OPTIMISING THE THIRD MOVE: A STUDY OF THE ROLE OF TEACHERS' TALK IN INCREASING CLASSROOM INTERACTION

Sabria S. Jawhar, PhD
Assistant professor of Applied and Educational Linguistics
Languages and Cultural Studies Department
King Saud bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
National Guard Health Affairs
Mail Code, 6565. P.O. Box. 9515
Jeddah 21423
Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Lemya Shammat, PhD
Assistant professor of Applied and Educational Linguistics
Languages and Cultural Studies Department
King Saud bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
National Guard Health Affairs
Mail Code, 6565. P.O. Box. 9515
Jeddah 21423
Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Introduction

This paper is an investigation of the interrelationship between interaction, language use and learning. It is an evaluation of the role of teachers' use of language in promoting or hindering interaction and, consequently, learning in content language integrated (CLIL) classrooms. It sheds light on how conversation analysis (CA) can be used to obtain a better understanding of the "interactional architecture" (Seedhouse 2004) of CLIL classrooms. CA has been chosen instead of any other method of analysis for its ability to provide an in-depth insight into the nature of what is happening inside the classroom within a social framework.

The argument here is that the teacher's use of language will affect the available opportunities for learning, with an emphasis on the need to promote an enhanced awareness of that role. The examples used in this paper show how the teachers, by the use of their talk, can optimise the use of the third move in the IRF/E cycle as an example of how interactional space can be created for the students in order to increase more opportunities for learning.

Background

The phrase "it takes one to get one" applies to any classroom, as "It takes a good teacher to make a good student". In spite of the decades-long attention that has been paid to the importance of classroominteraction and the factors that promote it, the majority of Saudi classrooms do not have an 'interactive learning environment' (Smith and Higgins 2006) in which students can become involved in discussions and knowledge sharing, which will help them to become part of the community of practice.

An examination of the available literature reveals that only a small number of researchers (Almeniei 2005; Al Noghaimishi 1985; Filemban 1981, Jawhar 2012) have focused on the interaction inside the classroom in Saudi educational institutions. Jawhar (2012), in particular, paid attention to interaction in CLIL higher education classrooms.

Linguists place importance on the type of language used by teachers, particularly in the second language classroom, emphasising its role in creating opportunities for learning. Walsh (2002) believed that teachers' use of language in the EFL classroom is as important as the methodology s/he uses. The teachers' use of language plays a fundamental role in either facilitating or hindering the learners' contribution.Walsh listed direct error correction, content feedback and extended wait time among the main features of the teachers' language use in the classroom that facilitate learners' involvement. By contrast, he labelled turn completion, teacher echo and interruptions as hindrances to learner involvement and restrictions to learning potential (Walsh 2002:16). Using discourse analysis as the main method of investigation, Cullen (1998:179) argued that the quality of teacher talk, such as the kind of questions teachers ask, has an effect on the quantity and quality of student interaction. He identified referential questions, content feedback, the use of speech modification and the attempt to negotiate meaning as communicative characteristics of teachers' talk that promote interaction. Cullen also considered the excessive use of display questions, form-focused feedback, echoing and sequences of predictable IRF as examples of non-communicative talk.

Some teachers, however, due to a focus on strict pedagogical goals, pay no or little attention to the kind of language they use inside the classroom, which results in the obstruction of learning opportunities. Walsh (2006) suggested a model that provides second-language teachers with an in-depth insight into the kinds of language used inside their classrooms. According to him, SETT (self-evaluation of teacher talk) is a reflective practice model that helps teachers to understand the interactional organisation of their classrooms. The model uses CA, as well as reflection and professional dialogue, to help teachers reflect on their use of language and the way in which learning opportunities are co-constructed. As part of the application of SETT, Walsh emphasised the third phase, which evaluates the extent to which teachers have developed an awareness of their talk. Awareness is a "more conscious use of language noticing the effect of interactional features on learning opportunity" (Walsh 2006:135). Walsh added that this can be described in relation to a teacher's use of metalanguage, critical self-evaluation and decision making that is more conscious and interactive. This paper is an addition to the body of work that examines the role of teachers' use of language in promoting classroom interaction, but in a context in which language is used as a tool for instruction, which is a context typically referred to as content language integrated learning (CLIL). It identifies some of the procedures that teachers use to engage the students in on-going dialogue. It also sheds some light on specific incidents in which teachers unintentionally close the space for interaction and consequently waste a precious opportunity for learning to occur (Walsh, 2002).

The context

The context is a Saudi institution for higher education. The learners are native speakers of Arabic. Their ages vary between 18 and 22. They are monolingual and use English as a medium for learning content subjects. The teachers, on the other hand, include bothnative speakers of English and non-native speakers.

Methodology

The source of the data used for illustration in this paper is a transcript of 16 hours of teaching videos of content subjects, such as physics and chemistry, taken from classroom videos. The data were transcribed and analysed interpretively using conversation analysis. The IRF/E exchanges were traced to locate the action sequences. The third move of these exchanges was also located to determine the types of language the teachers used in each exchange and the responses they generated. We then examined these action sequences in terms of the organisation of turn taking, focusing on any disturbances in the working of the system or successes with regard to creating increased interactional space.

Data Analysis and Discussion
A. An example of a teacher's good use of language

The following example is taken from a higher education chemistry classroom. The teacher is a native speaker of English with 10 years' experience of teaching. She is solving some problems in the students' books using equations to which the students had been introduced in previous classes. In this extract, the teacher initiates the exchange by asking the students a question about the four equations they could use to solve any problem (lines 1 and 2).

Extract (1) "The four equations"

```
1    T:     um:: yeah what are the four four equations that will help us answer any
2           questions related to mass, moles, molarity, dilution?
3    S2:    moles-equals-mass-over R-A-M
4    T:     moles-equals-mass-mass-over R-M-M and we use this one for?
5    S2:    °(( inaudible))°
6    T:     S2 we use this one for calculating moles of_?
7    S2:    °moles and° the atoms?
8    T:     yes, atoms or elements, yes, and then related to that is_?
9    SS:    moles-equals-mass-over R-M-M.
10   T:     yeah moles-equals-mass-over-R-M-M, and we use this one for calculating
11          moles of_?
12   SS:    molecules.
13   T:     molecules, okay. number three?
14   SS:    molarity-equals-moles-over-volume.
15   T:     molarity-equals-moles-over-volume, and can you tell me something
16          more about the units?
17   S3:    it has to be in decimetre-square.
```

S2 (line 3) waited until the teacher's turn was complete at what she perceived as a possible transition relevance place (TRP), and self-selected to answer the question; however, she provided only what the teacher considered a partial answer. The teacher (line 4) did not give negative feedback. Instead, she echoed the student's answer in a way that is understood, in this context, as

positive feedback, yet she combined this positive feedback with a designedly incomplete turn (Koshik, 2002)to elicit further information from the student. S2(line 5) offered another short or incomplete answer that also did not seem to satisfy the teacher who, this time, addressed the student by name and asked for further explanation, as can be seen in line 6. In line 7, the teacher used "yes" twice to agree with the student and to give what, again, is understood to be positive feedback. When the teacher reached this level of partial satisfaction with the student's answers, she used the same technique of elicitation but, this time, it was directed at the entire class, thus marking the closure of the expanded ERF cycle with S2. By using different types of positive feedback (repeating the student's answer, as well as agreement), combined with either questions or designedly incomplete turns, the teacher rewarded the student who willingly self-selected and led her (using scaffolding) through the process of answering the question. She successfully encouraged the student to verbalise her knowledge and to use what the teacher believes to be appropriate scientific language. The teacher did not give any negative feedback or interrupt the student during the entire exchange. By contrast, she played the role of a lifeguard and took the student's hand to lead her to the shore, which in this analogy is the correct identification of the first part of the four equations that the teacher requested at the beginning of the original IRF cycle. Nevertheless, because the first question was not answeredcompletely, the teacher kept the ball rolling by asking a new question that was directed at the entire class, as in lines 10 and 11. The new question, although it appears to be a new exchange, functions as a continuation of thequestion that was asked initially regarding the four equations. In this way, the teacher broke the original question down into four interrelated subsequent exchanges. The class, collectively, responded to the teacher's question in line 12.The teacher accepted the students' answer and repeated it (line 13) in what, again, is perceived as positive feedback. She followed with the discourse marker "okay", which functioned as agreement, as well as a marker to signal a shift in the topic as it was followed by a question regarding equation number three. By so doing, the teacher ended the first part of the bigger cycle; namely, the four equations that could be used to solve any problem. In line 14, the students jointly provided an answer with which the teacher agreed, on yet she expanded the exchange by asking for further explanation: *"and can you tell me something more about the units?"* As a result of the teacher's positive attitude and good use of the language, the students in this class felt sufficiently secure not only to self-select to answer questions that were directed at the entire class, but also to challenge the teacher, as can be seen in line 15. S3 self-selected (line 17) and provided an answer that showed confidence and certainty: *"it has to be in decimetre- square"*. The teacher agreed with the student and confirmed her assertion by adding, *"...we always convert the volume into decimetrecentimetres- cubed into cubed."* However, she followed this with another question that was related to the on-going exchange.

Extract 1, Part 2

```
18    T:      yes, we always convert the volume into decimetre centimetres-cubed
19            into decimetres-cubed, and how many centimetres cubed in_
20    SS:     one thousand.
21    T:      yeah one thousand centimetres-cubed make up one decimetre-cubed,
22            tell me something about the units of molarity?.
23    S2:     ((M))
24    S!:     ((M))
25    SS:     M.
26    T:      yes, it's capital M which signifies molarity concentration.
27    S4:     Moles
28    S3:     and mole per-decimetre-cubed?
29    T:      yeah  moles-per-decimetre-cubed  yeah  ,  moles-per-decimetre-cubed,
30            and historically, two more units have been used_?
31    S4:     grams
32    S5:     grams-per-decimetre-cubed?
33    T:      grams-per-decimetre-cubed, and one more?
34    S5:     gram-per-litre?
35    T:      moles-per-litre, yeah, moles-per -itre, okay, this is historically, and the
36            fourth equation?
```

In the above extract, we can see that the teacher, by using the correct language for elicitation and combining it elegantly with positive feedback, succeeded in enhancing the students' self-confidence, hence promoting interaction. The teacher did not seem to be convinced by any of the answers given, yet the way she approached the incomplete answers was remarkable and produces results towards the end of each episode of the on-going exchanges. The teacher used discourse markers (such as "okay" in lines 13 and 36) to keep the conversation going while simultaneously moving it forward towards achieving her pedagogical goals which, in this case, were to elicit the four equations with which she started the original sequence in line 1.

In conclusion, this example shows how the teacher's careful use of language to elicit information and to perform more than one social action resulted in a maximisation of interaction and, consequently, increased learning opportunities.

Example of a teacher's obstructive use of language
The next extract is taken for a higher education physics class. The teacher and the students are non-native speakers of English, although they are using English as the medium of instruction. The teacher is solving some problems from the textbook related to the acceleration of velocity and speed. The exchange starts with the teacher choosing one of the problems listed in the book and solving it with students, who had been taught how to solve this type of problem in previous classes.
In lines 1-7, the teacher summarised the requirements for solving this problem for the students, based on the textbook, and reminded them how to approach such exercises based on the given information. However, in the middle of the explanation process, she shifted mood and asked the students to display having epistemic access to the topic under discussion: *"why ((why)) to the negative, Why.".*S1 (line 8) self-selected and answered in a whispered voice, reflecting

uncertainty. S3 overlapped with S1 and gave the same answer with a slight modification: *"opposite direction"*. The teacher, however, did not give any feedback to any of the students' answers. In fact, she continued with her explanation using hand gestures to show the opposite direction. S1 (line 14) overlapped with the teacher in an attempt to take the floor and contribute to the on-going conversation. She whispered something that was not audible. The teacher ignored the student's attempt to take the floor and finished her turn with andesignedly incomplete turn to elicit an answer to the original question with which the exchange started; namely, why it is negative. It is obvious that the teacher's obsession with her pedagogical agenda has diverted her attention from the students' continuous attempts to display epistemic access by competing to take the floor.

Extract2, equations for the acceleration of velocity and speed

```
1      T:    O↑kay, this is the problem we're going to do (0.1) And with that
2            problem we have two↑ vectors.  Okay (0.1) we said vector one, vector
3            two. And usually when we have a vector they give us the magnitude
4            and they give us the direction. So↑ the first thing to look at his
5            problem we have two vectors vector A and vector B. And vector A is
6            forty meter with the angle of forty-five degrees with a positive X
7            direction. And↑ the second vector is thirty meters with an angle of
8            negative thirty seven degrees, why ((why)) to the negative, Why.
9            (0.2)
10     S1:   [°((opposite))°
11     S3:   [<opposite direction>
12     T:    This angle is forty five degrees and ↑this vector is forty ((writing on
13           the board)) and the other  vector is this ((hand gesture))way,[ thirty=
14     S1:                                                    [((inaudible))
15     T:    =and the [angle ↑is_.
16     S5:             [ragem ehdaísh ((tr. number eleven))
17     S3:   thirty [seven?
18     T:           [why to the negative >because< I always have at the angle with a
19           positive X direction. And↑  we're going to find out this is Very
20           important. Now↑ if we look at the points, ((pointing at the board)) and
21           we have a few points telling us what we need to do to. to add these
22           vectors. The ↑first one is to sket↑ch, okay? The second point is to
23           find the component↑ of each one of the vectors [involved.]
```

S3, once again, self-selected and took the floor in line 17, giving what was perceived by the teacher as the wrong answer, as S3 gave the measurement of the angle although the teacher asked why the angle was negative.

The teacher refrained from giving negative feedback or even clarifying her questions. In fact, she decided to give the answer herself. At the same time, she turned the PowerPoint presentation to the slide on which the steps required for solving such problems were listed. She read them aloud in an attempt tonudge the students' memories as a step towards solving the problem together. In this part of the extract, we can see how the teacher unintentionally blocked many opportunities for learning by closing the possible spaces for interaction. The interaction in the classroom seemed to be following a rigid lockstep sequences. The teacher also used extended turns similar to those used in what Seedhouse (2004) called the procedural phases of the lesson.

The teacher continued her explanation of the steps that should be followed to solve such types of problems. However, in line 24, a student overlapped with the teacher's turn by repeating the word *"component"* in what is understood as seeking clarification. The teacher did not notice the student and continued her explanation (lines 25-38).

Research Scholar
An International Refereed e-Journal of Literary Explorations

ISSN   2320 – 6101
www.researchscholar.co.in
Impact Factor 0.998 (IIFS)

RS IRJLE GWALIOR
Research Scholar - An International
Refereed Journal of Literary Explorations

Extract 2, Part 2

25	T:	So↑ here (.) we have two vectors vector one, and vector two
26		((pointing at the graph)). What will be the components we're looking
27		for this or we did it. So↑ to find the ((inaudible)) we have to find (0.2)
28		the components of each one. Let's look at each one before we go
29		because this is why people have, aha::Adding vectors: how do we add
30		vectors? First, draw a diagram (.) Choose X and Y axis (.)resolve each
31		vector into X and Y components, ((cut it)) each component using sines
32		and cosines (.) Add the components in each direction and↑ to find an
33		X and direction we have to the Pythagorean law, okay (.)So↑ these are
34		the steps we're going to be following all the time, especially when we
35		go onto the next chapter when we'll deal with forces. So↑ I Sketched
36		the two forces we have and I set the direction and now I have to
37		choose my X and Y axis. ↑So I'm going to put my X direction here and
38		the Y direction here? Sah ((tr.right))? ((looks at the class))
39	S3:	Sah ((tr. right))
40	T:	okay. Can I put the projector off now?
41	S?:	[yes]
42	S?:	[no]
43	S?:	[no]

Finally, in line 38, the teacher asked the students collectively to display having access to knowledge by asking, in Arabic, if they agreed which what she had just said. As can be seen, agreement is understood here as sharing the same knowledge. S3 felt accountable as she was among the few students who volunteeredto give answers to the teacher's question at the beginning of the exchange. She agreed with the teacher using Arabic in what was also understood by the teacher as a display of knowledge. However, in line 40, when the teacher asked if she could turn the projector off and move to the next step, which is the actual way of solving the problem, the students showed disagreement concerning their readiness to move on, as one said *"yes",* while two other students said *"no"*. The teacher ignored those who said "no", accepted the 'yes" and proceeded with the answer, as can be seen in part two of the extract. By turning off the projector, the teacher marked a shift of focus from jogging the students' memories to the actual answer to the initial question of the exchange, as can be seen in part three.

Extract 2, Part 3

```
44    T:      Yes. Okay. So ↑first I have to find the X and Y components of the first
45            vector. Let's say this is vector A and this is vector B(.)For vector A ↑first
46            I have to find_ (0.1) the X component of A which ↑iS  the magnitude of
47            the vector cosine the angle it makes with a positive X direction=
48    S6:     =< so it is forty cosine forty three >.
49    T:      ↑So it is forty cosine_.
50    S6:     Forty four↓
51    T:      forty:: f::
52    S6:     Forty four
53    T:      Five ((writing on the board)) and I find and answer for that? Okay and
54            then we go_, which means this is going to be_? ((pointing at the board))
55
56    S7:     twenty O↑ two
57    T:      thank you ((writing on the board)).
58    S6:     So↑ it is twenty eight point two?
59    S9:     <point twenty>
60    T:      ((thank)) you too. okay. So that will be this is the component here
61            ((pointing at the board)).
62    S?:     ° ((I see)) °
```

In part two, the teacher summarised what should be done in preparation for answering the problem. S6 self-selected (line 46) and latches with the teacher in what is also understood as display of having access to knowledge. She suggested an answer to the problem using the discourse marker "so" turn initially to preface a turn constructional unit (TCU) of part two of an adjacency pair sequence of a question and answer: *"so it is forty cosine forty three"*. The teacher repeated the student's answer to display positive feedback, yet she expressed having difficulty hearing the second part of the answer and used a designedly incomplete turn with a falling intonation designed to seek clarification. The student repeated her answer in line 52, but this time she changed her answerslightly from *"forty three"* to *"forty four"*. In line 53, the teacher offered the others initiated repair using a prolonged word followed by a designedly incomplete turnto elicit the correctanswer. The student repeated her answer in line 54. The teacher (line 55) refrained from giving negative feedback, but wrote the answer (*"five"*) on the board, adding a further explanation regarding how to find the answer for this part of the problem. She finished her turn with another the discourse marker, "okay", which was used to mark a shift in the topic that was introduced via a designedly incomplete turn to elicit an answer to the next part of the problem. S7 self-selected in line 56 and volunteered the answer. The teacher gave a positive feedback in line 57 and wrote the answer on the board. However, S6 expressed confusion regarding the answer and sought clarification. She used the discourse marker "so" turn initially to take the floor and to preface the TCU of her request for confirmation.

S9 (in line 59) responded to S6's request for confirmation, although with a slightly modified answer that was deployed to display a more precise response: *"point twenty"* for *"point one"*. The teacher acknowledged S9's contribution and thanked her in line 60. By giving positive feedback to S9's contribution, the teacher closed the first part of the exchange and moved to the next stage of solving the same problem.

Extract 2, Part 3

63	T:	The Y component is going to be here and it's going to be A- Y- . It's going
64		to be A, the sine of the angle.((writing on the board)) which is going to
65		be forty sine forty five, which is the same thing. Why is it going to be
66		the same thing? Be↑cause this is forty five degrees cosine forty nine.
67		↑Now what about the other vector? Do the same thing for the other
68		vector. So the thing about adding vectors is it's the same procedure.
69		The thing is we have to write many things, okay, but if we repeat
70		ourselves hundred times we'll get the right answer. (look at S3) Yes?
71	S3:	we find the X and Y for A and then X and Y for B.
72	T:	For B. And if there are ten of them we'll find the X and Y for each one of
73		them=
74	S7:	=do we take this later sine ((for confirmation))? =
75	S?:	=°you just said_°
76	S?:	°↑yes°
77	T:	°Yes° ↑so what we have for ↑B we are going to find B- X equal
78		((writing on the board)) (1.0) B- cos↑ine ((vector)) B (0.4) which ↑is_
79	S8:	[thirty cosine minus] thirty seven.
80	S7:	[Twenty point nine]
81	T:	How much?
82	S7:	twenty three point nine
83	T:	twenty three point nine and what about the Y component? Which
84		means_ this is the_ here is going to be_
85	S7:	twenty four because it's twenty three point nine five nine
86	T:	which is ((twenty))_
87	S7:	Twenty four
88	T:	twenty four point zero((writing on the board)) what about the Y
89		component?((looking at the students))
90	S?:	°minus A°
91	T:	T: it's, see, it's very important. In the problem, they gave me this angle
92		to be like that positive, they gave it to me positive. To find the sine and
93		cosine I have to be very careful because if I use the positive I'm going to
94		get a positive answer but look at the component, the component is
95		supposed to be here isn't it, in the negative Y direction? That's why it's
96		very important for me to

In part three of the same exchange, the teacher moved on to the next step of solving the problem of the acceleration of velocity and speed (lines 63-70). In line 71, the teacher noticed S3's orientation to participation and established a mutual gaze in what is understood as turn allocation. S3 took the floor (line 71) and added to what the teacher had said in the previous turn: *"we find the X and Y for A and then X and Y for B".* S3's contribution to the on-going conversation was understood as a display of knowledge by the teacher, who added (line 72) that they would follow the same steps with each axis. S7 waited until the teacher reached what she understood as a transition relevance point (TRP), and asked for further explanation. Two other students competed for the floor, one to initiate what seemed to be a confirmation request, and the other to offer a response to S7's answer. The teacher finally responded to S7's question via a turn

initial short response ("yes") followed by the discourse marker "so" that she used to mark a shift in the topic.

Discussion

In the analysis of the previous extracts, we saw examples of teachers' different uses of language in content language integrated classrooms in which English is used as a medium of instruction. Although both teachers were performing the same type of activity, namely problem solving, the teachers' use of language varied greatly.

The first set of examples, for instance, represents what we refer to as good use of language, as the teacher utilised the third move in the traditional IRF in a way that retained the flow of the conversation and encouraged more involvement on the part of the students. We saw that the teacher acted mainly as a facilitator, and refrained from spoon-feeding. In fact, she showed patience by extending her waiting time (Walsh 2002), which gave the students enough time to rehearse the answers in their minds. The continuous use of positive feedback, even in those examples in which the students gave a partially correct answer or half an answer to the original question, enhanced the students' participation in the on-going conversation. In some cases, it led to the students competing to take the floor and overlapping with the teacher, a feature that is rarely seen in classrooms.

The teacher also maximised the use of the third move by developing the topic or moving it forward using what is usually understood as the end of the IRF cycle to initiate a new sub-cycle related to the previous one. This was done without deviation from the original topic that was initiated by the first question. The insistence on keeping the ball rolling by the continuous use of the alternation of designedly incomplete turns and questions resulted in more involvement by the students.

In the same example, we noticed the repeated phenomenon of students self-selecting and a display of their understanding of the possible TRPs in the teacher's previous turns. The teacher's use of techniques, such as expanded IRF and designedly incomplete turns to elicit the desired answers, creates a more interactional classroom environment. These techniques facilitate the students' participation and consequently increase their chances of learning. When discussing learning in an EFL classroom, Walsh (2002) emphasised the important relationship between the teachers' use of language and their moment-by-moment interactional decisions with regard to the available opportunities for learning. Long (1996) also argued that learning takes place through interaction, especially when the students are involved in the process of meaning negotiation.

In the second set of examples, we noticed a more tightly controlled kind of interaction in which the teacher took control of the turns. Although the teacher did not introduce new material, she used extended turns, which meant the students had to struggle to take the floor to display having access to knowledge. Even in those instances in which the students managed to take the floor and contributed to the on-going conversation, the teacher did not seize the opportunity to promote interaction. On the contrary, the teacher provided positive or negative feedback, followed by further explanation.

A quick look at the second set of extracts also reveals the asymmetrical relationship between the teacher and the students with regard to the right to hold the floor for a longer time. The students in this classroom were trying hard to interact and to be part of the process of meaning negotiation, but the teacher blocked these opportunities by letting them pass unnoticed or by ignoring them.

In the few instances in which the teacher used a designedly incomplete turn to elicit answers and open the floor for participation, she accepted the minimum repose from the students and added to it to provide the expected answer. By so doing, the teacher impeded interaction and obstructed student involvement. In other words, she closed an interactional space that could have been used, as evidenced in the first set of examples, to optimise interaction and consequently to increase learning. It is very important to mention that, although the two teachers sometimes used similar techniques for elicitation, such as designedly incomplete turns, the moments at which they decided to use these techniques and the resulting discussion made all the difference. While one teacher increased her waiting time to give the students sufficient time to think about the answers and helped them to reach the desired conclusions by expanding the IRF cycle, the other teacher closed the cycle and provided the answer accompanied by further explanation despite the students' continuous attempts to participate. Walsh (2002) listed turn completion as one of the factors that imped interaction in classrooms. He also listed echoing as one of practices that teachers should avoid if they want to improve the students' involvement. However, in these data, echoing was used cleverly to amplify the correct answers and to provide positive feedback, as proved by the following TCU. In most of the cases, the teachers, particularly the first one, used a discourse marker to move the topic forward and to generate increased participation.

In summary, if learning is a considered to be a social process that can be achieved via the moment-by-moment co-construction of meaning, then only a methodology such as conversation analysis will help us in the better understanding of the unfolding of those moments and consequently in the raising of awareness about them. By exposing the teachers to a detailed transcript of their teaching, we can attract their attention to those moments during the interactions in which they succeeded in promoting involvement as a result of their careful use of language. Similarly, we can also point out the moments in which they missed the opportunityto invest in their students' readiness to take the floor and to add to the on-going discussion, which would have led to better opportunities for learning. Exposing the teachers to samples of their own data will raise their awareness and, through the use of reflective practice, they will be able to make better-informed decisions in the future with regard to their individual use of language.

Conclusion

In this paper, we investigated classroom interaction in content language integrated learning. The findings highlight the crucial role that teachers' creative use of language plays in creating space for interaction for students, which is believed to be one of the main factors behind learning as a social activity. The focus was on examining the teachers' use of the third move in the traditional IRF cycle to engage learners and to create a more interactional space in the classroom. Our argument is that educators can optimise student interaction if they can improve the teachers' use of language in such a way that allows more interactional space for the students. Using extracts from two different classrooms, it was also argued that CA isan appropriate scientific investigation tool that provides insight into classroom interaction. If carefully integrated with other methods of analysis, CA could be used to develop the teaching process in both language- and content-based Saudi classrooms as a major step towards solving the problem of the students' low level of proficiency in CLIL. Through a close analysis of teachers' talk and the resulting responses from the students, CA can help to identify the patterns of language use and the amount of participation. Using CA will contribute to our understanding of how students are socialised to use English in the process of learning, and to discover what counts as language or content learning and its relation to students' opportunities to use English. It will also help teachers to

employ more meaningful questions that stimulate students to "…tap into higher-order thinking processes" (Chin 2006:1344).

With regard to teachers, CA will help them to understand the nature of teacher-student interaction, particularly because CA is mainly concerned with revealing the constituent and organising features of the collaborative efforts between the teachers and their students.

As Chin (2006, p. 1315) argued, "When students learn science in a classroom setting, a primary source of information input comes from the teacher talk and teacher-student interaction, as the processes and transactions involved in the construction of meaning are mediated through language."

In conclusion, this is only a small-scale study that should be followed by further investigations into the nature of interaction in CLIL with a greaterfocus on the higher thinking skills that are aimed at through the presentation of the teaching materials; in other words, the skills involved in the conceptual content that enables the construction of knowledge, A closer look at how teachers and students socialise while performing various social actions, such as solving problems, will enable the making of informed decisions regarding the question of how to introduce these activities more successfully in the future. We recommend that conversation analysis should be introduced as part of the pre-service teaching programme as it helps the teachers to reflect on their own teaching. Walsh (2003) supported the use of conversation analysis as method for reflective practice, and added that it would help teachers to shift their focus from making decisions based on the materials introduced or on the methodologyused, to decisions that are informed by the moment-by-moment interaction in the classroom.

Appendix

Transcription Conventions
Adapted from Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008)

(1.8)	Numbers enclosed in parentheses indicate a pause. The number represents the number of seconds of duration of the pause, to one decimal place. A pause of less than 0.2 seconds is marked by (.)
[ ]	Brackets around portions of utterances show that those portions overlap with a portion of another speaker's utterance.
=	An equal sign is used to show that there is no time lapse between the portions connected by the equal signs. This is used where a second speaker begins their utterance just at the moment when the first speaker finishes.
::	A colon after a vowel or a word is used to show that the sound is extended. The number of colons shows the length of the extension.
(hm, hh)	These are onomatopoetic representations of the audible exhalation of air)
.hh	This indicates an audible inhalation of air, for example, as a gasp. The more h's, the longer the in-breath.
?	A question mark indicates that there is slightly rising intonation.
.	A period indicates that there is slightly falling intonation.
,	A comma indicates a continuation of tone.
-	A dash indicates an abrupt cut off, where the speaker stopped speaking suddenly.

↑↓	Up or down arrows are used to indicate that there is sharply rising or falling intonation. The arrow is placed just before the syllable in which the change in intonation occurs.
Under	Underlines indicate speaker emphasis on the underlined portion of the word.
CAPS	Capital letters indicate that the speaker spoke the capitalized portion of the utterance at a higher volume than the speaker's normal volume.
°	This indicates an utterance that is much softer than the normal speech of the speaker. This symbol will appear at the beginning and at the end of the utterance in question.
><, <>	'Greater than' and 'less than' signs indicate that the talk they surround was noticeably faster, or slower than the surrounding talk.
(would)	When a word appears in parentheses, it indicates that the transcriber has guessed as to what was said, because it was indecipherable on the tape. If the transcriber was unable to guess as to what was said, nothing appears within the parentheses.
+	marks the onset of a non-verbal action (e.g. shift of gaze, pointing)
italics	English translation

References

Almeniei, O. (2005). *What counts as language learning analysis of teacher-learner interactions in an English as a foreign language classroom in Saudi Arabia.* Thesis (PhD). University of Georgia: Athens, Georgia.

Al Noghaimishi, A. (1985). *Students' Perception of Teachers and Students' Personal Interaction in Riyadh Public Schools*. Thesis (PhD) University of Michigan: Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Chin, C. (2006). 'Classroom Interaction in Science: Teacher questioning and feedback to students' responses' [Research report]. *International Journal of Science Education, 28*(11), 1315-1346.

Research Scholar

ISSN 2320 – 6101

www.researchscholar.co.in
Impact Factor 0.998 (IIFS)

An International Refereed e-Journal of Literary Explorations

Cullen, R. (1998) 'Teacher talk and the classroom context'.*English LanguageTeaching Journal, 52*: 179-87.

Filemban, S. (1982).*Verbal classroom interaction in elementary school mathematics classes in Saudi Arabia.* Thesis (PhD).Oregon State University: Corvallis.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997).'On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research'.*Modern Language Journal* (81), 285-300.

Hellermann, J. (2007). 'The Development of Practices for Action in Classroom Dyadic Interaction: Focus on Task Opening'. *The Modern Language Journal* (91), 83-96.

Hin

Jarvis, J& Robinson, M. (1997). 'Analysing Educational Discourse: An Exploratory Study of Teacher Response and Support to Pupils' Learning'. *Applied Linguistics, 18*(2), 212-228.

Jawhar, S. (2012).*Conceptualising CLIL in a Saudi context: A corpus linguistic and conversation analytic perspective.*Thesis (PhD).Newcastle University: Tyne and Wear, UK.

Koshik, I. (2002). 'Designedly Incomplete Utterances: A pedagogical Practice for Eliciting Knowledge Display in Error Correction Sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 35 (3)

Lee, Y.-A. (2006). 'Towards Respecification of Communicative Competence: Condition of L2 Instruction or its Objective?' *Applied Linguistics, 27*(3), 349-379.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition.W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.) *Handbook of second language acquisition*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Pica, T. (1987).'Second language acquisition, social interaction and the classroom'.*Applied Linguistics, 8*, 3-19.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The Interactional Architecture of the LanguageClassroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Smith, H., & Higgins, S. (2006). 'Opening classroom interaction: the importance of feedback'. *Cambridge Journal of Education 36*(4), 485-502.

Walsh, s & O'Keeffe, A. (2007). 'Applying CA to a Modes Analysis of Higher Education SpokenAcademicDiscourse'. In: Hugo Bowles & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Conversation Analysis and Language for SpecificPurposes* (pp. 101-139). Bern: Peter Lang.

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating Classroom Discourse* (Vol. II). London: Routledge.

Walsh, S. (2003) 'Developing interactional awareness in the second language classroom', *Language Awareness, 12*: 124-142.

Walsh, S. (2002) 'Constructive or obstructive: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom', *Language Teaching Research, 6*: 3-23

Wells, G. (1993). 'Re-evaluating the IRF Sequence: A Proposal for the Articulation of Theories of Activity and Discourse for the Analysis of Teaching and Learning in the Classroom'.*Linguistics and Education, 1*(5).

Wood, D. (Ed.). (1992). *Teaching talk.* London: Hodder &Stoughton (for the National Curriculum)