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Abstract

The aim of this study is to describe and analyse oral classroom language use in order to identify opportunities for second language learning.

The study poses the following questions:

• What are typical patterns of classroom language use?
• What opportunities does the use of the target language in classroom interaction provide for second language acquisition?
• How can the analysis of classroom language use be exploited for the promotion of second language acquisition?

In this study I consider classroom language from the perspective of a communication system in the social institution of the school with the purpose of seeking to answer the educational question of how the social events of the classroom as exhibited in the speech of teachers and students may contribute to students’ second language development. From the perspective of second language acquisition the use of the target language by teachers and learners offers potential for second language learning.

This study focuses on the patterns of classroom discourse, in both L1 and L2, and considers these as sources of authentic input and as resources for interaction, which are available for learners’ developing second language. The study proposes ways in which classroom language use might be varied for the enhancement of second language learning.
Overview
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   1.2.4 Questions

1.3 Organisation of the report

Overview

The rationale for a study on classroom talk and second language learning is outlined in this chapter. The chapter summarises the focus, aims, objectives and questions of the study.

1.1 RATIONALE

This study examines aspects of language use in second language (L2) primary and secondary classrooms in order to explore the potential of classroom language use by teachers and learners for second language learning. The detailed scrutiny of classroom language use by learners and teachers reveals patterns of use with differential potential for language learning (Cazden 1988, Johnson 1995, Johnstone
How teachers and learners talk together, in other words, offers opportunities for language learning. In order to understand how language use may contribute to language development it is necessary to analyse the classroom discourse of learners and teachers.

In L2 pedagogy students' use of the target language for communication is considered an important condition for the development of L2 competence (Allwright and Bailey 1991, Van Lier 1988 and 1996). Communicative language teaching has been promoted as an approach to L2 teaching for at least two decades (Widdowson 1978, Wilkins 1976), but there is evidence from L2 classroom studies (for example Clyne et al 1995, Whitley 1993) that the approach is only partially exploited and partially successful in promoting learners' L2 communication skills. Although a variety of causes for this situation has been proposed, such as teacher preservice and inservice training (Kumaravadivelu 1993), and inadequate teaching circumstances and resources (Whitley 1993), and although these are possible contributing causes, in this study I will focus on the language use of teachers and learners as a central contributing factor.

What interests me about the use of the second language in second language teaching is the potential effect it has on students' second language learning. For many if not most of Australian L2 students the classroom is the most important context for learning to speak the languages they are taught. Outside of the classroom students have limited opportunities for using the target language, unless they have personal links with other speakers of the language, or they go
out of their way to establish personal relationships with target language speakers. It is in the classroom therefore that students will need to develop their skills in speaking the second language (L2). Learning to speak in the L2 implies developing skills in listening for meaning and speaking for meaning. Clearly learners need to experience what it is to converse in a second language for them to be able to converse themselves.

In this study I consider classroom discourse from the perspective of a communication system in the social institution of the school with the purpose of seeking to answer the educational question of how the social events of the classroom as exhibited in the speech of teachers and students (Cazden 1988) may contribute to students' second language development. Additionally, as classroom language use is socially determined, it is a factor which is amenable to change by teachers and learners. For this reason the study proposes how the use of classroom language might be developed for enhancing L2 learning.

McMeniman (1997) notes that "few recent studies are concerned with the teachers and learners themselves by way of in-depth examination of how Australians go about language learning and teaching ... " (6). This study is intended to be a contribution to the study of learning opportunities in L2 classrooms through the analysis of teachers' and learners' classroom talk.

In this study I am using second language programs to refer to those programs in which the language is taught as the object of study, at present referred to in
Australia as languages other than English (LOTE) programs, and formerly referred to as foreign language programs. The use of the term here distinguishes second language programs from content-based, bilingual or immersion programs. Although the distinction between acquisition and learning has been made by Krashen (1985), in this study I have used the terms language learning, language development and language acquisition interchangeably.

1.2 FOCUS, AIM, OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS OF THE STUDY

1.2.1 Focus

The focus of the study is teachers' and learners' oral use of first (L1) and second languages (L2) in classroom contexts. The patterns of classroom language use are frequently judged as inauthentic in comparison with language use outside of classrooms (Nunan 1987), so that it is necessary for the teacher to design tasks for learners to use the target language (TL) in meaningful interaction (Crookes and Gass 1993a & b). These tasks are considered to be preparation for authentic communication outside of the classroom context. It is argued in this study that classroom communication, like other institutional contexts of communication, has distinctive and identifiable patterns which arise from the social context. These patterns are displayed in teachers' and learners' L1 and L2 language use. An examination of L1 and L2 patterns of use reveals a wide range of discourse patterns.

From the perspective of second language acquisition the use of the TL by teacher and learners offers potential for second language learning, given certain
conditions: that the TL input is comprehensible (Krashen 1985), that the TL is
used in interaction (Long 1981), and that learners' attend to specific features of
the input in order to internalise them and incorporate them into their interlanguage
(VanPatten 1994). This study focuses on the patterns of classroom discourse, in
both L1 and L2, and considers these as sources of authentic input and as resources
for interaction, which are available for learners' developing second language.

1.2.2 Aim
The aim of the study is to describe and analyse oral classroom language use of
teachers and learners in two second language programs in order to investigate
opportunities for second language learning.

1.2.3 Objectives
The objectives of this study are
- to describe patterns of teacher and learner oral language use in second
language classrooms;
- to analyse these patterns of use as potential opportunities for second
language learning;
- to propose strategies for the exploitation of classroom language use for
developing learners' spoken discourse competence.

1.2.4 Questions
The study poses the following questions:
• What are typical patterns of classroom language use?
• What opportunities does the use of the TL in classroom interaction provide for second language acquisition?
• How can the analysis of classroom language use be exploited for the promotion of second language acquisition?

1.3 Organisation of the report

The literature review in chapter two presents an overview of recent studies on classroom language use in the context of communicative language teaching. Chapter three describes the methodology of the study. Chapter four presents teacher talk data. Chapter five presents data on learners' talk. Chapter six analyses the language of teachers and learners within a second language acquisition framework and chapter seven looks at the pedagogic implications of the study.
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview
2.1 Context
2.2 Analysis of Communication in the classroom
   2.2.1 Classroom language and authentic communication
   2.2.2 Classroom practice and features of classroom language
2.3 Communication in the classroom: a second language acquisition perspective
2.4 The classroom as context for communication and second language learning

Summary

Overview

This chapter reviews studies related to communicative language teaching, in particular those related to oral communication in classroom contexts and the opportunities offered for second language development in such contexts. The first section places the study in context. This is followed by a review of studies related to the nature of communication in classrooms. Section three focuses on communication within a second language acquisition framework. The final section addresses the relationship between classroom language use and second language development

2.1 CONTEXT

Communicative language teaching (CLT) has been promoted for foreign and second language teaching for at least two decades (Widdowson 1978, Wilkins 1976, Littlewood 1981). In Australia CLT has been enshrined in national
curriculum documents as the recommended approach to the teaching of languages. In the Australian guidelines for teaching languages (Australian Language Levels), communication is the central goal for teaching languages (Vale et al. 1991). The national Statement and Profiles for LOTE (Curriculum Corporation 1994) has the development of communication skills as the central goal of LOTE teaching. This document states "The outcomes of all LOTE learning focus on communicating in LOTE" (2), and asserts a communicative foundation to language teaching: "The profile has been developed on the basis of a communicative approach to language teaching and learning. This emphasises communicative use of the target language to convey meaning in a variety of contexts for a variety of purposes with a variety of interlocutors. Fundamental to the concept of communicative language use is the recognition that effective communication involves a dynamic interaction between the context, the language user and the interlocutors." (Curriculum Corporation 1994:2). The document identifies three strands for teaching languages, one of which is "communicating in LOTE: oral interaction" (2): "This strand involves using the languages in a variety of contexts, for a variety of purposes, and with a variety of interlocutors. Learners will speak, listen to speakers, view texts, and respond. The range of texts should be balanced and suit the linguistic, social and cognitive development of the learners" (Curriculum Corporation 1994: 8). Although the CLT approach is strongly advocated in the national document, the extent to which communicative teaching is implemented in L2 classroom teaching is not self-evident.
Theoretically CLT proposes learners using the target language (TL) for genuine communication in the negotiation of meaning (Savignon 1991). Despite communication being accepted generally as the goal of L2 instruction, it appears that communication has not been widely implemented in actual classroom practice. Kumaravadivelu (1993) notes that even teachers committed to CLT "fail to create opportunities for genuine communication in their classrooms" (13). Similarly, Rollman (1994) asks how much the communicative revolution "is actually penetrating the classroom" (221). And in her state of the art review of CLT, Savignon (1991) suggests that "patterns of classroom interaction provide little genuine communication between teacher and learner or, for that matter, between learner and learner" (271). Of the Australian context, McKay and Robinson (1997) comment "A sense of uncertainty around the definition and pedagogical implications of the communicative approach continues today" (12). They add: "Although there has been a move towards the rhetoric, at least, of the communicative approach in tertiary foreign language teaching in Australia, it would appear that many tertiary teachers are adhering principally to many practices of the grammar-translation approach ..." (12). Thompson (1996) comments that despite the apparent unanimity on features of CLT, "many teachers remain somewhat confused about what exactly CLT is" (9).

Although the evidence suggests that CLT is not generally applied in practice as the communicative use of the TL by teachers and learners in classroom contexts, Rollman (1994) reports some changes since 1976. She compared beginning German as a foreign language classes in 1993 with equivalent level classes studied in
1976 in order to determine how and to what extent the foreign language was used "as a real means of communication" (221). Using an observation schedule with a scale depicting language use ranging from repetition drills to real communication, Rollman recorded the types and amounts of speaking activities in which teachers and students engaged. Rollman documents an increase in students' real communication from two percent to ten percent of total student talk, and an increase in teachers' real communication from twenty one percent to thirty eight percent. Also the use of German as language of instruction increased from 21 percent to 52 percent. Taking account of the increase in real communication, Rollman nevertheless recommends further promotion of real communication by both teachers and students, noting, for example, that real communication only comprises 10 percent of total student talk. Rollman's study suggests that there have been some changes in L2 teaching practice toward more TL communication by teachers and learners, however the general consensus appears to be that there remains considerable scope for further development in practice.

In the United Kingdom, Mitchell, Brumfit and Hooper (1994) describe the stark contrast in talk about language between foreign language classes and English as a first language classes. They studied English as a first language (L1) and foreign language classes in three secondary schools over a period of eight weeks in an investigation of how language gets talked about in contemporary classrooms. They found in foreign language classes teachers typically paid substantial attention to grammar and morphology; language was largely dealt with at word
and sentence level, with few texts of substantial length. In contrast, they found in English (L1) classes teachers were concerned with function rather than form, with language use centred around reading of texts, rather than words or sentences. Their study illustrates "a fairly narrow and traditional focus on matters of syntax and, especially, morphology" (59), and "a preoccupation with smaller rather than larger text units" (59) in the foreign language classes observed. Their observations suggest a focus on form in the practice of foreign language teachers, rather than on the collaborative negotiation of meaning in communication.

Clyne et al (1995) conducted an Australian classroom study of eleven primary schools with Mandarin Chinese, Greek, and Italian programs in order to determine the main features of successful L2 programs. The programs studied had L2 programs in which the content of subjects in the curriculum was taught in the TL. This study reports that "Children in the classes in the primary school programs described in this study are slow in the development of their L2 discourse because most of the utterances are responses to the teachers' questions or to elucidations of statements" (127-128). The study also reports "The teachers themselves tend to overestimate the amount of L2 that they use in the classroom" (128), and that the children also used their L1 extensively. Their study suggests that the use of the TL for communication by teachers and learners is limited.

Similarly, Edelsky (1991) in the United States of America describes two studies of Spanish programs in which she analysed "non-acquisition as an activity engaged in by many social actors" (16). She reports that the English speaking
children in the first grade classes observed rarely produced Spanish in class, and that the "production was mostly single words, uttered in response to an opening gambit initiated by SH [one of the researchers]" (22).

Nunan (1987) analysed five communicative lessons in Australia to investigate features of genuine communication, and found that the patterns of interaction "resembled traditional patterns of classroom interaction rather than genuine communication" (137). He refers to constraints which account for this including the classroom as a setting for conversations in the target language, and the limited proficiency of learners.

The agenda for CLT is explicit. Canale and Swain (1980) suggest that classroom activities should be characterised by "aspects of genuine communication such as its basis in social interaction, the relative creativity and unpredictability of utterances, its purposefulness and goal-orientation, and its authenticity" (33). However, we can see from the above that the implementation of communication in the classroom following a CLT approach is not unproblematic. The theoretical construct of CLT has apparently not easily transferred to classroom practice. For this reason we need to investigate the classroom as a context of communication. This is the subject of the next section.

2.2 ANALYSIS OF COMMUNICATION IN THE CLASSROOM

In this section I will discuss the classroom as a context of language use for teachers and learners.
2.2.1 Classroom language and authentic communication

If we view the classroom sociolinguistically, we see the language used in the classroom as contextually determined by the social requirements of teaching and learning. The classroom then is a context of situated language use, which has distinctive patterns of speech stemming from the role and functions of the teacher and learners (Cazden 1988). The school is a social institution, with distinctive discourse and in which the discourse of the context is part of the power and purpose of the situation (Drew and Heritage 1992). We see, in this interpretation, the classroom as a place in which participants need to develop skills in the discourse of the classroom community or social context (Seedhouse 1996). This viewpoint suggests that although the language used for instructional purposes is not necessarily the same as language use in contexts outside of the classroom it nevertheless is authentic or natural. The classroom offers natural speech experiences, which, like other institutional talk, is clearly identifiable as contextualised classroom talk.

The real-life or authentic or genuine communicative nature of classroom talk has long been problematic for the communicative teaching of languages. In order to deal with the perceived shortcomings of the classroom as a context for using the L2 for real communication, efforts in CLT have been directed at replicating conversations or speech events outside of the classroom. A lot of teachers' effort goes into the thinking up, design and creation of tasks or activities which require learners to use the target language (TL) for genuine communicative
purposes (Littlewood 1981). At the same time considerable effort is devoted to suppressing talk not related to task and not in the TL (Macaro 1997). We have the contradictory situation that on the one hand we decry the fact that it is difficult to create genuine natural language use in the TL, at the same time learners are using their shared L1 to say what they want to say in peer interaction (Cazden 1988, Tarone and Swain 1995).

It seems that one problem in CLT is a view of the classroom as an unnatural speech setting. What is unnatural is the way the L2 language is used in the classroom to replicate contexts outside of the classroom in for example contrived dialogues of service encounters, rather than the unplanned discourse of service encounters outside of the classroom (McCarthy 1991). Also, as mentioned earlier, Mitchell et al (1994) note the difference between the language of L1 classrooms and that of the L2 classroom, where the overt focus is on grammar and morphology at the word and sentence level, whereas in the L1 classroom teaching centred around the reading of texts and discussions around the texts.

Kramsch (1992) notes that despite the injunctions of the communicative approach, "the classroom context itself has been in practice devalued, fulfilling a mere service function for the real world to come. Pedagogic rhetoric reinforces the impression that the classroom is indeed, in time, space, use, and status, a transit place, a rehearsal studio for a later, more serious, performance" (11). She notes that such a view is alienating for learners, as it focuses on surface features, leaving no time for a deeper critical understanding of cross-cultural contexts.
A tenet central to communicative teaching approaches is learners' need to engage in authentic use of the target language (TL). The emphasis is on authentic communication with the focus on meaning. Authentic communication raises the issue of the differences between classroom language use, and so-called natural or real life language use outside of the classroom. Seliger (1983 cited in Nunan 1987:142) says of the differences:

"These differences are the necessary result of the organisation of contexts for the formal teaching of language that takes place inside the classroom. Outside the classroom, however, in naturalistic environments, language is a means to an end ... The language classroom is, by definition, a contrived context for the use of language as a tool for communication. The bulk of time in a language class is devoted to practising language for its own sake because the participants in this activity realise that is the expressed purpose of their gathering together in a room with a blackboard and a language expert, the teacher" (Seliger 1983:250-251).

Seedhouse (1996) refers to the paradox of CLT orthodoxy, in which classroom talk is institutionalised and therefore not communicative. He points out that "communicative orthodoxy ... equates genuine or natural communication with conversation" (17), which differs from discourse in institutional settings such as the classroom. He argues that conversations in lessons are not possible:

"There would appear to be an inherent paradox in the communicative orthodoxy: communicative theorists would like to see teachers introducing the pedagogical purpose of replicating genuine discourse or conversation. But as soon as the
teacher has introduced any pedagogical purpose at all, even if the instruction is
to 'have a conversation in English', he or she has ensured that what will occur
will be institutional discourse rather than conversation. We might go so far as to
propose that a paradoxical institutional aim of communicative language teaching
is to produce non-institutional discourse in an institutional setting" (22).
The consequent problem with "the empty mouthing of decontextualised sentences
or dialogues" (Kramsch 1992:4) is that learners draw a distinction between the
real world and a school world (Chin 1994), and they remain unwilling to maintain
the fiction of realness as a frame of reference for their interaction. In other
words they reject the imposition to use the TL for real communication, as their
experience of it is not for real purposes. The classroom as a context of use of the
TL is unrelated to their need to make meaning and they no longer cooperate in
their use of the TL. The rhetorical situation does not require them to cooperate
to maintain relationships through the TL. However, their relationships with
other students continue to be of importance to them, and therefore their
communication is in their shared language. As Seedhouse (1996) notes, in
classrooms which share a LI, it is natural for learners to converse in their first
language.

Based on the above it appears there is a need to review the communicative
teaching of second languages, in particular through the analysis of classroom
language use (Clyne et al. 1995, McCarthy 1991). In terms of the paradox identified
earlier, it seems that there is potential for taking pedagogic advantage of
institutionalised language use in L2 teaching by considering the classroom as a
context of authentic language use. The language of the classroom is as natural
and authentic as in other contexts, although this does not mean it is the same as
language use in other contexts. We can view this different discourse as not
useful for L2 learning or we can consider it as pedagogically appropriate as a
kind of discourse fitted to the purposes of schooling and the roles of people in
schooled settings. This requires refocussing on the legitimacy of the discourse
in classrooms as distinctive and differentiated, at least to some degree, from
discourse outside of the classroom. Sociolinguistically the discourse of the
classroom is just another example of situated discourse.

For many second language learners in Australia the classroom is the main, if
not the only, place where they hear the LOTE being spoken and where they can
speak the LOTE themselves. The opportunities we provide in the classroom for
both exposure to spoken LOTE and for use of the LOTE is therefore a matter of
central concern. Clyne et al (1995) have emphasized the need for more output or
production opportunities in the classroom situation. They identify limitations
on what children can say because of the nature of the TL input and the
opportunities to interact in the TL. The first step is to create the need for interaction
(Clyne at al 1995). In the classroom there is a great deal of communication.
Although the discourse of the classroom is distinctive (Cazden 1988, Sinclair
and Coulthard 1975, Tsui 1995), it nevertheless offers a wide range of language
uses. The need to interact in the L2 is promoted by a) teacher's use of TL and b)
children's opportunities to use L2 on tasks and activities. So central to the
development of communication skills are the opportunities for teachers' and
children's communicative language use in the classroom. In this next section we will consider more specifically studies which refer to the L2 communicative experiences of learners.

2.2.2 Features of L2 classroom language use

In this section I will briefly review some of the characteristic patterns of language use in second language classrooms. First I will consider teacher talk in teacher-directed lessons or segments of lessons.

One of the noticeable features of language use in classrooms is the dominance of teacher talk (Chaudron 1988). Although there is considerable variance in the amount of teacher talk, Chaudron (1988) in a review of studies on the topic reports that teachers do about 60% of the talking. The dominance of teacher talk relates to teaching functions such as class management, organisation of learning, content teaching and socialising. In situations where teachers' talk prevails there are obvious limits to learners' speaking opportunities.

A significant variable in teacher talk is teachers' choice of language. Duff and Polio (1990) found that "there was a range of from ten to 100 percent FL [foreign language] use by teachers in twenty-six hours of sampled classroom discourse" (163). In classes where teacher and students share a common L1, code-switching typically occurs. Chaudron (1988) notes that the choice of language addressed to L2 learners "has a bearing on the general quality of the language environment
that L2 learners experience in the classroom" (121); for example in classrooms where the teacher does most of the speaking, and this in a shared L1, learners are exposed to limited spoken TL and therefore may not be predisposed to using the TL themselves (Chaudron 1988:124).

Studies of teacher talk also show that questions comprise 20 to 40 per cent of classroom talk (Chaudron 1988). Tsui (1995) reports in a study of English lessons in schools in Hong Kong that nearly 70% of classroom talk consists of the teacher asking a question, nominating a student to answer the question, the student responding and the teacher giving feedback in response. This typical pattern of interaction observed in both L1 and in L2 classrooms is referred to as the initiation-response-feedback (IRF) exchange pattern (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, Tsui 1995, Van Lier 1988). The pattern restricts the contribution of learners to the response move and limits the initiation of topics by learners. The pattern of teachers' questioning also enables or limits learner contributions depending on the type of questions asked (Tsui 1995): for example open questions solicit a genuine response from students, whereas closed questions solicit a known answer.

From the above we note that learner talk averages less than thirty percent in L2 classrooms and that in teacher-fronted lessons or stages of lessons the talk is controlled by the teacher. For this reason pair and group work is recommended in communicative language teaching. Long and Porter (1985) summarise pedagogical benefits of group work as increased language practice opportunities, improved quality of talk and individualisation of instruction. In group work the
quality of learner talk changes: Cathcart (1986) found that when learners had control of the talk they used a wide variety of speech acts and syntactic structures, whereas when the teacher controlled the talk learners produced single word utterances, short phrases and formulaic chunks. Small group work provides conditions for interactional adjustments or negotiation of meaning in learners' talk (Gass and Varonis 1985).

When L2 learners share a first language, at least some of their talk is in the first language. In a study of small group work of German students who had been learning French between three and a half and five and a half years, and who knew they were expected to speak French, Legenhausen (1991) reported much variation between individuals in the use of L1, varying from 8 per cent to 24 percent, with all individuals code-switching. Even in immersion programs Tarone and Swain (1995) report the tendency of older students not to use the L2 when speaking with one another in the classroom. Both the Legenhausen and Tarone and Swain studies suggest a sociolinguistic explanation for code-switching. Liegenhausen proposes that learners accept the use of the L2 for didactic purposes, but for personal uses of the language they disidentify with the didactic context and assert their identity in use of the shared L1. Tarone and Swain (1995) observe a diglossic social situation in immersion programs, where the L2 is used for institutional and academic purposes and the shared L1 is used for peer-peer social interactions. In another study of language choice in a Spanish immersion program, Blanco-Iglesias, Broner and Tarone (1995) observed the use of vernacular English, the shared first language, between children at all
grade levels in a primary school. They observed "when the children are "on
duty", as it were, focused on their schoolwork, they speak Spanish. When they
relax, they speak English" (251).

Blanco-Iglesias, Broner and Tarone (1995) point out that that the students have
not been taught a vernacular style of speech in L2, so they do not have the
discourse resources in L2 to interact with one another as they do in L1. Tarone
and Swain (1995) also suggest that students have not learned the L2 vernacular
style needed for interaction with their peers. This points to the L2 language data
learners are exposed to in the L2 classroom. Lightbown (1992) has observed
that "input must be truly representative of the target language that learners are
seeking to learn, not a misleading and distorted sample of it" (195). She observed
in FL teaching that learners of ESL learned rules that did not correspond to
spoken English; this knowledge eventually had to be unlearned for students to
develop native-like use of the TL. Similarly, McCarthy and Carter (1994) point
out the differences between textbook dialogues and natural use of the TL. The
suggestion is that learners are exposed to dialogues which are artificially
constructed and which do not display characteristic features of spoken language.
Corder has noted (1981):

"A language learner, at least in a formal instructional setting, does not in fact
spontaneously produce much data for the investigator to work on...learners do
not use their interlanguage very often in the classroom for what we may call
'normal' or 'authentic' communicative purposes. The greater part of interlanguage
data in the classroom is produced as a result of formal exercises and bears the
same relation to the spontaneous communicative use of language as the practising of tennis strokes does to playing tennis" (68).

Not only do learners have limited opportunity to communicate in the TL, but, as Clyne et al (1995) have pointed out with reference to primary L2 classes, lots of activities such as colouring in and cutting and pasting are "devoid of interaction" (153).

The studies of classroom language referred to here and in the previous section indicate learners' limited use of the TL for communicative purposes and a focus on form rather than meaning in L2 teaching. This may be considered a product of pedagogy, which a. sees the learning of language forms as a prelude to use of the L2 for communication and which b. endeavours to recreate "real world" language use tasks or situations of use in the classroom. Learners' experience of the L2 is seen as preparation for using the language purposefully in the real world outside of class. So we find typical topics include contexts of language associated with visiting the country of the TL, or of meeting with a native speaker. It is nevertheless no more authentic for students to act out a speech role for example ordering in a restaurant than to respond to the teacher in the IRF exchange. Although such topics may be an integral part of a course or program, particularly a language course for specific purposes, the activity of ordering in a restaurant by itself does not constitute real life language use, or authenticate classroom language use in real life terms. A role play acted out is just that — playing a role. Now this may be an activity which is helpful for promoting second language use, but it does not itself bring to bear situated
language use with pragmatic force of for example an exchange with a native speaker. The lack of L2 experience in oral communication is problematic. Lightbown (1992) comments: "In the current atmosphere of emphasis on communicative language teaching that involves learning in activities focusing primarily on meaning, the quality of the input available to the students must be given serious attention" (194). The authenticity of the input learners receive in the classroom is clearly an important issue for learners' perception of TL use and for the development of their interlanguage.

Based on the above we can say that in general learners have limited opportunities to interact in the TL, given the amount and nature of teacher talk and learner-learner interaction, that these interactions are often artificially constructed as they are based on stereotypical situational dialogues, and that the opportunities for negotiating meaning are limited. In the next section I will briefly review how studies in second language acquisition suggest a relationship between learners' linguistic environment and second language learning.

2.3 COMMUNICATION IN THE CLASSROOM: A SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION PERSPECTIVE

Any consideration of the application of second language acquisition (SLA) research to L2 pedagogy must be tentative, despite the vast amount of research in the field (Ellis 1994). As Larsen-Freeman (1991) notes, "SLA research has not directly answered questions about teaching, which is why a research agenda is needed for pedagogical concerns" (335). This does not imply that SLA research
is irrelevant to teaching practice. In fact the interest of SLA in understanding learning processes provides methods and approaches for investigating and analysing learning environments. One of the obvious connections between SLA research and communicative language teaching is the idea that learners learn to communicate by communicating (VanPatten 1991). I have therefore adopted this perspective for the explication of language use as opportunities for SLA in this study.

The study of teachers' and learners' spoken interaction is a focus in second language acquisition (SLA) research on how a second language is learned (Ellis 1994, Corder 1981). Although studies in second language acquisition are undertaken from psycholinguistic, linguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives (Beebe 1988), the classroom study of second language acquisition has focused on learner language or interlanguage (Allwright and Bailey 1991, Selinker 1992, Van Lier 1988 and 1996). One of the theoretical frameworks adopted for analysis of SLA has been termed the interaction hypothesis (Ellis 1991, Gass and Magnan 1995, Long 1983). Central to this hypothesis are the necessity of comprehensible (and incomprehensible) input, conversational interactions (negotiation) which make the input comprehensible, and production, which aids learners to move from semantic to syntactic processing of the TL, or to put it another way, which causes changes in learners' interlanguage. Figure 2.1 depicts this. The components of the framework are briefly discussed in the subsequent sections.
comprehensible input i+1

negotiation of meaning in interaction to aid comprehension and provide input for interlanguage restructuring

production for syntactic processing and interlanguage restructuring

Figure 2.1: Interaction hypothesis

2.3.1 Comprehensible input

Krashen (1981) has developed a detailed hypothesis to explain L2 development centred on the comprehensible input hypothesis. Input in SLA studies "refers to the language samples to which the learner is exposed. It contains the raw data which the learner has to work on in the process of interlanguage construction." (Ellis 1990: 96). Krashen has proposed that the input must be understood. This means that the L2 samples we expose our learners to must be comprehensible. In addition, he has argued that optimal input includes structures that are just beyond a learner's current level of competence, and that the input needs to get progressively more complex. The comprehensible input hypothesis, according to Krashen, explains why free conversation fails as optimal input, as it is often not understood. It also explains why drills or exercises fail as optimal input — their primary focus is the form of the language being used, rather than on its communicative purpose, so that students do not pay much attention to the meaning. So he argues that the best input activities are natural, interesting, and understood. Krashen proposes that in the classroom we speak only in the L2 and that our students read extensively, so that they experience massive amounts of comprehensible input. The assumption of the input hypothesis is that the
input is provided through communication in the second language. Krashen also observes that learner motivation and attitude have a role in L2 acquisition: he refers to an "affective filter" which may limit the processing of input, so that acquisition will not take place.

2.3.2 Interaction

The question raised by the comprehensible input hypothesis is how the input is processed by the learner for it to become intake. Input, in other words, is not to be equated with intake (Corder 1981). Krashen (1985) claimed "Humans acquire language in only way - by understanding messages or by receiving comprehensible input" (100). This claim does not establish how the input is processed by learners so that it becomes intake. The interaction hypothesis of Long (1983) offers an explanation for how input is made comprehensible, and in the process may contribute to L2 development. Long observed that in native speaker and non-native speaker interaction, when either speaker signalled lack of comprehension or wished to confirm that the message was conveyed, the speakers engaged in negotiated interaction in order to maintain the conversation. Such modifications have been variously studied and they include clarifying what has been said, modifying, repeating, and asking for clarification. Pica et al (1996) give examples of how the negotiation of meaning not only enhances message comprehension but also serves as input on L2 form and meaning. White (1987) has extended the notion of interaction by proposing that incomprehensible input causes interlocutors to seek clarification, expansion or repetition in order to understand what has been said. Incomprehensible input
requires an interlocutor to negotiate meaning as suggested by Pical et al (1996).

Van Lier (1988) summarises the role of interaction in second language learning as follows: "The interaction (or social) model of language acquisition holds that language learning occurs in and through participation in speech events, that is, that talking to others, or making conversation, is essential" (74). And Chaudron (1988) proposes the role of interaction in second language learning as follows. "Interaction is viewed as significant because it is argued that 1) only through interaction can the learner decompose the TL structures and derive meaning from classroom events, 2) interaction gives learners the opportunities to incorporate TL structures into their own speech (the scaffolding principle), and 3) the meaningfulness for learners of classroom events of any kind, whether thought of as interactive or not, will depend on the extent to which communication has been jointly constructed between the teacher and learners" (10).

The interaction hypothesis accounts for how input is made comprehensible through the negotiation of meaning, and at the same time provides an explanation of how the negotiation of meaning contributes to restructuring of learners' interlanguage. The next section examines the role of TL production by learners in promoting second language development.

2.3.3 Output or production of the target language

Swain (1985) noted how children learning French in immersion programs developed fluency but did not achieve accuracy, although the children received
a lot of comprehensible input. She suggested as an explanation the lack of opportunities to produce the target language, and proposed the crucial role of output or production in development of the L2 (output hypothesis), which may force the learner "to move from semantic processing to syntactic processing" (249). Swain observed that it is possible to understand (semantic processing) without recognising or using the syntax of the TL, whereas in oral language production there is a need for syntactic processing as learners use the TL in meaningful communication. In output or production learners have the opportunity to try out their hypotheses about the TL and to make modifications in their responses (Swain and Lapkin 1995).

The output hypothesis suggests not only a strong role for learners' participation in interaction, it is also underlines Hatch's (1978) strong version of SLA, that learning occurs through carrying on conversations. Learners' participation in interaction in L2 assists in learners obtaining input and extending interlanguage through the negotiation of meaning. In negotiating meaning learners seek clarification and modify their output to get their meaning across. In the process of negotiation they develop their discourse skills and build their grammatical and lexical resources in order to achieve understanding.

2.3.4 Language awareness

Ellis (1991) proposed a revision to the interaction hypothesis to include learners' noticing or attending to new features in the input and comparing it with their own output. VanPatten (1994) has argued for the need to draw learners' attention
to specific forms during comprehension of meaning-focused input. He suggests further research on the place of attention in second language learning in which "attention should be comprehension-based and focus on input processing where both meaning and form are attended to" (35). Ellis and VanPatten highlight the need to target specific elements in TL input, that is to make them salient for the learners, so that they attend to them. Swain's (1995) explanation of the output hypothesis includes noticing aspects of language use so that speakers can control them. The suggestion is that learners' awareness of language use has a role to play in L2 development.

Although as noted above second language acquisition studies do not provide definitive explanations of second language acquisition processes, the interaction hypothesis provides an analytical framework for the analysis of communication in L2 classrooms as offering opportunities for L2 development. It proposes a role for exposure to TL data (input) which is processed through learners' understanding (comprehension) and use of the TL in interaction (output). This is discussed in more detail in the next section.

2.4 THE CLASSROOM AS CONTEXT FOR COMMUNICATION AND LANGUAGE LEARNING

What is clearly needed is the close examination of communication patterns in lessons in order to characterise the context as opportunities for interactional L2 use, and thus for L2 development. The interaction hypothesis of second language acquisition offers an explanation for language development through
communicative interaction. Learning a language is a social experience, in which language is used to communicate with speakers of the TL and to participate in their institutions (Larsen-Freeman 1991). As a social phenomenon, people use language in collaboration with others, thereby promoting language development.

I have argued earlier that a social view of classroom discourse identifies it as institutional discourse, which is authentic communication. The formal or official discourse of the classroom is not however identical with language use in conversations, in which the perlocutionary function of language use is most important. Nevertheless the formal discourse of the classroom depends on joint action. Brown and Yule (1994) argue that the overriding function of spoken language is "the maintenance of social relationships" (11), which is evident in interactional chat, and which is also characteristic of harmonious classroom working environments. Brown and Yule (1994) differentiate between primarily "interactional language", which is listener-oriented, and "transactional language", which is message-oriented (13). In the classroom both functions are identifiable, but they are constituted as distinctive to, but not exclusive to, the classroom context. Language is constitutive of, and constituted by, the context of use. As Cazden 1988) states " ... speech events such as lessons are social events accomplished by the collaborative work of two or more people. In metaphorical terms, "school" is always a performance that must be constituted through the participation of a group of actors" (44).

The system of communication in the L2 classroom covers both L1 and L2 use.
The research reported earlier suggests that learners' use of the L2 is limited, and that the L1 serves as the organising system of communication. In analysing communication in the L2 classroom we need to take into consideration the use of both L1 and L2, and examine how the use of both can be exploited for language development.

The teaching of second languages is centrally concerned with language study and language use for second language development. The classroom is an appropriate context for language use and for language development. Classroom language events are relevant to the immediate experience of learners — the form-function relationship is there, the need to get things done is there, the discourse exponents are there. The language use is experientially based. Now it could be argued that this is what is already the case in the L2 curriculum, particularly at the primary level, where topics such as my pets, my home, likes and dislikes are dealt with. However, the discourse is different from how we normally talk about such topics (Mickan 1997). Although the topics relate to the experiences of learners, the question is whether the discourse on the topics promotes genuine communication. It may be necessary to distinguish between the topics and the discourse on the topics — how we talk about them — as determined by the contexts of talking about them. This is where the context of use is central to looking at language and I suggest looking at language teaching.

Research on language learning emphasises the need to look at the context of language use and its impact on language learning (Duranti and Goodwin 1992).
The central issue for second language teaching is the significance accorded to the language of the classroom as an environment for experiential L2 development opportunities. Communicative language teaching has tended to look to more communicative, more authentic contexts of language use outside of the classroom. Learning languages is valued for its possible eventual uses. Instead of building on learners' knowledge of interactional and transactional speech in their first language (Brown and Yule 1994), learners are required to learn the discourse of situations with which they may be unfamiliar and in which language use is variable (Larsen-Freeman 1991). This presents problems for the collaborative use of the TL, and thus for L2 development. The alternative is to exploit the situated communication of teaching and learning, drawing on discourses from the mainstream curriculum.

Cazden (1988) points out that it is necessary when children first go to school for them to learn how the communication structure of lessons works; they need to acquire what she terms "communicative competence" (46) in order to fully participate in lessons. For L2 learners it is possible to exploit their familiarity with classroom communication, as Cazden (1988) points out: "One benefit of a clear and consistent event structure is that it allows participants to attend to content rather than procedure ... to the extent that a lesson structure is consistently enacted by the teacher (with flexibility for improvisations ... ) and learnable by her particular students, it can become sufficiently familiar and predictable to offer clear cues to the shifting contexts, and to the talk that is appropriate within them" (47-48).
One of the problems here of course is that the use of the TL will not resemble use by NSs, as this is a context of use which is constitutive of interlanguage use and foreigner talk. This is not of itself problematic, as this is normal for learning/teaching contexts, and is no different from any other subject area — schooling after all is a social apprenticeship, which, as any apprenticeship, has some deliberate teaching/learning, some simulations and some real tasks. In other words the transitional or interim nature of language use is normal for the educational enterprise as we know it.

If we want our students to speak we need to give them not just practice in listening and speaking, but the experience of speech events. They need to participate in spoken interactions, converse and give oral presentations. Clyne et al (1995) stress the importance of creating a communication rich environment for L2 learning, as do other writers (see for example Burt and Dulay 1981, Ellis 1992, VanPatten 1991). In the classroom there is a great deal of communication. Although the discourse of the classroom is distinctive (Sinclair & Coulthard 1975), it nevertheless offers a wide range of language uses. The need to interact in the L2 is promoted by a) teacher's use of TL and b) children's opportunities to use the L2 on tasks and activities. So central to the development of second language learners' oral communication skills are the opportunities for teachers' and children's communicative language use in the classroom. This study addresses this central issue by analysing the classroom talk of teachers and learners in two LOTE contexts.
Summary

In this chapter I have set the context for the study by reviewing research related to communicative language teaching, in particular research related to oral communication in classroom contexts and to the opportunities offered for second language development in such contexts. The chapter has looked at the nature of communication in classrooms and outlined a second language acquisition framework for viewing classroom language use as opportunities for second language development. In the next chapter the methodology for the study is described.
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Overview

This chapter presents a theoretical and methodological rationale for the research design. This is followed by a description of the procedures followed for conducting the study:

• the selection of sites
• the subjects in the study
• the collection of data
• the analysis of data.

3.1 RESEARCH APPROACH

This study is an investigation of three questions related to second language teaching and learning:

• What are typical patterns of classroom language use?
• What opportunities does the use of the TL in classroom interaction provide
for second language acquisition?

- How can the analysis of classroom language use be exploited for the promotion of second language acquisition?

In order to investigate these questions I have adopted a qualitative research approach. Although this term embraces multiple meanings and refers to a variety of research approaches (Davis 1995, Lazaraton 1995), I have used it in the general sense as summarised by Denzin and Lincoln (1994):

"... qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. Qualitative research involves the studied use and collection of a variety of empirical materials ... that describe routine and problematic moments and meanings in individuals' lives" (2).

Following Denzin and Lincoln's description of qualitative research, I have adopted an inquiry approach which looks at language use in classroom settings. I have used as a method of data collection video-recording of spoken language in order to gain an understanding of spoken interactions, and how these may contribute to L2 learning. The analysis of the data has not been based on a predetermined framework; it has involved the sustained scrutiny of the data for the identification of spoken discourse patterns and for an explanation for the observed phenomena in terms of opportunities for second language learning.

The choice of a qualitative research approach has been influenced by my interest in classroom language learning and teaching, and the wish to understand how
language development may be promoted in second language teaching. For this reason the study is situated in classroom settings. The study of naturally occurring phenomena is one clearly defining characteristic of qualitative research (Allwright and Bailey 1991). A second reason for the adoption of qualitative procedures is to depict the data in context so that its relevance to teaching, both as an approach to investigation and as a way of analysing specific classroom events, is foregrounded. The study in other words is intended to have pedagogic relevance. Van Lier (1988) asserts that "Any theory of second-language acquisition which does not explicitly take into account classroom data, either in the form of using such data for theory construction, or in terms of being relevant to the analysis of such data, is seriously incomplete" (23).

I have used what Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) call a "focused descriptive methodology" (17), with the focus on patterns of social interaction in class in order to investigate the language learning opportunities in the working operations of classes. Brooks (1990) points out that "While language learning is the object of foreign language instruction, language learning is embedded in the instructional conversations that take place during lessons. Therefore, by exploring the instructional talk between teachers and students in a principled and systematic manner one is able to extract recurring patterns of action and interaction during lessons to 'be able to explain how classroom instruction influences and interacts with learning' (Breen, 1985: 135)" (154). The study of classroom interaction "leads the researcher to observe and describe the interactional events that take place in a classroom in order to understand how learning opportunities are created"
(Ellis 1994: 565). Allwright (1984) refers to interaction as "the fundamental fact of classroom pedagogy" because "everything that happens in the classroom happens through a process of live person-to-person interaction" (156) (italics in original). The data for the study are the interactions of teachers with students and student-student interactions in two classroom settings. Given the complexity of classroom events, the focus on spoken interaction sets boundaries to the investigation.

3.2 RESEARCH PROCEDURE

The research procedure comprised the observation and video-recording of LOTE lessons in two different schools. The spoken language of the lessons was transcribed from the video-recording and subsequently analysed in terms of the patterns of interaction in the lessons.

3.2.1 The sites

The selection of sites was determined by three factors:

1. I wanted to obtain data from two different LOTE programs in order to obtain different perspectives on language use. One program was a bilingual program and the other was a standard LOTE program.

2. School A requested the evaluation of their new bilingual program and as part of the evaluation I requested the video-recording of a bilingual teaching session. School B was recommended as a school with a successful LOTE program, and the LOTE teachers in the school were active in language associations and on LOTE committees.
3. The teachers agreed to participate in the project and were interested professionally in it. They considered their involvement as a process for reflecting on their teaching and developing their understanding of classroom learning. These factors resulted in data collection on two different language programs. The bilingual program was an Italian language program and the LOTE program was Japanese.

Both schools are metropolitan schools. School A is located in an inner suburb. It is a Catholic parish primary school, which is strongly supported by the local community. School B, a state secondary school, was established ten years ago in an expanding outer suburb.

The recording of lessons was preceded by meetings with teachers to discuss the project and the collection of data. After the teachers agreed to participate, the principals of the schools were also informed of the project and gave their approval to the project. Letters with a consent form were distributed to parents and guardians of students outlining the purpose of the project and seeking permission for students to participate in the project. Permission to participate in the project was obtained for all students in the classes. Further visits were made to the schools to observe the lessons and to talk with the teachers about their programs. Observational notes were made during these visits. The lesson observations made by the researcher prior to recordings being made familiarised the researcher with the class and the teacher. The visits were also used to explain to the students the procedure for class video-recording, and to accustom the students
3.2.2 The students

The students in school A were in the first grade of primary school. The bilingual class had been established in the middle of Term One, after parents of all Grade One children had been informed about the program and had received invitations for their children to join the program. The bilingual class was a novelty in the school and was enthusiastically supported by the school community. The bilingual session was recorded after the program had been running for 6 months.

The students in school A were in Year 9 of their secondary schooling. Most of the students had some experience of Japanese study in the primary school, although their level of Japanese proficiency was considered by the teacher to be a little beyond basic proficiency. The lessons were recorded in mid year, after they had been learning the language for one and a half years in the secondary school.

The learners in both schools shared English as a common language, almost all of whom were learning a LOTE as a second language, although for very few individuals it was a third language. The target languages for the learners were foreign languages, as they were not used in the learners' social context for every day communication.

Both teachers are confident, enthusiastic and competent LOTE teachers. At the
time of recording the teacher in the bilingual program was teaching in such a program for the first time; she is bilingual and was supported with release time, resources and advice from a LOTE Consultant in the development of the program. The teacher of Japanese is very experienced teacher and curriculum writer of that language.

3.2.3 Data collection

The primary data collected for this study were the video-recordings of the classes made by a professional educational team of technicians. The researcher made general observational notes during the recordings of the lessons to help in understanding the lessons when scrutinising the recorded data.

In school A the bilingual class was recorded for the full extent of the program on that day: this included a religious lesson for half an hour before lunch and one and a half hours of recording after lunch. In school B a double lesson of one hundred minutes was recorded.

The recorded spoken language from both classes was transcribed. The recording from school A was transcribed by a bilingual English/Italian lecturer and from school B by the teacher of the class.

As is common with classroom recordings, there were technical limitations on what was recorded. In the bilingual class, the recording equipment captured what the teacher said, because of the use of mobile microphone worn by the teacher. In the Japanese class, group work was recorded, in addition to the
teacher in the teacher-fronted sections of the lesson, because of the clear
demarcation of the lesson in phases, including a phase when the students worked
in groups. However, only two groups were recorded, although other students
were working in groups as well. As a result all the language used in class has
not been recorded. Nevertheless significant language interactions in teacher-
fronted lesson phases and examples of student group work in the Japanese class
were documented.

3.2.4 Analysis of data

The principal research method I chose for the data analysis was discourse analysis:
"Discourse analysis serves as a device for systematically describing the kinds of
interactions that occur in language classrooms" (Ellis 1994: 568). The analysis of
the data involved the following procedure:

The recorded lessons were viewed and the transcript read a number of times in
order to check on accuracy of the transcription and to become familiar with the
details of language use in the classes. With the research focus of the study in
mind during these initial viewings and readings it became apparent that the
two teachers were using language for significant functions in the management
of the class, that there were certain patterns of use which typified different
stages of the lesson, and that language choice was a significant feature of language
use in both classes. These patterns were then analysed in more detail from the
perspective of the L2 learning opportunities they offered the learners.

For the analysis I have used a framework which identifies
a. the patterns of target language input to which learners were exposed
b. the kind of interactions learners engaged in and
c. the target language production opportunities learners experienced.

Summary
In this chapter I have presented the rationale for the research design adopted for this study. Following this I have described how the sites for data collection were selected, the subjects of the study, the data collection procedure and the approach to the analysis of the data.
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Overview

This chapter focuses on teacher talk and the opportunities teacher talk creates for second language learning. It specifically examines two characteristic features of teachers' classroom talk in teacher-fronted situations. These features are:

• the functions of teacher talk in the classroom and

• teacher's choice of language (code-switching).

The data for this chapter comes from 2 sources:

• the recording of a Year 1 Italian bilingual class

• the recording of a Year 9 lesson in Japanese.

The functions of teacher talk and teacher code-switching exemplify the institutional character of classroom communication and as such can be considered as potential opportunities for second language learning.
4.1 INTRODUCTION TO TEACHER TALK

One of the general observations made of language use in classrooms is that the teacher talks for most of the time (Chaudron 1988). This can be explained in part by the role of the teacher in managing the class, in organising the learning activities, and in giving instructions on the content of the lesson. The amount of teacher talk varies according to different contextual factors, such as the stage of the lesson, how long students have been learning the language, the level of schooling (junior primary, primary or secondary), and the purpose or purposes of the lesson. For example, teacher talk dominates in teacher-fronted sections of lessons, usually at the beginning of a lesson when the content of a lesson is being introduced or practised, when instructions are being given and in reviewing work. An analysis of teacher talk reveals different purposes for their talk. This is the first aspect of teacher talk examined — the purposes of teacher talk. The data referred to in the first section is from the Italian bilingual class and in the second section from the Japanese L2 class. I have identified four major purposes for which teachers talk in class: for classroom management, for giving instructions, for social interaction and for teaching subject content.

4.2 FUNCTIONS OF TEACHER TALK IN AN ITALIAN BILINGUAL CLASS

In the recorded lesson the teacher speaks only in Italian. At two points she speaks in English — when children from another class come in on an errand, and when another teacher comes in to consult with her. The teacher speaks Italian fluently in a relaxed and natural manner. The transcription records the spoken language use without corrections or alterations. Where it has not been
possible to identify what a speaker has said this has been notated as an x in the transcript.

4.2.1 The language of classroom management

Italian was used for the management of the students' activities and behaviour. The following extract shows how the teacher uses Italian for organising a classroom activity - she is asking the children to get together with their partners.

T: Grazie! M7, adesso mettetevi con i partner speciali, per favore. F9, non toccare il naso. F9 e F2 mettetevi insieme per favore. Dove sono i vostri partners? M7 e F12, su, insieme! [7 -9]

The teacher's instructions are in the context of previous activities and relate to the children taking action to locate and join their partners. She addresses the whole class and then individual children, when required, to gain their attention. She repeats her instruction four times, each time using a different form, but repeating key words and phrases that have become familiar to the children through repeated use in predictable situations in the course of the program. The use of repetition here has three purposes: to get children's attention, to organise the learners for the first phase of the lesson and to assist the learners' understanding of the teacher's directions.

Teacher's classroom management extends to behavioural directions. She reprimands and praises learners in Italian. For misbehaviour children are sent
to the "la tavola della ripensimento" [discipline desk]. Class rules are developed and displayed in Italian. These rules for maintenance of classroom order are explained and reinforced through repetition. The language of management is directed at the whole class as well as at individual children, and usually requires children's responses, which is a means of checking their understanding.

The teacher uses Italian for giving routine instructions. The routines and classroom rituals govern children's movement and behaviour in class. These routines include directives to bring the children to order quickly:


This extract contains four linguistic routines to call the children to attention:

• counting to give the children time to attend to the teacher
• a physical response from the children to manifest their compliance- "Mani sulla testa"
• the call for one child to look at "signora" to attract the attention of one child
• and repetition of the verb "guarda" to attract the attention of the whole class.

The next extract [145 - 158] illustrates how the teacher uses Italian to organise group work. On the day of the video recording the children sat at tables in groups of four, with each group identified by color (tavolo rosa/giallo/verde/azzuro/viola). As is evident in the transcript this procedure
allowed for orderly movement into groups. The procedure in this extract was a normal part of a lesson, when children moved from the space at the front of the room to their tables.

T: Si. Okay, tavola rosa per favore. Quattro persone. F5 date dei fogli oggi.
F2: Signora. [F2 comes up to speak to T.]
T: Si?
F2: I don't know what to do.
T: Devi seguire la strada. Io adesso vengo tavolo per tavolo e vi aiuto.
L: XX [not distinguishable]
T: Si, io vi aiuto. Tavolo verde.
L: Can I give them out?
T: M7 consegna i fogli oggi. Tavolo viola. M3 consegna i fogli oggi.
F11: [F11 comes up to T.] M6 can give them out today.
T: Va bene M6. Uno, due, tre, quattro, tavolo azzurro. Io vi aiuto. F7 io vengo aiutarvi. E tavolo giallo, quattro fogli...

[Students go to their tables.] [F8 approaches T.] [146 -158]

This extract illustrates how the teacher gave instructions in Italian, and how the children followed the instructions. Also in the extract two children initiate turns in English [at lines 149 and 153]. In the first instance F2 responds to the teacher's question (Si?), and in the second instance the child initiates a turn in English. This exchange shows the normality of code switching between the learners and
As the bilingual program extended over two sessions, one before lunch and one after lunch, the Italian used for class management was extensive. It gave children regular exposure to a range of management expressions in Italian to do with the movement, behaviour, and functioning of the class. Because the language was used routinely and required learners to respond, the children had frequent opportunities for processing the Italian used in classroom management. Their ability to process the instructions are observable in the children's response to instructions. The next extract records children responding to the teacher's instructions:

T: M7! M7 la signora si arallia! M5 vieni qui per favore questa parte... [M5 moves across.] F4 tu vai dietro a F9, per favore. [F4 gets up and sits behind F9.] Dietro F9. [439 -441]

The data show children responding as a matter of course to instructions in Italian. Their responses reflect understanding of the target language.

The use of the target language for class organisational purposes provided patterns of language use which were a source of target language input to the learners (Ellis 1992 and Krashen 1985), because of their regularity of use and contextualised familiarity.
4.2.2 The language of instruction

The use of Italian for instruction, that is for introducing new work, explaining activities and for giving directions on how to carry out tasks, was a significant feature of the teacher's classroom language. In giving the children instructions, the teacher explained how to do things, to make things, to carry out directions and how to initiate and respond according to social expectations.

In the extract which follows the teacher introduces an activity. She presents the task using visuals — a worksheet with diagrams and pictures — to the whole class seated on the carpet in front of her.

T: Si, si, si è tagliata, si è tagliata. Va bene. [T turns to pick up sheets.]
Adesso io voglio che voi andate a fare un compito sul pezzo di carta che signora ha fatto da fotocopi e oggi. É un porcospino. Il porcospino è uno dei animali che abbiamo visto sull'autobus oggi....Cerca a mangiare. Cosa vuole fare il porcospino? Vuole mangiare. Cosa significa mangiare? Sì M8?
M8: Eating. [98 - 104]

The teacher signals the commencement of the activity by picking up a work sheet for the children and addressing the class with a familiar "Adesso io voglio..." and then tells them what she wants them to do. She makes reference to specific events related to the children's recent experience [100 - 101] (The children had visited an environmental display in a mobile van in the morning which included an echidna - hence the reference to the "Il porcospino").
seating arrangement enables her to direct information to all children as well to individuals and to respond to the questions and requests of individual children. The extract contains a mixture of content language and language to do with the activity and the children's experience. It illustrates the use of Italian integrated in classroom actions.

The next excerpt shows how the teacher follows through an instructional procedure in Italian. In this case she focuses on a book "Cappucetto Rosso" ("Little Red Riding Hood") and a game.

T: Si, brava F5 ha capito....M7! Tu devi spostare cosi' F3 puo' venire piu' vicino. Spostati! Grazie....M5! Tu quella cartina devi mettere in centro cos non tocchi. Bravissimo.

L: What's that game called?

T: Noi giochiamo, voglio vedere se voi capite la parole del, del libro. Ok! Guardiamo insieme al libro...F8 non toccare! "Il mondo" ...

M1 to pick it up and put it on his lap.] Bravissimo! Io voglio che M3 trova il papà di Cappuccetto Rosso. Dov'è il papà?... Si vai prendere. Si prendi la cartina che dimostra il papà. [M3 goes to pick it up.] Ma quanto sei bravo M3.


M6: I know!

T: Chi è? ... Chi taglia l'albero? ... Eh, non so, lui è cacciatore mi sembra...

[F5 shows picture to T and M6 looks too.]

M6: XX [not discernible].

T: Pero' F5, F5 questo potrebbe'essere il papà. Si, brava ... il papà.

F1: That's not him.

T: Perchè? Chi è? [lines 547 - 579]

In the first two lines [547 - 548] the teacher is settling the children into a circle and preparing for an activity. Prior to this she has taken the book "Cappuccetto Rosso" and checked with the children what it is about. She has put cards illustrating the story on the carpet, which the children find irresistible, hence the need for
the teacher to tell the child to return a card to the middle of the circle, which the child does and the teacher acknowledges it ["Bravissimo" 549].

The teacher's request marks the beginning of a segment in the discourse and one child, recognising this, calls out in English "What's that game called?" [550]. The seamless nature of the code-switching here is an identifiable feature of the interactions in class between the teacher and learners. In this instance the learner initiates the turn in English and the teacher responds in a natural way in Italian to the child's question and then continues immediately with an explanation of what she will do with the class by using an oft-repeated "...voglio vedere..." [551]. The repetition ["la parol-le parole"] serves to clarify the task but also gives the children an opportunity to grasp the focus of the activity. Class management is required at line 552 and then the teacher reads as she holds the book for the children to see pictures and text.

The next lines [553-4] reveal some of the teacher's strategies for making Italian comprehensible: she checks learners' comprehension with a question and then uses a number of references to make the meaning clear — first she refers to the class puppet [Matilda] and then to the families of those present. The references are intended to assist the learners to connect the teaching point to their prior experience. A response to a child intervenes and then the teacher continues with the story. She points out the main characters.

In what follows the teacher relates the Italian language to actions of the children
— they are asked to pick up the cards picturing the characters she names. Here the teacher is directing her instructions to individual learners using a familiar pattern:

Adesso io voglio che M1 trova la mamma. Dov'è la mamma di Cappuccetto Rosso nelle cartine?

The child responds with the selection of the correct card and is instructed verbally and with body language where to place it - the association of the spoken language with gesture supports the child's understanding.

Non vedo. Sì. Prendila..e te la metti qui. [T gestures for M1 to pick it up and put it on his lap.] Bravissimo!

After praising the child she follows a similar pattern with other children. The instruction/action is repeated, with variations, with four other children.

The number of repetitions and the variations in this sequence is concentrated. Within twelve lines [557 -569] the phrases and key words (with variations) recur often: "Adesso" appears twice; "io voglio" 5 times; "Dov'è" 6 times; "trova" 4; "Bravissima/o" 3 times. These are lexical items. A similar analysis of functions (e.g. in relation to the verb "prendere") or of syntax shows the extent to which learners are exposed to lexico-grammatical patterns in Italian. These patterns permeate the classroom language of the teacher, offering learners consistent exposure to a range of discourse structures in Italian.

4.2.3 Subject specific language

The learning areas taught in the bilingual class were Science, Health, Society
and Environment, and Religious Education.

A significant amount of the teacher's language use is related to teaching the content of subjects included in the bilingual program. In what follows extracts from the transcript illustrate the use of Italian for content teaching in two subject areas — Health and Religious Education.

**Health Studies**

The following extract related to Health Studies shows how the teacher introduced new lexical items in Italian, and the strategies she used to make new items comprehensible.

The extract starts at line 60 of the video transcription:

T: Si, pero` questo è F3...e là...[T points to part of the photo.] Cos'è questo sulla testa?

L: Brain.

T: Cos'è?

LL: Brain.

T: Il cervello. Come si chiama?


L: XX.

L: Heart.

L: Lungs.
Come si chiamano?
L: Lungs.
T: Sì, e qui c'è cuore. Do-do, do-do, do-do. Cos'è?
L: Heart?
T: Va bene. Allora abbiamo il cuore.
T: Il cuore.
T: Il cervello.
T: I polmoni.
LL: I polmoni.
T: E poi c'era il sangue, cos'è il sangue? È rosso, di solito, il sangue. F6?
L: È blu.
L: Blood.
T: Sì, è blu. C'è il sangue rosso e il sangue blu. Dove sta il sangue blu, si vede sulle mani, sulle braccia. Fammi vedere.
L: X.
T: Uh?
L: X.
T: Sì, brava. Manca l'ossigeno. [60 - 96]

The teacher signals the commencement of a new teaching sequence through an opening question, which, although addressed to an individual child, is asked in order to get the whole class to attend to her. She then verbally ["e là"] and physically [points to the board] draws children's attention to a photograph on the board she has at the front of the class and around which the children cluster.
She then puts the question again ["Cos'è questo sulla testa?"] but with variation of both form and of additional contextual information. The explicit reference to "sulla testa" offers more information about what she is referring to. This results in the appropriate response from at least two children in English, which is accepted by the teacher, and is used by the teacher to prompt a whole class response in English as it seems to confirm that the class has understood what she is referring to. She then introduces the Italian word ["Il cervello"] and prompts repetition from the class. The whole class repetition indicates the familiarity of the class with the prompting question "Come si chiama?".

At line 69 the teacher then commences another speech episode, in which she introduces a new lexical item - "polmoni" - three times, first in a clause, then as an individual word and then in a prompt question. The repetition focuses attention on the new lexis. In order to clarify the meaning the teacher also breathes in audibly, associating the word with the action of breathing. The first response of a learner is incorrect but it is followed immediately by a correct one which the teacher confirms with a familiar [for the learners] prompting question. The response of a learner is affirmed through "Si" as the teacher introduces another sequence. The new lexical item is associated with the sounding of heart beat as well as visual reference resulting in a tentative response in English, which is strongly affirmed - "Va bene". This is followed by repetition by the teacher of the lexical item in a clause and then as one word with the teacher pointing to the picture. This is a signal to the class to repeat "Il cuore". It is also taken as an opportunity for the teacher to lead the children in repeating the previously
introduced lexical items. This is practice in order to reinforce the learning of the new vocabulary items.

At line 87 the teacher introduces further content. She does this through three different clauses, each of which ends with the new lexical item - "sangue" - in order to emphasise it. Her reference to a child at line 88 is to call the child to attention. At line 89 a child takes the initiative by stating "È blu" while another child responds in English. Both children's responses indicate learner comprehension. The teacher follows [L 92 - 92] with an affirmation of what the child has said - "SI, è blu"-, provides an explanation, poses a question, provides a response while pointing to the veins on her wrist and then calls for learner's action response. In doing so the teacher uses a number of strategies:

• she incorporates the child's contribution into an explanation
• she uses previously taught vocabulary - colors
• she elaborates with reference to hands and arm using an oft-used question form - "Dove sta.." - and familiar vocabulary
• she invokes further response from learners.

The sequence ends with some unintelligible children's responses, which according to the teacher's response at line 96 included reference to oxygen.

Religious Studies

The teacher had established routines in her running of the class, which gave her opportunities to use repeatedly certain discourse patterns from individual subject areas. This is observable in the teaching of Religious Studies. The integration of
religion into the life of the class offered opportunities for the children to engage in religious routines in Italian.

Prayers were said routinely before the lunch break, from which point in the lesson the following extract is taken. Just prior to this exchange the teacher had walked to the front of the class and sat down in the usual position for whole class work with the children sitting on the carpet in front of her. Her movement and verbal command ("tutti seduti") signalled to the class to join her.

... Mani insieme...Vogliamo fare questa preghiera qui o quella sul muro? [T points to easel and then to prayer up on wall.]

LL: That one. [Some students point.]


T: M5, come si fa la croce?

In this extract the routines of prayer time are predictable. The commencement of prayers is marked by "Mani insieme" and the teacher asking the children which prayer they wished to say. In asking she points to the options which are texts pinned on the wall. The children understand and indicate their preference and the teacher responds with phrases familiar to the children. The prayers are said together and then the teacher puts a question to a boy ["M5, come si fa la croce?" 455] to which the boy responds by making the sign of the cross.

The example illustrates how the class participated in a quite natural use of Italian for religious purposes. The class was well-rehearsed in the routines associated with prayer time and was confident in using Italian. The texts of the prayers were visually presented, although it was clear that children knew the prayers. However the visual display of the texts offered the opportunity for the children to associate the sounds with the written words thus potentially reinforcing their learning. It is apparent in such routine uses of Italian that the children had multiple opportunities to rehearse the target language in meaningful contexts and through such regular uses to internalise the target language.

The extracts from the transcribed lesson discussed above illustrate the teacher's use of Italian in teaching the content of the curriculum. The naturalness of the discourse in her discussion of topics is particularly apparent.

4.2.4 The language of social interaction

The teacher uses Italian in social interactions with children. Her lessons include
personal comments addressed to individual children. She gives explicit instructions on how children should apologise. She gives directions on socially appropriate uses of Italian such as how to make requests and in the following example she greets the children as they go out to eat their lunch:

Teacher:


LUNCH BREAK. [469 - 472]

The teacher uses "Buon appetito..." with the name of a child in order to dismiss them individually for the lunch break. Outside of the classroom the teacher often addressed the children in Italian. In instances where this was observed the children responded as though the use of Italian was quite normal. This extended the use of Italian beyond the realm of the formal to informal social interaction.

4.2.5 Comment

The teacher taught with the consistent and confident expectation that the class would understand her and be able to follow her instructions and be able to interact with her in Italian. In her interactions with the children she did not expect them to use Italian — she accepted their responses in English, but replied to them in Italian when addressed in English. The teacher commented in relation to this:
"There is no pressure placed upon the children to use the second language. However, words and phrases used by them are welcomed with enthusiasm and praise. Responses in English are simply turned into Italian without any negativeness towards the child. If a child makes a grammatical error it is simply corrected by repeating the phrase correctly. I do not want the children to feel any sense of failure which might in the long run inhibit the development of their second language. When the children are ready they will begin to speak."

[transcribed from interview with teacher]

When the teacher provided specific input on a new topic or introduced new language items she asked children to repeat the new items after her in Italian and on these occasions expected the children to respond in Italian. The same was expected of Italian used for class routines, such as seeking permission to go to the toilet.

As the teacher spoke in Italian, the children were exposed to a wide range of language, both subject specific and as part of normal classroom interactions. These purposes are common to classroom language use in general. Students are familiar with such teacher talk from other subjects as well. As the Italian was contextualised and related to students' expectations of the teacher and of the classroom setting, students were familiar with the teacher's utterances in Italian and responded to them.
Of particular interest is the value of teacher talk as potential target language input for the learners. The predictability and contextualised nature of the teacher's talk exposed learners to a rich array of discourse data in the target language. As Italian was used in all lessons, the students also had repeated exposure to a range of discourse patterns, which increased the potential over time for their understanding and internalisation of the Italian input.

The analysis of the functions of TL use in the bilingual classroom illustrate significant aspects of classroom communication and communicative language teaching.

1. The extracts illustrate the authenticity of language use. Although the teacher talk is characterised as classroom talk, it is apparent that the language has much wider currency, and that the discourse reflects the purposes for which language is used in contexts outside of lessons as well.

2. Although the data used for this analysis were recorded in a bilingual class, it is apparent that they typify instructional contexts. The functions, in other words, can be identified in other classrooms, and can be applied to L2 teaching. The important role of teacher talk as contextualised and comprehensible input in the L2 classroom is highlighted in the bilingual setting. The context for L2 learning offers a rich environment for developing learners' comprehension of the TL.

3. In the use of the TL, the form-function relationship in language use is evident. The learners' have experience of the TL for making meaning.

4. Teacher use of the TL is a significant aspect of CLT as it provides authentic interaction which involves learners in relevant and consequential communication.
4.3 FUNCTIONS OF TEACHER TALK IN A JAPANESE L2 CLASS

The functions of teacher's classroom language use identified in the bilingual lesson are also identifiable in the second language class. In contrast to the bilingual lesson the teacher carries out the same functions largely in the shared L1 rather than in the target language, Japanese. The analysis of the extracts is brief, as the main purpose of this section is to illustrate the contrast in language choice between the two programs in the performance of comparable classroom functions of teacher talk as discussed in the previous section. The purpose of the lesson is for students to prepare interviews for presentation the following week. The lesson extends over two class periods. The lesson comprises three stages (see Figure 4.1 below):

i. Language practice

ii. Activity planning and

iii. Activity phase.

4.3.1 The language of classroom management

The Year 9 Japanese class has thirty students for whom space is at a premium in the classroom. Therefore at the beginning of the lesson the teacher supervises students' attendance and seating in class. The following extract precedes the formal beginning of the lesson, and is part of teacher's management of a class. The teacher speaks in English.

T. People away? Still waiting for C. and A. Are they here?
D.'s coming. So do you need a fifth desk? You'd better grab one. Opposite M. there's a fifth desk.

D. How about C.?

T. Who's going to sit at your table?

D. C. and me.

T. Just the three of you?

Right! (3:4-13)

In this excerpt the teacher is supervising the attendance and seating of the class. This is routine management for the teacher, who has to oversee the orderly settling in of a large class. The language is identifiably classroom language related to the normal business of teaching. We could assume that students would be familiar with the language of these routines in L1, and that this suggests the potential opportunity for conducting the management function in L2.

4.3.2 The language of instruction

After the teacher has brought the class to order, she formally begins the lesson. As her purpose in the following excerpt from the recording is to explain the course of the lesson, I have called this the language of instruction. Here she summarises in English what the class will do during the lesson.

T. Today we're going to be writing our conversations.

We've been looking at some Year 8 revision work of the questions and answers. Today there's going to be an opportunity to work on your oral tasks.
To date we've done the reading comprehension work where you've read and answered questions, you've done the listening task which was listening and filling in the chart.

Now it's the oral assessment.

The format of the double lesson will be the question and answer practice, where we're making sure that we can use the language we've been revising.

Then we'll be doing the discussion of the [points to the blackboard on which she has written some introductory topics in Japanese]:

インタビュー.

What do you think インタビュー is? [4:2-16]

In this extract the teacher provides students with an introduction to the lesson, reviewing what has been done in previous lessons and outlining her plan for the lesson. She refers to what has been done and will be done in class — her language pertains to the ongoing operations of the class. The lexical references such as 'writing', 'conversations', 'questions and answers', situate the language in the classroom context and as such could be expected to be understood by students. The language in other words is concerned with the present situation of the class — the contextualisation of the language therefore potentially supporting learners' comprehension if Japanese were used for giving instructions.

4.3.3 The language of subject content

The content in this lesson covers primarily linguistic input [questions for
conducting an interview in Japanese], explanation of language use, and cultural information related to the Japanese language. In the first half of the lesson, when the teacher asks questions and students respond, there are frequent explanations of linguistic features of the Japanese language. Here the teacher explains the importance of the suffix 'ka' for question formation in Japanese. Her explanation is in English.

T. What will come always at the end of the question?

What indicates a question in Japanese?

S. か

T. か  Ok, so at the end of the sentence

we need to write a か, so we need to hear a か

If there is no か it means you've made a statement not a question.

It's really important that we finish all of those sentences with a です, because that's a verb, it's the it is, I am and so forth. [16:17-26]

This explanation occurs in the second stage of the lesson when the teacher is priming the students for the preparation of their interviews. As their interviews require them to put questions to one another she is revising the characteristic marker of questions in Japanese. The content of this extract is linguistic explanation.

In the next extract the teacher inserts a comment about sports clubs in Japan.
T. What about joining a sporting club?

Ok, if you had to join a sports club.

In Japan they have lots of sports clubs after school where students actually study from 4-6 and there may be a baseball club or a hockey club or a drama club or an English club.

They may actually ask some information about what sports you can play and so forth. [18:3-11]

The extract illustrates the way cultural information about Japan is incorporated into the lesson as topics arise. Here the teacher chooses to convey the information in English, although in the first phase of the lesson she had practised questioning about students' sporting activities in Japanese. Therefore some of the lexical items referring to sport would be familiar, and unfamiliar items may be understood by learners from the context. We might therefore assume that there is potential here for use of the TL in fulfilling the content function of teaching in this context. Although the subject content differs from teaching in the bilingual classroom, nevertheless it offers scope for explanation and information giving in Japanese.

4.3.4 The language of social interaction

In this exchange the teacher is talking with a student about her attendance at Polish lessons. The teacher goes to greet the student as she comes into class.

T. Hi! Um, have you nominated which is the best class? [looks at note student
has brought] Oh!
S. Oh!
T. Are you interested in going?
S. Yeh!
The teacher speaks in English in such social exchanges.

4.3.5 Comment

In the Japanese class the shared L1, English, is used by the teacher for conducting classroom business. She uses English for management, instruction, content teaching and for social interaction. Such classroom functions typify the operations of classroom teaching, so that it may be assumed that in Year 9 students are familiar with language associated with them, and furthermore that this familiarity would assist their comprehension. Thus the predictable and contextualised nature of this talk, if conducted in Japanese, offers opportunity for TL input: as the discourse of the functions conceivably is repeated with variations over time, students have repeated exposure to the data, presenting communicative events for the development of spoken comprehension in Japanese and for the internalisation of Japanese discourse patterns.

To sum up, the choice of L1 for teaching functions in the Japanese class contrasts with language choice in the Italian program. The teacher in conducting the business of teaching engages in communicative use of language which is identifiably institutional. She is engaged in authentic communication which is relevant to the learners. However, this is conducted in English, not offering
opportunity for L2 development through exposing learners to contextualised and relevant uses of the target language.

4.4 LANGUAGE CHOICE IN THE JAPANESE CLASS

Where the teacher and class share a common L1, one of the noticeable characteristics of teacher talk is the switch between the target language (the language being taught) and the shared L1. Code-switching refers to a common phenomenon of language use in second language classrooms and in bilingual contexts (Poulisse and Bongaerts 1994). Chaudron (1988) notes that the choice of language addressed to L2 learners "has a bearing on the general quality of the language environment that L2 learners experience in the classroom" (121), as a rich TL environment is believed to promote development of second language competence.

In the bilingual data discussed above code-switching did not occur, apart from two minor interruptions, as the teacher conducted the entire lesson in Italian. This contrasts with the use of L1 and L2 in the Japanese class. Clearly language choice is a significant feature of L2 learning environments.

Teachers' code-switching serves different purposes. One reason is to help students understand what is said. This is most commonly observed when a teacher says something in the TL, and then repeats it in L1. Where this pattern of classroom language use occurs, students come to expect the teacher to translate target language utterances; they do not focus on understanding or deconstructing the
target language utterance in order to make sense of it, but wait for the translation. They therefore may not benefit from the input, nor develop their comprehension skills by trying to make sense of the utterance. It is also unnecessary for students to ask for clarification or explanation of what is said, which would offer them an opportunity for interaction in the TL.

A second reason for code-switching is related to the first: that it is easier to explain certain points in English, particularly grammatical points or new lexical items. Although there is a case to be made for explaining grammatical points in English, it seems that this may deprive the learners of input in the target language, and also of opportunities to ask for the meaning of what they don't understand, and so to use the language themselves for a practical purpose.

The ensuing discussion examines patterns of code-switching in the data from the Japanese class, and in Chapter 6 the possible influences on L2 learning opportunities are dealt with in more detail. First I will look at language choice in different stages of the Japanese lesson. The lesson consists of three phases, which I will call a language practise phase, an activity planning phase and an activity phase. These are depicted in table 4.1 with reference to the choice of language for each phase.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Language choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Language practice</td>
<td>Revision with teacher addressing questions to students</td>
<td>Japanese with very little English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Activity planning</td>
<td>teacher prepares students for interview activity: discussion of interview questions and responses</td>
<td>English with very little Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Activity Phase</td>
<td>Students in groups prepare interviews for video-recording</td>
<td>English with some Japanese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1: Lesson phases and language choice in the Japanese L2 class

At the macro-level of lesson phases, there are significant differences in language choice. I will discuss language choice in relation to the first two phases below. The third phase will be discussed in the next chapter.

4.4.1 Phase 1: Language practice

In the language practice phase the teacher and students use Japanese almost exclusively. Here the teacher is revising work students have been learning since beginning the study of Japanese. The dominant discourse pattern is Initiation/Response/Feedback (IRF). First, the teacher addresses individual students to elicit their responses. In terms of language choice during this phase, the use of Japanese reflects the familiarity of the class with the pattern and with the discourse exponents required for successfully carrying out each exchange. The teacher assumes that students will be able to give appropriate responses, and this is borne out by successful student participation in responding appropriately.
In this first phase English is used minimally for a number of purposes:

- translation of individual words
- translation of phrases
- instructions to individual students in relation to their initiating questions: for example

  Jack can you ask someone a question (11:6)

  Ok David, your turn (11:22)

There are four instances when English is used for longer explanations of specific aspects of Japanese language use: here is one example:

  T. Mr is an English phrase; in Japanese what do we add to the end of a person’s name which sort of indicates the Mr? [15:22-24]

The choice of English in this first phase relates primarily to explanations of specific linguistic features. This occurs rarely as the work being revised is familiar to learners. The dominant IRF discourse pattern regulates teacher and student use of the TL, enabling this section to be conducted in Japanese. The teacher is linguistically in charge of language use, regulating student contributions or moves.

4.4.2 Phase 2: Activity planning

In phase two, when the teacher is preparing students for writing their own interviews, which will be assessed through a procedure of video-recording, the nature of the discourse is more complex and less predictable. Here the teacher is
also controlling student contributions by asking questions, inviting contributions and giving explanations. The teacher invites students to envisage interview contexts, and to anticipate the kinds of questions appropriate to interview contexts. Individual students are called upon to write interview questions on the blackboard, so that the contributions can be referred to in phase three, when the students collaborate in the preparation of interview presentations. The following extract illustrates the discourse in this phase:

T. What other sorts of questions could we add?

Ok, you want to find out about this person.

S. Where does he live?

T. Where does he live? Okay.

It's important because you want to know how far he has to get to work and whether he can work late.

Ok, what's the question we're going to ask for that?

Alana, write it up! And what's she going to be writing up?

Kim, what's she going to be writing up? How do you ask 'Where do you live?'

S. どこに住んでいますか。

T. Excellent どこに住んでいますか。

Yeh どこに

Ok, while Alana's writing that one up, what's another possible question that a person at Foodland may want to have information about?

S. Phone number.
T. His phone number. Ok. Who's going to do that one?
You're going to leave that one to me?
Phone number.
Ok Jade. You can actually start on the other side.
Just write Shaun. Right excellent.
どこにすんでいますか, it's just a straight どこ not どうこ
You write up the phone number. You're asking
the question, so put Shaun. Start over here so
you've got room.
Right.
Now where's Jim going to live?
Melanie, where's he going to live?
S. Hallett Cove. Hallett Cove. Ok. and we're going to be writing Hallett Cove in
—
you're asking the question? Katakana. [23: 8-43]

In this excerpt the teacher is eliciting questions which students can use in the
preparation of interviews. The business of this phase — building up the L2
resource for student use — is conducted almost entirely in English. The Japanese
interpolations are minimal, and are isolated elements within teacher directed
discourse. They are in a sense bracketed elements of the communicative action,
which in terms of the functions discussed earlier, is the language of instruction.
The excerpt contains routines associated with instruction, and therefore has
predictable discourse features. Although the pattern is not dissimilar from that
of the IRF pattern in phase one, it allows for learner contributions — suggesting the questions — and for greater learner participation, as the talk is not regimented with predictable questions and answers.

The discourse in this segment suggests that there is opportunity for use of the TL instead of the L1. The discourse exhibits features typical of L2 classroom contexts, with which students are familiar. The contextualised language and the relative predictability of the discourse presents opportunity for development of learners' L2 spoken comprehension skills. Because English is the language of choice, it does not offer learners the opportunity to focus on what is being said in Japanese and to attempt to follow the spoken Japanese. As the discourse is not as controlled by the teacher as in the IRF sequence in phase one of the lesson, the language is less predictable. Therefore, if the teacher spoke the TL, learners may need to ask for explanations, for clarifications or for expansions, thus engaging in the negotiation of meaning, which it is suggested promotes L2 development (Long 1983).

In this phase the discourse is identifiably that of instructional contexts. The tight control of contributions by the teacher limits learner interaction. The fact that the language of choice is English, limits learners' exposure to comprehensible input in Japanese, and also obviates their need to negotiate meaning by asking for clarification, explanation or repetition. There is in other words limited opportunity for developing learners' discourse skills in maintenance of communication through the TL. The use of Japanese is limited to isolated questions
and answers, which are being rehearsed for later utilisation by learners.

Summary

In this chapter I have analysed teachers' classroom talk from two perspectives — the purposes for teacher talk and the choice of language. In the bilingual class teacher's use of Italian was illustrated, and this was contrasted with the use of English for the same purposes in the Japanese class. Language choice was then analysed in the three stages of the Japanese lesson. It was suggested that teacher talk is an important source of TL input for learners, and that therefore the choice of language is a significant variable in the linguistic environment for second language development. In the next chapter I will consider learner talk.
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Overview

In this chapter the focus is on learners' talk. In the first section teacher-learner interaction will be considered. This is followed by the analysis of learners talking in groups. In the final section the opportunities for learners' negotiation of meaning are discussed. The perspective of this chapter is on the opportunities learner talk offers for second language development.

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter I noted that, in general, as classroom talk is dominated by teacher talk, the opportunities for student talk are limited. I have also noted that this is influenced by the role of the teacher in 'leading' the lesson, as well as by other factors such as learner experience in using the TL, and classroom expectations of what discourse is appropriate. Factors which may inhibit learners using the target language (Allwright and Bailey 1991, Van Lier 1996, Tsui 1995)
include the fear of making a mistake and the lack of target language discourse resources for interaction in the TL. The latter is a significant factor in the early stages of learning a language, when students are building up their TL repertoire. However, students' participation in spoken interaction is considered crucial for second language learning.

With reference to L1 learning, Hatch (1978) had this to say about learners' participation in classroom interaction: "language learning evolves out of learning how to carry on conversations" (404). According to Hatch, students learn to talk by participating in conversations, just as they learn to read by reading, or write by writing. These assumptions underpin communicative language teaching and second language acquisition research into students' L2 oral language development which it is suggested is triggered by producing the TL more frequently, more correctly and in a wider variety of circumstances (Chaudron 1988: 90).

In the analysis of learner talk which follows I will be considering both the opportunities for interaction or joint action in learners' use of the L2, and for L2 development consequent upon interaction. I will first look at teacher-learner talk in teacher-fronted stages of the Japanese lessons referred to in the previous chapter. The interest is in the speech patterns identifiable in the transcript of the Japanese lesson. The main questions addressed are: how much do learners speak in the TL, for what purposes and with whom? I will refer to language use in the three phases described in the previous chapter (Figure 4:1)
5.2 TEACHER AND LEARNER INTERACTION

As previously noted, the initiation/response/feedback (IRF) pattern is a typical pattern of classroom language use (Chaudron 1988, Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, van Lier 1988). Here is an example from the Japanese lesson:

T. 何才ですか。

F2. 十四才です。

T. はい、よくできました。

T. How old are you?

F2. Fourteen years old.

T. Yes, well done! [5:20-22]

The teacher asks a nominated student a question. The student replies. The teacher responds by affirming the correctness of the response and by commending it. In a standard IRF sequence, the teacher initiates the turn, a student answers, and the teacher responds with an evaluative comment. The following analysis focuses on this pattern.

In phase one of the lesson the IRF pattern dominates. The teacher marks this section of the lesson as practising ('Let's do some practising' 5:15).

T. メラニーさん、何才ですか。私は三十五才です。

あなたは？十三才ですか。十四才ですか。
何才ですか。

F2. 十四才です。

T. はい　よくできました。
　　シャンテルさんは　どこにすんでいますか。
　　私は　レネーラに　すんでいます。
　　あなたは　どこにすんでいますか。

F3. Um

T. ハレット　コープに　すんでいますか。

F3. Oh. ハレット　コープ

T. に

F3. に　すんでいます。

T. はい　よくできました。

　　リンダルさん　何人ですか。何人ですか。

F4. オーストラリア人です。

T. はい　上手ですね。

　　アデルさん、でんわばんごうは　何番ですか。

F5. 三二二の

T. はい　上手ですね。

F5. 二四八九

T. です

F5. です
T. はい、よくできました。

ジャソンさん 何が好きですか。何が好きですか。

M2. Um

T. 何が好きですか。

M2. バドミントンが好きです。

T. はい バドミントンが好きです。

バドミントンが上手ですか。上手ですか。

M2. Um

T. 上手ですか。

かかりますか。

上手ですか。

M2. Um

T. 上手はえい語で何ですか。

上手

上手、いみは何ですか。

ジャド

F6. Skilled at

T. はい Skilled at

バドミントンが上手ですか。

M2. はい

T. 上手ですね。よくできました。

リア、バドミントンが上手ですか。
You can't do it.

T. F2, how old are you? I am 35. And you? 13 years? 14 years? How old are you?

F2. Fourteen years old.

T. Yes, well done!

Chantelle, where do you live?

I live in Reynella. Where do you live?

F3. Um.

T. Do you live in Hallett Cove?

F3. Oh, Hallett Cove.

T. In ..?

F3. I live in ..

T. Yes, well done!

Lyndal, what nationality are you? What nationality are you?

F4. Australian.

T. Yes, excellent!

Adele, what's your telephone number?

F5. Three two two.
T. Yes, excellent!

F5. Two four eight nine.

T. It is..

F5. It is..

T. Yes, well done!

 Jason, what do you like? What do you like?

M2. Um.

T. What do you like?

M2. I like badminton.

T. Yes, I like badminton.

 Are you good at badminton? Good at?

M2. Um..

T. Good at it?

 Do you understand?

 Good at?

M2. Um..

T. What is good at in English?

 Good at ..?

 Good at ..? What does it mean?

 Jade?

F6. 'Skilled at'

T. Yes, skilled at.

 Are you good at badminton?

M2. Yes.
T. You are skilled. Well done.

Ria, are you good at badminton?

Are you good at badminton?

F7. No!

T. No!

F7. I can't do it!

T. You can't do it. Yes. You can't do it. 'You can't do it'

What are you good at, Ria? [5:19-7:5]

This extract illustrates the IRF pattern in this phase of the lesson. The IRF pattern of turn taking has a sequence structure through which the activity of instruction is accomplished (Drew and Heritage 1992: 41). The teacher generally asks questions to which students have prepared answers, or put questions which don't have particular interest or significance for the learners being addressed. The evaluation part of the sequence reaffirms the role of the teacher, who is in charge of the class and also possesses expert L2 knowledge. The three part sequence of turns reflects in its distinctive sequential pattern the classroom nature of the exchange.

There are two aspects to this pattern, which are of significance for language development: one that the focus is on a formal response rather than a genuinely communicative exchange, so that the effort of shaping an answer is minimised; the other is that it allows little space for learners to try out a variety of expressions in responding in the target language, thereby exercising and stretching their
target language repertoire: the teacher controls the turns, and thereby limits the responses and contributions of students.

The pattern of turn taking has consequences for second language learning, as the pattern limits the opportunities for input, as well as restricting students' use of the target language — which of course is considered significant for L2 development. The pattern limits participation of learners in a class, as it allows in each sequence the contribution of only one student at a time, while the other class members are overhearers (Clark 1996), who may or may not be attending to what is happening. Allwright and Bailey (1991) point out that when the teacher directs questions to individual learners, other learners may not pay attention: "Sadly it seems that many learners do not bother to pay very much attention to what is happening to their fellow learners..." (21). As this pattern of questioning is typically repeated in L2 lessons, it is not necessarily promotive of comprehension skills, and therefore does not necessarily contribute as input by extending what learners are already capable of understanding in the TL. Of course, it does not contribute in any way at all, if listeners are not attending to what is said.

In a more fundamental way the restrictive character of the sequence necessarily means that learners have little opportunity to develop their discourse skills in this exchange. Van Lier (1988) notes the importance of participation in turn-taking. He says that:

1. the organisation of conversational turn-taking requires speakers to listen to
turns, and to pay close attention to what is said. In second language acquisition terms, comprehension is essential for exposure to be transformed as useable input.

2. "...conversational turn taking forces participants to be actively involved, and to plan and structure their contributions in contextually appropriate and acceptable ways" (106).

As one of the aims of L2 teaching is to develop the conversational skills of learners (Curriculum Corporation 1994), it is important that learners develop the ability to initiate turns and to nominate topics, while monitoring what is being said in order to maintain a conversation. The classroom pattern of language use contrasts with turn-taking in conversations, in the predictable nature of the questions and the responses, and in the third evaluative turn (Tsui 1995, Stenstrom 1994). However Seedhouse (1996) points out that the IRF sequence is common in child-adult talk, where it serves a developmental role in L1 spoken language. As the pattern is predictable it serves to enable learners to construct appropriate responses in the TL. For this reason the teacher uses it for practice in the first phase of the lesson.

In the extract we see how the teacher uses the sequence for instruction. For example, in homing in on the use and meaning of "good at", and in highlighting F7's "I can't do it". Such highlighting focuses attention on particular expressions, which the learner may thereby integrate into her developing second language (Schmidt 1994). In addition the IRF sequence is not adhered to relentlessly, as the teacher responds to learners' contributions, both supporting their production
and extending their responses. The teacher normally initiates a turn with a direct nomination of an addressee [e.g. Melanie, how old are you? or Chantelle, where do you live?]. The questions here deal with personal information. The questions require a circumscribed response from the students. The teacher repeats the question in some instances, and where the addressee appears not to grasp the question at first, repeats it, as in the following sequence:

T. ジャソンさん 何が好きですか。何が好きですか。
M2. Um
T. 何が好きですか。
M2. バドミントンが好きです。
T. はい バドミントンが好きです。

T. Jason, what do you like? What do you like?
M2. Um.
T. What do you like?
M2. I like badminton.
T. Yes, I like badminton.

The repetition gives the student time to understand and formulate an answer. In this case the answer is in a sentence, although a one word reply would suffice as an acceptable answer. The student understands that the teacher requires responses in a particular format, and where the expected format is not adhered to, the teacher prompts the student, as in the following example:
T. Adele, what’s your telephone number?
F5. Three two two.
T. Yes, excellent!
F5. Two four eight nine.
T. It is ..
F5. It is ..
T. Yes, well done!

The appropriately structured answer, from the teacher's perspective, receives approbation from the teacher. The variants on the IRF pattern provide some TL input for learners, but in general the pattern allows students to answer with a relatively predictable response from a very narrow range of options. The response does not require special effort and investment for the formulation of the answer. However, as Wells (1993) points out, the IRF exchange can also be used for opening up options for learner responses by using the third move in the exchange
for stimulating and scaffolding learner moves: this will be discussed in chapter 7.

In sum, then, the use of the IRF sequence in the practice phase of the lesson limits learning opportunities by restricting learners' participation in discourse management, as their responses are constrained, their initiation of turns and topics is not promoted, and the focus on single addressees may discourage the attention of other students in the class, as well as silencing them as only one student responds at a time. Nevertheless, the IRF sequence can serve instructional purposes, however limited, which include management of a class, as all students are required to focus on the teacher, and by providing structured TL production opportunities.

5.3 STUDENT TALK DURING GROUP WORK

In classrooms where the teacher controls who speaks, when they speak and what they speak about, learners have little opportunity to use the TL. In order to give learners opportunities for talking in the target language CLT and second language acquisition research (Long and Porter 1985) suggest learners work in groups on tasks which require them to use the TL (Crookes and Gass 1993 a & b). This reflects a general educational interest in structuring of learning contexts which are learner-centred (Nunan 1988) rather than teacher-focused. For second language learners there are a number of general arguments for learners working in groups. We have already seen that in the teacher directed lesson phase learners' spoken participation in classroom events is limited. For example when the teacher
directs questions at individual learners there is little opportunity for participation by others. Group work is introduced not only to maximise learners' use of the target language, but also to lessen anxiety which students may feel when required to respond in front of a whole class (Allwright and Bailey 1991). The following section deals with learners' group work talk.

5.3.1 Talk on task

The extracts below, from Phase Three of the Japanese lesson, illustrate learner talk produced on a set group task. The task was to write draft scripts of an introductory interview. The task was done in groups or pairs. The teacher underlined the importance of participation in group work by explaining criteria for self-assessing individual performances in carrying out the group task, and distributing to students a self assessment form. I have selected two extracts for the analysis of group work talk. The first is an extract of a group of three girls working together on the interview task. The transcript commences after they have begun working.

F14. You can be Laura!
F4. Laura.
F2. Right.
F14. So, Amy, no Kate-you can say こんにちは
F2. and then what she says こんにちは and
F4. You say お名前は何ですか。
F14. Who me? Or her?
Ok こんにちは お名前は何ですか。

はい  What's my? How do you do that?

F4. Here, name

何ですか。ですか。

F14. Ok you can write the next sentence.

F4. Amy and you say, do you want to say 私の

F14. Amy です

Ok now.

F4. and then Mel ??

you can say

F2. Shall I say my name? so I say

F14. So she says こんにちは

F4. What's your name, says Amy.

F2. I'll say that my name is

F4. You say 私の

F14. You should use that sentence

F4. No.

F14. How can you say: we are?

F4 You can't, can you?

F14. Yes, you can.

Mrs H.! [calls for the teacher] [34:1-29]

The extract begins with the students deciding on the roles they will take in the
interview. This is followed by the allocation of turns for the interview, which, together with what will be said, are the main topics of the exchanges between the three speakers. As the students talk they are also concerned with writing the text for the interview [F14: Ok, you can write the next sentence], and they also help one another with working out the appropriate Japanese phrases [What's my? How do you do that?]. The extract ends with an appeal to the teacher to help with a phrase they want to say in Japanese.

There are a number of noticeable features in this brief extract of students in action. The first is that the talk is on task. All speakers are focused on the task, and show engagement and energy in carrying it out. They are working on a common task and help one another in doing it. The talk is related to the production of a written script, so the focus is on the production of a text, but it is an action text in which the students are actors, in which they project their roles and what they will say in their interview. The speakers are enmeshed in the action, and the discourse arises from the interaction on the task, and also maintains and pushes the development of the interaction.

The second noticeable feature is the highly interactional and dynamic character of the exchanges. All speakers participate and initiate moves. The turns are short. They are tightly entwined and overlap:

F14. You can be Laura!

F4. Laura.
F2. Right.

F14. So, Amy, no Kate—you can say こんにちは

F2. and then what she says こんにちは and

F4. You say お名前は何ですか。

The speakers collaboratively work out roles and speech acts for the interview through the coordination of individual actions or contributions (Clark 1996), and meaning and understanding are created around this event. The negotiation of meaning defined by Ellis (1994) as "the collaborative work which speakers undertake to achieve mutual understanding" (260) can be observed in the interaction. This will be discussed further in the next chapter.

The third feature is speakers' control of the discourse. All speakers initiate turns, although F14 takes a leadership role in the exchanges, as she initiates and directs the production of the written interview text.

The discourse in the extract has characteristic features of conversational language. In comparison with the interactions in the IRF sequence, the speakers communicate freely. The talk is authentic communication. However, the language of choice is English. The use of Japanese is minimal and static: it consists of words and phrases for insertion into the text being written. The students reproduce a few phrases which they have learned previously, some of which have been practised in Phase Two of the lesson and written on the blackboard.
5.3.2 Task talk and chatter

The next transcript segment comes from a group of five boys working together on the same task. The boys have been working on the task for fifteen minutes, when the following extract begins.

M2. When do these have to be performed?

So I can be sick on Monday.

M3. Right.

M4. Hey!

M2. Daniel, you have to ask me a question.

M4. Why don't you ask me a question?

M3. Ask Jason a question.

M5. I'm lost now.

M3. You're asking me one. What are you going to ask?

M4. Tell him to show you homework.

Leigh しゅ こと いお

M2. What about 'excuse me. I have to go to the jon' or something.

That'd be good!

Ryan, what are ....

Alright, what do you like?

M3. What are you going to ask him?

M2. Why don't you ask him 'What do you like'?
M4. Ask him what sports he likes?

M2. Yeh, what sports do you like?

So, it's Daniel to Leigh

M2. What sport do you like?

何才ですか。 is age

M4. He likes fencing.

M2. Alright, so

M4. Fencing!

Yeh, girls sport!

M2. Yeh, you must play it then.

M4 It's better than バドミントン

M2. もしですか。

M4. That's skiing.

M2. No, it's not.

What page is it on?

M4. 13

M3. Are you asking me what sport I like?

How do you write that?

M2. スポーツ

What is

M5. Uh?

M4. スポーツが。 What do you play ですか?
What do you play?
M3. What sport

好きですか。

M4. Do you like 好き?

M3 I can ski. It's easy. It's good fun. [47:7-48:22]

The boys' talk in this extract has features comparable with the extract discussed above: it centres around the task; the turns are short, with ellipsis and overlaps; all speakers participate in the interaction, although M5 in a limited way in moves which indicate that he is not a main player in the discourse [I'm lost now & Uh?]. The speakers are involved in the joint construction of the discourse, and self-regulate the interaction. They are in control of what is said, which allows them to make a variety of contributions.

The casual conversational nature of the interaction reflects personal familiarity. This gives rise to distinctive features in the interaction. The boys banter and joke with one another: M4 suggests that he can take a sick day so he does not have to take part in the class presentation of the interview. M2 suggests that they insert 'excuse me. I have to go to the jon [slang for toilet]', to give a slightly ribald twist to their interview. M2 gets teased for liking fencing.

The examples show how the official talk related to the task is interwoven with the unofficial chatter of students working together on a task. The talk serves both an illocutionary function related to getting the task done and for the exchange
of information related to the task, and a perlocutionary function related to the maintenance of personal relationships in doing the task collaboratively. In terms of communication, we see how the talk arises dynamically from each move. This is not a prefabricated dialogue; the moves in the exchange cannot be predicted, yet each turn is linked to previous contributions. The context of speech is significant in the extract. The speakers control the flow of talk. As the boys are working in a group they do not experience restrictions on what are permissible contributions. For this reason they do not need to adhere to officially approved classroom talk. In this context they collaborate on the task, assisting one another in producing a Japanese script.

5.3.3 Language choice in group work

As in the extract from the girls' group work talk, the boys carry out their task in English. The Japanese phrases are static insertions for the interview. What is particularly significant is that although in the earlier phases of the lesson the students were practising phrases in Japanese, the same phrases are used here in English [What sport do you like? & What do you play?]. There is not a transfer from previous contexts to the students' speech in groups, which was the intention of the practice in the previous phases of the lesson. The teacher states in her introduction to the lesson: "The format of the double lesson will be the question and answer practice, where we're making sure that we can use the language we've been revising" [4: 9-11]. Japanese does not feature as part of the authentic communication in the groups, even though at least some of the expressions used in the group interactions have just been practised in class in the TL.
Clearly the language of choice for learner interaction and thus for second language development is problematic in the extracts which have been discussed, where the language of choice is the shared L1. The same characteristic of learner talk has been observed in immersion programs: when learners speak informally with one another they use their shared L1 (Tarone and Swain 1995). Blanco-Iglesias, Broner and Tarone (1995) report: "There have been persistent but poorly documented reports from teachers and students alike that indicate that students do not exclusively speak in the second language (L2) in immersion classrooms during periods when they are supposed to be immersed in L2, but rather make extensive use of their native language (L1) in those classrooms" (241). In the Italian bilingual program documented for this study children spoke in English amongst themselves when they were working at their tables on individual and group tasks. However they were in the early stages of learning Italian and, as I commented in the discussion of teacher talk in the bilingual program, the teacher did not expect and did not instruct the children to use Italian.

The reasons for learners' preferred use of L1 in group work probably lie in social and linguistic explanations: socially in the function of the use of L1 and L2, and linguistically in the input learners are exposed to.

Tarone and Swain (1995) report that the use of L1 apparently increases in upper grade levels. They suggest a view of the classroom as speech communities which are diglossic. They hypothesise that the L2 is a language variety used
predominantly for academic topics in interaction with the teacher and in the public discourse of the class. They further suggest that L1 may be used as a vernacular for more private learner interaction. In a classroom investigation (Spanish immersion for English speakers) of these proposals Blanco-Iglesias, Broner and Tarone (1995) record that a great deal of English slang is used by fifth-grade children for in-group communication of a pre-adolescent nature, which they believe serves as marking in-group membership of that speech community.

The data discussed in this chapter and the previous one, suggest the separate use of L1 and L2 for functional purposes arising from a diglossic situation, as hypothesised by Tarone and Swain (1995). Where the teacher chooses to speak in the target language and is in control of the discourse — controls topic, turns and responses — there is agreement to use the formally agreed upon L2 icons, whereas in group work the learners engage in negotiation in their shared L1 in order to get a task done together: the social importance of organising themselves requires positioning and negotiating, of some personal import, and therefore requiring to be carried out in the shared L1. The requirement to do a task set by the teacher represents a different order of significance for the learners, a schooling task, which they have become attuned to doing in the process of schooling. In carrying out such tasks there is little personal investment on the part of learners except to meet the requirements set by the teacher. When however learners are working in groups they are not constrained by the teacher: they are involved in joint social action requiring group cooperation, which they naturally conduct in
A further explanation for learners' preferred use of L1 in group work is offered by Blanco-Iglesias, Broner and Tarone (1995). They point out that the children may not have been taught or been exposed to the Spanish equivalents of the vernacular expressions used amongst themselves. Clyne et al (1995) have also commented on the lack of discourse input enabling learners to engage in TL interaction.

It seems that such language use events as group work, when students negotiate tasks, topic content and roles in English, may need to be targeted for discourse input, so that students are equipped to negotiate in the TL. The intention is to increase students' skills in conducting their interactions in the TL, so that they are able to exploit input and also acquire discourse skills in the process. In group work there is opportunity for learners to interact conversationally: students have opportunity to ask and answer questions, to initiate turns and to check comprehension. How this might be exploited in teaching will be discussed further in chapter 7.

Although conducted in English, the group work nevertheless has a contributory role in TL learning, as the students assist one another with writing the interview in Japanese [How do you do that? & How do you write that?]. The collaborative activity includes helping one another in producing appropriate speech segments for the interview. I will discuss this further in the next chapter.
In summary we can say that during group work learners participate in authentic communication with discourse features, which, although identifiably classroom situated, are typical of other contexts where speakers are getting a task done: for example in the nomination of roles, the directives and the use of questions. From a L2 development perspective we see that the need to produce Japanese text engenders use of the TL as well as talk about the TL. The TL is however cocooned in the L1 talk, and this is circumscribed as phrases or expressions. Now, whilst the writing of the script provides conscious attention to the form and indeed function of the TL items, it does not provide the interaction in the TL which mirrors conversational contexts, and which the interaction hypothesis from second language acquisition studies proposes is necessary for oral L2 development (Long 1983, Pica et al 1996, Van Patten 1991). The communicative use of the TL by learners is considered central to learners' L2 oracy development.

In group work we observe students using the L1 for the negotiation of meaning in joint activity. In order to carry out the task, the students have to negotiate roles, situations, and the content of the interview. This generates a lot of normal conversational exchanges associated with carrying out a task. How this could contribute to second language learning is the topic of the next chapter.

Summary

In this chapter I have analysed learner talk in teacher-learner exchanges and in group work. The analysis has focused on the patterns of learner talk and on the opportunities learner talk offers for second language development. The next
chapter focuses on classroom talk and second language learning.
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Summary

Overview

The data discussed in the last two chapters depict instances of oral language use in two different second language teaching contexts: an Italian bilingual program and a Japanese second language program. The context of both classes is a foreign language context in which the teacher shares English as the common L1. The discussion in this chapter focuses on the L2 learning opportunities which the classroom language data suggest are available to learners in those contexts. The analysis examines how patterns of classroom language use offer potential for promoting L2 development, specifically in teachers' use of the TL for management, organisation, teaching content and social purposes, and in teacher-learner and learner-learner interactions.
6.1 CLASSROOM LANGUAGE USE AND SECOND LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

In chapter 2 [section 2.4] I gave an outline from second language acquisition research of conditions which it is hypothesised contribute to second language development. They included:

1. that target language input is comprehended by learners (Krashen 1985);
2. that the talk presents discourse elements which are at least slightly in advance of learners' current knowledge of the TL (Krashen 1985);
3. that modifications to the input are made in the process of negotiating communication problems (Long 1983);
4. that learners notice or attend to new features in the input (Schmidt 1994).

Applied to second language classrooms it is suggested that learners experience a language rich L2 environment, in which learners are exposed to and engage in authentic communication, and in the process of communication develop their interlanguage. This framework provides the background to the discussion in this chapter.

6.2 TEACHER TALK AS INPUT

Consistent with other studies (Chaudron 1988), teacher talk in the data under consideration dominates classroom talk. Given its prominence, and given the teaching role of the teacher, teacher talk is an important factor in the creation of an environment for second language development. Specifically, teacher talk is a potential source of input to learners' developing interlanguage (Wong-Fillmore 1985). Chaudron (1988) states that "... in the typical foreign language classroom,
the common belief is that the fullest competence in the TL is achieved by means of the teacher providing a rich TL environment, in which not only instruction and drill are executed in the TL, but also disciplinary and management operations" (121). The assumption underlying teacher talk as input is that the teacher uses the TL for classroom communication, so that learners need to engage with what the teacher says in order to participate in the activities of the class. This is not necessarily an argument for exclusive use of the TL by the teacher, who may choose to use a common L1 for presentation and discussion of new knowledge. However, it presupposes that when the TL is used, it is not immediately translated into the L1, so that there is no requirement for learners to attempt to understand the TL, to negotiate meaning when they fail to understand what has been said, or to produce the TL themselves in responding to the teacher. VanPatten (1991) argues that "If instructors themselves use language meaningfully and are constantly attempting to communicate with learners, then the learners in turn will attempt to communicate with each other when tasks with clear information goals are set up for them. It is only in the latter scenario that learners will actually focus on the interpretation, expression, and negotiation of meaning" (70). Teacher talk according to VanPatten serves to model the communicative use of the TL in addition to being a potential source of TL input.

In a paper published in 1985 Wong-Fillmore asked the question "When does teacher talk work as input?" (17). She summarised her answer to the question as follows:
"Characteristics of Teacher Talk That Works as Input:
Clear separation of languages-no alternation or mixing
Comprehension emphasized-focus on communication:
• Use of demonstration, enactment to convey meaning
• New information presented in context of known information
• Heavy message redundancy
Language used is entirely grammatical-appropriate to activity:
• Simpler structures used, avoidance of complex structures
• Repeated use of same sentence patterns or routines
• Repetitiveness, use of paraphrases for variation
Tailoring of elicitation questions to allow for different levels of participation from students
Richness of language use, going beyond books, playfulness" (Wong-Fillmore.1985: 50).

Wong-Fillmore lists here conditions under which teacher talk provides input to learners' language development, in particular she identifies the consistent choice of language, the necessity of comprehension, and modifications in the use of the TL to enhance comprehension. However it should be noted that exposure to teacher's talk in the TL, or for that matter to the talk of other native speakers, does not necessarily contribute to language learning. Input does not equate with intake (Corder 1981). For example, in a later study Wong Fillmore (1991) reports observing one class in an English as a second language context, in which 40% of the children who entered school at the beginning of the year had learned no English by the end of it, although the teacher and her assistant spoke English exclusively and there was the opportunity to interact in English with peers. Edelsky (1991) also documents a study in which children acquired no
Spanish in a bilingual class, except for a few colour and number words. Wong Fillmore (1991) attributed the failure to the lack of direct, structured instruction on the part of the teacher, because the learners worked together on child-selected activities. Edelsky (1991) found that no Spanish was addressed individually to the children observed, and that in group work in Spanish they "tuned Spanish out" (16) and did not take the language learner role. The studies suggest that mere exposure to teacher's use of the TL does not lead to L2 development (Guthrie 1987). Comprehension (Krashen 1981) is only the minimum condition for learner processing of what the teacher says. Comprehensible input in other words may facilitate acquisition, but does not ensure it.

Ellis (1991) points out, exposure to comprehensible input facilitates acquisition, but learners also need to notice features in the input for it to become internalised (Hulstijn and Schmidt 1994). Wong Fillmore (1991) suggests that it is necessary for learners to figure out the units or segments of speech for it to serve as input. They need to find out how segments of speech are assembled structurally to communicate ideas: "Learners apply a host of cognitive strategies and skills to deal with the task at hand: they have to make use of associative skills, memory, social knowledge, and inferential skills in trying to figure our what people are talking about. They use whatever analytical skills they have to figure out relationships between forms, functions, and meanings" (57). The teacher has a specific role in assisting learners to notice features of the input while attending to the meaning of what is said. VanPatten (1994) reports on a series of studies in which learners were directed to attend to features such as word order as they
listened to input — they attended to the input to get the grammar. These learners gained in comprehension and production abilities. In other words the studies suggest that the teacher has an important role in making aspects of the discourse salient for learners. I will discuss this further in Chapter 7 in looking at instructional strategies to assist input processing where both meaning and form are attended to by learners.

Based on the above I suggest that teacher’s use of the TL in the classroom provides significant opportunities for TL input. This of course depends on teacher's choice of language. Teachers' choice of the TL for teaching functions has the potential to promote L2 development in at least two ways:
1. it provides exposure to TL data, which learners may process and internalise for the development of their interlanguage;
2. it provides learners with experience in hearing the language which may contribute to the development of comprehension of spoken TL.

A noticeable difference between the bilingual and the L2 classroom data is the choice of language in the realisation of classroom functions. That it is possible to conduct instruction entirely in the TL is demonstrated in the bilingual data. The bilingual data show the teacher using Italian exclusively. The teacher used various didactic techniques, such as use of visual information [texts and illustrations], and the use of gesture to support learners' comprehension. These actions enhanced the potential for comprehensible input. The children primarily spoke in English in responding to the teacher and when engaged in group
work. Their responses and their reactions to instructions indicated that they comprehended sufficient Italian to participate in class activities. Their use of English is a consequence of two factors: the children were in the first six months of the program, and the teacher considered English responses as appropriate at this stage of their learning, and therefore accepted their responses in English. As Krashen (1983) points out, learners' responses in the L1 in the early stages of learning, lowers the affective filter or reduces the anxiety of learners in using the TL. The learners then focus on the comprehension of what is being said by the teacher. VanPatten (1991) writing on learner communication in the early stage of learning a second language suggests that we should not expect the production of the TL as the goal of every lesson or unit. At this stage the learner's job is to process input or get language, so that the learners' involvement is more interpretation of speech events rather than production: "It is the instructor, the materials, reading texts, and other target sources of language that express most of the meaning in the earliest stages. Appropriate communicatively based activities, then, involve having the learners actively process and interpret language that they hear and see. The verbal output of learners is minimal, in a sense, though ... learners can be encouraged to use "packaged" language for communicative purposes as well as for providing input to each other" (58). The normal operations of the classroom involve contextualised talk which assists learners' comprehension. The view here is that this classroom talk provides significant input to learners' developing interlanguage.

In both the bilingual class and the L2 class the teacher used the TL for purposes
which I have categorised under management, organisation, subject content, and social interaction. The functions are associated with the pedagogic role of the teacher in managing a large group of children, in organising the curriculum into lesson activities, in teaching subject content, and in responding to the social needs of class members as they arise. The functions are socially situated in the institutional practices of the school. The functions are realised in the discourse of the teacher and are connected with the teacher's actions. The functions are thus contextually linked to what the teacher does instructionally. As a generalisation, this holds true for both L1 and L2 teaching contexts. In the L1 classroom, learners are socialised into an understanding of the teacher's and their own speaking rights and patterns in their shared language. They learn the social rules and patterns of classroom discourse. This acquired L1 language experience is of value in the L2 context, where it aids learners' comprehension of what the teacher says in the TL.

The analysis of teacher talk as institutionalised classroom discourse suggests that such talk is routinised and contextualised. As such it has predictable patterns into which learners are socialised over time in their first language. The choice of the TL for carrying out teaching functions taps into learners' familiarity and expectations of discourse patterns and linguistic expressions gained in their L1 schooling experiences. Teacher talk in managing the class, organising learning events, socialising and teaching content relate to classroom procedures which require learners' procedural understanding (Brown 1994). As Brown notes, "it is procedural understanding which is exploited in many foreign language classroom
activities, where familiar activities make transparent the language which accompanies them (12). For learners the spoken language of the teacher is associated with here-and-now sequences of behaviour, with teacher's actions, and with activities in and phases of the lesson. The contextualised and predictable nature of teacher talk in the conduct of classroom business gives learners contextual cues which support their interpretation of what is being said. In addition the repetitive nature of classroom procedures aids their understanding and the potential for internalisation of language associated with such procedures (Brooks 1990).

So far I have proposed that the teacher's use of the TL for teaching functions, as in the bilingual class, presents learners with opportunities for input which, because it is contextualised in classroom practice, can be comprehended and processed for internalisation by learners. The use of the TL by the teacher also serves a more general purpose in L2 learning — the development of comprehension skills in listening to extended use of the TL, and in listening to a range of discourse types associated with different teaching functions.

When the teacher speaks in the TL, learners hear the TL language spoken for authentic purposes, which gives them the opportunity to develop the ability to follow speech, and the ability to listen for the gist of what is said. They become attuned to listening for meaning in longer stretches of discourse, and may develop specific strategies as listening for key words, interpreting ambiguity and accepting multiple meanings. When they do not understand the teacher there is also
potential for them to seek clarification, request explanation and repetition, thus
making segments of discourse salient, while engaging in the negotiation of
meaning. I suggest that the exposure to TL prosody may also impact on their
own spoken language. In this respect teacher talk models fluency and
pronunciation for learners. Listening to teacher talk is thus part of their experience
of language used communicatively, that is, for authentic purposes, particularly
as it relates to their own participation in classroom activities. This ability serves
not just the development of L2 listening skills in the classroom. As the range of
language used by the teacher corresponds to wider uses of language outside the
classroom (Hüllen 1990), learners develop comprehension skills for L2
communication in general.

In this section I have considered why the use of the TL by the teacher in the
performance of classroom functions offers opportunities for second language
acquisition. I have suggested that teacher's use of the TL while teaching models
TL speech which has the potential to influence learners' interlanguage, and at
the same time offers opportunities for the development of learners' L2
comprehension of authentic spoken language. In the next section I will look at
the importance of learner production of the TL in oral interaction.

6.3 TEACHER-LEARNER INTERACTION

So far I have considered how teacher talk serves as potential input to learners'
developing L2. Swain (1995) has argued for the role of production in promoting
second language acquisition. She suggests that in speaking or writing, learners
can stretch their interlanguage to meet communicative goals. She hypothesises three functions of output in SLA (1995):

1. it promotes noticing: in producing the language learners may notice a gap between what they want to say and what they can say, leading them to recognise what they do not know; this may trigger cognitive processes which might lead to linguistic knowledge;

2. it is one way of hypothesis testing, which may invoke feedback and lead to modifications or reprocessing of output;

3. it serves a metalinguistic function, enabling them to control and internalise linguistic knowledge.

The output hypothesis provides a framework for the consideration of classroom interaction and second language development. I will first discuss this in relation to the IRF pattern of teacher interaction with students, and then look at students' group work talk.

6.3.1 The initiation/response/feedback (IRF) pattern

The initiation/response/feedback pattern of interaction between teacher and learners has been described as a typical exchange structure of classroom language (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, Tsui 1995). It is an example of institutional language use. In the first phase of the Japanese lesson we saw the teacher following the pattern to practise Japanese phrases. The structure of talk in the IRF pattern reveals who is managing information in the classroom. The teacher is in control of contributions through the nomination of the topic, initiation of turns and the evaluation of responses. The extract below clearly shows these characteristics.
T. Lyndal, what nationality are you? What nationality are you?

F4. Australian.

T. Yes, excellent!

Adele, what's your telephone number?

F5. Three two two.

T. Yes, excellent!

Here the communication is asymmetrical, with learner contributions circumscribed: their responses are performance talk and knowledge reproducing, rather than exploratory, meaning focused or knowledge transforming (Bereiter and Scardamalia 1983). The teacher is not speaking with learners for illocutionary
or perlocutionary purposes. In other words, the exchange does not constitute
the joint construction of meaning, as the purpose of the teacher's moves in the
exchange structure is to elicit, direct and evaluate learner contributions.

From the perspective of communication as a collaborative activity (Clark 1996),
a major limitation in the IRF pattern in comparison with conversational exchanges
which do not have the evaluative move of feedback, is that it does not require
the self analysis of the move or contribution by the speaker in relation to the
follow-up move. In conversation, an interlocutor's response to an initiating move
continues the exchange, and influences a follow-up move, or else the sequence
of speech discontinues. This constitutes the interactive nature of conversation
— the moves have both retrospective and prospective relevance. What this also
means is that the moves are not predictable, so that the speaker needs to consider
an appropriate move in relation to what has just been said by the interlocutor,
and to exercise discoursal options to maintain the interaction in the response.
By mutual agreement the interaction depends on each speaker making
contributions to maintain communication, unless the cessation of the exchange
has been signalled either verbally or non-verbally by a speaker.

In the IRF exchange the feedback response of the teacher does not require a
further move on the part of the learner — it terminates the exchange. This is in
fact the effect of the teacher's feedback move — it signals to the learner that the
exchange is finished and the responsibility for collaborative continuation of the
exchange has ceased. It may also signal to the learner that they don't have to
attend to the teacher's feedback move, unless it is signalled by the teacher as wrong, as another student will probably be called on in any subsequent exchange. Guthrie (1987) in her observation of classroom communication in university French classes, suggests that despite a high level of TL use by teachers in the cases she analyses, the focus on textbook exercises, as well as inattention to the meaning of students' responses, may contribute to them tuning out and not listening to the verbal interaction in the classroom. The IRF exchange may encourage tuning out because it does not require the dynamic continuation of the exchange. Additionally it does not create an opportunity for learner initiation of a topic or learner contribution to the development of a topic.

The IRF exchange, then, both circumscribes learners' contributions, and limits their engagement or commitment to the exchange. Allwright and Bailey (1991) point out that it is the effort exerted in the negotiation of meaning which is significant in pushing learners' interlanguage development. Learners display a low level of engagement in the IRF exchange, as they are not required to participate in the joint construction of meaning. They are not required to extend or push their own output by monitoring the course of the exchange and in formulating appropriate responses. The exchange structure thus limits the promotion of interlanguage development.

In terms of Swain's (1995) output hypothesis, learners' production is so limited that they may not notice a gap between what they want to say and what they can say. Even teacher feedback on a learner's moves which could make certain
language features in their production salient and thus develop metalinguistic awareness and control of TL use, may have very limited impact on interlanguage development. In the following exchange there is a gap between the teacher's expectations of what the student is to say and what the student says — she does not reply in a full sentence. However, the student has already delivered a correct response (said what she wants to say), and the modification is prompted by the teacher, suggesting that this is not an opportunity which may trigger learner's attention and lead to new linguistic knowledge appropriate to the exchange.

T. Chantelle, where do you live?

I live in Reynella. Where do you live?

F3. Um.

T. Do you live in Hallett Cove?
Quite apart from the appropriacy of F3's original response, such exchanges do not offer occasion for learners' hypothesis testing, nor metalinguistic functioning: F3's contribution is predetermined by the teacher's move. This suggests that there is little opportunity in the recorded use of the IRF exchange for promoting second language acquisition, at least according to the output hypothesis. What is significant in this exchange is the help the teacher gives to F3 to produce a response. She provides a sample answer. The exchange illustrates how the structure can be used to assist learners' moves through scaffolding or building-in possible discourse resources in the teacher's initiating moves.

Although the IRF pattern is associated with teaching in classrooms (Van Lier 1988) — in the case of the Japanese data to practise the TL — from a second language acquisition perspective there is a need for variation to this standard pattern to give learners opportunity to interact in a more symmetrical pattern of communication (Van Lier 1996). In Wong-Fillmore's (1985) study of lessons which were successful she found "teachers in successful classes tended to use a variety of turn-allocation procedures, but they were consistent in following a well-established set of procedures within lessons for any given subject" (31). The turn-allocation procedures, she reports, gave lots of turns for each student,
and teachers invited and elicited a variety of response types.

Variations in teacher-learner interaction impact on how learners interact with one another. Brooks (1990), in a study of student interaction in an elementary university class, found that students working in pairs imitated the teacher's interactional patterns: "It appears as though the two students have learned through imitation and inference, rather than explicit instruction ..." (162). Brooks' suggestion adds a further dimension to our analysis of the value of the IRF exchange in L2 learning: the teacher's spoken language provides models for learner-learner interaction. We need therefore to consider the importance of teacher talk in modelling interaction in the TL. Long (1981) hypothesised that "Participation in conversation with native speakers, made possible through the modification of interaction, is the necessary and sufficient condition for second language acquisition" (24). For Long the interactional features in NS/NNS talk influence L2 acquisition through interactional modifications brought about through confirmation checks, comprehension checks, clarification requests, expansions and repetitions. In the L2 classroom the teacher is usually the most proficient speaker and is therefore in the position of a native speaker, or at least a more proficient speaker than the learners. As the IRF exchange limits who gets to talk, it may be necessary to consider strategies for the introduction of variations on the IRF pattern of classroom interaction to allow learners more opportunity for spoken interaction and for initiating and maintaining turns themselves, in order to engage in the kind of interaction proposed by Long. In the data of learners' group talk such interaction is observable.
6.4 LEARNER TALK IN GROUP WORK

In this section the focus is on the group work talk of students in the Japanese class. The oral interactions of Japanese learners working together resembles conversational talk. The question of how this talk offers potential for L2 development is considered from the following perspectives:

a. the input students offer one another in the development of their interview scripts;

b. the authenticity of the communication when students work and talk together;

b. the potential for L2 development in the negotiation of meaning in group work talk.

6.4.1 Talk around tasks

As the students in the Japanese class prepare their interview scripts together, they give input to one another. They assist one another in formulating the Japanese phrases to be used in their interviews: they ask for help ("How do you do that?"/ "How can you say: we are?"/ "How do you write that?"), and they provide each other with input ("You should use that sentence."/ "M4: That's skiing. M2: No, it's not."). The speakers help each other at the point of need — they support one another in selecting the L2 discourse components when the students need or request them. This process of selection of discourse elements is part of the management of discourse (McCarthy 1991). The mutual contributions made in the group work result in a written product. The interaction helps learners construct the text of the interview. In the process the students identify
gaps in their knowledge ["Are you asking me what sport I like? How do you write that?"]], they engage in hypothesis testing ["That's skiing. M2: No, it's not."]], and, in talking with one another, activitate metalinguistic functioning ["How can you say: we are?"]. As Swain (1995) suggests, these processes may contribute to L2 development.

In the extracts of interaction presented in chapter 5, we see how group talk serves a heuristic function: the speakers are engaged in problem-solving interaction in figuring out the language components of the interview, as well as determining who says what. Such talk is associated with concept development and thereby language learning (Brumfit 1994). In the context of learning Japanese the group talk suggests that the spoken interaction enables speakers to rehearse and produce a L2 script in a process of joint construction.

However the use of Japanese is restricted to the preparation of a written script, while the group interactions are actually carried forward in the shared L1. The group work talk displays a number of distinctive characteristics. The first is that every member has the right to talk and participate. Although members' participation in the group varies, this does not remove the rights of each member to contribute. In the Japanese class the teacher's explicit focus on collaborative group work in the instructions which she gave to the class before the activity commenced encouraged participation and collaboration.

The second feature is the highly interactive nature of the exchanges. The turns
are short, many of them only one or two words. The speakers interact dynamically: they initiate turns and react to one another's moves in their responses. There is a constant shift of topic, with new contributions made by participants. The speakers are comfortable working together as they interrupt, direct, challenge, tease and question one another. The interactional nature of the group talk is typical of conversational exchanges, characterised by familiarity and cooperation in getting a task done.

A third feature is the way the task frames the interaction. The group talk is framed rather than directed by the task which the teacher has set. In other words the talk is not constrained by a set dialogue, nor is it restricted to the utilitarian goal of completing the task of writing an interview text. Rather, the task provides a referential frame and context for the talk and at the same time necessitates or creates the need for communication between members of the group in order to do it. The talk is bound up with doing the task, but at the same time serves to maintain social relationships in the group.

The fourth feature relates to collaboration. The task requires contributions from members of the group. Joint activity of this kind serves illocutionary and perlocutionary functions: in order for the task to be completed participants need to cooperate at a social level. There is a personal dimension to the talk, which is particularly evident in the boys' joking. The register which the boys use is a mixture of informal and formal talk, talk which in a very natural way switches from a focus on task to unofficial talk. The informality of the exchanges
of the boys is normally discouraged in the classroom. However here it is invested with personal interactions associated with conversational talk, while carrying out the assigned task. The language use is embedded or contextualised functionally in the groups' operations.

The learners' talk displays characteristics of authentic communication. In the next chapter I will suggest how developing learners' resources to conduct such interactions in the target language offers opportunities for L2 development. The need for strategic action on the part of the teacher to realise this is highlighted by the lack of transfer of phrases rehearsed in an earlier phase of the Japanese lesson into the students' group work talk.

A noticeable feature in the group work talk is students' use of L1 for phrases which have been practised in the previous phases of the Japanese lesson: for example, "What [sport] do you play?"/ "What do you like?". In their group work the students use L1. Now the choice of language in these instances is not determined by the lack of TL resources for the use of Japanese. The preferred language is L1. The TL use is incidental in the working relationships of the students. The speakers clearly differentiate the use of L2 from L1: the former is restricted to the written task, whilst the latter is used to carry out the task. This functional separation shows up English as the unmarked language in the group work context. The shared L1 is used in the informal and personal interactions, which can be characterised as personal. This talk is situated, natural talk for making meaning, whereas the language for the interview is performance talk.
The authentic talk is not associated with the task of the interview, which is the
ostensible communicative activity, but to do with getting the task done together.

The separation of language use in the group interactions indicates a socialisation
process, modelled by the teacher in her interactions with the students, in which
the TL is used for set pedagogic purposes, whereas the L1 is used for
communication. We can take this point further with reference to the students'
talk associated with classroom language learning. Here are some examples:
"How can you say: we are?"/ "How do you do that?"/ "What are you going to
ask?"/ "Why don't you ask him ...?" and "How do you write that?". This is
classroom language, which is transferable and relevant to other contexts of
language learning. In a study of student classroom interaction Brooks (1990)
found that the Spanish learning students imitated the teacher's way of correcting
pronunciation and error correction in Spanish. He comments: "The instructional
and communicative processes that take place across time during classroom foreign
language teaching and learning influence not only what occurs in the classroom
and how it occurs, but also what is eventually learned. That is, as students are
learning the pieces and parts of language, they are simultaneously learning how
to be competent members of the classroom in order to participate in language
learning activities" (165). In the data under consideration, the preference for L1
use by the teacher and students deprives learners of such learning opportunities
through the communicative use of the TL. I will discuss strategies for exploiting
this contextualised use of language in student group work in chapter seven. The
importance of utilising the normal spoken interactions in the classroom for
learning is underpinned by the role described for the negotiation of meaning in second language acquisition studies.

6.4.2 Negotiation of meaning

The negotiation of meaning as speakers talk together has been suggested as a triggering process for second language acquisition (Long 1981). The negotiation of meaning helps to make spoken TL comprehensible when, for example, learners seek clarification and ask for repetition. Through the negotiation of meaning, elements of discourse are made salient to the learner, contributing to learners' interlanguage development. In a study of learners talking to each other in the TL, Porter (1986) concluded "though learners cannot provide each other with the accurate grammatical and sociolinguistic input that native speakers can provide them, learners can offer each other genuine communicative practice, including the negotiations for meaning that may aid second language acquisition" (220). As the negotiation of meaning is considered to be facilitative of L2 development, we need to consider the data presented above from this perspective.

In negotiated interaction learners are not just responding to questions or initiating turns, as in the Initiation/Response/Feedback pattern we discussed earlier. Rather they are involved in the joint construction of meaning in order to make themselves understood and to understand. The negotiation of meaning is observable in exchanges which include repetitions, seeking clarification and clarifying what has been said, checking comprehension and repeating something, and confirming that what has been said has been understood. In negotiated
interaction learners are not just interacting or verbalising in order to take part in an exchange or respond to a comment or question. Instead "they are interacting to clarify meanings" (Chaudron 1988: 106). Here "the linguistic, semantic, and pragmatic rules of the learners' interlanguage are presumably put to the test, in terms of their communicative results, when learners are negotiating for meaning as opposed to when they are simply responding or initiating" (Chaudron 1988: 106). The negotiation of meaning assumes opportunities for unscripted conversation in which L2 learners engage in genuine communication in the target language. In the interactions speakers use acquired speech patterns, but in order to convey meaning they need to develop discourse skills to maintain the conversation through questions, through initiating topics and turns, as well as use expressions seeking clarification, expansion, explanation or repetition. In this process they develop their discourse skills for authentic communication.

In the Japanese classroom language data under consideration, students use of the TL for the negotiation of meaning is restricted. There appear to be four main reasons for this. The first has to do with the institutional character of language use. Children learn situationally appropriate ways of talking, which in teacher fronted situations limits them exercising their rights as participants in the speech situation. The power relationships and associated roles and functions in the school setting determine what speech and patterns of speech are acceptable and what are not. We have seen this exemplified in the IRF pattern of language use, where the room for learners to initiate moves and respond in a variety of ways is limited. In reference to a number of studies, Ellis (1994) comments "that when
role relationships are asymmetrical, meaning negotiation is inhibited" (261).

Language choice also influences meaning negotiation. If L1 is the teacher's language of choice for conducting the business of lessons and carrying out functions such as management and content teaching, the language conditions do not promote negotiation of meaning, in that learners have no need to ask for explanations or clarification in the TL.

A third factor impacting on the use of the TL for the negotiation of meaning is the L2 discourse resources available to learners for engaging in such interactions. In the classroom data referred to in this study, there is no evidence of relevant instruction in the speech exponents necessary to engage in the negotiation of meaning. In a text on foreign language teaching method Cajkler and Addelman (1992) discuss in some detail the use of the TL by teacher and learners, and list certain words and phrases as useful for pupils:

"Productive language which should be taught could include:
I've forgotten ...
May I have a ...
I don't know
I can do it
I know what to do
I don't know what to do
I have done it
I can't understand
The listing of such phrases for learners' use suggests that teaching them will equip learners to transfer their use to other contexts. We have seen above that phrases practised in one stage of a lesson are not transferred to use in other contexts. Lists of such language items are decontextualised and unrelated to intentional language behaviour, so they do not equip learners for joint or coordinated action in making meaning. The list of phrases suggests that the language of interaction is not part of the TL input learners receive in class (Blanco-Iglesias, Broner and Tarone 1995).

The fourth reason has to do with learners' perception of the TL. Through experiences of TL use in, for example, the IRF sequence, learners become accustomed to TL use as a non-meaning making activity. This is reinforced by teacher's language choice, when the L1 is preferred for important classroom functions, such as giving homework or giving instructions. Cajkler and Addelman (1992) observe of contexts where English language is the shared L1: "To use English for any casual talk, for any important messages, for events in the classroom which are not part of the lesson plan is to devalue the target language" (93). Under such conditions, learners do not see the L2 as the medium of normal communication. This experience is reinforced in the choice of topics and activities they engage in, where these may be external to their experience and are unrelated to classroom functioning, such as pretending to be tourists in the TL country.
Whilst there is a place for role-plays and simulations, which after all are social and pedagogic activities, if they comprise the main language experience of learners, they gain the impression that the L2 is different from L1, in that it is not used for essential communication in class. As a result, they may not take the use of the TL seriously — it is for performance, not for getting things done or for joint activity. TL talk is compartmentalised in a socially agreed system of language use. Tarone and Swain (1995) in proposing a diglossic situation in the L2 classroom consider social factors such as peer group pressure inhibit learners' use of the TL. Other factors such as motivation and confidence in use of the TL (Allwright and Bailey 1991, McLaughlin 1987) also impact on students' preference for use of L1, as well as their perception of the L2 as object of study rather than medium of communication.

If we view the classroom as a place of situated language use, particularly, for the present argument, as situated TL language use, then the classroom has an established system of communication with the need for participants to interact collaboratively in conducting the business associated with instruction. A language class constitutes a speech community. Wesche (1994) states that "In language socialization research, the learner is viewed in the role of cultural member, learning to use the L2 to accomplish social and cognitive goals in the new cultural context ..." (245). Learning a language is a social phenomenon in which language is used to communicate with speakers of the TL and to participate in their institutions (Larsen-Freeman 1991). As a social phenomenon, people use language for collaboration. As Savignon (1991) puts it "The terms that best
represent the collaborative nature of what goes on are interpretation, expression, and negotiation of meaning" (262). Clark (1996) describes language use as joint action, which emerges when speakers and listeners "perform their individual actions in coordination, as ensembles" (3). Tsui (1995) claims "conversation is an interactive process, during which the meaning and illocutionary force of utterances are negotiated between the speaker and the addressee ..." (32). The view of language use as joint action describes the linguistic environment of the classroom speech community, in which language use and language development are concurrent activities.

The group work talk of learners has a purposeful role in the speech community. Pica et al. (1996) highlight the importance of this in the foreign language context: "For many L2 learners wide-ranging interaction with NSs is all too infrequent and often simply impossible ...Even when NS teachers are available, if small-group and pair work, roleplays, and discussion are emphasized in the curriculum, then learners experience greater verbal contact with each other than with their teachers for much of the class time ... it is the learners who become each other's principal interlocutors in the classroom. ... language learners are frequently and increasingly each other's resource for language learning" (60). Language is constitutive of, and constituted by, the context of use. As Cazden 1988) states "... speech events such as lessons are social events accomplished by the collaborative work of two or more people. In metaphorical terms, "school" is always a performance that must be constituted through the participation of a group of actors" (44). The implications of this social view of language for LOTE teaching
is the topic of the next chapter.

Summary

In this chapter I have examined how the opportunities for L2 development are influenced by classroom patterns of communication. The significant factors discussed were the choice of language, the nature of teacher-student exchanges, the characteristics of group work talk of learners, and the opportunities for meaning negotiation in the classroom. The implications for teaching is the topic of the next chapter.
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Overview

In this final chapter I will draw together the arguments for the authenticity of second language classroom communication and I will relate this to the learning opportunities afforded by the classroom for second language development. This leads to a discussion of the implications for L2 teaching, and to the proposal of a model for action which exploits the communication in the classroom as a language learning context. The proposal implies the need for classroom research to test the model in practice.

7.1 THE NATURE OF COMMUNICATION IN THE CLASSROOM

In this study I have considered LOTE lessons from a social interaction perspective. I have analysed spoken classroom language use which serves institutional purposes — in this case, educational purposes. The classroom is considered as
a complex social context in which communication takes place for the social purposes of instruction and of learning. Brooks (1990) considers classrooms to be "active and dynamic communicative environments in which both social and academic goals are pursued" (154).

The criticism of L2 use in the classroom as inauthentic, and the attempt to replace it with real-life L2 use from outside of the classroom, overlooks both the contextualised use of language, and the potential of institutionalised language use for L2 learning. What is at issue here is more than whether we can contrive authentic communication activities in the classroom, quite apart from the practical difficulties of creating contexts of use which can be authenticated through real-life tasks from the real world outside of the classroom. The essential point is that the classroom in the wider locus of the school has institutionalised L1 uses of discourse, into which children are socialised over time. In overlooking the discourse of classrooms as situated language use in L2 pedagogy, we reduce the potential of classroom language use for language learning. In particular we undermine the very socialising involvements and participation which promote language learning in the classroom community: the use of the L2 by the teacher for teaching-related activities, and the use of the L2 by learners for conducting the activities of schooling. Goodwin and Duranti (1992) refer to work of Ochs and Schieffelin who "have demonstrated that the process through which a child learns to speak cannot be analyzed simply as language acquisition (i.e. an encapsulated process of interest only to students of language), but instead constitutes a profound process of language socialization through which the
child by learning how to speak in a community becomes a competent socialized member of his or her society" (1) [emphases in original]. Although Goodwin and Duranti are referring to first language acquisition, central to the argument here is a view of the classroom as a context which offers opportunities for a process of socialisation into a community of L2 learner-speakers.

In the attempt to create authentic second language learning contexts imitating out of classroom language use, we overlook the contexts of use in the classroom. We also overlook the essentially dialogic nature of spoken and written language (Emerson and Holquist 1986) which is embedded in and determined by contexts of use. Although all the world is a stage, and the role of the imagination in creating fictional contexts of use is part of the repertoire of pedagogic action, nevertheless the message learners internalise from such practice is that the use of an L2 is different from L1 use. It may undermine their efforts to use their L1 experience in the development of their interlanguage and to utilise strategies such as hypothesising in the construction of their L2. The L2 is used for fictional performance rather than authentic purposes. The motivation for learners to participate in the joint construction of meaning in the L2, for using the L2 amongst themselves, is eroded. What in effect happens is that the L2 is decontextualised and reduced to linguistic activity, lacking semantic and pragmatic force, and so reducing opportunities for L2 development through interaction in the TL. A different perspective on classroom communication might therefore be proposed, a perspective which views classroom communication as embedded in the institutional purposes of schooling.
Although classroom discourse has features which distinguish it from talk outside of the classroom, it is not deficient as a communicative context. Hüllen (1990) notes: "We cannot regard the context of classroom learning as some debased form of the context of language acquisition but we must look at it in its own right" (109). As the classroom language data in this study show the classroom is a context in which everyday pedagogical activities are associated with a wide range of communicative language uses. Hüllen (1990) describes nine types of acts identifiable in a study of English as a foreign language classroom discourse, most of which are teacher utterances (75%). Learners' utterances are limited to "responsive and reactive acts" (115). Rather than seeing this as a weakness in teaching, Hüllen says the findings "should be taken as an insight into the diversity of speech acts in communication for which learners must be prepared. With the exception perhaps of repeating acts, all the others also occur in everyday dialogue and must be mastered eventually by our learners, although in different wording and rhetorical patterns, since partners in communication do not confront each other in teacher and learner roles" (115) [my emphasis]. The language data in this study illustrate the point Hüllen makes — that acts in classroom discourse have application to other contexts of communication as well.

Within the teaching-learning events of classrooms are authentic language uses which extend beyond the classroom, potentially preparing students for future interactions with TL speakers, and certainly providing opportunities for communication in the classroom. Kramsch (1992) proposes, "Rather than making
the classroom the artificial mirror of the external world, we apply the concept of communicative competence to the type of communication best suited for that setting. Talking and talking about talk are among the things the classroom does best ..." (21-22). There is, according to Kramsch and Hüllen, a strong case to be made for re-evaluating the authenticity of classroom language use and its role in language learning, a case put forward by Widdowson (1978) almost twenty years ago: "A good deal of material for the teaching of foreign languages presents the language to be learned in dissociation from a real communicative purpose in contexts devised solely as a means of teaching language. The foreign language is in this way represented as a different kind of phenomenon from the mother tongue, an artificial construct detached from the purposes for which language is normally used. It is not discourse: it is language on display. This means that the learner is denied the opportunity of drawing on his own experience of language. If it is the case, as I have argued here, that the learning of language means acquiring the ability to handle discourse and if this crucially depends on a knowledge of conventions, then it would seem to follow that we have to link the foreign language to be learned with real contexts of use in one way or another. One such set of contexts ... is quite naturally provided by other subjects on the school curriculum" (53).

Widdowson's point is well illustrated in the bilingual data we have seen, where subject content is taught in Italian. The bilingual teacher's focus on content and on classroom actions in the Italian language exposed learners to authentic Italian of great linguistic variety. The institutionalised talk of teachers and learners
presents an immediate context and purpose for communication. Brooks (1990) argues that: "Throughout instruction ... teachers and students continuously use language in order to teach and to learn language. The interpersonal and conversational nature of foreign language learning in the classroom has largely been ignored, especially by classroom research in foreign language learning" (165). It follows from Brook’s comment that the classroom as a communicative environment with genuine uses of language has received insufficient attention in L2 communicative pedagogy.

7.2 IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING PRACTICE

Clyne et al (1995) identify three principal factors associated with the success of second language acquisition: functional specialisation, communicative need and comprehensible input (107-108). A fourth factor identified in second language acquisition studies is the need for interaction in the target language, which gives practice in the use of the target language as well as alerting speakers to features of their target language use. Clyne et al (1995) propose that communicative need is created through the first factor, functional specialisation, achieved through L2 use by the teacher and in content teaching. Their proposal implies the need to rethink the communicative needs of L2 learners: instead of viewing the communicative needs of school learners in some general, eschatological sense, the needs will be seen as getting things done in the classroom, and doing the business of teaching and learning. This will align L2 teaching with learning in other subjects in the curriculum, and see the learning of a L2 as learning in other subjects in the curriculum, such as learning the language of
science (Widdowson 1978). Already in the 1960's with language across the curriculum programs (Barnes 1976) and more recently in the teaching of genre (Cope and Kalantzis 1993), we have in education generally an integrated view of teaching subject content and the discourses of the subject at the same time. This puts a different light on a L2 pedagogic view that teaching language is foundationally different from other areas of the curriculum, because L2 teaching involves separation of the teaching of language and content. Ellis (1992) comments that "In many teaching contexts, the target language continues to be viewed as an object to be studied rather than as a tool for communication" (50). Cook (1991) expands on the observation of Ellis. He states: "There is a falseness about much language teaching that does not exist in other school subjects because language has to fulfil its normal classroom role as well as be the content of the class. N.S. Prabhu (1987) suggests dealing with this problem by treating the classroom solely as a classroom: 'learners' responses arose from their role as learners, not from assumed roles in simulated situations or from their individual lives outside the classroom'; the real language of the classroom is classroom language"(92). Communication in classrooms offers opportunities for focused language instruction through communication in the TL. After all this is what the bilingual teacher did in Italian, and, as we see comparable patterns of language use in the Japanese class, is conceivable in other second language contexts as well.

I have argued in this study for the potential to exploit the classroom language environment for oral language development. The classroom is a primary context
of target language interaction and thus for second language development. The language is familiar to learners; the routines and associated relationships are familiar to learners as are the illocutionary and perlocutionary functions embedded in it, factors which are constitutive of the use of language for making meaning. If the L2 is used in lessons, learners are able to use their predictive abilities for understanding and for responding as well as for initiating contributions — they are situated for the negotiation of meaning in joint actions. The discourse is relevant to what they are doing and is not an abstraction of what they might do in the future, and is thus more likely to lead to the motivation to use the language as a member of that speech community and adhere to its language mores.

The question is how can we make use of the "rhetorical exigency" (Freedman 1994: 201) of classroom contexts for developing L2 learners' discourse skills? Proposals for how this might be put into action in the communicative teaching of languages is the topic of the next section.

7.3 PROPOSAL FOR ACTION

A key principle underpinning the following proposal is the utilisation of the social and therefore linguistic environment of the classroom for providing both appropriate input data and interactional opportunities for second language learning. Ellis (1992) describes an acquisition-rich classroom as best characterised "as one which provides both experiences associated with communicating in
natural discourse and those experiences derived from cognitive activities designed to raise the learner's consciousness about the formal properties of the L2 and their function in language use" (49). I have argued that the business of classrooms offers experiences in "communicating in natural discourse" which need to be exploited for second language learning. What follows is a suggestion of how this might be implemented in teaching second languages.

7.3.1 Discourse awareness actions

The data discussed in this study suggest the need for planned instruction in communicative interaction by exploiting the opportunities for communication in the classroom. Based on the studies which have documented the lack of TL discourse input in classroom language which would enable learners to engage in spoken interaction (Blanco-Iglesias, Broner and Tarone 1995, Clyne et al 1995, Tarone and Swain 1995) a priority in communicative teaching strategy will be accorded to such discourse input. As Clyne et al (1995) note "It is important for the children to be equipped with the linguistic devices (e.g., questions, vocabulary) to be able to conduct the interactions." (154). If we want our students to speak we need to give them not just practice in speaking, but the experience of speech events. They need to participate in spoken interaction, converse, give oral presentations and so on. Van Lier (1988) suggests "teachers and learners can use their own recorded classroom interaction for self-monitoring, feedback, and various kinds of meta-communicative work, thus using ethnography as curriculum" (40). [italics in original]. Similarly Carter and McCarthy (1995) suggest as a course of action for the development of learners' discourse skills "to expose
learners to natural spoken data wherever possible and to help them to become observers of the grammar of talk in its natural contexts and in different genres ..." (154). In order to equip learners with the discourse resources to participate in TL communication teachers and learners will need to become observers or investigators of language use themselves. Using classroom research procedures (Nunan 1989, Van Lier 1988) or action research (Mickan 1996) teachers and learners need to observe and record the language of the classroom to select the discourse features for input, that is for explicit teaching and for deliberate use of the TL. The actualisation of the discourse in the classroom will need to be monitored and documented for the identification of developing discourse needs of speakers and for selecting new input, thereby developing the use of the TL for classroom actions. What is suggested is that such languaging experience will build up learners’ resources to participate increasingly in the TL, and complement and strengthen participation in other language tasks and literacy activities.

In Figure 7.1 I have outlined a general model for providing the second language input and interaction opportunities needed to exploit the linguistic environment of the classroom for second language learning.
Identification of discourse needs:
recording episodes of classroom talk
Transcribing of classroom talk
Teacher/learner analysis of targeted TL input
Selective input of TL discourse data
Experiential use of TL input in interactions

Figure 7.3: Language awareness model applied to second language teaching

The model proposes a staged process in promoting use of and interaction in the target language. An initial stage is the identification of appropriate contexts or speech episodes for deliberate teaching or input of the TL. The selection of speech episodes will be focused on for example teacher or learner talk. The selected speech episodes will be video- and/or audio-recorded. The recording could be used to analyse at a general level the use of language in the classroom. For example Kirkby (1996) used video-recordings of children working in groups to show them strategies for developing their topic discussion skills through such techniques as asking questions. As she video-ed the working groups over time she was able to demonstrate discourse strategies and their effect on discussions.

In the above model the initial viewing of speech episodes on video would enable teacher and students to observe general patterns of language use such as language choice or how the teacher talks with students. Through this process
the teacher, together with students, would be able to identify particular features of spoken language for input. In order to obtain more specific detail of language use, the teacher and students might transcribe a lesson and identify patterns of code-switching and select particular functions spoken in a shared L1 for use of the TL. The next level of analysis would require the preparation of students for using the second language — targeting discourse input in modelled TL extracts based on the transcription. This would be followed by the experiential use in class of the selected TL input. A cyclical process of recording, analysis, input and TL use would enable the building up of second language resources over time.

Underpinning the application of the model will be the analysis of classroom discourse by teachers and learners. They will engage in the recording, transcribing and analysis of discourse. A prime resource will be the depiction or description of the discourse of the classroom — teacher talk, teacher and learner interaction, group work talk and talk on tasks. Through the analysis of language use, learners will attend to particular features of spoken language, they will analyse their interlanguage, and they will deliberately choose discourse strategies for TL communication in different contexts and for different purposes. The use of NS [native speaker]/NS, NS/NNS [non-native speaker] and NNS/NNS spoken data in audio/video-recorded and transcribed form will present learners with authentic input data in order to expand their discourse resources, and to equip them with the discoursal forms for doing tasks and activities. The use of discourse data as a central resource for teaching will obviate the need to disassemble
spoken language into component parts and then reassemble it for teaching purposes: the language will be presented with integrated grammatical, socio-linguistic and pragmatic components, and where NS discourse data is used, the cultural component of the language will also be incorporated. The model has specific application to the classroom language uses discussed in this study, which I have summarised in the next sections.

7.3.2 Language choice

In this study language choice has been identified as a significant variable in the classrooms studied. The analysis of code-switching enables teachers to select for teaching purposes functions for which they could use the TL. In so doing they would expose learners to comprehensible and incomprehensible input and so develop learners' comprehension capabilities. This would also provide opportunities to develop learners' discourse skills in the negotiation of meaning: for example, if learners do not understand the teacher, they would need to negotiate meaning and ask for clarification, for repetition and so on: in other words to do what we would normally do in conversation.

The teacher's task would be to select from a transcription sequences of moves or exchanges (language use in context) spoken in L1, translate those into the TL, or where possible using NS transcriptions, and exhibit them for learner analysis and understanding, and then incorporate them into the spoken routines of a class. These would be coupled with the discourse moves for learners to be able to interrogate, clarify or confirm (Yule and Tarone 1991) in the TL what the
teacher says. In other words as part of the discourse input the teacher would model the language for negotiating meaning in the target language.

The same procedure would be followed for increasing the TL use of learners. Through the documentation of learners' L1 use, discourse sequences in the TL would be introduced and integrated into the routine functioning of the class. In the bilingual classroom, the L1 responses of children would be documented and progressively L2 options introduced. So the use of the TL would be systematically developed, based on the normal interactions of the class.

By using analysis of the classroom functions of teacher talk identified in this study, the teacher is in a position to selectively widen learners' exposure to TL discourse data. Because the teacher uses language for specialised functions as an integral part of teaching, focused instruction using transcript data will highlight for the teacher and for students communication episodes for TL use and input.

7.3.3 Teacher talk

The model presents a process for the teacher to evaluate her own use of language, as well as a procedure for building up programatically the TL resources of learners. How the teacher speaks with learners is an obvious target for analysis.

Although I have pointed out the limitations of the IRF exchange for L2 development, the IRF exchange can also be used for opening up options for learner responses by using the third move in the exchange for stimulating and
scaffolding learner moves (Wells 1993). Cazden (1988) points out in relation to first language education that the third move of the IRF exchange "... often serves not to deliver a verdict of right or wrong but to induct the learner into a new way of thinking about, categorizing, reconceptualizing, even recontextualizing whatever phenomena (referents) are under discussion" (111). Clearly there is value in inducting second language learners into reflective and dialogic uses of the TL in a similar way. The third move for example offers opportunity to extend learners' answers, to draw out the significance of contributions and to make connections with learners' experiences. Again this will be achieved by providing learners with specific input into the discourse needed for expanding their responses.

7.3.4 Group work

The model applies to learners' talk in groups, both for targeting their use of the second language for doing group work, as well as for instructing in discourse features for negotiating meaning in the TL. As Ellis (1991) states, group work is a "situation in which the conversational partners share a symmetrical role relationship [which] affords more opportunities for interactional restructuring" (183). The model suggests a learner role in the recording and transcribing of group work talk, so that learners' attention is drawn to their language use, thus raising their awareness of language use and of language needs.

The application of the model discussed in the last three sections is underpinned by the second language acquisition framework discussed in chapter three. The
TL input is made comprehensible because it is drawn from the classroom context of use. The analysis of classroom discourse raises awareness of language use and draws learners' attention to their use of language. The TL data is used in authentic communication in the conduct of classroom activities. The procedure suggests the integration of the discourse resources for communicating in the TL into the usual tasks and activities of lessons and programs of work. This suggests the need for classroom research to investigate the practical application of the model to different teaching contexts.

7.4 Directions for research

This study has illustrated how the very practical uses of classroom language are rich in potential for promoting second language learning. The language awareness model outlined in the previous section needs to be investigated in practice. As classroom contexts and social dynamics in classes vary, we can assume that teachers and researchers will experience different responses in different contexts. What is needed is classroom documentation (Mickan and Burton 1994) of modifications in speech patterns and use of the TL by teachers and learners. The model implies an action research process in which teachers and learners participate in the critical analysis of their language use. A research agenda would include at least the following:

• the analysis of language choice by teachers and learners;
• the investigation of procedures for instruction in target language discourse features for enhancing classroom communication;
the monitoring of modifications in speech patterns, in particular of the teacher in interaction with learners, in order to develop interactional patterns which extend learners' construction of meaning through the target language;

the analysis of language interactions in other subject areas of the curriculum and their application to teaching second languages.

Research on these topics would provide experiential documentation for use in teacher education programs, as well as contributing to the understanding of how second language development in classroom contexts could be enhanced. The implementation of such studies conducted longitudinally would provide documentation of the practical problems, as well as of the kinds of explicit teaching used, and teachers' and learners' experiences of participation in the process.

A focus for the research would be the use of transcript data for documentation and analysis of classroom communication by teachers and learners, and the use of authentic target language transcript data for discourse input and use in classroom communication. Implied in this approach is a learner role for analysis of oral discourse, including learners' participation in recording and transcribing their own interactions and, where possible, of the interactions of native speakers in similar contexts.

7.5 CONCLUSION

At the beginning of this study I posed the following questions:
• What are typical patterns of classroom language use?
• What opportunities does the use of the TL in classroom interaction provide for second language acquisition?
• How can the analysis of classroom language use be exploited for the promotion of second language acquisition?

In the remainder of this report I will summarise key points to emerge from the study which are responses to these questions.

The purpose of the study has been to examine aspects of spoken classroom language as potential opportunities for second language development. The study relates to the teaching of languages other than English in Australia. In order to achieve the goals of the national Statement and Profiles (Curriculum Corporation 1994) it is necessary for learners to develop their skills in oral interaction.

Within a second language acquisition framework the study has provided insights into specific ways in which classroom language use has the potential for promoting second language acquisition.

1. The study has demonstrated the authenticity of classroom language as situated and contextualised in the institutional practices of schooling.

2. The study proposes that language use offers opportunities for L2 development, although some language uses are more enabling of L2 development than others. A significant determinant of opportunities offered for L2 development is language choice.

3. The study suggests that the differentiated use of language in the classroom,
according to different purposes and classroom functions, present differentiated L2 development opportunities. Classroom talk in other words differs in both the potential for contributing to L2 development, but also to the development of different aspects of language use.

The study describes functions of teacher talk. The talk serves both transactional and interpersonal purposes in the classroom. The use of the TL by the teacher contributes to the development of:

- skills in comprehending extended spoken discourse; this is valuable for using the TL for learning content, for getting things done, and for working together;
- learners' comprehension of discourse domains outside of the classroom;
- learners' negotiation of meaning, where learners require clarification or explanation to understand what the teacher is saying, and request repetition, elaboration or exemplification;
- learners' aural patterning of language;
- learners' development of selective listening skills and communication strategies.

This suggests the importance of teacher as text, who models the spoken patterns of the target language.

In the teacher-learner interactions the study depicts the constraints of the use of the IRF pattern, and suggests modifications to this exchange pattern might be considered. Such modifications might include more exploratory patterns of talk
in questioning and responding to learners.

The value of learners' group work talk has been suggested, both for the assistance learners give to one another, and, if conducted in the TL, for the development of conversational skills.

The analysis proposes that learners' management of TL discourse for classroom interactions is not topic or theme dependent nor context confined, but extends to domains of language use outside of the classroom. Learners who develop skills in interaction, also develop the independence for using the skills for different purposes, whether for subject content learning or learning to personally manage situations in the TL.

The study proposes a discourse awareness model for application to teaching which incorporates analysis of the discourse of the classroom as at least one component of the instructional content of second language lessons.

Finally the study suggests that the classroom offers many opportunities for oral interaction which are authentic and which have the potential for promoting second language development. The analysis of classroom language has enabled the identification of uses of classroom language which are promotive of L2 development. As Wong Fillmore (1991) comments: "When there are regular activities that both invite and support the use of the target language in the context of learning about the subject matter that is made relevant and interesting
to the children, they learn the language, with or without much additional informal social contact with speakers. But classrooms, as noted earlier, can vary considerably as settings for language learning" (64). In looking into two settings for language learning, this study has detailed how an analysis of classroom discourse identifies factors impacting on learners' second language development, factors which are within the ambience of teachers' pedagogic decision-making. They are amenable to change and therefore to the nurturing of enriched second language learning environments.
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