oral communicative skills. Interaction as a process is regarded as a central element to effective teaching. As it is also considered of a paramount value to trigger learners’ attention and will to produce output. Having that strong impetus in the learning and teaching process of a target language, it is fair to say that achieving fluency implies to take into account a profound examination of classroom interaction. Hence, all participants’ talk should be revised to get closer to its components and their nexus with the enhancement and weakening of classroom interaction.

The pivotal focus of this study was to bring into light how the course of interaction is taking place within the scope of oral expression sessions; taking it for granted right from the beginning of the investigation that it is a jointly constructed procedure gathering learners’ and teachers’ language as well. This is certainly justified since most of studies conducted on the issue, so far, endorse that both types of talks; i.e., learners and teacher’s one are to be closely inspected to have a patent vision about the elements leading to fruitful classroom interaction. Walsh (2011) ascertains in saying:” Crucially, in a classroom, it is through language in interaction that we access new knowledge, acquire and develop new skills, identify problems of understanding, deal with the ‘breakdowns’ in the communication, establish and maintain relationships and so on.” (p. 1)

Based on the assumption that interaction is the outcome of a dual process, this study took the task of exploring teacher talk and learners’ language for they compose what is called ‘classroom discourse. On the one hand, the piece of research in hand tried to describe two teachers’ talk in its real immediate context by selecting two parameters of
study: questions and feedback. On the other hand, the study depended on two components comprising learners’ language; turn taking and adjacency pairs generated in two classroom settings. In actual fact, findings of the study proved that learners’ output and interaction was strikingly associated with teachers’ type of addressed questions. That is, it was found that when learners were asked open and referential questions, their produced utterances were longer and more complex for they strived to clarify their output and negotiate the meaning with their interlocutors. Learners were interested in going on speaking when their teachers dragged them into courses of meaning negotiation, or when they generated questions from their students’ already produced output. Students were also incited to take more turns when they were addressed questions to reveal facts about their own experiences or express their proper opinions. It was remarked that when teachers opted for closed or display questions, learners’ oral contribution was so simple and moderate compared to what it ought to be from the part of third year English language university students. Moreover, teachers’ questions were on the whole derived from the use of English idiomatic expressions. These were the basic content of teaching oral expression class. This fact limited, to some extent, the oral production of learners and made it less spontaneous. With reference to the second parameter implemented in this study; feedback, it was noticed that in addressing positive feedback to their learners, teachers succeeded at motivating and encouraging their learners to go on speaking; especially those hesitant and shy ones. As far as corrective feedback is concerned, it was deduced that when learners mistook in a part of their output, grammatically or phonetically speaking, and received no repair from the part of their teachers, they continued making the same error. And when even an indirect feedback was offered, as recast for instance, they could not perceive the erroneous part for they did not even pay attention that a remedy was performed by the teacher. Moreover, when teachers took the floor to give direct and explicit corrective feedback in the form of
repetition, learners lost the flow of their ideas they were trying to convey. This was very recurrent, especially when the teacher took long time to explain the type of the committed error before correcting it. Some learners were even reluctant to take again the floor to speak owing to the ongoing overlaps exercised by the teacher.

Other findings of this study unveiled the truth that learners did not take turns and risks as it was supposed to be from the part of third year students. It was very clear from the analysis of their discourse that they did not start interacting unless they were given the floor to do so. That is, the analysis of conversations displayed that the structure of discourse under investigation was more alike to the discourse of traditional fronted classroom. Learners were allocated the turn to speak and then received feedback on their utterances. Yet, when learners overlapped their peers and teacher and collaborated in the construction of discourse throughout commenting on one another’s output, the structure of classroom interaction was more communicative and spontaneous; far from being rigid, strictly and purely instructive. Furthermore, learners’ performance of adjacency pairs is so simple, in the sense that it was falling in the form of preferred adjacency pairs, which are short and simple in form. It was in very few occasions that learners performed dispreferred pair parts; exhibited in the form of disagreeing and arguing moves…etc.

It was also found that when the course of interaction got out of the track of idiom production, learners’ output was considerably longer and more complex, especially when they started to talk about their experiences and opinions. We concluded that the content of teaching oral expression class is also a keystone factor that triggers learners’ willingness to speak. After all, it is the exposed input to learners which is acknowledged to be vital in arousing their eagerness to speak and interact. In the whole attended sessions, discussions were centered on the use of idioms, the context of their use…etc. Yet, students were very rarely dragged into process of meaning negotiation to deduce the meaning of the given
idioms. Unquestionably, the role of producing output in EFL classroom is highly worthy to push forward the wheel of language acquisition and the achievement of oral proficiency according to the exposed diverse perspectives. To these, output production is exceedingly associated with oral language proficiency.

Undeniably, using Conversation Analysis as a method of analyzing pieces of conversations paved the way for us to conclude that collaboration and interaction among peers was approximately missing in classroom discourse. The course of the latter was held and restricted to the teacher and learners mainly. Peers’ interaction was not very prevalent in classroom interaction, for learners did not take turns to give feedback, comment or show appraisal about oral output of their colleagues. They did interact cooperatively when they were assigned to perform pair works as dialogues, for instance. Yet, fostering this type of interaction isvaluably advised for it decreases learners’ feeling of anxiety. Moreover, Ellis& Fotos (1999 ,p. 219) stress that to decrease communication problems, learners need to take control of discourse rather than their teacher. This control over discourse is likely to be achieved in case learners are given the chance to control the topic of discussion, i.e., *topicalisation*. Indeed, this was not the case of both classroom contexts investigated in this study; for the fundamental core of communication was about the use of idiomatic expressions.

The most notable recommendations this study can suggest is that teachers should have a deep analysis and overview about the components of their talk if they strive to perfect their learners’ oral communication skills. It is highly necessary to train themselves of addressing appropriate types of questions that can open the gate for fruitful classroom interaction. As they are also required to take fitting positive feedback to encourage their learners to interact and to practise the language for the latter makes it perfect with time going on. Needless to say that corrective feedback is also required for students; especially
third year English Language university ones, for they are about to graduate. Thus, there are some errors that maybe fossilized unless they are corrected as it was revealed in the study of some pieces of conversations in which learners continued making the same errors for no corrective feedback was offered to repair them. However, teachers should take many points into consideration while deciding to repair the erroneous parts of their learners’ output. Among these points are: students characters, the focus of the task whether it is the content or the form which is targeted and the allocated time to correct errors which should not distort the flow of communication. Moreover, teachers should give their students enough space for exchanging moves to develop collaborative discourse among their students since the latter is considered worthy for fastening language acquisition. Additionally, teachers can even take the task of teaching their learners how to manage conversations throughout exposing them to plenty forms of adjacency pairs. Teachers are indeed advised to free themselves from the rigid structure of IRE/IRF to approach spontaneity while speaking. They can even do this throughout giving their learners the choice of choosing topics of discussions for their enthusiasm to speak more will be considerable if they select topics of their own; topics representing their needs and interest instead of sticking to teaching idioms mainly. From their part, learners need to take more risks and turns to interact instead of waiting for turn allocation. They are advised to overcome their fear to speak if they intend to be fluent speakers of the target language.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). Understanding Language Teaching: from Method to Post-


http://ltr.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/6/1/3


APPENDIX 1

Categories used in the COLT Coding Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Types of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Participation organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Part Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Content of the communicative feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Target language use</td>
<td>- The researcher is supposed here to measure and determine to what extent in the target language is used in the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Information gap</td>
<td>- The observer’s task in examining the feature is highlight whether the information being transmitted in classroom setting is genuine, true authentic and predictable or it is not the case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sustained Speech</td>
<td>- In this category the observer id to mention the degree of the speakers involvement indo the participants have really the chance to keep up and sustain in long conversation extensive, long and comprehensive discourse . that is to say; do the participants have really the chance to keep up and sustain in long conversations or not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reaction to code or message</td>
<td>- This denotes that the observer has to examine whether priority is given to the content of the learners’ message and interaction or to their language correctness i.e., the message (meaning) or accuracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Incorporation of preceding utterances</td>
<td>- In this level, the use of COLT scheme, has to perceive if the participants make a correlation and a linking up to the given comments or not i.e., is there any kind of comments or enchainment or there is o sort of incorporation. As he is also to pay attention whether the participants paraphrase, comment, expand their contributions and elaborate them or not.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Discourse initiation

- Attention here is to be drawn on observing who usually initiates and begins the exchange and interaction, is it always the teacher or the students...

7. Relative Restriction of linguistic form

- In this category, the coder is to make it clear if the teacher expects a response whose linguistic form is restricted i.e., a definite, single form is demanded from the parts of the learners, or is it (the response) unpredicted and unrestricted. That is, no former presupposed form is being expected by the teacher. That is, no former presupposed form is being expected by the teacher. To say it simply does the teacher makes use of referential or display questions.

**Example 1**

Teacher and student speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>T: What’s the past tense of ‘I go’?</th>
<th>S: I goed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Giving predictable information (although information is incorrect)

**Example 2**

Teacher and student speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>T: Does anyone know when Jose’s birthday is?</th>
<th>S: I think it’s the 24th.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Giving unpredictable information (although information is incorrect)

S2: No, it’s the 25th; I know because it was my birthday on the 26th and I know hers is the day before mine.  
(Adapted from Mc kay, 2006, p.92)
APPENDIX 2

FIAC Coding Scheme

Teacher Talk
1. Accept feelings.
2. Praises and encourages.
3. Accepts and uses ideas of pupils.
4. Asks questions.
5. Lectures.
7. Criticizes or uses authority.

Pupil Talk

Silence
APPENDIX 3

Categories used in Goldstein and Conrad’s Limited System

1. **Episodes**: These are the subunits of a conference. Each episode has a unique combination of topic and purpose.

2. **Discourse Structure**: Each episode has a particular discourse structure.
   1. Teacher talks and student backchannels.
   2. Teacher questions and student answers.
   3. Teacher talks and student talks.
   4. Student talks and teacher backchannels.
   5. Student questions and teacher answers.
   6. A combination of the above.

3. **Topic Nomination**: The participant who introduces a new topic or new purpose is said to have nominated the topic of a new episode.

4. **Invited Nomination**: An invited nomination occurs when the participant nominates the topic in response to a question, such as “What would you like to discuss?”

5. **Turns**: A change of speaker signifies a new turn.

6. **Questions**: This category includes all questions except those used for negotiation.

7. **Negotiation**: Two types of negotiation exist.
   - **Negotiation of meaning** includes confirmation checks, comprehension checks, and clarification requests.
   - **Negotiation of revision** takes place when revision strategies need to be clarified and consists of
     a. the student confirming the teacher’s suggestion for revision;
b. either the teacher or student checking to see if the student understands discussion of revision options;

c. the student checking to see if it would be appropriate to revise in a certain way; or

d. the student stating that he/she does not understand either why a revision is necessary or how to revise.

(Adapted from Goldstein and Conrad, 1990, p. 448) (as cited in Mc Kay, 2008)
APPENDIX 4

SETT Scheme

Reformulation

T (1) do you believe in what do you mean you you should always take opportunities is that what you mean no?=
L5 =no I want my life to be very (1)
T happy?= 
L5 =yeah and also I I do many things (1) many different experiences=
T =why don’t you say you just believe in experiencing as many different things as you want= 
L5 =oh yeah=

Extension

T =and does this bother you = 
L1 =what?= 
T =this feeling that you get does it bother you? = 
L1 =it’s eh you know when I am alone I’m ok but if I feel that somebody is near I would be nervous=

Modelling

L4 the good news is my sister who live in Korea send eh …
T SENT=
L4 =sent sent credit card to me= 
T =ooh very good news …

(Adapted from Walsh, 2006)
APPENDIX 5

The Discourse Analysis Model (1975)

(T═ Teacher, P═ any pupil who speaks)

T: Now then… I’ve got some things here, too. Hands up. What’s that? ;
   What is it?
S: Saw.
T: It’s a saw; yes this is a saw. What do we do with a saw?
P: Cut wood.
T: Yes. You’re shouting out though. What do we do with a saw?
   Marvelette?
P: Cut wood.
T: We cut wood. And, erm; what do we do with a hacksaw, this
   hacksaw?
P: Cut trees.
T: Do we cut trees with this?
P: NO. No.
T: Hand up. What do we do with this?
P: Cut wood.
T: Do we cut wood with this?
P: No.
T: What do we do with this then?
P: Cut wood.
T: We cut wood with that? What do we do with that?
P: Sir.
T: Cleveland.
P: Metal.
T: We cut metal. Yes we cut metal. And, er, I’ve got this here.
   What’s that? Trevor.
P: An axe.
T: It’s an axe yes. What do I cut with the axe?
P: Wood, wood.
T: Yes, I cut wood with the axe. Right…Now then, I’ve got some more
Things here… (etc)

(Sinclair and Coulthard1975:93-4) (adapted from Mc Carthy1991)
APPENDIX 6

Students’ Questionnaire

Dear Third Year Students

This questionnaire is a research tool for a Magistere dissertation which investigates the practice of teaching and learning in the “oral expression module”. This is not a test, so there is no ‘Right’ or ‘Wrong’ answer; your answers and personal opinions will remain anonymous interested in your personal opinion. Will you, please, put a tick in the small box corresponding to the appropriate answer? Thank you very much for your help

1. Do you enjoy attending oral expression classes?

   Yes □

   No □

2. Once you attend an oral expression session, do you feel?

   Very comfortable and self-confident to speak and communicate □

   Shy and do not want to react to what is being said □

   Very bored and not interested in what is being said □

3. Are you or the other students given the opportunity to suggest the topic to be discussed in oral expression classes?

   Yes □

   No □

4. Does your teacher give you the opportunity to express yourself freely?

   All the time □

   Often □

   Sometimes □

   Never □

5. When you don’t agree with your teacher about a point of view do you:

   Try to discuss with him so as to clarify your opinion and convince him □

   You just listen and keep silent □

6. Do you appreciate the way topics are being discussed in oral expression module?
7. Does the teacher take control of the discussion during the session?
   Yes □
   No □

8. Does the teacher give you the chance to comment on your peers’ works and interventions?
   Yes □
   No □

9. When one of the students makes errors (grammatical or pronunciation ones), does your teacher:
   - Stop him at once and corrects the error □
   - Let him carry on his intervention and then corrects the error □
   - Neither interrupts, nor corrects the error □

10. Do you engage with the other students in conversations and dialogues?
    Yes □
    No □

11. Do you consider your participation and communication during oral expression sessions:
    - Worthy (beneficial) for it enhances your self-confidence □
    - Not necessary □
    - Develops your proficiency in using English language □

12. Do you think your teacher of oral expression module?
    - is using a traditional way in teaching because s/he speaks more than you do □
    - is teaching in a cooperative way for s/he invites all individuals to participate □

13. According to you, the topics discussed in oral expression sessions are:
    - Very interesting and encouraging students to interact □
    - Acceptable and ordinary (normal) □
    - Boring and do not stimulate students to react □

14. While listening to one of your classmates’ opinion, or intervention you:
    - Feel willing and encouraged to exchange ideas with him/her □
Don’t enjoy sharing and taking part in the conversation 

Want to express your opinion but you feel shy or afraid to tell what you think

15. Do you feel ready to be involved in a conversation or a dialogue with a native English language speaker?

Yes ☐
No ☐

Thank you for your collaboration
APPENDIX 7

Teachers’ Questionnaire

Dear Teachers

This questionnaire is a research tool for a Magistere dissertation which investigates the practice of teaching and learning “oral expression”. We rely on your experience, attitudes and opinions to elaborate a case study and attempt to bring some suggestions; your answers and personal opinions will be of great help but will remain anonymous. Will you, please, put a tick in the small box corresponding to the appropriate answer? Thank you very much for your help.

1. Have you ever been a teacher of oral expression module before?
   Yes ☐
   No ☐

2. Do you enjoy teaching oral expression module?
   Very much ☐
   Not very much ☐
   Not at all ☐

3. During oral expression classes, learners interact with you, with their peers, and with the input materials. Please, rate this importance in the table below (tick the box of your choice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate of importance</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Less important</th>
<th>Not important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the input materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Do you consider your learners reluctant/passive in communicating and expressing their viewpoints?
   Yes ☐
   No ☐

5. Do you try to get all your students involved in the conversations and dialogues that are taking place during the session?
6. Do you try to encourage / stimulate the silent students or the shy ones to interact and speak?
   - Yes □
   - No □

7. Do you favour your students commenting on the contribution of their peers in classroom?
   - Yes □
   - No □

8. Have you ever intervened when your learners discuss, argue with each other?
   - Yes □
   - No □

9. Are the same students always interacting in classroom?
   - Yes □
   - No □

10. Have you ever felt that you control the discussion in class and give little opportunities for students to speak?
    - Yes □
    - No □

11. Usually, the topics of discussion are suggested by:
    - Students □
    - You (as a teacher) □
    - Teacher and students □

12. The material types you use in teaching oral expression are:
    - Oral materials (as tapes / cassette or audio CD recordings) □
    - Written materials (as graphic texts from newspapers for example) □
Audiovisual / Visual materials (recordings)  □

13. The tasks you assign to your learners are:
   Small projects (group works)  □
   Pair work  □
   Individual work  □

14. When students present their work, you give priority to:
   Oral communication fluency (e.g. pronunciation)  □
   Grammar correctness  □
   Creativity  □

15. Concerning the way you are teaching oral expression module you feel:
   Satisfied and convinced  □
   Willing to change the way you processed the lesson  □
   Never satisfied  □

16. As an English teacher of oral expression do you feel your students comfortable and willing to attend your sessions?
   Yes  □
   No  □

17. As an English teacher do you have an idea about classroom language discourse?
   Yes  □
   No  □

18. Are there any other comments, opinions, or suggestions you would like to add?
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................

Thank you for your collaboration
APPENDIX 8

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

[ ] Point of overlap

] Point of overlap termination

== (a) Turn continues below, at the next identical symbol

(b) If inserted at the end of one speaker’s turn and at the beginning of the next
speaker’s adjacent turn, indicates that there is no gap at all between the two turns

(c) Indicates that there is no interval between adjacent utterances

(3.2) Interval between utterances (in seconds)

(.) Very short untimed pause

**Word** Speaker’s emphasis

**:r the ::::** Lengthening of the preceding sound

— Abrupt cutoff

? Rising intonation, not necessarily a question

! Animated or emphatic tone

, Low rising intonation, suggesting continuation

. falling (final) intonation

**CAPITALS** Especially loud sounds relative to surrounding talk

° ° Utterances between degree signs are noticeably quieter than surrounding
talk
Marked shifts into higher or lower pitch in the utterance following the arrow

Talk surrounded by angle brackets is produced slowly and deliberately (typical of teachers modeling forms)

Talk surrounded by reversed angle brackets is produced more quickly than neighbouring talk

A stretch of unclear or unintelligible speech.

Indicates the transcriber’s doubt about a word

Speaker in-breath

Speaker out-breath

Mark features of special interest

Additional Symbols

Non verbal actions or editors comments

In the case of an inaccurate pronunciation of an English word, an approximation of the sound is given in square brackets

Phonetic Transcription of sounds are given in square brackets

Teacher

Unidentified learners

Identified learner

several or all learners simultaneously

(Adapted from Seedhouse, 1994)
Résumé

ملخص

يتمثل هدف هذه الأطروحة في دراسة خواص الخطاب البيداغوجي للأساتذ في معهد اللغة الإنجليزية من جهة، و خواص خطاب الطلاب من جهة أخرى، كما تركز هذه الدراسة على تحليل بعض الخواص لكل من خطابي الأستاذ والطالب، لدرجة تأثير هذه الأخيرة على سير التفاعل الجاري في الفصل بين الطلاب فيما بينهم، و بين الطلاب والأستاذ أيضاً، كما يهدف هذا البحث إلى معرفة العلاقة المباشرة بين أساتذة الأستاذ المطروحة داخل الفصل، ومنهجيته في تصحيح الأخطاء اللغوية المرتكبة من طرف الطلاب، و فعالية و نجاعة التفاعل الجاري في الفصل. إضافة إلى محاولة معرفة مدى اندماج الطلاب في تركيب الخطاب البيداغوجي عن طريق تحليل كيفية و طبيعة الأدوار الموزعة فيما بينهم إستندًا إلى تجربة هذه الأخيرة.

- توضح الدراسات الجارية حاليا أن كل من أساتذة الأستاذ في خطابة الشفهي، كيفيات تقييم الأخطاء اللغوية للطلاب، و تداول الأدوار بين الطلبة، للتفاعل مستعملي في ذلك اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة الاتصال داخل الفصل، لها تأثير مباشر على نجاعة أو فشل التفاعل اللغوي الهادف. و لدرجة تأملنا على نظرية التحليل المحادثة البيداغوجية، لأنها الأكثر استعمالاً في هذا النوع من الدراسات حالياً.

- تنقسم هذه الأطروحة إلى أربعة فصول: فصول نظام موجه إلى دراسة المواضيع المتعلقة بدراسة الخطاب البيداغوجي داخل قسم تعليم اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، و خطاب الأساتذة و مكونات خطاب الطلاب.

أما القسم التطبيقي لهذه الأطروحة، فقد تم استعمال نظرية تحليل المحادثة داخل قسم متميزين مختلفين مدرس من طرف أساتذين مختلفين، للحصول على معلومات أكثر بصوصية طبيعة الموضوع المعالج. معتمدين في ذلك على أخذ مقارنة من كلا خطابي (الأستاذ، و الطلاب)، إضافة إلى تعليم الدراسة badges بين الطلاب و أساتذة السنة الثالثة جامعي بجامعية – محمد الصديق بن يحيى – جيل.

- أثبتت النتائج المتصلة إليها مع نهاية الدراسة، أن خواص الخطاب لكل من الأستاذ و الطالب، لها علاقة و طبيعة بنجاح عملية الاتصال، و التفاعل الشفهي، إذا أخذ الأستاذن بين اعتبار نوعية السؤال الموجهة، و طرق تصحيح الأخطاء من جهة، و إذا بدأ الطلاب بدأ الأدوار للمشاركة زادت فرص التواصل إلى نجاعة التفاعل الفعال، و بالتالي طاقة استعمال اللغة الإنجليزية، كما تطرح هذه الدراسة في ختامها مواضيع لدراسات مستقبلية لها صلة و طبيعة بموضوع الخطاب، و التفاعل داخل الفصل.