L2 teachers' disaffiliation from learners' actions: A joint conversation analysis & stimulated recall methodology proposal for L2 teachers' decision-making inquiry

José Ignacio Aguilar Río
Université du Maine, France
aquilario@hotmail.com

Abstract

This article presents the first results drawn from a current research study focusing on L2 teachers' decision-making processes in classroom-instructed language teaching for adult learners. Conversation analysis and stimulated recall interviews are integrated in the research methodology in order to (a) locate instances of L2 teachers' disaffiliation from learners' interactive actions, and (b) elucidate the principles that originate such disaffiliation. Previous literature on L2 teachers' decision-making argued that these principles are of a pedagogical nature, namely the teachers' observance of previously designed class-plans, and teachers' concern to have as many as possible of the learners actively engaged in class interaction. The results show the occurrence of emotional responses during the analysis made by one teacher regarding her classroom decisions. It is argued that a distinction be made between pedagogical principles and principles accounting for more emotional responses.

Keywords: foreign language teaching, language teachers' cognition, conversation analysis, disaffiliation, decision-making

Resumen

Este artículo presenta los primeros resultados de una investigación en curso sobre la toma de decisiones de profesores de L2 en clase. La metodología aúna el análisis conversacional y entrevistas de auto-confrontación para aislar situaciones en las que los profesores de L2 muestran su desafiliación respecto a las acciones interactivas de los aprendientes y proponer, mediante las entrevistas de auto-confrontación, posibles motivos para la desafiliación. Trabajos anteriores en didáctica de L2 sugieren principios pedagógicos como origen de las decisiones que toman los profesores de L2: el respeto por un plan de clase previo y el deseo de involucrar activamente en la interacción al máximo de aprendientes. El artículo muestra la aparición de reacciones emocionales durante el análisis que una profesora hace de sus decisiones en clase y sugiere la pertinencia de distinguir entre principios puramente pedagógicos y otros de naturaleza emocional.

Palabras clave: enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras, cognición de profesores de lenguas, anáisis conversacional, disafiliación, toma de decisiones

1. Introduction

Classroom instructed language teaching (CILT) is one possible way to learn a foreign language (L2); according to Block (2003, 51-55), it differs from naturalistic language-learning in that CILT takes into account "sociohistorical factors related to the educational system and attitudes in general about foreignness". There is extensive literature on foreign language teaching (FLT) and learning based on classroom research; this literature takes different stances to analyse specific aspects of FLT and learning: studies in second language acquisition (SLA) point at CILT as an insufficient medium for L2 learning to take place (Ellis, 1997: 109; Pica, 1987: 11), whereas research on FLT argues that CILT facilitates the L2 learning processes (Cicurel, 2002: 148; Seedhouse, 1996: 21 ; van Lier, 1988: 178-179). Recent research on FLT has searched for ways to improve L2 learning in CILT contexts; one major trend is the analysis of classroom discourse. Interaction in CILT contexts has been described as discursively asymmetric (Cicurel, 2002: 194; Ellis, 1997: 109; Pica, 1987: 4; Richards, 2006: 52); in order to account for the learners' creativity and needs, FLT researchers suggest that the role of L2 teachers' discourse be reconsidered in order to account for L2 learners' discourse more efficiently (Clifton, 2006; Cullen, 1998, 2002; Richards, 2006; Walsh, 2002). Despite these proposals, most language planning and decisions remain the monopoly of L2 teachers in CILT contexts (Hall, 2007; Seedhouse, 1996: 21-22; Walsh, 2002: 3-4).

Analysing the balance between L2 teachers' planning and on-the-spot decision-making is the purpose of this paper: first, it will address conversation analysis (CA) literature on (dis)affiliation and literature on teachers' cognition. It will be argued that the combination of these two approaches produces more comprehensive results as regards the logics underneath the interactive decisions made by one L2 teacher in a specific CILT situation.

2. Conversation analysis, second language acquisition and L2 teachers' cognition

This article draws both on CA and studies on L2 teachers' cognition. CA is taken as a methodological tool that allows the analysis of observable verbal and non-verbal actions; this leads, subsequently, to analysing the participants' attitudes while engaged in oral exchanges. In this article, CA will be used to analyze one interactive sequence taken from a CILT context; the analysis will illustrate the co-participants' shared role as co-agents of the sequence as it is.

Studies on L2 teachers' cognition focus on L2 teachers' cognitive processes. Research on this field assumes (a) that L2 teachers' actions in class are motivated by pedagogical principles (Breen et al., 2001), (b) that these principles may be accessed, analysed and described (Borg, 2003; Leindhardt & Greeno, 1986).

2.1. A brief overview of CA

CA seeks the order that regulates the observable actions performed by participants engaged in naturally occurring interactions. The participants' actions leave traces of their permanent adjustment to the intersubjectivity (Schegloff, 1992; Seedhouse, 2004: 9) that makes the interaction possible. Due to space limitations, no lengthy details about the background of CA will be provided; the readers are referred to the works by Antaki & Widdicombe (1998), Atkinson & Heritage (1994) and Ten Have (1999). However, three CA tenets of paramount importance need to be highlighted: (a) CA's interest lies on the emic perspective of the interactants and this entails working without *a priori* research questions (Markee, 2000: 26; Markee & Kasper, 2004: 494-495; Ten Have, 1999: 36); (b) although CA does not claim to give access to the interactants' inner motivations, it may characterise their attitude. Interactants' attitude may be taken into account by examining the interactants' preference or dispreference for specific actions that occur along the interaction: participants affiliate to preferred actions while they disaffiliate from dispreferred ones. By CA standards (dis)preference does not refer to an emotional state (Markee & Kasper, 2004: 495; Seedhouse, 2004: 13); instances of disaffiliation must be understood as the interactants' (re)actions *vis-à-vis* actions previously displayed by the other interactants. False starters, hesitations, pauses, silences, stuttering, and repair are specific structural features that package disaffiliation (Pomerantz, 1994; Ten Have, 1999: 106). Disaffiliation may lead to new courses, momentary breakdowns, or cul-de-sacs in the interaction; (c) CA considers the actions displayed by interactants and the way they are displayed as being equally important in that both are meaning conveyors (Ten Have, 1999: 76).

Socio-constructivist approaches to applied linguistics regard CILT contexts as social situations where social practices and actions are performed (Dewaele, 2005; Ellis, 1997; Firth & Wagner, 1997; Narcy-Combes, 2005; Van Lier, 1998, 1996). Socio-constructivist literature in FLT and SLA has shown interest in the analysis of classroom interaction: Cicurel (2002), Cambra-Giné (2003) and Seedhouse (1996, 2004) used transcripts of L2 classrooms to deconstruct CILT interaction; this allowed Cicurel (2002) to affirm that L2 classrooms have a ritual nature. The analysis of L2 classroom practices, taken as rituals, has led to commenting on specific aspects of CILT interaction, such as the unequal discursive rights among participants (Cullen, 1998, 2002; Walsh, 2002). SLA-oriented studies, such as

Markee (2000) and Mondada & Pekarek Doehler (2004), relied on CA to track instances of learners' L2 acquisition processes. As learners co-constructed the contexts for the L2 tasks they were required to perform in CILT mediums, and thus they left traces of their L2 use. Analysing the ways in which the learners (dis)orient to elements of the L2 helped to draw conclusions about their mastery of the L2.

2.2. Research on L2 teachers' cognition

Research on L2 teachers' cognition examines the actions performed by teachers while interacting with the learners in the classroom; the assumption is that certain principles, which cannot be observed directly, motivate the teachers' observable actions. Leindhardt & Greeno (1986) analysed the performance of a group of primary mathematics teachers; the authors suggested that teaching, taken as a reflective practice may be broken down into distinct cognitive units that constitute the basis for the teachers' observed practice. Leindhardt & Greeno (1986: 75) defined the observed teaching contexts as "ill-structured, dynamic environment[s]"; according to the authors, expert teachers make use of "complex knowledge structures [...] flexibly and with little cognitive efforts"; this allows teachers to overcome the dynamism and the lack of structure of the contexts where their teaching takes place.

Taking L2 teaching as a practice that entails the making of decisions, Woods (1996) explored the relation between (a) actions, processes and plans in L2 teaching contexts, and (b) classroom events, previous classroom planning and their subsequent interpretation. The L2 teachers analysed by Woods (1996: 118) were described as "the key player[s] in transforming [conceptual structures] into classroom events". Woods (1996: 126) noticed that a major constraint on L2 teachers' decisions and subsequent actions is that "only one thing can be done at a time". Smith's (1996: 211) analyses of L2 teachers' decision-making led him to distinguish between planned and unanticipated interactive decisions: unanticipated decisions were described as "usually prompted by student factors [or] teacher factors." Finally, Breen et al. (2001) describe the teaching practice as an equation that integrates principles, decisions and actions. Breen et al. aimed to elucidate the relation between pedagogical principles and classroom actions by virtue of a comprehensive, longitudinal research project comprising classroom observations and interviews – open ended and stimulated recall. Pedagogical principles work as general guidelines that regulate teachers' actions in class. These principles relate to five categories: (a) teachers' concept of learners' undertaking the learning process; (b) teachers' awareness of learners' attributes; (c) teachers' use of human and material resources; (d) teachers' concept of the subject matter; (e) teachers' capacity to contribute as teachers (Breen et al. 2001: 484). For more comprehensive accounts of L2 teachers' cognition research see Borg (2003).

3. Methodology

3.1. CA *and research on L2 teachers' cognition: methodological compatibility*

Contrary to the claims made by CA regarding its incapacity to give access to the participants' motivations, research on L2 teachers' cognition is precisely interested in L2 teachers' "mental lives" (Borg, 2003: 86); taken as such, both approaches seem incompatible. Moreover, whereas most CA practitioners discourage the use of data other than transcripts of naturally occurring interactions (Ten Have, 1999: 53-54), the literature on L2 teaching research makes extensive use of open ended (OEI) and stimulated recall (SRI) interviews: these are often used to complete classroom-based observations (Borg, 1999; Breen et al., 2001). However, common ground for the two approaches can be found: CA practitioners and researchers on L2 teachers' cognition agree that having interactants analyse their performance implies the risk of misinterpretation and reconstruction of the original oral event (Breen & al., 2001: 498; Pomerantz, 2005: 101; Woods, 1996: 36).

This article is ultimately concerned with L2 teachers' decision-making. In order to find answers the questioning-free approach of CA has been used. CA-generated data – classroom transcripts – has revealed instances of L2 teachers failing to renew the course of the learners' previously displayed actions; the L2 teachers' disaffiliating moves led to new courses of action. Instances of disaffiliating moves by teachers were submitted to the teachers within the framework of SRI interviews. Teachers were required to verbalise the logics behind the disaffiliating moves observed.

The joint methodology proposed in this paper is a two-step process; if taken as stand-alone, the results may either yield information about the interactive phenomena that occurred in a given L2 classroom as regards the participants' actions and orientations (CA), or shed light on the possible reasons that led a participant, namely an L2 teacher ("C"), to act in the way she did (Stimulated Recall Interviews, SRI). However, it is by merging the two sets of results that the understanding of the equation principles-decisions-actions may be further increased, as regards CILT L2 teachers.

4. The research set-up: participants, contexts and procedures

The excerpts presented makes part of a larger corpus used as the supporting data for an ongoing research project whose results are due in 2010. The project focuses on the interactive, interpersonal and intrapersonal rapport-building strategies (Cicurel, 2005; Richards, 2006) displayed by L2 teachers in CILT classes of young adults. The corpus comprises classroom observations and SRI in four

CILT contexts: the University of Glasgow, the University of Sorbonne Nouvelle, and the Universities of Malaga and Almeria.

The excerpt was drawn from a University Pre-Entry class of young learners coming from Northern Africa, Eastern Europe, Middle-East and Asia (approximately a CEF B1 level). The class was taught by teacher C at the Language Centre of the University of Glasgow. C is a female teacher of English as a Foreign Language whose career goes back thirty years. She has been a teacher trainer and has taught English for different purposes (general, academic, professional) to learners with different backgrounds and needs in Britain and abroad (Eastern Europe, Middle-East and South America). As C explained during the SRI, the University of Glasgow is the ultimate judge as regards the learners' capacity to pursue their education. According to C, this put considerable pressure on learners, who often behaved in class as if they were auditioning.

Teacher C's classroom observations took place during the second fortnight of April 2007: three hours of audio-taped material were recorded. The choice to audio-record the lessons was made in accordance with the Head of the Language Centre. Subsequent video-taped fieldwork has made evident the insufficiencies of audio-recorded data: a whole kinaesthetic array of information is lost that is often crucial when accounting for participants' orientations. As regards the data presented here, the value of the commentaries produce during the SRI may make up for the likely insufficiencies of the audio-taped material. All through the data-gathering stage, the analyst remained a passive participant at all times during the observations; no measures were taken to evaluate the impact of the analyst's presence (Woods, 1996: 37). Upon completion of the transcripts, in March 2008, a series of SRIs was conducted. In preparation for the SRI, the analyst selected a number of transcripts presenting disaffiliating moves by teacher C and these were submitted to teacher C for commentary. C was requested to read the transcripts and listen to the original audio-clips. She was required to react to any aspects of the recordings or transcripts that might strike her. No further instructions were necessary: C commented frequently and generously on her own actions. C was also asked to correct any inaccuracies in the transcripts. The SRI with C was then audio-recorded and transcribed. No attention was paid to conversational phenomena, and only information was gathered.

5. Discussion

To avoid a cumbersome analysis, the excerpt will be broken down into four parts each of which will be followed by C's comments as she recalled the sequence during the SRI.

5.1. Discussion of data, part 1

```
 1   C:    so TODAY {carrying on with the theme} we're moving on to
 2         something that's a little bit less: less CHEERFUL (1.3)
 3         we're talking about when STRESS-affects-our live-and our
 4         work
 5         (0.6)
 6         in our XXX
 7         (0.2)
 8   FT:   {yes} (3.0)
 9         {it's cause} [many] {diseases}
10   C:              [yes ]
11         (1.0)
12   C:    WHAT↑
13         (0.2)
14   FT:   {it's cause} many {diseases} (0.5)
15         like hypertension=
16   C:               =hmm=
17   FT:                  =or headache
18   C:                      YES (2.8)
19         and:-HOW do you know this↑
20         (1.4)
21   FT:   how I know↑
22   C:          a-ha
23   AF:          I: read
24         (0.8)
25   C:    (.) a-ha (0.2) have you-have you yourself {suffered that
26         sort of things:}↑ + hyper[tension]
27   FT:                  [ y e s ] + when I (0.2) {go enter
28         in a kind of exam}↑ (0.4) (.) {my rate starts} (2.9)
29         {it's cause} #{all sorts}# [((chuckles))]
30   C:                      [ a – ha ] + ok: (0.4) do
31         you:-do you::- do you {do} the SAME thing↑ you-you-you st-
32         you ALWAYS have sTRESS before the eXAM:↑
33         (0.7)
34   FT:   YES
35   C:      a-ha
36         (0.9)
```

C introduces the topic ("stress", lines 1-6) to the group; learner FT aligns with the topic (line 8) and suggests one possible outcome ("diseases", line 9). A rather long silence comes next (line 11) that suggests C's inability to affiliate to FT's move at once; this is followed by C's clarification request (line 12), which confirms that the momentary intersubjectivity between C and FT is threatened. FT develops her original argument (lines 14-15 and 17) by giving examples of the element to which she has oriented ("diseases", lines 9 and 14); C formally affiliates to FT twice (lines 16 and 18). After another long silence (line 18) C requests FT to justify her action

Aguilar Río, J.I. 2010. "L2 teachers' disaffiliation from learners' actions: A joint conversation analysis & stimulated recall methodology proposal for L2 teachers' decision-making inquiry". *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 7: 9-29.

——— 15

(line 19); this suggests C cannot affiliate to FT's move as it is. After another long silence (line 20) FT asks C for confirmation (line 21); this suggests that FT is on her way to restore her intersubjectivity with C, who insists on having FT justify the source of her original actions (lines 9, 14-15 and 17). Intersubjectivity seems to be momentarily restored in these new terms (lines 21-23); C eventually affiliates to FT's original moves (line 25), which C integrates in a new request for clarification addressed to FT (lines 25-26). FT satisfies C's clarification request (lines 27-28); this is formally linked with FT's original move ("{it's cause}" line 29, but also 9 and 14). C pursues her affiliation to FT until the end of the excerpt (lines 30-35) with one last confirmation request by C (lines 30-32), satisfied by FT (line 34).

The first excerpt presents one disaffiliating move by C, in line 19. C commented the excerpt as follows:

> I am a bit surprised, I think, when this student says it cause many diseases because that's {what initially} what I thought, I suppose also because, when I think of disease, I think of cancer, so when I'm wondering what that particular student, what connection she's making [...] basically I think I'm saying you sound {as if} you have a lot of medical knowledge, so tell us, what you know, tell the class [...] I'm not just talking all the time but hoping that they will say something.

SRI commentaries 1

C's remarks regarding FT's action indicate that her surprise comes from the fact that FT has been able to give an accurate answer with virtually no eliciting taking place – "because that's {what initially} what I thought". FT's unexpected move leads C to evaluate the scope of the learner's answer – "I'm wondering what that particular student, what connection she's making". FT's competence to be a valid answer provider is also evaluated: "I think I'm saying you sound {as if} you have a lot of medical knowledge". C's silence in line 18 and her subsequent action in line 19 are described as attempts to elucidate FT's competence: "so tell us, what you know, tell the class".

In terms of C's decision-making, she shifts from a topic-introduction, pre-eliciting work, intended to involve as many learners as possible: "I'm not just talking all the time but hoping that they will say something", to concentrating on a single learner, whose answer has arrived rather fast, and in a somewhat unexpected manner. It cannot be assumed that this shift entails C's appealing to principles other than purely pedagogical. C's attempts to fit FT's answer into her original question-frame suggest: (a) her concern to observe the topic that she has introduced, and (b) her attempt to keep the group functioning together, either as an answer provider or as an answer evaluator – "tell the class".

5.2. Discussion of data, part 2

The sequence continues as follows:

```
37   BS:    this-eh: stress there's: many type of stress eh
38          {professional} is-eh: {lifestyle + change} + eh: stress-eh
39   C:     u-hu=
40   BS:      =become more (0.3) and there's-eh: {many} {indications}
41          to the stress-eh: now-it-has-increased-eh: heart-{rate} {a
42          HEART rate blood pressure}
43          (0.4)
44   C:     right
45   BS:       and-eh:=
46   C:            =ok=
47   BS:              =XXX {stroke}↑
48          (0.9)
49   C:     [s o]
50   BS:    [AND] high {blood pressure}
51   C:                      a-ha-{RIGHT} + you said + before
52          then↑
53          (0.2)
54   AF:    then-eh: stroke
55          (0.9)
56   C:     the: {brainstorm}↑ (0.7)
57   BS:              sTROKE↑ (0.3) XXX
58   C:                      a-a STROKE ok:
59          u-hu (0.6)
60          (.) so we GOT beFORE {EXAMS} you said also: (0.2) modern
61          lifestyle↑ + a-ha (1.4)
62          oth-oth-oth-other things↑ + that can contribute to
63          sTRESS::↑ + that can produce stress in us↑
64          (3.2)
```

Learner BS affiliates to C's original topic presentation: she orients to the topic in her own terms (lines 37-38, 40-42 and 45, 47). An orientation by BS ("heart rate", line 42) to an element previously introduced by learner FT is noticed ("{my rate starts", line 28, part 1). All through BS's opening moves, C displays formally affiliating moves (lines 39, 44, 46). After a rather long silence (line 48) come two overlapping moves: C's action may indicate her purpose either to open the interaction to the other participants or to move on (line 49); however, BS manages to keep the floor to develop her previous moves further (line 50). Subsequently, C formally affiliates to BS's last move (line 51), followed by a clarification request (lines 51-52). BS's reiterates (line 54) a previous action (line 47). After a rather long pause (line 55), C displays a reformulated clarification request (line 56): indeed, no participant has oriented to the element introduced by C so far ("{brainstorm}", line 56). After another rather long pause (line 56), BS orients to C's demand as

she repairs it (line 57), which seems to restore the intersubjectivity. C displays three consecutive formally affiliating moves (lines 58-59) before displaying a subsequent move that seems to link back with a previous false start ("so", line 49). C's move (lines 60-63) allows her (a) to link back with one of her previous orientations ("before the exam", line 32), that resulted from modifying one of FT's earlier moves ({"go enter in a kind of exam"}, lines 27-28) and (b) to affiliate partially ("modern lifestyle", lines 60-61) to one of BS's earlier moves ("lifestyle change", line 38); once again, C transforms BS's original move by adding an element to which no participant has previously oriented: "modern". Finally, C opens up the discussion by displaying an information request that does not seem to be directed to any specific participant (lines 62-63), and which no participant satisfies right away (long silence in line 64).

In this excerpt, C is seen to disaffiliate once: in line 48, she does not pursue the display of immediately previous short affiliating moves (lines 44 and 46); plus, because these short affiliating moves are tightly displayed and performed (lines 45-47), they seem to function as a structural announcement by C that she is taking back the floor. The strategy here seems to be to increase C's moves by limiting BS's. After a long silence (line 48), C initiates a move that suggests formally a detour ("so", line 49). C commented the excerpt as follows:

> I think what's happening here is {as always} somebody like FT is able to give a very concise answer and then the other {woman} [...] talking, talking, and show her medical knowledge and all the time I'm thinking on the one hand [...] I don't want to cut her off [...] but I'm always looking for {what kind of way we can get} back to the main theme [...] it's getting too medical, too technical [...] I didn't really want all that detail, so I'm sort of wondering what way can I reasonably stop her and get back on track.

SRI commentaries 2

Even though learner FT does not seem to have participated in excerpt two, the fact that C opens her remarks by referring to her: "somebody like FT is able to give a very concise answer", suggests an implicit comparison between BS's moves and those made by FT in excerpt one. Signs of affection can be seen in C's discourse as regards the choice of elements and its structure: "as always", "talking, talking". The implication seems to be that BS's moves are assessed as inappropriate. This assessment seems to be confirmed by C's subsequent commentaries: (a) regarding her current intention to regain the control of an interaction that has gone adrift: "{get} back to the main theme"; (b) as regards what can be possibly done in order to tackle BS, who seems to be perceived as responsible for the diversion: "I'm sort of wondering what way can I reasonably stop her and get back on track". C shows awareness as to which ways are not acceptable to deal with learner BS: "I don't want

to cut her off". The idea of having gone adrift is further confirmed by C's assessment of BS's recent moves – "it's getting too medical, too technical", as opposed to C's original plan: "I didn't really want all that detail. C's final remark indicates her intention to open up the debate: "at that point, it's a kind of a question mark, because I'm inviting them [...] I'm asking them to come up with more examples." It should be noted, however, that the medical orientation was introduced by learner FT earlier in the excerpt ("disease", lines 9 and 14; "hypertension", line 15; "headache", line 17, part 1); plus, learner BS has oriented to medical elements ("heart rate", line 41) to which FT seemed to orient previously ("{my rate starts}", line 28, part 1). Therefore, it does not seem accurate to suggest that the medical detour perceived to have taken place was operated by BS alone.

Regarding C's recall discourse, although some signs of emotion occur, it cannot be argued, as regards part two, that her moves correspond to principles other than the purely pedagogical: observing the topic and having the most learners participate still remain C's chief concerns. BS's behaviour as a potential threat to C's plan remains a subsidiary matter.

5.3. Discussion of data, part 3

```
65  BS:   maybe it's just the eh:: as the result of-from eh:
66        relationship of the peo-some people-{social stress}
67        (0.3)
68  C:    ok + u-hu
69        (0.9)
70  BS:   and:-eh: the:-eh: this-eh {social stress} may {lead} to:  +
71        eh: {psychotical crisis}-psychological disease + as
72        depression↑
73        (0.7)
74        (.) and another (0.2) eh: psychological disease ((banging
75        noise))
76        (0.6)
77  C:    so you got HEADACHES + dePRESSION + hyperTEN:SION
78  {AF}:                      [u h]
79  C:                         [any]
80        other:↑ (0.6)
81        MANIFESTIATIONS of sTRESS:↑
82        (0.3)
```

BS affiliates to C's previous demand (lines 65-66); BS orients to an element ("relationship", line 66), to which no participant has previously oriented. After a short silence (line 67), C formally affiliates to BS's move (line 68); this is followed

Aguilar Río, J.I. 2010. "L2 teachers' disaffiliation from learners' actions: A joint conversation analysis & stimulated recall methodology proposal for L2 teachers' decision-making inquiry". *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 7: 9-29.

——— 19

by a rather long silence (line 69). According to her subsequent action (lines 70-72), BS seems to interpret this long silence (line 69) as a demand to develop her argument. This pattern is repeated once again: after another rather long silence (line 73), BS displays a further, shorter move (74-75). These two moves serve to introduce new elements ("psychological disease", lines 71, and "depression", line 72), one of which is reiterated ("psychological disease", line 74). It should be noted that these new orientations partially renew an earlier orientation by learner FT ("{it's cause} many diseases", lines 9 and 14, part 1). After a further silence (line 76), C renews a seemingly transition formula ("so you got", line 77); C has already displayed this formula once ("so we got", line 60, part 2) and seems to have tried, but failed to, display it earlier before ("so", line 49, part 2). Notwithstanding the fact that C takes into account one of the elements ("depression", line 77) that BS has oriented to in her most recent moves ("depression", line 72), the "so you got" formula used by C (line 77) indicates a disaffiliating scheme insofar as the formula aims at opening the interaction to other participants, thus moving away from BS. After a brief overlapping (78-79) C attempts a new opening of the interaction (lines 79-81).

C's comments on lines 68 and 69: "I'm just trying to take it back to basic vocabulary they need to know" confirm her affiliating move described above, insofar as it indicates C's acknowledging the adequacy of the move displayed by BS. This is expressed in terms of the pedagogical appropriateness of the element introduced by BS ("relationship", line 66). C commented the excerpt as follows:

> I'm not quite sure whether, is this student, either she's not listening, {she's hearing something else in her brain} that just makes her want to {talk on that} or she's misunderstood the path that we've taken, or [...] she just wants to show [...] she may be thinking if I can contribute to everything on every subject then I'll show people how good my speaking is [...] is she just trying to show that she's a good {speaker} or has she quite not focused on what we're saying [...] I'm aware that at this point, apart from one comment from FT, this other student [...] is dominating and I keep hoping [...] that {other people will come in} but they're not [...] people just got fed up listening to this lady.

SRI commentaries 3

C's commentaries on excerpt three focus on assessing learner BS's behaviour, which C increasingly perceives as inappropriate: "either she's not listening, {she's hearing something else in her brain} that just makes her want to {talk on that} or she's misunderstood the path that we've taken". Moreover, BS's behaviour is implicitly described as potentially threatening to participants' intersubjectivity – "is

she just trying to show that she's a good {speaker} or has she quite not focused on what we're saying". Previous signs of emotion on C's recall-discourse get increasingly noticeable here: C's perceptions of learner BS are formulated as possible facts: "she may be thinking if I can contribute to everything on every subject then I'll show people how good my speaking is". There is one last piece of evidence indicating C's increasing emotions as she recalls the event. Instead of using one of the two rather neutral formula previously used to address learner BS: "woman" and "student", C uses a seemingly emotion-laden one: "lady" as she commented on the (perceived) effect learner BS's behaviour is having on the rest of participants: "people just got fed up listening to this lady". Although this may not be taken as reliable proof of C's original state of mind during the event, it remains a valid emotional indicator of C's reaction as she recalled it (cf. Pomerantz, 2005: 95).

As far as decision-making is concerned, C is seen to discard learner BS's contributions as not appropriate in part 3; C's increasingly identifying learner BS's contributions as inappropriate leads her to ponder (a) why learner BS keeps coming up with off sided arguments; (b) how to deal effectively with BS.

5.4. Discussion of data, part 4

The sequence ends as follows:

```
83   AF1:    XXX: (0.6)
84        XXX
85   EM:   sometimes depression-eh
86        (0.5)
87   C:   u-hu yes a-ha=
88   BS:          ={but-eh} maybe eh: the: (0.2) {in} the case
89        of the stress-eh: (0.2) become more for-eh this-eh person
90        and {becomes} {shizophrenia}↑ (0.5)
91        and-eh-some-another-eh:-[{the:-tension}]
92   C:              [b e C O M E: ↑]
93   BS: {shiz}–{sh}-{shizophre{l}ia} {(.)} (0.9)
94        {shi}-eh:=
95   {C}:        =[sh:::]
96   {EM}:        =[shizo]
97   BS:            {shi[zophre]{l}ia}
98   C:                [X  X X]
99        (1.0)
100  BS: EH↑:-eh:: (0.2) {the} person become ((trembling voice)) BAH:::-
101       eh-and the PERSONAlity-eh-psychological disease-and the
102       personality {abnormal}
103  C:                (({board}, 0.7)) °ok°=
```

Aguilar Río, J.I. 2010. "L2 teachers' disaffiliation from learners' actions: A joint conversation analysis & stimulated recall methodology proposal for L2 teachers' decision-making inquiry". *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 7: 9-29.

———— 21

```
104  BS:                              ={shi}-{shizophrelia}
105       (0.6)
106  C:   (({board}, 3.6)) ehm:-{#schizo#phre#nia#} (1.8)
107       schizophrenia↑ (({marker}, 1.0))
108  BS:                      {schizo}↑
109       (0.3)
110  C:   schizophrenia↑-wh-what's the best way to describe↑ (0.4)
111       someone who's suffering from schizophrenia
112       (0.8)
113  BS:  {maybe}-f:rom:-depression XXX becomes XXX
114       eh:-depression↑=
115  C:            =u-hu=
116  BS:              ={comes}↑-eh-{shizophre{l}ia}=
117  C:                          =a-ha (0.6)
118       BUT FOR:-for an ordinary person-who didn't know the MEDICAL
119       term (0.4) (.) how would you exPLAIN↑
120       (0.7)
121  BS: eh: {it's} a medical ter-eh::-hmm-eh: the person-and-eh:-person
122       be:-come ab-normal-as-eh-the two:-eh {(.)}
123       different-eh-uh-eh::-beHAVIOUR↑
124  C:                      right + ok↑ + [yes]
125  BS:                                  [eh:]
126       (0.4)
127  C:   (.) so you COULD-SAY: (0.8)
128       would-would you:-would you agree that it could be something
129       like THAT↑ + to: (0.7)
130       to exPLAIN IT↑
131  BS:       {split} person
132  C:            you have: [a {s}plit personality↑ +
133  BS:                     [pers]
134  C:   a-ha (0.4) ok↑-u-hu (.) RELATIONSHIPS↑ + wh-what kind of
135       relationships may-cause stress:↑ (0.9)
```

Learner AF1 seemingly orients to C's previous completion demand (lines 83 and 84). Learner EM then takes the floor to orient to C's demand by affiliating back (line 85) to one of learner BS's previous moves ("depression", line 72, part 3). After an average pause (line 86) C affiliates to learner EM's move (line 87). Learner BS displays immediately a new move (lines 88-91): BS's use of "but" (line 88) may indicate that she partially disorients from the other participants' actions in order to keep the floor; in turn, this partial disorientation allows her to plead ("maybe", line 88) for the suitability of her current move, which eventually leads to introducing a new element ("schizophrenia", line 90), to which no participant has oriented so far. C and BS dwell on BS's newly introduced element for a while: C's overlapped

clarification demand (line 92) indicates her perception that the intersubjectivity is being momentarily threatened due to BS's mispronunciation (line 90). BS orients to C's repair (line 93) somewhat hesitantly, and seemingly incapable to perform adequately. After a long silence (line 93) BS delivers a false starter (line 94) that suggests her performance is getting more uncertain. C and EM take then the floor simultaneously: C's move (line 95) may function as a cue for BS, or she may be trying to work out BS's introduced element. As for EM, she echoes BS's last move (line 96). BS tries once again to validate her orientation (line 97); this is followed by a long silence (line 99). BS's subsequent move (lines 100-102) indicates her purpose to avoid concentrating on the seemingly formal problems, as regards the pronunciation of the element she has introduced; instead, BS's move attempts to deal with the momentary lack of intersubjectivity by attempting a paraphrase of "schizophrenia". The data show no indication of C orienting to or disorienting from BS's paraphrasing. C writes something on the board (lines 103, 106) and this allows her to get the floor and to open the interaction to the rest of participants (line 106-107). BS's move immediately previous to C's board-work (line 104) indicates that she orients to the faulty delivery of "schizophrenia"; BS's mispronunciation is later partially repaired (line 108), after C has focused on the form of this element. Once the attempted pronunciation has been achieved, C addresses the group in order to find an explanation for the element "schizophrenia" (lines 110-111). After a rather long silence (line 112), learner BS displays a new move to satisfy C's demand (lines 113-114); BS suggests an element to which she has previously oriented ("depression", line 72, part 3). A tight and fast sequence is followed: it consists of short, formal affiliating moves by C, and short move-developments by BS (lines 114-117); this is reminiscent of a previous similar sequence between BS and C (lines 45-47, excerpt 2). BS orients once more to the element she has introduced, which she mispronounces again (line 116); C's short and fast, seemingly affiliating moves (lines 115 and 117) allow her to keep the floor; she renews her clarification demand (lines 119) by introducing a condition (lines 118-119) that performs two functions: (a) it allows her to disaffiliate from BS's previous attempts to define "schizophrenia"; (b) it pre-shapes, thus constrains, BS's possible next moves, insofar as it explicitly indicates the type of orientation C is expecting. A rather long silence follows (line 120) after which BS attempts yet another move (lines 121-123); this move presents false starters and recurrent hesitation; it allows BS to introduce a new element ("behaviour", line 123). C seems to affiliate to BS's immediately previous move right away (line 124); however, C affiliates to neither the preceding element ("behaviour"), nor any of the earlier ones ("depression", "schizophrenia", "abnormal") to which BS has so far oriented. Instead, C predefines BS's possible next move in terms of a ready-made response (line 127-130) that seems to refer to something C has written on the board ("it could be something like that", lines

Aguilar Río, J.I. 2010. "L2 teachers' disaffiliation from learners' actions: A joint conversation analysis & stimulated recall methodology proposal for L2 teachers' decision-making inquiry". *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 7: 9-29.

———— 23

128-129). C does not seem to wait for BS's confirmation (line 132), after which she displays a new attempt to open the interaction to the rest of the participants (lines 134-135). This attempt leads C to orient to an element ("relationships", line 134) originally introduced by BS (line 66, excerpt 3). The passage concludes here.

A disaffiliating mood is perceived throughout part 4: BS's proposal of "schizophrenia" is rather systematically reframed by C, either by having BS and the group focus on its pronunciation (lines 95-110), or by having BS and the group give a satisfying definition for it (lines 110-132). C commented the excerpt as follows:

> this is EM, who has produced a word, and I thought great [...] finally we're getting somewhere, and then, our medical friend comes back with her medical diagnosis [...] notice the way she takes command again [...] I think then probably I've put that word on the board so that [...] everybody can understand what this student is saying [...] because I've got this word on the board I'm thinking what do I do with this word [...] asking her to describe it, which would at least give her a much more limited task, I hope rather than XXX and also explain for the students who may have got XXX they may have no idea what's happening [...] because we've had all these medical {diagnoses}, I'm trying to remind her this is a classroom with lots of different people, that none of us is a specialist apart from you, so try to give us and ordinary everyday explanation of this word [...] as a lead-in this is a lot longer than I would normally do [...] because it has got hijacked by this one student [...] I'm trying to get an agreement or I'm trying to get her to reformulate the sentence [...] I don't want to give the explanation [...] I want her to do it, but it's trying to coax her [...] to give one fairly simple straight forward non-technical explanation [...] I've changed the topic {completely} not as much change the topic but I thought [...] I'll try now to {plan} another theme to do {with} stress so that it doesn't seem to obvious [...] it was coming back to what I was hoping for".

SRI commentaries 4

C's comments on learner EM's attempt to participate in the exchange as being aborted by learner BS: "our medical friend comes back with her medical diagnosis". C seemed to perceive that the gap between BS's moves and her plans asked for her to remedy the situation right away: "asking her to describe it, which would at least give her a much more limited task". C's original purpose was still present: "as a lead-in this is a lot longer than I would normally do"; plus, C's use of the board indicates that, however demanding the negotiation with BS may be, she did not forget about trying to engage the rest of the group: "I've put that word on the board so that [...] everybody can understand what this student is saying". Learner BS is made responsible for the unexpected detour that C's planned lead-in has taken: "it has got hijacked by this one student". C opts to impose her criterion in order for

the lesson to be resumed as planned: "I think I ended up thinking I'm not going to get much from her [...] and I ended up saying it partly because I wanted to get on back to the track of the stress and because I thought my attempt to coax her {is not really working}". Finally, C acknowledges her decision to take a detour in order to go back to the path she had in mind: "I've changed the topic {completely} not as much change the topic but I thought [...] I'll try now to {plan} another theme to do {with} stress so that it doesn't seem to obvious [...] it was coming back to what I was hoping for".

6. Conclusion

The data presented illustrate a situation of CILT: teacher C had to decide interactively about the adequateness of some of the contributions made by learners; these were evaluated in terms of their compliance with the possible courses that C had planned. As C attempted to incorporate learner BS's contributions into the collective discourse, she had to make decisions concerning both the contributions and the contributor: at first, these decisions were identified as originating from pedagogic principles: topic observance, and participants' inclusion within the discussion. C's analysis of her own actions revealed signs of emotion as regards learner BS and her contributions; signs of emotion persisted along with indicators of pedagogical principles. According to C's analysis of her actions, both elements worked as co-agents leading her to shut off BS in order to resume the lesson as planned.

Pedagogical principles have been described as guidelines that assist teachers in their decision-making processes in class. Whenever a decision needs be made, different, maybe mutually exclusive, courses of action are considered; the ability to consider several courses of action indicates an awareness of the possible, inadequate, appropriate and impossible actions that may be implemented in the course of a lesson, regarding an unexpected, maybe problematic, element. As regards teachers' decision-making in CILT, it may not be adequate to characterise decisions as being either good or bad: it may be more appropriate to consider decisions that, once made, may – or may not – favour, directly or indirectly, learners' opportunities to L2 learn. Equal opportunities in CILT are sometimes difficult to grasp. Accounting for one learner's needs and creativity may at times mean not being able to account for the rest of learners.

Locating instances of disaffiliation seems to be an efficient enough guide to isolate areas of CILT L2 teachers' discourse where decision-making processes occur. Whenever possible, SRI should take place shortly after the original event: the smaller the gap between the two, the richer the recall may be and the more the SRI-

Aguilar Río, J.I. 2010. "L2 teachers' disaffiliation from learners' actions: A joint conversation analysis & stimulated recall methodology proposal for L2 teachers' decision-making inquiry". *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 7: 9-29.

——— 25

generated data may be taken as reliable. Caution must be used when considering the validity of SRI-generated data as new emotions may arise during SRI that do not relate to the emotions in the original event. According to Pomerantz (2005: 112), SRI-generated data may (a) suggest "places in the interaction for close investigation"; (b) "help us to understand the bases of puzzling patterns of interactive conduct"; (c) "serve as correctives of inferences"; (d) "serve as confirmatory evidence for claims"; (e) "lead us to investigate possible instances of conduct".

Further research on L2 teachers' decision-making processes should compare how different teachers, in different situations, with different groups and different backgrounds, comment on their decisions: having teachers confront their own classroom decisions and their visible consequences may help to draw more a complete description of specific L2 teachers' styles (Cicurel, 2005: 7-8). Consequently, this may help to determine the scope of pedagogical principles as regards L2 teachers' decision-making. Ultimately, integrating the analyses and the interpretations of the rest of participants' actions, namely the learners, may yield more a complete picture of L2 teachers' decision making processes and of their consequences.

7. Annexes

7.1. *Transcript convention*

C̲: teacher `BS EM, FT, AF1`: learners `(0.2)`: silence measured in tenth of seconds +: silence shorter than (0.2) seconds `:, :, ::::` syllable progressively lengthened ↑: rising intonation `(.)`: breath intake `((fragment))`: analyst's commentary, additional information	`[Fragment]` `[Fragment]`: overlapping turns `FRAGMENT`: loud utterance `Frag-ment`: self-correction, hesitation, `{fragment}`: analyst is uncertain `°fragment°`: whispering `#fragment#`: laughter while speaking `XXX`: incomprehensible

8. Acknowledgments

9. References

Antaki, C. and S. Widdicombe (ed.) 1998. *Identities in Talk*. London: SAGE.

Atkinson, J. M. and J. Heritage (eds) 1994 [1984]. *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Block, D. 2003. *The Social Turn in Second Language Acquisition*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Borg, S. 1999. "The use of grammatical terminology in the second language classroom: a qualitative study of teachers' practices and cognitions". *Applied Linguistics* 20: 95-126.

_____. 2003. "Teacher cognition in language teaching: a review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do". *Language Teaching* 36: 81-109.

Breen, M. P., B. Hird, M. Milton, R. Oliver, A. Thwaite 2001. "Making sense of language teaching teachers' principles and classroom practices". *Applied Linguistics* 22: 470-501.

Cambra Giné, M. 2003. *Une approche ethnographique de la classe de langue*. Paris: Crédif-Didier.

Cicurel, F. 2002. "La classe de langue : un lieu ordinaire, une interaction complexe". *AILE* 16: 145-163.

_____. 2005. "La flexibilité communicative : un atout pour la construction de l'agir enseignant". *Le Français dans le Monde : Recherches et Applications*: 145-164.

Clifton, J. 2006. "Facilitator talk". *ELT Journal* 60: 142-150.

Cullen, R. 1998. "Teacher talk and the classroom context". *ELT Journal* 52: 179-187.

_____. 2002. "Supportive teacher talk: the importance of the F-move". *ELT Journal* 56: 117-127.

Dewaele, J. M. 2005. "Investigating the psychological and emotional dimensions in instructed language learning: obstacles and possibilities". *The Modern Language Journal* 89: 367-380.

Ellis, R. 1997. *SLA Resarch and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Hall, J. K. 2007. Redressing the roles of correction and repair in research on second and foreign language learning". *The Modern Language Journal* 91: 511-526.

Leinhardt, G. & Greeno, J. 1986. "The cognitive skill of teaching". *Journal of Educational Psychology* 78: 75-95.

Markee, N. 2000. *Conversation Analysis*. Mahwah: LEA.

Markee, N. and G. Kasper 2004. "Classroom talks: an introduction". *The Modern Language Journal* 88: 491-500.

Mondada, L. and S. Pekarek Doehler 2004. "Second language acquisition as situated practice: task accomplishment in the French second language classroom". *The Modern Language Journal* 88: 501-518.

Narcy-Combes, J. P. 2005. *Didactique des langues et TIC : vers une recherche-action responsable*. Paris: Ophrys.

Pica, T. 1987. "Second-language acquisition, social interaction, and the classroom". *Applied Linguistics* 8: 3-21.

Pomerantz, A. 1994. "Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes". In J. M. Heritage and J. Atkinson (eds) 1994. *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Pres: 57-101

_____. 2005. "Using participants' video stimulated comments to complement analyses of interactional practices". In H. T. Molder and J. Potter (eds) 2005. *Conversation and Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 93-113

Richards, K. 2006. "'Being the teacher': identity and classroom conversation". *Applied Linguistics* 27: 51-77.

Seedhouse, P. 1996. "Classroom interaction: possibilities and impossibilities". *ELT Journal* 50: 16-24.

_____. 2004. *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Blackwell.

Smith, D. B. 1996. "Teacher decision making in the adult ESL classroom". In D. Freeman and J. C. Richards (ed.) 1996. *Teacher Learning in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 197-216.

Ten Have, P. 2007 [1999]. *Doing Conversational Analysis: A Practical Guide*. London: Sage.

Van Lier, L. 1988. *The Classroom and the Language Learner*. Essex: Longman.

Van Lier, L. 1996. *Interaction in the language curriculum: awareness, autonomy & authenticity*. London and New York: Longman.

Walsh, S. 2002. "Construction or obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom". *Language Teaching Research* 6: 3-23.

Woods, D. 1996. *Teacher Cognition in Language Teaching: Beliefs, decision-making and classroom practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aguilar Río, J.I. 2010. "L2 teachers' disaffiliation from learners' actions: A joint conversation analysis & stimulated recall methodology proposal for L2 teachers' decision-making inquiry". *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 7: 9-29.

29