Constructive or Obstructive Features of Teacher Talk in Iranian EFL Classes

Fatemeh Poorebrahim
Maragheh University, Iran

Mohammad Reza Talebinejad
Islamic Azad University, Shahreza Branch, Esfahan, Iran

Farhad Mazlum
Maragheh University, Iran

Abstract—**The present study was an attempt to investigate classroom discourse from the vantage point of the SEET (Self-evaluation of Teacher Talk) framework which has resource to conversation analysis as its underlying powerhouse. In addition, it aimed at exploring how teacher talk can lead to more learner involvement in EFL classes. This study was carried out on advanced EFL classes in a private language school in Maragheh, Iran. The audio and video-taped classes were transcribed and analyzed based on pre-defined modes of the SEET framework with special focus on *teacher talk*. Results indicated that *confirmation checking*, *scaffolding*, *direct error correction*, and *content feedback* constituted the constructive whereas *teacher interruptions* and *turn completions* made up the obstructive sides of teacher talk respectively. Findings are used to maintain that there is a greater need to highlight the significant relationship between teacher talk quality and learner contributions in EFL contexts; and, to argue that through reflective teaching EFL teachers' verbal behaviors can gradually enrich and flourish in terms of teacher talk and learner contributions standards.**

Index Terms—**conversation analysis, teacher talk, SEET framework, learner contributions**

I. INTRODUCTION

A currently well-documented view in the field of second language acquisition gives credence to *talk* which is co-constructed by teacher and learners in a goal-oriented context of classroom discourse. Social constructivist theories of learning reject the singular nature of classroom contexts and advocate plural and multi-layered contexts. Interactions between teachers and learners are assumed to be the building blocks of these contexts. An attempt to understand such interactional patterns entails a thorough understanding of talk itself and, more importantly, of the pedagogic goal behind it. In other words, teaching/learning goal at a given moment determines teacher talk and is well presented in it. As demonstrated by Walsh (2003, p. 125): "An understanding of the 'interactional architecture' (Seedhouse,1996) of the L2 classroom may not only enhance understanding of the teaching and learning processes at work- it would arguably result in a wider range of opportunities for learning".

Furthermore, the interrelatedness between teacher talk and pedagogical role smoothes the way for a scrutiny of the quality of teacher talk in the form of constructive or obstructive talk in order to decide whether teachers hinder or facilitate learner contributions by their use of language. The fact that Iranian EFL classes seem to have failed in bringing out learners competence to full capacity is undeniable. Teacher centeredness which is manifested in teachers' excessive talking time, topic control, and interaction management is the prevailing feature of Iranian EFL contexts. Learners' contributions are largely restricted to one word or too short turns. This is mainly due to the fact that teachers do not have a clear understanding of the relationship between their talk and pedagogical goals related to their talk. If such an understanding is gained, teachers can enhance the quality and quantity of learners' output by their careful use of language.

Our knowledge about the effective use of talk in classroom has increasingly been informed by research in cultural settings other than those of the UK and the USA (which hitherto dominated the field). This has fed into an appreciation of the potential variety of effective ways of teaching and learning (Mercer, 1997, p. 181). Mercer has argued that "one of the principle aims of education should be enabling children to become confident users of 'exploratory' talk: that is, talk in which partners reason together, engaging critically and constructively with each other's ideas" (Mercer, 1997, p. 182).

Anyone concerned with evaluating the 'effectiveness' of talk in educational setting is likely to find difficulties in reaching a satisfactory definition of what constitutes 'effectiveness', and in measuring it. While there might be a general agreement about the aims of education, any measure of how effective the use of talk is in any actual situation must move from generalizations to particular and observable features of talking and learning. For some researchers, a satisfactory measure of the effectiveness of teacher-pupil talk may be a 'process' measure--such as the relative extent to

which a teacher is able to elicit enthusiastic, extended contributions from students. Others (e.g. Brown & Palincsar, 1989 as cited in Mercer, 1997) find it necessary to make some 'outcome' measures--that is, to assess what students appear to have learned as a result of interacting with their teacher.

A. Teacher Talk and Learning Opportunity

An EFL class is a social context in its own right, worthy of study and scrutiny. Any attempt to understand the nature of classroom discourse should focus on quality rather than quantity by recognizing the relationship between language use and pedagogic purpose. The point is that appropriate language use is more likely to occur when teachers are sufficiently aware of their goal at a given moment in a lesson to align their teaching aim and pedagogic purpose to their language use. Where language use and pedagogic purpose are at one, learning opportunities are facilitated and increased; conversely, where there is a significant deviation between language use and teaching goal, opportunities for learning and acquisition are diminished (Walsh, 2002). Walsh (2002) invokes teacher's deep concerns to include the following activities in teacher-fronted classes:

- Engage learners in the classroom discourse;
- Encourage international adjustments between teacher and learners;
- Promote opportunities for self- expression;
- Facilitate and encourage clarification by learners.

Teachers have a vital role to play in understanding, establishing and maintaining patterns of communication which will facilitate second language learning. In the words of Johnson (1995, p. 9) "teachers control what goes on in classrooms primarily through the ways in which they use language".

In an attempt to discover an order in classroom context, one must take account of the uniqueness and complexity of communications in that context. The first step in gaining such an understanding is familiarization with the features of language classroom discourse (Walsh, 2006). According to Walsh (2006, p.62), "class-based L2 learning is often enhanced when teachers have a detailed understanding of the relationship between teacher talk, interaction and learning opportunity". Therefore, admitting the versatility and fluidity of communications in every L2 classroom is a vital prerequisite for a sound analysis of it. This is in chief due to the asymmetrical nature of classes in terms of relationships, backgrounds, expectations and perceptions of learners.

B. The Central Role of Interaction in Language Classrooms

What impact might an understanding of "interactional architecture" (Seedhouse, 2004) have on learning efficacy? There exists a substantial body of research evidence highlighting the interdependence of interaction, input, output and the need for meaning negotiation. Ellis (2000, p.209) maintains that "learning arises not through interaction but in interaction". As such, interaction needs to be understood if learning needs to be promoted.

Long's Interaction Hypothesis (1996 noted in Walsh, 2006) takes account of the importance of meaning negotiation in feedback learners receive on their contributions from teachers. In her Output Hypothesis, Swain (1995) highlights the importance of teacher-learner dialogues in promoting acquisition. Successful teaching stems from "successful management of the interaction… the sine qua non of classroom pedagogy" (Allright, 1984, p. 159). Walsh (2006, p. 16) strongly believes that "interaction does not simply happen, nor is it a function of the teaching methodology; interaction, in an acquisition rich classroom, is both instigated and sustained by the teacher". Owing to teachers' special status, L2 teachers control most of the 'patterns of the communication' (Johnson, 1995), primarily through the ways in which they restrict or allow learners' interaction' (Ellis, 1998) and facilitate or hinder learning opportunity.

Under this view, terms such as high and low teacher talking time (TTT) become meaningless; teacher talk is understood and adjusted according to teaching/ learning goals at a given moment and by acknowledging the fact that any lesson is made up of a number of contexts, not one (Walsh. 2003, p. 122).

C. Classroom Modes

The most original and central position which Walsh (2006) adopts is that single classroom context does not exist; contexts are locally constructed by participants through and in their interactions in the light of overall institutional goals and immediate pedagogic objectives. Pedagogy and interaction team up through talk: pedagogic goals are manifested in the talk-in-interaction. The term 'mode' (Walsh, 2006, p. 62) encompasses the interrelatedness of language use and teaching purpose. Mode is defined as an L2 classroom micro context which has clearly marked pedagogical goals and distinguishing interactional features determined largely by a teacher's use of language. The definition is intended to portray the 'interface' (Seedhouse, 1996) between the actions and words, behavior and discourse which are the very essence of classroom interaction (Walsh, 2003)

D. SEET Framework

According to Walsh (2006, p.1), the SETT framework has been constructed around three key stands:

1. "The argument that L2 classroom interaction is socially constructed

2. The proposal that an understanding of classroom interaction must take account of both pedagogic goals and language used to achieve them

3. The suggestion that any lesson is made up of a series of locally negotiated micro contexts (Modes)".

The aim is to provide a descriptive system which teachers can use to extend an understanding of the interactional processes operating in their own classes. Walsh (2003) further explicates in detail that the modes do not claim to account for all features of classroom discourse, nor are they sufficiently comprehensive to take account of each and every pedagogic goal. The main focus is on teacher-fronted classroom practice. Those interactions where learners work independently of the teacher are not described.

The SETT framework is identified by four patterns, four micro contexts which are characterized by specific patterns of turn-taking, called modes, which is defined as an L2 classroom micro context that has a clearly defined pedagogic goal and distinctive interactional features determined by a teacher's use of language (ibid).

Pedagogic goals represent the minute-by-minute decisions teachers make, their objectives and intended learning outcomes. Pedagogic goals are based on the goal-orientedness of all interactions in an L2 classroom which are demonstrated in the talk-in-interaction of the lesson. Interactional features can be regarded as language functions of teacher and learner talk, derived from a conversational analysis of turn-taking and sequence, and topic management (ibid).

By analyzing the corpus, four patterns of modes have been identified by Walsh (2006, p.67), namely, *managerial mode*, *material mode*, *classroom context mode*, *skills and system mode*. The pedagogic goals of managerial mode are: To transmit information related to the management of learning, to organize the physical conditions for learning to take place, to refer learners to specific materials, and to introduce or conclude and an activity. The interactional features that characterize managerial mode are: A single, extended teacher turns, frequently in the form of an explanation or instruction, the use of transitional markers, confirmation checks, and the absence of learner contribution.

E. Materials Mode

The principal pedagogic goals are as follows: To provide language practice around a specific piece of material, to elicit learner responses in relation to the material, to check and display answers, to clarify, and to evaluate and extend learner contribution. The principle interactional features are: The predominance of IRF (Initiation, Response, Feedback) sequence, closely managed by teacher, display questions to check understanding and elicit responses, form-focused feedback to "correctness" rather than content, repairing to correct errors, and scaffolding.

F. Skills and System Mode

Pedagogic goals of this mode are: To enable learners to produce correct utterances, to enable learners to manipulate the target language, to provide corrective feedback, to provide learners with practice in essential sub- skills, and to display correct answers. Interactional features are as follow: The use of direct repair, the use of scaffolding, extended teacher turns, teacher echo used to display responses, clarification requests, and form-focused feedback.

G. Classroom Context Mode

Pedagogic goals include: To enable learners to talk about feelings, emotions, experience, attitude…, to establish a context, to activate mental schemata (MacCarthy, 1992), to promote oral fluency practice. Interactional features are as follows: Extended learner turns, relatively short teacher turns, direct repair, content feedback, extended use of referential questions, rather than display questions, scaffolding to help learners express their ideas, and requests for clarification and confirmation checks.

Since the framework is intended to be representative rather than comprehensive, identifying deviant cases are inevitable to maximize the reliability of research, which are as follows: Mode Switching: movements from one mode to another; Mode Side Sequence: brief shifts from main to secondary mode and back, and Mode Divergence: where interactional features and pedagogic goals do not coincide.

II. METHODOLOGY

This part expands on research questions, the methodology and the design employed in this study, detailing the outline of study, characteristics of participants, data collection and analysis, and interpretation of findings. First, a need is felt to touch upon the objectives of the study once again:

1. To evaluate the applicability of SEET framework to the Iranian EFL context
2. To identify the modes, mapped out within the SETT framework and to observe their operation in Iranian advanced EFL classes
3. To specify whether interactional features of the interactions coincide with or deviate from the pedagogic goals of each mode of the SETT framework being used
4. To identify the obstructive or constructive use of teacher talk in advanced classes.

A. Participants

Two groups of subjects partook in this study namely teachers and EFL learners.

1. Teachers

The proficiency level of teaching and the willingness to participate served as two leading and prime criteria for the researchers in choosing teachers. The teachers were approached and asked about their inclination in the study. A general explanation of the research objectives was given to the teachers. The objective was explained as being a mere

investigation of the interactions between teachers and EFL learners. One of the benefits of such an approach was the opportunity to observe and investigate naturally occurring classroom interactions (Van Lier, 1998). The teacher participants were all female, non- native speakers of English with B.A or M.A degrees in TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language), with 3-6 years of teaching experience at different proficiency levels.

2. Learners

Four intact EFL classes were observed. There were around 50 participating female language learners with a variety of motives for learning English including preparation for academic study, professional development or immigration. The age range was between 19-35 years and their proficiency levels were measured by a placement test.

B. Instrumentation

Instrumentation included a TV set for observing the classes, small wall-mounted cameras installed on the upper corner of each class, a headphone for receiving the voice, a video set for recording, and a high tech voice-recorder.

C. Materials

Based on a multi-skills syllabus, the course books covered in advanced levels were *Passages 1* and *2* (Richards & Sandy, 2000) and some complementary books such as *Vocabulary for High School Students* and *VOA (Voice of America) Listening*. These books include activities designed to develop fluency and accuracy in four skills and sub skills.

D. Procedures

In conversation analysis, the investigation starts with making an audio and/ or video recording of naturally occurring interactions. These recordings are carefully transcribed according to specific conventions. This was also taken into in this study. Next, only the episodes containing interactions between teachers and learners were identified and separated from the whole. Data were transcribed based on a transcription system adopted from Van Lier (1988) and Johnson (1995). (Appendix 1). Data analysis came next. Based on the SETT framework, the interactional features as well as the underlying pedagogical goals fostered the identification of the Modes and paved the way for spotting the obstructive or constructive type of teacher talk.

III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

At this point, we will be bringing out what modes emerged from the analysis and what set of insights and implications flow from them.

Before Skills and System Modes, Managerial Mode was again put to use by teachers. The pedagogical goal was to transmit information about grammatical points. The teacher did not go beyond the decontextualized self-standing gloss of grammar acting upon the assumption that being on top, as it were, and in charge, would be enough to contribute to learning. The intriguing point was the absolute absence of confirmation checks; simply put, the teachers never inquired whether the learners have understood the general drift of the language point or the lexical, discoursal or lexicogrammatical point being implicitly or explicitly taught during the classroom.

There was a scattered use of discourse markers which seemed to have been deployed to attract learners' attentions and guide them towards the new activity. All in all, since learners' profuse bewilderment and mistakes in making out the grammatical points or the circumstances of carrying out tasks were repeatedly observed, it can be claimed that there was not an absolutely aligned agreement between teacher talk and pedagogical purpose.

Material Mode:

The interactions that symbolized this mode revolved around the topics concerning *Different ways of Shopping* and *The Power of Advertisement*. By contemplating the various interactions, the teacher's principal pedagogic goal proved to be eliciting learners' response through checking, evaluating and extending their responses.

There were a number of features of interest in data after applying the SETT framework. Loose *interactional space* and boundless choice of topic were observed. Display and referential questions which functioned to stretch and alter topics were used quite infrequently. Where subtopics commenced in the light of the main topic, the use of three types of scaffolding by teachers acted to provide more scope for learners' extended and prolonged contributions. Learners had been given more interactional space and more freedom to self-select and shift the topic. Direct repair with the least possible obstructive impact on the flow of interactions occurred in turns.

The IRF sequence no longer lingered as the only prevalent form of progressing classroom discourse and where a close-knit IRF structure existed, teachers turned feedback move to clarification requests, through which precise and explicit productions were turned up.

Negotiation of meaning occurred in conducting tasks. High proficiency level of students prevented teachers from being the exclusive and mere managers of interactions; however, the extended teacher turns were observed only in three cases.

Surprisingly enough, the occurrence of *form-focused feedback* and *content-focused feedback* was subtle and imperceptible. In some respects, the discourse looked like that of ordinary observation in that the learners were offered

more scope to self-select topics and discuss. In the same vein, symmetrical and equal roles for participation were observed; this was where a number of *extended learner turns* showed up.

TABLE1.
MATERIAL MODE

Feature of Teacher Talk	Frequency
Scaffolding	12
Direct repair	4
Content feedback	2
Extended wait- time	0
Referential questions	3
Seeking clarification	11
Extended learner turn	6
Teacher Echo	1
Teacher interruptions	0
Extended teacher turn	3
Turn completion	4
Display questions	8
Form focused feedback	0

Skill and System Mode

The extracts in which teachers taught grammar demonstrated the skills and system mode. The pedagogic objectives lying behind the interactional features included: to enable learners to produce correct forms, to help them to manipulate the target language, to display correct answers and, when necessary, to provide corrective feedback. Most of the features were in line with the ones specified in SETT framework. Nevertheless, some features overrode others and the occurrences of some others were few and far between. The approach teachers adopted to teach grammar was the tightly controlled deductive one which strongly influenced the pattern of turn-taking and pushed it towards a narrow confined channel of grammar practice. The interactions unfolded through the use of tight question-answer routine that typically used lots of display questions.

There was some evidence showing how teachers prompted the learners to produce accurate and exact responses by providing some cues. Having got the cues, learners changed the form of their responses to match with the corrective feedback. Finally, the contributions resulted in longer and precise responses which Swain (1995) calls *pushed output.* Scaffolding as "feeding in" (Walsh, 2006, p. 82) the essential and needed language, played a faint role in pushing learners towards producing the correct form. The sporadic occurrence of scaffolding manifested itself in the form of modeling.

In some interactions teachers' turns took up less evaluative form and were not indicative of pupils' satisfactory contribution. Teacher echo as a kind of feedback was only noted in one case which seemed inadequate for an advanced class.

It can be claimed that, although the expected interactional features were almost observed, the infrequent occurrence of each might be attributed to the fact that teachers spent a great deal of class time in explaining grammatical points and devoted less time for providing practice for the points taught.

TABLE2.
SKILLS AND SYSTEM MODE

Feature of Teacher Talk	Frequency
Scaffolding	4
Direct repair	3
Content feedback	0
Extended wait- time	0
Referential questions	0
Seeking clarification	4
Extended learner turn	0
Teacher Echo	1
Teacher interruptions	0
Extended teacher turn	0
Turn completion	0
Display questions	5
Form focused feedback	2

Determining Constructive or Obstructive Nature of Teacher Talk in Advanced Classes

EFL teachers choose, control and shift the topics of classroom discussions; they direct the flow of interactions and lead the whole scenario to desirable and preplanned results. These all, give rise to classes where teacher- learner role is asymmetrical and unequal. As a result, the quality of teacher talk gains greater significance. Since extended and complicated teacher talk is needed to accomplish most of EFL classroom tasks (teaching grammar) and teacher talk time occupies most of class time, it becomes evident that there is an immediate need for a profound and substantive understanding of the vital role brought off by teacher talk aligned with the pedagogic goal in question at a given

moment of the lesson. Learning opportunities would be far better facilitated and expedited when and if such alignment and harmony exists. Teachers' choice of language can assist or impede learning opportunities. By comparing advanced classes, the features of construction and obstruction became evident. Learner involvement differed in classes under comparative analysis, precisely due to variations and contrasts in teacher talks. In both classes, evidence of construction and obstruction was noticeable, but the occurrence of each differed fundamentally in different classes. Once the teacher produced constructive talk, she established a good context, maximized learners' involvement and led to precise linguistic strings on the part of learners.

Constructive Features of Teacher Talk

Direct error correction

As it occurs in follow-up turns, this type of error correction is time-saving, less intrusive and is favored most by learners since it brings minimal interruption in interaction flow.

Content feedback

In classroom context mode, where the teacher drove the topic of the lesson towards genuine and real life topics, the use of content feedback by the teacher helped foster a conversation-like language and was appropriately conducive to keeping pedagogic purpose and teacher language at one.

Confirmation check

The two-way checks for confirmation between teachers and learners paved the way for meaning negotiation which was clearly of great benefit for expediting language acquisition.

Scaffolding

Scaffolding is defined as feeding in essential language when a breakdown happens. This is a skill which requires good listening skills and predicting what might be needed before a breakdown occurs. Scaffolding appeared in different forms.

The features which foisted the least intrusion on communication flow are as follows: Latched modeling, alternative phrasing and prompting. These all furthered the learners' contributions and pushed them towards more extended ones. Since teachers' talk and their goal are in tune, other features of naturally occurring conversations (e.g. learner self–selecting the topic and overlapping) were also observed.

TABLE 3.
OBSERVED CONSTRUCTIVE FEATURES

The observed features of construction	Class 1	Class 2
Direct Error Correction	2	6
Content Feedback	3	1
Checking confirmation	12	6
Scaffolding	7	10

The Observed Features of Obstruction: Blocking learning opportunities

Depending on the quality of teacher talk, obstruction may happen which subsequently hinders learning opportunity and changes turn-taking mechanisms, length of learner turns and the quality of their contributions. What follows are some of the observed features that reduced learning potential.

Turn Completion

The profuse latching indicated that the teacher fills the gaps to further discussions. Perhaps the main reason is the shortage of time in EFL classes, but teachers miss the chance for meaning negotiation. This seems to confirm Walsh's argument that, "There is a sense of the learner being 'fed the lines' instead of being allowed time and space to formulate her responses" Walsh (2002, p.18).

Walsh (2002) asserts that turn completion should not be equalized with scaffolding. Turn completion is deemed as an inadvisable factor in classroom settings. It limits the recurrence and alters the quality of learner contribution. Learners are not afforded a chance to explicate their contributions and make the meaning plain.

Teacher Interruptions

Interaction flows are frequently cut off by teacher's inadvertent interruptions. It was noted that whenever the smooth continuity of learners' contribution was disturbed by teachers, learners lost the thread of ideas and arguments and this resulted in flawed production and reluctance to participate further. Sometimes, the efficient recourse to silence on the part of teachers culminated in learners' longer and more complex linguistic productions. This is in line with what Walsh (2002, p.19) lays emphasis on: "learning potential would have been increased by a more judicious use of silence, by reducing or eliminating teacher echo and by resisting the temptation to interrupt, unless absolutely necessary".

TABLE 4.
THE OBSERVED CONSTRUCTIVE FEATURES

The observed constructive features	Class 1	Class 2
Turn completion	5	0
Teacher Interruptions	20	2

Although the occurrence of constructive features does not differ starkly in number, the obstructive features in first teacher's talk outnumber those of her colleague. Put simply, the first teacher, knowingly or not, hinders the long and

extended contributions on learners' part, which might be attributed to her verbal behavior. If an awareness of the importance of teachers' choice of language is well established, it may well be conducive to enhanced learning opportunities.

IV. CONCLUSION

The paper aimed at investigating the potential contributions of the SETT framework in Iranian EFL context. It was found that the SETT framework can be an appropriate means through which one could access and study classroom discourse. The SETT finely highlights the role of language in education, not to mention the support it lends to the standpoint on conversation analysis. It is a fact that conversation analysis is a rigorous method geared to describing the intricate and multi-faceted interactions in the classroom by means of determining and analyzing turn-taking mechanisms.

The present study made an attempt to delineate the actual operational applicability of the SETT in Iranian EFL classrooms. Steps were taken to trace workings and functions of all the specified modes within the framework.

The results of this paper are not intended to imply that some teachers come to make more apt and masterful use of language than others. Nor do they imply that certain teachers are, by extension, more conscious of their language use than others. However, one might safely argue that the rich deployment of some features by some teachers and the infrequent or no use of such features by other teachers is certainly ascribable to teachers' verbal behavior rather than the methodologies they have recourse to.

Once such awareness is established, teachers themselves will come around to the substantive significance each feature carries in order to meet relevant pedagogic goals, and the importance attached to the features in question will be brought home for them.

In terms of the perspective on *construction* and *obstruction*, the transcripts bring out the fact that teachers displayed no tendency to assume a "back seat" role or more to be a mere observer of the unfolding classroom scenario. They constantly and conspicuously ended up imposing their presence by cutting across the smooth flow of communicative interactions.

It is not difficult to argue that where the obstructive factors reached their minimal deployment, learning opportunities flourished and the classroom discourse assumed a conversational dimension not to say, an appearance, although this was seen to be fleeting.

V. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The need for fostering awareness about the link between the appropriate and constructive teacher talk and pedagogic goal is being felt even more acutely than before. Such awareness can be reached more easily if teachers attempt to record and transcribe their own classes on organized bases and engage themselves in grasping what sort of talk on their own part culminate in long, extended and more comprehensible learners' contributions or conversely in meager, short and cursory ones.

The SEET framework also lends itself to critical reflective practices through which teachers can evaluate the interactional opportunities that present themselves in their classes. The point of departure would be the modifications that teachers bring to bear on their verbal behaviors rather than their methodologies. It would be optimally desirable if language schools develop guidelines with emphasis on the importance of qualitative aspects of teacher talk. Such guidelines can be effectively included in their Teacher Training Programs.

APPENDIX. TRANSCRIPTION SYSTEM

T	teacher
L	learner
L1:L2:etc.,	identified learner
LL	several learners at once or the whole class
Ok/ok/ok	overlapping or simultaneous utterances by more than one learner
Do you understand ?	overlap between teacher and learner
(I see)	
=	turn continues, or one turn flows another without any purpose
…	pause of one second or less marked by three periods
(4)	silence, length given in seconds
?	rising intonation- question or other
Correct	Emphatic speech: falling intonation
((4))	unintelligible 4seconds: a stretch of unintelligible
Paul, Peter, Mary	capitals are only used for proper nouns
To organize groups	editor's comments (in bold type)

REFERENCES

[1]   Allwright, D. (1988). Observation in language classrooms. London & New York: Longman.
[2]   Allwright, D. & Baily K.M. (1991). Focus on the language classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[3]   Brown, A. L., & Palincsar, A. S. (1989). Guided, cooperative learning and individual knowledge acquisition. In L. B. Resnick (Ed.), *Knowing, learning, and instruction: Essays in honor of Robert Glaser (pp. 393–451).* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
[4]   Ellis, R. (1998). Instructed second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
[5]   Ellis, R. (2000). Task–based research and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research, 49,*193-220.
[6]   Johnson, K. (1995). Understanding communication in second language Classrooms. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[7]   Mercer, N. (1997). Effective educational talk. In B. Davies & D. Corson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education,* Volume3: oral discourse and education, (pp. 179-186). Dordrecht: Kluwar Academic Publishers.
[8]   McCarthy, M. & Carter, R. (1994). Language as discourse: Perspectives for language teaching. London: Longman.
[9]   Richards, J.C. & Sandy, C. (2000).   Passages (Student's Book2). An upper multi skills course. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[10]   Seedhouse, P. (1996). The international architecture of the language classroom: A conversational analysis perspective. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
[11]   Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching, 38,* 165-187.
[12]   Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning in G. Cook and B. Seidlehofer (Eds.). *Principle and practice in applied linguistics*: Studies in honor of H. G. Widdowson. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
[13]   Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: Teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classrooms. *Language Teaching Research, 6,* 3-23.
[14]   Walsh, S. (2003). Developing interactional awareness in the second language classroom. *Language awareness, 12,* 124-42.
[15]   Walsh, S. (2006). Investigating classroom discourse. New York: Routledge.

Fatemeh Poorebrahim is a Ph. D. student and the teacher of EFL at Maragheh State University, E. Azerbaijan, Iran. Her research interests include improving EFL textbooks and teaching methods using cross- cultural materials, teacher evaluation, discourse analysis, and ESP. She   has published articles in foreign/second language teaching and ESP, and is the corresponding author of this article: She can be reached at: Dept. of English, Maragheh University, Iran

Mohammad Reza Talebinejad is a professor of applied linguistics at Islamic Azad University, Shahreza Branch, Esfahan, Iran. He has published articles in foreign/second language teaching.

Farhad Mazlum is an assistant professor of applied linguistics at Maragheh University. He has published articles in foreign/second language teaching and ESP.