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ABSTRACT

A widely held principle of communicative language teaching is that instruction should be in—and should elicit from students—the target language as close as possible to language used by native speakers. This dissertation illustrates that the foreign language (FL) teachers do not employ the native-like patterns of discourse to create context for communication, but simulations of French discourse for the classroom.

The purpose of the study was to investigate how two novice teachers of elementary university French classes created meaningful contexts for the development of authentic and sustained communication in the foreign language classroom.

The notion of discourse is discussed, stressing its archeological and orderly nature. Samples of naturally occurring conversational exchanges were collected during ten weeks of classes for two teaching associates, one American, one French. The samples were transcribed and analyzed, using a method that sought to expose the sequential structure of interactional events.
This analytic program was inspired by the Conversation Analysis field of study.

Analysis of habitual questioning patterns and the creation (or lack of creation) of a common discursive ground led to the following conclusions. At the elementary level, using native discourse may be impractical. Teaching associates tended to create simulations of the content to be taught.

The created simulations of discourse in these two classes were in sharp contrast. In the case of the nonnative speaker, the simulations consisted of stressing discrete facts about the linguistic properties of the target language. In the case of the native speaker, simplified models of communication were created to maximize student language production.

It is recommended that further conversation analysis studies of the target code be conducted, along with analyses of classroom communication between native and nonnative instructors and learners with different levels of language proficiency.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

I. Overview: The role of the Foreign Language Instructor

All around the world, billions of people are learning language, millions are teaching language, and they do so with effort, intelligence, and ingenuity. These activities are the true data of SLA (Second Language Acquisition), they are the air that both constrains the dove of SLA, and keeps it aloft. (van Lier, 1994, 346).

Van Lier (1994) argues that in the field of second language acquisition (SLA), most research efforts have thus far been concerned with establishing or rejecting linguistic theories. Little is known about the daily practice of language teaching. Such an allocation of interests seems rather surprising since, as van Lier points out (1994, 338), "Theory is not something that is constructed and subsequently applied to practice. Instead, it is nothing but a reflexive dimension of practice" (italics added). This research project relies on
the assumption that efforts to document what constitutes the daily practice of foreign language instruction may therefore result in the building of a more comprehensive theory of second and foreign language acquisition.

The assumption that investigating the practices of foreign language (FL) instructors may lead to the development of a more sound theory of language teaching and learning is in itself the result of multiple mutations in the field of SLA inquiry. Indeed, the historical process that now renders such assumptions possible has recently found the FL instructor, the other complex human factor in the SLA equation, worthy of inquiry.

When SLA research emerged as a true discipline after World War II, the scientific aspirations of applied linguists such as Robert Lado and Charles Fries at the University of Michigan set new standards; it was then believed that second and foreign language acquisition could be explained by a systematic contrastive analysis of the native and target languages of the learner. Thus native and target languages were to be scrutinized, and Lado (1957) proposed a linguistic procedure (contrastive analysis) for comparing languages in order to predict which aspects of the target language would be troublesome for the learner (see also Corder, 1967). But neither the learners nor the instructor nor their interaction were ever considered a part of the investigations. Fries (1945), however, conceded that many "practical" teachers had, out of experience, been able to predict how easily students might—or might not—learn a given topic. He claimed that such discoveries
were unreliable, achieved by chance, unrelated to any linguistic theory, and therefore not as valuable to the profession as the products of a systematic linguistic inquiry.

As the contrastive/error analysis hypothesis was shown to be limited (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991, 53-63), some linguists following Chomsky's Universal Grammar (Chomsky, 1965) argued that the answer to the language acquisition conundrum may be found in yet another type of systematic linguistic analysis; but instead of comparing surface features of the two languages, they tried to discover underlying linguistic features common to most languages. The Nativists—as they are sometimes called—also argued that every learner is innately endowed with the linguistic knowledge of these grammatical universals. Since they were mainly concerned with the acquisition of the first language in a natural environment, and SLA was only of secondary interest, classroom instruction and interaction were not settings for the study of the language acquisition process proposed by these linguists.

As neither of these positions seemed sufficient to explain second language acquisition, the focus turned from descriptions and analyses of languages to the prescription of new teaching methods. During the 1970's, numerous authors defined the characteristics of new second language teaching methods and defended their benefits as they compared these approaches to other methodologies, usually older and which in most cases
had already found numerous detractors (for instance, Wilkins, 1976) or Allen (1977) defending the Notional/Functional approach against the more traditional Structural approaches). This era was also marked by a high level of creativity in the field of SLA. Oller and Richard-Amato (1983) described a plethora of methods developed during this period of time: the Silent Way (Gattegno, 1972), Counseling-Learning (Curran, 1972), Total Physical Response (Asher, 1979), the Natural Approach (Terrell, 1977), and Suggestopedia (Lozanov, 1978) among others.

Although the focus of most of the studies defending specific teaching approaches shifted toward classroom procedures, the enterprise that all these methods defined was routinely prescriptive (i.e., This is what teachers ought to teach in order to enhance language acquisition), and rarely descriptive (i.e., This is actually what teachers do in their classrooms). When large-scale studies attempted to contrast the "new" methods with more traditional ones, foreign language teachers disappeared behind the label which was assumed to characterize their practice: audio-lingual, structural, inductive, deductive, etc. Examples of such large scale empirical/quantitative studies may be found in the Pennsylvania Project (Smith and Baranyi, 1968), the GUME Project (von Elek and Oskarsson, 1972), and, more recently, the Development of Bilingual Proficiency (DBP) Project (Harley, Allen, Cummins, and Swain, 1990).
Some researchers who were attracted by Nativist theories refined their position to focus on even newer types of linguistic analyses, but softened their claims by emphasizing language learner variables. Dulay and Burt (1973), for instance, tried to determine whether there were any regularities in the order in which certain morphemes were acquired and laid the foundation for Krashen's five hypotheses (Acquisition/Learning hypothesis, Comprehensible Input hypothesis, Monitor hypothesis, Natural Order hypothesis, and Affective Filter hypothesis) on language acquisition. These hypotheses virtually ignore the role played by the FL instructor—except for the Affective Filter hypothesis, which recognizes only the adverse effects that formal instruction may have on acquisition when students feel threatened by the second/foreign language teacher. Krashen (1985) presented the best-known and the most widespread theoretical position on SLA, but also one of the most controversial. Two different approaches would oppose his intuitive and widely publicized positions: Not only psycholinguists such as McLaughlin (1978), but also discourse analysts interested in authentic instances of language instruction. With discourse analysis, the focus of SLA research at last began to include the foreign language instructor.

Discourse analysis became increasingly popular in SLA as it was argued that, "[A]t the risk of oversimplification, research can be divided into a type which wants to obtain proofs and a type which wants to understand." (van Lier, 1988, xiv) Researchers and practitioners who wanted to
understand second and foreign language acquisition gained acceptance in the profession. Practically, the effects of discourse analysis on SLA research methodologies was evident: (a) It introduced descriptive modes of inquiry, instead of more widespread empirical methods of investigation that had prevailed since World War II; and (b) It turned the focus away from the language being learned, away from the prescribed method, and away from the sole language learner, instead proposing to observe learners, instructors, and language in the context of the FL classroom.

Turning the focus of inquiry toward the FL classroom was not to be understood as necessarily adopting a qualitative approach to SLA research; Long (1983) reviewed eleven studies and concluded that formal (i.e., classroom) second language instruction does not seem able to alter acquisition sequences, but has positive effects on the rate at which learners acquire the language. His review, however, showed that the early studies investigating the effects of formal instruction continued to be more product-oriented (How much language was learned by the students?) than descriptive. Descriptive studies were nevertheless gaining acceptance; for instance, Pica and Doughty (1985) found that there was little or no negotiation of meaning in teacher-centered classrooms. As soon as more studies such as this one (which focused on the classroom as a whole) became
available, the door was open in SLA inquiry for a new paradigm to be introduced; one that focuses on the description of classroom interaction, learners, and teachers.

With van Lier (1988), SLA inquiry began to characterize and describe the interactions that take place inside the foreign language classroom. Arguing for the need to turn away from experimental settings aimed at finding cause-effect relationships between certain actions and their outcomes, van Lier (1988) presents a new paradigm in which the researcher focuses on the context in which language learning occurs. The researcher describing the language acquisition process therefore produces analyses of classroom discourse which show that this context for language learning is dynamic; it is a domain of constant collaborative construction of shared meanings between instructors and learners. Discourse analysis is an interactional paradigm which introduces in SLA the idea that:

Meanings in discourse are neither singular nor fixed, as they are in a fully specified computer program or in a closed set of mathematical axioms and theorems. Rather, terms take on specific and contextually grounded meanings within and through the discourse as it develops and is shaped by speakers. (Mishler, 1986, 64)

Therefore, discourse analysis introduces the idea that meanings and mutual understanding between FL instructors and their students are contingent upon the context for the interaction. A more complex definition for the
interactional context and a more complex notion of classroom discourse therefore emerged in SLA. These new notions generated new descriptions of foreign language classroom contexts that have been instrumental in building a more comprehensive SLA theory.

Many descriptions of FL classrooms and lessons have indeed been produced. In the explosion of qualitative inquiries conducted since the late 1980s, researchers have emphasized the context that instructors and learners create in FL classrooms. Summarizing these descriptions, Kramsch (1993, 3) explains the delicate balance that goes into a teacher's decision-making process:

Classroom teaching is a juggling act that requires instant-by-instant decisions based on both local and global knowledge and on an intuitive grasp of the situation. Many of the decisions teachers make are based on compromises between how they perceive the needs of their students and how they view their role and their responsibility as teachers.

Conclusions have so far been unanimous to acknowledge the primacy of the interactional context on FL instruction. Kramsch's (1993) observations are based, however, on studies conducted in contexts different from the one in this study. In fact, although several attempts have been made to document the context and the dynamics of teaching a second or foreign language—the "instant-by-instant" decision-making process that Kramsch describes (quoted
above)—none of them is concerned with the context defined in this project: novice teaching associates or teaching assistants in charge of first-year college French instruction.

The important role played by teaching associates and teaching assistants in foreign language classrooms at most North American universities and colleges cannot be underestimated. In many colleges, they are the sole "knowledge/language providers" facing classes of undergraduate students, and as such are often the first contact that these undergraduates have with a second/foreign language at the post-secondary level. Research projects documenting the daily practice of these students-teachers in the foreign language classroom have not yet been undertaken; they are, however, needed if the training and education of these novice and non-specialist instructors is to be improved. This study investigates how the instructors use the target language in the classroom and what they do to encourage their students to speak in a foreign language.

The novice teachers in this study are graduate students majoring in French literature. They are often sent to teach in a classroom with minimal knowledge and no experience of how they are supposed to communicate the target language—in this case, French as a foreign language—to undergraduate students. At The Ohio State University, assistance is, however, available to help them face their teaching task. During the summer preceding their first quarter as foreign language teachers, they are asked to
attend a two-week workshop which provides them with some theoretical knowledge and a lot of practical information about foreign language education. During their first quarter as language instructors, they have to attend a weekly seminar during which they can both discuss practical issues and address their theoretical concerns. As a result of the workshop and seminar, teaching associates are able to enter the classroom with some knowledge about SLA, departmental guidelines, and the means at their disposal to reach departmental objectives. How to plan and conduct the FL lesson in order to reach these objectives is, however, one of the decisions that instructors have to make on their own.

In order to facilitate the decision-making process, some indications are given during the training program about the general directions taken by foreign language programs at The Ohio State University. One of the messages that is emphasized to the instructors is the necessity to speak and involve language learners in verbal exchanges in the target language. They are asked to teach more communicatively; they are asked to teach for "proficiency."

What is, however, proficiency? Would anyone ask the novice teachers to define this term that has in the last decade shaped and changed FL classroom instruction (Omaggio-Hadley, 1993, 17), none of them could,
however, be expected to provide the following expert (and somewhat facetious) position:

Proficiency: (noun, verb, adjective) a term popular among foreign language educators in the United States. Its meaning varies among users. In its strong form, the term relates to communicative performance of language students as measured by rating scales proposed by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Its usage (as noted in conference programs and journals) has expanded to include activities, approaches, and materials purported to lead to communicative or functional language ability. (Birckbichler & Corl, 1993, 116-7)

Proficiency, as "opportunities [which] must be provided for students to practice using language in a range of contexts likely to be encountered in the target culture," (Omaggio-Hadley, 1993, 17), is the organizational foundation upon which the language methods, textbooks, and materials given to the teaching associates are modeled. For instance, the very first line of the introduction to the instructor's edition of Invitation, Fourth Edition (Jarvis, Bonin, & Birckbichler 1993, I-vii), the French textbook used in this study, states: "Invitation: Contextes, culture et communication develops communicative proficiency in French." It reflects the paradigm shift toward communicative language learning that is one of the characteristics of the Proficiency movement according to Phillips (1993, vii). The pedagogical
message that is emphasized to the novice foreign language teachers by Omaggio-Hadley (1993), Birckbichler and Corl (1993), and Phillips (1993) is simple: Speak and make your students speak in the target language.

In today's Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and Proficiency era, student production of the target language is seen as an essential part of the language learning experience. Lyster (1994, 448) for instance, explains after observing immersion classes in Canada:

[It] is indeed language production that allows them [i.e., students] to test their hypotheses about syntax and this is the teacher's and the peers' retrospective effect that force them [i.e., students] not only to make themselves understood, but also to express themselves in a precise, coherent, and appropriate manner^2.

Lyster reinforces the idea that a consensus about student production in the target language has been reached. While the focus of past studies was to evaluate the effect of student production on language learning, little is known about how this language production is created in the foreign language classroom. Is such language production spontaneous or is it induced by the language teacher? If it is induced by the language teacher, how do novice teachers encourage their students speak in the target language? The collection, description, and analysis of such interactional events when teaching associates try to engage their students in verbal exchanges in the target language motivates the interests of this research.
II. Purpose of the study

The aim of this project is to describe and to analyze how two novice teaching associates from the Department of French and Italian at The Ohio State University motivate their students to speak in the target language. The discovery and description of routine interactions in French that take place between teaching associates and their students is its primary interest. Descriptions and analyses of conversational exchanges in the FL classroom are used to show how the instructors succeed (or not) in creating conversations in French. A definition of language/discourse is, however, necessary before discourse analysis of classroom interactions can be performed.

In Chapter Two, this study argues that language is just an analytic formalism—the birth and history of which are uncovered and documented in Foucault (1966). The primary interest of this study is therefore discourse. It is also argued that discourse needs to be analyzed from an ethnographic perspective. This ethnography of communication therefore needs to focus on human interactions, mostly conversations, that are the medium of social order (Moerman & Sacks, 1971).

This project asserts that without an understanding of the social order which regulates conversations in these two classrooms, and without adequate observation and description, many of the successes and failures that novice teaching associates encounter when trying to produce interactions in French
during their lessons are opaque to the outside observer. Understanding how novice teachers create successful conversational exchanges in the target discourse is moreover indispensable to present a more comprehensive theory of language teaching and learning.

Such concerns reflect Nunan’s (1996, 44) approach to classroom research as he argues that:

As a course evolves over days, weeks, and months, a culture emerges through the interaction of personalities and events. Without an understanding of that culture, many of the events that occur in a particular lesson will be meaningless to the outside observer.

This study suggests that the "culture" defined by Nunan—another term for social order—is not the realm of the exceptional and the unusual. It is indeed a domain where teachers and learners produce with regularity the routine actions that define a specific classroom culture. For "cultural" events to become meaningful, the researcher needs to adopt an ethnographic standpoint; for "cultural" discourse patterns to yield information about target language conversations, an ethnography of communication needs to be applied to verbal exchanges collected in the classroom setting. The purpose of this study is to analyze such verbal exchanges collected in two foreign language classrooms.
III. Significance of the study

This study investigates verbal exchanges in the foreign language classroom. Its significance is dependent upon the definitions of language and discourse that have been chosen. It argues that the usual notions of "language" and "discourse" as operationalized in language teaching poorly capture the essence of discourse. Kramsch (1991, 191) explained:

The notion of discourse in language teaching, born with Widdowson within the push for communication, has not had the role it should have had in subsequent public discussions. Second language acquisition research ... has been interested mainly in linear phenomena of turn-taking in conversation according to a cause-and-effect notion of interaction.

This study agrees with Kramsch that such a concept constitutes a "weak interpretation of discourse" as merely a system of appropriate use of social politeness formulae and conversational management strategies. Kramsch attempts to define a "stronger" interpretation of discourse, which she relates to Foucault's (1970) "Order of Discourse." An attempt is made to further Kramsch's proposition, and to present a notion of discourse more compatible with the goals of communicative language teaching.

French philosopher Michel Foucault proposes a notion that acknowledges the complex nature of discourse; he declared: "I do not question discourses about their silently intended meanings, but about the fact and
conditions of their manifest appearance," (Foucault, 1991, 60). Similarly, this study assumes a notion of discourse that directly questions the fact and the conditions of existence of what is actually said in the foreign language classrooms. It considers discourse not in terms of what it means (the "silently intended meanings"), but discourse in terms of its functioning: discourse as a materialism, and discourse as a practical domain defined by its own rules of formation and conditions of existence (Racevskis, 1983).

Foucault's first insight is therefore that discourse is the product of discursive practices. He proposed, for his own work, that such a discourse be unveiled and exposed by a careful analysis of the changes and transformations occurring within a given discursive field (a diachronic analysis). However, no description of transformations is possible unless it relies on previously made available descriptions and analyses of the order of regularities that such changes have disturbed (a synchronic analysis). The work of the discourse analyst, in contrast to the role of the "philosopher/genealogist," must focus on an ethnographic account of discourse regularities. Such regularities occur in the French classes observed in this study, and the role of the ethnography of classroom discourse is to help to uncover them and to describe them in the context of their environment.
Cicurel (1994, 43) defined the significance of ethnography of classroom discourse as follows:

[It] is to understand how and why a gathering of students and teacher interact to produce learning. The aim of classroom discourse analysis, from an ethnographic perspective, is to describe how a specific social entity—the world of the classroom—functions thanks to the study of discourse having actually been produced and that has been transcribed.

Although the profession may now see the value of ethnography of classroom discourse for SLA research, it still lacks descriptive studies investigating the behavior of teaching associates in first-year college French. Williams (1994), for instance, reported a rare project that proposed to use discourse analysis to study the successes and failures of teaching assistants in their classrooms. Her study, however, unfolded in a different setting: Williams' subject was a native Chinese-speaking international teaching assistant (ITA) conducting an organic chemistry class in English. Similar studies produced in the field of English as a second language include Rounds (1987). These studies have not been replicated in foreign language classrooms.

The significance of this study, consequently, lies on the methodological processes selected in order to unveil these discursive/conversational regularities. So far, scholars in the field of SLA have concurred with researchers in education that meaning is negotiated and lessons are co-
produced by teachers and students alike (Allwright & Bailey, 1991, 25; Bailey, 1996, 19). Unanimity was, however, always reached by observing the content of what had been said—Foucault's "silently intended meanings."

What is missing is the systematic analysis of interactional organizations of naturally occurring FL classroom discourse. Such analyses, it is argued, can lead to considerable insights on how common understandings are established (or not) between the novice teaching associates and their students. In monolingual settings, such analyses have been produced by conversation analysts (Cf.: Moerman & Sacks, 1971; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson 1974, etc.). It is the goal of this study to produce similar analyses in the first-year college French classes that were investigated.

The significance of this study potentially lies in its comparative nature. It contrasts an American teaching associate and a teaching associate who has thus far studied and lived in France most of her life: She is originally from Sweden but has earned three degrees from the University of Paris⁵. The two subjects are observed teaching similar departmental syllabi, and their individual interpretations of departmental goals, policies, and materials may be compared and contrasted. A corpus of audiotapes and videotapes of naturally occurring classroom interaction was collected from the two classes offered by the Department of French and Italian at The Ohio State University during Winter Quarter, 1996. Analyses of classroom discourse are presented to investigate how the teachers' knowledge of
pedagogy, French language, and French culture, as well as how the students' language and culture interact with each other to shape classroom interactions, or, as K.E. Johnson (1995, 7) formulates it, "recognizing how that which is hidden merges with and shapes that which is public."

This study is significant in the fact that it investigates different teaching behaviors and verbal techniques employed by a European and an American teaching associate teaching French as a foreign language. Education literature proposes that these differences in teaching behavior may be the product of different knowledge bases. More specifically, such differences may be the product of differences in pedagogical content knowledge, which is defined by Shulman (1987, 8) as:

...that special amalgam of content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province of teachers, their own special form of professional understanding (...), the category most likely to distinguish the understanding of the content specialist from that of the pedagogue.

It is suggested that for such a model to be applied to the field of language education, one must be able to analyze the content to be taught—language—in a readily identifiable structure, the teachable content, which could be emphasized and taught to novice teachers. Is classroom discourse a concept than can be organized into a teachable content? The successful application of Shulman's pedagogical content knowledge to the field of SLA depends not only on how language/discourse is analytically defined by the researcher, but
also on how it is interactionally defined by the language instructor and the learners. More specifically, this study addresses the question of the compatibility of pedagogical content knowledge and the notion of classroom discourse.

IV. Statement of the problem

The setting that has been chosen is first-year college French in at The Ohio State University. The instructors are two teaching associates with no previous experience teaching a foreign language. These instructors were made aware of general pedagogical issues and of broad classroom management guidelines inspired by communicative language teaching; in short, during their training program, they were urged to teach communicatively as it is believed that involving students in verbal exchanges in the target language facilitates language learning.

Research in SLA tends to agree with this position, as Ellis (1994, 604-7) summarizes current findings and concludes that "opportunities to negotiate meaning may help the acquisition of L2 vocabulary" and that "teacher-controlled 'pedagogic discourse' may contribute to the acquisition of formal language skills, while learner-controlled 'natural discourse' may help the development of oral language skills." Therefore, nothing in his careful choice of words contradicts the idea that speaking in the target language
during the foreign language lesson may facilitate language acquisition. These novice instructors may thus memorize the following precept: "Speak and encourage your students to speak French."

Speaking French and motivating nonnative students to speak in this language, however, encompass many assumptions about conversations and discourse that have not yet been tested in a foreign language setting. The task presupposes that novice instructors be able to establish common understanding in a given discursive field in the target language with their students. In other words, it presupposes that teacher and learners of the target language be able to exchange information within a shared communicative context. From previous conversation analysis studies (Moerman & Sacks, 1971), it has been found that one can achieve successful communication only if there are multiple and immediate demonstrations during the interaction by both parties that they understand each other.

Establishing mutual understanding is in itself no small achievement; as Moerman and Sacks (1971, 185) conclude:

[We] are asserting that understanding matters as a natural phenomenon in that conversational sequencing is built in such a way as to require that participants must continually, there and then … demonstrate to one another that they understood or failed to understand the talk they are a party to.
In the present setting, while the topics are always given by the departmental syllabus, one expects the FL teachers to create a communicative context in the target language, to tailor their questions at a level that their heterogeneous group of students will presumably understand within the boundaries of the previously mentioned context, and then engage their students to participate in the activities and conversational exchanges in the target language. While it is expected from teaching associates that they succeed in accomplishing these conversational tasks, they are not given any specific guidelines as to how they need to tackle them. The creation of a meaningful context for conversations to occur in a foreign language is therefore a task that faces foreign language instructors; how it is achieved from a conversational perspective is the problem that this study attempts to clarify.

This central question raises peripheral queries that the comparative framework adopted in this research may allow the researcher to address. These questions concern the possibility to impute strategy differences to variability in the instructors' pedagogical content knowledge, and what kinds of discourse occur in a classroom whether or not the instructors have succeeded to establish a common communicative context for their students to speak in the target language.
V. Research Questions

The objective of the present study is to investigate the following questions:

1. What are the interactional resources used by novice teaching associates to create a meaningful context for the development of verbal interactions in the target language in their classrooms.

2. How do the conversational resources used by a European teaching associate compare to the devices utilized by an American teaching associate?

3. What does the study of the foreign language classroom reveal about the notion of language as a teachable pedagogical content?

VI. Research Design

The study can be described as two ethnographies of classroom communication. The subjects are two teaching associates from the Department of French and Italian at The Ohio State University; one of them is American (Debbie) and one is a native of Sweden (Anne⁹) who has spent an extensive period of time living and studying in France before recently moving to the United States (Cf. next section). These two novice teachers enrolled in the graduate program in French at The Ohio State University in Autumn
1995; they successfully passed a TA training program that is similar to the description given by Goepper and Knorre (1980), and which is summarized in a following section.

The subjects volunteered to take part in this project and did not receive any compensation in return. Their teaching experience prior to enrollment in the Department of French and Italian at The Ohio State University was rather similar: Neither of them had any experience in a classroom at all. Debbie was 23, and Anne was 26 when the data were collected for this project.

As far as their teaching assignment is concerned, they form a comparable pair since Debbie and Anne were each responsible for teaching a different section of Elementary French II (French 102.01). Both of them were given standard departmental syllabi for the class they taught, and, consequently, on any given day, both instructors were supposed to teach the same aspects of the French language. Both instructors taught with the same textbook: *Invitation, Fourth Edition* (Jarvis, Bonin, and Birckbichler, 1993).

The self-stated objective of *Invitation* is to develop communicative proficiency in French. The textbook is divided in eighteen chapters, one preliminary, sixteen thematic chapters, and one final chapter entitled "Invitation à la lecture." Each chapter features a topic such as "the weather" (chapter 8), "health or personal habits" (chapter 11), or "the future" (chapter 14). Each chapter is structured as follows: Vocabulary related to the
topic is presented in the opening section "Point de Départ"; then the first
"Vie et Culture" document of the chapter introduces information about
different aspects of French-speaking cultures; next "Fonctions et
Structures" presents grammatical topics related to the communicational
topic of the chapter; finally, the chapter ends on the second "Vie et Culture"
and the "Intégration et Perspectives" sections providing more cultural
information. Chapters 7 through 12 are studied in French 102.01, the course
taught by Anne and Debbie.

As explained in the previous section, the goal of this study is to
contrast the conversational organizations that these two subjects use to
create any type of student oral production in French. In order to find such
instances of language production, the class sessions were recorded using both
audio- and videotape. It is thus possible to provide descriptions of the lessons
as well as a sample of transcripts to be analyzed. These descriptions, called
logs, were compiled in four copybooks, two for each instructor, and describe
the chronology of pedagogical events for each recorded lesson. Anne and
Debbie also agreed to meet regularly with the researcher during the time of
the data collection (informal interviews). The log descriptions and the
interviews allowed the researcher to become familiar with the context for
language acquisition in both of these two classes.
In the analysis of transcripts, special attention will be given among other features to the use of the habitual questioning patterns and the turn allocation systems. It is believed that the study of these features can lead to valuable conclusions about the sequential structures that lead to successful student production of L2 utterances.

The following time line was adopted for the collection of classroom data. Observations and recordings were scheduled to begin on the first day of class during Winter Quarter, 1996. During the first two weeks, all the lessons in these two classes were taped. At the end of the second week of Winter Quarter, 1996 (Friday, January 12, 1996), recording was temporarily suspended in order for the researcher to meet with the instructors, to ask them informally to comment on the effect that the researcher's presence in their classrooms had on their teaching. This cycle was repeated twice more: Mid-quarter observations and videorecordings were scheduled to take place for two weeks beginning Monday, January 29, 1996; and end-of-quarter data collection was scheduled for Weeks 9 and 10 of the quarter, beginning Monday, February 26, 1996.

Altogether, forty-two hours of classroom recording were available to the researcher for analysis. Ethnographic notes and logs of each lesson were prepared in order to assist in the selection of significant interactional sequences. These descriptive records were then used to locate several types of events in the foreign language classrooms; such interactional events
include how instructors invited their students to respond in French and what they do when they fail to create a verbal exchange in the target language. With these descriptions in hand, it was possible to further reduce the corpus as significant recurring sequences were transcribed for each class. After these operations, the corpus included one hundred twenty-two pages of transcribed classroom interactions: seventy-four pages from Anne's, and forty-eight from Debbie's. No target reduction percentage was set prior to reviewing the recordings. The selection of interactional events was solely based on the contribution of each pedagogical sequence to understanding how instructors succeed in involving their students in a verbal exchange in French, how they fail to produce such an interaction, and what type of communication takes place in the foreign language classroom. These data are presented and analyzed in chapter four.

VII. The teaching associates

The first participant in this study is American. Her pseudonym is Debbie.

Debbie was born in 1972 in Indiana. She is married (her husband is also American), and she graduated from Wright State University in Dayton, Ohio, with a bachelor's degree in French (Cum Laude) in the Spring of 1995. When asked to describe her teaching experience prior to her enrollment at
The Ohio State University, she listed tutoring (5 years), giving private lessons in French to a young boy and his mother with her old textbooks and French picture books (2 years). She had no classroom teaching experience. She had no foreign language education methodology course prior to the TA training workshop defined in a following section.

When asked to define her experience as a learner of French as a foreign language, Debbie reported one experience traveling abroad. For six weeks in the Summer of 1993, she took part in an exchange: She studied for four weeks in *L'Institut Lyonnais* (Lyon, France), and traveled for two weeks from Paris, Avignon, Mont St-Michel (France), and Geneva (Switzerland). In a follow-up interview, Debbie expressed doubts about whether this exchange had any effect on her proficiency in French; she explained that she spent most of her time with other American exchange students and spoke English with them most of the time.

She stated that she followed “about a dozen” courses taught entirely in French. She described these courses as mainly grammar, conversation, and literature courses, and she characterized them as going from lectures to very interactive in content. No further description was offered. In the end, Debbie self-evaluated her own language skills. Even though the researcher did not specify how teaching associates had to evaluate themselves (summary statement of strengths and weaknesses, assessment of their four skills – reading, writing, speaking, listening—and knowledge of culture, etc.), Debbie
chose to give herself a letter grade. She gave herself an A-minus; she justified her choice by explaining that her French was "not bad, just a little rusty." She did not explain why she thought her French was rusty, but she added that it was good enough to teach French Elementary and French Intermediate courses.

Finally, Debbie's long-term professional plans were rather uncertain. She entered the Master's program in French at The Ohio State University because she enjoyed the idea of teaching French. After completion of her Master's degree, Debbie was not sure what she would do.

The second teaching associate is Swedish-French, and her pseudonym is Anne.

Anne was born in 1969. She lives with her fiancé, a French post-doctoral student in Physics invited to continue his research at The Ohio State University. They both arrived in the United States at the end of Summer, 1995. Anne lived in France for six years prior to arriving at The Ohio State University. She earned three college degrees at the University of Paris La Sorbonne Nouvelle—Paris III. The first two degrees (DEUG and Licence) may be compared to an American undergraduate degree. The third degree (Maitrise) is the equivalent of an American Master's degree. Her specialization remained the same for these three degrees: French literature.
Anne described her teaching experience more rapidly than Debbie: She had no teaching experience and never followed a course in foreign language education methodology. When asked whether she had any other professional experience which could help her in her new position as instructor of French as a foreign language, Anne’s immediate response described three summers as a tour guide-interpreter for American tourists in France; she added that she was used speaking French with “foreigners” (i.e., nonnative speakers of French).

Anne speaks not only French and Swedish, but also English and German. She enrolled in Russian courses, and two beginner-level courses in Spanish while studying at the Ohio State University. When asked to assess her proficiency in these different languages, she succinctly states “bilingual in Swedish and French.”

Anne’s professional goals were very precise. She wanted to finish her doctorate degree at the Ohio State University in French/Francophone literature, then go back to France with her fiancé and earn the necessary French academic degrees to teach literature at the college level.
VIII. Explanations and definition of terms

The following terms were used in the study. They are defined as follows.

a) *Adjacency pair, first and second pair parts*: First and second pair parts are the constituents of an adjacency pair. Analyses of the sequential structure of discourse is based on the premise that the production of any conversational action proposes a here-and-now definition of the situation to which subsequent conversational participation will be oriented. This orientation of a relevant next language production is achieved by the production of the first pair part of an “adjacency pair.” A current first pair part projects a range of appropriate second pair parts such as “question/answer,” or “invitation/acceptance/rejection” (Heritage & Atkinson, 1984, 6).

b) *Chunking*: For the purpose of this study, chunking is defined as the process that consists in segmenting the input utterance addressed to the cohort in smaller sets of informational units. These informational units, the “chunks”, are grouped together for students to process more easily—similar to smaller pieces of pre-processed/pre-digested pieces of information.

c) *Cohort*: One of the terms borrowed from the field of Conversation analysis, “cohort” refers to the whole body of language learners being addressed by Anne or Debbie. When the instructor asks a question to the
cohort, all the students—individually and as a group—are asked the question, and any student may either self-select or be selected to provide a response.

d) **Discourse**: Kramsch (1991) argued that the field of SLA does not need to endorse a new notion of *language*, but rather needs to define a stronger concept of *discourse*. SLA has, however, already borrowed notions of discourse from so many different fields (linguistics, psychology, philosophy, applied linguistics, etc.) that the multiplication of related yet different meanings of discourse appear at times to be rather confusing (Cf. Kramsch 1995, 43). At this point, discourse is defined as a set of rules situated in space and time that determine what a given speaker may say. This notion is not as original as it may seem at first; it echoes Michel Foucault's (1972, 117) definition that discourse is "a body of anonymous … rules [which] always determined in the time and space, economic, geographical, or linguistic area, the conditions of operation of the enunciative function." Defining this body of rules helps to limit what can be said in any given situation; it defines what is *sayable*. Discourse therefore becomes the set of rules that defines what is sayable in a given situation, time, and place. The argument leading to the adoption of this definition of discourse is presented in Chapter Two.
e) *Elementary French II (French 102.01):* Undergraduate students at The Ohio State University choosing French to satisfy their foreign language requirement are expected to take a placement test before attending any French class. The number of years studying French in high school and the placement test score are the two critical factors in determining at which minimal level of French the student will be allowed to enter a French class for credit. Ideally, true beginners (1 year or less of high school French and a placement score of 15 or less) are placed at the beginning of the 100-level sequence: French 101.01. Students successfully completing 101.01 are then allowed to enroll in French 102.01, and, upon successful completion of this class, continue with French 103.01. The student population in the low-intermediate French 102.01 may however be more diverse: high school students with a maximum of two years of French and scoring between 16 and 25 on the placement test are allowed to enroll in French 102.01 without having to attend French 101.01. The purpose of the 100-level sequence is to develop proficiency in French in the four skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking, as well as to teach basic concepts about French culture and about the culture of different French-speaking countries. Further details about the content of French 102.01 may be found in the syllabus for this course which is located in the Appendix A.
f) **IRE sequence:** "IRE" stands for Initiation-Reply-Evaluation, a canonical sequence in classroom instruction according to Mehan (1982). The sequence expresses the fact that, once a student responded to one of their questions, teachers have the right and obligation to give a comment on the sufficiency of that answer.

g) **Latch:** A transition between two turns at talk is said to be a latch when no silence and no pause can be heard between the end of the first turn and the beginning of the next one, almost as if Speaker B finishes what Speaker A said.

h) **Lesson plan:** Teaching associates are given a syllabus which contains the list of instructional content for any given day during the quarter. The teaching associates must decide individually how to introduce and teach the different items on the syllabus. The set of activities that an instructor plans in order to teach the different items listed on the syllabus for any given day makes up his/her individual lesson plan for a given day. Bailey (1996, 18) offers the following definition of a lesson plan which can be adopted in the context of the present study: (a) in general terms, it is similar to a road map which indicates where a lesson starts and where it should end, (b) more specifically, it is "some time-bound unit of instruction, often structured around thematic units (e.g., vocabulary items, grammar points, functions, and literary selections)." Broad
departmental guidelines for lesson planning are provided. For instance, it is asked that the lesson plan follow a review/view/preview format (see Jarvis, *et al.*, 1993, xxv). Within this format, instructors are free to use the activities that best suit their own teaching styles and personalities; they are also free to create and use their own teaching materials.

i) *Minimization of gaps between turns at talk*: Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974, 205) have evidenced rules of natural conversations that bring transitions between turns at talk in such a way that each speaker take a new turn only during a narrow window of opportunity that opens with the silence of other candidate speakers, i.e., no earlier than the end of one speaker's turn (no overlap), and to have transitions effected no later than the end of one speaker's turn (no gap).

j) *Pedagogical content knowledge*: If applied to the present setting, the pedagogical content knowledge of the teaching associates would be greater than their knowledge of the French language, and also their pedagogical content knowledge would exceed their communicative competence (Canale & Swain, 1980) in French. A straightforward application of Shulman’s concept to the setting of this study would define pedagogical content knowledge as the knowledge of a relationship between French for communication and its teachability to American undergraduates. Because of the emphasis on proficiency and communication, the content that is the center of this study is therefore the
concept of discourse. It is then necessary to review known properties of
discourse to explore its compatibility with Shulman’s notion of
pedagogical content knowledge.

k) TA training program: All four subjects have satisfied the requirement for
a first-quarter training program that is similar to the description offered
in Goepper and Knorre (1980); i.e., they arrived on The Ohio State
University campus two weeks prior to the beginning of Autumn Quarter
1995, and they followed an intensive two-week workshop, during which
they were introduced to basic concepts of second/foreign language
education and applied these concepts in daily micro-teaching exercises.
Throughout that quarter, the teaching associates also met once per week
in a seminar on teaching French as a foreign language at the university
level, where they worked to improve their knowledge of the fundamentals
of foreign language education.

l) Teaching associate: In this study, both teaching associates are two
graduate students. Both of them are full-time students; i.e., they are
registered for at least nine credit hours per quarter. They have full
responsibility for teaching an Elementary French II (French 102.01) class
at The Ohio State University.
m) **TRP:** “TRP” stands for “transition-relevance place;” it is a term proposed by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974, 704) to qualify the moment in a conversation when Speaker B knows it is appropriate to talk after Speaker A. TRPs often occur during pauses between utterances, but their occurrence is not restricted to these interactional moments.

IX. Conversational vs. classroom discourse

As explained earlier in the presentation of communicative language teaching and the Proficiency movement, the pedagogical message that is emphasized to the novice foreign language teachers is simple: First, speak and make your students speak in the target language, and second, have the language produced in the classroom as close as possible to the language used by native speakers of French. Since communicative discourse, as observed between native speakers of French in a non-classroom setting, is the objective, it is necessary to summarize what is known about natural and classroom discourse.

Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974, 729) proposed that oral discourse (talk) can be conceptualized as a continuum; on this continuum, different kinds of talk can be characterized by their turn allocation system.

The linear array is one in which one polar type (exemplified by conversation) involves “one-turn-at-a-time” allocation, i.e. the use of
local allocational means. The other pole (exemplified by debate) involves pre-allocation of all turns; and medical types (exemplified by meetings) involve various mixes of pre-allocational and local-allocational means.

The formality of verbal exchanges can thus be characterized by their sequential organization. If natural conversations at one pole of this continuum, where may classroom discourse be located in comparison on the same continuum?

Studying the turn-taking system of classroom discourse, McHoul (1978, 211) concluded that “the social identity contrast ‘Teacher/Student’ was expressed in the [turn allocation] system in terms of differential participation rights and obligations.” Detailed findings by McHoul will be quoted whenever appropriate throughout the data analysis, but the conclusion of his study can be summarized as follows: The main feature in the structure of participation to classroom discourse was found to be that only teachers could “creatively” select the next speaker; this predominance of one of the participants to talk production establishes a sharp contrast between natural conversations and classroom exchanges.

In foreign language education, van Lier (1988) studied the turn allocation system and challenged McHoul’s (1978, 188) claim that “only teachers can direct speakership in any creative way.” His data emphasized that many teachers’ utterances were undirected and the learners frequently
self-selected. Van Lier's study made explicit comparisons between classroom and natural discourse.

This comparison between natural and classroom discourse in the communicative foreign language classroom was defined by Edmonson (1985, 162) in a very succinct manner; he characterized the tension between discourse that is appropriate to pedagogic goals and discourse that is appropriate to the pedagogic context as he observed: "We seek in the classroom to teach people how to talk when they are not being taught."

The data presented in chapter four will allow the researcher to conclude whether such tensions are present in the two French 102.01 courses surveyed for this project and to propose conclusions about classroom discourse in both of these courses.

X. Limitations and assumptions

The present study is limited to two teaching associates and to the setting defined in this situation, i.e., teaching French 102. at The Ohio State University. The teaching associates were chosen from a restricted population of nine new candidates who entered the graduate program in French in Autumn 1995, one of whom (the first native speaker of French who had
originally agreed to participate in this study) dropped out of the program at the beginning of the second week of Autumn Quarter, leaving a population of only eight novice teaching associates from which to choose.

If objections can be formulated as to the generalizability of the population surveyed in this study, it is reasoned that the data and the conclusions to which they lead will present an acceptable type of alternative validity, more qualitative in essence, that is defined by Mishler (1990) as "trustworthiness." Clearly a more extensive effort to document and contrast the classroom behaviors of European and American teaching associates is needed if the trustworthiness of two exemplars used in this study is to be established. If implications are to be drawn for future applications in professional development in other colleges and universities, this project shall provide a basis for subsequent research.

XI. Conclusion

Since teaching a foreign language more communicatively implies that the instructor needs to provide the learners with numerous opportunities to speak in the target language and to teach authentic French discourse, it becomes necessary to investigate how foreign language instructors involve their students in communicative exchanges in the target language. Provided
the setting described in chapter one, this is the objective that this study has set for itself.

This initiative was historically situated in a brief overview about the developments in the field of SLA. In light of this overview, the present project was shown in this chapter to be indebted to prior studies which share the common feature of bringing a qualitative perspective on the processes of teaching and learning a second/foreign language. This project is also indebted to studies acknowledging the importance of discourse, rather than a simplified and codified notion of language, to explain the interactional events occurring inside the foreign language classroom and to be more consistent with the profession's objective to teach more communicatively.

The literature relative to teaching associates, pedagogical content knowledge, classroom research in SLA, discourse in the foreign language classroom, and conversation analysis is reviewed in chapter two. Chapter three presents a detailed explanation of the methodological procedures used in the study. Presentation and analysis of the classroom data are found in chapter four. Finally, discussion of the results, conclusions, and recommendations for further study are presented in chapter five.
The novice teachers who are surveyed do not share their classes with colleague or senior faculty; they are therefore considered teaching associates, not teaching assistants (Cf. chapter 2).

Lyster (1994, 448): “C’est en effet la production langagière qui leur permet de mettre à l’épreuve leurs hypothèses concernant la syntaxe et c’est la rétroaction du professeur et des pairs qui les pousse non seulement à se faire comprendre mais aussi à s’exprimer de manière précise, cohérente et appropriée.”

Michel Foucault defines a new diachronic field of study in “The Archeology of Knowledge.” In order to simplify definitions, the term “genealogists” will refer here to researchers adopting this diachronic/archeological standpoint as defined in “The Archeology of Knowledge.”

Cicurel (1994, 43): “Le but de l’ethnographie des discours de la classe est de comprendre comment et pourquoi une assemblée constituée par des élèves et un professeur interagissent dans le but d’apprendre. L’étude des discours de la classe, dans la perspective ethnographique, a pour visée de décrire le fonctionnement langagier d’une entité sociale déterminée—le monde de la classe—par le biais de l’observation des discours effectivement produit et retranscrits.”
Anne, originally from Sweden, spent the six years prior to this study in Paris where she earned her two undergraduate degrees (French Diplôme d'études universitaires générales and licence) and one graduate degree (French Maîtrise) in French literature. At the University of Paris, she had mostly French friends and also met Christophe, her fiancé, with whom she speaks exclusively French. For the purpose of this study, it is assumed that Anne's competence in French is at least as good as that of a true native speaker.

The researcher has spent the two years prior to this study observing TAs teaching French at The Ohio State University as a peer supervisor. It was in this context that different patterns of behavior for European and American TAs became obvious.

The researcher does not imply that large state schools throughout the United State entrust undergraduate language classes only to novice teaching associates. More experienced teaching associates, lecturers, and professors may also be assigned to undergraduate language classes. The situation that is described here is the following: When a graduate student is awarded a teaching scholarship, he or she is more likely to be assigned to a first-year language class. In addition, it is not implied that teaching associates rarely have any classroom experience teaching a foreign language. It is simply stated that, of the two subjects who volunteered for this study, neither Anne nor Debbie had any classroom experience at all.
To emphasize the immediacy of the shared construction of a verbal exchange, conversation analysts sometimes use the term “on line.” These on line demonstrations of common understanding are explained in the quote by Moerman and Sacks (1971, 185).

Anne, and Debbie are aliases because one of the teaching associates (Debbie) requested not to be named in this study.

Invitation to reading

Point of departure

Life and culture

Functions and structures

It was the first day of Week 5 of the ten-week quarter.

The neologism “sayable” is borrowed from Karlis Racevskis (Racevskis, personal communication, April 17 1995) and translates the following substantive in French: “dicible” (see Kerbrat-Orecchioni 1990, 30) that defines, as noted earlier, what can be said in a given situation within the boundaries of a discursive formation.
Overview

A study of the interactional resources used by novice teaching associates to create a meaningful context for the development of verbal interactions in the foreign language classroom will entail a review of the following analytical domains: the teaching associate; pedagogical content knowledge; notion of discourse in the foreign language classroom; classroom research and ethnography; as well as conversation analysis. The order in which these topics are reviewed reflects a progression from general topics (teaching associates, their pedagogical content knowledge, and the kind of discourse in the foreign language classroom) to more specific concerns about the ontological and epistemological positions, as well as the analytic program adopted in the present study (e.g., classroom research and ethnography; as well as conversation analysis).
I. The teaching associate

It seems useful to clarify a source of ambiguity: The terms teaching associate and teaching assistant are not necessarily interchangeable. The literature on this topic is often ambiguous, but it seems that teaching assistant is now used as a generic term to characterize a graduate student who performs an ill-defined type of teaching assignment in return for financial help from the university. The ambiguity was born out of the fact that departments have entrusted their graduate students with different types of teaching assignments. The teaching assistant is generally and traditionally pictured as someone who assists a professor in the teaching of a given subject matter. In several fields, however, graduate students who teach have outgrown this restrictive definition. They often do not share their teaching assignment with a senior faculty member and may be the main contact that students have with the department (Azevedo, 1990, 24).

Such TAs need to be recognized as a distinct group because the duties, tasks, and responsibilities of graduate students who are the sole knowledge providers in their classrooms are different from the duties, tasks, and responsibilities of their peers who merely provide opportunities to practice concepts taught by the main instructor. When college departments entrust their graduate students with the sole responsibility of the teaching load, the term “teaching associate” will be preferred in the present study. This very
practical distinction is, however, hardly acknowledged in the literature, where “teaching assistant” remains the descriptive heading for all the studies concerning graduate students teaching at the college level.

This study uses “teaching associate” to refer specifically to graduate students who are the sole instructors in their FL classes; “teaching assistant,” or “TA,” is used in a more generic manner to refer to graduate students who teach or assist in the teaching of undergraduate courses, without further defining the responsibility of the instructors. When the term “teaching assistant,” or “TA,” is used in a generic manner in the present study, it shows that the authors of the reported studies intended to include to both groups of graduate students.

Beyond the definition of the two groups of graduate students, the teaching assistant, whom Kaplan (1984, viii) defines as “he [who] faces, Janus-like, in two directions, being neither truly student nor truly faculty,” has generated both academic work and personal reactions. Azevedo (1990, 24) explains why TAs play an important role in colleges and university. He shows that the employment of large numbers of graduate students as TAs derives from a twofold need to hire relatively inexpensive instructors for teaching introductory courses for undergraduates in a mass education system, and to provide financial support for graduate students who, without this help, might not be able to attend school. In the field of foreign languages, becoming a TA also provides a valuable professional teaching
experience. The usefulness of TAs is therefore undeniable; it seems even more impossible to deny when one remembers the argument originally proposed by Orth (1982) that today's teaching assistants will be tomorrow's faculty, and that universities therefore have the obligation of providing this opportunity to as many students as possible.

The literature concerning these college-level instructors is replete with questions concerning their lack of teaching experience and/or their lack of familiarity with the cultural context in which they have to teach. Much of the research efforts, however, have generally concentrated on international teaching assistants (ITAs) performing in content-area classes.

Bailey, Pialorsi, & Zukowski-Faust (1984) offer a review of the common problems that ITAs have typically met in U.S. universities; they coined a generic name for the topic: the foreign teaching assistant problem. A clear illustration of this "problem" is the following excerpt from a letter published in the Minnesota Daily (quoted in Bailey, 1984, 4; Rounds, 1987, 644):

It is not fair for students to take a class such as math, economics, or statistics, and listen to someone whom they cannot understand lecture, but whose material they are responsible for... It is ridiculous to go in to obtain individualized instruction when students can't understand the teacher to begin with.
As a response, Bailey (1984, 4) quotes letters sent to school officials suggesting that "undergraduate students' ethnocentrism" is often the problem:

Research indicates that some U.S. students decide they will have difficulty understanding their instructor simply upon learning that the instructor is an international. This attitude can be changed very slowly, but only through U.S. students' increased contact with people from other countries in both educational and social settings.

McCone (1994, 51) summarized the same aspect of the problem when he argued that undergraduate students play a crucial role in determining the success of a teacher's communication. His Vygotskyan perspective allowed him to escape the use of value-laden terms (such as "ethnocentrism") in order to show that, in this situation, American undergraduates and ITAs have little or no basis for intersubjectivity¹. In his conclusion, he emphasizes the need to find prompt solutions to the foreign teaching assistant problem since TAs and ITAs are an important part of higher education.

Most publications that followed Bailey, Pialorsi, & Zukowski-Faust (1984) are concerned with: (a) defining more precisely the foreign TA problem (Lambert & Tice, 1993); (b) sharing how specific programs assess the adequacy of international candidates for the demands of a teaching assistantship in North America (Richards & Crookes, 1988; Yule & Hoffman,
1990); (c) offering specific advice for educating ITAs (Waldinger, 1990; Rhodes, 1993; Yule & Hoffman, 1993); and/or (d) relating case-studies of particularly successful/unsuccessful ITAs (Tapper, 1994).

Case-studies are noteworthy, not because they pretend to present universally valid answers to the ITA conundrum, but because the wealth of details that their descriptions provide allows the reader to form hypotheses about both successful and unsuccessful instances of classroom communication. Smith (1993), for instance, presents the case-study of a successful ITA, Li, a Chinese graduate student responsible for a science laboratory. Smith explains that Li is successful because he was able to use "imposed conditions" to serve "selected (personal) goals," and also because his personal goals helped him improve his performances on the academic "imposed conditions". She concludes that:

The developmental process of "making it fit" would be enhanced tremendously if ITAs believed their assistantship provided the means of achieving their personal goals. A positive attitude about trying unfamiliar teaching approaches, experimenting with language, learning from students and understanding a new culture would contribute to productive behavior needed to achieve these goals. (Smith, 1993, 161-2)
The relevance of Smith's case-study to the present study can be expressed as follows. If "making it fit" involves using contractual obligations to the university department in order to serve personal objectives, and using selected personal goals to improve academic teaching performances, how do Smith's conclusion compare in a different setting, such as the case of an ITA teaching his/her native language? What are the goals and imposed conditions of a TA teaching his/her native language? How is it relevant to the task of creating successful communication in the target language? The notion suggests, however, that success involves more than mere linguistic proficiency in the language of instruction. It suggests that, for successful TAs, the problem may be one of finding a common ground between personal beliefs, contractual requirements, course/departmental objectives, and communicative language teaching priorities.

Successful communication, according to Smith (1993), involves more than linguistic competence in the target language. Yule & Hoffman (1993) asked a group of 43 US undergraduates to evaluate the teaching/communication skills of ITAs through mock teaching exercises. Their project was meant to test the common belief that good language skills yield good teaching. The results of their study confirm earlier findings (Yule and Hoffman, 1990), which stated that high verbal test scores are no guarantee that the ITAs would be able to present and organize instructional material. Similar findings are available in the field of English as a Second
Language (ESL), but this issue needs to be investigated for the context presented in this study: Is it possible to equate the ability to speak the target language fluently with the ability to communicate and teach in this target language, while also teaching about the language and culture(s) in which the language is spoken?

Research on ITA education therefore set as its goal to describe, beyond the formal aspects of language (syntax, phonology, etc.), the skills that need to be mastered if ITAs are to be successful when teaching their American students. Hoekje and Williams (1992) showed that, in order to respond to these long-known problems, most university programs have answered with language-centered and skill-centered needs analyses (i.e., TAs who are native speakers of English are observed and language items and functions are listed). ITAs are later "taught" these language items and functions. Some of the functions that are commonly lacking in the teaching of ITAs reflect the importance of nonlinguistic factors (e.g., perceived authoritarian vs. nonauthoritarian approaches, importance of "teaching skills," understanding of structure of U.S. higher education) which are often summarized under the headings of pedagogy and culture. Hoekje and Williams used Hymes' (1972) and also Canale & Swain's (1980) communicative competence framework.
while arguing in favor of teaching communicative competence for classroom usage:

[Although] the communication problems of ITAs are often perceived as a problem of English oral proficiency effectiveness, we maintain that, for ITAs, the aim is effective language usage while performing the role of TA. (Hoekje & Williams, 1992, 247)

The researchers agreed with Orth (1982, 57) and McCone (1994, 49) that language proficiency is context-dependent. They argued that the nature and the purposes of the communication, the roles and attitudes of the different interlocutors, and the topic of the exchange all play a role in determining the proficiency of the nonnative speaker.

Are Hoekje and Williams' conclusions applicable to the context of the present study? Does a native speaker possess the specific communicative competence necessary to perform the role of TA—that is, the specific communicative competence necessary to create a conversational exchange in the target language? The literature on FL teaching assistants' communicative competence is limited. Previous studies, however, may instruct the reader about elements which help define the communication between TAs and their students. The way in which TAs conceptualize their role may be an important element.
Turner (1988) investigated TA perception of problems and TA perception of role in teaching Spanish as a foreign language in college classes. She raised many issues that are relevant to the specific reasons justifying TA behavior in the FL classroom. For instance, she argued that the way TAs perceive their roles necessarily influences their classroom conduct. Turner proposed the following roles: imparting skills-transmitter of knowledge, affecting pupils' attitude toward learning, arranging classroom situation, disciplinarian, etc.

However, listing relevant perceived duties and roles may not be as useful as synthesizing the aspects of the instructor's knowledge and personality that are relevant to the way he or she conceptualizes his/her role in the classroom. Bailey (1984, 7) proposed a tentative conclusion which regrouped the differences between ITAs' performances and American undergraduate students' expectations:

Among the difficulties most often cited (in descending order of frequency) were cultural differences between TAs and students, finding the right words to express one's ideas, students' complaints about the TAs' pronunciation, general communication problems, and a lack of trust from the students, who blame the TAs for their comprehension problems with the subject matter.
Bailey (1984, 3) proposed that ITAs have to face difficulties that were different from linguistic difficulties in the language of instruction; these difficulties were both communicative and cultural in nature. She was even more specific when she suggested that these differences may result from the ways TAs and their audiences conceptualize the role of the instructor in the specific discipline that is taught; her data showed that students who did not share a common major with their TA were more critical in their evaluations of the ITA (Bailey, 1984, 13).

Thus, the elusive foreign TA problem involves phenomena that may include, but exceeds, linguistic concerns. For the TAs, the conditions of success may be determined by their knowledge of their students' expectations, by their usage of their content/discipline knowledge, by their ability to communicate this knowledge, or some combination of the three. The literature offers the concept pedagogical content knowledge to characterize these different aspects of a teacher's competence, and it is now appropriate to introduce this notion.
II. Pedagogical content knowledge

Shulman, who provides a way to conceptualize the notion of teacher's knowledge, based his efforts on a detailed study of old examination forms in order to conceptualize the underlying assumptions about efficient teaching. According to Shulman:

The assumptions underlying those tests are clear. The person who presumes to teach subject matter to children must demonstrate knowledge of that subject matter as a prerequisite to teaching.

(Shulman, 1986, 5)

He then examined standards in terms of teacher certification; he noticed that several states require certification examinations. However, he contested the content of these tests. They were, according to him, mostly concerned with general pedagogical matters; that is, they focused on (1) organization in preparing and presenting instructional plans; (2) evaluation; (3) recognition of individual differences; (4) cultural awareness; (5) understanding youth; (6) management; and (7) educational policies and procedures. Shulman's research asked the following question: Where did the subject matter go and what happened to the content? In order to answer this question, he first explained his efforts to redress this imbalance by focusing on "Knowledge Growth in Teaching."
Because such a framework is helpful to novice teachers in teaching French as a foreign language, a review of the work on pedagogical content knowledge is important to the scope of this study. For Shulman, the necessary and sufficient knowledge base to teach a given subject matter was based on three categories of knowledge: (1) curricular knowledge, (2) subject matter content knowledge, and (3) pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1986, 9).

In his discussion of curricular knowledge, Shulman (1986, 10) offered the following metaphor: "Would we trust a physician who did not really understand the alternative ways of dealing with categories of infectious disease, but who knew only one?" In their professional exercise, instructors, like physicians, face problems of different natures; they need to know more than one solution per problem to be efficient. It is therefore necessary for them to have some knowledge of alternative curriculum materials and some knowledge of curriculum materials in other disciplines.

Content knowledge, on the other hand, was defined as follows: "This refers to the amount and organization of knowledge per se in the mind of the teacher..." Shulman (1986, 9). He was, however, aware that the amount and organization of knowledge is not necessarily an entity that is objectively definable:

In the different subject matter areas, the ways of discussing the content structure of knowledge differ. To think properly about content
knowledge requires going beyond knowledge of the facts or concepts of a domain. It requires understanding the structures of the subject matter. (Shulman, 1986, 9)

To understand the structures of the subject matter as defined above, Shulman (1987) believed that one must become a member of a specific academic community (i.e., the community that defines the content of the discipline). Shulman emphasized this idea as he explained:

[Teaching] is, essentially, a learned profession. A teacher is a member of a scholarly community. He or she must understand the structures of the subject matter, the principles of conceptual organization, and the principles of inquiry that help answer two kinds of questions in each field: What are the important ideas and skills in this domain? And how are new ideas added and deficient ones dropped by those who produce knowledge in this area? (Shulman, 1987, 9)

In the context of the present study, being a member of the community requires that teaching associates understand the structure of French for communication, be able to answer the two questions previously asked by Shulman: What are the important ideas and skills in French for communication?; how are new ideas about French for communication added and inadequate ideas dropped? In more general terms, answering these two questions will help define "the structures of the subject matter" for the
teaching of French as a foreign language, and consequently define some elements of content knowledge for the teaching of foreign languages.

The third category in Shulman's knowledge base is pedagogical content knowledge; which Shulman defined as follows:

[Pedagogical content knowledge] goes beyond knowledge of a subject matter per se to the dimension of subject matter knowledge for teaching... [It is composed of] the aspects of content most germane to its teachability. (Shulman, 1986, 9)

Refining his definition, Shulman (1987, 8) proposed the definition that has been quoted so often: "pedagogical content knowledge [is] that special amalgam of content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province of teachers, their own special form of professional understanding." He emphasized, however, that pedagogical content knowledge is the result of a dynamic process that includes comprehension of the content, and comprehension of purpose; transformations, combination or ordering of the processes such as preparation of the instructional materials, representation of the ideas, selections of instructional methods and models, and adaptation of the previous representations to the characteristics of the pupils; instruction, evaluation of the teaching performance, and reflections about how to improve the classroom performance, which leads to new comprehensions. Shulman (1987, 19) warned that, even though the processes summarized above are presented in a sequence, they represent neither a set of fixed phases nor a
series of steps; the sequence tries to capture a competence that allows teachers to improve their classroom techniques. Shulman added that teacher education needs to provide student teachers with the understandings and performance abilities that are needed in order to complete an act of pedagogy.

Shulman and one of his doctoral students, Sigrun Gudmundsdottir, documented the notion of pedagogical content knowledge. One of their earliest interests was to contrast the pedagogical content knowledge of novice and experienced teachers. Shulman & Gudmundsdottir (1987) compared two social science teachers. They assumed that both instructors were specialists in their fields, and contended that the observed differences between their behaviors in the classroom were only due to differences in pedagogical content knowledge. For instance, they explained that, while the expert teacher developed sophistication in segmenting and structuring the curriculum and knew the positives and the negatives of each approach, the novice teacher, in contrast, knew only one way and he or she tended to visualize only one unit at a time. The novice teacher in the study did not often see the connections or development from one unit to the next. This inability to enforce a continuity and make connections was evidenced by research which showed that student teachers learned short-term coping techniques only to make it through the next lesson. It is suggested that short-term plans may be all that a novice teacher can count on as a result of
a limited pedagogical content knowledge. The conclusion of Shulman &
Gudmundsdottir (1987, 67-68) stated that:

[The research] suggests that visualizing larger and larger units in
terms of curriculum is an important element in a growing pedagogical
content knowledge. Veteran teachers can more easily make sense of
large units like a course of study. Novices, on the other hand, think
about one move at a time without trying to see relationships to the
larger whole. This observation is supported by cognitive psychology
where an expert is defined as someone who can form larger and more
powerful structures which organize smaller pieces of information.

How do these trends manifest themselves in the domain of teaching
French as a foreign language? The overall pedagogical goal in the French
classroom is to communicate in the target language. Nevertheless, one
wonders whether the teaching associates in the present study adopt short-
term coping techniques to make their students speak French, or whether
they display some consistency in their approach to target language
production. If differences between the target language production techniques
are observed, to which aspects of the teaching associates' background should
they be attributed?

The present study proposes to control as much as possible the effect of
experience on the TAs' pedagogical content knowledge. Both subjects started
teaching at the same time for the Department of French and Italian at The
argued, therefore, that observed differences among the two subjects cannot be attributed to the graduate school experience factor. If these different ways to elicit French in the foreign language classroom are nonetheless attributed to differences in pedagogical content knowledge, one needs to explain the relationship between Shulman's pedagogical content knowledge and discourse, which is the content that teaching associates have to teach.

Before teaching differences among the two participants in this study may indeed be attributed to differences in their pedagogical content knowledge, it is necessary to define the content that language instructors teach. How is language to be organized into a content structure that could, like social studies and mathematics in Shulman's research, be emphasized and then taught to inexperienced TAs? Shulman refers to the "structures of the subject matter", but what are these structures in the field of teaching a foreign language?

III. Notion of discourse in the foreign language classroom

Analyses and discussions of language as an identifiable structure is a question that is neither new nor original. Linguists have organized language into categories, concepts, and units, but their work is only partly concerned with these aspects of language that are meaningful to teachers of foreign
languages. Stern (1983, 97-114) provided a brief historical summary of foreign language education, indicating that it is currently less about syntax, phonology, and morphology than about communication and culture.

Since communication and culture are the objectives that foreign language teachers have set for themselves, the content that needs to be organized is consequently less language than discourse. Language, the linguistic competence presented in Chomsky (1965), is an abstraction created by linguists for the purpose of analysis. Language has already been organized into categories, concepts, and units. It is a structured content that fits Shulman's guidelines. However, language, defined as the Chomskyan notion of linguistic competence, has been severely criticized, since it does not account for the knowledge of communication and culture that foreign language instructors need to teach to their students. In short, it does not accommodate the type of knowledge described in the following quote.

Native speakers of a language speak not only with their own individual voices, but through them speak also the established knowledge of their native community and society, the stock of metaphors this community lives by, and the categories they use to represent their experience... This makes native speakers' way of speaking predictable enough to be understood by other native speakers, but it is also what makes it so difficult for non-native
speakers to communicate with native speakers, because they do not share the native speaking community's memory and knowledge.

(Kramsch, 1993, 43)

These multiple voices from the target discursive community, these metaphors which make meaning so predictable, and this native speaking community's knowledge are dimensions that a Chomskyan definition of language does not typically accommodate.

The problem posed by Chomsky's linguistic competence is that it defines all the possible grammatical utterances, but it predicts more than what is actually acceptable in a given social, geographical, and historical situation. Sociolinguists such as Hymes (Hymes, 1972) have already argued that Chomsky over-predicts what can actually be said, what has been called the "sayable". Bourdieu (1977, 20) explained the problem as follows:

Chomskyan competence is an abstraction which does not include the competence that allows the speaker to use adequately the competence (when is it necessary to speak, not to speak, to speak in this language or that one, etc.). The problem is not the possibility of generating a great number of grammatically coherent utterances, but the possibility of using, coherently and adequately, a great number of utterances in a great number of different situations. Practical knowledge of syntax is useless without practical knowledge of the conditions that govern adequate use of the countless possibilities offered by syntax⁵.
Therefore, Chomsky's linguistic competence needs to be replaced by a concept which does, in Bourdieu's own words, "include the competence that allows the speaker to use adequately the competence." One cannot help but notice how the knowledge emphasized by Bourdieu includes the notion of knowledge which, according to Kramsch's (1993, 43), foreign language instructors need to communicate to the language learners. Kramsch (1991, 192) reformulated her own description when she proposes a shorter definition of the same concept.

[Discourse is] all the rules and categories of language use that organize our thoughts and our experience and that are so taken for granted, so much assumed as constituent part of our cognitive system and therefore of knowledge, that they remain unvoiced and unreflected.

According to the knowledge of Kramsch's "rules and categories of language use that organize our thoughts and our experience," it is therefore discourse competence that a conception of language organized as mere linguistic content would not be able to capture. If verbal production in the target language is an important objective, and if communication and culture are to be taught, it is therefore discourse that needs to be presented to language learners in foreign language classrooms.
In order to satisfy the emphasis on communication and culture, it is thus necessary to adopt discourse as the primary content to be practiced in the foreign language classroom. However, is such a concept self-evident and open to investigation; is it transparent? In order to be consistent with the previous argument against the notion of language, the concept of discourse that needs to be adopted is one that recognizes not only Bourdieu's (1977) rules of adequacy, but also Kramsch's (1993, 43) insights that such discourse carries with itself "the established knowledge of [the] native community and society, the stock of metaphors this community lives by," (i.e., the signs and marks of a long history of use and practice). Therefore, the notion of discourse that needs to be adopted is more than "a certain interjection between speaking and thinking" (Foucault, 1971), more than thoughts made visible through unambiguous and friendly signs (i.e., the words). This discourse is more than this immediate translation of thoughts into the world outside the speaker, and it entails rules that limit the use of grammatical utterances that Chomsky's linguistic competence makes available. How can such a concept be described?

Foucault's insight is that discourse develops control mechanisms that determine the ways in which a native community will be able to speak and think about a given topic, and how it will affect and be affected by daily practices. For instance, Foucault demonstrated in several studies that the way in which mental illness was talked about influenced the development of
psychology (Foucault 1957, 1965, 1970). Foucault (1991, 63) emphasized the same constitutive properties found in Kramsch (1993). He defined discourse: it is not what was “meant,” which he qualified as “that obscure and heavy charge of intentions, imagined as carrying far more weight, in its shadowy way, than what is said.” He continued his definition of discourse as follows:

[Int] is not what has remained mute (those imposing things which do not speak, but leave their traceable marks, their dark profile set off against the light surface of what is said): discourse is constituted by the difference between what one could say correctly at one period (under the rules of grammar and logic) and what is actually said.

Having rejected the idea of discourse as the non-problematized representation of the speaker's (or writer's) thoughts, Foucault thus reduced the general notion of discourse to the more manageable concept of discursive field®, which he defined as the difference between what one can correctly say at a given moment in time, and what one actually say®. The notion of correctness described above is not without logical ties to Bourdieu's notion of "adequacy," but Foucault's discursive field (what is actually said) can logically be inferred to be more restrictive than Bourdieu's idea of competence (what may be adequately said in a given situation). This difference is crucial since it reflects two opposing views of discourse. On the one hand, Bourdieu (1977), as well as sociolinguists such as Hymes who proposed the notion of competence, considered a domain of possibilities and probabilities, (i.e., what
is said and what the analyst considers to be forms that could have been substituted). On the other hand, Foucault considered only what was actually said, and did not infer a hypothetical competence, but described a range of "regulated practices" (Foucault 1991, 63).

Therefore, it appears at this point that an emphasis on communication in the foreign language classroom leads to the adoption of discourse as the main content to be presented; discourse has been shown to be constituted of discursive fields that are themselves the products of discursive practices. The promotion of communication in the foreign language classroom therefore entails the description of discursive practices during the French as a foreign language lesson.

After defining the notion of discursive practices, Foucault summarized their functioning, and related how his work built on such a concept of discourse:

...in discourse something is formed, according to clearly definable rules; [...] this something exists, subsists, changes, disappears, according to equally definable rules; in short [...] alongside everything a society can produce (alongside: that is to say, in a determinate relationship with) there is the formation and transformation of "things said". It is the history of these "things said" that I have undertaken to write. (Foucault, 1991, 63)
Recognizing the order of discourse, Foucault wrote the history of these changes in discursive practices. The diachronic analyses of the discursive practices in a given field or discipline constituted most of his work. Foucault (1994, 826-7) did not, however, deny that synchronic analyses can also be performed:

The synchronic point of view is not a static picture that would deny evolution; on the contrary, it is the analysis of the necessary conditions for evolution to occur... [S]ynchronic analysis asks the question: For changes to happen, what are other transformations which need to happen in this contemporary field? It is indeed a different way to analyze change, and is in no way a denial of this change in favor of immobility.

Synchronic analyses of discourse are therefore not only presented as being compatible with the definition of discursive practices that has been reviewed, but they are also instrumental in showing that discursive formations are not governed by the "themes of universal mediation" between discourse and experience. Foucault (1972), however, stressed that such analyses have several pitfalls; the most serious of which seems to be the reduction of the discursive formations to be analyzed to mere linguistic constructions, or logical riddles to be decrypted, both of which would create a circularity which would send the reader back to the notion of a transparent language.
In the foreword to *The Order of Things*, Foucault (1970, xiv) explained:

Discourse in general, and scientific discourse in particular, is so complex a reality that we not only can, but should, approach it at different levels and with different methods. If there is one approach that I do reject, however, it is that (one might call it broadly speaking, the phenomenological approach) which gives absolute priority to the observing subject, which attributes a constituent role to an act... which in turn leads to a transcendental consciousness\(^{12}\). It seems to me that the [...] analysis of scientific discourse should, in the last resort, be subject, not to a theory of the knowing subject, but rather to a theory of discursive practice.

Veyne's (1978, 215) concise statement summarized Foucault's notion of discourse: It is to be found neither in semantics, nor in ideologies, nor in complex logical riddles, but in praxis; and to study discourse is not to explain it in terms of its fixed and secretly intended meanings, but in terms of the practices which define its coherence\(^{13}\). Since the synchronic analysis of discourse practices as previously defined concentrates on what is actually said/written, since it focuses on the practices which lead to an apparent coherence in discourse, this synchronic analysis does not contradict Foucault's definition of discourse.
Moreover, such synchronic analyses, Foucault (1994, 838-9) adds, may prove useful to several different fields and disciplines. He explains:

I think that the sociologist could enrich linguistics\textsuperscript{14} itself, if he [sic] gets rid of his attitude of total rejection or unconditional acceptance and that he asks the question: What do I need to change in the concepts, methods, and procedures in linguistics so that I can use all these in this or this other domain?\textsuperscript{15}

The present study asks in a similar fashion: How can discursive formations be examined? How can the discursive practices defining the FL classroom be documented?

IV. Classroom research, ethnographies, and SLA.

Classroom research has recently entered the field of SLA. The novelty caused some misunderstandings in the profession; as Nunan (1991) pointed out, a confusion was often made where classroom research failed to be differentiated from classroom-oriented research. The latter consists of studies motivated by issues relevant to classroom second/foreign language acquisition, whereas the former takes place in language classrooms, allowing the researcher to obtain insights into the classroom as a cultural system (Chaudron, 1988). As explained in the previous chapter, the main focus of the present study is the verbal behavior of two teaching associates in the
language classroom. It is therefore necessary to collect and analyze naturally occurring samples of speech from the FL classroom. After presenting examples of classroom research in SLA, this section describes the epistemological position and the analytic program which define the study.

According to Gaies (1983), scholars who are interested in second/foreign language classroom research have based their efforts on three premises. First, they rejected the idea that classrooms differ on a single trait or characteristic (e.g., "method"); second, they understood the urgent need to describe instructional events as precisely as possible in order to further our collective understanding of SLA processes; and finally, language lessons are understood as socially constructed events involving instructor(s), learners, and specific contexts. These scholars considered using ethnography to describe the different routines that constitute a second/foreign language lesson. In the same review of literature, Gaies listed some of the advantages of ethnography. Among others, he remarked that it provides rich descriptions which may help define the context(s) for language acquisition.

Some attempts to use ethnographies in SLA involve different investigations of the nature of classroom discourse in second/foreign language lessons that imported various analytic programs and methodological procedures from outside the field. Among other examples, Ellis (1994) mentioned attempts to bring to SLA research Mehan's (1979) three components of lessons, Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) hierarchical
model of the structure of a lesson, and even Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson's (1974) organization of turn-taking. These examples make it clear that varying ontological positions were "invited" in SLA research. This eclecticism suggested to some SLA specialists that much could be learned from applying theoretical frameworks that were not originally developed for language education; e.g., Kramsch (1985) argued that the nature of classroom talk does not differ qualitatively from natural conversation, but that its nature depends on the roles the different interactants agree to adopt, the nature of the pedagogical tasks, and the type of knowledge that is targeted (i.e., instructional intervention or natural discussion); therefore, SLA researchers are warranted in borrowing new ways to characterize discourse from other disciplines. Many of these new ways characterizing classroom talk implied that new research methodologies be used in SLA research. Therefore, an openness to qualitative research methodologies used in related fields has become a popular position.

Van Lier (1988) provided one such attempt to investigate SLA with qualitative classroom research methodologies. He presented a study based on a large corpus of classroom observations, and concluded that there are four types of FL classroom interactions that are determined by whether or not the instructor controls the topic of the interaction, and by the modality of the interaction (i.e., the pedagogical activity). Although he emphasized elsewhere that one needs to be "on guard against high-risk inferences" (van
Lier, 1988, 16), and even if his conclusions may be challenged for not considering, for instance, whether the instructor is a native speaker of the target language, or what the interactional task demands from the interactants, his message can be paraphrased as follows: Observation is central to SLA research.

The problem remains what, when, how often and how to observe. For second-language acquisition research, it is clear that second-language development in action must be observed. If the argument is presented that the L2 classroom is an important place where this development occurs, then classroom must be observed (van Lier, 1988, 22). Van Lier therefore argued in favor of classroom research since it produces studies "which aim to understand what goes on in classrooms and why, in the same way anthropologists aim to understand unknown cultures" (van Lier, 1988, xiii). To conclude his argument, van Lier stressed that such observations can expose a domain often undocumented in previous studies: the context for language acquisition.

Van Lier (1988, xiii) added that classroom research studies share the common characteristic of allocating special attention to "the social context of that which is described." More than just a rebellion against positivist research methodologies, this change in analytic programs proposed by van Lier is an epistemological reflection on the meaning of observed facts. The scientific method, which is the model for quantitative inquiry, neglects the
context of the language learning interaction in order to increase control over
explained:

Experimental procedures are generally successful to the extent that,
through experimental manipulation, behavioral variation is limited to
those aspects selected for investigation under controlled conditions. In
this context, it is the experimenter who must determine the relevant
dependent and independent variables, and the experimenter's
formulation of these variables will tend to be restricted by what he or
she can anticipate on an intuitive basis. Yet without previous
exposure to a range of naturally occurring interactional data, the
experimenter is unlikely to anticipate the range, scope, and variety of
behavioral variation that might be responsive to experimental
manipulation, nor will he or she be in a position to extrapolate from
experimental findings to real situations of conduct.

They argued, consequently, that efficient experimental procedures may not
mention the fact that they rely on observations and descriptions of the
phenomenon under study. Experimental procedures cannot, however, be
successful without knowledge of the given phenomenon that is based on
preliminary observations and descriptions. Heritage & Atkinson (1994, 3) added:

By the same token, while certain of the experimenter's data may or may not be artifacts of the more general experimental situation in which the data were produced, such influences (if any) can be determined only by systematic comparison with a large corpus of naturally occurring data. The most economical procedure, therefore, has been to work on naturally occurring materials from the outset. Naturally occurring interaction presents an immense range of circumstances—effectively amounting to a "natural laboratory"—for the pursuit of hunches and the investigation of the limits of particular formulations by systematic comparison.

Heritage and Atkinson therefore argued that collecting naturally occurring data is ultimately not only a more efficient but also a more economical procedure. Moreover, this approach leads to a better appreciation for the context in which language acquisition interactions take place.

Van Lier (1988, 9) proposes that the context for language acquisition is important because it is "dynamic," and because it helps define meaning; in other words, the idea that meaning is situationally and contextually defined entered the field of SLA. It is, however, impossible to acknowledge the fact that meanings are situationally and contextually defined without considering, by the same token, the great potential for ambiguity and/or
misunderstanding in verbal interactions. By their very essence, objects and interactional exchanges—what was previously defined as discourse—are equivocal without a visible context: Meanings are indexical (Holstein & Gubrium, 1994, 265). During oral exchanges, interactions become the site for generating a meaningful context, and both speakers assemble their respective understanding of the on-going communication to create the context that gives meaning to their interventions (Garfinkel, 1967, 6-7). One therefore needs to investigate how, because of the indexicality of meanings, speakers are able to communicate. One needs to study how two conversants from different language backgrounds and different language proficiency build common understanding from indexical expressions. Summarizing this position, Mishler (1979, 14) wrote that "the principal topic of research should become the study of the remedying practices through which we make sense of each other in the ongoing course of our talk and action." Describing how novice teachers and language learners make sense of each other, while the interactional task at hand is for the former to help the latter to produce communicatively logical responses, is the goal that this study has set for itself. The physical and institutional backgrounds in which data were collected, the notion of discourse as practice, the epistemological position that has been defined for this study are all factors that need to be taken into
account in order to adopt an analytic program that is compatible with its setting and objectives. The emphasis remains on practice, on what is said or written.

The acknowledgment of a specific analytical determines the epistemological position that has been defined for the present study. In the present setting (i.e., FL classrooms), the nature of the analytic program is constrained by the definition of discourse which has been adopted. As previously argued, this study needs a methodological approach that is "directed towards that which, outside man, makes it possible to know" (Foucault, 1970, 378), and an approach that leads to a theory of discursive practice (Foucault, 1970, xiv).

V. Conversation analysis

Foucault recommended a methodical approach that is "directed towards that which, outside man, makes it possible to know" (Foucault, 1970, 378). In the conclusion of The Order of Things, he argued in favor of a model for the human sciences that finds meanings not in the consciousness of the modern man, but in the forces and mechanisms which influence his behavior. It is the reason why ethnology provides a sound model of scientific endeavor; it forces the observer to leave behind his/her own prejudices in order to reveal the rules that govern ordinary actions in another culture.
The point of view that an observer adopts to observe rituals and everyday life routines among people from another culture is the prime quality of the approach that must be found. Is this point of view impossible to adopt when one decides to look at the rituals and routines that define his/her own culture? Foucault's response was unequivocal: "We can perfectly well apprehend our own society's ethnology" (Foucault, 1970, 377). Foucault's notion of discourse supposes the existence of rules, forces, and orders that influence how one is to speak or write; it also assumes that this order of discourse is born out of generations of discursive practices by members of a given discursive community. Further, it states that members of a given discursive community are so used to this discursive order that they are rarely able to step outside of it. What human sciences have been able to do so far is to look outside a given discursive order to look at another order in a different time and/or place and reveal the regularities that define the orderliness of the form of discourse being studied. While Foucault acknowledged that the same approach could be taken within one's own community, he did not explain how such an enterprise may be done within one's own discursive community.

Indications about how to use Foucault's notion of discourse are suggested by Holstein and Gubrium. Their own work finds its source in ethnomethodology. The following section will review the properties of "talk" as proposed in the ethnomethodological/conversation analysis literature.
Sacks, in a lecture delivered at the University of California in Spring, 1966, offered the following hypothesis about studies of order:

If ... we figure or guess or decide that whatever humans do, they are just another animal after all, maybe more complicated than others but perhaps not noticeably so, then whatever humans do can be examined to discover some way to do it [i.e., order], and that way will be stably describable. That is, we may alternatively take it that there is order at all points. (Sacks, 1984, 22)

Foucault's theoretical assumption about adopting a point of view "from the outside" finds in Sacks' claim a very practical response: Humans can be assumed to be "just another animal after all," just another describable entity whose rituals and routines can be analyzed. These descriptions of behavior may show that, in speech as well as in action, the most basic and most ritualized accomplishment is the never-ending creation of "order at all points" in human transactions.

This study postulates the omnipresence of order in human interactions; it refutes notions of order and organization that would be perceptible only on certain exceptional occasions. Order is everywhere and in everything that is said. Provided that meanings are indexical and that the context in which these meanings develop is dynamic, no research enterprise
could ever be fully understandable without this orderly nature of discourse. One way to make the research effort more understandable is to assume that it is a description and an analysis of an accountable social order.

Since order of meaning making exists, there is a need for a model to describe interactional exchanges that should be built through the contingent and on-going interpretative work of the members of a given discursive community. This model would postulate that members possess internalized and taken-for-granted discourse and interactional competencies that allow them to produce and interpret the orderly features of everyday life, events, and/or conversations. Such a model would focus on the unveiling, the description, and the analysis of these common practices. Such a model, ethnomethodology, was developed by ethnomethodologist Garfinkel (1967) and led to specific developments that interest the most essential notion in this study: discourse.

Sacks & Schegloff (1973, 290) explained how concepts of order and orderliness influence research about oral, interactional discourse.

We have proceeded under the assumption (an assumption borne out of research) that in so far as the materials we worked with exhibited orderliness, they did so not only to us, indeed not in the first place for us, but for the co-participants who had produced them. If the materials (records of natural conversation) were orderly, they were so because they had been methodically produced by members of the
society for one another, and it was a feature of the conversation we treated as data as they were produced so as to allow the participants to display each other their analysis, appreciation and use of that orderliness.

This orderly nature of discourse is thus experienced first by the interactants involved in the ongoing conversation, and then only to the researchers investigating their conversational exchanges. This order is not due to serendipity, but it is methodically produced by the conversants as they each analyze the previous turn, and react to it. Sacks and Schegloff (1973, 290) added:

Accordingly, our analysis has sought to explicate the ways in which the materials are produced by members in orderly ways that exhibit their orderliness and have their orderliness appreciated and used, and have that appreciation displayed and treated as the basis for subsequent action.

They also argue that comprehension is not the product of the "silently intended meanings" of statements (Foucault, 1991, 60), but instead the product of discursive practices to create order and orderliness at all point in human communication. Comprehension is not a propositional logic; comprehension resides in the sequential organization that produces order and meaning.
For orderliness to govern oral discourse and for communication to develop, it is necessary that the speaker whose task is to produce a response—a second turn—base his/her answer on an understanding of what the first turn was about in the interactional situation in which s/he is involved. As soon as this implicit task performed by the second speaker fails to produce an analysis that is close enough to the first speaker's analysis, communication is broken and needs to be repaired. The consequence of this "sequential implicativeness" (Sacks & Schegloff, 1973, 296) of a conversational turn can be summarized as follows, in the words of Atkinson & Heritage (1984, 6):

If it can then be shown that the producers of the first action deal in systematically organized ways with a variety of alternative seconds (or noticeably absent second), then it will also be demonstrated that the object of investigation is an institutionalized organization for the activity in question that is systematically oriented to by speakers.

The analysis of sequential organization of oral discourse should therefore yield valuable information about this state of orderliness, about the discursive practices used by members of the same community to convey information, commands, invitations, etc. In the context of this study, the analysis of sequential organization of oral discourse should show how teaching associates and language learners succeed or fail in building a conversational exchange in the target language.
A final observation must be made before explaining the procedure followed in studies in conversation analysis. When analyzing this observable orderliness, how does the order signify itself to the researcher? How do we know that the phenomena that are emphasized in the analysis of the proposed verbal exchanges are not just biased representations that the researcher invented? In Foucaldian terms, how do we know that, in spite of the ethnological approach to the problem of communication, the researcher is not trapped in one more anthropological (i.e., circular) initiative finding justifications for the generated knowledge in the assumptions that brought it to life? Even though Sacks & Schegloff (1973, 290) did not directly tackle this question, they reminded their reader that the stable patterns of orderliness they uncovered were evident "... not only to us, indeed not in the first place for us, but for the co-participants who had produced them."

Indeed, it is because researcher(s) and co-participants can unequivocally agree on the fact that the same enterprise which was pursued by the participants was also accessible for analysis by the researcher(s), that the doubt of an analysis biased by the prejudices of the observer can be eased. Heritage & Atkinson (1984, 1) explained:

Specifically, analysis can be generated out of matters observable in the data of interaction. The analyst is thus not required to speculate upon what the interactants hypothetically or imaginably understood, or the
procedures or constraints to which they could conceivably have been oriented. Instead, analysis can emerge from observation of the conduct of the participants.

No logical leap from what one sees to what one believes could have happened is allowed; one needs to report only the interaction since it is an interactional reality that has already been attested by the interactants. The same article by Heritage & Atkinson (1984, 4) gives more indications that conversation analysis procedures will strive to eliminate the analyst's prejudices, or, in the words of Sacks (1984, 27), to treat "some actual conversation in an unmotivated way" (emphasis added):

Nothing that occurs in interaction can be ruled out, a priori, as random, insignificant, or irrelevant. The pursuit of systematic analysis thus requires that recorded data be available, not only for repeated observation, analysis, and reanalysis, but also for the public evaluation of observations and findings that is an essential precondition for analytic advance.

It is thus also because the researcher's data are recorded and available for reanalysis, and because anyone can and may re-examine them to build another analysis of an interaction-in-the-making, that "analytic conclusions will not arise as artifacts of intuitive idiosyncrasy, selective attention or recollection, or experimental design" (Heritage & Atkinson, 1984, 4).
The necessity to have the data available for anyone to re-evaluate the materials of the analysis, as well as the nature of interactional discourse defined as sequential structures, brought forward one of the necessary methodological procedures for conversation analysis: Naturally occurring conversations must be recorded. Early studies made extensive use of audio-recording equipment; later, technological advances made it possible to use video-recording equipment. Holstein & Gubrium (1994, 266) summarized the methodological process for data collection as follows:

This focus on real-time, sequential details of ordinary conversation requires naturalistic methods of study. Naturally occurring talk is tape-recorded (increasingly, videotaping is encouraged) and transcribed to reproduce the fine-grained detail of speech exchanges...

Analysis then centers on the collaborative, constantly emerging structure of conversation itself, identifying principles that underpin sequential organization of talk, the local management of turn taking, and practices relating to opening, sustaining, and closing orderly sequences. In brief, talk is systematically examined for the methodical, structured ways that the orderliness of interaction is recurrently accomplished.

As will be explained in chapter three, the application of the method summarized by Holstein & Gubrium (1994) was applied to the setting of this study.
Having described the population and the setting, and having justified in this chapter the ontological, epistemological, and methodical positions adopted for this study, chapter three will present the analytical project of the present study.
ENDNOTES

1 Intersubjectivity is a term borrowed from the Vygotskyan approach to language education. It is defined by Donato (1994, 42) as the "process of negotiating contexts of shared understanding." Vygotskyan studies of intersubjectivity are not without logical relationships with the objective of this study which is to define how TAs (and their students) produce and manage instances of communication in the target language.

2 In the specific setting which concerns this study, the language of instruction is the target language.

3 The first question suggested by Shulman (1987, 9) is paraphrased as follows: what are the important ideas and skills for the teaching of French as communication? Asking this question, however, implies that such ideas and skills exist and can be defined. It is, however, argued in the following section that the existence and the nature of these ideas and skills depend upon the organizational structure adopted for the content to be taught, i.e., discourse. The analysis of data reported in chapter four yields valuable information as to whether discourse is a content that allows the researcher to isolate important ideas and skills for the teaching of French discourse.
Stern (1983, 97-114) echoes the introduction to the Teacher's Edition of Invitation (Jarvis, et al., 1993, vii) which emphasized the organizing principles of today's foreign language education.

*Invitation: Contextes, Culture et Communication* develops communicative proficiency in French. Beyond this practical goal, this basic textbook also helps students understand the richness and diversity of cultures and the wonder of the communicative process.

Such a statement, as will be argued in chapter five, does not imply that language accuracy will not be pursued and that basic grammatical concepts will not be taught. It does imply, however, that grammatical accuracy is a tool that will be mastered as instructor and students strive to reach the previously stated goals (i.e., creating communication in the target language and providing instruction about the culture of the communities where the target language is spoken).

"La compétence chomskyenne est une abstraction qui n'inclut pas la compétence permettant d'utiliser adéquatement la compétence (quand faut-il parler, se taire, parler ce langage ou celui-là, etc.). Ce qui fait problème, ce n'est pas la possibilité de produire une infinité de phrases grammaticales cohérentes mais la possibilité d'utiliser, de manière cohérente et adaptée, une infinité de phrases dans un nombre infini de situations. La maîtrise pratique
de la grammaire n'est rien sans la maîtrise des conditions d'utilisation adéquate des possibilités infinies offertes par la grammaire" Bourdieu (1977, 20).

6 The notion of "taken for granted" needs to be brought to the reader's attention as early as possible. If ways of creating communication and imparting cultural knowledge in a foreign language classroom are unveiled, then the apparent ordinariness which encourages speakers to take such knowledge for granted needs to be brought into view and described. The methodology adopted for the analysis of the transcripts selected for this study needs to recognize what is entailed in "being ordinary" (Sachs, 1984) as the next section will argue.

7 This notion seems already implied in the two arguments previously used to refute language as analytical abstraction: it echoes Bourdieu's concept of adequate use, and Kramsch's (1991, 1993) knowledge shared by a given native community.

8 Foucault's positions on discourse are spread throughout his works; the synthesis which is here presented is mainly inspired from Foucault (1991, 1970, 1969, and 1966). Foucault (1970) refers to this presupposed correspondence between discourse and thought as the "themes of universal mediation" between discourse and experiences. He shows that these themes have the convenient consequence of forcing the discourse to nullify itself.
"in placing itself at the disposal of the signifier." However, if the only notion of discourse that is available is such a transparent and nullified discourse, the observer is left with only a concept of language to be described. Having already showed that this concept over-predicts what is sayable in a given context, the observer knows that beyond the simplicity of language remains a more complex practical domain. Applied to the context of this study, it is the description of this domain that will allow, or not, an understanding of the content that needs to be emphasized to novice teachers.

It is the domain of what has been subsumed under the label of "sayable" in chapter one.

The relevance of these discursive practices for the present study cannot be underestimated. Aiming, as Invitation states, to help "students understand the richness and diversity of cultures and the wonder of the communicative process" depends on the knowledge, implicit or explicit, that teaching associate has of these cultural/discursive phenomena; i.e., it depends on the teaching associate's discursive competence. What role does this knowledge play when TAs invites their students to speak in the target language? How compatible is it with the notion of content as proposed by Shulman, and how does it affect the notion of a pedagogical content knowledge for foreign language education? These are some of the questions that motivate this project.
Foucault (1994a, 838-9): "...le point de vue synchronique n'est pas une coupe statique qui nierait l'évolution, c'est au contraire l'analyse des conditions dans lesquelles une évolution peut se faire... [L']analyse synchronique pose la question : pour qu'un changement puisse être obtenu, quels sont les autres changements qui doivent être également présents dans le champs de la contemporanéité. Il s'agit bien, donc, d'une façon différente d'analyser le changement, et non point d'une manière de nier ce changement au profit de l'immobilité."

"A transcendental consciousness," for Foucault, is synonymous to an absolute consciousness. Therefore, Foucault (1970) refuses modes of investigation in which meaning would be determined in relation to an almighty (conscious) author/observer who decides which forms the text presents. The second part of this quotation indicates that meanings originate in discursive practices; e.g., meanings depend on what is said in the context of the interaction.

Readers who are familiar with The Order of Things probably understood at this point that, after accepting Foucault's notion of discourse, discursive field, and discursive practice, this study tries to situate its analytic approach along what Foucault calls "the counter-sciences"-ethnology and psychoanalysis-rather than along what he labels "human sciences." The problem is less about providing an adequate label than with characterizing the enterprise.
which needs to be undertaken. The "transcendental consciousness" against which Foucault warns his readers in his introduction is typical of these "human sciences" which select Man as their subject of investigation and the condition of their very existence; or, as Foucault himself describes this phenomenon: "man became that upon the basis of which all knowledge could be constituted as immediate and non-problematized evidence; he became, a fortiori, that which justified the calling into question of all knowledge of man" (Foucault, 1970, 345). To the contrary, these enterprises which Foucault calls "counter-sciences" propose a different epistemological approach; they do not try to bring back the products of their investigations to the previously defined positive man, but reach this knowledge that is extremely routinized, mechanical, or unconscious: "they should...be sciences of the unconscious: not because they reach down to what is below consciousness in man, but because they are directed towards that which, outside man, makes it possible to know... that which is given or eludes his consciousness," (Foucault, 1970, 378). It is in this design that synchronic analyses of discourse are conducted in this project: to observe these discursive practices that, outside the individuals themselves, make them competent speakers.
"Linguistics" here needs to be understood in the context of the 1968 debate on Linguistics, Structuralism, and Social Sciences where this address and response were originally presented. Foucault previously mentioned "Linguistics and other related disciplines such as Semiology" and the context of his intervention indicate that he subsumed under the label "Linguistics" all the disciplines that could benefit from synchronic analyses of discursive practices.

Foucault (1994a, 838-9): "[I]l me semble que l'analyse de certains phénomènes sociaux pourraient sans doute être facilitée et enrichie par la transformation même de ces méthodes d'analyse. Je pense que le sociologue pourrait enrichir jusqu'à la linguistique elle-même, à condition qu'il se débarrasse de son attitude de refus total ou d'acceptation en bloc et qu'il se pose la question : qu'est ce qu'il faut que je change dans les concepts, méthodes et formes d'analyse de la linguistique pour que ces dernières soient utilisables par moi dans tel ou tel domaine?"

The general definition of discourse as practice that was adopted for this study allows the reader to envision the effects of this indexicality of meaning for both oral and written discourse. If this study is concerned with synchronic oral discourse in the FL classroom, it should be noted that diachronic studies of written discourse, tracing the effect of ambiguity and
changes in meaning of familiar terms, have been presented by Michel Foucault in fields such as economy, biology, and grammar (Foucault, 1966), or even prisons, sexuality, or psychiatry.

17 "Modern man" is used in this context with its philosophical, non-gender specific, definition.

18 Professor Jaber F. Gubrium, from the University of Florida, explained in a personal communication with the researcher:

[James] Holstein and I have a new book coming out next month —-
"The new language of qualitative method"—which you might consult for the latest version of the argument. It's an idiomatic history of a variety of discourses for qualitatively describing the social and marshals a great deal of empirical material to make a case of linking Foucault and ethnomethodology. We have also introduced methods of narrative analysis into the text and you might find that useful for your own work as well. (January 18th, 1997)

The co-author of this book, Professor James Holstein, Marquette University, in another personal communication added:

I do a little bit of the same in “Court-ordered insanity”, where I take some inspirations from Foucault, but do basically an ethnomethodological analysis of involuntary commitment hearings.

The same is true of another recent book “Dispute domains and welfare claims” (which I did with Gale Miler). This is more explicitly
Foucauldian, but we don't make much headway in fully explicating Foucault's relevance to understanding interactional matters.

The most self conscious Jay and I have been in dealing with Foucault and this connection to Ethnomethodology has been in our book, "The new language of qualitative method," to be published next month by Oxford Univ. Press. In Ch. 6, we try to make some explicit connections, using Foucault as the inspiration for importing concerns for the discursive environment and context to our ethnomethodologically oriented framework. We also try to use Durkheim in this fashion ... but Foucault is oriented to discourse in a fashion the others are not and thus allows for easier and more useful appropriation. (January 19\textsuperscript{th}, 1997)

Although the book they both referenced was not yet available at the time the researcher wrote his dissertation, they both argued that grounds could be found to reconcile a Foucauldian notion of discourse and an ethnomethodological analytical program.

\textsuperscript{19} The notes and lectures have been compiled by Gail Jefferson for publication in Atkinson & Heritage (1984).

\textsuperscript{20} This statement places conversation analysis at the extreme opposite of Speech Act Theory (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969). Foucault, defending his
notion of discourse in "The Archeology of Knowledge," also opposes this notion of discourse as an unproblematized correspondence between form and propositional content.
CHAPTER 3

ANALYTIC PROGRAM

I. Introduction.

This study has set for its main objectives to describe how language teachers and learners make sense of each other, while the interactional task at hand is for the former to help the latter to produce communicatively logical responses in the target language. Instructors and learners were observed and recorded from the first to the tenth and last week of Winter Quarter, 1996. These extended observations enabled the researcher to familiarize himself with the context of instruction in both courses, and to develop a sense of what constitute routine versus exceptional verbal interactions.

The issue of student and instructor routine verbal interactions frames the study itself. Its primary objective is to find a way to describe discourse as is, to avoid idealized, recollected, and/or invented notions of classroom discourse. The objective of this project is to describe conversational exchanges as they naturally occurred. Since the social world is mainly a
conversational one, also since most of human transactions are conducted through verbal exchanges, the necessary descriptions are made possible by the fact that concrete details of social interaction are strongly enough organized to permit formal description. In short, discourse, as defined in chapter two, displays at all times and at any point orderly features that can be investigated in order for one to describe the interactional organization of discourse in the foreign language classroom.

Chapter three describes the context and the process that lead to the selection of naturally occurring classroom verbal interactions for analysis in two selected courses of beginning French at a large public research institution.

II. Research setting

Thanks to the assistance of the language director in the Department of French and Italian at The Ohio State University, the two data collection contexts were made as similar as possible. Some variables could not, however, be controlled. Examples of such variables include the nature and quality of the individual students who enrolled in these two French classes, but also the time when these two classes were offered (Debbie taught at 8:00 a.m., while Anne taught at 1:30 p.m.). In every other aspects, the contexts in each classroom were made as identical as possible.
For instance, novice teaching associates in the Department of French
and Italian at The Ohio State University are usually responsible for teaching
one of the following courses*: Elementary French I (French 101.01),
Elementary French II (French 102.01), Intermediate French I (French
103.01). Both Anne and Debbie were observed while teaching French 102.01.

Although French 102.01 was defined in chapter one, the following
section brings additional information on the course that was taught by both
teaching associates who participated in this study during Winter Quarter,
1996.

Elementary French II (French 102.01) is described in The Ohio State
Course Offering Bulletin as a continuation of Elementary French I (French
101.01). Its objectives are therefore to further the process that Elementary
French I initiated with true beginners in the French language; i.e., to develop
their listening, reading, speaking, and writing skills and to further students’
understanding of French culture(s).

All the 100-level courses in the Department of French and Italian meet
three times a week on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. Each class
period is seventy-eight minutes long.

The syllabus is organized around the textbook Invitation: Contextes,
Culture et Communication that is used in Elementary French I, Elementary
French II, and Intermediate French I. Invitation is divided into sixteen
chapters. Each chapter is characterized by a list of functions and structures
to be presented to the learners. In Elementary French II, students study chapters seven through twelve of *Invitation* during the ten week quarter. Chapter seven of *Invitation*, for instance, presents the following functions: “Point de départ” (vocabulary), to speak about time, to speak about past events (I and II), to speak about important events in your life. Chapter seven also presents structures such as: television, time, past tense—*passé composé*—with auxiliary *avoir*, past tense—*passé composé*—with auxiliary *être*, and finally *choisir* and verbs of the second conjugation group\(^2\).

For the reader to understand how the syllabus is organized is essential since the structure of this document has a direct effect on the classroom interactions. Learners are supposed to come to class prepared, and to begin studying the items listed on the syllabus before their instructor teaches about them in class. Typically, the syllabus describes to novice teachers and language learners the timetable that needs to be followed for each chapter. For instance, during Winter, 1996, the second week of instruction was described as follows:


*Exercises—Invitation à écouter et écrire.


Such timetable should be interpreted as follows: On Monday, January 8th, 1996, the lesson covered the beginning of chapter seven. The instructor was supposed to start the course with a short test (i.e., vocabulary check) to evaluate whether students studied and retained the vocabulary in Point de départ4. Then, instructors were expected to propose an activity to use the vocabulary listed in Point de départ in a communicative context. Next, they could apply this newly acquired vocabulary to the reading of the first cultural text in the section Vie et Culture (entitled: La télévision française5). Eventually, teaching associates have to clarify any comprehension problem and explain how to tell time in French, which is the last function to be presented on Monday. The last description on the syllabus, preceded by an asterisk, is there to remind students that they are supposed to prepare the
workbook (*Invitation à écouter et à écrire*) exercises related to the functions and structures that needs to be studied for any specific day. The first page of the syllabus is clear in this respect:

*Written Preparation:* Each chapter (and each section) of *Invitation* has corresponding pages in *Invitation à écouter et à écrire*, the combined workbook and lab manual. The *partie écrite* has written exercises; the *partie orale* has taped versions of parts of the textbook and special comprehension activities with written components. These exercises are to be completed in writing on a daily basis and the chapter turned in to your instructor at the end of a chapter... Your instructor may assign additional exercises and activities as part of the course.

This description of the context of instruction in French 102.01 and the presentation of the contexts and roles of teacher and learners was necessary to understand, and subsequently, to interpret the data presented in chapter four. This description stresses the importance of student preparation that is facilitated by, but also indispensable to, the Review-View-Preview lesson plan format that teaching associates are asked to adopt.

The Review-View-Preview format is recommended by the authors of *Invitation* in the *Introduction to the Instructor's Edition* (Cf. examples pp. I-xxvi—I-xxxiii). The Department of French and Italian requires that its teaching associates follow this format that consists in reviewing at the
beginning of the lesson the items that were presented (i.e., viewed) during the previous lesson, and to prepare students for the functions and structures of following lesson.

To come back to the previous example, chapter seven, teaching associates were expected on Wednesday, January 10, 1996 to start their lesson with (at least) one activity to review the vocabulary in *Point de départ* and how to tell time in French. When instructors had the feeling that the previous items were mastered by students, then they could go on to the functions and structures that needed to be viewed on Wednesday. Finally, before dismissing their students, instructors were to briefly explain how to conjugate verbs of the second conjugation groups in French, and to provide some information about the two documents (*Intégration et perspectives*, and *Vie et culture*) that would be explained in class on Friday.

Teaching associates are consequently provided with a uniform structure to teach their French classes. More specifically, on any given day, both teaching associates have an identical list of items to review, view, or preview in class. They are also expected to develop communication in the target language (Cf.: Jarvis et al., 1993, xvi). The teaching associates decide, however, which activity they select to teach the different functions and structures, and which verbal strategies they adopt to develop communication in French.
III. Timeline for the data collection

As peer supervisor in the Department of French and Italian at the Ohio State University, the researcher observed two teaching associates during their first quarter—Autumn 1995—teaching French. The contrast between the classroom language behaviors of these two teaching associates was such that the researcher requested the permission from the language director in the Department of French to study formally their classroom discourse elicitation techniques during Winter Quarter, 1996.

Authorization from the Department of French and Italian was granted to approach these two teaching associates. Thanks to the help and collaboration of the language director, teaching assignments for Winter, 1996 were arranged so that both teaching associates would be teaching Elementary French II (French 102.01). It was expected and assumed that making the teaching contexts for both teaching associates as similar as possible would provide for easier comparisons of the individual instructor’s teaching behavior and discursive strategies and more convincing conclusions.

In December 1995, both teaching associates were officially invited to be part of the research project. The researcher defined in very general terms the scope of his research project. The teaching associates were told that the purpose of the study was to document how they, as novice instructors of French as a foreign language, coped with their daily duties and obligations toward their students. The researcher gave no specific indication that the
study was to focus on the communication in the foreign language classroom and the instructors' techniques to create and sustain such exchanges in French. This very general—and rather vague—definition of the objective of the project seemed necessary to ensure that verbal exchanges would be as natural as possible and to avoid influencing the subjects' behavior in the classroom.

The field of qualitative studies is unanimous to acknowledge the need for a trusting relationship between the field-worker and the subjects of a research project (Punch, 1994, 93; Fontana & Frey, 1994, 367). The first sign of trust from the two teaching associates came during this introductory meeting; the researcher gave them the opportunity to ask as many questions concerning the research project as possible. Even though the aim of the study had been presented in very broad and general terms, neither one of them requested a more specific formulation of the research agenda. Neither one of them ever questioned the motivations and purposes of the study. They both agreed that documenting their teaching activity, with its daily problems, was a worthy endeavor that could eventually help future novice teaching associates in the French program. The subjects instead asked questions of a more practical type. Both of them welcomed the given opportunity to demonstrate their strengths, and hopefully remedy their weaknesses. The question that seemed to come most often was to know what both participants would have to do if they agreed to be part of the
research project; both subjects feared that it would occasion additional work. The data collection process was explained, and both novice teachers agreed to take part in the study.

A timeline for data collection was then discussed at the same meeting. An academic quarter at The Ohio State University consists of ten weeks. While it would have been unmanageable to tape every lesson taught by both instructors during this ten-week period, the researcher wanted to make sure that a sufficient amount of lessons would be recorded so that the presence of the camera may not to be felt as unusual or exceptional by the instructors and the learners when classroom data were collected. Once again, this decision was made on the basis that conversation analysis necessitates to have access to naturally occurring interactions. A compromise was therefore presented to the subjects, which had already been discussed with—and agreed upon by—the language director in the Department of French and Italian.

The solution proposed to the teaching assistants consisted for the field-worker to be present in the classroom from the first week to the last, without having to tape the whole course for ten weeks. The recording equipment had to be part of the teaching/learning context in both of these classes. The researcher would tape each class every day for two weeks three times during the quarter. The first period of two weeks was originally planned to be weeks 1 and 2 on the Elementary French II syllabus (from January 3rd to
January 12th, 1996). The researcher was then to take a two-week break. At
the beginning of week 5, recording resumed for another two-week period
(from January 29th to February 9th, 1996). Finally, after another break, the
last recording two-week session took place (from February 26th to March 8th,
1996). Both subjects agreed to be flexible and to substitute other dates if
technical or scheduling problems occur.10

IV. Defining how much recording is needed

The goal of the study is to provide an ethnomethodological account of
the French as a foreign language lessons taught by both subjects. According
to Coulon, ethnomethodology “analyzes the beliefs and the behaviors dictated
by common sense for any socially organized activity” and studies ways in
which individuals “give meaning, and at the same time accomplish routine
actions” (Coulon, 1987, 26). This section argues that the field-worker’s
sustained presence in both classrooms was indispensable to gain access to
routinized discursive exchanges.

For the camera and the field-worker to minimize the “observer effect”
(Adler & Adler, 1994) of the classroom behaviors of teachers and learners, it
was necessary for the field-worker and his or her camera to become, as early
as possible and for as long as possible, part of the natural context, part of the routine in these two classes. Concerning the observer effect, Adler & Adler (1994, 382) explained:

Many people believe that entirely avoiding researcher influence on subjects is an idealistic improbability [...] yet there are ways that such effects can be diminished. The naturalness of the observer role, coupled with its nondirection, makes it the least noticeably intrusive of all research techniques.

It seemed rather improbable to entirely avoid some effect of the video-camera on the context in which verbal interactions would develop during Winter Quarter, 1996. Since the goal of the study has been to elucidate how everyday discourse in the foreign language classrooms is socially constructed by the members of these environments, making the field-worker and his recording equipment a natural part of this environment was the only solution that would permit to minimize the observer effect. The field-worker needed to establish his presence and, out of necessity, he recorded more data than would be exploitable in one research project.

On the first day of class (January 3rd, 1996), students were told that their French class had been selected to participate in a study¹¹, and that if the presence of the recording equipment in the classroom should make them feel uncomfortable, they could still join a different section of the same course.
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Students in these two classes were given the possibility to ask questions, and/or to make comments. All of them accepted the presence of the video-camera in the back of the room.

As will be explained in chapter four, while there are indications that students were aware that the class was being taped, their behavior led to believe that the field-worker's presence did not seem to affect these learners. First, both Debbie and Anne, in informal conversations with the researcher, found their students did not behave any differently when the recording stopped after the first period of two weeks. Second and most importantly, the field-worker became so much of a natural presence in the classroom that students included him in informal conversations before or after the lesson (for instance, Anne's class on Wednesday, February 21st). Therefore, while it is obvious that students knew about the recording equipment and the field-worker, they never gave any indication during the entire quarter that such presence was considered unnatural, inhibiting, and/or disturbing. Standing silently being the tripod and the video-camera, the field-worker was a part of the daily routine in these two French classes.

V. The use of recorded materials.

Conversation analysis and ethnomethodology present several reasons for describing conversational exchanges as they naturally occur in foreign language classrooms and for making these exchanges available to the reader.
It has been established in the previous chapter that the social organization of discourse in the foreign language classroom is an on-going practical achievement of the participants in the foreign language classroom; (i.e., the people who routinely interact in the context of each of these four French classes), and who can be called “the members”13 (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1970, 342).

This practical achievement is the result of local methods and practices developed by the members to understand each other and produce the on-going interaction. Most local methods are applied through verbal interactions (i.e., classroom discourse). One therefore needs to have access to faithful reports of naturally occurring sequences of classroom discourse in order to study the social order in effect in the foreign language classroom. The validity of the claims presented in this study depends upon the quality of the reports on routine classroom discourse.

In a manner consistent with the literature on conversation analysis, this study favors direct access to the data upon which it bases its claims. Participants’ idealizations and representations about the situation being investigated are not considered. The main contention of conversation analysis in this respect is that without faithful records and transcriptions, concepts and generalizations that are made and based on idealized descriptions are blurred; they eventually have only a vague and indeterminate relationship with the specific event that was set to be studied.
If, as reported in chapter one, the goal of research is to build a theory that is a "reflexive dimension" of educational practices (van Lier, 1994, 346), the sum of all these indeterminacies is eventually detrimental to SLA. As the difference between events and their records grow wider, the theory becomes less accurate. In the long run, it becomes difficult to decide whether a specific case to be studied and compared to established theoretical assumptions may support or undermine known generalizations. Therefore, if the language/discourse to be communicated is more than mere grammatical competence, if it is "what is sayable," one needs to adopt an analytical program that concentrates on the data—what is actually said. Sacks (1984, 235) asked a similar question, finding that his enterprise could not be a useful science,

    Unless it was able to handle the details of actual events, handle them formally, and in the first instance be informative about them in the direct ways in which primitive sciences tend to be informative, that is, that anyone else can go and see whether what was said is so.

After explaining how he responded to this challenge in his own domain of research, Sacks provided the rationale for the use of tape-recorded conversations.

    It was not from any large interest in language or from some theoretical formulation of what should be studied that I started with tape-recorded conversation, but simply because I could get my hands on it
and I could study it again and again, and also, consequentially, because others could look at what I had studied and make of it what they could, if, for example, they wanted to be able to disagree with me. (Sacks, 1984, 235)

The range and detail of observations is increased since repeated analyses of the selected samples of interaction are made possible by the recording of routine discourse. The researcher, as well as any observer, may examine the raw data as often as necessary; these conversations are neither invented nor idealized nor constrained by a specific research agenda, they are available to anyone for comments, counter-examination, counter-claims, etc.

While most conversation analysis studies have continued Sack's original focus on fine descriptions of actual interactions as well as his effort to "forestall the process of idealization" (Heritage, 1994, 236), it seems useful to provide here an argument in favor of such a method.

The rationale that puts the emphasis on naturally occurring discourse samples requires records of interaction in real time. First, the use of interviewing techniques would not be useful; conversation analysts contend that, in interview studies, what subjects say about what they do or say is treated as an appropriate substitute for formal descriptions of actual events. No matter how faithful such recollections or accounts might be, they cannot be taken for what conversation analysis, and this study in particular, proposes to study: actual occurrences of classroom discourse.
Second, the use of participants' intuitions or invented examples is not considered any more enlightening. Participants pose their own topics and examples. With such examples, "native" intuitions is used as a means of inventing examples of interactional behavior. Often, these members' recollections lead to the creation of examples about what could have been said/done, rather than has actually occurred. Invented or recollected data cannot reveal the order or the range of actual conversational organizations.

Reconstructed accounts are produced in the context of their own elicitation rather than the context of the occasion they describe. In real life, specific contexts are too complex and difficult to be made explicit: Each actor speaks through an acquired competence, and through it are expressed generations of discursive practices—expressing his/her social, cultural, ethnic, etc., identity, in short, expressing his or her belonging to a specific discursive community. Each participant analyzes and responds to the perceived communicational context at hand; i.e., the purposes and circumstances for the on-going interaction. The indefinite number of ways in which such specific contexts, even in merely dyadic interactions, generate conversational exchanges vastly exceeds the range of our recountings of it. In the latter case, only one perception of the communicative context express itself. In the former, it is the collaborative work of two discourse proficiencies that is made visible; two proficiencies at work that relentlessly call on each other to check their specific and idiosyncratic understanding of the
communicative context, and eventually find a common ground to define a shared interaction. How this collaborative work expresses itself in the interaction is irremediably lost when only one speaker tries to complete both roles.

Third, much research has used observational methods in which data are recorded with pre-coded categories (e.g., the COLT observation scheme; Harley et al., 1990, 58-63) or through field notes (e.g., in bilingual studies Phillips, 1972; Wong-Fillmore, 1985). When using these methodologies, as well as when using experimental methodologies involving the direction or manipulation of behaviors, proponents of conversation analysis and ethnomethodology do not pretend to substitute a better approach, but argue that their direct focus on the actual data presents an analytic program that reflects the orderly nature of discourse.

To the opposite of conversation analysis, the approaches mentioned previously have a common denominator: Definable aspects of naturally occurring behaviors are replaced by generalizations about how it ought to work. In the case of experiments, experimenter contamination—imposing on the interaction being studied the experimenter's understanding of how it is indeed occurring—of the studied samples of verbal interaction is inevitable (Heritage, 1984, 239). As was discussed in chapter two, such experiments are uneconomical since the experimenter cannot isolate dependent and independent variables without prior exposure to naturally occurring
conversations. Without prior analysis of exposure to naturally occurring conversations, experimenters can neither extrapolate from their experimental findings to the natural situation of conduct nor parse among the findings what are the artifacts of the manipulation from the independent variable that they tried to characterize. Such characterization and parsing, if they have any other foundation but experimenters' intuitions, need a thorough and systematic description of experimental findings and naturally occurring conversations. It is therefore more economical to work with naturally occurring materials from the onset and, as argued in this section, to make these conversational exchanges available to the reader in a systematic manner.

VI. The selection of interactional samples

One basic assumption of conversation analysis is that social actions and interactions can be found to exhibit organized patterns of stable, identifiable, sequential features, and that the participants produce it. At all times, discourse exhibits orderly structural features; at no times is there discourse that is not socially organized. The selection of samples of interaction for analysis is therefore not based on whether a given
interactional episode exhibits more (or less) structural features of social order, but what the interaction under scrutiny reveals about the meaning and order the interactants enact.

Any specific local organization needs to be treated as a researchable orderly structure in its own rights, and no local structure of interaction is more social, more regularly shaped, or more valid than the next. Implicit knowledge of all these structures is the element that allows individual speakers to participate in conversational exchanges, and understand how other speakers interpret the context of the conversational exchange. The analytic program that such a notion of the order of discourse entails is not to study specific types of local interactional structures rather than any other ones, but instead to study any ordinary interaction that shows evidence of the social order being studied.

Conversation analysis emphasizes ordinary interactions. “Ordinary interaction can ... be analyzed so as to exhibit stable organizational patterns of action to which the participants are oriented.” (Heritage 1984, 241). The observable behavior of speakers is the main resource out of which analyses of ordinary organizations of speech can be developed. In a given context, analyses of ordinary, naturally occurring discourse are therefore essential to understanding the order of the discourse that is being studied.
While studying the order of discourse enacted in the foreign language classroom, it has been argued that ordinary interaction exhibits orderliness. The selection and aggregation of different examples by the researcher was therefore not a problem of finding more or less order to be characterized, documented, and explained. No specific sequence that has been faithfully recorded and transcribed is more valid than the next. The choice and selection of specific samples of naturally occurring interactional events cannot therefore enhance or impede the validity of a given study.

Since the collection of transcripts would become for the reader the main access to both of these courses, the corpus of the present study needed to reflect the researcher's more global understanding of ordinary interactions during these lessons. The researcher developed a notion of what constituted routine exercises in these two classes. In order to do so, videotapes of both classes were watched in sequences. The researcher watched, for instance, the two tapes recorded on Day I one after another, and took notes of the different events that took place on separate copybooks. Although the logbooks of the two different classes were necessarily subjective, they allowed the researcher to develop an awareness of the context of instruction in these two French 102 courses. These notes reflected the order in which events had occurred during the course, and specific symbols in the margin signaled the occurrence of sustained conversational exchanges, long silent pauses, conversations without ties to the didactic activity at hand, or discipline
problems. No specific set of fixed descriptors was used to characterize classroom interactions; coded conversational exchange had to answer the following questions: How does this exchange contribute to communication, and what type of communication does it promote?

The same operation was repeated for the all subsequent days, until the two logbooks for Anne's and Debbie's lessons contained detailed descriptions of interactions for both classes. The viewing order in which videotapes were presented was, however, alternated; i.e., if the researcher started to take notes on Debbie's tape and viewed Anne's tape last, the order would be reversed the following day.

The rationale for these self-imposed and constant changes was to balance out fatigue effects, and to avoid creating some type of "natural attitude" about the data. According to Coulon (1987, 5), one of the two major influences of Garfinkel's ethnomethodology is the works of Alfred Schütz. The notion of "natural attitude" is borrowed from Schütz who researched comprehension processes that people use in daily activities to give meaning to their activities, and the activities performed around them by others.

Emphasizing the natural attitude of every day life, Schütz explained his position with the following example: Two individuals may both be watching the same bird flying in the sky, in spite of differences in placement in the physical space, in spite of personal differences that may affect their personal perceptions of this experience, in spite of different goals for
watching the bird flying (admiration, getting ready to shoot, etc.), both individuals constantly make unconscious adjustments to assume that they are, indeed, experiencing the same scene. The assumption that individuals are sharing the same common world, when indeed they have qualitatively different experiences, is what defines the “natural attitude.”

Developing a natural attitude toward the data for the researcher means to stop questioning them. Because of a great familiarity with the data, the researcher assumes that he is able to understand—without further analysis—at any given point the recorded interactions. For instance, the instructor’s code switches are considered normal or the students’ silence is accepted without asking questions about what happened during the previous turn. This natural attitude also means that, instead of making the routine activities the extraordinary focus of the study, the researcher just takes for granted the mundane and loses valuable data.

The researcher, because of routine and always using the same procedures, builds expectations about the classroom interactions. It was hoped that avoiding in this manner that the interaction being studied becomes predictable would provide some practical, even though perhaps only psychological, help to the researcher and help him concentrate on the details of the interactions during the time-consuming descriptions kept in the logbooks.
Logbooks gave detailed descriptions of each recorded lessons during Winter, 1996. They were used to collect interactional sequences that were then transcribed. Instances of similar interactional or pedagogical events occurring in both French 102.01 classes were then isolated. First, the researcher tried to isolate sustained interactions in the target language. Then, the logbooks suggested that long pauses and/or conversations that were aborted by the participants be regrouped under the heading “communication breakdown.” Last, every time teaching associates were involved in similar pedagogical activities (review, view, or preview of the same topics in *Invitation*), these activities were transcribed and compared.

From this original corpus of transcripts, the selection of specific sequences of verbal interaction presented and analyzed in chapter four was finally made. Preference was given to specific pedagogical events occurring in both classes (review of conjugations, etc.) during which each teaching associate displayed a behavior toward communication that was consistent with what was observed during the whole quarter, as reported in the researcher's logbooks. The first two transcripts for each instructor were to illustrate their routine questioning pattern. Finally, one additional piece of transcript would be added for each instructor during which similar opportunities for communication in the target language occurred. The final corpus presented in chapter four was ready for analysis.
VII. Transcripts as representations of routine conversations

Garfinkel (1967) borrows from sociologist Karl Mannheim (1893-1947) the concept of the documentary method of interpretation. Garfinkel argues that this documentary method is already at work in everyday practices and processes that members use to understand each other:

Mannheim called it “the documentary method of interpretation.” It contrasts with the methods of literal observation, yet it has a recognizable fit with what many sociological researchers, lay and professional, actually do.

According to Mannheim, the documentary method involves the search for “...an identical homologous pattern underlying a vast variety of totally different realizations of meanings.” The method consists in treating an actual appearance as “the document of,” as “pointing to,” as “standing on behalf of” a presupposed underlying pattern. Not only is the underlying pattern derived from its individual documentary evidence, but the individual documentary evidence, in turn, is interpreted on the basis of what is known about the underlying pattern. Each is used to elaborate the other (Garfinkel, 1967, 78).

The “documentary method of interpretation” can thus be defined as a process that consists in identifying an underlying pattern to a specific surface features, events, conversational exchanges. The underlying pattern that may reveal the order of discourse brought forward in the two surveyed foreign
language classrooms need to be understood as what is accountable in these language classrooms; i.e., what is reportable, observable, describable, and can be documented. Coulon (1987, 54) explains that anybody who is involved in a verbal exchange is always looking for patterns in the development of routine conversations—otherwise the verbal exchanges would not make any sense.

Garfinkel (1967) explains that the documentary method of interpretation enables the member to see the accountable actions being studied as the expression of these patterns. In this manner, people assemble a recognizable social order.

In the light of this discussion, the objective of the present study may be reformulated as follows: This project proposes to study transcripts of naturally occurring classroom interactions and to adopt the members' documentary method of interpretation. This method is not a methodology; it is a position that postulates that discourse displays at all point the meaning-making practices of the participants. If the researcher avoids taking for granted the participants' interactional achievements, patterns of conversational organizations are evidenced. These patterns, in turn, help the researchers to identify the order of discourse used in the foreign language classroom.
VIII. Summary

The objectives of this chapter were to describe the educational context in which data were collected (section II), to explain how data were collected for this study (section III) and how the corpus of transcripts was created from the recorded data (sections IV and V), and finally to explain the reasons guiding the methodological approach (sections VI and VII). These last two sections borrowed from conversation analysis and ethnomethodology the rationale to analyze discourse from transcripts, and how such transcripts were to be approached. The first four sections summarized the different steps followed by the researcher from the conception of the study to the analysis of data presented in chapter four. This process is described in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 1995</td>
<td>Identification of subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 1995</td>
<td>Permission to study formally from Language Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 1995</td>
<td>Permission granted; Agreement to have both TAs teach the same course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1995</td>
<td>Meeting with the TAs, request participation in study, discussion of study objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1995</td>
<td>Description of the adopted timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 1996</td>
<td>Data Collection—Recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Each lesson is audio- and video-taped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forty-two hours of classroom interaction are available for analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular informal meetings between instructors and researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1996,</td>
<td>Data reduction;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1996</td>
<td>From videorecording to detailed descriptions (logbooks).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selection of interactional sequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creation of a corpus of transcripts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selection of transcripts analyzed in chapter four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 1996</td>
<td>Beginning of data analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Data collection process
IX. Analytic program and validity claims

The analytic program needed to be defined in order for claims on the validity of the data and findings to be presented. Mishler (1990, 417) proposed that the key issue as far as validity claims are concerned is not whether conditions and conclusions of a given study conform to preset, external criteria; the key issue for Mishler is defined as follows:

I will begin by reformulating validation as the social construction of knowledge. With this reformulation, the key issue becomes whether the relevant community of scientists evaluates reported findings as sufficiently trustworthy to rely on them for their own work. (Mishler, 1990, 417)

Mishler argued that studies in the history, philosophy, and sociology of science based on the actual practices of scientific researchers have brought to the forefront the fact that scientific endeavor was always marked by uncertainty, indecision, unexpected problems demanding quick-fix coping practical responses; according to Mishler “a far cry from an abstract and severe ‘logic’ of scientific discovery” (Mishler, 1990,417).

In this respect, Coulon (1987, 104-5) summarized several ethnomethodological studies about scientific discoveries in laboratories and reaches the conclusion that scientists, while engaged in their research, use specific social resources that seem quite natural to them, such as theories.
logical reasoning, results from past experiments, but forget the objectified character of such resources, forget that these resources were socially and practically produced.\textsuperscript{14}

Knowing when, how, and in which proportion to use safely these resources without threatening the trustworthiness of the research project constitutes an underestimated part of the researcher's competence. This competence is based on the researchers' experience in the field, on their ability to adapt the rules to new and unexpected circumstances. This competence may even lead the researcher to invent \textit{ad hoc} rules that allow to pursue the experiment when the collected data are different from what was expected. This flexible competence demonstrated by the researcher is not considered to constitute transgressions of the rules. Instead, it is a sign of the researchers' familiarity with their topic; in a nutshell, this flexibility is a testimony of their membership (Cf. section III) in the scientific community.

Kuhn (1970, 42) established that science "is a highly determined activity;" that the scientists brings to the experiment a "strong network of commitments—conceptual, theoretical, instrumental, and methodological.” As a consequence, even experimental sciences proceed by constant re-adjusting of methods to local contexts, by a process of trial and error, and by
pragmatic decision-making on the basis of prior experience. As Mishler (1990, 436) explained:

This discovery—of the contextually grounded, experience-based, socially constructed nature of scientific knowledge—should be cause for celebration rather than despair. It does not dispense with methods for systematic study but locates them in the world of practice rather than abstract spaces of Venn diagrams or Latin Squares... Methods are still assessed for their consistency and utility in producing trustworthy findings, and trustworthiness is tested repeatedly and gains in strength through our reliance on these findings as the basis for further work.

Mishler's contention is that experimental sciences are often cited as examples of strict systemization and severe disciplined methodologies. The analysis of experimental achievements, however, shows an implicit reliance on a "contextually grounded, experience-based, socially constructed nature of scientific knowledge." Consequently, claims about the validity of the data and/or findings of any given research project need to be displaced from the artificial circle of mathematical formulas and procedural check-lists, and placed within the social environment where the knowledge of a specific scientific community is produced.
Accordingly, another type of validity is needed to evaluate studies such as the present one. This new type of validity is a notion that displaces validation from the traditional objective reality, and moves it to the social world; i.e., a world constructed through interactions—verbal or not—and praxis. The validity/trustworthiness of the findings presented in these pages does not reside in the selection of specific interactional sequences rather than others. Each sequence presented in the transcripts is “valid” in the sense that it is naturally occurring and readily available for new analyses. The validity/trustworthiness of the collection of sequences upon which this study is based (i.e., the corpus) is not affected by the selection or non-selection of specific individual interactional sequences.

Trustworthiness does not depend upon fixed criteria of conventionality or upon standard rules of typicality. Mishler (1990) argued instead that trustworthiness depends upon whether the study proposes an exemplar that the community of researchers is ready to accept. Kuhn (1970, 187) defined the concept of exemplar as follows.

By it I mean, initially, the concrete problem-solutions that students encounter from the start of their scientific education, whether in laboratories, on examinations, or at the ends of chapters in science texts. ...[but I also mean] at least some of the technical problem-solving found in the periodical literature that scientists encounter during their post-educational research careers and that also show
them by example how their job is to be done. More than other sorts of components of the disciplinary matrix, differences between sets of exemplars provide the community fine-structure of science.

The conception of knowledge that is then proposed is one where knowledge is “embedded in shared exemplars.” It is a systematic type of knowledge that emphasizes ways of learning thanks to hands-on experience.

Mishler (1990, 422) summarized this notion of socially constructed knowledge and explores how it affects notion not of validity, but of trustworthiness.

[Knowledge] is validated within a community of scientists as they come to share nonproblematic and useful ways of thinking about and solving problems. Representing the community-fine structure of science, exemplars contain within themselves the criteria and procedures for evaluating the “trustworthiness” of studies and serve as testaments to the internal history of validation within particular domains of inquiry. Developing new exemplars is a complex social process, over which individual investigators have only modest control.

The trustworthiness of the corpus upon which this study is based as well as the trustworthiness of the findings proposed in chapter five ultimately reside in foreign language educators re-examining the data presented in chapter four, and accepting the related analyses as trustworthy exemplars of the procedures and expectations through which
native/nonnative novice teachers of French as a foreign language produce and understand ordinary conversational behavior.

Since the trustworthiness of the study depends upon how recognizable is the ordinary conversational behavior of the subjects, the central domain of data that is of interest in this study is not, for instance, a few exceptional examples of fluent conversation in the target language. The central domain of data with which this study is concerned is repetitive, everyday, mundane verbal interactions. Sequences that were transcribed were not selected because of there exceptional character, but because they were instances of verbal exchanges which occur routinely in the different language classrooms.
1 The reader must be aware that other possibilities are available. For instance, the Department of French and Italian at The Ohio State University offers review courses, such as 102.66 or 103.66, for learners who took some French in high school but did not achieve a determined score on their placement test. It is also possible at times that novice teachers be assigned one of the four versions of the Intermediate French II course (French 104). Another option would be for the novice teachers to request teaching in the Individualized Instruction Center where the same courses are taught on a one to one basis with the learners. Novice teachers may be assigned to teach in one of these settings. Neither Anne nor Debbie had any experience with these different options.

2 For a complete list of chapters from the textbook Invitation that are studied in French 102.01, as well as the functions and structures presented in these chapters, see the syllabus for French 102.01 in Appendix A.

3 1/8 Chapter 7, Point of departure (television); Life and culture, pp. 162-165. Vocabulary check. To speak about time, pp. 166-171. *Exercises—Invitation to listen and write

1/10 To speak about past events (I and II), (past tense—passé composé—
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with [auxiliary verbs] _avoir_ and _être_, pp. 171-178. *Exercises—Invitation to
listen and write

1/12 To speak about important events in your life ([verb] _choisir_ and _-ir_
verbs), pp. 178-181. Integration and perspectives; life and culture;

4 The following section explains in greater details the Review-View-Preview
format, but all the items marked for Monday, February 8, 1996 were pre-
viewed at the end of the previous lesson, on Friday, January 5, 1996. It
cannot be considered unfair practice to ask students to have a basic
knowledge of the _Point de départ_ vocabulary since these items were
introduced and explained at the end of the previous lesson, and students had
48 hours to study them at home and get in contact with their instructor,
during office hours or by electronic mail, if serious comprehension problems
arose before the short test.

5 French television

6 Writing section

7 Oral section

8 Debbie and Anne; see chapter one, Section 1.6.

9 While it was made clear to both instructors that the researcher would give
no feedback and make no comments on their respective teaching
performances during the time of the data collection, they were both given the
opportunity to come after Winter Quarter 1996 to review their personal tapes with the researcher. One of the two teaching associates indeed requested some of the tapes during Spring 1996, and discussed at length with the researcher pedagogical and communicative aspects of her teaching.

Several factors came to disturb this original schedule. First and foremost, the blizzard of 1996 made it impossible to start recording before January 10th (week 2 of the ten-week quarter). Second, this original recording schedule included data collection dates when the instructors were indeed not able to teach but had to administer different tests (departmental quizzes, exams, oral exams, mid-terms, etc., and also tests for the Ohio State University 1996 Program Evaluation Initiative) and holidays (such as Martin Luther King Day). Researcher and teaching associates tried to adapt the original data collection timeline while staying faithful to the two rules that had been agreed upon during the Autumn 1995 meeting: (1) preserving three two-week sessions of data collection, (2) having these sessions as close as possible to the beginning, the middle, and the end of Winter quarter 1996.

The classes taught by Debbie and Anne were recorded on the following dates:

- Wednesday, January 10th; Friday, January 12th; Wednesday, January 17th;
- Friday, January 19th; Monday, February 5th, Wednesday, February 7th;
- Friday, February 9th; Monday, February 12th; Wednesday, February 21st;
- Friday, February 23rd; Monday, February 26th; Friday, March 1st; Monday, March 4th; and Wednesday, March 6th.
At least the few students who had been able to come to class; January 3rd was the first day of the blizzard of 1996. Several students, instructors (such as Debbie or the researcher), were unable to reach the Ohio State University main campus on this specific day. The announcement that, during the whole quarter, the class would be taped was repeated on Friday, January 5th.

When class resumed after Martin Luther King Day on Wednesday, January 10th, the researcher could at last be introduced to the four groups of students, and the data collection could begin.

Unfortunately, always in English.

Garfinkel and Sacks (1970, 342) explain how important the notion of “member” is to study phenomena of order in discourse:

The notion of member is the heart of the matter. We do not use the term to refer to a person. It refer instead to a mastery of natural language, which we understand in the following way.

We offer the observation that persons, because of the fact that they are heard to be speaking a natural language, somehow are heard to be engaged in the objective production and objective display of common sense knowledge of everyday activities as observable and reportable phenomena ... For speakers and auditors the practices of natural
language somehow exhibit these phenomena in the particulars of speaking, and *that* these phenomena are exhibited is thereby itself made exhibitable in further description, remark, questions, and in other ways for the telling.

A member in one of the different French classes described in this study is therefore someone whose language proficiency allows him/her to be “engaged in the objective production and objective display of common sense knowledge of everyday activities.” Coulon (1987, 44) further explained:

To become a member, it is to become affiliated to a group, to an institution, which necessitate the mastery of the common institutional language... Once affiliated to a group, members do not need to ask each others about what they do. They know the implicit meaning of their behavior and accept routines imposed by social practices... [A member is] a person endowed with a repertoire of processes, methods, activities, know-how that renders one able to invent mechanisms to give meaning to the surrounding world.

Participation and communication patterns in the language classroom should therefore demonstrate the type of memberships that students and instructor create during the foreign language lesson.

Overview

The previous chapters explained the current emphasis in foreign language education to teach “communicative proficiency” (Jarvis, et al., 1993, I-vii). The consequences of this orientation toward communication in the foreign language classroom not only maximize student participation in classroom discourse, but also make student French production as close as possible to the communicative norms in the native discourse communities where the target language is spoken.

This chapter aims at describing and analyzing naturally occurring discourse recorded in two French 102.01 courses. More precisely, the emphasis on student production suggests an examination of the way in which these two teaching associates ask question.

The first part of this chapter presents transcripts of naturally occurring interactional sequences recorded in Debbie’s French 102.01 class.
The second part of chapter four presents interactional sequences recorded in Anne's class.

The sections characterizing each teaching associate's classroom discourse are organized according to a similar pattern. In order to respond to the first research question reported in chapter one (i.e., what are the interactional resources used by novice teaching associates to create a meaningful context for the development of verbal interactions in the target language in their classrooms?), the first two transcripts in each section (Debbie: transcripts I.1 and I.2; Anne: transcripts II.1 and II.2) display the questioning patterns of each teaching associate.

The proficiency movement sets as the primary objective for classroom instruction that students learn the language as it is used in authentic communicative situations in the countries where the language is spoken. The last transcripts reported in each section (Debbie: transcript I.3; Anne: transcript II.3) propose a similar communication situation in each of these two French courses. These transcripts are figured and analyzed as examples of the coexistence of classroom discourse and communicative discourse in the target language classroom.

Each of these two sections presents general background information, the presentation of the transcripts, then a general summary. A synthesis of all the findings concludes the chapter.
It is hoped that an analysis of these examples of naturally occurring discourse in the foreign language classroom will allow the researcher to characterize the classroom discourse produced by each of the two teaching associates and their students. Such characterizations will be summarized at the end of chapter four, and will help the researcher address the two remaining research questions in the conclusions presented in chapter five, i.e.; how do the conversational resources used by the European teaching associate compare to the devices utilized by the American teaching associate? What does the study of the foreign language classroom reveal about the notion of language as a teachable pedagogical content?

I. Debbie

The first two transcripts presented in this section document the manner in which Debbie asks routine questions of her students. The instructor is observed while reviewing the material that was presented during the previous lesson (see chapter three for explanation of the review-view-preview format adopted in French 102.01). The question that opens the sequence is called the topic-question; it is the question that establishes the topic of the conversational exchange that follows. Follow-up questions on the
same topic may be asked once students have provided a response to the topic-question. The following transcripts present the way in which Debbie, the nonnative speaker, presents a single topic-question and its follow-ups to the learners.

I.1. Debbie and the review activity on “choisir”.

Introduction

The first twenty minutes of Debbie’s lesson were spent on a test which, according to the syllabus, should have been administered during the previous lesson. At the end of the exam, Debbie collects the copies and passes handouts to the students. Since a silent test with paper and pencil does not constitute an interactional sequence between Debbie and the learners, the distribution of instructional materials at the end of the exam seemed to indicate that the first instructional event was to be based on the handout.

Lines 1 through 5: Uncharted territory

1. Debbie: <Facing the class> OK, très bien…(...) Uhm…(...) OK,

2. (.) nous allons uh reaviser un p’tit peu avant d’faire ça. <She points

3. to a green handout> (.) Alors uh…(...) gardez s’il vous plaît ce
As she returns and stands behind her desk, Debbie looks at the handout she just gave to her students. Even though she signifies that she intends to resume the lesson after the exam (line 1: “OK, très bien...”), the falling intonation and fading volume of her intervention gives the impression that Debbie is tentative. This “OK, very well” announced the completion of one task, and the transition to a new one. The transition is not immediate; during the pause that follows, Debbie looks for some information in her textbook as she flips its pages. During this time, Debbie still holds the turn at talk. As is the case in informal conversation (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974, 705; on minimization of gaps), Debbie uses the conversational device “Uhm...” to avoid silence during her turn, while thinking about what to do next. After one more pause, she resumes the action.

The second “OK” signals to the cohort that Debbie is about to resume speaking (i.e., this “uhm” is here called a resumptive device). Repeating the first word she pronounced after completion of the exam, Debbie repairs her previous false start with this second resumptive “uhm.” She now introduces the topic of the next activity: She proposes a review before starting to work on “this,” (i.e., the green handout that she displays in front of her, lines 1 and
2). The false start, the hesitations, and the two resumptive “OKs” seem to indicate that Debbie is looking for a way to engage the cohort in an interaction.

Debbie’s arms move fast. Her large gestures emphasize that transition is being made from the exam to something that needs to be done before the green handout (i.e., “we are going to uh review a little bit before we do this). As she explains that use of the green handout will be postponed until after the review; she picks up one of the handouts, places it high in front of her, and taps on it with her left index finger.

It can be inferred that Debbie thinks that her students cannot successfully complete the activity presented on the green handout without, first, reviewing some specific syntactic or lexical materials. This is what the review proposes to achieve.

Debbie rephrases the same information (i.e., we are not going to work on the green handout), including it in a command: “please keep this paper, but...” The command is to keep the handout: There is thus a reason for discarding the green handout, “but” the paper needs to be kept. The logic of her command is that the green handout will be useful for future classroom activities, but it has no relevance to what will immediately follow. Debbie changed her initial lesson plan.
She finishes her turn with a comprehension check which generate no student uptake. She therefore implies that everybody understood that she had introduced a review activity (line 2: "reuviser").

The relevance of the previous microanalysis to the present purpose is to show that the following questioning sequence that follows is unprepared, unrehearsed, and improvised. She had first planned to work on the green handout after the test, but is now initiating a different interactional sequence.

Lines 6 and 7: Presentation of the topic-question

6. **Debbie**: Alors uh (...) nous allons discuter un p’tit peu (...) uh (...) choisir,
7. et les verbes du deuxième groupe! (...) Uhm.(...)

Debbie resumes speaking with a second “Alors uh...” It is pronounced with a falling intonation and is followed by pause. The phrase “Alors uh...”, may, thus, be as much as of a gap avoider as it is, for Debbie, a logical connector: Since students have understood that a review activity, and not the green handout, would come next, Debbie may go on with the review. At any rate, no student uptake could be heard after a new pause.
Next, Debbie defines how she expects students to participate in the next activity. The only clue that she provided so far is that it will be a review (line 2: “revisor”), defining this domain as the collection of pedagogical events that occurred during the previous lesson(s). Her choice of words also defines the genre of the interaction that will follow: “nous allons discuter un p’tit peu (.),” i.e., we are going to have a little chat. Debbie tells the students what she hopes to do with them; that is, have an informal conversation about the grammar topics which the students prepared as homework. After a pause in mid-utterance, Debbie also states what the subject of the interaction needs to be: “uh (.) choisir, and the verbs of the second conjugation group!”

Therefore, it can be observed that Debbie provides the genre to be practiced (i.e., informal conversation) and the topic (i.e., choisir and French verbs of the second conjugation group), and leaves students free to self-select and to provide any information relevant to the given topic.

After completion of her turn, a first pause (2”), a new gap avoider, and a new pause (3”) emphasize to the students that it is their turn to speak (line 7: “(.) Uhm, (.)”). No one volunteers, the turn remains unclaimed, and still belongs to the instructor until a learner provides an element of information about the verbs similar to “choisir,” or until Debbie assigns the turn to someone else.
Lines 8 and 9: Second attempt

8. Debbie: Quels sont uh... (...) Donnez-moi uh...(.) un verbe uh (.)

9. de du groupe avec choisir?

There is no response to the previous invitation. Debbie interprets this silence as a need to further define the task since she proposes a new question about the grammatical content at end. After a new false start (line 8: “quels sont uh...”), Debbie abandons the idea of having students volunteer what they know about the verbs of the second conjugation group. She proceeds to present a more specific question: Students need to list orally the verbs that are similar to “choisir” (line 8: “Give me uh ... a verb of from the group with choisir”).

She hesitates as she asks the question. Her sentence presents two false starts and three intra-turn pauses. Another false start, with exactly the same rhythm, pauses, and falling intonation can be heard (Cf. line 1). On the video-recording, Debbie can be seen looking at the ceiling, then back to the textbook she holds in her hands, but not looking at the cohort to which the question is addressed. All of these help to reinforce the idea that Debbie is looking for words to express herself, and that she is experiencing difficulty in giving ad hoc instructions in French.
The second formulation is different from the initial topic-question. Although any student is still free to volunteer while the topic has been circumscribed, from “anything about these verbs” to “name these verbs,” Debbie changed the modality of the questioning from an invitation to volunteer any relevant information to a command. At the same time, she organizes the competence from which students have to produce their responses. If an informal conversation is the domain of every day communicative competence, a request to name verbs that have already been presented in class is typical of the domain of the question with a known answer, typical of classroom discourse.

Lines 10 and 11: Third attempt

10. Debbie: (..) Y avait uh... (..) peut être six (..) six verbes; (..) Est-ce que vous
11. pouvez uh... (..) vous rappeler: choisir... (..)

At the beginning of line 10, Debbie is in the same situation as she was at the beginning of line 8. No one has volunteered to respond to her request to name the verbs similar to “choisir.” The turn remains unclaimed, and still belongs to the instructor until a learner proposes another verbs presented in the lesson on the second conjugation verb group in Invitation. Or, the turn remains unclaimed until Debbie assigns it to someone else.
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For the third time, Debbie decides to revise the instructions for students to produce some French. She revises the guidelines for producing the expected French utterances: “There were... (.) maybe six (.). six verbs. Can you uh... (...) remember: choisir...” The use of the verb “rappeler” (remember) is not accidental; Debbie reminds students that they were supposed to study “choisir” and similar verbs before coming to class. She produces this new question as she shows the textbook in her hands to the cohort. In the same manner as she used “ça” and pointed to the green handout on line 2, Debbie uses “Y avait/T’ was”, and holds the textbook. The use of the imperfect may, however, indirectly refers to what students were supposed to have studied prior to coming to class: studying the French verbs in the textbook.

Students are still free to volunteer, but this time, Debbie presents a different question. She no longer asks: “What are the verbs like ‘choisir’?” but “Can you name them?” If students openly admit that they cannot name any of these verbs, they would at the same time acknowledge that either they failed to pay attention when Debbie previewed the topic two sessions ago as well as when she taught this grammar topic two days ago, or that they did not study this topic since it was first introduced. Such an acknowledgment would represent a serious violation of the rules stated in the syllabus (Cf. 147.)
Chapter three; students are supposed to be prepared. It is then rather improbable that any next speaker should respond to the previous question with anything but a positive response.

The third attempt presents a question that is even more precise than the previous one. Students are supposed to have studied the presentation of the verbs belonging to the second conjugation group in their textbook. The implied domain of potential competent answers is therefore now very narrow; it is defined as the few pages in the textbook that explain the grammatical topic at hand, and which were supposed to be studied at home by the learners.

In addition, Debbie starts the list that she expects to build collaboratively with her students (line 11: choisir...), and therefore communicates that the format of the activity is a rejoinder. Her previous suggestion for an informal discussion about French verbs has not led to the expected conversation. Debbie next proposes a new task, one that asks students to demonstrate that they can list the second conjugation verbs.

Lines 12 through 14: An uncommon command

12. Debbie: Commencez uh... (...) Quels sont les autres? (...)

13. Harry: Finiss?

14. Debbie: Finir, (...) très bien. (...) Et qu'est-ce que ça veut dire en Anglais?
Debbie’s intra-turn pauses do not match semantic units segmented. Nor is the input “chunked,” in order to facilitate student processing of the different lexical elements of her utterances. For the purpose of this study, “chunking” was defined as smaller sets of informational units that are grouped together for students to process more easily—similar to smaller pieces of pre-processed/pre-digested pieces of information (chapter one). She looks away, and seems to look for the next word, sometimes even repeats the last word that was uttered before the pauses. It seems therefore that some of Debbie’s intra-turn pauses are repair devices. She repairs her own utterance as she produces it, and these repairs are now more frequent in the subsequent reformulations of the initial topic-question.

Since the learners have not taken a turn at talk, Debbie now prompts them to speak (line 12: “Commencez uh...” i.e., “Start now uh...”) before proposing the question a second time (“What are the other (verbs)”). In the view of the descriptive logs of Debbie’s class, this type of direct command is nevertheless rare. What is more common is for the instructor to make obvious when a turn is completed, and when it is appropriate to claim the next one.

After a three-second pause during which Debbie flipped the pages of her textbook, she raises her head and establishes eye contact with Harry. The student knows that this eye contact is a form of selection and that he needs to respond to the request, and therefore proposes an answer.
His answer is hard to decipher. Harry mutters a word that almost sounds like a conjugated form of the French verb “finir” as he seems to say “finiss?” with a rising intonation that seems, like a tag question to ask Debbie: “Am I right?” Such a response pronounced with a rising intonation is called a “try marking.” The student completes his turn as economically as possible and sends it back to Debbie, the instructor, who now has to tell him whether or not his response is correct, and if it is not accepted, why it is not correct.

Debbie seems to accept Harry’s grammatically incorrect answer: She nods and her evaluation of his effort is positive (line 14: “very good”). Whether or not she heard Harry’s error, she publicly corrects it as she says aloud the (proper) infinitive for the cohort. The whole sequence gives the impression of a canonical IRE² (McHoul, 1978, 190); it is one, however, where the student’s response, because it was grammatically inaccurate, was corrected (“finir”), but nevertheless positively evaluated (nodding and “très bien” evaluation). If one considers that issues of correctness are locally defined, and if one recalls Debbie’s four attempts to obtain some language production out of her students, it is possibly Harry’s capacity to respond to a command in French rather than the accuracy of his answer that Debbie positively evaluated.
It should be noted that since the first presentation of this topic-question, Debbie has limited the scope of the topic, and has simplified the genre of pedagogical exercise, nonetheless she keeps addressing her invitations, her questions, and her commands to the whole cohort, leaving to the students the task of finding a next speaker. Even the request was addressed to the cohort. The selection of a next speaker came after three unsuccessful attempts to have students self-select.

After Harry's response, Debbie abandons this topic-question (and consequently stops the list of verbs from the second conjugation group to choisir and finir), and proposes a new topic-question about the conjugation of these verbs in the present tense.

The following transcript allows the researcher to observe Debbie as she is engaged in the same type of questioning activity and to determine whether the same questioning pattern was present, or whether Debbie's behavior changes with the topic?

I.2. Debbie and “Eurovision”

Introduction

The following transcript shows that the questioning pattern discussed in the previous section is consistent for Debbie. Although the context is different. The lesson has begun twelve minutes earlier. Students were
supposed to prepare at home a text discussing the French media. Debbie asks comprehension questions about some information in the text, questions for which responses can be found in the textbook. The first question is not included in the following transcript and was answered rapidly. Debbie asked the cohort to provide an example of public television channel in France. The following topic-question is asked immediately after having positively evaluated the preceding student response.

Lines 1 and 2: Presentation of the topic-question

1. Debbie: Et, uh, est-ce que quelqu’un <she raises her hand> peut
2. décrire “Eurovision?” (..)

The format that Debbie adopted for this sequence is the following: It is a series of comprehensions questions in French based on the assigned reading. After successful completion of the first question, Debbie makes a transition to the second question (line 1: “Et”—And—is the transition marker between the first topic-question and the second question 2 analyzed in the present sequence).

As she starts asking the second topic-question, Debbie raises her hand, indicating that she would like a student to volunteer to respond. Debbie just completed asking the first question, and the hand signal shows that she is
asking for volunteers. It was showed in the first sections that Debbie, at
times, seems to doubt that her students are able to understand what she
says; she reinforces here this idea as she illustrates for the students with
gestures the expected consequence.

Debbie's gestures do not point out that students need to raise their
hand to be allowed to speak—i.e., to ask for permission—but they indicate
that she reached a transition-relevance place (TRP) and that she expects
them to speak next. Therefore, as her hand raises, she asks the topic-
question—her rising intonation just before the pause should indicate that a
new interactional sequence was initiated, and that Debbie now intends for
students to take the next turn.

As she presents the topic-question (lines 1 and 2), she mispronounces
"Eurovision³," giving to the word an American-English accent. No student
volunteers to either give the answer or make a guess. The turn at talk
remains unclaimed, and still belongs to the instructor until a learner starts
describing the "Eurovision" or until Debbie assigns the turn to someone else.
Debbie waits only two seconds, then proposes the second formulation of the
same topic-question.

Lines 3 and 4: Second attempt

3. **Debbie:** Comment est-ce que cette émission marche—work? (.).
4. Comment est-ce que cette émission marche? (..) “Eurovision?”
Note: Next follows a pause. This pause is 12 second-long. During the first 4 seconds, Debbie reads her textbook lying on top of the overhead projector—a student coughs. After the cough, she looks up, looks at a student to her left and smiles.

If the first formulation of the second topic-question opened a broad array of possible answers—any information on the topic of “Eurovision” is acceptable—the second formulation restricts the potential answers to the topic of the functioning of “Eurovision.” Debbie goes from asking for a description of “Eurovision” to asking how it works.

The only potentially problematic word in the new question is “marche,” which Debbie immediately and accurately translates as “work.” At this point, Debbie has tried to clarify the topic (lines 1 and 2), to stress the interactional structure (line 1, she raises her hand to show that she needs somebody to volunteer), and to disambiguate the question (line 3). A shorter pause yet, and Debbie repeats the question (line 4): It is word for word the previous question (line 3) without “work,” the code switch glossing what Debbie anticipated to be the main difficulty in her second attempt. The repetition is identical to the previous question; it is the second question minus the word that was first included to insure comprehension. The repetition repairs the code switch as it gives Debbie’s question a more native-like, a more conversational appearance.
Debbie's questioning pattern seems therefore consistent: The first question is always the broadest and the most general topic. This question appears to have two possible functions: The most proficient students may volunteer an answer in French; however, if no one attempts to answer it, it serves to establish the context in which students have to locate the meaning of the more specific question that follows. Debbie's second formulation of the topic-question narrows the topic, and may establish a sentence pattern for students to follow, or introduce most of the necessary lexical elements, in order to answer the question. This second formulation may be repeated (line 4) before Debbie waits for students to take a turn at talk.

The importance of the second formulation of the topic-question cannot be underestimated. This formulation has been previewed by the general topic-naming broader question and presents most of the grammar and lexicon necessary to provide an answer. It may be the reason why Debbie makes sure that every single word is or will be understandable in this second question-form; this explains why Debbie felt that she had to gloss the word "marche" (line 3). Debbie pauses. She has completed the presentation and reformulation of the topic-question, and signaled that she was expecting learners to self-select. Students, however, do not volunteer to answer the question on the functioning of "Eurovision." Reasons for this silence can be diverse and numerous. In spite of Debbie's efforts, students may experience
a comprehension problem; or, as often the case with beginning learner, students may feel the need to silently rehearse their answer before presenting it publicly to the instructor and the rest of the cohort.

At first, Debbie seems to choose the second hypothesis. Sitting on her desk facing the cohort, she suddenly turns her head and looks to her right at her textbook lying on top of the overhead projector, giving students more time and letting them think their answers for themselves. As she looks away, the possibility of being designated as the next speaker is suspended for a few moments. After 12 seconds, no student has yet volunteered to take the next turn at talk.

Lines 5 through 7: Third attempt and selection of a student
5. Debbie: Essayez en Français, essayez premièremen <hand gestures> en
6. Français (…) 
7. Paul, est-ce que vous savez?

Debbie puts an end to the long pause (12 seconds) as she looks to her left, smiles, and nominates an unidentified student first without naming him or her. She tells the students that he or she should try “first” answering
in French—therefore implying that if he or she could not answer the question in French, another chance would be given at a later time to answer it in English (line 5 and 6: Try in French, try first in French).

There is another pause (3 seconds). Debbie’s suggestion to try an answer in French is not followed. Finally, she nominates student (Paul⁵), allocates the turn to him, and presents the third formulation of the question. She therefore confirms the previous observation that the third presentation of the topic-question is usually not addressed to the cohort any longer, but to a specific student.

Lines 8 through 32” Construction of a response to the topic-question

8. **Paul:** *<No verbal response. 2 seconds>*

9. **Debbie:** Non?

10. **Paul:** I just ... *<says something in English very low>*

11. **Debbie:** OK. Dans uh... (...) ce paragraphe, il y a quelque chose sur

12. Eurovision. (..)

13. C'est un type, uh (...) pas exactment une émission uh (...) c'est sur la

14. télé.

15. Est-ce que vous pouvez, uh, décrire (...) comment (...)“Eurovision”

16. marche? Work, how *<hand gestures> does it work?*

17. **Paul:** *<11 seconds>* Oh uhm (...) I guess (...) en Anglais?
18. Debbie: Essayez en Français. (.) Essayez...

19. Paul: Uhm (6")

20. Debbie: Il y a des émissions dans beaucoup <hand gestures> de langues?

22. Paul: Uhm (...) Uhm (...) How do you say “Broadcast”/ 


24. Paul: It (.). it broadcasts in a bunch of different countries <hidden by noise> yeah! (...) I'm sorry, I didn't know/

26. Debbie: /Non, ça va/

27. Paul: /how to say “broadcast”/

28. Debbie: /ça va. <hand gestures> C'est pour tous (.)

29. Alors, <hand gestures> c'est pour tous les pays uh de l'Europe,

30. c'est ça?

31. Alors France, Suisse, uh, <hand gestures> Allemagne, Espagne,

32. tout ça. OK. C'est bien.

At first, Paul provides no verbal response (line 8). Debbie insists (line 9: "No?" with a rising intonation), which finally provokes a response from the designated student. His answer, however, bypasses the necessary step to try first to formulate his response in French (Cf. lines 5 and 6). Paul speaks in English in a low voice: The few words that can be heard (line 10) seem to
indicate that Paul makes a side comment about what he understood or that he did not understand in Debbie's question. Since Debbie gives additional details when she resumes speaking (lines 11 and 12), it is probable that Paul's comments expressed that he did not understand the topic-question.

Paul initiates a side sequence (Jefferson, 1972), a time-out from the interaction. He expresses his lack of comprehension, and consequently sends back the turn to Debbie who may now either initiate repair of the previous question to make it clearer to Paul or select another student.

Debbie, therefore resumes speaking (line 11: "OK"). During this turn, she tries to clarify her question; she chooses not to re-phrase her question, but to show that the answer can be found in a particular paragraph in the book (lines 11 and 12: i.e., In this paragraph, there is something about Eurovision). The only way for Debbie to help her students is not discursive, since she does not provide any new and different formulation of the question on lines 3 and 4, but deictic as she shows Paul the paragraph where the information can be located in the assigned reading. She pauses (2 seconds), but Paul does not react and does not take the next turn.

Debbie is again in a situation where, being the person entitled to allocate turns and change topics (Cf. McHoul, 1978, 190), the turn at talk came back to her and she will keep it unless either she abandons the
question-and-answer activity on the assigned reading or unless a student (Paul) provides a response defining how "Eurovision" functions. Unless she finds a way to allocate the next turn, she cannot proceed with the lesson.

Because Debbie allocated the turn to Paul, as long as he shows that (a) he does not understand the question, and/or (b) he is unable to formulate his answer in French, the instructor faces the same two alternatives: selecting another student or repairing the previous instructions, in hopes that such repair will make the production of an answer in French easier for the selected student.

Instead of selecting another student, Debbie starts repairing her instructions. Her repair strategy is to start providing a valid answer to her own question. She has to try in French first since she could do no less than what she demands from her students, but her hesitations make the difficulty of the task evident. Two intra-turn pauses can be observed and three different utterances are started during her turn (lines 13 and 14: "It's one kind uh (.) not exactly a show uh (.) it's on TV"). Finally she concludes by repeating almost exactly the second formulation of the question (line 4), providing this time a simultaneous translation—a subtitle—for the whole question (lines 15 and 16: "Can you, uh, describe (.) how 'Eurovision' works? <In English>Work, how does it work?").
Paul delays his answer (11 seconds), but nonetheless accepts his turn (line 17: "Oh uhm"), hesitates more (3 seconds), then asks Debbie whether he may say what he knows in English (line 17). Paul responds to Debbie’s question with a question of his own. His tone is serious and he tries to say what he can in French (i.e.; "en Anglais?"). It is probable that Paul interactionally transmits two pieces of information: (a) he is unable to communicate in French what he knows about Eurovision, and (b) since he cannot achieve the task first in French, he needs to be allowed to communicate the information in English.

In other words, Paul expresses the fact that either he therefore may say anything he can say in French and his answer will be appropriate for the pedagogical context, or he may respond to the content of topic-question at hand, but then needs to be allowed to respond in English. Expressing his lack of proficiency to Debbie, he shows that his response will not satisfy the pedagogical exercise defined on lines 5 and 6 about the functioning of "Eurovision." Paul requests a permission to bypass the French response; he requests a permission to divorce content (the functioning of "Eurovision") and language of expression (French).

Debbie understands Paul’s request since she insists that he respond in French, but she does not acknowledge his latest claim that he is unable to provide an answer that would be both pedagogically appropriate and communicatively relevant to respond the question (line 18: "Try in French. (.)."
Try”). She requests that Paul respond in French and therefore expresses the idea that the topic-question defined a domain of potential response in which she believes Paul is proficient. She indicates that she wants him to both discuss the content and to express himself in French.

In response to Debbie's command to try in French, Paul does not refuse the turn re-allocated to him by Debbie (line 19: "Uhm..."), but does not even begin to utter the expected answer in French. A six second pause follows his "Uhm" during which neither Debbie nor any other student claim the turn at talk still allocated to Paul. The pause illustrates in a foreign language education setting the following claims by McHoul (1978, 1989) that state that classroom talk is characterized by the fact that the potential for gap and pause is maximized, but also that the potential for overlap is minimized. It also illustrates the observation that a selected student, once in the midst of preparing an answer, is entitled to feel that s/he will be given "reasonable" time to produce an uninterrupted answer (McHoul, 1978, 191).

Debbie may estimate this reasonable time to be around six seconds (length of the pause before she regains the turn at talk). She brings a solution to Paul's quandary as she gives him the preferred answer (lines 20 and 21: "There are a lot of shows in many languages?"), rising her intonation at the end of the utterance, so as to make it sound like a question to which Paul just needs to answer positively to acquit the task. Indeed, under the disguise of keeping the interaction entirely in French, Debbie prevents Paul
from communicating his own response; the preferred answer has now been
made a public matter, and Paul needs to show his comprehension by
repeating the model—or even just nodding in agreement.

Paul, however, does not just agree with Debbie's response to the topic-
question. As the turn fell back on him once Debbie asked him to agree with
her preferred answer, he takes advantage of having his turn secured
(McHoul, 1978, 191) to say something different. He grabs his turn
instantaneously with a latch (line 22), then pauses (3 seconds), claims to
keep his turn with the same tactic, then pauses (2 seconds). Then, after a
third "Uhm," he turns to Debbie and asks her how to translate in French the
word "Broadcast." Whether or not Paul understood the instructor's previous
turn as a response to the topic-question at hand, he asks his instructor to
solve the lexical problem that prevents him from expressing his personal
meaning in the target language.

Debbie seems to resist code switching that is initiated by students, and
she interrupts Paul, literally translating in French "No, it's all right-OK. In
English, it's all right, it's all right." Paul is no longer expected to
communicate in French. Debbie signifies that "it's all right" for him to
provide his answer in his first language (line 23). Paul defines the
functioning of "Eurovision" in English (line 24), but is not told how to say
"broadcast" in French.
Debbie brings closure to the sequence after a rapid exchange (2 interruptions) with Paul. She avoids opening additional side-comments in English about the reasons why Paul was unable to acquit the task in French. The first interruption occurs on line 26, after Paul apologized to her; the second one (line 28) is more definitive as it is illustrated by a hand gesture to close the topic.

She does regain control of classroom discourse at the end of line 28, as she pauses in mid-sentence. She repeats the information she gave earlier (lines 20 and 21); i.e., that "Eurovision" is for all the European countries. Her personal definition (lines 20 and 21; lines 29 and 30) is, however, qualitatively different from Paul's definition. It is repeated at the end of the sequence to bring closure. Her "OK. C'est bien" marks the conclusion of this interactional sequence and a transition to a new topic-question. Paul did not learn either how to say "broadcast" or how to express his idea in French.

1.3. Debbie and the conclusion of the review activity on “choisir”

Introduction

The first two transcripts characterized Debbie's usual questioning pattern. The purpose of the following transcript is to characterize the coexistence of several discursive fields in Debbie's French class. The
recommended pedagogical approach used by the language program is inspired by the proficiency movement in foreign language education (see chapter one), and the teaching associates are asked to teach “communicatively.” Therefore, the following transcript was collected with the following concern: How do teaching associate and students create opportunities for casual conversations in the target language? It needs to be compared with transcript II.3 which presents a similar situation in Anne’s French class.

This transcript represents the final episode in the review of “choisir” and similar verbs; it occurred toward the end of the review activity that Debbie initiated in transcript I.1. Even though Debbie code switches again during this sequence, it is the conversation with Fred that provided the main reason for analyzing this portion of transcript.

Lines 63 through 66: Debbie and Karen

63. Debbie: (...) Après, uhm... <5”> Uhm,

64. Karen! (...) Est-ce que vous avez encore choisie <emphatic> une

65. profession (...) ou non?

As noted previously, Debbie’s transitions to new topics or new questions are often marked by hesitations or false starts; the transition to this last part of the review of “choisir” follows this pattern. McHoul (1978, 207) argues for the preponderance of tag addresses in classroom discourse, Debbie, however, chooses a pre-positioned address, which means that Karen will have to respond to the following question. If tag-addresses emphasize the cohort’s responsibility to listen to the question-in-production, the pre-positioned address to Karen relieves Debbie from having to wait for one student to volunteer, and therefore to speed up the pace of her lesson.

The question that follows is delivered without pauses (no “chunking” of information). Debbie raises the volume of her voice and stresses the verb to be practiced (line 64: “choisi <emphatic>”). It seems that she has reached completion of the sentence after the word “profession,” where she lowers her voice, but after a short pause, she adds a tag-marking to show Karen the two alternative responses (i.e., positive or negative). Debbie does not repeat her question, and waits for Karen to speak.

Karen displays her understanding of Debbie’s question, claiming her turn with a “Uhm.” Then she starts uttering the elements of her answer in “perfect” (i.e., grammatical) order (line 49: “Uhm (...) Je n’ai pas (...) choisi (...) une profession”). Karen responds negatively (I have not selected a profession), which prevents Debbie from further asking her to explain in French her choice for a professional career. The turn falls back to Debbie.
The instructor abandons the topic with Karen and starts looking for new volunteers. Since Karen’s response is accepted, she did fulfill the task presented by the instructor. The nature of the task was therefore not to ask about her professional goals, but to have her make a sentence in French with the verb “choisir.” The domain of competence hence defined by the instructor and students is not communication in the target language, but knowledge of grammatical drills in a foreign language classroom.

Lines 67 through 70: Not “excited” at all

70. Debbie: <She raises her right hand> Qui a choisi (.) une profession? Qui a
71. choisi (.) une profession? <lower>
72. It’s a job. (..)
73. Personne? Hmm…? <5”>
74. I’m afraid you’re not that all <emphatic> excited! <She laughs at her own
75. joke, turns her back and goes behind her desk> (...)

After Karen’s negative response, Debbie raises her hand to signify that she needs someone else to volunteer. She re-directs the question initially addressed to Karen to the whole cohort (lines 67 and 68: as she raises her hand, she says: “Who has chosen (.) a profession? Who has chosen (.) a
profession”). Debbie repeats the re-directed question; the repetition serving, however, as the prompt for a quick gloss in English of the French word “profession” (lines 68 and 69: “Qui a choisi (.) une profession? It’s a job”). This stealthy use of the first language, which will be henceforth referred to as “subtitles,” indicates Debbie’s hypothesis about the source of the difficulty. Debbie thinks that the students’ lack of participation or poor understanding of the question at hand is due to a lexical difficulty. But even when the meaning of “profession” is clarified, no one volunteers to speak.

Since no one self-selects, Debbie speaks and switches to English. Her tone is humorous, and she pretends to crack a joke. Debbie, however, shares with the cohort her opinion about her students’ lack of participation (lines 52 and 53: “I’m afraid you’re not that excited!”). She seems to bring closure to the activity of producing sentences with “choisir.” Debbie does not propose a new question or side-comments about the syntactical properties of the French language. She states the students’ lack of motivation to take part in this “discussion” announced at the beginning of the activity (see section I.1; line 6). She seems to prepare them for a transition toward a new topic that they may find more “exciting.” She laughs about her own joke, but gives up as she switches back to English to express comments that are not meant to facilitate and explain the task at hand, and turns her back and goes back toward her desk.
Lines 73 through 86: Fred's shortcut

73. **Fred**: Uh (.) Je... (...) je veux être uh... un pilote!

74. **Debbie**: Un (.) comment?

75. **Fred**: un pilote!

76. **Debbie**: Pilote! (.) Très bien... (..) OK! (.) Et est-ce que vous avez uh... (..)

77. les yeux très bons, (.) oui? (..)

78. **Fred**: Oui!

79. **Debbie**: Il faut avoir (.) les yeux très bons (.) pour être pilote, oui? (..)

   OK...

80. Très bien! (..)

81. Uh... Il faut avoir (.) les yeux très bons (.) pour être pilote, oui? (..) OK...

82. Très bien! (..) Uh...<4" looking in her book>

83. Hmm! <Talking lower, as if to herself> Je crois c'est tout! (.)

84. Bon, (.) <higher now> Est-ce que vous avez des questions sur le (.) ces verbes? Parce qu'ils sont uh... (...) assez différents? (..) <Very low>

85. <incomprehensible> (...) OK! (.)

While Debbie faces the blackboard Fred self-selects as the next speaker with a "Uh." The turn is claimed, and Fred now possesses some time to propose his answer (McHoul, 1978, 191). Fred's response is interesting in several ways: (a) although Debbie gave up speaking French, he responds in the target language, (b) he starts talking just after Debbie's comments that
her students are not motivated enough, (c) his answer is inadequate from the didactic perspective of the activity—Fred failed to use and conjugate the verb "choisir"—but communicatively appropriate since it responds concisely to the last question addressed to the cohort (lines 67 and 68: Who has chosen a job?).

In the daily routine of conversational exchanges, partners tend to be more economical, and they constantly operate omission, simplification, and deletion of redundant information. Fred's succinct "Je veux être un pilote" (line 73: i.e., I want to be a pilot) demonstrates a natural discursive competence: He displays his understanding of the interaction at hand by self-selecting, he proposes a perfectly valid response without "choisir," and he anticipates Debbie's natural follow-up question asking him to name his choice of a career.

Debbie turned back facing the cohort as she heard Fred's voice. She first checks her comprehension of Fred's response as she asks him to repeat the name of the profession he has chosen (line 74: i.e., A (.) what?). Fred repeats only the new information (line 75: "a pilot!"), as he would in a natural conversation without any didactic requirement to express oneself in complete sentences.

Debbie's follow up can be described as follows. First, she seems to react very didactically as she positively evaluates Fred's response, as if they were both completing an IRE that could be defined as follows: The initiation
would be the collective question (lines 67 and 68), the reply would be Fred’s answer (line 73), and Debbie’s evaluation (line 76: i.e., Pilot! (. ) Very good…) would come last.

After a short pause, Debbie resumes speaking and adds to her initial evaluation; she stumbles and hesitates, her syntax is imperfect, but she asks Fred’s about his eyesight (lines 76 and 77; “And do you have uh… (...) the eyes very good, (. ) yes?”). She attempts to expand on the topic nominated by the student (i.e., Fred as a pilot), tries to facilitate comprehension using hand gestures (she points to her eyes); and uses a yes/no question so that Fred may build his answer on her question13. In response, Fred’s simple “Oui!” provides the briefest possible answer, and sends the turn at talk back to Debbie.

Debbie speaks in turn, and makes one more attempt at clarifying the meaning of her previous proposition; therefore, if Fred did not understand “les yeux très bons,” he has one more chance to ask for explanations or process what she says. At any rate, by delaying the transition to the next activity that seemed imminent before Fred’s intervention (line 72), Debbie shows to the student that she is ready to give him more time to speak if he wants to and to let him decide on the next subject since the “perfect vision” topic did not generate any uptake.
Instead, two pauses follow: The length of the first pause is two seconds and it occurs after Debbie's evaluation "Very good. This pause is followed by a gap-avoider "uh," and then by a second pause. The length of the second pause is four seconds and it occurs while Debbie broke eye contact with Fred, and looks at her textbook. Fred remains silent during these pauses (line 82). The angle of the camera does not allow the researcher to see whether the student might have responded to Debbie's last yes/no question with a nonverbal clue (head nod, etc.), which is in itself a competent response. Fred does not verbalize any new answer, nor does any other student volunteer to respond to the same question.

At the end of the second pause, as Debbie is still in possession of the turn at talk, she utters another gap avoiding device (line 83: Hmm). Next, she seems to be talking to herself, and she speaks so low that neither the video-recording nor the audio-recording equipment captured what she said. She then signifies that she thinks this is all the material she wanted to cover (line 83: "I think that's all"), previewing the following transition. Debbie hesitates one more time, talks to herself, then asks her students aloud whether they have any question on the grammatical topic of the review. Unless a student asks a question, a transition to a new topic is imminent. The cohort remains silent. No one voices a question. The silence indicates the end of the activity. The transition can be made to another topic.
The foreign language classroom is a place where several discourses co-exist. The previous transcript brought to the surface the tension between a didactic language defined in the expected response ("I have chosen to become a pilot"), and the more conversational response ("I want to be a pilot," or just "a pilot") presented by the student (Cf. Edmonson, 1985).

The topic selected by the student did not generate a long interaction. As a matter of fact, after establishing the topic of becoming a pilot, Fred does not say anything else. Reasons for his silence can only be conjectured, but the transcript shows that, in the communicative situation described above, Fred chose the shorter conversational response over the favored didactic form sentence. He did not respond to Debbie's attempt to propose a follow-up question as she selected the topic of the pilot's vision, responding only with single words. Debbie, as the first follow-up question generated only minimal responses, did not attempt to ask Fred any new question. The several pauses at the end of the transcripts were as many transition-relevance places (TRPs) for any student in the cohort to delay the transition to another topic. As no one selected, Debbie concluded the sequence.
I.4. Debbie: Summary of findings

The presentation of the last transcript showed the superposition in the foreign language classroom of different discursive fields. While the interaction at hand was on the verge of being aborted, a student self-selected to propose a response that was not didactically adequate, but communicatively relevant. Instructor and student, however, could not develop the interaction past the early stage when the student self-selected to talk. Although the instructor selected the topic of the follow-up question the student remained silent.

The analyses of the first two transcripts show some consistency in Debbie's routine questioning pattern. This routine questioning pattern is characterized by a linear progression that can be described as follows:

1. Debbie presents the topic-question. The question is vague and defines a broad domain of appropriate responses. In the first transcript, Debbie tells her students that she welcomes any information about the verbs of the second conjugation group; in the second transcript, she calls for any description of “Eurovision.” She hopes that students respond as they would in a casual conversation, i.e., she expects them to self-select and to volunteer any information relevant to the nominated topic. No one self-selected.
2. Debbie reformulates the topic-question. This second attempt at creating an interaction with the students differs in two respects. It is always presented as a question, and Debbie narrows the range of appropriate responses by targeting some specific fact. In the first transcript, Debbie went from a large domain of appropriate responses (i.e., tell me anything about the verbs of the second conjugation group) to a more specific (i.e., make a list of the verbs of the second conjugation group). In the second transcript, the same change in focus is evident as she goes from any description of “Eurovision” to its functioning. She still does not select the next speaker.

3. Debbie presents the topic-question for the third time. The same answers are expected, but the main characteristic is that Debbie, this time, selects a student to respond to the question. As soon as Debbie and the selected student agree on an appropriate answer, Debbie moves on to the next topic-question, and the same pattern is repeated. The concept of linearity is thus suggested because Debbie’s interactional sequences may thus be characterized as a linear progression from the first presentation of the first topic-question, to the second presentation of the first topic-question, to the third presentation of the first topic-question, then to the first presentation of the second topic-question, and so on.
The following section describes Anne's questioning pattern. As was mentioned earlier, Anne is also a novice teaching associate in charge of an Elementary French II class. The results of the analysis of Anne's classroom discourse will allow a comparison with the linear pattern identified in the discussion of Debbie's classroom.
Figure 1. Debbie's questioning pattern
II. Anne

The transcript presented in this section documents the manner in which Anne asks routine questions. It has been divided in two smaller transcripts: The beginning of the sequence shows how the questioning pattern is established (transcript II.1), while the last part of the sequence shows the closure of the activity. Although longer than the two transcripts from Debbie’s classroom, the following sequence is presented here to illustrate Anne’s habitual behavior for several reasons. First, it shows a repetitive and typical pattern: five distinct question-answer episodes extending on an average of almost 13 lines per teacher/designated student interaction. Second, Anne demonstrated a remarkable consistency during Winter, 1996, and this episode is characteristic of most of the recorded opening review sessions used by this instructor as shown in the ethnographic notes taken by the researcher. Third, this episode is a whole organizational unit that shows when Anne initiates a topic-question, and when she abandons it.

The instructor is observed while reviewing the material that was presented during the previous lesson, in the same manner that Debbie was observed reviewing the conjugation of verbs from the second conjugation group or the text on the French media. The following transcript presents the way in which Anne, the native speaker, presents a single topic-question and its follow-up questions to the learners.
II.1. Anne and the review on shopping (beginning)

Introduction

The sequence takes place at the beginning of the lesson; after greeting the students, Anne initiates the first topic-question. The sequence transcribed here after is stopped after Anne called on the third student. Anne follows a repetitive, and therefore predictable, pattern with the three students who are asked to respond to the first topic-question.

An individual student is designated; this student understands that he or she is asked to respond to the topic-question that Anne addressed to the whole cohort. The next few turns are used to produce, alone or with Anne’s assistance, an acceptable response to the topic-question; i.e., to obtain a positive evaluation from Anne after expressing oneself on the topic of shopping.

Anne adds an additional question, a follow-up, to the embryonic conversational exchange. This follow-up question is also predictable for the student since it asks them to specify either where they went shopping or what they bought.

Lines 1 through 6: Greetings

1. Anne: Où sont tous les autres? (...) Y a personne? (...) Un deux trois
2. quatre cinq six non! (...) Un deux trois quatre cinq six sept huit
3. neuf dix onze <emphatic> (...) C’est tout? (...) Bon! (..)
4. Ça va? (. ) Ça va? (. ) Ça va?

5. **Ervin:** <1st row who established eye contact with Anne, but very low> ça va.

6. **Anne:** Oui! (. ) Oui? (. ) Bon appétit! ( . )

The bell rings: Anne is reminded of the time and stops arranging in an orderly fashion her handouts, realia, notes, and lesson plan on the desk. She raises her head and sees that on this Friday afternoon few students are attending class. She reacts in conversational French (line 1: “Y a personne,” which could be translated by “There is almost no one here,” but where Anne operates the contraction of “Il n’ y a [personne]” into the more familiar “Y a [personne]” which is more typical of ordinary oral French). Then she counts the students (lines 1 and 2), and emphasizes the number eleven as she reaches the last learner seating in front of her. Still in French, she voices her surprise (line 3; Translation: “That’s all?”), then the resumptive “Bon!” (i.e., “OK!”) announces a transition, an opening toward a new topic.

Anne simply asks her students how they feel (line 3; “How are you doing?”). Here again, the register is more familiar and oral than academic. Her gaze runs through the room. It is probably because she does not establish eye contact with any student that she repeats her question three times, with only short (one second) pauses in between utterances. Such pauses are shorter than all other pauses signaling transition-relevance places (TRPs). Anne is gathering the cohort, trying to attract their attention.
trying to get the students to raise their heads. When finally one student in the first row, Eryn, raises her head and looks in Anne’s direction, she knows that the turn at talk belongs to her.

Quite economically, Eryn simply answers “Ça va” with a falling intonation (line 6); which is succinct but conversationally and culturally authentic since a native speaker of French would probably not have responded any differently. The usual conversational routine has probably been already presented to the student who was able to use it in a meaningful context. Eryn plays the role of a proficient French speaker as she uses the learned colloquial expression (line 5).

As she acknowledges the learner’s response (line 7), Anne tries again to let the student volunteer any additional utterance in French, to let Eryn initiate another conversation topic. As Eryn remains silent, Anne re-addresses the question to the rest of the cohort with the second “Oui?” with a rising intonation—so as to say “What about you-guys?” No one wants to self-select, and her attempt to relinquish her privilege and duty to select and initiate topics fails. Students are silent, and the turn still belongs to the instructor.

Teasingly, Anne says “Bon appétit!” to a student snacking in the first row. She pauses and, since no one else takes a turn at talk, she may now present the first topic-question.
Lines 7 and 8: The topic-question

Anne: Est-ce que, (.) est-ce que vous avez fait des achats hier? (.) Est-ce que vous avez fait des achats hier? (.) Jeff?

When organizing these reviews-discussions\(^{14}\), Anne's favored organizational sequence is to first present to the cohort the topic-question to which each student is supposed to be able to respond. She speaks slowly, and "chunks" the input while maintaining eye-contact with the cohort. As mentioned earlier, these chunks are smaller sets of informational units that are grouped together for students to process more easily—similar to smaller pieces of pre-processed/pre-digested pieces of information. Then, Anne repeats this question twice\(^{15}\), leaving a two-second pause in between new repetitions and therefore creating a TRP. No one self-selects either at the first TRP (line 8), or at the second and longer one (line 9). Therefore, Anne nominates Jeff as the first student to respond to the topic-question.

Lines 9 through 21: Interactional exchange with Jeff


10. Anne: Hmm-hmm! (. ) Qu'est ce que tu as acheté?

12. Jeff: Uh... (. ) J'ai achette uh... (. ) or j'ai acheté (. ) présent pour
13. ma mère (.) uh…
14. Anne: Hmm-hmm…
15. Jeff: Uh… Birthday!
16. Anne: Oui: (.) Pour ma mère, (.) j’ai acheté un cadeau (.) <she writes on the board> un cadeau! (.) pour son anniversaire!==
17. Jeff: ==Ah! Pour (.) pour son anniversaire…
18. Anne: Ouaih, (.) son anniversaire… (.) <she is still writing> (.)
19. Stacy: Féminin?
20. Anne: Masculin! (.)<she stops writing and turns back toward the cohort>

Jeff is therefore the first student selected to respond to the topic-question. Jeff acknowledges in a timely fashion that the turn at talk is his, even before he is able to produce an appropriate verbal answer in French (line 10: “Uh”). His reply is interrupted by a tardy student making a loud entrance in the classroom. At any rate, after acknowledging his turn, Jeff mutters something that sounds like: “I bought yesterday, yesterday of the afternoon.” Anne nods as she utters a “Hmm-hmm;” a head nod and the falling intonation acknowledge and positively evaluates Jeff’s response.

Jeff’s response, however, illustrates the difference between the local criteria of acceptability of an answer and external measures of appropriateness. By the standards of a native speaker, Jeff does not respond appropriately to the topic-question: To the question “did you go shopping
yesterday?" a native speaker of French could either respond “Oui,” or “Oui, j’ai fait des achats” (Yes, I went shopping), or go on to explain “J’ai acheté X and Y” (I bought X and Y). The point is that “acheter” is a transitive verb, and that if it is used in response to the question “Est-ce que vous avez fait des achats hier,” it is both more syntactically and more conversationally appropriate that “acheter” be followed by a direct object—the item(s) that were bought. The local criteria for judging the relevance of Jeff’s first response are therefore concerned neither with grammatical accuracy nor with native-like communicative authenticity. Jeff’s response has to be interactionally relevant.

Anne’s follow-up question targets the missing element in Jeff’s first response. By asking him “Qu’est-ce que tu as acheté?” (line 12; “What did you buy?”), she leads him to specify the element of information that was missing in the student’s previous answer. Jeff proceeds in the same timely fashion, but struggles in producing a new response. He tries to express himself in full sentences. When his turn comes, he shows that he is able to self-correct his syntax: His first conjugation “J’ai achette” is faulty, and Jeff pauses briefly before starting his answer all over and providing the appropriate conjugation “J’ai acheté” (line 13).

The second difficulty for Jeff is a lexical one: He struggles to express in French “a present for my mother’s birthday.” He interrupts himself after saying “I bought [présent’] for my mother.” Once again, Anne utters a
“Hmm-hmm,” to acknowledge the timeliness of his production. Jeff, however, did not express what he meant, and he code switches and adds “birthday.” His code switch interactionally defines a breakdown in his own proficiency, and he asks Anne to help him repair it.

Anne understands that Jeff did not mean that he bought a present for his mother, but that he bought a present for his mother’s birthday. As she acknowledges that she understood Jeff’s problem, she starts modeling a more appropriate answer, both orally and visually since she starts writing the sentence on the blackboard (lines 17 & 18). Jeff repeats only the part of Anne’s model that correspond to the lexical element he was previously missing (line 19). Eventually, Anne evaluates positively his repeat, as she keeps writing on the blackboard. The whole sequence reaches its conclusion as Anne is now able to write on the blackboard Jeff’s (intended) answer built over five turns for each of the two speakers.

Side-comments interrupt the collaborative dialogue between Anne and Jeff as Stacy, writing in her notebook what Anne is posting on the blackboard, asks in French and with a single word whether the new word “anniversaire” is feminine (line 21). Latching on Stacy’s turn, Anne responds with a single word, “masculin,” and keeps on writing. The communication is reduced to its simplest expression, but it is happening naturally, in French, and not in full sentences.
Finally, Anne finishes writing Jeff's collaboratively built answer on the blackboard. Next, she provides the final (positive) evaluation (line 23) since the collaboratively built answer, now visible to all members of the cohort, responds to the topic-question. Instead of a three-turn exchange—initiation, response, and evaluation—the exchange consists of over nine turns divided between instructor and learner that the exchange developed.

Lines 22 through 44: Interactional exchange with Courtney

22. *Anne:*  
23. OK! (. ) Bien!  
24. Courtney?  
25. *Courtney:* L-le (. ) dimanche...  
26. *Anne:* Comment?  
27. *Courtney:* Le dimanche – It's not Sunday?  
28. *Anne:* Le dimanche...  
29. *Courtney:* D-dimanche, /  
30. *Anne:* Hmm-hmm.  
31. *Courtney:* Le dimanche (. ) j'ai... (. ) uh j'ai acheté uhm...( ) hat?  
32. *Anne:* Un chapeau??  
33. *Courtney:* ==Un chapeau, pour moi.  
34. *Anne:* Oui! (. ) C'est bien! (. ) Et euh... Est-ce que tu l'as acheté (. ) dans un
35. \(\text{petit magasin} \) ou dans un \(\text{centre commercial}\)?

36. \textbf{Courtney}: \(\text{uhm...}\)

37. \textbf{Anne}: Dans un supermarché?

38. \textbf{Courtney}: Non/

39. \textbf{Anne}: Non?

40. \textbf{Courtney}: Non, dans \(\text{grande}\) uh... dans dans (.) dans (.) un

41. grand marché.

42. \textbf{Anne}: Dans un grand magasin?

43. \textbf{Courtney}: Mag-magasin.

44. \textbf{Anne}: Un grand magasin? \(<\text{Courtney nods}>\) D'accord.

Even though the number of successive turns taken by instructor and learner in this exchange seems greater than the number of turns exchanged during the previous sequence with Jeff, the two speakers still construct only two questions and two answers, just as was the case with Jeff. Once again, Anne demonstrates that the limited proficiency of the students may stretch the canonical IRE across several more turns at talk than in monolingual classrooms.

The angle of the camera did not allow the researcher to judge whether Anne’s choice is random, or whether the designated student uses nonverbal clues to suggest to the instructor that she is ready to talk. If such cues are used, they do not include raising one’s hand, but may include establishing
eye contact, or ever so slightly for the student to change her body position. Further study, where the recording equipment would focus as much on the students as on the instructor, is clearly needed to determine the different nonverbal conducts with which a turn at talk may be claimed in the foreign language classroom.

At any rate, Courtney is called upon by Anne (line 24). She latches on Anne’s turn and starts the production of her answer to the topic-question (lines 8 & 9), but her pronunciation of the French word for “Sunday” is inaccurate. Anne interrupts Courtney with a single-word utterance\(^\text{17}\) (line 26), asking her to repair the beginning of her response. The local criteria of acceptability that emphasized interactional competence for Jeff include, for Courtney, proper pronunciation. Courtney reacts surprised as she repeats her answer, switching to English to express what she meant (line 27: “Le dimanche—It’s not Sunday?”). Courtney understood that Anne requested a repair; her response on line 27, however, indicates that she believes the trouble source to be a lexical problem (i.e., using the wrong word).

Anne does not respond to Courtney’s invitation to switch to English. Instead, she models the appropriate pronunciation for “dimanche,” the French word for “Sunday.” Her modeling shows Courtney that the problem was not an inappropriate word choice, but faulty pronunciation. After this exchange, the interaction between Courtney and Anne develops one new word at the time: First, Courtney repeats “Dimanche” with the same
pronunciation pattern and the same intonation as Anne previously (line 29),
she hesitates but Anne's evaluation/reinforcement (line 30: “Hmm-hmm”) indicates that she may continue with the public assembling of her answer. Courtney attempts to deliver her response (line 31); her first two intra-turn pauses testify that she knows she does not need to worry about being interrupted either by Anne or other students; the last one is due to a breakdown as Courtney switches to English to ask Anne how to say “hat” in French. Anne provides the missing element (line 32), and immediately (latch between line 32 and 33) Courtney completes her response.

As Anne evaluates Courtney's participation to classroom discourse (line 34), it becomes evident that the present sequence can be likened to an IRE: The initiation occurred when Anne called on Courtney (line 24) to tell her that she was expected to respond to the topic-question presented earlier (lines 8 & 9); the turn was exchanged four times between learner and instructor to construct the response (Courtney's turns: lines 25, 27, 29, 31, and 33; Anne's turns: lines 26, 28, 30, and 32); and the teacher's evaluation concludes the sequence. These four turns exchanged between Anne and Courtney all had the same objective: the collaborative and public construction of Courtney's answer “Dimanche, j'ai acheté un chapeau pour moi.”
Anne proposes a follow up question to Courtney. Anne follows the organizational approach adopted by the textbook *Invitation* as she asks Courtney whether she bought the hat in a small retail store or in a commercial mall (lines 34 & 35). Courtney seems either to be confused by the question, or to be unable to express in French what she wants to say; she waits three seconds, voices a gap-avoider as if to ensure Anne that she knows about being in possession of the turn at talk, then waits more (line 36).

Courtney has been on task for almost a minute already. After the second (3") pause, Anne helps the student to construct her second response in the same manner she helped her to build the first one. She splits the difficulties presented in the question (lines 34 and 35) as she asks Courtney whether she bought the hat in a supermarket (line 37). Anne and Courtney are not attempting to build complete sentences any longer.

Courtney responds as economically as possible as she simply replies “Non” (line 38). Anne, however, waits for Courtney to develop her answer: it is the student’s opportunity to apply the vocabulary she studied to the communicative situation at hand. Courtney and Anne build the student’s response collaboratively. Once it is established that Courtney bought the hat in a big store (line 43), Anne repeats her question with a rising intonation “un grand magasin?” to have Courtney make a complete sentence. Courtney
simply nods, as if to acknowledge that she felt she communicated her meaning. Anne accepts this nonverbal response, and positively evaluates the sequence (line 44). She is ready to call on another student.

Lines 45 through 48: Interactional exchange with Renée

45. Anne: Et... les au-les autres? (.). Euh, (.). Renée. (.). Est-ce que tu as fait des achats?
46. Renée: Non...
47. Anne: Non? (.). Tu n'as rien acheté? (.).<Renée shakes her head>

Anne invites volunteers to take the next turn at talk (line 45; translation: “And (what about) the others?”). After a short pause, then a gap-avoider, Anne realizes that she still needs to select the next speaker since no one volunteers. She calls on Renée. She reminds the newly selected student of the theme of the mini-conversations as she repeats word for word the initial topic-question (lines 45 and 46).

In response, Renée does not reply with a full sentence, and therefore in a manner that is quite un-classroom like; she simply says “Non.” This concise answer may translate several factors. First, Renée may not have understood the meaning of the question at hand and she responds negatively so as to avoid a long meaning negotiation with Anne. The second possibility
is that Renée understood that the topic-question (i.e., did you go shopping?) calls for two possible answers (i.e., positive or negative). She knows that a positive answer (i.e., “Yes,” or “Yes I did”) will allow Anne to ask a follow-up question (i.e., either “What did you buy,” or “Where did you go”). Renée expresses her reluctance to speak French in front of the cohort not only in the brevity of her answer to the topic-question, but in the interactional move that allows her to make it impossible for Anne to ask her the usual follow-up questions.

Renée confirms her reluctance to speak French as she responds to Anne’s reformulation of the topic-question (line 48: No? You did not buy anything?) with a simple head shake expressing another simple “Non.” Anne does not continue the conversation.

After selecting three students, Anne was able to construct two mini-conversations during which she learned that Jeff bought a present for his mother’s birthday and that Courtney bought herself a hat in a big store. Anne failed to develop an interaction with Renée who kept her French to a minimum. The following transcript shows how Anne concludes this interactional sequence after the last (short) exchange with Renée.
II.2. Anne and the review on shopping (conclusion)

Introduction

The sequence takes place after the short exchange between Renée and Anne reported in the previous section. Anne has interactionally defined a repetitive questioning pattern with the three first students selected to publicly speak French. Renée, by responding negatively to the topic-question, is the only student who shortened the mini-conversational exchange with the instructor.

The sequence transcribed here after is stopped when Anne presents a second topic-question, just as both of Debbie's transcripts in section I.1 were stopped once the teacher moved to another topic-question.

After the very short sequence with Renée, Anne selects Beth as the next speaker.

Lines 49 to 68: Interactional exchange with Beth

49. **Anne**: Beth?

50. **Beth**: Oui... (.) J'ai acheté (.) uhm crayons? <Anne signals that she does not understand with her head>

51. *does not understand with her head* (.) crayon? How do you say/

52. **Anne**: Un crayon?

53. **Beth**: Un crayon?

54. **Anne**: Un crayon (.) pour écrire?
55. **Beth:** Uh/
56. **Anne:** Write?/
57. **Beth:** Real crayons, (.) like Crayloas.
58. **Anne:** Ah! Oui, des crayons, aussi, (.) des crayons de couleurs./
59. **Beth:** Coul/
60. **Anne:** Oui, des crayons de couleurs, (.) Hmm-hmm? (.) Tu les as
61. achetés (.) au supermarché?
62. **Beth:** Uh, non! (.) Uh, (.) je les ai achetés (.) le magasin de
63. l'université?
64. **Anne:** Oui dans un—oui dans le (.) Au *Bookstore*?
65. **Beth:** Oui!
66. **Anne:** Oui! (.) Euh… dans la Papeterie…
67. **Beth:** Dans (.) la Papeterie?
68. **Anne:** Hmm-hmm! De (.) l'université. (.) Bien! Hmm-hmm.

The sequence between Anne and Beth bears a striking resemblance with the previous two longer sequences (Jeff and Courtney). Beth starts by answering the topic-question (line 50), but in the same way that Courtney stumbled on the last word of her response (hat), Beth fails to communicate to Anne what she bought: Her Americanized pronunciation of the word “crayon” prevents Anne’s comprehension. Just as Renée in the previous sequence
used a nonverbal way to respond to Anne’s second question (line 48), Anne uses a similar nonverbal manner to communicate to Beth that she did not understand what was bought.

Courtney (lines 27 & 31) switched to English to solve her lexical problem; when Anne and Beth try to disambiguate “crayon” (line 51 to line 58), Beth switches first (line 51). Unlike the exchange with Courtney, Anne this time switches to English with her student to disambiguate the comprehension problem (line 56: “Write?”).

It seems that the difference between the two contexts is that the turns at talk switched three times between Anne and Beth (from line 52 to line 57), and when the turn falls back on Anne for the third time, the meaning of this word “crayons” has still not been established, while a simple exchange Courtney-Anne-Courtney was sufficient to establish that “hat” is translated in French by “chapeau” (lines 31 to 33). The first interactional move from Anne is to clarify the problem with simple short questions to check her comprehension (line 52: Un crayon?; line 54: Un crayon pour écrire?). When these two turns have failed to clarify whether Beth bought pencils or coloring crayons, Anne asks another short question, but this time in English. The side-sequence (Jefferson, 1972) to disambiguate “crayons” opened on line 50 when Anne shook her head is closed on line 60 when Anne confirms the pronunciation of “crayons de couleurs.”
Once the meaning of “crayons/crayons de couleur” is established (line 60), Anne asks essentially the same follow-up question (re: location where the item was bought), even though the wording of the second question addressed to Beth is different from the wording of the second question to Courtney.

Beth’s response is inventive and intelligent: Not knowing how to say “bookstore” in French, she stops and thinks (Cf. the pause on line 62), then proposes to Anne “le magasin de l’université”—literally, the university store. Once again, Anne opens a side-sequence in English to disambiguate Beth’s response; she simply proposes “bookstore?”—with a rising intonation (try-marking)—to check on her own comprehension of Beth’s answer. Beth accepts Anne’s understanding (line 65), Anne provides the appropriate French word (line 66) which is repeated by the student (line 67). The whole sequence is positively evaluated by the teacher and the sequence reaches its conclusion.

These two side-sequences, however, bring to the surface an interesting property of these embryonic discussions between Anne and her students: As observed, they do not involve questions with known answers. These communications need, however, to be brief, repetitive, and predictable. It may be because these exchanges need to establish a pattern, to be short and
repetitive that Anne does not spend a lot of time explaining in French the meaning of “crayons” or “bookstore” with Beth. Instead, she clarifies their signification in English, and goes on with the routine.

On line 68, as Anne positively evaluates Beth’s participation, she is ready to go one with the questioning routine.

Lines 69 to 79: Interactional exchange with Michelle

69. **Anne:** Michelle? Est-ce que tu as fait des achats?
70. **Michelle:** Uh Oui! *<quite low>* j’ai fait des achats hier.
71. **Anne:** Oui? (.) Qu’est-ce que tu as acheté?
72. **Michelle:** J’ai acheté… how do you say “food?”
73. **Anne:** De la nourriture? (.) de la nourriture.
74. **Michelle:** De la nourri?
75. **Anne:** Nourriture.
76. **Michelle:** Nourriture?
77. **Anne:** Hmm-hmm.
78. **Michelle:** A supermarché.
79. **Anne:** Au supermarché? (...) D’accord
Michelle is the next student designated to respond to the topic-question. Anne may judge that it has been a long time since the topic-question has been reminded to the cohort since she now repeats it to the designated student (line 69); she had previously repeated the topic question only to Renée (lines 45 and 46). It is also possible that the instructor’s decision was also motivated by her knowledge of the individual she selected; she may assess Renée and Michelle to be among the most shy or the least proficient students. At any rate, reminding the students of the topic question before soliciting an answer can only improve their chances to successfully take part in the interaction.

The exchange with Michelle reaches a fluidity that was not evidenced in the previous dialogues; it may be due to the fact that Michelle’s fluency is superior to the fluency of the four previous students. Another possibility is that Michelle may benefit from the repetitive effect of the three of the four previous sequences. The questions and the order in which they will be asked are known, and Michelle had more time to prepare her responses.

Anne asks her whether she went shopping (line 69); without apparent difficulties or hesitations, Michelle agrees, and moreover expresses herself with a full sentence (line 70; translation: Yes, I went shopping yesterday). Immediately, Anne asks Michelle to explain what she bought (line 71). Michelle starts answering (line 72) but interrupts herself.
It appears that Michelle did not include this piece of information in her first answer because she did not know how to express in French “food.” Therefore she switches back to English to ask her instructor (line 72), in a manner that is coherent with the previous code switches (Jeff on line 16, Courtney on line 27, Beth line 51, Anne lines 56 and 64).

Once the lexical problem is resolved, and once Michelle correctly repeats the proper word (lines 74 to 78), she anticipates the next question—where was the item bought—and volunteers the last piece of information even before Anne has a chance to ask her the question (line 78).

Her last response, however, is a short answer (line 78: At the supermarket). Anne accepts her answer, and moves on to the next topic-question. It seems that Michelle showed that she understood the conversational pattern that was practiced which consisted in communicating what the student bought and where. She demonstrated to Anne that she had learned the conversational structure by being able to anticipate the last question.

From the above, it can be concluded that Anne’s typical questioning pattern consists in asking simple personalized questions. These questions are related to the topic studied in the textbook, but they are genuine questions since Anne does not know what the students will respond. The type of interaction sought by these questions is, however, short, repetitive, and predictable. In the present case, it seems as if Anne tried to have her
students practice embryonic conversations in which, if they went shopping, their interlocutor would ask them what they bought and where they went. Once the pattern is familiar enough for students to volunteer the sought information without being asked—like Michelle does on line 78—Anne’s pedagogical reason to repeat the same communicative pattern disappears. The simulation of conversation is exposed once one of the partner makes it a public matter that the next question is already known (Cf. chapter five, section III.3).

II.3. Anne and the conclusion of the review activity on “choisir”

Introduction

The first two transcripts characterized Anne’s usual questioning pattern. The purpose of the following transcript is to characterize the coexistence of several discursive fields in Anne’s French class. The recommended pedagogical approach emerged from the proficiency movement in foreign language education (see chapter one), and the teaching associates are asked to teach “communicatively.” Therefore, the following transcript was collected with the following concern: How do teaching associate and
students create opportunities for casual conversations in the target language? It needs to be compared with transcript I.3 presenting a similar situation in Debbie's French class.

The context for this interactional sequence is defined as follows. At the end of her review on "choisir," Anne starts operating her transition to the next activity. The last question during this review was to ask students whether they wanted to become stars. In not so many words, Anne next communicates to her students: "Well, since we were on the topic of 'stars,' let me introduce the video segment that we are going to watch next."

She starts "We are going to see..." as she moves in the direction of the VCR. Some private discussions among students can now be heard. Anne interrupts herself, repeats what she was saying as she tries again to complete her transition ("nous allons regarder (...) un [sic] vidéo"). Eventually, she looks away from the corner where the VCR stands and in the direction of the student who causes of the noise. She recognizes Shawn, and calls on him.

In the following sequence, the canonical IRE format for verbal exchanges inside the classroom tends to disappear. What becomes apparent is the building of a fantasy, Shawn's daydream about becoming an actor. The fantasy is built through a series of exchanges where interactants keep openly
checking each other’s comprehension, which is quite typical of the
negotiation of meaning between two speakers with unequal proficiencies in
the language of communication (Cf. Ellis, 1994, 260-4).

Lines 1 through 6: Disciplinary measure

1. **Anne**: Ah, Shawn! (.) Tu veux
2. **être une star?**
3. **Shawn**: Je—non, (.) je choisis une acteur!
4. **Anne**: D’être acteur?==
5. **Shawn**: ==Yeah-Oui!
6. **Anne**: Hmm, (. ) Tu veux être acteur! <Students giggle>

Anne’s initiation has the rising intonation pattern of a question: she
assigns the following turn to Shawn (lines 1 and 2), the apparent trouble-
maker seating in the back of the room. She identifies Shawn as one of the
students being involved in a private conversations (line 1: “Ah! Shawn”), she
singles him out and asks him a question related to the previous topic of
conversation (lines 1 and 2: “You want to be a star?”).

After an initial hesitation, Shawn provides an answer that would have
been quite appropriate (line 3; “Uh no, I choose an actor”20) in responding to
the second topic-question of the previous activity. Anne responds with a
partial rephrase of Shawn’s response (line 73; “To be an actor?”). This partial rephrase, pronounced with a rising intonation, indicates that the error made by Shawn (omission of “to be”) caused Anne to ask Shawn for clarification and/or correction of his answer on line 3.

Shawn ignores Anne’s request for correction to which he should have responded by repeating the sentence that Anne expects; i.e., “J’ai choisi d’être un acteur.” Instead, he interprets her rising intonation as a request for clarification. Therefore, he positively evaluates Anne’s rephrase. He spontaneously evaluates Anne’s understanding in English (line 5: “yeah”), but repairs immediately his code switch (line 5: “Yeah—Oui!”). The spontaneity, the economy, and the lack of formality of his style are definitely more conversational than academic.

Anne pretends to tidy up her desk, she does not add any new information; she does nothing more than repeating what Shawn already established. (line 6; “You want to be a comedian”). Her summary statement does not call for a next turn, and could mark the end of this sequence.

Lines 7 through 14: Defining a didactic-free zone

7. **Shawn**: Oui!

8. **Anne**: D’accord. (. ) Quel genre euh de film?

9. **Shawn**: Uh non! (. ) Soap operas! *everybody—Anne included—*
10. *laughs>*

11. **Anne**: (...) D’accord! (...) Et euh… (...) le genre de rôle?

12. **Shawn**: Les feuille-(-.)-tons?

13. **Anne**: Dans un feuilleton!

14. **Shawn**: Oui.

Students giggle after Anne’s summary of the previous exchange.

Shawn is limited in his capacity to initiate a new topic, but his acceptance (line 7: “Oui”) of her summary, while no response was called for, extends the interaction beyond Anne’s attempted summary statement. Anne agrees to expand the conversation, and asks Shawn a new question related to his fantasy (line 7: “What type uhh of movie?”).

Shawn speaks in turn. He collaborates with Anne, and tries to be humorous since his instructor allows him this time-out from a strictly pedagogical interaction. He rejects the idea of movies. But he does not remember at first how to express in French what he wants to say; he switches back to English (line 9) and initiates the topic of soap-operas.

Anne accepts his answer in English, and make no move to either translate it or to have Shawn repair it (line 11: “(...) OK!”). The communication, for Anne, has been successfully completed since she asked a question (line 8), Shawn provided a response (line 9), and she positively evaluated his response (line 11). In the view of this sequence, Anne defines
local criteria of correctness that include neither didactic preferred forms of communication nor consistency in the use of one of the two languages. Instead, she now asks him to specify what kind of role he hopes to play (line 11: "And uh.. (...) the type of roles?").

Shawn ignores Anne's last question; he still thinks about what he tried to express in French during the previous turn. Tentatively, he utters "Les feille-(.)-tons?" (line 12: his personal rendition of the French word for "soap operas") with a rising intonation (try-marking) which shows Anne that he needs reinforcement. Anne checks her own comprehension at the same time as she confirms to Shawn that "feuilletons" is indeed the translation for "soap operas" (line 13). Shawn wears a big smile as he agrees with Anne (line 14). He succeeded in communicating that, in the fantasy that he and Anne are collaboratively building, he wants to be a soap opera actor.

The interaction taking place between the instructor and the student has little to do with the conjugation of "choisir." It has little to do with drills and practice, and it is far beyond the usual domain of the question with a known answer. The uncertainty involved in each turn, the constant concern from both speakers that they indeed understood what the preceding turn involved (Cf. the comprehension checks on lines 4, 7, and 13), the brevity of the turns now reduced only to the most crucial informational elements are as many elements indicating that the present order of discourse is not a didactic
discourse, in French or in English, about the target language but a “pedagogy-free” zone of conversation where everyday/ordinary fluency dictates the rules of conversational relevance.

Lines 15 through 27: Negotiation of meaning

15. Anne: Combien d’épisodes? <Shawn shakes his head to show that he did not understand> Combien (.) d’épisodes <emphatic>? <Anne starts counting> UN épisode/

16. Shawn: Qu’est-ce que c’est... (.) “pizod”/

19. Anne: Un épisode? (.) <She moves toward the board>


22. Shawn: senq (.) cent...

23. Anne: Cent?

24. Shawn: Cent!

25. Anne: Cent?

26. Shawn: Oui!

27. Anne: D’accord! (.) OK. <Now she introduces her video-clip; end of Review>
After successfully establishing in French that Shawn wants to be an actor in soap operas, Anne initiates a new topic: In how many episodes does Shawn want to appear? (line 15; Translation: “How many episodes?”). Here again, it needs to be noted that neither instructor nor student speak in complete sentences, the preferred didactic mode of expression as emphasized in the TA training session defined in chapter one. They each narrow their intervention around the new informational content, and check each other's understanding, then move on.

Anne's latest extension to the communication (the topic of the number of episodes), however, confuses Shawn. As she waits for his next answer, Shawn shakes his head to show that he did not understand what she said. Anne repeats her question, with more emphasis on the key-word “episode,” and tries to count aloud and on her fingers to suggest that she is expecting an answer that contains a number of this entity “episode.”

The unusual development presented in the interaction is that when Shawn's French proficiency breaks down, he refuses to switch back to English. Instead he asks Anne to explain the meaning of this “pizod” word that translates this entity which she wants him to count. Jeff, Courtney, Beth, and Michelle (Transcripts II.1 and II.2), and even Shawn earlier (line 9) took advantage of their lack of proficiency to switch back to English, and
maybe encourage their instructor to do the same. This time, Shawn decides to communicate in French even his lack of comprehension (line 18: “What is it... (.') 'pizod'?”).

The reason for Shawn's sudden enlightenment are not known, but he figures out that the French “épisode” and the American “episode” are indeed cognates while Anne faced the blackboard. As soon as Anne knows that Shawn understands, she reformulates the question from line 15, counting out loud one more time to indicate that the logical answer she expects need to indicate a quantity of “épisodes.” Shawn answers, self-correcting his own pronunciation error (line 22: “senq”), bringing a new element of information to the fantasy which may now be summarized as follows: Shawn wants to be an actor, he wants to play in soap-operas only, and wishes to appear in one hundred episodes.

The end of the sequence is very similar to the previous exchanges presented in this transcript. First Anne makes sure that she understood Shawn and repeats what she thinks he said during his previous turn at talk (line 23). Shawn confirms the meaning with a head-nod and the repetition of the number of episodes (line 24); when Anne sends the turn back to him after presenting a second comprehension check about the number of episode (line 25), Shawn confirms one more time (line 26). As with the previous times the meaning has been established and confirmed, the interaction stops until Anne proposes a new topic, a new possible development (line 1, to be an
actor; line 8, type of movie; and line 15, how many episodes). She does not initiate a fourth topic, neither does Shawn. The construction of Shawn's fantasy has reached its conclusion; instructor and student have established in French that Shawn would like to be a soap opera actor, and that he would like to appear in one hundred episodes.

The tension between didactic discourse about French (either in French or in English), and communicative discourse in French (either about conversational or syntactical topics) characterizes most of the transcripts reported for French 102.01. The reason why this tension was absent from this last sequence is that neither student nor instructor worried about didactic goals concerning the French response; their mutual goal was to exchange meanings in the target language.

This sequence is not reported here with the ulterior motive to suggest that it constitutes either good or bad language pedagogy. It does illustrate, however, that, at the elementary level, students may be able to reach some fluency in the target language, even though the price for this fluency may be to sacrifice full-sentence responses, often typical of beginning language classroom but not typical of natural conversational discourse. It also shows that rudimentary dyadic conversational structures may occur in the foreign language classroom, even early in the students' learning of the target language. In short, it shows that students do not have to adopt the previously described attitude of input processing and solicited output-only as
soon as the first word in the target language is uttered. This passage suggests that communication in the target language is not an unreasonable goal since it may, as it did in this sequence, emerge naturally.

II.4. Anne: Summary of findings

From the above, it can be concluded that Anne’s typical questioning pattern consists in a series of personalized questions. These questions are related to the topic presented in the textbook or the Instructor’s Resource Manual, but they are genuine questions since Anne does not know how the students will respond.

The type of interaction sought by these questions is, however, short, repetitive, and predictable. In the present case, it seems as if Anne tried to have her students practice embryonic conversations in which, if they went shopping, their interlocutor would ask them what they bought and where they went.

If Debbie’s questioning pattern was described as linear, Anne is rather “circular.” Anne keeps coming back to the center, the topic-question, until she judges that it is time to present a new topic-question. The following figure tries to translate this idea that Anne presents the topic-question to a first student, then once the student provided an answer accepted by the
teacher, Anne asks the same student a follow-up question. Once the student provided an answer to the follow up question that is positively evaluated by the instructor, Anne comes back to the topic-question, selects a new student, completes the same routine (follow up), keeps repeating these mini-conversations always by starting with the topic-question.

Cases such as Renée’s are not presented in the following figure. It is not know how typical it is from Anne to accept that a student does not go through the proposed routine (no other such case was identified and transcribed). Renée’s short response does not change the circular aspect of the routine, it just sends the circular motion back to the topic-question without going through the follow up question/answer.
Figure 2. Anne's questioning pattern
III. Summary of findings

III.1. General findings

Since the training provided to teaching associates emphasizes the importance of maximizing student participation in classroom affairs, one may conclude that the instructors propose to their students only questions to which they expect the learners can respond. Each question is tailored to what the instructor estimates the learners’ proficiency to be, so as to give them opportunities to demonstrate their competence.

Each effort to involve the students in a conversation is, indeed, an assessment from the novice teacher of what the learners can say in the target language. Therefore, as the instructor proposes a question, she also defines a typical response and claims that at least some of the students are proficient enough to provide a response. In short, each question defines a domain of potential responses in which the language learner is thought to be competent. The feedback given by the teachers to their students allows to define the following dimensions of an appropriate response:

i. Grammatical accuracy. When students provided a response in French that was not grammatically accurate, teachers, most of the time, modeled a grammatically correct answer for students to
repeat (Anne, Transcript II.2, line 4). Not all grammatical errors were corrected. This study therefore confirms previous findings on error treatment (Cf. Ellis, 1994, 583-6).

ii. Didactic appropriateness. Most questions were designed to elicit and practice specific grammatical forms. However, student responses did at times avoid the targeted grammatical forms. Several questions asked by the instructor could have been answered in a more elliptical manner in real life conversations. The didactically appropriate response is the one that conforms to the rules of the drill/practice exercise at hand (Debbie, Transcript I.3, line 64).

iii. Interactional relevance. Responses need to be provided when they are expected; in other words, students need to display their analysis of the instructor's first pair parts and react accordingly. Students showed their interactional analysis of the communicative situation at hand by responding in a timely fashion, by speaking in turn even when they were still unsure about what to say. In addition to timeliness, students had to display their understanding of the ongoing interaction by proposing an appropriate second pair part to the teacher. For instance, when a direct question was asked in the target language, students were showed either to respond immediately in the target language, or to propose side comments to
clarify the appropriate vocabulary needed to respond to the question, or to respond immediately in English—all of which necessitate that the initial question be understood.

iv. Conversationally authentic. With the current emphasis in the field of foreign language education on communication, proficiency in the target language, and knowledge of the target cultures, one would expect to find instances of conversational exchanges aimed at speaking "like the natives." Teachers provide at times opportunities for students to practice conversational exchanges that would come close to what similar exchanges may be between two native speakers of the target language (Anne, Transcript II.3).

The following sections summarize specific findings about Debbie's and Anne's lessons, and especially determine how these four qualities of the expected response are defined by the instructors.

III.2. Conclusions about Debbie's class

Debbie's classroom interventions in French were often marked by false starts, hesitations, and even syntactical errors. For the purpose of this study, "chunks" of input were defined as smaller sets of informational units that are grouped together for students to process
more easily—similar to smaller pieces of pre-processed/pre-digested pieces of information (chapter one). It was showed that Debbie's intra-turn pauses did not “chunk” the input to make it easier to the learners. Most of Debbie's intra-turn pauses were followed by repairs of what preceded: repetitions, reformulations as she looked to the ceiling or looked away in search for a new or the next word (for instance, see line 10 in the transcript analyzed in section I.1). Debbie did not pause during her own turns to help students understand better, but to allow herself the necessary time to find how to express what she meant.

This is not the only manner in which her tentativeness manifested itself. If both instructors used prosody and hand gestures to help students understand their questions or comments, Debbie seemed to doubt the students' ability to understand her and she emphasized transition-relevance places (TRPs) either with direct orders (Transcript I.1, Debbie asked the question, then ordered her students to start answering—line 12), or her with body language clues as she raised her hand to show students that they were expected to speak next (both in the transcripts presented in transcript I.1 and transcript I.3).

It is suggested that Debbie, teaching only her second French course, experiences several problems to express herself in French.
During Winter, 1996, she did not show that her proficiency in French was adequate for the type of interaction desired in the program. More important is to determine what Debbie talked about with her students.

In the logs and in the preceding transcripts, it was noted that Debbie situates herself between three different discursive fields during most of her lessons: talking conversationally about French grammar in French (transcript I.1, Debbie wants to talk about "choisir" with her students), talking didactically about French grammar in French (Transcript I.1, lines 8 to 12), talking about French grammar in English. The discourse observed in her classroom led the students in one specific direction: the domain of questions with known answers.

The notes taken during the logging of the tapes confirm that most of these content questions were related to a grammar topic taken from the textbook *Invitation*, and that Debbie was attempting to preview before the following lesson, to explain, or to review. As shown in transcript I.1 and I.2, the answers to almost all of her questions could be found in a selected pages of the textbook that were to be studied before coming to class and that she often displayed in view of the cohort when the response failed to come in a timely manner.

How did Debbie integrate communication in her lessons? It seems that Debbie’s attempts to involve the students in L2 conversations hardly ever had any other focus than the content to be
taught (either the grammar topics or the information in the assigned readings, as in the case of section I.2). Personal questions were rare, and when opportunities arose for such personalized exchanges to develop, Debbie and her students did not seem to know how to have a conversation in French with their different levels of proficiency (Transcript I.3).

Students knew that the real topic of communication was some factual information selected by Debbie in the text to be studied, and most of the time, this topic was the linguistic properties of the French language. Personal examples, as rare as they were, occurred only as scarce illustrations of the grammar topics under study (Transcript I.3, line 64). The domain of competence in which Debbie wanted her students to become proficient was not necessarily a French discursive field; it was the domain of a specific content knowledge; i.e., the knowledge of French as a linguistic code.

In spite of the fact that conversational interactions targeted discrete pieces of information, Debbie attempted to have “conversations” on this topic with her students. As observed in transcripts I.1. and I.2., the first question she presented to her students was usually very vague and very broad; she even told her students that she wished to have a quick chat with them about the topic to be reviewed.
Therefore, by giving no other guidelines to the students, Debbie was indeed telling them that she would accept any response in French that was interactionally relevant as long as the informational content conformed to the grammar topic at hand. One has the feeling that the didactic, the grammatical, and the conversational dimensions of the answer were always implied, never mentioned by Debbie, as if students were assumed to be already competent in these domains, or as if these competencies were no factors in evaluating the appropriateness of the answer. What matters is for students to display the knowledge or skill that Debbie tries to make them practice. The French course is *de facto* defined as a course in French syntax.

Debbie therefore attempted to have casual discussions with her students; but how realistic was the communication situation? Students could not select the topic, it was pre-selected for them as being the conjugation of verbs like “choisir”, definitions of the word “Eurovision” as could be found in the textbook, etc. They could not communicate any genuinely new information to the instructor since she was the specialist in French syntax. It was indeed an oral test of their knowledge of French grammar, not a conversation, that Debbie was proposing to the students. The “conversations” proposed with each new first question were Debbie’s way to assess her students’ preparedness.
The students' lack of enthusiasm as noted by Debbie (in transcript I.3) provides an interesting hypothesis. If Debbie was really proposing a casual conversation, then the interactional norms describing casual conversations (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974) state that the students are entitled to participate or to ignore the conversation as one to which they can make no valuable contribution: Debbie already knows more on the topic at hand than they do. If Debbie is proposing an oral test of their knowledge of French syntax, then the conversational norms of classroom interactions (McHoul, 1978) state that Debbie needs to select not only the topic, but also the next speaker.

These attempts most often did fail since Debbie had to reformulate the topic-question twice. Her attempts to start a conversation were short-lived. Her second and third attempts made no false pretense about conversational exchanges: They were most often direct questions targeting the specific aspect of the grammatical topic being studied. It was observed that these reformulations could even take the form of rejoinders or commands (section II.1). Then, it became apparent that communication was reduced to what Debbie assumed to be the most essential quality of her French course: the teaching and testing of her students' knowledge of French syntax.
Debbie's pedagogical choices are expressed in her selection of activity, her selection of types of interaction, and the type of responses targeted: She intends to teach her students the contents of the textbook *Invitation* that are assigned by the syllabus. Communication—"discuter" as she says in Transcript I.1—is only a secondary goal. It is one also that she fails to reach. As will be proposed in chapter five, Debbie believes that the essential part of teaching French to beginning English-speaking learners is to give them the factual knowledge of French syntax that is printed in the textbook and tested during exams. For Debbie, any interaction based on this situation is authentic since the models, the resources, the contents are printed in the textbook. Questions on French discourse (what is sayable, how to express oneself) are absent because they have no authenticity.

III.3 Conclusions about Anne's class

In contrast to Debbie, Anne's intra-turn pauses were pronounced as the instructor maintained eye contact with the students, and rarely repeated the element or the word that was last pronounced before the pause (a typical example of Anne's chunking was presented in section 1.4: "Est-ce que tu l'as acheté (.) dans un (.) petit magasin (.) ou dans un (.) centre commercial?"). Her pauses were not marks of hesitation. Her utterances appeared instead
to have been slowed down as much as possible, and dissected into smaller elements—the chunks—that needs to be understood individually for the sentence to make sense as a whole.

At the beginning of transcript I.3 (Cf. lines 1 through 4), Anne tried to start the lesson by inviting students to simply chitchat in the target language. The appropriate response invited back by a first pair part such as “ça va?” (section I.4, line 4) left students rather free to initiate any topic related to their personal lives, and it could be defined along the four dimensions previously described as follows.

Anne expressed *a priori* no specific criterion about the grammatical accuracy or the didactic acceptability of the second pair part. Anne's first pair part required that students provide a second pair part that would be interactionally relevant and if possible conversationally authentic. She expressed her demand to obtain an interactionally relevant response as she repeated her question—“ça va”—three times and until one student self-selected (transcript I.3, lines 4 and 5).

Anne therefore creates opportunities for students to self-select, to select the topic of the interaction, to speak when interactionally relevant, and to approximate the norms of oral communication in the target discursive community. She tries to engage her students in conversations in the target discourse. When such opportunities to
develop communication are offered, students are not always able or willing to take advantage of such opportunities. As a matter of fact, section I.3 demonstrates that they may only respond in the most economical and succinct manner. Students may indeed chose not to communicate, and, most of the time, these beginners—second-level students—seem to feel more comfortable with less demanding tasks. Anne, then, switches to a routine communication mode that is more predictable.

The questioning pattern presented still allows students to respond in a personalized manner—Anne does not know what students will say even though the question (taken in the Instructor Resource Manual) is designed to encourage them to use specific structures or lexical items—on the topic selected by the instructor (and which complies to the topic presented in the textbook). The topic is therefore fixed.

Grammatical accuracy, is a goal to be reached, as Anne was showed to accept (or partially accept) responses that were grammatically problematic before modeling an error-free response (For instance, transcript II.1, lines 17, 26, transcript II.2, line 64).

The didactic acceptability of student responses exemplifies the tension in Anne's French class between pedagogical and communicative discourses. Like Debbie, Anne was never observed
refusing or negatively evaluating a second pair part just because it did not conform to the preferred didactic guidelines.

As far as conversational authenticity is concerned, it proves to be a somewhat more problematic notion: Which criteria need to be chosen for authenticity to be evaluated. The recommendations from communicative language teaching supporters encourage to teach communicative proficiency, and therefore to aim for authentic target language as defined in the native community. A second pair part is, thus, judged to be authentic because it conforms to what a native speaker could have said in a similar situation. Transcript II.3, however, suggests another type of conversational authenticity—one in which learner and instructor collaborate to negotiate meaning. This two notions will be discussed in the next chapter.

Conclusions and recommendations based on the previous findings are presented in chapter five.
ENDNOTES

1 As already observed in MacBeth (1994, 333): “Our sequence instantiates the long standing observation that the stock in trade of classroom teaching is the question with the known answer (see McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975).”

2 McHoul (1978, 190): “Teachers have the right and obligation to give—once an answer has been produced—a comment on the sufficiency of that answer. What Sacks (1967: October 31) has called ‘utterance pairs’ include question-answer (Q-A) pairs. In the classroom situation this becomes an ‘utterance triad’, question-answer-comment on the sufficiency of that answer (Q-A-C).”

3 Eurovision, pronounced the French way, can be phonetically transcribed as [ʃrovizijɔ]. Debbie clearly says [juərovɪsən], pronouncing the French word like an American one.

4 The student to whom Debbie speaks (lines 5 and 6) is off, and it is impossible to know from the recording whether she was already addressing Paul, whom she designates as the next speaker (line 7) after this invitation to keep the interaction in French.
The videorecording does not allow to determine whether Paul was already the student nominated earlier (line 5).

Paul could, in this case, avoid the question, pretend that he does not know what "Eurovision" means in the world of French media, and reply to Debbie a sentence that even students in Elementary French I learn before the end of the first week, i.e., "Je ne sais pas"—I don't know.

This section does not argue that the necessity to code switch, as expressed by Paul on line 17, makes for pedagogically sound practice. As a matter of fact, other instructors observed teaching have been confronted to the same problem, and found a different pedagogical and communicative way to deal with this tension. The only fact that is here emphasized is that when faced with the tension between these two orders of discourse, Debbie and her students are often tempted to switch back to English.

Debbie's avoidance of a French translation for "broadcast" makes her French response to her own question less accurate than Paul's answer; "Eurovision" is a simultaneous broadcast "in a bunch of different countries" (Paul, line 24). Debbie's answer—using an indexical "c'est"/"it's"—may be translated as follows: "It's for all the countries in Europe, isn't it? So France, Switzerland, Germany, Spain, all these countries" (lines 31 and 32), and it is less specific than Paul's definition.
From the ethnographic notes taken during Winter 1996, and the logs of the tapes, it can be said that it is a characteristic of Debbie's oral techniques she does not often repeat her questions. Out of necessity when confronted to students' silence, she has been showed to wait and then to rephrase her initial question. Debbie, however, in her attempts to make the exchange as conversational as possible, does not repeat the question more than once before sending the turn to the students.

Cf. section I.2, lines 1 and 2.

As noted in the logs and the field notes of the researcher, as evidenced also in the transcripts presented in section I.1 (beginning of the same activity), relying on volunteers has often failed to bring a next speaker in Debbie's class.

Another perspective on this communicative economy and mutual understanding is found in Charaudeau (1983, 50): "...individuals who belong to the same body of social practices are susceptible to agree on the methods of discursive representations for these social practices. It follows that the subject who communicates will always be able to reasonably suppose in the Other (the non-I) a discursive competence that is similar to his/her own. The discursive act then becomes an act of complicity between I and the Other."
Debbie may be trying to complete the following adjacency pair:

Debbie: Et est-ce que vous avez uh... les yeux très bons, (.) oui? (And do you have the eyes very good, yes?)

Fred: Oui. (.) J'ai les yeux très bons. (Yes, I have the eyes very good)

The discussions are always arranged around functional topics suggested by the chapter studied in the textbook. Topic-questions, such as the one presented in this transcript, are borrowed from the Instructor Resource Manual accompanying the textbook Invitation.

When students failed to understand the topic-question as quickly as they do in the present transcript, Anne's enunciation patterns slows down, and she may repeat the question more than twice. Also, when some of the words used in the formulation of her question have not all been previously presented or taken from the vocabulary section of Invitation, Anne "chunks" (Cf. chapter one) her utterance in several shorter informational units. Anne may consider the present topic-question rather simple since it uses vocabulary items taken from the vocabulary section to be studied prior to coming to class, and it has been practiced during the previous lesson.

"Présent" is not a good translation for "present." Anne will supply the appropriate word on line 17 (un cadeau).

In this respect, French and English here differ that Anne's "Comment?" cannot be concisely translated in English. "Comment" belongs to a more
polite register than "what," which would be better translated by "quoi" in French. At the same time, "comment" ambiguously expresses both a lack of comprehension due to bad hearing or a request for repetition from Anne to Courtney.

The vocabulary presentation in the textbook is organized along two themes: (a) naming goods, and (b) naming the stores where these goods are sold.

Both "crayons" and "crayons de couleur" are acceptable in French.

It is not clear whether Shawn understood Anne's last question about being a star. In response to this third question, his response would mean: "No, I don't want (necessarily) to be a star, but I want to be an actor."

Appendix D reports the totality of the review on "choisir." It can be seen that Debbie often switches to English to explain French syntactical properties. The same observation has been a recurrent theme in the logs of Debbie's tapes.

Texts such as those presented in the sections "Intégration et Perspectives" or "Vie et culture" are authentic extracts of French discourse; as observed in section 1.2, Debbie teaches only factual knowledge about these texts, she never uses them to emphasize how things are said in French, she never patterns an interactional exchange on how meaning as it is expressed in the text. As demonstrated by her choice to have Paul respond to her question in English rather than to teach him how to express the concept of
“broadcasting” in French, the relevant dimension is not what is sayable, but discrete, factual, and testable knowledge.

23 At times, though, students seem to request these didactic-free zones of communication as exemplified in Shawn’s efforts to explain that he wants to become an actor (section II.3). According to the logs and the ethnographic notes taken during Winter 1996—and as illustrated in the contrast between transcript I.3 and transcript III.3, such efforts were never observed in Debbie’s French 102.01 class.

24 Research in second language acquisition has established that both types of conversational authenticity play an important role in the development of proficiency in the target discourse. These two notions will be examined in chapter five.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The present study has as its main objective to describe how two teaching associates create a meaningful context for the development of communication in the target language in their classrooms. In order to reach this objective, samples of naturally occurring classroom discourse were analyzed, according to the analytic program presented in chapter three.

This chapter proposes first to review the notion of foreign language discourse presented in chapter two. Next, results of the findings in chapter four are presented, and notions of classroom discourse in both Elementary French II courses are proposed. Comparisons are drawn between the stated communicative goals to teach native-like discursive formations and the presentation of representations of French discourse observed in the two French courses.
I. Discourse in the foreign language classroom

Jarvis, et al. (1993, vii) explained that the objectives of the method *Invitation* focus on the teaching of "communicative proficiency in French". The goals of *Invitation* reflect those of communicative language teaching (CLT) and the Proficiency movement. This study therefore acknowledged that, in order for foreign language education ever to reach the goals of authentic communication in the target language, it needs to adopt a notion of discourse, and not merely of language.

Discourse in the foreign language classroom needs to reflect more than the linguistic properties of the target language alone. Such a notion of discourse, in recognizing an inherent cultural component, also needs to reflect the archeological and orderly natures of speech. Kramsch (1993, 43) acknowledged this archeological dimension when she described "the established knowledge of their native community and society, the stock of metaphors this community lives by." She explains that this archeological dimension of native discourse—the way in which meaning has been expressed through time in a given community—has a direct effect on the way native speakers express themselves. Meaning is not created afresh by each new generation of, for instance, French speakers. When one speaks French today, one speaks through a medium that, at any time, carries with itself the traces of a long evolutionary process. Meanings are expressed,
comprehension is displayed, through a device that has been shaped and
formed through years of usage. Discourse is this device; discourse is this
practical apparatus; discourse is therefore more than mere linguistic
competence (Chomsky, 1965). It is more than "a certain interjection between
speaking and thinking" (Foucault, 1971).

Discourse is thus what is sayable. One may adopt one of the two
following orientations to characterize how it functions; one may decide to
investigate discourse diachronically—historically—and to observe how same
(or similar) "things [are] said" (Foucault 1991, 63). This approach first
describes the regularities, and then the ruptures in how "things" are said.
The present study investigated how discourse functions synchronically in two
Elementary French II courses, it investigated the regularities of foreign
language classroom discourse.

Thanks to audio and videorecordings, oral discourse can be studied. In
such investigations, however, the researcher needs to define what is sayable
in the context of the ongoing communicative situation. To reach this
objective, the researcher needs to define how communication is ensured
between two or more individuals—to define how the individuals
instantaneously understand each other, and how they use this immediate
understanding to produce new contributions to the topic at hand. This type
of analysis requires solid descriptions of the type of discourse under investigation and yields insights into the order of meaning-making during an ongoing communicative exchange.

Sacks (1984, 22) provides an analytical program inspired by the orderly nature of discourse. He showed that humans can be assumed to be "just another animal after all," just another describable entity whose communication routines can be analyzed. These descriptions of routine verbal behavior eventually show that the most basic and most ritualized accomplishment is the never-ending creation of "order at all points" in human transactions and especially in human communication; these descriptions and analyses show what is sayable.

In oral discourse, such as the classroom interactions that have been analyzed for the present study, speakers are observed trying to establish mutual understanding in order to comply with the orderly nature of speech. The researcher's task therefore consists of the systematic unveiling, description, and analysis of the discursive practices. The reason for such an enterprise, in the words of Atkinson & Heritage (1984, 6) can be summarized as follows:

If it can then be shown that the producers of the first action deal in systematically organized ways with a variety of alternative seconds (or noticeably absent seconds), then it will also be demonstrated that the
object of investigation is an institutionalized organization for the activity in question that is systematically oriented to by speakers. The analysis of sequential organization of oral discourse should therefore yield valuable information about what is sayable at any given moment in the foreign language interaction, about the mechanisms used by members of the foreign language classroom to communicate meanings, and about the state of orderliness in classroom discourse.

In the context of the present study—the description of how novice foreign language teachers and their students make sense of each other, how they "are oriented toward" target language communication in the foreign language classroom—the researcher was able to investigate how teachers and learners implement the goals of developing communicative proficiency in French.

II. Classroom discourse in French 102.01

II.1. Foreword

Two instructors of French 102.01, Debbie (an American instructor) and Anne (a Swedish-French instructor), participated in this study. On average, they were taped teaching every other day during Winter Quarter, 1996. They also gave feedback to the researcher, in informal diaries and during interviews, about their specific experiences while teaching during their
second quarter. Thanks to this feedback and thanks to an extensive presence in the classrooms, the researcher developed a familiarity with the contexts for language teaching in both of these courses. Since the stated objective of the study was to document routine ways, these precautions proved to be a valuable asset when, out of forty-two hours of recorded materials, the time came to select routine interactions for transcription and analysis.

These two teaching associates had dissimilar experiences during Winter Quarter, 1996. Debbie reported feeling overwhelmed, struggled all quarter long, and almost dropped out of graduate school. In contrast, Anne was nominated by her students for a university award in teaching excellence. These opposite levels of success were related to the novice teachers' experiences in their foreign language classrooms.

As will be summarized in the following sections, differences in the French linguistic competencies between both instructors surfaced during this study. It is not the purpose of this research to argue that a native speaker is more proficient in her native language than a nonnative speaker. The objective of this study was not to illustrate differences in French proficiency.

The questions that the analyses of transcripts tried to answer were the following: How was communication in the target language achieved in these two foreign language classrooms? How did instructors and learners use the target language—how did they actively define what is sayable in the foreign language classroom—and what can the researcher conclude about the
implementation of communicative goals at the elementary level? What were the interactional resources used by these two novice teaching associates to create in their respective classroom a meaningful context for the development of verbal interactions in the target language? The present study contends that it documented the teaching associates' personal orientation toward—as well as their experience with—communication in and about the target language.

II.2. Teaching both linguistic and discursive competencies

While the communicative sequences were rather rare in Debbie's class, they surfaced during Anne's lessons. Most routine interactions in French seemed, however, to be limited to one of three possibilities: (a) teacher addressed a question to the cohort, a student volunteered; (b) teacher addressed a question to the cohort, then called on a student since no one volunteered; (c) teacher addressed a question directly to a specific student. This study, conducted in French Elementary II, therefore confirms the conclusions proposed by McHoul (1978), and presented in chapter one. It seems to indicate that, at the beginner-second quarter level, students do not feel proficient enough to self-select, or that they are so used to the organization of classroom talk in other courses that they tend to naturally rely on the teacher to initiate the topics and select the next speakers.
The preceding observation emphasizes several potential explanations that are not mutually exclusive; (a) students were not yet proficient enough to know what is sayable in the target discourse when one wants to initiate a new topic; (b) when students attempted to initiate a new topic, they felt very self-conscious about not being able to do it as effortlessly as in their first language; and (c) French lessons take place in an institution—the university—and in a context—classroom instruction—that impose on the participants favored modes of communication.

Holstein & Gubrium (1994) summarized how specific orders of discourse become "institutionalized." They explained that institutions, such as the university, are "involving typical and routine ways of representing social reality." They added that these routine organized social conventions have been likened to Foucault’s discursive formations, and they are defined as:

Contextually grounded discourses, vocabularies, and categories from local interpretive resources or cultures for defining and classifying aspects of everyday life. (Holstein & Gubrium, 1994, 268)

These discursive formations and local interpretive resources define the functioning of given institutions. In the present study, students entered the classroom with knowledge of these preferred ways of interpreting and contributing to the institutionalized form of discourse. These local interpretative resources do not favor small talk and casual conversations.
Therefore, Debbie's failed attempts to start conversations with her group are related to the idea that an authentic communication situation in a college content course is not one in which students self-select to "chitchat" about the topic selected by the instructor. Students could not be expected to initiate a type of interaction that runs against what they learned to be the institutionalized behavior expected from them. In other words, this attitude of input-processing and solicited output-only that was described in chapter four is part of the learning structure that students have to internalize to be successful learners in other non-foreign-language classes at the university. Specific interactional rules for the foreign language classroom have to be emphasized to the students.

Anne's reversals of orientation between order of discourse that emphasized casual conversations (transcript II.1; "Ça va?") and orders of discourse that were more similar to repetitive pedagogical exchanges (Figure 2.) were the result of her own interpretive achievement about the pedagogical and communicative situation at hand. She acknowledged the conversational goals presented by communicative language teaching, but like Debbie, met obstacles such as the students' lack of proficiency, their resistance to speak in a code they do not master yet, and these institutionalized discursive formations.
Anne therefore proposed to teach some communication in French, while reducing the demands that such an ambitious goal imposes on beginning learners. Kramsch (1993, 3) was quoted in chapter one explaining that "classroom teaching is a juggling act that requires instant-by-instant decisions based on both local and global knowledge and on an intuitive grasp of the situation." Anne's decisions (i.e., her permutations between didactic and communicative discourses), best illustrated, instant by instant, this compromise described by Kramsch between how Anne balances the competency of her students and her role and duty as a teacher.

Facing difficulties to develop verbal interactions with her students, facing the tension between pedagogical and communicative goals (Edmonson, 1985), Debbie teaches about the French language and other discrete, testable, elements of information. She consequently abandons communication in order to focus on the teaching of French syntax. Anne simplified communication, and made it more accessible under more basic, primitive, repetitive and easily rehearsed forms.

In Anne's course, each first presentation of the topic-question defines its interactive, didactic, and communicative goals and proposes to the students the more manageable, more basic, communication forms being rehearsed. When facing the tension between didactic and communicative discourse, this first question represents Anne's efforts to display the
assembling of potentially adequate second pair parts (as exemplified by the step by step public construction of Courtney's answer in transcript II.1, lines 24 to 44, stretching the canonical IRE across ten turn exchanges).

Once the first part of the interaction has been successfully completed by the student, and the didactic as well as the interactive goals had been met, Anne's second questions displayed the property to be more communicative than pedagogical (for instance, neither Courtney nor Michelle have to clearly repeat their answer in transcripts II.1 and II.2). Once the goal of publicly displaying how the construction of a competent second pair part was reached, it even became acceptable to involve the instructor in an interaction such as the exchange reported in transcript II.3, in which the only objective seemed to communicate in the target language without any pre-established topics and didactic guideline.

II.3. Defining the authenticity of the interaction

The type of exchange reported in transcript II.3 between Anne and Shawn can, however, be problematic for the language teacher. It is a "pedagogy-free" zone since neither grammatical accuracy nor didactic acceptability seem to matter. The student help selecting the topic (in transcript II.3, Shawn selected the topic of soap opera acting), speaks, and responds when it is interactionally relevant. The student does not try to
reproduce a conversationally authentic communication between two speakers of the target language, but fully assumes the role of a beginning learner involved in negotiating meaning. The student experiences the authentic communicative indecisiveness of everyday conversation in the target language. The low proficiency of one of the participants makes it necessary for comprehension to be constantly checked in order to produce a logical next turn. The student thus experiences authenticity in conversation that resembles the authenticity of communication between native and nonnative speakers in non-classroom contexts.

The type of authenticity that Shawn experienced in the building of his fantasy therefore compels the observer to modify the definition of an appropriate response proposed in chapter four. Previously, conversational authenticity implied that the instructor and the learner converse as if they were both competent members of the target discursive community. It involves responding, for instance, simply "I want to be a pilot" or even just "pilot" instead "I have chosen to be a pilot" as explained in section III.1; it is a sort of role-play authenticity where students mimic what they learned competent native speakers would say in a natural conversation.

The exchange between Shawn and Anne proposed a notion of authenticity that resides in the actual communication situation: Shawn is not imitating what a competent native speaker would say—he has not yet learned and never rehearsed such a communicative predicament. His is a
situational conversational authenticity. In the first case, students assume the status of a fictional competent speaker, have knowledge of the different possibilities offered to them to provide a second pair part, and select the response that best approximates what they learned was the most probable manner in which native speakers would respond. It consists in being able to use at the opportune time previously learned and rehearsed discursive formulas. In the second case, meaning has to be created anew. Students do not have the possibility to play any other role but their own: speakers with a limited proficiency in the target discursive field.

II.4. Authenticity and discourse production

Each type of authenticity presents benefits and drawbacks. The verbal exchange in transcript II.3 shows that the interaction gains in situational authenticity what verbal exchanges may loose in linguistic accuracy. The communication that occurs between instructor and learner presents a context rich in negotiation of meaning, but a discourse that is far from approximating the native-like discursive formations that are the objectives of communicative language teaching. It is a rich context for discourse production; but a poor context for discourse learning. It is a context in which students hardly ever
correct faulty utterances and produce mostly elliptical statements. This type of language production has been called interlanguage talk (Krashen 1981, 121; Ellis 1994, 247).

Interlanguage talk, as observed in Anne's class, was studied by Porter (1986) who concludes that 20% of this type of language production is grammatically faulty. Moreover, if one considers that the norms for sociolinguistic competence are those of the target discursive community, Porter noted that interlanguage talk is also sociolinguistically deficient. Finally, when used as input, interlanguage talk is a dangerous resource. Gass and Lakshamanan (1991) provided evidence that ungrammatical input has a direct effect on second/foreign language acquisition; in a longitudinal study, the researchers were able to demonstrate a strong and consistent correlation between input and output over time.

Faulty input may lead to early foreign language fossilization. Evidence was given about the negative effect of this type of language production without proper feedback (Harley, Allen, Cummins, & Swain, 1990, 67, on the early fossilization in Canadian immersion programs where this grammatically inaccurate discourse is incidentally used as the main source for input, and is not monitored). It may be detrimental to the development of foreign language proficiency to achieve only situational conversational authenticity during learner-instructor dialogues.
Indirect evidence exists to demonstrate how situational conversational authenticity may enhance foreign language acquisition, when it is not the sole targeted quality of the learner-instructor exchange. Swain (1985) argued that language learners need to be given "meaningful" opportunities to use their L2 competencies in order to achieve higher proficiencies in the target language. She argued that, when learners are facing the possibility of a communicative failure, they need to be forced to make their output more precise, more coherent, more native-like. In other words, situational conversational authenticity puts the students in an ideal position for production of foreign discourse. However, for language acquisition to take place, this type of student language production needs to be monitored and corrected.5

As the exchange in Anne's course demonstrates, situational conversational authenticity provides opportunities for freer language production, but less opportunities to rehearse and learn native-like discursive formations. These exchanges are unplanned and rare, but they do surface at times in Anne's French course. They are an important part of the foreign language teaching environment, and they help in providing contexts for students to try out hypotheses and generate output. They need, however, to be closely monitored to avoid confusion or early fossilization.
III. Foreign language classroom communication as a simulation

III.1. The creation of conversational authenticity

In the previous section, it has been argued that instructors propose first pair parts to their students that create a domain of potential second pair parts in which students are believed to be proficient. Each question anticipates a typical response. From the feedback that instructors gave to students, five qualities of the students' second pair parts (grammatical accuracy, didactic acceptability, interactional relevance, as well as two different notions of conversational authenticity) were characterized.

The first two qualities seem rather straightforward. Grammatical accuracy is the quality that evaluates how closely the student's response approximates the rules of syntax in the target language. Didactic acceptability is a quality that tends to reduce to a minimum the student's freedom to produce a second pair part that would not conform to a pre-established pattern. If, for example, the topic of today's lesson is the subjunctive mood, the teacher's question targets this conjugation, and the student is expected to respond with a verb conjugated in the subjunctive. It is probable that these two properties of learners' responses could already be observed in language classrooms when second/foreign language education followed the precepts of the Grammar-Translation or the Audiolingual methods.
Because foreign language education aims to develop communicative proficiency in the target language, because classroom communication aims at teaching the archeological and orderly natures of the target discourse, teachers expect their students' response also to also be interactionally relevant and conversationally authentic. Different examples in chapter four (for instance, transcript I.1, line 14; or transcript II.1, line 12) showed that both teaching associates positively evaluate student second pair parts that are faulty in all aspects but interactionally relevant. The novice teachers still accept the response, and most of the time, model an error-free rephrasing of the student's answer if the student reacts to the teacher's first pair part in a timely fashion, displaying in the response an understanding of what was said during the previous turn, even if the language production of the response is faulty (grammatical error, not using the preferred language form, delivered in the first language).

The notion of conversational authenticity in the foreign language classroom is more complex. Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary (1988, 117) defines "authentic" as (a) "conforming to an original so as to reproduce essential features," and (b) "worthy of acceptance or belief as conforming to fact or reality." Applying the first definition to the language learning situation, an authentic conversational exchange is one in which instructor and learner are conforming to an original conversation in the
target discursive community so as to reproduce its essential features in the classroom. It is what was named in the previous section "role-play conversational authenticity."

However, the reality of the foreign language classroom is that both learners have different and unequal knowledge of conversations in the target discursive community; the demands of unplanned, unrehearsed communication exceed at times the expertise of the less proficient speaker. The authenticity of the conversation resides then in the situation at hand.

Both positions present a notion of authenticity. In the first case, the criterion against which authenticity is evaluated is a native speaker-to-native speaker conversation; in the second case, it is non-proficient nonnative speaker-to-native speaker conversation.

The argument could be made that both situations lack authenticity since both participants are fluent in the first language of the less proficient L2 speaker. When communication difficulties or communication breakdowns occur, the most genuine and the most direct communication should occur in the learners' L1. Situational conversational authenticity could indeed be achieved only when both speakers speak in the language where they are both fluent. Such a decision is, however, inauthentic in foreign language education. The foreign language classroom is a location where the medium is also the subject to be studied, so that everything that is said (the output) can in turn become what needs to be learned (the input). To be true to its
purpose, the foreign language lesson needs to be conducted in the target language as much as possible. Hence the efforts, from foreign language syllabus designers, textbook authors, and everyday practitioners to reduce the qualitative gap between input and output—to make student output as close as possible to the input, the target discourse.

In the foreign language classroom, the medium and the subject to be taught are similar entities. Therefore, communication between teacher and students is achieved in an unusual manner. The instructor provides a question, a first pair part, which defines a domain of potential responses in which the learners is thought to be proficient. The provided second pair part is characterized first by its interactional relevance; its didactic acceptability if specific L2 structures are targeted, and its syntactical accuracy.

The goals that communicative language teaching now seeks to reach require that students ultimately be able to approximate the conversational norms of the target discourse. Each student response needs to be assessed for its likeness, for its resemblance with target discursive formations, for its authenticity. The goal is to "say it like the natives." As was previously explained, it necessitates that the likeness of the response—its role-play conversational authenticity—be built through a process of production-correction/modeling-new usage in a proper communicative context.
Conversational authenticity is therefore manufactured, created during the foreign language lesson, either through language production and correction/modeling, or conceivably by imitation if the learner has been exposed to sufficient input from the target discursive fields and integratively motivated. Role-play conversational authenticity did not occur during interactions between Debbie and her students. She presented communicative contexts that had situational conversational authenticity, but which did not seem to motivate students to speak (they were indeed masked tests). She assumed that students were able to provide responses that would be didactically, grammatically, and conversationally appropriate.

An authentic conversational exchange is defined as a verbal interaction in which instructor and learner are conforming to an original conversation in the target discursive community so as to reproduce its essential features in the classroom. As such, it needs to be created, assembled, manufactured in front of the learner.

III.2. Simulations

The conclusions from the data analysis demonstrate that, for native-like communication to occur in the foreign language classroom, communication first needed to be reduced to simpler, more basic and more typical units, then re-created according to these simpler models.
It is suggested that instructors are applying to the communication situation in the foreign language classroom the following process. This process consists in analyzing a phenomenon, and reducing it to more essential features in order to reproduce it. French philosopher Jean Baudrillard studied this process. He developed this analysis in "L'échange symbolique et la mort" (1976).^8

Baudrillard (1976) explained the social and historical mutations leading to the current era in a well-known model of the three orders of simulacrum.\(^9\) He characterized each of the previous three orders of simulacrum by a specific law of value, by a dominant form of exchanges, and by the predominance of certain semiotic features. He characterized the period from Renaissance to the Industrial Revolution as a time when value depended upon a "natural law," where exchanges were most influenced by "counterfeiting," and where the dominant semiotic feature was "arbitrariness." The Industrial Era is the second age being studied, and it is characterized as a time when value depended upon a the law of the "market," where exchanges were governed by "production," and where the dominant feature was "seriality." Finally, he analyzed the present era as a time when value depends upon binary oppositions and a "structural" law, where the dominant scheme is "simulation," and where the dominant feature is "codification." It is at this point that his analysis meets the conclusions of the present study.
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Baudrillard (1976) explains that simulations function according to the following pattern: It is a process according to which most human, and all scientific, endeavors prove their achievements by re-creating a reality that has first been analyzed and codified. The codification of the real phenomenon under study allows the elaboration of the structural laws previously mentioned. Reality is then reduced to a system of binary oppositions; this code, this man-made structure presents the enormous advantage to be more docile than the real phenomenon—it allows the practitioner to re-create the real simply by duplicating the structure outlined in the analysis. The second state of reality thus produced by man is a simulation. Baudrillard (1993, 61-2) explained that this process, based on models borrowed from sciences such as genetics, permeates daily life.

[This process] haunts all the messages and signs of our society, and we can clearly locate its most concrete form in the test, the question/answer, the stimulus/response. All content is neutralized by a continuous process of orchestrated interrogations, verdicts and ultimatums to be decoded, which this time no longer come from the depths of the genetic code but still possess the same tactical indeterminacy-the cycles of meaning become infinitely shorter in the cycles of the question/answer, the bit or the return to a minuscule quantity of energy/information to its point of departure.
To apply the preceding remark to the situation under study: It is precisely what defines a given interaction as a pedagogical one that irremediably determines it as a simulation. For the instructor to insure that he or she has taught, to insure that the content was learned, classroom communication needs to become an ongoing series of tests, questions and answers, stimuli and responses. Classroom communication is by definition the domain of the “test.” Classroom communication is by definition the domain of simulation, the domain where “[the] real is produced from miniaturized units, from matrices, memory banks, and command models-and with these it can be reproduced an infinite number of times” (Baudrillard, 1993, 343).

Baudrillard (1993) examined the dynamic relationship between real and simulation. He demonstrated how simulation threatens the difference between "true" and "false," between "real" and "imaginary." He showed that the representation of the real goes through successive phases. First, he notes that the created image tends to be the reflection of a basic reality. Then, this representation “masks and perverts” a basic reality. Next, it masks the absence of a basic reality. Finally, it bears no relation to any reality any longer: It is its own pure simulation. Baudrillard concluded that the simulation is substituted for the real phenomenon and becomes detached from it; the "mediation of the real" becomes the real.
In the context of this study, Anne and Debbie attempted to create an environment that develops communicative proficiency in French. They substituted for real conversational French discourse their personal simulations, which are the reflections of the basic reality of the language/discourse as they understand they have to teach it. The factors justifying the substitutions—the exchanges—have not been documented in the present study, but additional data collected from the same teaching associates during the same quarter suggests a vast array of different personal and external factors. At any rate, Baudrillard argued that these factors are themselves signs that are no more real than the simulations they are supposed to validate.

Anne and Debbie's simulations, according to Baudrillard, then take on a life of their own: They start masking and perverting the basic reality—the discourse—for which they have been substituted, until these simulations are completely autonomous from their model. The outcome is unavoidable: The simulation itself becomes the goal to be reached. No matter what the nature of the simulation is that Anne and Debbie create to teach French, it becomes French as a foreign language for them and for their students.

The conclusion at this point may be summarized as follows: Even if the professed goal is the teaching of native-like discourse, proficient communication in the foreign language classroom can never re-create this authentic target discourse. The very nature of classroom instruction
determines that communication will at best be created through a simulation of the target discourse. Each instructor proposes her distinct version of a simulation that best reflects what needs to be taught for communication to occur. Each simulation becomes real; what the teaching associate thinks needs to be taught for communication to occur becomes the target language/discourse.

Therefore, even if communicative proficiency in the target discursive field is the common professed goal, the medium used to reach this goal—the nature of the task proposed to the students—determines how closely classroom discourse approximates the norms of the communities speaking the target language. As reported above, Baudrillard (1976, 96) explains that the most concrete manifestation of the simulation is the test, question/answer, stimulus/response. In other words, the simulation neutralizes contents through a process that allows to find easy shortcuts to meanings. He also notes that:

Both object and information already result from a selection, an edited sequence of camera angles, they have already tested "reality" and have only asked those questions to which it has responded. Reality has been analyzed into simple elements which have been recomposed into scenarios of stable oppositions, just as the photographer imposes his own contrasts, lighting and angles onto his subject.11 (Baudrillard, 1993, 63)
The specific simulation created in any foreign language classroom, therefore, is due neither to serendipity nor accident. It is created by the montage, by the specific point of view, by the question that is asked, by the way it is tested—what Baudrillard calls the medium (Baudrillard, 1976, 100).

Moreover, the simulation of native discourse is so convincing that, in responses to specific questions, it sends back a representation of itself that conforms exactly with the selected structure. In other words, medium is the message (Baudrillard, 1993, 65).

Therefore, in the analysis of communication in Debbie's and Anne's courses, it is inaccurate to claim that both teaching associates were engaged in the same task. It was shown that Anne attempted to create a simulation based on a simplified communication structure, while Debbie created a simulation based on factual knowledge of the syntax of the target language. Each instructor presented different simulations of French as a teachable content. Irremediably, these two simulations of language/discourse were substituted for what they were supposed to represent, and became de facto the object of the course.
III.3. Simulations in Anne's and Debbie's lessons

Foreign language education presents the following quandary: It wholeheartedly embraces a desire to teach more than merely syntactic competence—a desire to teach the actual discourse used by native speakers in communication situation. At the same time, qualitative differences between classroom discourse and native discourse can be observed—and the present study contributes in demonstrating these differences—and these differences lead the practitioner to question whether reconciling both discourses is a reasonable objective. This study notes that both discursive fields remain qualitatively different at the beginner-second term level. More studies are needed to analyze how closely nonnative speakers can approximate what is sayable in a native discursive community even when the learners reach an advanced level of proficiency in the target code.

Therefore, simulations of native discourse in the foreign language lesson are unavoidable because: (a) native discourse is by definition inaccessible to learners, (b) native discourse needs to be made accessible to learners so that it may be taught to, and used by, the learners.

Foreign language instructors teachers are compelled to present a simulation of the native discourse that reflects the practitioner's understanding and knowledge of the target discursive formations. This
simulation is more easily accessible to the learners, and that accessibility allows learners to make contributions that maximize their chances to memorize the targeted discursive formations.

The linear analyses conducted in the present study were aimed at documenting the interactional resources used by novice teaching associates to create a meaningful context for the development of verbal interactions in the target language (Cf. research question No. 1, chapter one). The conclusion is that each instructor created through questioning different simulations of the target French language and/or discourse.

First, both instructors (and the students themselves) acknowledged the learners' lack of proficiency, and therefore the impossibility to create native-like conversations in the classroom. Based on this fact, Debbie finds a topic where students can be expected to be as proficient as possible. The collective repeated failures from instructor and learners to develop a meaningful context for the development of verbal interactions in the target language suggest that the choice of a topic in which students were knowledgeable was not a sufficient answer to the communication problem. No study demonstrates the transferability of conversational skills, and being a competent conversant in English might imply the knowledge and mastery of different conversational rules than those necessary to be a competent conversant in French. In addition, if the choice of a specific topic can make
participation in classroom matters more manageable for the students, the
consistent emphasis on discrete knowledge of grammar was not conducive to
creating interactions with the language learners enrolled in her course.

Debbie did not use adequate interactional resources to create a
meaningful context for the development of verbal interactions in the target
language (finding a topic for conversation where students are knowledgeable)
during the course of the study.

The questioning pattern emphasized in Figure 1. also clarifies Debbie's
view on target language communication; the interactional organization
documented in chapter four brings to the surface Debbie's simulation of
discourse. The sequential organization of turns showed that Debbie
originally relied on self-selection, on defining a broad domain of appropriate
responses so as to avoid discouraging participation, and on informing
students that the interactional task at hand was the construction of an
informal conversation in French.12

In the absence of response, Debbie abandoned the conversational
mode, and asked a discrete question about facts she read in the textbook
(linguistic properties, or a discrete piece of information about the assigned
reading). If no one responded to the second attempt, the question was
repeated, and a student was selected to respond. The descriptive logs show
that, once a satisfactory response was provided, Debbie usually went on to
introduce, or provide, the next discrete topic.
Therefore, Debbie did not acknowledge the need for students to practice and rehearse French discursive formations. Meanings were established in French. Question/answer models were provided but seldom could be employed in similar communicational contexts. Debbie's questions presented situational conversational authenticity because they put students in a situation where they had to use their knowledge of French to the fullest in order to compose a competent second pair part. Her questions, however, had no role-play conversational authenticity because, once a discursive formation has been emphasized, it could seldom be practiced and new formations were introduced. The descriptive logs also show that, when this type of interaction failed, Debbie ended up summarizing or explaining the targeted discrete fact in English, proving that the simulation replacing native French discourse is indeed a discourse about French language and its linguistic properties. The goal of developing a meaningful context for the development of verbal interactions in the target language was abandoned.

Anne showed a different approach. Since the goals were to develop communicative proficiency in French, Anne persisted in trying to create communicative exchanges in French. Anne tried to simplify communicative exchanges.

Anne knew this self-evident truth: For students to produce a second pair part, they need to understand the first pair part. Therefore, she slowed down her speech as much as possible, briefly posing between each group of
words constituting distinct informational units; she pre-processed the informational content of her utterance for the learners (chunking). She immediately repeated the question at least once. The obvious benefits were that students had more time to process the input, and also more opportunities to check on their own comprehension. At times, if the first pair part was still not understood after these efforts, Anne or one of the students could give side-comments (at times even in English) to clarify the specific language difficulty preventing student comprehension. However, by the time the first student volunteered or was called upon, the meaning of the first pair part could be thought to be clear for most learners. The interactional resources used by Anne to create a meaningful context for the development of verbal interactions in the target language therefore included slowing down and pre-segmenting the first pair part, repeating it, and if necessary defining some of its elements to insure student comprehension.

In terms of the properties of the response, it was shown that both Debbie and Anne expected responses to be interactional relevant. Grammatical accuracy was a property that could always be improved. Both instructors accepted intelligible yet ungrammatical responses that they usually corrected for the students. Authenticity is the domain where Anne and Debbie differed.
The context for the development of verbal interactions in French defined by Anne was qualitatively different from the context defined by Debbie. It has been noted earlier that Debbie's questions presented only situational conversational authenticity; Anne's questions potentially presented either situational or role-play conversational authenticity. If the question presented a conversational context that had previously been learned by the students, the latter were free to use immediately the discursive formation(s) that would probably be used by native speakers in such a context; in short the original question had role-play conversational authenticity.

On the other hand, if the proposed question presented a conversational context that had never been previously learned by the students, the question had situational conversational authenticity. Students had to use their knowledge of French to compose an unrehearsed response; the instructor then evaluated how closely this response approximated known native-like ways to respond to the question. Once Anne's feedback provided students a more native way to respond to the first pair part, as showed in Figure 2, Anne repeated the same question several times—often up to five times—so that students may practice the newly learned question and answer, and could pretend to be competent target language speakers. Anne enhanced the role-play conversational authenticity of her questions.
If Debbie's simulations emphasized the role of language as a linguistic code, it was indeed communicative exchanges in the target discursive community that Anne analyzed and attempted to re-create during her lesson. She had a solid knowledge of what is sayable in French, and she had learned a simple model of communication that she used to recreate these primitive exchanges documented in chapter four.\textsuperscript{15}

While there is no empirical proof that these rudimentary conversational exchanges facilitate the acquisition of French, this study documents that the simulation of communication presented by Anne had a positive effect on student production of French discourse, and she consequently applied the recommendations of communicative language teaching with more success than her colleague.

Anne's students produced more French than Debbie's, and the turns were claimed and assigned more quickly in Anne's class. In addition, her students kept on producing French even when the situation did not require it (Cf. transcript II.3, Shawn had several opportunities to drop the topic, he had several opportunities to switch to English; he chose to keep speaking French).

This study cannot claim that one group of students, rather than the other, was better prepared or more proficient at the end of French 102.01. No measurement of the learners' proficiency at the end of Winter, 1996, was scheduled. Because this study documented interactional practices in two
French courses, it may only report about the type of interactions observed in both courses. Even a cursory look on the data reported in chapter four reveals that Anne's students spoke more French than Debbie's, and that interactions were more sustained in Anne's lesson than in Debbie's. It is therefore suggested that Anne's lessons more closely reflected the departmental objective of maximizing student production, and that this goal was reached not by selecting topics where students were expected to be more fluent, but by simplifying the structure of conversational exchanges.

IV. Further contrasts

It needs to be noted that the collected data do not allow the researcher to propose a conclusion about the pre-data collection research question aiming at contrasting the American and the French teaching associates (Research question No. 2). This study expected to investigate the different ways that Anne and Debbie worked to sustain and repair meaningful contexts for the development of verbal interactions in the target language in their classrooms. It was also proposed to compare the conversational resources used by the European teaching associate to the devices utilized by the American teaching associate. These questions assumed that both instructors would be engaged in the same task; i.e., the development of verbal interactions in the target language.
Everyday, the rapid disintegration of the conversational context in Debbie's class, the collective inability or lack of motivation from the instructor and the students to repair it, and Debbie's choice to focus on testing and teaching of discrete linguistic elements prevented further comparisons. As indicated above, Anne and Debbie were not engaged in the same task, and their respective choices may indicate their personal beliefs about the mission of foreign language education. Debbie did not apply the recommendations of communicative language teaching (CLT). If Debbie had also tried to build a simulation of the target discourse, or if Anne had tried to teach solely the linguistic rules of the target language, interactions would have been more similar, and finer contrastive results could have been reached. As argued above, Anne and Debbie reflected in their practice different interactional and pedagogical enterprises, as well as different views on the nature of the subject to be simulated and taught.

V. Pedagogical content knowledge

A question remains that this study cannot answer: What type of knowledge should be emphasized to insure that the instructor will, indeed, build a simulation of discourse that remains close to what is sayable in the target discursive community? The method and the textbook provide authentic texts and examples of what is sayable in the target language, but
once students produced their approximations of the target discourse, corrections and fine-tuning are needed for foreign language acquisition to occur. These corrections and fine-tuning remarks rely on the teachers' appreciation, and therefore their own knowledge of French discourse.

Materials, such as texts, audio- and video-tapes, are provided to the teacher. These help to explain not only what people say in the target community, but also how they say it. These materials are direct reflections of what is sayable on any given topic in the target discourse; they need to be used as resources and as models.

Nevertheless, it is always the teacher who has the last word and decides, at each level of proficiency, what is—or not—an acceptable approximation of French discourse. The necessary language and discursive competencies for a teaching associate to teach "proficient communication" (Jarvis, et al., vii) remain to be determined.

It was concluded that, because of the exchange between the real and its simulation (Baudrillard, 1976), it is never truly the discourse of the target community that is taught to the learners, but a manufactured simulation of this discourse. It can be expected that, as learners become more knowledgeable about French, the qualitative differences between the simulations and the target discursive formations become less noticeable. As far as the context of this study is concerned, discourse, as characterized
earlier by its archeological and orderly properties, is not a teachable pedagogical content, and it was necessary for the instructor to present a more compliant form of medium and content.

Debbie chose to present her students the simplest reduction/simulation of French discourse available to her: the codified linguistic properties of the French language as printed in the textbook *Invitation*. Debbie does not simulate French discourse (what is sayable), but French language (the syntactic properties). The factors influencing her choices are varied, and will be analyzed in a future project. She never gives students and observers any indications about how her discourse competence would allow her to teach "proficient communication" in French. Her discourse competence cannot, therefore, be compared to Anne's.

In deciding to promote the teaching of proficient communication, the profession also forced the adoption of a new content, a new norm: the foreign discourse. It is, however, a content that is characterized by archeological and orderly properties, and which consequently may only be presented as a simulation to the foreign language learners. Teaching a foreign discourse is thus an enterprise of simulating the entity to be taught. For these simulations to reflect the pedagogical objectives of communicative language teaching (CLT), it is thus necessary that future studies investigate communication in the target discursive communities. Ethnomethodological
accounts of French oral communication need to be made available that explore how members of different French discursive communities take turn, repair a previous turn, disagree, etc. Until such accounts are available and can be contrasted with ethnomethodological studies of similar topics in the learners' discourse, the codification of teaching of communication in French into a readily available pedagogical content knowledge is rather illusory.

Even when such ethnomethodological studies are available, one wonders whether the multitude of potential communication situations could be exhausted by analyses of discrete communication situations in both the first and the second discursive communities. Immediate studies are needed to explore potential relationship between the following factors: the instructors' discourse competence, their capacities to simulate communication in the target code, their own experiences as language/discourse learners, their experience with communication in foreign discursive communities. All of the previous factors may have a role in defining the notion of language/discourse that individual teachers simulate in their classroom. These factors play a role in the definition of the content to be taught and the pedagogical content knowledge necessary to transmit it to the students.
VI. Suggestions for further studies

Reflecting on Kramsch's (1993, 43) intuition about the nature of discourse, this study argued that native discourse exhibits at all points both an archeological and an orderly nature that need to be taught to the learner, but that are mostly inaccessible to the beginning foreign language learners. Studies are needed to document whether and/or when a nonnative speaker of a given language starts gaining access to these archeological and orderly dimensions of foreign discourse.

Qualitative differences between the way in which a given native community talks and the way the target language is used in foreign language classrooms need to be documented. The pedagogical situation, in Anne's and Debbie's case, relies on the teacher's knowledge of what is sayable in the target discourse in order to teach communicative proficiency. More studies are needed to analyze how closely nonnative speakers can approximate what is sayable in a discursive community even when the learners reach an advanced level of proficiency in the target code.

Qualitative descriptions of the native and nonnative foreign language teachers' competencies need to be made available. They need to be compared with the proficiency criteria to be reached to pass a course. Considering the learners' linguistic and discursive needs at each level of proficiency, such analyses could help match teacher's competence to the appropriate group of students.
The learners' proficiency affects the teacher's language production, and the present collected data reflect the lack of proficiency of beginning learners. Further studies are needed to document how native speaker instructors and nonnative instructors interactionally implement the communicative goals defined in this study with learners of higher proficiency.

The parallel established between Baudrillard's simulation and the communicative language teaching context suggests that the instructors recognize that native discourse in French cannot be the vehicle for communication. The instructors then use their conception of the subject to be taught, and their understanding of the educational context in order to create a more easily teachable medium. In Baudrillard's term, an exchange then occurs in which the teachers' simulation of the native discourse becomes what needs to be taught. This study did not investigate possible personal factors motivating the exchanges made by each instructor. The instructors' familiarity with what is sayable in the target discursive community may be one of the reasons, but the claim that it is the only or even the main reason is, at this point, unsubstantiated. Studies investigating the relationship between teacher's classroom behavior and their personal definition of foreign language/discourse are needed.
VII. Limitations of the study

The present study is limited to two teaching associates and to the setting defined in this situation—teaching French 102.01 at The Ohio State University. If objections can be formulated as to the generalizability of the population surveyed, and the data selected, the conclusions of this study present an acceptable type of alternative validity, more qualitative in essence, that is defined by Mishler (1990) as "trustworthiness." Clearly, a more extensive effort to document and contrast the classroom behaviors of European and American teaching associates is needed if the trustworthiness of two exemplars used in this study is to be established.
ENDNOTES

1 This university-wide committee observed Anne several times during Spring, 1996, and eventually made her one the 1996 recipients for this award in teaching excellence.

2 As demonstrated, for instance, by Courtney (section 1.4) who tries to bring into the conversation the concept of hat, and feels so self-conscious about syntactical accuracy that she demands ongoing reinforcements from the instructor after each new element as she composes her response.


4 This is no way implies that the institutionalized forms or discourse at any time prevent the pursuit of communicative goals in the foreign language classroom. As also noted by Holstein & Gubrium (1994, 268):

   Practitioners of everyday life are not "organizational dopes," mere extension of organizational thinking. They exercise interpretative discretion, mediated by complex layerings of interpretive influence... Prevailing interpretations thus emerge as provisional adaptations of diverse local resources and conditions, serving the practical needs at hand, until further notice.
The instructor needs to acknowledge these institutional constraints. But it seems premature to think that these forces necessarily will annihilate every effort to bring other orders of discourse in the foreign language classroom.

According to the proficiency of the language learners and the type of errors made, the instructor may decide to put more emphasis on any of the other properties: didactic acceptability, grammatical accuracy, or interactional relevance.

To review studies on the properties of input that facilitate second/foreign language acquisition, read Ellis (1994, 243-291).

To review studies on the motivation second/foreign language acquisition, read Crookes & Schmidt (1989).

The English translation of this book will be referred to as Baudrillard (1993).

In works published after “Symbolic exchange and death,” Baudrillard proposed a new form of simulacrum for the present times. This new simulacrum does not seem, however, to illustrate communication in the foreign language classroom as well as the previous order did. Baudrillard's latest form of simulacrum is characterized by a "fractal" law; its dominant form is "proliferation," and its dominant feature is "viral metonymy."

The analogy presented in this section is based on Baudrillard (1976), and more specifically on his description and characterization of the third order of simulacra.
Baudrillard (1976, 96): "[Cette régulation] hante tous les messages, tous les signes de nos sociétés, la forme la plus concrète sous laquelle on peut la repérer étant celle du test, de la question/réponse, du stimulus/réponse. Tous les contenus sont neutralisés par une procédure continuelle d'interrogations dirigées, de verdicts et d'ultimatums à décoder, qui ne viennent plus cette fois du code génétique, mais qui en ont la même indétermination tactique-le cycle du sens étant infiniment raccourci en celui de question/réponse, de bit, ou quantité infime d'énergie/information revenant à son point de départ."

Baudrillard (1976, 98): "Tous deux, objets et informations, résultent déjà d'une sélection, d'un montage, d'une prise de vues, ils ont déjà testé la « réalité » et ne lui ont posé que les questions qui leur « répondaient » , ils ont analysé la réalité en éléments simples qu'ils ont recomposés en scénarios d'oppositions réglées, exactement comme le photographe impose à son sujet ses contrastes, ses lumières, ses angles."

She thus makes public her unwarranted belief that, provided a topic simple enough, students may approximate the conversational rules of the target discursive formations.

This dynamic process may explain why Debbie's students seemed so overwhelmed in comparison to Anne's. It is not necessarily that Anne's French was easier to understand, it is not necessarily that Debbie was more demanding. Anne's students could practice what they were taught, they
were given opportunities to rehearse in familiar contexts what they were taught. Debbie, instead, kept on going from question to question, from new French form to new French form, always multiplying the contexts and facts to memorize. In this context, the truly amazing fact is not that these students spoke as little as reported in the data analyzed in chapter four. The amazing fact is that, always confronted with what appeared to be a newly created context for interactional exchange in French, they spoke as much as they did.

Both the descriptive logs and the data presented in chapter four attest that students in Anne’s class ask for clarification when the meaning of Anne’s previous turn seems unclear. In transcript II.1, Stacy interrupts an exchange between Jeff and the instructor (line 20), and Courtney asks a question (line 27). In transcript II.2, Michelle also asks her instructor for help (line 72). Such instances are rarely found in the descriptive logs of Debbie’s class, and no such example was presented in her transcripts.

This knowledge of simplified structures of interactions cannot be attributed to Anne’s proficiency in French. The researcher informally observed other instructors, native and nonnative speakers of French, creating similar simplified and repetitive structures of communication in their foreign language classes. A future study need to investigate the relationship between patterns of communication suggested by foreign language instructors and their past experiences as language learners.
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APPENDIX A
French 102.01 MWF Class  Student Assignments  Spring 1997  29 days

Instructor's name: __________________________________________ Office: __________________________ Phone:

Office hours: _____________________________________________ Instructor's e-mail address:

A. Textbooks:
2) Invitation à écouter et à écrire. 4th ed. Holt, Rinehart and Winston. (Lab manual and workbook)
3) FR 101-103 Answer key to the workbook and lab manual, 4th. ed.

B. The Syllabus: The syllabus contains the following information:
1) Due date for the assignment described
2) Material assigned for the day and corresponding pages in Invitation
3) Lab tape numbers
4) Written assignments
5) Tests and quizzes

C. Laboratory Information: Tapes, to be listened to on a daily basis, correspond to each chapter in the textbook and are divided as follows:

A. Tapes contain the Point de départ and the first two Fonctions et structures
B. Tapes contain the last two Fonctions et structures, an end-of-chapter listening passage and dictation, and pronunciation practice.

You can listen to the scheduled tapes either by asking for them in one of the listening labs located in Cunz and Denney Halls or by duplicating them for home use. The complete set for French 101-103 is also available for purchase at SBX.

Tape Call Number: When requesting tapes in the IMC, use the call number for French (FRE05) + the number of the chapter and tape you want to use. Thus, to request the tape for the first part of Ch.7, you would ask for FRE057A, etc.

D. Written Preparation: Each chapter (and each section) of Invitation has corresponding pages in Invitation à écouter et à écrire, the combined workbook and lab manual. The partie écrite has written exercises; the partie orale has taped versions of parts of the textbook and special comprehension activities with written components. These exercises are to be completed in writing on a daily basis and the chapter turned in to your instructor at the end of a chapter. Use the workbook/tape answer key to verify your work (mark corrections in a different color). Your instructor will check free-response activities. Your instructor may assign additional exercises and activities as part of the course.

E. Course Evaluation: Final exam 25%; Vocabulary/grammar checks 5%; Unit tests 40%; Participation 10%; Oral test 5%; Homework 5%; Chapter quizzes 10%.

Exam dates: Please note the dates of the exams and quizzes. Make-ups, which will be given only if you can present a valid written excuse, will be scheduled at your instructor's convenience. Missed tests will count as a zero.

Unit tests: There will be three unit tests (Chapitres 7-8; Chapitres 9-10; and Chapitres 11-12). These tests will cover your knowledge of the grammar, vocabulary, and culture in these chapters. Tests will focus on your ability to use the material in meaningful and communicative contexts. Each test will have the following parts: listening (25%); culture/reading (20%); and written (55%).

Chapter quizzes: There will be a twenty-minute grammar/vocabulary quiz at the completion of chapters 7, 9, and 11. Review sheets will be given for chapters 8, 10, and 12.

Vocabulary/grammar checks: Vocabulary checks (5-10 words) are given over the material in the Point de départ section of each chapter, unless otherwise specified by your instructor. Additional announced vocabulary and grammar checks can be given.

Oral tests: An oral test (Chapters 7-10) will be scheduled in your instructor's office. He/she will give you specific information about the time, place, and content of the oral.
Participation: Your instructor will give you a grade for your in-class participation every two weeks and will give you the rating scale used to assess your work.

Final examination: The final examination covers chapters 7-12 in Invitation. There will be listening comprehension, reading, and writing sections on the examination. Culture will not be tested. **Date and time of final exam:**

"Please note that you are responsible for obtaining this information from the Master Schedule. The departmental office will not supply this information during finals week. The date and time of your final are determined by the university schedule and cannot be changed. You should have no conflicts with exams in other courses."

F. Attendance: Since classwork is an essential part of the course, regular attendance will be required. If you have to be absent or are ill on a certain day, please inform your instructor immediately. Repeated and/or lengthy absences without a valid excuse may result in your being asked to drop the course or in your receiving a poor grade. Unexcused absences during a lesson will result in an E for oral work during the grading period. You will find that regular rather than sporadic preparation is essential for steady progress and good performance. If you have difficulty with any of your assignments or are dissatisfied with your performance, do not hesitate to seek your instructor's help.

G. Computer Software: A supplementary computer program called Invitation is available for you to use with your Student I.D. in Cunz 148 and Baker 590 (24-hour lab). The exercises correspond to French vocabulary and grammar topics in FR 101, 102, and 103. Laser disks called Causons and A la rencontre de Philippe are available in Cunz 176 for supplementary listening comprehension practice, as well as a CD-ROM program called Nouvelles Dimensions, which is in Brown 145, Cunz 176, and University 126. Système-D, a computer writing program that combines basic word processing with access to reference materials (vocabulary, grammar, verb conjugations, functional phrases) is available in Cunz 148 and Baker 590. French Pronunciation Tutor, a CD-ROM program to help improve your pronunciation, is available in Brown 145. 'French Your Way', a multimedia CD-ROM program is available for purchase at SBX. (For beginning and intermediate levels.)

H. Grading Scale: The Department of French and Italian uses the following scale for numerical equivalents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>93-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>90-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>88-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>83-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>80-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>76-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>73-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>70-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>68-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>65-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0 to 64.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Academic Misconduct Policy: Students enrolled in courses at The Ohio State University are expected to adhere to the highest standards of academic conduct. The instructor will be alert to any kind of inappropriate conduct in the course. Suspicion of misconduct will be handled by official rules and policies of OSU. Penalties for cheating or plagiarism may result in a failing grade in the course or expulsion from the university. The Department will abide by the decisions of the Academic Misconduct Committee.

*Note: Your continued enrollment in this course means that you have completed all prerequisite courses or that you are enrolled in the appropriate course as determined by the results of the required placement test and your years of high school French.
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4/4 Chapitre 7, Point de départ (la télévision); vie et culture, pp. 162-165 [FRE057A]
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Pour parler de l'heure, pp. 166-171 [FRE057A]
*Exercises—Invitation à écouter et écrire
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4/11 Lecture supplémentaire
  Quiz, Chapitre 7
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4/21 EXAMEN: Chapitres 7 & 8
  **Chapitre 8 workbook/lab manual due

*Instructions to do the exercises in Invitation à écouter et à écrire will not be repeated after this point. However, you are still expected to do the accompanying workbook/lab exercises each day. Note: Workbook/lab manual will be collected at the end of each chapter as indicated on the syllabus by a double asterisks (**).

4/23 Chapitre 9, Point de départ (le travail); vie et culture, pp. 216-220 [FRE059A]
  Pour parler de vos intentions, options et obligations (vouloir, pouvoir, devoir), pp. 220-223 [FRE059A]
  Vocabulary check

4/25 Pour parler de quelque chose déjà mentionné (les pronoms objets directs: le, la, les), pp. 223-226 [FRE059A]
  Pour parler de quelqu’un déjà mentionné (les pronoms objets directs: me, te, nous, vous), pp. 226-229 [FRE059B]

WEEK 5
4/28 Pour évaluer vos options (le subjonctif avec il faut que, il vaut mieux que), pp. 229-232 [FRE059B]
  Intégration et perspectives; vie et culture; prononciation, pp. 232-241 [FRE059B]

4/30 Lecture supplémentaire
  Quiz, Chapitre 9
  **Chapitre 9 workbook/lab manual due
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5/5 Pour offrir des suggestions ou donner des ordres (l’impératif), pp. 252-255 [FRE0510A]
Comment préciser les quantités désirées (les expressions de quantité), pp. 255-257 [FRE0510B]

5/7 Comment indiquer clairement de qui on parle (les pronoms disjoints), pp. 257-260 [FRE0510B]
Intégration et perspectives; vie et culture; prononciation, pp. 260-269 [FRE0510B]
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Pratique orale
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5/12 EXAMEN: Chapitres 9&10
**Chapitre 10 workbook/lab manual due

5/14 Examen oral (Chapitres 7-10) Your instructor will give you precise information about when and where your oral exam will take place and what the exam will be like.

5/16 Chapitre 11, Point de départ (le corps et la santé); vie et culture, pp. 272-275 [FRE0511A]
Pour parler de vos habitudes de vie (le présent des verbes réfléchis), pp. 275-279 [FRE0511A]
Vocabulary check
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5/19 Pour parler de ce qu'on a fait (le passé composé des verbes réfléchis), pp. 279-282 [FRE0511A]
Pour donner des conseils (l'impératif des verbes réfléchis), pp. 282-284 [FRE0511B]

5/21 Pour être plus précis (les adverbes), pp. 284-286 [FRE0511B]
Intégration et perspectives; vie et culture, pp. 286-291 [FRE0511B]

5/23 Lecture supplémentaire
Quiz, Chapitre 11
**Chapitre 11 workbook/lab manual due

WEEK 9
5/26 MEMORIAL DAY OBSERVED - NO CLASSES

5/28 Chapitre 12, Point de départ (l’habillement et l’apparence); vie et culture, pp. 294-298 [FRE0512A]
Pour parler de quelqu’un qui a été déjà mentionné (les objets indirects), pp. 299-302 [FRE0512A]
Vocabulary check

5/30 Pour parler de ce que nous portons (mettre, etc.), pp. 302-304 [FRE0512A]
Pour faire des comparaisons (le comparatif), pp. 304-308 [FRE0512B]

WEEK 10
6/2 Pour parler des extrêmes (le superlatif), pp. 304-308 [FRE0512B]
Intégration et perspectives; vie et culture, pp. 311-315 [FRE0512B]
Lecture Supplémentaire
Révision

6/4 EXAMEN: Chapitres 11&12
** Chapitre 12 workbook/lab manual due

6/6 Révision pour l’examen final
THE TEACHING ASSOCIATES

DEBBIE

Born in 1972

Education degree: BA in French (Magna Cum Laude) from Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio (USA)

Teaching experience: Occasional tutoring and private lessons. No university classroom experience.

Background in SLA: None

Travel abroad: 6 weeks in Europe (Switzerland, and France)
THE TEACHING ASSOCIATES

ANNE

Born in 1969

Education degree: DEUG, licence, and Master's in literature from the University of Paris

Teaching experience: None listed

Background in SLA: None

Travel abroad: Lived both in Sweden and in France before moving to the United States.
THE NOTIONAL SCHEME

The notional schema tried to render the sequential structure of the conversational exchange.

Pauses are noted in parentheses. From one to three seconds, the number of periods inside the parentheses stands for the length in seconds of the pause. Over three seconds, the length in seconds of the pause is figured by a number.

= at the end of a turn, and a similar = at the beginning of the next turn signifies that a latch occurred between these two turns at talk.

[ over two lines, notes that the two speakers talk simultaneously.

<Notes> Occasional field are figured inside or at the end of the transcripts in italics.

/ at the end of a turn denotes an interruption.
The transcripts presented in chapter four are literally translated in Appendix D for the readers who do not understand French. In these transcripts, words or clauses figured in small capital italics letters were originally said in English in the original transcripts. For instance, line 3 in transcript I.2 in chapter four reads as follows:

3. **Debbie:** Comment est-ce que cette émission marche—work? (.)

To display the fact that Debbie switched from French to English at the end of her question, line 3 in the translation of transcript I.2 in Appendix D reads as follows:

3. **Debbie:** How does the show works—*WORKS*? (.)
APPENDIX D

THE REVIEW ON VERBS SIMILAR TO “CHOISIR”

THE FULL TRANSCRIPTS
Anne: Review CHOISIR

Anne: … OK? (..) Courtney?
Courtney: J'ai (.) étudi (.) la sociologie (.) des femmes.
Anne: La sociologie des femmes, (.) ou-oui… (.) La sociologie féminine. (..) Euhm, (..) quels cours (.) vous avez choisis (.) ce trimestre? (.) Quels cours vous avez choisis ce trimestre? (.) Vous avez choisi le Français! (..) Courtney a-choisi la sociologie. (..) Renée a choisi la civilisation de l'occident. (..) Quels cours est-ce que vous avez choisis ce week- Euh! Ce weekend!-- ce trimestre? (.) Stephanie?
Stephanie: Je choisi (.) je choi--
Anne: J'ai choisi! <emphatic>
Stephanie: J'ai choisi (.) Uhm (.) l'Anglais.
Anne: L'Anglais!
Stephanie: L'Anglais.
Anne: Hmm-hmm. (.) Roxana?
Roxana: J'ai (.) j'ai choisi (..) l'Anthropologie?
Anne: L'Anthropologie, (.) l'Anthropologie, Oui! <She now looks at Anne-Marie>
Anne-Marie: J'ai choisi (.) uhm… (.) la civilisation (.) d'Afrique.
Anne: La civilisation Africaine, (.) oui, (.) ou d'Afrique. (.) Eryn?
Eryn: J'ai choisi la science politic.
Anne: Les sciences (.) politiques, (.) <Overlaps with Eryn repeating: Les sciences politiques> pluriel. (.) les sciences politiques, oui! (.) Melany?
Melany: J'ai soussi...
Anne: Choisi!
Melany: …choisi (.) les économiques.
Anne: (..) L'économie/
Melany: L'économie=
Anne: =L'économie, et Jeff?
Jeff: J'ai choisi (.) la journalisme.
Anne: Le journalisme? <Jeff agrees by a head movement>
D'accord! (.) Et, est-ce que vous avez choisi (.) votre future profession? (.) Est-ce que vous avez choisi (.) votre future profession? (.) Jeff?=
Jeff: =J'ai choisi (.) la journaliste…
Anne: D'accord, (.) J'ai choisi d'être journaliste; (.) j'ai choisi d'être journaliste. (.) Renée?
Renée: J'ai choisi (.) la psychologie…
Anne: (..) La psychologie… Donc, (.) d'être psychologue.
Renée: La psychologue.
Anne: Être alors <she moves toward the blackboard> donc:
la psychologie, d'accord? Mais un psychologue, ou un psychiatre,
ou un psychanalyste. D'accord?
«C'est un psychologue?»
Renée: Un psychologue.
Anne: Oui, d'accord!
Renée: un psychologue…
Anne: <Tardy student comes in, interrupts exchange> Oui,
Eryn?
Eryn: J'ai choisi une avocat…
Anne: D'être avocat! Avocate, Hmm-hmm? Et Roxana?
Roxana: J'ai choisi l'anthropologie…
Anne: Oui! Et quel métier? Quelle profession? Qu'est-ce qu'on fait avec euh…?
Roxana: Culture…, Country? I don't understand what you're saying; again?
Anne: Tu peux travailler dans un musée…<she starts counting on her fingers>
Roxana: Oh! Uh, United Nations!
Anne: <Anne looks like she is drawing a blank> Oui, euh…
<5", then to herself> Au s'cours! United Nations? L'ONU, c'est ça? L'ONU. <7" thinking, then pretending to have a serious nervous breakdown> AhAhA! <students laugh> Euh… United Nations, that's F.N, so it's
<she starts writing on the board> Oui? I'll check it out for you! I'm not sure, now! D'accord! Euh, est-ce que quelqu'un a choisi d'être vedette? Est-ce que quelqu'un a choisi d'être vedette? Vedette! Vous connaissez le mot "vedette"? <some murmurs "star," but nobody clearly claims the turn> one star, une star! Une star. Est-ce que quelqu'un a choisi le métier de star? Jane? <Jane nods, smiles, and agrees with Anne; Anne smiles with her> Oui?
Courtney: Oui!
Anne: Tu veux être une star! Bien! Nous allons regarder un vidéo <murmurs in the crowd> Ah, Shawn! Tu veux être une star?
Shawn: Uh non, je choisis une acteur!
Anne: D'être acteur? = Yeah-Oui!
Anne: Hmm, (. ) Tu veux être acteur! / <Anne and other students giggle>
Shawn: Oui!
Anne: D'accord. (. ) Quel genre euh de films?
Shawn: Uh non! (. ) Soap operas! <everybody — Anne included—laughs>
Anne: (...) D'accord! (...) Et euh... (...) le genre de rôle?
Shawn: Les feille-(-) -tons?
Anne: Dans un feuilleton!
Shawn: Oui.
Anne: Combien d'épisodes? <Shawn shakes his head to show that he did not understand> Combien ( . ) d'épisodes <emphatic>? <Anne starts counting> UN épisod /
Shawn: Qu'est-ce que c'est... (...) "pizod"/
Anne: Un épisode? (...) <She moves toward the board>
Shawn: Oh! Episode. Oh, oh, OK!
Anne: Combien d'épisode? (. ) Deux? (. ) Trois?
Shawn: senq (. ) cent...
Anne: Cent?
Shawn: Cent!
Anne: Cent?
Shawn: Oui!
Anne: D'accord! (. ) OK. <Now she introduces her video-clip; end of Review>
**Debbie: Review “Choisir”and similar verbs**

*Right after the quiz. She has given them a handout, but is now explaining that, they need to do a little review before being able to tackle the exercises on the handout.*

Debbie: <Sitting on her desk> OK, très bien... (...) Uhm... (...) OK, (. ) nous allons uh (. ) revoir un p’tit peu (. ) avant d’
faire ça. She points to a green handout> (. ) Alors uh... (<incomprehensible>) Alors uh... (.) Nous allons
faire ça juste uh (. ) maintenant, OK2? (..)
Alors uh... (.) nous allons discuter un p’tit peu (. ) uh (.) choisir les verbes du deuxième groupe! (.)
Uhm, (...) quels sont uh... (...) Donnez-moi uh... (...) un verbe
uh (. ) de du groupe avec CHOISIR? (...) Y avait uh... (...) peut être six (. ) six verbes, (. ) est-ce que vous
pouvez uh... (...) vous rappeler: CHOISIR... (...) Commencer3 uh... (...) Quels sont les autres4? (..) 

StM1: Finiss?
Debbie: Finir, (. ) très bien. (. ) Et qu’est-ce que ça veut dire en Anglais?
StM1: To finish.
Debbie: Oui. (...) Uhm... (...) <She flips the pages of her book quite rapidly> Et la page, (. ) ici... (...) Très bien, (. ) OK, (. )
dix et uh... quoi d’autres?
StF1: Réussir?
Debbie: Réussir! <She nods> Réussir, (. ) et qu'est-ce que ça veut dire?
StF1: Uh... (...) to do well?
Debbie: To do well, to succeed; (. ) Très bien, (. ) OK! (. ) Et uh... (...) Les les fins <emphatic> des verbes sont différents,
(. ) oui? (. ) Avec uh (. ) -ER, (. ) C'est vrai? (. ) Avec -IR
pardon! (. ) C'est vrai? <4"> Par exemple uh, (...) "Je réussis," (. ) avec I-S. (...) "Je" (. ) et à la fin, (. ) c'est "IS." (. ) Est-ce que
vous pouvez me donner uh... <4"> par exemple (. ) avec le
verbe uh (. ) "CHOISIR," donnez-Est-ce que quelqu'un peut
me donner uh (. ) une phrase (. ) avec le verbe CHOISIR? (...) 
<Moving her head> "Je/tu... (...) choisis... <10. She stares at
them and raises her eyebrows> Michael, (. ) vous savez?
Michael: Je choisis regarder la télé?
Debbie: <low> Bien, (. ) OK... (...) Since there are two verbs
there... (...) if you-if you listen to that real carefully, (. ) there
are two verbs there: (. ) "I ch-choose to <emphatic> watch
television," you left out the second one in the infinitive;
That's what you're supposed to do, (. ) OK? (. ) It doesn't
make sense to me either, (. ) très bien. (. ) Uh... (...) Jim6! En quelle année (. ) êtes-vous né? (. ) En quelle année êtes-vous né?
Jim: <5"> Uh... <5"> You want that in French?
Debbie: Oui!
Jim: J- Je n'
Debbie: OK! (. ) What's your calling verb gonna be? (. . . ) Vous avez deux choix, (. . . ) oui?: <Counting on her fingers> AVOIR ou ETRE.
Jim: (...) Uh... <8"> Not sure!
Debbie: ETRE. (. . . ) Peut être, (. . . ) OK? (. . . ) "Je (. . . )?" Et présent, (. . . ) qu'est-ce que c'est le présent du verb–verb
ETRE? (. . . ) "J-je... (...)" "...suis," (. . . ) Oui? (. . . ) "Je... (/
Jim: Je suis...
Debbie: ...suis," OK! (. . . ) Et qu'est-ce que c'est la... (. . . ) participe passé (. . . ) de NAITRE! (. . . ) To be born? <6"> Qui sait? (. . . ) Qui sait?
StF2: Né?
Debbie: N - E accent aigu, oui! (. ) Et si vous êtes une femme,
(. ) il faut ajouter7... (. . . ) E, (. . . ) un autre E, (. . . ) très bien. (. . .
Après, uhm... <5"> Uhm, Karen! (. ) Est-ce que vous avez (. . .
encore ? choisi une profession (. ) ou non?
Karen: Uhm (. . . ) Je n'ai pas (. . . ) choisi (. . . ) une profession.
Debbie: Qui a choisi (. . . ) une profession? (. ) Qui a choisi (. . . ) une profession? A job? (. . . ) Personne? Hmm...? <5"> I'm afraid
you're not that all <emphatic> excited! <She laughs at her own joke> (...)
StM3: Uh (. . . ) Je... (...) je veux être uh... un pilote!
Debbie: Un (. . . ) comment?
StM3: un pilote!
Debbie: Pilote! (. . . ) Très bien... (...) OK! (. . . ) Et est-ce que vous avez uh... (...) les yeux très bons, (. . . ) oui? (...) StM3: Oui!
Debbie: Il faut avoir (. . . ) les yeux très bons (. . . ) pour être pilotes, oui? (. . . ) OK... Très bien! (. . . ) Uh... Il faut avoir (. . . ) les yeux très bons (. . . ) pour être pilotes, oui? (. . . ) OK... Très bien! (...) Uh...<4" looking in her book> Hmm! <Talking lower, as if to herself>
Je crois c'est tout! (. . . ) Bon, (. . . ) <higher now> Est-ce que vous avez des questions sur le (. . . ) ces verbes? Parce qu'ils sont uh...
(...) assez différents? (. . . ) <Very low> <incomprehensible> (...) OK! (. . ) Again, there were a couple in here that, (. . . ) that do not end in IR8, but I think uh (. . . ) Carla explained you that (. . . ) the best explanation is just that (. . . ) they all seem to kinda go together because they all seem to describe major events in
your life. (.) So NAITRE (.) is not IR, (.) it's RE, (.) and... (..)
what makes it even worse is that it's one of these ETRE verbs, so... (..) sometimes you have to... (..) to really read that carefully; (.) <she bows her head to look at her book, speak rather softly, and it becomes completely inaudible in the back where the microphone is located. 6" later, she finally looks up> This is sometimes what you're gonna have to keep in mind in the future! (.) B'cause not-there are actually three types of reflexive verbs... (..) Verbs like ER9, conjugated like regular verbs, (.) IR10, and RE. And FAIRE is one of those, (.) NAITRE, (.) uh... (..) a lot of times, (.) these are going to also be your (.) irregular forms, (..) especially likeFAIRE, <incomprehensible> "Je fais," (..) it's (..) it's just... And also the uh (.) past participles; you need to make sure that <incomprehensible> . Uh <Student coughs> Super! <Then she goes on to next part of her lesson plan>
APPENDIX E
Literal Translations of the Transcripts presented in Chapter Four.

Transcript I.1. Debbie and the review activity on "choisir"

1. **Debbie:** <Facing the class> OK, very well... (...) Uhm... (...) OK,

2. (...) we are going uh to roview¹ a little bit before doing this. <she points
to a green handout>. So, uh... (...) please keep this

3. paper (.). but we are <student coughs> not going to do this uh (.)

4. just yet, OK? (..)

5. So uh... (...) we are going to discuss a little bit uh (.).uh (.). “choisir,”

6. and the verbs from the second conjugation group! (...) Uhm. (...)

7. What are uh... (...) Give me uh... (.). a verb uh (.)

8. of from the group with “choisir.”

9. T was uh... (...) maybe six (.). six verbs; (.). Can you

10. uh... (...) remember: choisir... (...) 

11. Start now uh... (...) What are the others* (...)

12. **Harry:** Fini?

13. **Debbie:** “To finish,” (.). very well. (.). And what does it mean in English?

¹ The translator chose the spelling “roview” instead of “review” to transcribe in English the phonological error made by Debbie in French, i.e., “r eviser” instead of “réviser.”
Transcript 1.2. Debbie and “Eurovision”

1. Debbie: And, uh, can somebody <she raises her hand> can
2. *describing* Eurovision (..)
3. How does this show works--*WORKS*? (.)
4. How does this show work? (..) “Eurovision?”

Note: Next follows a pause. This pause is 12 second-long. During the first 4 seconds, Debbie reads her textbook lying on top of the overhead projector—a student coughs. After the cough, she looks up, looks at a student to her left and smiles
5. Debbie: Try in French, try first <hand gestures> in
6. French (…)
7. Paul, do you know?
8. Paul: <No verbal response. 2 seconds>
9. Debbie: No?M
10. Paul: *I JUST ... he says something in English very low*
11. Debbie: OK.. In uh... (.) this paragraph, there is something about
12. Eurovision. (..)

---

2 The translator chose the form “describing” instead of “describe” to transcribe in English the error made by Debbie in French, i.e., the invented form “décrire” instead of “décrire.”

3 As explained in Appendix C, words or clauses figured in small capital italics letters were originally said in English in the original transcripts.
13. It’s a kind, uh (. ) not exactly a show uh (. ) it’s on
14. TV.
15. Can you, uh, “describing” (. ) how (. ) “Eurovision”
16. works? WORK, HOW <HAND GESTURES> DOES IT WORK?
17. Paul: <11 seconds> OH UHM ( . . ) I GUESS ( . ) in English?
18. Debbie: Try in French. ( . ) Try...
19. Paul: Uhm (6")
20. Debbie: There are shows in many <hand gestures>
21. languages?
22. Paul: UHM ( . . ) UHM ( . . ) HOW DO YOU SAY “BROADCAST” /
23. Debbie: /No, it’s all right -OK. In English, it’s all right, it’s all right.
24. Paul: IT (. ) IT BROADCASTS IN A BUNCH OF DIFFERENT COUNTRIES <HIDDEN
25. BY NOISE> YEAH! ( . ) I’M SORRY, I DIDN’T KNOW /
26. Debbie: /No, it’s OK /
27. Paul: /how to say “broadcast” /
28. Debbie: /It’s OK. <hand gestures> It’s for all (. )
29. So, <hand gestures> it’s for all the countries uh from Europe,
30. That’s it?
31. So France, Switzerland, uh, <hand gestures> Germany, Spain,
32. All these. OK. That’s good.
1.3. Debbie and the conclusion of the review activity on "choisir"

63. **Debbie:** (..) Next, uhm... <5"> Uhm,

64. **Karen!** (.) Have you still\(^4\) chosen <emphatic> a

65. job (.) or not\(^5\)?

66. **Karen:** Uhm (..) I did not (.) select (.) a job.

67. **Debbie:** <She raises her right hand> Who has chosen (.) a job?

68. Who has chosen (.) a job <lower>

69. *IT'S A JOB.* (..)

70. Nobody? Hmm...? <5"

71. *I'M AFRAID YOU ARE NOT THAT ALL <emphatic> EXCITED!* <She laughs at her

72. *own joke, turns her back and goes behind her desk>* (..)

73. **Fred:** Uh (.) I... (..) I want to be uh... a pilot!

74. **Debbie:** A (.) what?

\(^4\) The translator chose “still” instead of “yet” to transcribe in English the error made by Debbie in French, i.e., “encore” instead of “déjà.”

\(^5\) Even if the structure “Have you chosen a job (.) or not?” is a poor translation, it was necessary to keep it to show that Debbie intends to demonstrate students the relevance of the question during an activity that targets practicing different forms of the verb “choisir” (to choose).
75. **Fred**: A pilot!

76. **Debbie**: Pilot! (. ) Very good... (. ) OK! (. ) And do you have uh... ( .. ) the
    eyes very good,\(^6\) (. ) yes? (. )

78. **Fred**: Yes!

79. **Debbie**: It is necessary to have (. ) the eyes very good (. ) in order to be a

80. pilot, yes? (. ) OK... Very good! ( .. )

81. Uh... It is necessary to have the eyes very good (. ) in order to be a

82. pilot, yes? (. ) OK... Very good! ( .. ) <4" looking in her book>

83. Hmm! <*Talking lower, as if to herself*> I think that's all! (. )

84. Good, (. ) <*higher now*> Do you have any question on the (. ) these verbs?

85. Because they are uh... ( .. ) relatively different? (. ) <*very low*>

86. <*incomprehensible*> ( .. ) OK!

---

\(^6\) The English translation is purposefully ungrammatical to indicate a similar pattern in the French utterance reported in the original transcript.
Transcript II.1. Anne and the review on shopping (beginning)

1. **Anne:** Where are the others? (..) There is almost no one here? One two three four five six no! (.) One two three four five six seven eight

2. nine ten _eleven_ <emphatic> (.). That's all? OK! (..)

3. How are you doing? (.) How are you doing? (.) How are you doing?

4. _Eryn:_ <i>1st row who established eye contact with Anne, but very low</i>
   Fine⁷.

5. **Anne:** Yes! (.). Yes? (.) "Bon appétit."

6. Did you, (.) did you go shopping yesterday? (..) Did you go shopping yesterday? (..) Jeff?

7. **Jeff:** Uh (.) Yes! (.) I bought yesterday <Interrupted, door closes>

10. yesterday of the afternoon.

11. **Anne:** Hmm-hmm! (.) What did you buy?

12. **Jeff:** Uh... (.) I have buy uh... (.) OR I bought (.). present for my mother (.) uh...

---

⁷ In everyday conversational French, "Ça va?" with a rising intonation is a common greeting; it was thus translated by a greeting in a similar register in American-English: "How are you doing?" In a response to this greeting, "Ça va," with a falling intonation, is one of the most succinct responses; it was thus translated by "fine" in American-English.
14. Anne: Hmm-hmm...

15. Jeff: Uh... **BIRTHDAY**!

16. Anne: Yes: (.) For my mother, (.) I bought a present (.) <she

17. writes on the board> a present! (.) for her birthday==

18. Jeff: ==Ah! For her birthday...

19. Anne: Yeah, (.) her birthday... (.) <she is still writing> (...) 

20. Stacy: Feminin?

21. Anne: Masculin! (..) <she stops writing and turns back

22. toward the cohort>

23. OK! (.) Well!

24. Courtney?

25. Courtney: O-on (.) Sundey...

26. Anne: What?

27. Courtney: On Sundey—IT'S NOT SUNDAY?

28. Anne: On Sunday...

29. Courtney: S-Sunday/

30. Anne: Hmm-hmm.

31. Courtney: On Sunday (.) I... (.) uh I bought uhm... (...) **HAT**?

32. Anne: A hat==

33. Courtney:==A hat, for myself.

34. Anne: Yes! (.) That's good! (.) And uh... Did you buy it (.) in a
35. (.) small retail store (.) or in a (.) commercial mall?

36. **Courtney:** (...) Uhm… (...)

37. **Anne:** In a supermarket?

38. **Courtney:** No/

39. **Anne:** /No?

40. **Courtney:** No, in (.) big (.) uh… in in (.) in (.) a

41. big market.

42. **Anne:** In a big store?

43. **Courtney:** St-store.

44. **Anne:** A big store? <**Courtney nods**> (.) OK. (.)

45. And… (what about) the others? (.) Uh, (.) Renée. (.) Did you

46. go shopping?

47. **Renée:** No…

48. **Anne:** No? (.) You did not buy anything? (.) <**Renée shakes her head**>
Transcript II.2. Anne and the review on shopping (conclusion)

49. **Anne**: Beth?

50. **Beth**: Yes... (.) I bought (.) uhm CRAYONS? <Anne signals that she does not understand with her head> (.) CRAYON?  **HOW DO YOU SAY?**

51. **Anne**: A pencil?

52. **Beth**: A pencil?

53. **Anne**: A pencil for writing?

54. **Beth**: Uh/

55. **Anne**: WRITE?/

56. **Beth**: REAL CRAYONS, (.) LIKE CRAYOLAS.

57. **Anne**: Ah! Yes, crayons, also, (.) coloring crayons./

58. **Beth**: Col/

59. **Anne**: Yes, coloring crayons, (.) Hmm-hmm> (.) You bought them at the supermarket?

60. **Beth**: Uh, no! (.) Uh (.) I bought them in the store of the university

61. **Anne**: Yes, in a—yes in the (.) at the BOOKSTORE?

62. **Beth**: Yes!

63. **Anne**: Yes (.) Uh... in the bookstore.

64. **Beth**: In the bookstore?
Anne: Hmm-hmm! University. Good! Hmm-hmm.

Michelle? Did you go shopping?

Michelle: Uh Yes! <quite low> I went shopping yesterday.

Anne: Did you? What did you buy?

Michelle: I bought... HOW DO YOU SAY “FOOD”?

Anne: Some food? some food.

Michelle: Some foo?

Anne: Food.

Michelle: Food?

Anne: Hmm-hmm

Michelle: At supermarket

Anne: At the supermarket? OK.
Transcript II.3. Anne and the conclusion of the review activity on “choisir”

1. **Anne**: Ah, Shawn! (. ) You want
to be a star?

2. **Shawn**: I—no, (. ) I chose to be an actor!

3. **Anne**: To be an actor?==

4. **Shawn**: ==YEAH—Yes!

5. **Anne**: Hmm, (. ) You want to be an actor! <Students giggle>

6. **Shawn**: Yes!

7. **Anne**: OK. (. ) What type of movie?

8. **Shawn**: Uh no! (. ) SOAP OPERAS <everybody—Anne included—

9. **Anne**: In a soap opera!

10. **Shawn**: Yes.

11. **Anne**: How many episodes? <Shawn shakes his head to show that he did not understand> How many (. ) episodes <emphatic>? <Anne starts counting>

12. **Shawn**: What is it… (. ) “pizod”/

13. **Anne**: One episode? (. ) <She moves toward the board>
20. **Shawn**: Oh! *EPISODE*. Oh, oh, OK!

21. **Anne**: How many episodes? (.) Two? (.) Three?

22. **Shawn**: ‘ne hundr (.) One hundred…

23. **Anne**: One hundred?

24. **Shawn**: One hundred!

25. **Anne**: One hundred?

26. **Shawn**: Yes!

27. **Anne**: OK! (.) OK