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ABSTRACT
The purpose of the research reported in this monograph has been twofold. First, it aims at contributing to an inquiry of the ways in which language and context are intertwined. Second, it aims at giving a characterization of a specific communicative event, second language teaching.

The study starts out from a broad social-theoretical perspective, inspired by language game theory and ethnomethodology, as well as Goffman's (1974) 'frame analysis' and the work of Ragnar Rommetveit (1974, 1987). Levinson's (1979) notion 'activity type' is used in exploring how relevance criteria and frames of interpretation vary with the context of the activity in which language is used.

The empirical material for the study consists of eight dyadic lessons of Swedish as a second language in grades 4-6 of the Swedish comprehensive, compulsory school. As material for comparison, the pupils, 10-12 year old boys from the Middle East, also participate in two non-didactic conversations around tasks defined by the research team, one together with his teacher of Swedish, one together with a class-mate of his.

The first of the three empirical studies is a qualitative, discursive analysis of salient dialogue processes in language teaching activities. Abrupt shifts and breaks in the dialogue, misunderstandings, and lack of tuning between the conversational parties are interpreted as results of a tension between language at two levels in the language lesson. The dialogue in the language lessons of the corpus is characterized by an ambivalence between two perspectives on language, the ordinary, everyday perspective on language as a means for constructing and conveying messages versus the 'level 2 perspective', where language is seen as an abstract system of decontextualized linguistic items.

The two other empirical studies are quantitatively oriented. In the first of these, important differences in dialogue processes, concerning dynamics, coherence and fluency are found between the lessons and the non-didactic conversations, as well as between different activities within the confines of a lesson. One of the most important results is that the teacher's interactional dominance seems to be systematically related to the content of lesson activities. The results of the last study suggest that in lessons, and especially language lessons proper, the pupil is given fewer opportunities for talking and, also, that he refrains from taking the opportunities actually given to him.

The main significance of the research is the demonstration of the dynamic character of linguistic communication and of the way in which linguistic meaning is the product of utterances being embedded in activities on which activity-specific premisses for communication are brought to bear. Also, the second language teaching situation is characterized as connected with particular communicative practices that are imbued with a certain degree of ambivalence and ambiguity.
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Lennart Gustavsson
INTRODUCTION

Second language instruction — some preliminary remarks

Until a couple of decades ago, Sweden was — compared to many other nations in Western Europe — ethnically and linguistically relatively homogeneous. In schools, Swedish was taught as a mother tongue — the subject carried precisely the name of "mother tongue" (Sw.: modersmål). Modern languages, principally English, German and French, were taught as foreign languages. The traditional models for language instruction, then, consist of, on the one hand, "culturally motivated" foreign language teaching, and, on the other hand, mother tongue instruction that takes as its point of departure the fact that the pupils have already acquired the language "the natural way".

Today, the picture is radically different. Swedish is now taught also as a second language to thousands of immigrant children. This teaching situation shares properties both with that of Swedish as a mother tongue and that of foreign language teaching, but is certainly far from identical to either of them. Like the foreign languages traditionally taught, Swedish is taught in a formal school setting to pupils who do not have it as their mother tongue. However, that's about the only similarity there is between the traditional foreign language teaching and second language teaching. Firstly, the goals in second language teaching are tremendously more ambitious. Secondly — and this is precisely what the distinction foreign vs second language is supposed to capture — a second language is taught, learnt and/or acquired in an environment where the target language is used as the dominant, official language.

In the two points mentioned, second language instruction is rather to be compared with mother tongue instruction. Unlike mother tongue teaching, however, the second language teaching cannot rely on the pupils' previous acquisition of the language — though the "formal learning" can be supposed to go with "natural acquisition" to a radically greater extent than in the case of foreign language learning.

These are, in very broad terms, some important characteristics of the situation under scrutiny in the present study. Before leaving this section of preliminary remarks, it should be pointed out that different countries may have adopted different policies for the second language instruction of immigrant children. In the Swedish compulsory school, second language instruction is obligatory for every pupil who, according to the standards set up by the school authorities, is in need of such instruction.
A brief introduction to the general perspective of the study

This study concerns communication connected with second language instruction. It contains an inquiry into a few problematic features of second language lessons as an activity type, as a communicative event — in comparison with non-didactic, non-language-centered conversations with the same participants. In this introductory chapter, only a broad overview will be given of the general perspective in which the study has been pursued, as well as a very brief introduction to the main themes that will be elaborated on later.

One basic assumption, on which the study rests, is that language is not context independent, i.e. that language and language use must be understood in relation to the activities of which they are integrated parts. Each type of situation involves activity specific premises for communication; what people say, how this is said, how it is interpreted and meant to be interpreted, is related to the different purposes, the culturally determined, but to a certain extent also individually shaped expectancies and relevance criteria that communicators have as they enter any communication situation.

Linguistic activity is situated, i.e. language use takes place under concrete circumstances within the frames of particular activities to which language typically serves as a means, a support and, at the same time, as a constitutive element. Situational factors, the purpose of the activity, the time and place where the activity takes place, the role configuration connected with it etc, will determine to a large extent what kind of language is used, what it is used for and how it is used. The contextual anchorage of language is, however, not unidirectional in such a way that language is entirely determined by external, situational factors. The relation between language and contexts of use is a reflexive one: language also plays a part in building up situations, contexts and activities. The language teaching situation certainly is no exception in this respect. The language use during a language lesson is determined by objective factors of the situation in which it takes place and, reflexively, particular uses of language constitute a language lesson.

The basic distinctive feature of an activity is its purpose. Thus, what primarily characterizes lessons as an activity type is the purpose of teaching, i.e. the explicit, superordinate aim of promoting learning. (There are clearly numerous other situations that promote learning; what distinguishes teaching from those situations is precisely whether the aim of promoting learning is superordinate or not.) Language lessons are a subclass of lessons, distinguished from other subclasses by the content of the teaching. In the language lesson, language is not only a means for carrying out the activity, it is also the material around which the activity gravitates. This is the very point at which language instruction becomes interesting for the purpose of this study.

The study starts out from a general assumption that, in language teaching, language is typically treated as an abstract, decontextualized entity, codified and objectified in grammars, dictionaries and readers. This may perhaps or partially be the result of a tradition, tacitly taken for granted or explicitly based on linguistic theory, or an inevitable consequence of language being placed in focus
in its own right, thus not serving merely as a means for other goals — for the present the question is left open. In this respect, however, language teaching is placed at a point where two cultural domains converge: on the one hand that of education, which seems in general to engender abstraction, reification and an attitude of distant observation, on the other hand that of linguistics, in which language is traditionally conceptualized in terms of an abstract, reified structure.

Thus, language in a language lesson, as the principal means for carrying out the activity, is inevitably bound to the specific context as is every use of language. At the same time, for language as the content of the lesson, as the subject matter being taught, there is typically a striving for decontextualization and abstraction from concrete situations of use. Here we find the first problematic feature of language teaching to be examined in this study, the decontextualization paradox:

Decontextualized language — language viewed, taught, presented in readers, examples and exercises as structure and form — is connected with certain specific types of contexts; it shows up in contexts such as that of teaching.

Secondly, the language lesson is treated in this study as a type of communication situation, which, due to the context dependent nature of language, will promote certain uses of language and inhibit others. Obviously, the aim of language teaching is to enable the pupil to handle a wide range of communicative situations where the target language is needed, the teaching situation itself being but one and probably not the most important. Still, it is unavoidable that the teaching situation rests upon its own grounds, situational parameters that are proper to it and that it does not share entirely with any other type of activity. This leads to the naturalness paradox:

What is natural (use of) language in a teaching situation tends to be more or less unnatural in those target situations for which the teaching prepares, and vice versa.

If one accepts these two fundamental hypotheses about the nature of language instruction, the decontextualization paradox and the naturalness paradox, several empirical questions suggest themselves to be examined:

— With regard to the decontextualization paradox: what are the repercussions of the tension between, on the one hand, language as decontextualized, abstract structure, and, on the other hand, the concrete context of the language lesson and the natural attitude to language as a means for conveying messages within the frames of an ongoing activity? A main hypothesis of this study is that communicative dysfluencies during lessons can be explained with reference to the decontextualization hypothesis.

1 Independently of my first formulation of this paradox (Gustavsson, 1983b; see also Gustavsson, 1985b), it has been put forward in roughly the same way by Lörscher (1986). Cf also Edmondson (1981:28, 1985:162).
With regard to the naturalness paradox: what are the characteristics of the language used in language teaching, what are the specific uses of language and the specific discourse patterns connected with language teaching? Another general hypothesis is that changes in activities from language lessons to non-didactic activities and changes in activities within the frame of a lesson will be systematically related to variation in interactional patterns and dialogue characteristics.

The aim of the present study is twofold. On the one hand, it should contribute to the inquiry of the ways in which language and contextual features are intertwined and interdependent. On the other hand, it should provide a thorough description of the language lesson as a communicative event.

3 Outline of the thesis

In chapter II, the theoretical background for the present enterprise will be outlined and its relation to neighbouring research areas, such as research on language use in schools and classrooms in general and second language teaching in particular, will be described.

The corpus of the study consists of eight lessons of Swedish as a second language, more precisely eight teacher-pupil dyads, eight non-didactic conversations with the same two participants, i.e. the teacher and the pupil, a 10-12 year old immigrant boy, and eight conversations that the pupil participates in together with a class-mate of his own choice. In chapter III, the empirical data are presented in detail.

Chapter IV is devoted to a qualitative analysis of salient dialogue processes that occur specifically in language teaching activities where the primary focus is on language itself. The problem of separating two levels of language in the language lesson — the language actually used versus the language talked about — is investigated. Taking as the point of departure the way language is talked about during the eight lessons of the corpus, a description is also given of the language lesson as a specific cultural domain, as a minor ‘province of meaning’ (Schutz, 1962).

Chapter V contains the presentation of a method for conversation analysis — the Initiative-Response Analysis (Linell & Gustavsson, 1987) — and its application to the eight lessons, under comparison with the non-didactic communicative situations belonging to the empirical material of the study. The quantitatively oriented analysis aims at describing the dynamics and coherence of the dialogue in different activity types and special interest is devoted to dominance in interaction.

In chapter VI, the pupil’s opportunities to talk under various premisses for communication are investigated and a special study is made of question-answer patterns in lessons and non-didactic conversations between the pupil and the teacher.

The results are summed up and discussed in chapter VII.
II THEORY AND BACKGROUND

1 Theoretical foundations

1.1 Language as a social phenomenon

In this study I shall be preoccupied with the way in which tacitly held premises for communication are overtly manifested in interaction and dialogue, both through what is said and through the way it is said. In so doing, I shall insist upon the necessity for the study of linguistic communication of taking into account the context in which language is embedded. The focus of the study is on linguistic means of communication (as opposed to e.g. cognitive processes or various types of non-verbal communication). Still, a theoretical cornerstone on which the study rests is that language is an integral part of human communicative devices, albeit an especially important one.

It then becomes apparent that — for the present purpose — theories of linguistics in a narrow sense are not a sufficient basis. As pointed out by many (for recent discussion and criticism by scholars with their background in various disciplines see e.g. Bourdieu, 1982; Harris, 1980, 1981; Rommetveit, 1980, 1983, 1987a, b), linguistic theories traditionally underemphasize — to say the least — the social character of language, and instead they focus on structural relations within language conceptualized as an autonomous, abstract system. Furthermore, this orientation tends to be connected with a view of language that is oriented towards written language (Harris, 1980; Rommetveit, 1988); traditional linguistics has a "written language bias" (Linnell, 1982). As Levinson (1983) points out, this criticism can also be raised against linguistically inspired work in discourse analysis, where the concept of language as a static product rather than a dynamic process (cf Brown & Yule, 1983a) has been carried along also when attempts have been made to overcome the traditional restriction in linguistics to idealized data in the form of isolated, fabricated sentences.

Hence, theoretical foundations for a study of language as it appears in concrete communicative behaviour in specific contexts, especially spoken interaction, must be sought elsewhere. Such sources of inspiration for the present study are language game theory, social constructivist theory, ethnomethodology and other attempts to place the study of language in a social perspective (Rommetveit, 1974, 1980, 1983, 1987a, b, 1988; Goffman, 1974, 1981). Obviously, the common denominator of these various theoretical frameworks is the fundamental assumption that language, as a means of communication, is socially constructed and organized as to its form and meaning and therefore must be understood with reference to actors, their goals and the settings in
which they find themselves. The setting also includes the participants' more or less subjective assumptions and conceptions about what is going on; Goffman (1974:106) defines his central notion 'frame' as "principles of organization which govern events and our subjective involvement in them" (italics mine).

All this can be summarized as the context dependence of language. Now the notion of context is used in a variety of different ways in literature, and plays an important role in several disciplines. However central it may be to the analysis of language and communication, it has proved difficult to give a formal definition (for a discussion from the point of view of psychology, see Clark & Carlson, 1981; for considerations more akin to the spirit of the present study, see Rogoff, 1984). Partly, this is why what has been said up to now about the contextual embeddedness of language may appear as extremely abstract. Still, even on this level of abstraction, emphasis on context in the study of language may demarcate the theoretical framework from much work in the language sciences.

However, even within the different lines of thought where the need for taking context into account is taken for granted, there is room for divergences and controversies. This goes for differing theoretical conceptions of the exact nature of context, e.g. how broad a context that will have to be accounted for, as well as for methodology, i.e. concerning the most fruitful ways of going about concrete studies. Two dimensions where such divergencies are at hand have to be mentioned in order to determine the position of the present enterprise. First, we have a divergence between scholars who maintain that context must be conceived of in a wide sense, e.g. the context of an institution or a subculture, and that more global ethnographic knowledge of the specific setting is a prerequisite for understanding what actually goes on in a particular interaction. A proponent for such a view is Cicourel (1981) who criticizes the school of "conversation analysis" ("CA") for neglecting superordinate social structures, thereby losing sight of their influence on interaction. "CA" as initiated by Sachs and developed, among others, by Schegloff (see Heritage, 1985), on the other hand, concentrates on interaction itself and programatically leaves aside considerations of larger social structures. This is reflected also in "CA"'s insistence on "ordinary conversation" as the primary field of inquiry, which has to be uncovered in detail before investigations of institutional contexts become meaningful; "ordinary conversation" is taken to be the baseline and institutional discourse mainly seen as deviances, as the products of subjecting interaction to particular sorts of constraints on e.g. turn-taking, topic selection etc (Heritage, 1985; Schegloff, 1987).

Second, there is a methodological divergence between detailed qualitative analysis on the one hand, which until now has been "CA"'s unique preoccupation, and, on the other hand, the aim of describing general patterns by means of coding and categorizing (possibly summarizing results in quantitative terms), making available comparisons between, and within, specific corpora. The importance of these controversies should not be underestimated — when radical positions are taken in either dimension there is incompatibility of perspectives, even though, as I started by pointing out, there is a fundamental agreement in sufficiently abstract terms upon the impossibility of studying language in vacuo. In the present study, I shall try to overcome such possible incompati-
bilities by taking (the somewhat eclectic) standpoint that the ecology of communication, the ethnographic knowledge, must not be ignored, even if focus very clearly is on the interaction itself. So, though the characteristics of school and education as a societal institution, as a 'system of activities' in Leontiev's (1981) terms, will not be discussed at all in this particular study, this should not be seen as a programmatic neglect but rather as a choice of focus. Secondly, both qualitative and quantitative analyses will be used. Thus, though similarly concentrated on fine details of conversation, the work cannot, in either of these aspects, be seen to adhere to the tradition of conversational analysis of an orthodox ethnomethodological kind. Nevertheless, inspiration from ethnomethodology is of utmost importance for the way research questions have been posed and the way the study has been carried out, namely if ethnomethodology is taken in a sufficiently broad sense and particularly as its main themes have been outlined by Heritage (1984).

Another source of inspiration is language game theory, which has sprung from the later Wittgenstein's thinking. As Severinson Eklundh (1983) puts it, the notion of language game is a natural unit in the analysis of discourse by its emphasis on the goal-directed and reciprocal nature of communicators' actions in socially defined and delimited activities. This view on language is an important feature in the make-up of this study in general, and in particular through the way it underlies the method for conversation analysis presented and used in chapter V.

In the ethnomethodological tradition we find a conception of social phenomena, one of which is clearly language, that share many fundamental assumptions with language game theory. The point to which there is convergence in substance between language game theory and ethnomethodology appears in the following quotation from Heritage (1984:139f):

understanding language is not to be regarded as a matter of 'cracking a code' which contains a set of pre-established descriptive terms combined, by the rules of grammar, to yield sentence meanings which express propositions about the world. Understanding language is not, in the first instance, a matter of understanding sentences but of understanding actions — utterances — which are constructively interpreted in relation to their contexts. This involves viewing an utterance against a background of who said it, where and when, what was being accomplished by saying it and in the light of what possible considerations and in virtue of what motives it was said. An utterance is thus the starting point for a complicated process of interpretative inference rather than something that can be treated as self-subsistently intelligible.

Although I start out from the standpoint that contextual factors actually come into play at several levels in the process of communication, there is no need to enumerate all these factors from the outset, nor to disentangle their complex interrelationships as a preliminary to the study of how language and context are intertwined (cf Ahrenberg, 1987:72ff; see also Erickson & Shultz, 1981, who raise the question "when is a context?"). If, instead, we consider that the contextual anchorage of linguistic utterances has to be continuously displayed in interaction and therefore is available to the analyst when data consists of actual
dialogues in their natural settings (cf Levinson, 1983:321), we may remain within what Reichenbach (1938) labelled 'the context of discovery' (see Saljö, 1982:59). Taking as the field of inquiry a socially constituted, intuitively well-known activity type such as second language teaching (a subclass of "a paradigm example", see citation from Levinson below), we are able to investigate empirically the emergent relation between, on the one hand, activity specific circumstances and, on the other hand, forms and patterns of language use. This should make it possible to give a precise account of the specific activity type(s) investigated by uncovering some of the ways in which the linguistic utterances that constitute the activity interact with features of the surrounding context for their design, interpretation and function and thus, how the language teaching situation is acted out and sustained "in and through the talk" (Heritage, 1984:283). In line with Levinson's (1979:393) conclusion: "a full understanding of the ways language usage is inextricably entangled with social activities will require the description of a heterogeneous mass of arbitrarily varied, culturally determined language games", such a study may also contribute to adding substance to the very notion of context.

1.2 Activity types, premisses for communication and relevance criteria

In the previous section, the theoretical perspective in which the present study will be pursued was established in broad terms. I shall now proceed to specifying some key concepts: activity types, premisses for communication and relevance criteria.

Language use is situated, i.e. takes place under specific circumstances. These circumstances, most of which are social in character, can be seen to influence how language is used. Levinson (1979) introduces the notion of 'activity type' which refers to:

- goal-defined, socially constituted, bounded, events with constraints on participants, setting, and so on, but above all on the kinds of allowable contributions. Paradigm examples would be teaching, a job interview, a judicial interrogation, a football game, a task in a workshop, a dinner party and so on. (p 368).

The central element in any activity type is, according to Levinson, its goal, "that is the function or functions that members of the society see the activity as having" (p 369). Levinson's view emanates directly from Wittgenstein's (1953) notion of 'language game' but is strikingly reminiscent of elements in Soviet activity theory (Leontiev, 1981), though the focus in the latter is on cognition rather than on communication or language. (It should be remembered though that one of the hallmarks of e.g. Vygotskyian psychology is the view of social action, communication and cognition as integrated.)

Allwood (1980, 1981), in his model of spoken interaction, based on the concept of activity language (Sw.: "verksamhetsspråk"), also stresses the primacy of purpose in determining activities. In a third paper, Allwood (1985) discusses how "foci of relevance" are established by a number of parameters
that take on activity specific values. The gist of his demonstration seems to be well in line with what Levinson takes the role of activity types to be: "On the one hand they constrain what will count as an allowable contribution to each activity, and on the other hand they help to determine how what one says will be 'taken' — that is, what kinds of inferences will be made from what is said." (p 393). With reference to the study of cognition, Rogoff (1984) may serve as an example of the same fundamental preoccupation when she advocates for "an emphasis on the purposes for which people engage in activities and the pragmatic considerations involved in people's solutions to problems." (p 8).

Summing up, one may say that the present study is "linguistic" in the sense that it will focus on language and the way it is used as a means for acting out specific activities. The language teaching situation and the conversations used for comparison will be taken as activity types in Levinson's sense, following Allwood's suggestion that particularly relevance should be seen against the background of activity types. I shall regard the contextual constraints and relevance criteria which operate in particular activity types as "premises for communication" (Rommetveit, 1974; see also Säljö, 1982).

Later in the study (chapter IV), I shall argue that one characteristic feature of the language teaching situation is that language is decontextualized, i.e. linguistic items and fragments are abstracted from coherent communicative contexts and used as objects for particular kinds of manipulation. This, of course, does not mean that language lessons are exempt from contextual embeddedness. On the contrary — and this is precisely what the point is — it is part of the premises for communication in language lessons that language be treated as decontextualized. To rephrase the 'decontextualization paradox' introduced in chapter I: decontextualization of linguistic items is part of the premises for communication that characterize the context of a language lesson. However, before proceeding to a general description of the language teaching situation and the ways in which it is a particularly interesting field of study in the theoretical perspective outlined in this section, I shall give a cursory review of a couple of research areas that are directly, or at least tangentially, relevant to different aspects of this study.

2 Main topics and tendencies in research on classroom interaction and second language instruction

The focus of the present investigation being on language use in a setting specifically created for promoting learning/acquisition of a second language, several research areas could potentially be seen as interesting as a background to the study. Enormous amounts of work on various aspects of classroom interaction, as well as on second language learning/acquisition, have been carried out during the last two or three decades and cannot possibly be reviewed in any detail for the present purpose. Nevertheless, I shall venture to give a
cursory description of what seem to be central points and tendencies within a
couple of research areas, concentrating on those aspects that are central either
because of their affinity to my own work, or because of the need for demarca-
tion, i.e. showing what this study is not. Thus, the overview is carried out
without any pretension whatsoever of exhaustiveness, but merely in order to
locate my own enterprise in some important respects.

In an article aiming at describing common patterns found in institutional
discourse and to link these findings to broader social theorizing, Agar
(1985:148) writes that "the work on discourse in educational settings between
students and teachers is too elaborate to even begin to review here". That is,
even though very much of the work accomplished in the field of classroom
interaction does not even fall within the scope of "work on discourse", which
was Agar's concern (and mine), we have to do with a very large research area.
Initially, however, classroom interaction research was associated with the cat-
egorization of time-sampled behaviour, e.g. in the tradition established by
Flanders (1970). Obviously, this kind of study has little to do with the present
study — for theoretical and methodological reasons and also because of differ-
ences in the field of interest; the concern of describing discourse processes pre-
supposes quite another approach.

Bellack & al (1966) concentrated on the language of the classroom and de-
scribed pedagogical cycles made up of soliciting, responding and reacting
moves, a pattern that reappears in several studies under similar or slightly dif-
ferent labels. Later, classroom interaction was used as data when scholars start-
ted to develop models of discourse structure. Sinclair & Coulthard (1975), ac-
tually one of the first steps in linguistics "towards an analysis of discourse" —
the title of their volume — found it convenient to work out their model from
classroom situations where the teacher was "likely to be exerting the maxi-
mum amount of control over the structure of the discourse" (p 6). The research,
thus, was motivated primarily by the aim of developing a general model for
discourse; specific discourse patterns in the classroom were taken as a point of
departure and used in order to "make things as simple as possible initially" (p
6) rather than something yet to be uncovered. Their approach to discourse
analysis, the Birmingham approach, has been quite influential and the
framework has been elaborated to suit language classes (Lörscher, 1983). The
system of analysis is taxonomic and the resulting description represents dis-
course as a hierarchical structure with each level composed of entities from the
level below. The level which is given most attention is the Exchange, which
in classroom discourse typically consists of (teacher's) initiation, (pupil's)
response and (teacher's) feedback. These are moves in Sinclair & Coulthard's
terms, and the Exchange can be seen to correspond to Bellack & al's typical
pedagogical cycle, mentioned above.

This tripartite structure has also been studied in depth by Mehan (1979) and
found to be an organizing principle in classroom interaction. In fact, Mehan
considers such structures as constituting the event of a lesson. The term 'con-stitute' is important in this connection as it is the constitution of social
reality in interaction, i.e. social organization rather than discourse structure per
se, that is Mehan's concern; his own label of his approach is "constitutive
ethnography". Mehan studies how pupils learn to adhere to the rules governing
classroom interaction, this process being what the title of the study — "Learning Lessons" — refers to.

The studies mentioned so far are concerned with patterns of interaction and discourse generally found in classrooms. From such a general perspective, language teaching has attracted very limited attention. On the other hand, if we change our perspective and start looking at work which has been done in order to explore learning/acquisition of a foreign/second language, we find a considerably larger amount of classroom studies carried out in language classrooms. However, classroom research is only one of many themes in second language research and by no means the most important. Indeed, much of the research carried out on second language acquisition can be characterized as dealing with acquisition as an intrapersonal phenomenon. In most cases, data has been gathered in informal settings for acquisition, i.e. away from language teaching contexts; the huge EALA-project for instance (Perdue, 1982) searched for subjects as little influenced as possible by formal language teaching. Furthermore, as we shall see later, when the classroom has been taken into account as the setting in which acquisition might take place, classroom interaction has been studied in a limited range of perspectives.

A couple of decades ago, research efforts were directed at the problem of improving (foreign) language teaching through evaluation of different teaching methods. Nowadays, there is general consensus on the shortcomings of this line of research: not only did the studies rarely come to conclusive results (Levin, 1972; Allwright, 1983), it has also been pointed out (Long, 1983) that the studies were uncontrolled in the sense that it remains unknown what actually went on in the classrooms where instruction was supposed to follow method A or B according to the research design; thorough descriptions of classroom practices were lacking. During the first half of the 1970's, the interest changed from this "comparing methods paradigm" to acquisition processes and language development within the learner. Selinker's (1972) notion of 'interlanguage' marks a stage in this change, as well as Oller & Richard's (1973) catchword "focus on the learner". The title of one of the most important contributions to this line of research — "Developing grammars" (Klein & Ditmar, 1979) — gives a succinct hint at what was described: successively changing grammatical systems mastered by the learner as (s)he developed his/her second language towards the target norm.

By the same time, the question whether, or to what degree, second language acquisition resembled first language acquisition gained in interest. This was first investigated in what has been labelled "the morpheme studies", the most well-known ones being those conducted by Dulay & Burt (1974). The morpheme studies gave way to studies of acquisition orders in particular grammatical areas such as word order (e.g. Hyltenstam, 1977, 1978) and negation (e.g. Cancino & al, 1978). Findings indicated that, when a second language was acquired in an informal context without tutoring, i.e. outside classrooms, there was actually a stable order of acquisition within certain structural domains. This made it natural to question the role of teaching; if there is a "natural order" in which linguistic structures are acquired when language is "picked up" without intervention, what about typical pedagogical devices such as corrections, pedagogical progression, different kinds of
syllabuses and so forth? A paper by Lightbown (1985) gives a distinct formulation of the problem: "Can language acquisition be altered by instruction?". One of those who would answer a clear no to such a question is Krashen (1982), who, leaning heavily on the morpheme studies, claims in his Monitor model that formal instruction does not influence acquisition and that what is consciously learnt can be used only for monitoring utterances produced by the acquired competence.

Obviously, in such a perspective, a decreasing interest in classroom studies is very likely to occur. In Federal Germany it has come to something of a controversy between, on the one hand, proponents of "acquisition research" ("Zweitsprachenerwerbsforschung") who claim that traditional research on language teaching is inadequate and cannot contribute to optimize learner success (Hahn, 1982) and, on the other hand, proponents of language teaching research ("Sprachlehrforschung") who reject this criticism. Thus e.g. Bausch & Königs (1983) maintain that there are crucial differences in learning context between (foreign) language learning and (second) language acquisition and they claim that Felix (1981; Felix & Hahn, 1985), one of the most prominent representative of acquisition research, is making undue overgeneralizations when applying results from untutored second language acquisition to language learning in the traditional, formal context of education (see also Königs & Hopkins, 1986).

Wagner (1983) could be taken to represent an effort to overcome the confinements that may result from exclusive focus either on the individual's acquisition or on classroom practices, as he explicitly sets up the goal of "empirische Spracherwerbetheorie mit der Didaktik des schuligen Fremdsprachenunterrichts in Gleichakt zu bringen" (p 9). With this aim in view, he critically assesses prevalent theories of language acquisition and current teaching methodologies as well as new methods that have been proposed as new possibilities for language teaching. Stressing the institutionally determined limitations on possible changes of classroom practices, his empirical study contains a study of the effect of didactic games on interactional patterns in the classroom. The degree of complexity which characterizes the relationship between language acquisition theory and classroom practices and which complicates the task of making them "keep in step" is emphasized on the very last page of Wagner's study (p 211):

Notwendige Konsequenz der hohen Komplexität von Sprachaneignungsprozessen und der mangelnden Komplexität von kodifizierten Unterrichtsmethoden sind die in der Unterrichtspraxis herrschenden eklektischen Konglomerate aus unterschiedlichen Methoden, die zwar theoretisch nicht konsequent sein mögen, aber offensichtlich den Vorteil haben, dass sie funktionieren.

When, in the beginning of the 1980's, research attention was again paid to the language classroom, it was to a high degree because of the importance that the notion of 'input' had taken (see the volume edited by Gass & Madden, 1985). Not only did Krashen's model stress the role of "comprehensible input" in the process of second language acquisition, research on mothers' interaction with their children (e.g. the volume edited by Snow & Ferguson, 1977) had pointed
to the existence of speech adjustments, sometimes interpreted as a specific register ("motherese"), that were taken to be a mechanism functioning to facilitate the child's language acquisition. Parallel adjustments were found in native speakers' interaction with foreigners ("foreigner talk"; Ferguson, 1975) and it became natural to explore if adjustments were at hand also in teachers' talk (Håkansson, 1982, 1987) and, more generally, what the input was like in the language classroom (e.g. Gaies, 1977).

Classroom-oriented research in second language acquisition is the topic — and the title — of the volume edited by Seliger & Long (1983), "state-of-the-art-articles" are Allwright (1983) and Gaies (1983). Second language acquisition research is overviewed in a broader perspective by Hyltenstam & Piemann (1985), an overview which indicates the — after all — modest place that is occupied by classroom studies within the field of second language research. In a review of second language acquisition research comprising more than 160 titles, Viberg (1985:86) concludes, concerning classroom studies:

In order to understand what happens in language teaching and to be able to evaluate different types of teaching, it is obvious that we have to supply ourselves with a more clear picture of what actually goes on in the classroom. This insight is more important than specific results from the investigations carried out. (My translation).

3 Rationale for the research

In the light of the theoretical perspective described in section 1 and against the background of main preoccupations in previous research as outlined in section 2, I shall try, in this section, to outline the significance of the present research effort. In doing this, I would like to point to the originality of the study in three respects:

— It applies a wider theory of communicative action to the study of language in language teaching, a domain which traditionally has been considered as belonging to the realm of linguistics proper (section 3.1, below). Stated the other way around, it brings the language teaching situation with its particularly interesting complexities into research on communication (3.2).

— It contains a description of second language teaching in its own right, as a variety of institutional discourse, i.e. not necessarily subordinated to assumptions about what is propitious to learning/acquisition within the individual (3.3).

— It proposes an analysis of situated spoken interaction that is not restricted to general structural descriptions but that concentrates on dynamic dialogue patterns and their connection with variations in the content of lessons and other activities (3.4).
3.1  Broadening the theoretical perspective

Language teaching traditionally has been seen as the perhaps most important branch of "applied linguistics", and the debate on language teaching methodology and didactics can be seen to reflect rather narrowly the evolution of, and fluctuations in, linguistic theory. As Wagner (1983:38) puts it: "Die Fremdsprachendidaktik hat sich üblicherweise darauf beschränkt auf die Nahstelle zur Sprachwissenschaft hinzuarbeiten. Das allein ist unzureichend." Still quite a long time after the advent of more functionally oriented linguistic theories as sources of inspiration for language didactics — e.g. Halliday's (1973, 1978) influence on the important Threshold Level Project (van Ek, 1975), not to mention the response with which Hymes's (1972) notion of 'communicative competence' was met in language teaching circles — the system view on language characteristic of linguistics seems to linger on. Jakobovits & Gordon (1979) strongly question the abstraction of language from social exchanges in language teaching and plead for "the art of not-teaching language" (p 10). To date however, few studies have been carried out starting out from such a broad social-theoretical perspective as that outlined in section 1. One such study is Kramsch (1985), who stresses the "multiplicity of possible interaction formats of the language classroom/ and its variety of activity types" (p 170). To uncover these formats and relate them to the variation in activity types must be seen as an urgent task for research, research which becomes feasible when the theoretical perspective is widened to treat language as a social phenomenon.

3.2  Contextualization and decontextualization in educational settings

Rosen (1972) has already noted that knowledge, in school settings, can be demonstrated only in a restricted array of ways and has to be linguistically expressed in specific fashions in order to be recognized as valid. Anward (1983) views the activity of teaching as text production — or rather reproduction of a canonical text with a certain form that stands for the relevant body of knowledge. Bautier-Castaing (1982) discusses how language is dis-authenticated ("désauthentifier") in the exercise function typical of school settings. In teaching there is a striving for "representational speech" that, according to Minick (in press) building upon Vygotskian notions, differs from ordinary "communicative speech" and represents quite another function of language. In the representational use of language, Minick argues, emphasis is laid on explicitness and the literal form of sentences more than on the communicative meanings that these sentences are normally used to convey.

The discussion so far deals with language in education in general. There, the tendency to detach language as a self-contained system and its separation from the authentic, communicative functions that it fulfills elsewhere, is still, as it were, parasitic upon its use to create and convey meanings related to other subject matter than language itself. Obviously, when it comes to language teaching, language is focused in its own right in a much more clear-cut man-
ner; language is by definition the core content of the lessons (which, of course, does not exclude variation in lesson activities, see chapter III).

The presence of language both as the means for communication and as the subject matter in the language classroom creates a complexity of the communication situation that has been noted by several authors and discussed in various terms. Edmondson (1981, 1985) borrows the concept of 'possible worlds' from semantics when demonstrating how utterances must be interpreted as belonging to different operant discourse worlds in order for a sequence of utterances in the language lesson to be understood as coherent. Trévise (1979) introduces the notion of 'double énonciation' to refer to the fact that pupils (and teachers) have to design their solutions to linguistic tasks in language lessons with reference to a fictive context embedded in the concrete situation of the lesson: "une situation d'énonciation translataée qui vient se greffer sur une situation d'énonciation véritable" (p 45). She further states that:

plus généralement en situation didactique, le langage est détourné de sa fonction et de ses opérations fondamentales de mises en relation entre des objets linguistiques qui renvoient à des objets extralinguistiques. Il n'y a pas alors d'activité de signification véritable au niveau de ce qui est produit et parfois au niveau de ce qui est entendu. (p 49).

In Edmondson's terms, different discourse worlds are operant for utterances, or aspects of utterances, belonging to one or the other of the linguistic functions inherent in language teaching. For each utterance the duality of "la double énonciation" must be disentangled, and it must be decided which discourse world is actually operant. In the notional apparatus developed by Goffman (1974), it is a matter of different frames, or keyings.

One could summarize all this as a problem of contextualization of utterances. This is precisely where language teaching becomes of particular interest for a study of the context-embeddedness of language. For, when the problem is seen in the light of a theory which emphasizes that language use is subject to "unavoidable reliance (...) on procedures of contextual determination" (Heritage, 1984:157), each attempt to focus on language as a self-contained system, removed from its normal reliance on a context which is unproblematically treated as integral and shared in everyday life, could be expected to inherit a potential of problems. Hence, how and when these problems arise, their precise nature and how they are solved by the actors, becomes a way of exploring the relationship between language and context. Language teaching, thus, can be seen as a particularly fruitful area for studying the role of context in communication.

3.3 Language teaching as institutional discourse

As noted above in section 2.2, second language acquisition research is characterized by its focus on acquisition as an intrapersonal phenomenon. Furthermore, when the setting in which language acquisition takes place is studied, e.g. as an inquiry of the character of the input to the learner, the study is often restricted to questions about efficiency in terms of learner success, i.e. again
though more indirectly reduced to acquisition in an intrapersonal perspective. Long (1983:10) makes himself a spokesman for such an outlook in his review of methodologies in classroom-oriented research in second language acquisition:

Observational instruments are, in fact, no more (or less) than theoretical claims about second language learning and teaching. Their authors hypothesize that the behaviors recorded by their categories are variables affecting the success of classroom language learning.

The value of analytical systems must ultimately depend on the significance for teaching and learning of the categories they contain.

According to the present author, such a standpoint is too narrowly confining. Valuable research results may come from studies designed totally independently of such considerations. Paradoxically enough, they might even contribute to the highly respectable and urgent task of enhancing the success of classroom learning — precisely by not addressing this goal, and thereby opening up for complementary views on the event of language teaching.

In this study, language teaching is studied primarily as a variety of institutional discourse, alongside other studies on discourse in other institutions such as medical settings, courtrooms, social welfare agencies and so on. Such a perspective is an important complement to research on language learning/acquisition as an intraindividual process. If the focus on the learner becomes exclusive and the fact that teaching takes place under institutional constraints is lost from sight, the integration of findings in the domain of individuals’ learning and in the domain of teaching is jeopardized. Suggestions about how teaching should be carried out according to findings on learning and acquisition may simply not be applicable because of the institutional frames governing teaching. Careful studies of what goes on in classrooms and what can go on there, i.e. the range of variability, are needed.

On the other hand we find studies of schools as societal institutions, e.g. Bourdieu & Passeron (1970), Lundgren (1972) and several others where the stress is on the educational system as a reproducer of social structures and the established order of things. This work is often carried out in a macro-perspective which seems, at least superficially, hard to reconcile with the idea that one could use data from the domain of learning as it takes place in individuals and apply it in order to change the way things are done within the educational system as determined by its functions in society.

In this study, I will attempt to work at an intermediate level. Direct concern with the outcome of the teaching in terms of learning will be left aside (though I certainly do not want to dismiss this aspect; I shall also return to the question of applicability in the final discussion). The overall societal determination operant in educational settings is taken for granted and not problematized here. Instead, I shall give a description of the interaction between teacher and pupil as it takes place within the frames of the lesson and, in the non-didactic conversations, within settings that are still possible to create within school but by
introducing tasks that are not of the ordinary didactic kind. Through the focus on micro-processes it is possible to study the kind of variation that is, so to speak, allowed to take place in the educational system, given the constraints put upon it by societal macro-structures.

3.4 Activity dependent variation in dialogue processes

The last point in this attempt at determining the position of the present work concerns the way I shall go about trying to relate dialogue patterns to different activity types. This point actually comprises two different considerations. The first one is the interest in accounting for variation within what can be globally seen as one activity type, namely the language lesson, and more precisely variation in the content of the lesson. The second consideration is of methodological character and affects the way I prefer to carry out discourse analysis, given my specific purposes. The two considerations converge as a need for measures of dialogue characteristics through which comparisons are made available between pieces of discourse that have been categorized on independent grounds as being different kinds of activities. Accordingly, the lesson data will be classified into types of lesson activities on the basis of the purpose and content of teaching events (and other activities within lessons). A method for conversation analysis will be used that permits results of the analysis to be summarized as global scores in various dimensions for stretches of dialogue — as a complement to the qualitative analyses also carried out on the lesson data.

Variation in language use and dialogue patterns connected with different tasks and activities in the classroom has attracted only scant attention in research. This may be due to the research interests that have motivated the studies. Often enough they simply amount to attempts at describing typical, or prototypical, discourse structures in general terms, and then variation (unless of a considerable magnitude) is obviously of little interest. A couple of studies, however, indicate that task characteristics and the content of teaching activities may entail important differences in linguistic interaction. In an experimental study involving problem-solving, role-play and 'authentic' interaction with students of English as a second language as subjects, Tong-Fredericks (1984) found that "The relative degree to which a student draws on his communicative and linguistic resources seems to be related to the communication needs of the particular kind of activity engaged in." (p 133). In a naturalistic study in French primary schools, Jones & Pouder (1980) studied pupils' opportunities of gaining the floor and found consistent differences between two kinds of lesson activities, grammar teaching and vocabulary teaching. In chapter III, a device for classifying lesson activities in terms of their content will be presented and the question will be raised as to whether there is a connection between discourse patterns and the content of lesson activities.

When it comes to methods of carrying out conversational analysis, the discussion may begin with Levinson's (1983:286) distinction between 'discourse analysis' ('DA') and 'conversational analysis' ('CA'). The former label stands for work which is directed at describing discourse structure and can be seen, as
Levinson points out, as an extension of theories and methods of traditional linguistics. Typical representatives of this approach are Sinclair & Coulthard (1975). The reason why it is found unsatisfactory for the present purposes is, firstly, that the analyses it proposes are made in static, structural terms whereas the interest here lies in the dynamics of interaction as an on-going process, and, secondly, that I share the criticisms that have been raised on theoretical grounds towards "DA" from a "CA" point of view and expressed also by Levinson (ibid, p 287ff).

In "CA", on the other hand, the main body of work concerns either rather basic organizing principles in conversation, such as those pertaining to turn-taking, repair and sequence organization, or it has dealt with specific types of moves found in conversation, e.g. blamings, formulations and second assessments. Up to date, no "CA"-inspired methodology has been presented with which it is possible to handle large corpora, to "diagnose" entire conversations in specific respects and to employ quantitative methods to make comparisons between conversation types. I do not share the view (Schegloff, 1987) that such attempts are necessarily premature and even threatening to adequate micro-analysis of conversation. Therefore, in chapter V, I shall give a detailed description of the Initiative-Response Analysis (Linell & Gustavsson, 1987), which, partly inspired by ethnomethodological conversation analysis and drawing upon insights gained from there, offers a methodological framework for such studies.
III THE EMPIRICAL MATERIAL

1 Data and data collection

The empirical material for the study consists of a corpus of

- eight lessons (teacher-pupil dyads) of Swedish as a second language, S2L
- eight non-didactic conversations with the same actors involved, i.e. the teacher and the pupil
- eight conversations between the pupil and a class-mate of his.

Second language lessons as the material for a study such as this one present several advantages:

- In second language lessons of the kind studied, all linguistic activity is in the target language, in this case Swedish. Since Swedish is the only language common to pupil and teacher, "the fictitious character of communication in a foreign language" (Krumm, 1981:263) need not necessarily be present. This, in turn, means that comparisons can be made between different parts of a lesson; e.g. sequences where the purpose of teaching is, as it normally is, predominant, versus sequences where this purpose is temporarily suspended; sequences where language structure and form are focused versus sequences where language is a mere means for talking about other matters than language itself.

- Second language instruction in Sweden sometimes takes place in very small groups. As a matter of fact, the eight lessons of the corpus are dyads: one teacher teaching one pupil. This is important for two reasons. Firstly, data collection in a class where the teacher is in front of many pupils may be considered as more complicated than is usually realized. Long (1983) points out that, ideally, the distinction should be drawn between exchanges between the teacher and the class as a whole, between the teacher and parts of the class only, and between the teacher and a single pupil (and between pupils themselves, one might add, see Granström, 1987). Secondly, it would be difficult to create a natural situation for non-didactic conversations that could give meaningful data for comparison.

Dyadic teaching is obviously not the most frequent organizational frame for S2L-teaching in Sweden. However, according to a survey of the S2L-teachers in Gothenburg presented to the Swedish Minister of Education in a letter later published by the Association of S2L-teachers in Gothenburg (LISA, nr 2, 1987), 207 teachers out of 438 who were covered by the survey, i.e. not far from 50%, were at least on one occasion per week engaged in individual, i.e. dyadic, teaching.
Second language teaching aims at giving the pupil communicative competence for immediate use in his/her immediate environment, whereas in the case of foreign language teaching, the aim may (sometimes or partly) be that of giving theoretical knowledge only, about the target language, for future application if, and when, this is needed. Because of this difference, the 'decontextualization paradox' and the 'naturalness paradox' (see chapter I) are more relevant to second language teaching than to foreign language teaching (or, at least, more visible in the case of second language teaching).

After some pilot work, it was decided that the study should concentrate on grades 4-6 in the Swedish comprehensive, compulsory school (Sw.: grundskolans mellanstadium). The pupils, aged 10-12, would then be sufficiently accustomed to school expectancies to be able to "perform" in a lesson in a typical manner, still young enough to adhere to a naive view on the matters taught, i.e. language. Furthermore, it would be reasonably easy to find a task that would give the conversation needed for the comparison material and to instruct the children about what to do. It is also a common sense view that the age of 10-12 is one of relative harmony and that problems in school occur less frequently than later, in grades 7-9 (Sw.: högstadet). Finally, it is easier to administer contacts with teachers and pupils of grades 4-6, where each class has its own teacher, than in higher grades, where there are different teachers for different subjects.

For the selection of pupils to investigate, we opted for the group of Assyrians, since it could be assumed that they attended the type of S2L-teaching we were looking for. This is often not the case when it comes to the immigrant groups more important in number. These children often go to "bilingual classes", where the teaching is partly in their mother tongue and the S2L-teaching organized in another way than described above.

The statistics available at the County School Board (Sw.: länsskolnämnden) were used in order to locate pupils belonging to the group of Assyrians. The local Boards of Education in communities where there were such pupils were then contacted. More precise characteristics of the pupils could be gained from them: their age, sex, estimated language proficiency, and the name of the school district in which they went to school. Via the headteacher, the specific school and, in the last instance, the class-teacher and the S2L-teacher, the pupils could be reached. Although we did not turn to teachers who we already knew were willing to participate (as we had done in the pilot studies), all S2L-teachers who were asked and eight out of nine class-teachers accepted to be recorded together with their pupils.

The data collection took place between October 1984 and May 1985 in seven different communities of varying size (about 8,000 inhabitants for the smallest; >100,000 for the biggest), situated in four different counties in the southern part of Sweden. The type of school represented in the corpus is very varied: from the ultra-modern school situated in a suburban centre (with a relatively high percentage of immigrants in the population) to small, old schools in the centre of a little town (with relatively few immigrants).
The pupils recorded were all boys, aged 10-12 (3 in grade 4, 1 in grade 5, 4 in grade 6). They all came from the Middle East (Turkey, Iraq, Lebanon) but their linguistic (and ethnic) background was not as homogeneous as could be expected from the statistics from which they were selected: four of them were reported to speak Assyrian, three Arabic and one Kurdish at home. They were all rated in the middle of the language proficiency scale\(^1\), used in Swedish schools to estimate the pupils' need for second language instruction; five of them were rated at D, three of them at C. The time they had lived in Sweden, however, varied considerably — from 2.5 years to 10 years, with an average of about 6 years (Md 5.5 years). The number of S2L-lessons/week that they attended varied from 2 to 6 (Md 4).

The S2L-teachers participating in the study were all female and had many years of teaching experience (ranging from 6 to >15 years, average about 10 years). They all had experience of S2L-teaching (ranging from 1 year to 8 years, average about 4 years). Two of them had taken special courses for S2L-teachers at the university, 5 weeks (Sw.: 5 poäng) and 20 weeks (Sw.: 20 poäng) respectively. Six of the teachers did more than 20 lessons/week of S2L-teaching (out of 29 lessons/week demanded from a teacher in grades 4-6); two of them worked as remedial teachers/resource teachers including 4 and 8 lessons/week respectively of S2L-teaching.

Each recording (R1-R8) consists of five conversations collected in five different situations:

1. A talk-and-chalk lesson in the pupil’s class, a lesson of geography, history or the like (Sw.: orienteringsämnen).
2. A group discussion with the pupil (the pupils will be referred to as P1-8) working together with three other children from his class on a task given by the teacher and, if possible, related to the lesson recorded.
3. An S2L-lesson with the pupil in question alone with his S2L-teacher (the teachers will be referred to as T1-8).
4. A conversation between the pupil and a Swedish class-mate of his own choice (referred to as C1-8) around a task given by the researchers (see further section 2.2 below).
5. Another conversation on parallel tasks between the pupil and his S2L-teacher (in this situation referred to as A1-8).

The recordings were always made in this order. Only the dyadic situations are used in this study.

All data collection was carried out by the present author and a colleague from the University College of Jönköping, fil lic Ulf Samuelsson. In order to

\(^1\)The language proficiency of immigrant pupils is assessed sometimes impressionistically, but nowadays more systematically by means of tests, the so-called SVAN-tests (Projekgruppen GUME, 1983). The scale which is used ranges from A to F, where A stands for no proficiency at all and F for proficiency comparable to native Swedish children; B, C, D and E thus stand for intermediate levels of increasing proficiency.
get acquainted with the class and let the children (and the teacher) get used to our presence, we started by just being present in the classroom. We sat in to listen or, when the pupils worked with individual tasks or in groups, we walked around, talked to the pupils and, if we were able, tried to help them when they asked for assistance. During a break after a couple of lessons, we hung four mini-microphones (Sony ECM 30) from the ceiling, one in each corner of the classroom, connected to mixer (Sony MX P42) and tape recorder (Sony TCD-5 Pro) placed in a desk at the back of the classroom. Of course, microphones and connections were all visible, and the pupils certainly noticed and commented upon them when entering the classroom after the break. This is why the first recording was not made immediately but only a couple of hours after we had set up the microphones, i.e. when they seemed only incidentally to pay attention to them.

The S2L-lessons were recorded in the classroom where the S2L-teacher usually did her teaching. One microphone of the same kind as in the other classroom was attached so that it hung from the ceiling, above the heads of teacher and pupil. It was connected to the tape recorder (Sony TCD-5 Pro), discreetly placed on a book-shelf, a window-sill, or the like, but not hidden. One of the researchers saw to it that the tape recorder was switched on, then left the classroom in order not to interfere during the lesson. When the lesson was finished, the tape recorder was either switched off by the teacher or left running until one of the researchers came back.

The conversations were recorded in the same room as the S2L-lessons, under the same physical conditions and with the same equipment.

2 The content of the recordings

2.1 The lessons

The first impression one gets when listening to the eight lessons is one of heterogeneity. Though in Lessons 1, 4 and 8 (the lessons of the corpus are henceforth referred to as L1, L2 etc), teaching materials from the same widespread and frequently used series of text- and exercise books (Andersson, 1975)1 are used — different parts however — and there are a couple of instances of exactly the same exercise in two different lessons (as the answering of yes/no questions to check "what the pupil remembers" after the reading of a story (L5 and L8); the seeking of antonyms to given adjectives or verbs (L4 and L8)) or of roughly the same activity (as the reading and commenting upon content and vocabulary in the pupil’s book of geography (L7 and L8); the giving of verb paradigms/changing the tense of given verbs (L4, L6 and L8)), a vast variety of activities, methods and materials seems to be represented in this rather small corpus of lessons. Before proceeding to a classification into types of activities

1Since its first publication in 1975, the series has been reprinted seven times in twelve years.
(2.1.2, below), an informal, impressionist description of the eight lessons may be appropriate.

2.1.1 A preliminary, informal, impressionist description

Lesson n:o 1 (L1)

The lesson consists of three parts. The first exercise is one that is often recommended in handbooks of "communicative language teaching" (e.g. Brown & Yule, 1983b:126ff; Lindberg & al, 1984:81): one of the participants, teacher or pupil, instructs the other how to draw a geometrical figure that the latter cannot see. In L1 the pupil twice takes the role of the instructor, once the role of the follower. In the second part of the lesson the pupil is to retell a "funny story of the kind found in newspapers". The last part of the lesson is devoted to the comparison of adjectives and brings into focus the difference between regular and irregular adjectives.

Lesson n:o 2 (L2)

The topic of the entire lesson is the difference in spelling of /svälta/ when it is, respectively, the supine or past participle of the verb svälta (swell), i.e. svälta, or the root of the verb svälta (starve) and its corresponding noun, i.e. svält. These homophones are an instance of a general problem in Swedish spelling: the choice between single or double consonant letter denoting the consonant sound following a short vowel in stressed syllables. According to Lindell & al (1971:13) and Grogarn, (1984:101), misspellings concerning single or double consonant amount to about 50% of the misspellings Swedish school-children make. In L2 the approach to the problem is that of a well-known method for teaching orthography, Ekener (1968).

The lesson goes through different phases. The teacher starts out by trying to make it clear that there are two words having different meanings and spellings though pronounced in exactly the same way. Thereafter, a number of conjugated forms, derivations and compound words are treated according to the method, first of the word svälta, then of svält. Finally, the pupil is invited to produce sentences where /svälta/ in its two senses is properly used. However, almost immediately after he has begun, the lesson is interrupted by another pupil entering, claiming that time is up.

Lesson n:o 3 (L3)

This lesson is very different from the other seven. Principally, this is due to the fact that P3 is the only pupil who is unwilling, even hostile, to attend the lesson to be recorded. This, in turn, is due to unfortunate circumstances that occurred this very day, the second that we visited the school in question. "Our" class had gone to visit a factory in the neighbourhood, but, since the class-teacher had forgotten to inform us about this and she did not want us to have

---

1 Since its first publication, it has been reedited four times, in 1971, 1973, 1976 and 1982.
made the rather long trip in vain, she had decided that P should stay in school for his S2L-lesson and go to the factory on another occasion. This is how the recording starts. (Since this sequence is not part of the lesson, the turns at talk are not numbered in the same way as in the lessons. P = the pupil, T = the teacher, R = the researcher; for transcription conventions, see section 5 below in this chapter.)

(1) L3:a P: (...) vad ska jag göra här
b T: ja..
c P: /AVBRYTER/ jag skulle egentligen till en fabrik, varför får jag inte gå dit för
d T: ja det vet jag inte men det är väl det att du har besök idag
e R: skulle få gå på..
f P: /SAMTIDIGT, HÅNFULLT/ besök
R: den där fabriken en annan gång sa...
g T: sa Karin ja
h R: sa Karin /T:mm/ till mej
i T: men vi var så oroliga att du skulle vara sjuk idag
   (3s)
j R: men det är han inte, pigg som en /P:mm/ mör
k T: men du förstår att...när jag inte har min man hemma, då händar
   det så mycket konstiga saker i vårat hus
l P: ha

(1) L3:a P: (...) what am I gonna do here
b T: well...
c P: /INTERRUPTS/ I was to go to a factory really, why can't I go there
d T: well I don't know but I suppose it's 'cause you have a visitor
t today
e R: could go to that..
f P: /SIMULTANEOUSLY, SCORNFULLY/visitor
   R: factory another time, Ka...
g T: Karin said yes
h R: Karin said /T:mm/ to me
i T: but we were so worried you'd be ill today
   (3s)
j R: but he isn't, fit as a /P:mm/ fiddle
k T: but let me tell you..when my husband isn't at home, then so many strange things happen at our house
l P: yeah

The atmosphere is rather tense. Note P's interruptions, his failing to answer, his scorn and defiance, and on the other hand T's and R's eagerness to support each other and to bring up other topics of conversation than P's challenge.

Eventually, the lesson starts. In the first part of it, T tries to take up and finish the writing of a story that had been interrupted the lesson before. Very soon, however, P (who apparently moves around in the classroom) happens to find a sheet of paper on the teacher's desk and suggests that, instead, they do the tasks presented there:

(2) L3: 54 P: vad är det här för nåt då
55 T: mm det var lite... papper som jag hittade ute i /HARKLAR SIG/
   förrådet igår, jag var där och tittade
56 P: vad till hör det här papper
57 T: (3s) ja, det handlar om teknik
(4s)
58 P: herregud kan vi inte göra en sån där en gång
59 T: joå, jag vill eh bara titta... lite på det själv först, ni... pratar
om... teknik nu ju... i skolan, jag tror ni har börjat med det
också
60 P: /AVBRYTER/ // är det där papper
61 T: (3s) ja vet du vad en sån där... grej heter när den blir färdig
62 P: ja /T:ja/ drake
63 T: mm
(7s)
64 P: ha, jag skulle vilja jättegärna göra uppgiften
(3s)
65 P: finns ingen mer här va
(4s)
66 P: titta vad festliga grejer då
(4s)
67 T: mm, ser du vad dom har gjort där

(2) L3:54 P: now what's this
55 T: mm it was some... papers I found out in /CLEARS THROAT/
the store-room yesterday, I was there looking
56 P: what to does it belong this paper
57 T: (3s) well it's about technology
(4s)
58 P: my God couldn't we make such a thing once
59 T: sure, I just want to er look... at it a little myself first, you
are... talking about... technology aren't you now... in class, I
believe you've got started with it too
60 P: /INTERRUPTS/ // is that paper
61 T: (3s) well do you know what such a... thing is called when it's
finished
62 P: yes /T:yes/ kite
63 T: mm
(7s)
64 P: well I would really love to do the task
(3s)
65 P: there is no more here is it
(4s)
66 P: and look what great stuff
(4s)
67 T: mm, can you see what they've done there

After this sequence the conversation floats for a short moment, until some-
ething decisive happens: the teacher has to leave the room to take a phone-call.
When alone in the classroom, P starts working on the tasks presented on the
sheet and when the teacher comes back, a couple of minutes later, he is in full
activity. The teacher then chooses not to try to impose any of the activities she
had planned for the lesson. (Our task is not to evaluate T's decisions but, given
P's complete switch from hostility to enthusiasm, one cannot help to think
that her choice was as motivated as wise!)

The rest of the time is devoted to planning on how to construct a kite and to
the construction of a miniature, which raises a technical problem that is dis-
cussed at length. The discussion is interfoliated by the teacher telling about
problems she had had in the morning with her freezer — the reason why she had been called on the phone (cf. k in (1) above).

I have dwelled upon the description of this lesson, called attention to its atmosphere and cited a couple of sequences, since all this seems crucial for the understanding of what actually goes on in L3. To sum up, the following characteristics of L3 should be kept in mind:

— P is explicitly non-cooperative from the outset and the lesson the teacher has in mind is interrupted almost immediately, first by the pupil's doings, then, conclusively, by the phone-call.

— The major activity during the lesson (the construction of a kite) is not planned by the teacher as a language lesson, but rather, as it were, imposed by the pupil.

These statements are based principally on the interpretation of the key sequence cited as (2) above. Firstly, one notices that T's answers are given with some delay, as if she were reluctant to answer. Secondly, T responds in a vague and evasive way to P's questions. Thirdly, and perhaps most important, she explicitly declares that she does not want to work with this material until she has had time to prepare herself. And fourthly, she even steps out of the conversation for quite a while (turns 63-66), before she, hesitantly (turn 67) starts to follow in the direction proposed by P.

Lesson n:o 4 (L4)

In contrast to L3, L4 can be described as the most classical language lesson of the corpus. It starts with some typical preliminaries (date, name of the day etc), goes on with the control of P's homework and proceeds to the introduction of a new text from the text-book. The text is first played on the tape recorder, then read aloud by P. There are questions concerning the content of the text and grammatical features met in the text are brought into focus (word order; present, past and "future" forms of verbs) by underlinings and special exercises. In the middle of the lesson there is also a short exercise on pronunciation.

Lesson n:o 5 (L5)

The lesson is centered around a text, an old Nordic folk tale. It follows in every detail what is given in the reader (Manne & Hvenekilde, 1980). P reads the tale aloud, which permits T to take up and correct pronunciation errors, he then answers yes/no-questions about its content, works his way through the grammar exercises related to the text (indefinite/definite article; antonyms; direct/indirect speech), whereas after its vocabulary is taken up in the form of a crossword. When this is finished, the pupil starts reading the next text.

Lesson n:o 6 (L6)

The point of departure for this lesson is also a text, an extract from a children's book by a well-known Swedish author (Hellberg, 1970). P reads a passage aloud, his understanding is checked on some crucial points, some mistakes of pronunciation corrected, some difficulties commented upon, whereas
P reads the following passage, T checks his understanding and reads a passage herself while intermittently commenting upon what seem to be difficulties. In the second part of the lesson, there is a questioning/discussion of what happens in the story.

The name of the story is "The Tugboat" which serves as a point of departure for a vocabulary exercise on words for different means of conveyance. In the same way, different words for buildings are listed, as well as some vocabulary needed for the description of a home and words for facial expressions. Various grammatical problems (verb tenses; choice of prepositions; congruence of adjectives) are dealt with in exercises. At the end of the lesson, there is a conversation about P's plans for the summer holidays — a topic raised on P's repeated suggestion.

Lesson no. 7 (L7)

The lesson starts with the repetition of a particular problem in Swedish spelling/pronunciation: which vowels "conjure" a preceding <sk> to become /s/ and <k> to become /k/. P is to produce examples of words spelled with <sk> or <k> in front of such vowels, whereupon he does an exercise of discrimination between /s/ and /k/. The major part of the lesson consists of work in P's geography book, in order to forestall the problems of understanding that P might encounter during the ordinary geography lessons, because of his vocabulary lacunae.

Lesson no. 8 (L8)

When listening to this lesson one is struck by its quite intricate structure; it is the one out of the eight that shows the largest number of topic changes and the most rapid ones. In the first part of the lesson, the subject matter is geography (cf L7). Soon, however, there is a rapid switch to another text of a radically different kind. It is a text taken from a teaching material (of the same series of books as the one used in L4 and in the last part of L1: Andersson, 1975) and what follows proves to reproduce exactly the structure of that book. Thus, the complex structure of the lesson and the rapid switches from one kind of exercise to another, that in no way seem to trouble T and P but that might intrigue the observer, are no more, no less than the reflection of the method proposed by the text-book.

When the reading of the text is finished, P gives the principal forms of some verbs from the text, then fills in the correct form of verbs left out in sentences drawn from the text. P is then invited to find antonyms to some adjectives, to conjugate in all forms a reflexive verb found in the text, to answer yes/no-questions related to the story and to search for words in the text that suit given definitions or that can be fitted into slots in given sentences.

Then there is another abrupt transition. One dialogue is read rapidly, but not commented upon. A second dialogue, taking place in a chemist's shop, is read and gives rise to a questioning about what one can buy at the chemist's and about the procedure to follow when buying medicine. At the end of the lesson, when T is about to note today's activities in her calendar, it turns out that P is not sure of the ordinal numbers, which gives rise to a last exercise.
2.1.2 Types of activities in the lessons

2.1.2.1 Introduction

In order to be able to investigate characteristics of language use and discourse in the lessons and possible variations within the lesson corpus, a classification is needed into types of activities that occur in the recordings. Since it is a basic theoretical assumption in this study that language should be understood in relation to the situation in which it is used and that the primordial situational determinant is the purpose of the ongoing activity, there are specific prerequisites that must be fulfilled by the classification system to be used: the categories must be based on the purpose and the content of the sequences to be classified.

There exist classificatory devices for lessons, none of which, however, seem to suit the demands of this study. The method for discourse analysis presented in Sinclair & Coulthard (1975) is based on teaching dialogue and its superordinate structural level, the transaction, apparently corresponds to what I refer to as 'main parts' of a lesson (cf below). Lörcher (1983) adapts this kind of analysis to language lessons precisely. Though insights gained through these studies have been incorporated in the coding manual, e.g. the teacher's use of structuring moves to mark the beginning of a new transaction/main part, it is obvious that such a classification is too exclusively directed at the structure of the discourse, instead of its purpose and content, to be suitable for this study.

A commonly used classificatory device for language lessons is that of the four basic skills: listening, talking, reading, writing. So e.g., with listening and talking merged into one category and the addition of the two categories "grammar" (Sw.: språklära) and "civilization and culture" (Sw.: samhälls- och kulturorientering), this is how the subject matter S2L is presented in the official curriculum (Lgr 80).

The basic-skills-classification, however, is of no use for the purpose of this study. The categories are devoid of substance as long as one does not take into account what is talked about/listened to/read/written and for what purpose. 'Listening', e.g., might as well apply to an exercise aiming at training the capacity of discriminating /p/ from /b/ (or /f/ from /v/ as in L7) as to listening to a careers' counsellor in order to make up one's mind before the choice of course programme at upper levels; 'writing' applies as well to copying ready-made sentences or isolated words from an exercise book -- or even marking crosses in empty squares -- as to the writing of a novel.¹

In an observational study of S2L, Josefson (1977) uses a detailed scheme which covers several dimensions, the listen/talk/read/write division being but one, though the most exploited. Most interesting in connection with problems raised in this section is that her scheme comprises 'content' as one dimension. The observer has the choice between

¹This lack of substance, by the way, is reflected in the official curriculum: "Therefore they /the pupils/ have to train listening to texts, phrases, words and sounds." (Lgr 80:143; my translation)
— simple, trivial and/or informative about society
— determined exclusively by linguistic considerations

(p 13; my translation)

Though, in the view of the present author, the distinction is not very clearly formulated — one can easily imagine content that is not determined exclusively by linguistic considerations and still not simple, trivial or informative about society — it seems to be the distinction between focus-on-language vs no-focus-on-language that is aimed at. Though the application of the categories proves to be reliable when the agreement between two coders is measured (ibid, p 18), the categories, unfortunately, do not seem to be systematically brought to use in the observational study.

2.1.2.2  A classificatory device

What is needed in this study but cannot be found in the ways of categorizing reviewed above, is a category system which is based on the purpose of the pedagogic activities and which, at the same time, reflects the theoretically important division between focus on the language per se vs language used mainly as a means for communicating about other matters than language. Such a system was designed and used on the recorded lessons. It can be summarized in a tree-diagram as follows:

Figure 1  A classificatory device for activities in the second language lessons of the corpus

Lessons L1 - L8

- Non-teaching activities
- Teaching activities
  - No focus on language
  - Focus on language
    - Text-related exercises
    - Grammar exercises
    - Pronunciation exercises
      - Vocabulary exercises
      - Spelling exercises

The first distinction made is that between sequences where the pedagogical purpose is predominant — i.e. sequences of teaching in a narrow sense — vs sequences where the pedagogical purpose is temporarily suspended. Though the
global purpose of a lesson, of course, is that of teaching, it is clear that the teaching may be intermittently backgrounded or even postponed as the participants have to, or want to, take up other matters to talk about. To identify such passages and sort them out from teaching activities in a narrow sense, the category non-teaching activities (henceforth abbreviated NON) was designed. In the coding manual it was defined as follows:

Certain sequences fall outside the categories of language teaching activities defined above. This is due to the fact that, during a lesson, all of the conversation does not necessarily consist of teaching. It sometimes happens that the conversation follows other routes, that the participants start talking about something else, matters that more or less temporarily put the pedagogical purpose aside.

Your /i.e. the co-judge's/ second task is to mark passages of the conversation that you do not consider as lesson activities in a narrow sense, but rather as non-teaching activities, sequences of conversation that do not form part of the lesson planned or that are not primarily characterized by a pedagogical purpose.

When the NON-passages have thus been identified, we are left with the core of the lesson — those parts of the recordings that are characterized by a predominant pedagogical purpose. Then, the second important distinction comes into play, that between sequences where language per se is the primary focus of the teaching activities vs sequences where language is a mere means for teaching other matters than language itself. Sequences of the latter kind belong to the category other teaching activities (OTHER):

In contradistinction to the above categories, focus in OTHER is not on language or specific aspects of language. OTHER can consist of e.g. social background studies or remedial teaching in another school subject with focus on matters of that subject (if the work is directed primarily at explaining specific words or expressions, the sequence will, of course, fall under category WORD; if the matters of another subject are not central, but the text has been chosen rather for the sake of language, the sequence will fall under category TEXT). OTHER can also be a conversation exercise. However, in that case, it must be part of the teaching, i.e. a conversation whose content is subordinated to the aim of training conversation (cf category NON below).

The remaining parts of the lesson, i.e. those parts that do not fall under NON or OTHER, constitute the language lesson in the sense that language itself is

---

1In the coding manual, written as an instruction to the two independent co-judges who were used (cf below), the categories were presented in reversed order, i.e. from the bottom of the tree and upwards, which makes category names as "other teaching activities" and expressions like "the above categories" and "your second task" logical in their context, though strange-looking when I cite them here in the reversed order. The complete coding manual may be requested from the author.
the focus of the teaching activities. In the coding, this category was divided into several subcategories, in order to add substance to the classification:

TEXT = reading/listening comprehension. The activity aims at explaining the meaning, making understand/checking the understanding or training the reproduction of a whole text (spoken or written) or parts of a whole text (i.e. not specific words/expressions, category WORD above).

WORD = Vocabulary exercise. The activity aims at explaining the meaning, controlling the understanding or training the use of specific words/expressions.

GRAM = grammar exercise. The activity aims at explaining/training any specific grammatical phenomenon.

SPELL = spelling exercise. The activity aims at explaining/training any specific spelling problem.

PRON = pronunciation exercise. The activity aims at training any specific pronunciation problem.

Some aspects of the category system should be commented upon. It is important to notice, firstly, that the basis for categorization is the purpose of the activity ("aims at", Sw.: "gä Rut på") and, secondly, that the classification also is based on content ("another subject matter", "grammar" or "vocabulary" etc). The combination of these two features of the category system makes it neutral in two important respects. It is neutral as to the materials or the techniques of teaching, which is crucial for the generality of the categories. It is also neutral as to the effects of the teaching; the question e.g. whether one learns spelling while reading, or learns to read while training spelling, is irrelevant to the classification. What matters is the central point of the basic theoretical assumptions of the study, viz the decontextualization paradox: whether specific aspects of language are brought into primary focus or not.

The classification applies to the main parts of a lesson, main part being defined as a "delimited part of a lesson that has a specific pedagogical purpose". This means that the classification is made on a relatively high level of the structure of a lesson; a main part, classified into one of the seven categories, can incorporate minor deviations from its main activity. Still, it cannot be excluded that the activities during a main part of a lesson are a mixture of several categories — in other words: the categories are not supposed to be mutually exclusive (though the system — be it only through the wideness of the categories NON and OTHER — is designed to be exhaustive). The coders were therefore instructed to doubly classify passages which they judged to belong to one category but having at the same time "as a subgoal" another category, provided that there were recurrent instances of the activities of that latter category.
2.1.2.3 Reliability of the coding

The whole corpus of eight lessons has been coded by the present author and by two other independent coders. Since it was important that the categories and the way they were to be used in the study proved to be recognizable by people in the field of S2L-teaching, two experienced S2L-teachers were called upon to do the co-judging. One of them is now working as a researcher on S2L-teaching, the other as a headteacher of S2L-teaching in a big city in Sweden and also as a teacher-trainer.

Before entering into the details of the way the three different classifications match each other, we can note the most important result: through the coding I am able to establish a classification of 99.8% of the lesson corpus, corresponding to 3,871 out of the total of 3,878 turns at talk, that is based on the common coding of at least two independent coders. This "common-denominator" classification is the one to be used later on in the study (chapters V and VI), not my own initial classification.

Though double codings were not extensively used by any of the coders, they present a slight problem when it comes to deciding whether a sequence is coded identically or differently by the three coders. Therefore, results will be given according to two different ways of counting double codings.

a) In cases where double coding is used by any of the coders, only the first category is taken into account: While the coding WORD, WORD, WORD+GRAM by the three coders respectively for a certain passage is counted as 'same', WORD, WORD, GRAM+WORD is then counted as 'divergent' since one of the coders had marked GRAM as more prominent than WORD. (A coding WORD+GRAM, WORD+GRAM and GRAM+WORD counts as 'same', since the sequence has been coded as ambivalent between the same two categories, albeit with a discrepancy as to the relative prominence of the two categories.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A = B</th>
<th>B = C</th>
<th>A = C</th>
<th>A = B = C</th>
<th>Any two coders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2775</td>
<td>3051</td>
<td>2614</td>
<td>2358</td>
<td>3724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) A coding is counted as 'same' as soon as a sequence has been assigned to the same category, regardless of order in the case of double codings: WORD, WORD, GRAM+WORD as in the example above is then counted as 'same', i.e. as WORD, since WORD is represented in all three codings.
Table 2  Number of turns coded identically, and percentage of the whole corpus, double codings included, regardless of order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A = B</th>
<th>B = C</th>
<th>A = C</th>
<th>A = B = C</th>
<th>Any two coders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3053</td>
<td>3422</td>
<td>2937</td>
<td>2729</td>
<td>3871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78,7%</td>
<td>88,2%</td>
<td>75,7%</td>
<td>70,4%</td>
<td>99,8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The "common-denominator" classification mentioned above, thus appears to the right of table 2: 3871 out of 3878 turns at talk are assigned to the same category by at least two coders; 3724 (96,0%) (cf table 1) as the first category assigned by both coders in the case of double coding, 147 (3,8%) as first category for one of the coders, second for the other.

In the classification used later on in the study, 2729 turns at talk, i.e. 70,4% of the corpus, are thus classified according to three common codings, 1142 turns (29,4%) according to two common codings and 7 turns (0,2%) according to the only coder who had identified this passage as different from the surrounding teaching activities.

The overall reliability of the coding must be considered as satisfactory. Furthermore, this is the case also when one looks closer into the most crucial point of the classification: that of the focus-on-language distinction. Generally, one can say that coding discrepancies are to a different degree detrimental to the use of the classification in this study. So, discrepancies within the class of categories "focus-on-language" (e.g. between GRAM and WORD or SPELL and PRON, cf tree diagram above) are less serious than discrepancies between levels in the tree diagram (e.g. between OTHER and GRAM).

393 turns at talk are coded differently in a way that affects the focus-on-language distinction. Hence, 89,9% of the corpus is coded in the same way by all three coders in this very respect. The conclusion must be that the classification system is viable and that the results of the coding can be used in order to explore whether differences in discourse patterns and language use relate to types of activities that occur during the lessons of the corpus.

2.1.2.4 Classification of the lesson activities

The result of the classification, i.e. the "common denominator classification" that is to form the basis for the investigations of dialogue patterns in chapters V and VI, is presented in table 3 on the next page.

2.2 The non-didactic conversations

2.2.1 Manipulation of the situation

For the lessons to be recorded, our primary concern was to have them as "natural" as possible, i.e. as little influenced as possible by the fact that they were recorded. Ideally, they should be identical to what would have taken place
if the tape recorder had not been placed in the classroom (this point will be further discussed in section 3).

As a background, however, we wanted to be able to compare features of language and language use during teaching activities to what might happen in other situations, viz situations not characterized by a pedagogical purpose.

Table 3  Types of lesson activities in the corpus, numbers referring to the numbers of the turns at talk in the lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>L4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NON</td>
<td>389-405</td>
<td></td>
<td>12-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>413-424</td>
<td></td>
<td>177-198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>469-475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>1-69</td>
<td>54-388</td>
<td>1-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77-221</td>
<td>406-412</td>
<td>134-147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>425-468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>222-288</td>
<td></td>
<td>45-133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>148-176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORD</td>
<td>70-76</td>
<td>1-30</td>
<td>1-53</td>
<td>24-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>199-239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAM</td>
<td>289-420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>274-380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPELL</td>
<td>31-337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>240-273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L5</th>
<th>L6</th>
<th>L7</th>
<th>L8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>741-847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>334-342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>1-118</td>
<td>1-217</td>
<td></td>
<td>97-108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>512-574</td>
<td>302-309</td>
<td></td>
<td>194-213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>249-255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORD</td>
<td>198-223</td>
<td>218-301</td>
<td>236-282</td>
<td>69-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>330-511</td>
<td>310-499</td>
<td>317-503</td>
<td>109-116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>565-639</td>
<td></td>
<td>214-248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>287-294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>302-333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAM</td>
<td>119-197</td>
<td>500-564</td>
<td></td>
<td>117-193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>224-329</td>
<td>640-740</td>
<td></td>
<td>295-301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPELL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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From experiences gained through the pilot studies, we knew that shorter or longer sequences of non-teaching activities (cf section 2.1.2.2 above) often, but by no means regularly, do occur in lessons of the kind we were about to record. (Post hoc, we can see that non-teaching activities actually are represented in four out of the eight lessons recorded, corresponding, however, to less than 5% of the total number of turns, see 2.1.2.4 above.) To ensure a corpus of non-didactic conversations, two parallel situations were designed in which each pupil participated, in one of them with his teacher, in the other with a class-mate of his own choice. These are referred to below as adult-child conversations (abbreviation: Ad) and child-child conversations (Ch), respectively.

The outcome of our efforts to create a non-didactic situation depended heavily on the degree to which we could make the participants change their subjective definition of the situation, especially as the conversations were to take place under the same physical conditions as the lesson, often immediately afterwards. The principal features of the situation that we must try to manipulate or control were, of course, the purpose of the activity and the role configuration of the participants.

This was attempted in the following way. A task was assigned by the researchers to the two conversationalists jointly; together they had to provide the solutions to these specific tasks. This should, simultaneously, lead to the following three changes in the make-up of the situation and thus warrant that the participants define the activity otherwise than as a lesson:

- The purpose of solving the tasks assigned should outrule that of teaching or practising language, and hereby

- language should not be in primary focus but serve as a working tool, a means for solving the tasks.

- The roles of teacher and pupil (or pupil and pupil) should no longer hold. Instead, the roles should be defined by the precise nature of the tasks, as discussion partners, decision makers etc.

There are several problems connected with this manipulation. One category is of a theoretical nature, another category has to do with the specific ways in which the manipulation was attempted and with its outcome.

The theoretical problem takes the form of a methodological paradox. It is an important feature of the theoretical foundation of this study that the relationship between language and situational context is not one of simple, unidirectional determinism. Instead, the relationship is taken to be reflexive: objective situational parameters tend to determine to a certain extent communicative behaviour and interactional patterns, but at the same time, linguistic and other communicative activities are constitutive factors of the situation and they guide participants in their constant work at defining the situation (see also chapter IV, especially section 3.3.2). Hence, there is circularity in the way in which situational context and language use are related to each other.

Though, on theoretical grounds, I plead for the existence of such circularity rather than situational determinism, simple circular reasoning certainly cannot
be accepted in research practice. Applied to the present discussion of the manipulation of situational factors in the design of this study, this dilemma can take the following shape: Though, "objectively", the purpose of the activities in the conversation is not that of teaching, one might encounter sequences of conversation that are identical to the lessons:

(3) /P has just suggested to A that they take a photo of the school nurse for the picture book presenting the school (see below for the description of the task they are working at)/

A6:78 A: vad ska vi ha för bild på henne, tycker du, vad är...
79 P: /AVBRYTER/ av henne å så därinn..å eh av henne å sen därinne vad det är för spruta å sån där å för saker dom har /OHÖRBART/
80 A: /SAMTIDIGT/ ja just det, mm, hon kanske har nån elev där också, som vi kan /P:ja/ ta ihop med henne
81 P: /SKRIVER/ saker i... i...
82 A: vad har hon för saker i regel du, kommer du thåg det vad hon har...vad hon har för saker, eller vad har hon.
83 P: /AVBRYTER/ medicin /A:ja/ jaa olika mediciner dom har såna här /A:ja/ spruter som måste spruta
84 A: jaa, vad har man mer för instrument, en sån här som man lyssnar..det har...det har läka...
85 P: /AVBRYTER/ telekop
86 A: ett sietoskop ja /P:ja/ å när man har ont i halsen så brukar man titta med en...
87 P: en gaffel nåt, en pinne
88 A: /SAMTIDIGT/ en..jaa det ser ut..jaa just det å vad kallar vi det för, sp...
89 P: sport
90 A: spaa...
91 P: sta
92 A: spatel vs
93 P: jaha
94 A: en spatel ja /P:mm/ mm
95 P: och sen går vi in i personnumret
96 A: personalnumret?
97 P: jaa
98 A: mm

(3) /P has just suggested to A that they take a photo of the school nurse for the picture book presenting the school (see below for the description of the task they are working at)/

A6:78 A: what picture should we take of her, do you think, what is..
79 P: /INTERRUPTS/ of her and then in the..and er of her and then in there what kind of syringe and those..kind of things they have /INAUDIBLE/
80 A: /SIMULTANEOUSLY/ yes okay, mm, perhaps she has a pupil there too, that we could /P:yes/ take together with her
81 P: /WRITES/ things in... in...
82 A: what kind of things does she have generally, do you remember what kind of..what kind of things she has, or what does she have..
83 P: /INTERRUPTS/ medicine /A:yes/ well different medicines they have these /A:yes/ syringes when jabs
84 A: yes, what more instruments do they have, one of those for listening..that's what..that's what doct..
Between 82 and 94 the conversation takes on the character of a vocabulary exercise — it is identical to what is found in lesson activities classified WORD (see 2.1.2.2 above). Without going too deeply into the analysis of the sequence, one may note just one detail: the "exam questions" (the term originally from Searle, 1969) typical of teaching. Before this sequence occurs, the activity is clearly different from what one meets during the lessons; at the end of the sequence cited, we can also see by the way P's linguistic error in 95 is treated (cf chapter IV, section 2.4) that we are no longer confronted with language teaching.

The point of this demonstration should be clear: though measures have been taken to change the situation into a non-teaching situation, teaching sequences may still occur, and, utterly important, the changes of situation are brought about through the participants' linguistic behaviour alone (cf Heritage, 1984:290; see also (39) and (40) in chapter IV). Now, the problem is: if language is both determined by the situation — which is implied if language is treated as the dependent variable in the study — and plays a central role in determining the situation, how are we to find a way out? A straightforward circular reasoning that has to be condemned would be the following: we determine by means of linguistic parameters our classification of situations and then go on to study how the different situations, thus determined, lead to various uses of language.

For the lessons, the problem is solved by means of the classification by three independent coders into types of activity (section 2.1.2 above). The reader is reminded of the fact that the coding instruction was formulated in terms of purpose and content of the lesson activities and that nothing was said about communicative patterns or linguistic features in the coding manual. Inevitably, the coders have to stick to what is said and how it is said when classifying the lessons — this being the only overt manifestation of the purpose and content of the activity — and it cannot be excluded that they were thereby partly guided (consciously or unconsciously) by those dialogue characteristics that the author later on was to classify and analyze. However, the coders' classifications were
made in completely different terms (i.e. purpose and content) and hence, as far as possible, circularity in research method has been avoided.

For the conversations, no such independent activity classification has been made. Instead, the results of the manipulation are taken for good. This means that even if, at times, teacher and pupil seem to relapse into their habitual lesson activities and carry over the roles thereto attached, the overall situation is considered as changed. Whether or not this leads to dramatic changes in use of language and in interaction is an empirical question that might be formulated in the following way: What are the effects of bringing tasks of a special kind into the classroom where teacher and pupil usually work together in the well established situation of second language teaching? The patterns of the adult-child conversation will be compared to the parallel child-child conversation as well as to the lessons with their different types of activities represented.

### 2.2.2 Activity types in the conversations

I am now to proceed to a description of the tasks that were assigned to the dyads as the basis for the two conversations, i.e. the activities in which the non-didactic conversations were embedded. Each child-child dyad was confronted with the following three tasks:

1. They were asked to discuss the contents of a possible picture book that would highlight the town (area/neighbourhood) where they lived and to come up with enough proposals to fill one 24-shot camera film. This first part of the conversation was supposed to take the character of a brainstorming with discussions interspersed containing evaluations of the proposals.

2. When the brainstorming was finished, more emphasis was put on the evaluation aspect as decisions would have to be taken. The participants were asked to review their initial proposals and to reach an agreement upon the five best subjects for the picture book.

3. The third phase of the conversations was planned to lead to more profound discussions as more complex, possibly controversial matters were presented as the topic to be treated. The dyad was confronted with two questions that would bring up moral issues, viz justice/injustice. The first question concerned what could be called "collective punishment": if some children in a class have committed a wrong, but the teacher is unable to find out who did it, is (s)he then in his/her right to punish the entire class by cancelling an excursion that is planned? The second question concerned "fair distribution": if three children are selected to represent the class in a quiz contest between schools and they win a prize, should this prize be considered as belonging to the whole class or only to the three who had participated in the contest?

An effort was made to create a meaningful context for the picture book task. A detail from a small study on children's drawings (Gustavsson, 1983a) was used. There the striking thing had been the sharp differences between girls' drawings
and boys' drawings (or, more precisely, the accuracy with which both adult and child subjects were able to distinguish girls' drawings from boys' drawings) and the participants were told that our interest in the subjects they would choose was to study further whether there were any differences between boys and girls, concerning their preferences when selecting subjects to present the town where they lived. For the discussions tasks, a small story was told about "things that had happened in a class somewhere" and the questions about the children's opinions were asked directly. (For further details concerning instructions, time allotted etc., see below, section 2.2.3.)

The tasks given in adult-child conversations were exactly parallel to those of the child-child conversations. Instead of the neighbourhood, the picture book should concentrate on the school in which both teacher and pupil were working; instead of "collective punishment", the first issue to be discussed concerned whether the teacher should decide how much pocket-money that pupils going away on an excursion should be allowed to have, or whether this should be up to each pupil to decide for him/herself; instead of the distribution of a prize won in a quiz contest, the participants were invited for the second part of the discussion to take a stand on the way to use the small reward that we paid for their willingness to participate in the study.

It should be noted that the conversations consist of several subtasks. There is no such thing as a standard conversation to which one can unproblematically relate all other types of conversations. Therefore, we desired a couple of different tasks in order to make it possible for different activity types to occur, viz brain-storming, decision-making and discussion. Furthermore, a potentially interesting problem is the way in which passages from one activity to another are administered in the dyads.

2.2.3 Instructions and circumstances of the recording of the conversations

The child-child conversation was always recorded first, i.e. after the lesson but before the adult-child conversation. This procedure was due to the fact that we considered it necessary to counterbalance the advantage of the adult; whereas the adult would no doubt grasp the instructions immediately, the child might encounter difficulties of comprehension (a suspicion that was confirmed, see below). One would also suspect that if the adult and the child were given the instruction on equal terms, the adult would — also as a result of her habitual teacher role — take the entire responsibility for carrying out the tasks, while the child would act as a pupil, i.e. leave his responsibility and do as he was told by the teacher. Thus, the order of recordings should make a shift from teacher-pupil roles — one of the most important situational factors — more likely to occur.

After the lesson had been recorded, P was asked to choose one of his classmates with whom he wanted to "do a special job for me /the researcher/". In all cases, a boy was chosen. In case P chose a girl or another immigrant boy (more precisely a pupil who also attended S2L-teaching), he would be asked to suggest some other names and then with wariness and discretion be led to
decide for a boy with native competence in Swedish. Such a situation did not occur; in R5, however, P chose a child, Finnish by origin, but who no longer was considered in need of S2L-instruction. Thus, the children recorded together with P in the child-child conversations are all boys with native or native-like competence in Swedish, born the same year as P.

When the boys entered the classroom, tape recorder and microphone were already rigged up, since they had been used for the recording of the lesson. During a casual conversation about just anything, the tape recorder was discreetly switched on and the boys were invited to take their seats. The instructions for the brain-storming part of the picture book tasks were then given. As the situation should not be experienced as more formal than necessary, I did not read the instruction. I had learnt it by heart and tried to tell it as naturally and spontaneously as possible. This means that the exact wording of any detail in the instruction might vary somewhat from case to case, and often the boys inserted commentaries or questions which, of course, were immediately answered. As a result of this procedure, the time of instruction also varies (from 2 min 35 sec to 4 min 45 sec, Md 3 min 35 sec). As an example the instruction sequence from Ch2 is cited in the appendix.

The boys were then left alone to work with the task for about seven minutes. Since, in a couple of cases, the boys came out claiming they had finished, or, in a couple of other cases, asked for more time, the time of the brain-storming varies from 5 min 10 sec to 11 min 45 sec, Md 8 min 25 sec (see further table 4 below). After that, the instruction for the selection of the five best subjects was given, also orally, and when this was finished an envelope was handed over to the immigrant child and the children were told to open it once they had agreed upon the picture book task. (The time for this second oral instruction varies between 35 sec and 1 min 45 sec, Md 1 min 5 sec.) In the child-child conversations the decision phase is very short, varying between 15 sec and 1 min 45 sec, Md 1 min 2 sec. For this reason, the brain-storming phase and the decision phase will not be kept separate in the further treatment of the data, they are collapsed and treated as one single task: the picture book task.

Of course, the envelope that was handed over contained the instructions for the first issue to discuss and on the paper the children were also told that when they had discussed the matter enough, they should open a second envelope, stuck on the back of the instruction they had just read. (Both written instructions are presented in appendix.) In most cases, the children came out after some time announcing that they were finished; in a couple of cases, they were found reading when, after some time, the researchers decided to enter the room. The discussion phase in child-child conversations (including the time needed for opening the envelopes and reading the instructions) varies from 3 min to 7 min 40 sec, Md 4 min 50 sec (see table 4, below).

For the adult-child conversations, the instructions were given in exactly parallel ways, with the difference that the oral instruction for the picture book task did not contain the framing, but was built upon the fact that the pupil was acquainted with the type of activity. Hereby, the instruction time became considerably shorter (between 1 min 10 sec and 1 min 55 sec, Md 1 min 20 sec for the brain-storming phase; between 20 sec and 1 min 5 sec, Md 48 sec for the
decision phase). Since it is partly regulated by the coming in and out of the researcher, the time spent on the picture book task is almost equal in adult-child and child-child dyads. On the other hand, the average time spent on the discussion task is twice as long in adult-child conversations (see table 4).

There are a couple of things to add about the way in which the non-didactic conversations unfold. The suspicion that the children might be confronted with difficulties in following the instructions was confirmed in several cases. In Ch1, the pupils show clear signs of lack of concentration during the initial instruction and immediately when left alone they realize that they have to go out and ask for a repetition of what they were supposed to do. When they are briefly reminded of the picture book, however, they are able to start working. In Ch3, the lack of concentration is even more pronounced during the instruction, but the boys are nevertheless capable of carrying out the task, still without enthusiasm. Just before the brain-storming phase is ended, the Swedish child leaves the entire responsibility to his partner and starts planning the next match of the class hand-ball team, but only a couple of seconds later, the researcher comes in.

Though seemingly concentrated, the boys in Ch5 are victims of another misunderstanding: as they think they will have to travel around in town equipped with a real camera, they worry about the realization of the picture book and in the first part of the conversation they discuss whether they should refuse to participate. They go out to expose their problem to the researcher and immediately the misunderstanding is cleared up. The Swedish boy in Ch7 also thinks that the pictures have to be taken and wonders where they will find a camera. His friend, who is quite certain that it is "make believe", finds this misunderstanding very silly and amusing, which adds to the merriment that characterizes this very dyad. In Ch8, finally, the idea of a camera, real or make believe, does not get through at all: the boys are discussing drawings all the time and how to draw the pictures they propose — maybe by association to the first part of the instruction where it, in fact, mentioned "boys' and girls' drawings". This, however, does in no way affect the kind of work accomplished in the dyad.

In Ch1 and Ch5, thus, the researcher is called for to complete the instruction or clear up misunderstandings. In Ch2, Ch8 and Ad3, the participants are of the opinion that they have not yet finished the brain-storming when the researcher enters — they are then given additional time. In Ad5, on the other hand, the participants already agree after about six minutes that they have enough pictures, break off and go and fetch the researcher. In Ad8, the brain-storming is also brought to an end before the researcher enters and the participants start discussing the pupil’s family situation, thus filling out the time allotted.

This last digression from the principal tasks of the dyad is a somewhat special example of a more general phenomenon: the non-didactic conversations seem to offer a great deal more opportunities for free associations and integration of various topics and topic aspects in the course of the dialogue, than do the lessons. This could be interpreted to say that the non-didactic conversations are less task-oriented than the lessons. This may be true for the particular digression at the end of Ad8 mentioned above, but globally, however, there is an alternative interpretation. Rather, the difference seems to lie in the nature of
the tasks than in the strictness with which the participants stick to the task. For instance, when discussing whether the school nurse and her consulting-room is a convenient subject for the picture book, a couple of turns are easily integrated where it is a question of the pupil's own experiences of this setting; when discussing pocket-money for an excursion, it does not seem far-fetched to introduce a couple of remarks on previous excursions and events that occurred then. In the non-didactic conversations, such associations appear to constitute relevant aspects on the given topic, though not strictly necessary for carrying out the task. A corresponding degree of freedom in the choice of topics and topical aspects does not characterize the lessons, especially not the language lessons proper (cf chapter IV, where characteristic dialogue processes in lessons in this connection are discussed). In conclusion then, the criteria for the choice of relevant matters to talk about are more or less severe in the different situations. This is an important feature of the make-up of the tasks, not a variation in task-orientation.

3 On the effect of the tape recorder

As is always the case when recordings are done overtly in such a way that the actors are aware of the fact that they are being recorded — the only way to proceed without running into ethical problems — the data are to some degree distorted. This is known as "the Observer's Paradox" (Labov, 1978:209). Two aspects of this phenomenon should be kept separate (cf Schank, 1979). On the one hand, there is the distinction between recording an event that would have taken place regardless of the presence of the tape recorder versus creating an event especially in order for the recording to take place. On the other hand, especially relevant for events that are not especially created for recording, there is the question of the degree to which the participants' behaviour is affected by the very fact that they are recorded. In the first of these dimensions, there is a difference between the lessons and the non-didactic conversations of the present corpus. The latter are events created by our manipulations and these conversations take place only because of our presence. This is not the case with the lessons.

As far as the lessons are concerned, the corpus consists of eight lessons recorded in their natural setting where they would also have occurred without our presence. No selection of lessons has been undertaken, only the choice of pupils that would correspond to pre-determined characteristics. Furthermore, we have tried to influence as little as possible the content and the course of the lessons. Permission was simply asked to record a lesson planned for the day that was the most convenient for practical reasons. No other wishes were expressed as to its content than it be an ordinary lesson. In cases where the teacher asked if such-and-such a lesson would do — on spelling problems, a certain chapter of any text-book or the like — we just said it was perfectly alright and stressed that we wanted in no way to interfere with the normal work or with the agenda for what should be taught to the pupil in question. This, of
course, is no guarantee of the naturalness of the recorded lessons. The subgoal of acting out a lesson to be recorded for future use in research may possibly lead to a high concentration on prototypical lesson activities, leaving little room for activities outside second language teaching in a strict sense. If this is so, our lesson corpus would contain the same kind of things that usually go on in the classroom, only in a somewhat concentrated form, which is in no way disadvantageous for the study. The following points reinforce the impression that we have to do with the ordinary kind of lesson activities:

References to what has already been worked with during preceding lessons are made by teachers and/or pupils:

(4) L1: 1 T: /HARKLAR SIG/ vi ska börja med det här. Kan du igen dom här
   2 P: jaa

(4) L1: 1 T: /CLEAR S THROAT/ we shall start with this. Do you recognize these
   2 P: yes

(5) L3: 1 T: så, det var det den där bilden vi höll på med, vi kan fortsätta med den då
   2 P: mhm, men jag har ingen penna

(5) L3: 1 T: okay, we had that picture we were working on, so we can go on with that
   2 P: mhm, but I have no pencil

(6) L7: 7 T: (...) Allra först Yousuf så ska vi ta å repetera det här som som vi gjorde vet du med sje och tje-ljud

(6) L7: 7 T: (...) First of all Yousuf we shall repeat what we were doing you know about /sje/ and /tje/ sounds

(7) L8: 1 T: vi ska ta å prata lite grann om..ska se hur mycke vi har kvar /OHORBART/ i den här boken

(7) L8: 1 T: we are going to talk a little about..let me see how much there is left to do /INAUDIBLE/ in this book

(8) L5: 1 P: vi har läst den där...
   2 T: /AVBRYTER/ där ska vi börja

(8) L5: 1 P: we have read that one...
   2 T: /INTERRUPTS/ there's where we start

There is nothing to indicate that teachers present materials or suggest activities that the pupil is not familiar with, nor do the pupils show any signs whatsoever of surprise or bewilderment towards the kind of activities proposed.

Pupils, on the contrary, anticipate what the teacher is up to:

(9) /T is about to introduce an exercise on the comparison of adjectives/

306 P: /AVBRYTER/ sånt hårt kan jag

(9) /T is about to introduce an exercise on the comparison of adjectives/

L1:305 T: yes and I was one hundred and sixty-eight centimetres /P:yes/ so I was quite a bit taller. /CLEAR THROAT/ Now what we have is that when one.

306 P: /INTERRUPTS/ this kind of stuff I know

(10) L2: 87 T: mm, i sväll, vi tar ordbiten sväll först, vad hör du
88 P: (3 s) uppe
89 T: uppe
90 P: två l
91 T: ja och när det är uppe så ska vi ha två stjärnor, /P:ja/ där, och när vi har två.
92 P: /SAMTIDIGT/ konsonanter
93 T: stjärnor där vad ska det vara
94 P: två konsonanter

(10) L2: 87 T: mm, in /sväll/, we take this piece of the word /sväll/ first, what do you hear
88 P: (3s) upstairs
89 T: upstairs
90 P: double l
91 T: yes and when it is upstairs then we must have double asterisks, /P:yes/ there, and when we have double.
92 P: /SIMULTANEously/ consonantS
93 T: asterisks there what should we put here
94 P: two consonants

In 90, P goes directly to the solution "double l", skipping over some of the steps that the teaching method proposes and the teacher follows: "upstairs-vowels", i.e. short vowels, should be marked with double asterisks symbolizing the need for two consonants. The method then makes the distinction between, on the one hand, "brother-and-sister-words", i.e. those where the two asterisks have to be replaced by two different consonants (as sväll, the root of starve) and, on the other hand, "twin words", where there are two identical consonants (as sväll, the root of swell).

Texts and teaching materials are taken from well-known and wide-spread readers in S2L and the lesson activities are for the most part of a traditional kind of which the reader is invited to recall his/her experiences as a pupil in a language class, or, possibly, as a language teacher. There is only one exception to this overall impression of "ordinary lessons" which has already been commented upon: the kite construction in L3 (see above, section 2.1.1).
presenting, showing, a lesson to one or more observers by means of the recording. Though this should have inevitable consequences, it is not easy to find clearcut indications of the specific way(s) in which the presence of the tape recorder affects the behaviour of the participants. When, after the recording (or in a couple of cases during the recording), they talked about their experiences, no systematic picture emerged. Some declared having been nervous, both among teachers and pupils — this is explicitly stated by the pupil e.g. at the beginning of Ch5. Some of the teachers reported the impression that the pupil had been rather more alert than usual, as if he had been inspired by the attention shown to him. On the other hand, we had been told from the outset that a couple of pupils were always very shy and taciturn; it is not unlikely that their reticence is reinforced in the recording situation. Generally speaking, the picture of these reactions is hazy and heterogeneous and it is not possible to tell what specific effect they might have on the variables used later on in the study.

One particular advantage of the design of the study should be stressed in this connection. To the extent that the tape recorder effect is due to relatively stable traits of personality (e.g. shyness or extreme talkativeness), it should be about the same in the different situations, since the same persons appear in both lessons and conversations. Hereby, it does not interfere with the results as these are expressed in comparisons between different situations, not between individuals.

On the other hand, there may be reason to believe that the tape recorder effect might vary in strength between lessons and conversations, viz in such a way that the presence of the tape recorder is felt more strongly in conversations than in lessons. There are two kinds of arguments to support such a supposition. First, on a priori grounds, the purpose of performing something for a recording to take place must be considered to be less prominent in a natural situation (e.g. the lesson) than in a non-natural situation (e.g. the conversations), or to put it more precisely, the recording of the event is more likely to be experienced as the main purpose of the activity in the case of the conversations, as a secondary purpose in the case of the lessons. By the same token, the lesson is a situation with which both participants are extremely well acquainted, an event in which they have participated as professionals, as it were, several times a week during several years. In contradistinction to this, the non-didactic conversations that are based on tasks presented by the researchers constitute a more or less unfamiliar situation. Second, a posteriori, one can note that explicit references to the on-going recording are much more common in the non-didactic conversations than in the lessons; especially in child-child conversations the presence of the tape recorder seems to be clearly felt.

If the assumption is correct in that the lessons are less affected by the fact that they are recorded than are the conversations, the question must be posed how this might influence the comparisons between the situations. One could then suppose that increasing awareness of the recording going on should be a disadvantage to the weaker part in the dyads, e.g. in this case the immigrant child. His incomplete mastery of language, his subordinate role as pupil/child in relation to the teacher/adult, his lack of experience would then be less detrimental to his possibilities of coming to his right in lessons. As such a possible effect of the tape recorder goes counter to the hypotheses to be investigated
in chapters V and VI, I presume that results supporting the hypotheses should not be interpreted as artifacts of the recording, but rather that these results emerge in spite of the recording.

4 Size of the corpus

To summarize the description given above, the corpus is centered around eight 10-12 year old immigrant boys, each of them participating in three dyads: an ordinary S2L-lesson, a non-didactic conversation with his teacher around tasks presented by the researchers (adult-child conversation) and a conversation parallel to this, together with another boy of the same age with native, or native-like, proficiency in Swedish (child-child conversation). The non-didactic conversations are divided into two subtasks, the picture book task and the discussion task. By means of a specially created device for classifying lesson activities, the lessons are divided into non-teaching activities, other teaching activities than language teaching, text, vocabulary, grammar, spelling and pronunciation exercises, the latter five activity types being characterized by focus on various aspects of language per se. The total amount of time in all 24 dyads and the distribution of time on the different activity types are displayed in table 4 below. Only the time when the dyad is working within the frame of the lesson or the conversations and in the absence of the researcher is taken into account; the time e.g. for giving oral instructions in the conversations is left out.

Table 4 Size of the corpus, length of work in the dyads spent on different activities. ADULT-CHILD CONVERSATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ad1</th>
<th>Ad2</th>
<th>Ad3</th>
<th>Ad4</th>
<th>Ad5</th>
<th>Ad6</th>
<th>Ad7</th>
<th>Ad8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picture book task</td>
<td>8'50</td>
<td>11'05</td>
<td>16'05</td>
<td>16'15</td>
<td>7'05</td>
<td>10'50</td>
<td>10'05</td>
<td>13'10</td>
<td>1'33'25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion task</td>
<td>7'20</td>
<td>10'55</td>
<td>12'45</td>
<td>17'05</td>
<td>9'00</td>
<td>9'00</td>
<td>9'20</td>
<td>9'35</td>
<td>1'25'00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16'10</td>
<td>22'00</td>
<td>28'50</td>
<td>33'20</td>
<td>16'05</td>
<td>19'50</td>
<td>19'25</td>
<td>22'45</td>
<td>2'58'25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Child-Child Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ch1</th>
<th>Ch2</th>
<th>Ch3</th>
<th>Ch4</th>
<th>Ch5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picture book task</td>
<td>6’30</td>
<td>11’25</td>
<td>10’00</td>
<td>11’25</td>
<td>8’20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion task</td>
<td>4’15</td>
<td>4’50</td>
<td>5’30</td>
<td>7’40</td>
<td>3’00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10’45</td>
<td>16’15</td>
<td>15’30</td>
<td>19’05</td>
<td>11’20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ch6</th>
<th>Ch7</th>
<th>Ch8</th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picture book task</td>
<td>8’05</td>
<td>8’25</td>
<td>12’00</td>
<td>1’16’10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion task</td>
<td>4’10</td>
<td>4’50</td>
<td>7’30</td>
<td>41’45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12’15</td>
<td>13’15</td>
<td>19’30</td>
<td>1’57’55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>L4</th>
<th>L5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NON</td>
<td>13’05</td>
<td>2’30</td>
<td>2’55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>6’20</td>
<td>10’10</td>
<td>19’35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>0’15</td>
<td>1’35</td>
<td>2’30</td>
<td>6’05</td>
<td>14’05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORD</td>
<td>10’15</td>
<td>9’40</td>
<td>13’05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPELL</td>
<td>32’05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1’45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>29’55</td>
<td>33’40</td>
<td>32’00</td>
<td>32’15</td>
<td>46’45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L6</th>
<th>L7</th>
<th>L8</th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NON</td>
<td>4’15</td>
<td>9’40</td>
<td>1’25</td>
<td>11’05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>21’35</td>
<td>10’05</td>
<td>3’40</td>
<td>1’01’30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>16’05</td>
<td>17’30</td>
<td>9’20</td>
<td>1’07’25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORD</td>
<td>9’10</td>
<td>6’00</td>
<td>48’10</td>
<td>32’05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPELL</td>
<td>9’05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10’50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>51’05</td>
<td>36’15</td>
<td>30’30</td>
<td>4’52’25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All in all, thus, the corpus consists of nearly ten hours of recorded activity in the 24 dyads. During this time, 7,769 turns are taken and more than 60,000 running words are spoken (for definitions of turns and running words, see chapters V and VI, respectively).
5 Some notes on transcription

5.1 General problems with transcribing spoken data

The need for transcription of the data in a study like this is obvious. Transcripts are needed both for carrying out the analyses and for presenting their results. As has been discussed by several authors, however, transcription involves intricate problems of a theoretical nature (see Edelsky, 1981; Ochs 1979) and the user of a transcript is clearly in a different predicament compared to a listener, even by the mere fact that the spoken language has been transposed to the written medium (Linell, 1986). The description of the kind of transcripts regularly used in "CA" — Conversation Analysis — "one that will look to the eye how it sounds to the ear" (Schenkein, 1978:xii), cannot therefore, according to the present author, be taken literally.

It is important to realize that a transcript, however thorough it may be, is not a simple depiction of the spoken language (and, by extension, that an audiotape or even a videotape is not identical to the "real event" recorded, though in various ways closer to it). At least the following phenomena are inherent in speech and spoken interaction and cannot on a priori grounds be disregarded as unimportant: precise details in the articulation of speech sounds — at the level of recognized dialectal, sociolectal etc variations of pronunciation, or in even finer detail — prosody, including stress and intonation, pauses whether filled or unfilled, hesitation noises, repetitions, restarts; rhythm, tempo, sound prolongations; voice quality and breaths; vocal and other noises that accompany speech, laughter, coughs and hummings — not to mention non-verbal behaviour in other channels than the acoustic medium. All this exists in monological speech as well as in interaction; when it comes to interactive speech such as dialogues and multiparty conversations, there are new dimensions added: the way the parties connect their individual contributions to each other e.g. through timing, prosody and syntax. There is simultaneous speech, overlappings, latching, and pauses that may have interactional significance; interruptions, self-talk, as opposed to talk addressed to the conversational partner, co-construction of speech units and so on.

Clearly, all this cannot possibly be rendered in a transcription and this not only for practical reasons. One realizes that most, if not all, of the variables enumerated above are non-discrete (and certainly not binary), whereas the written medium to a much greater extent presupposes discrete variables. Thus, a full transcription is in principle impossible. This, however, must not prevent us from making those transcripts which are necessary. It is only to help us keep in mind the reductions and (re)interpretations of the primary data that are unavoidably involved in transcription. Transcription

— entails a risk for distortion
— is theory dependent
— should be made with respect to the purpose of the transcription.
The third of these points should be commented further upon, since it has to do with the way transcripts will look in the following (and from now on, the discussion is less general and more directly concerned with the principles that have guided transcription work within this particular study). Obviously, the purpose of transcribing for the analyst's needs is not identical to that of transcribing for the readers' needs. The requirements on a transcript that serves in the process of analysis do not coincide with those that will have to be met by a transcript used to illustrate the presentation of results. If, namely, one takes seriously what was said above concerning the nature of transcription, the analyst should not use transcripts alone as primary data (Linell & Gustavsson, 1987:189) but remain in continuous contact with the audio-tapes, making use of their tremendously more rich and subtle rendition of e.g. temporal patterns and paralinguistic phenomena.

This, in turn, means that readers cannot expect to be in a position to come up with alternative analyses based on the transcripts. For the possibility of verification and control, fundamental characteristics of scientific research, such a claim may seem unsatisfactory, to say the least, since data appear as adjusted and no longer retrievable in their original form. The only possible reply is that opportunities for control, replication and other ways of verifying/falsifying the results obtained must be created otherwise. Sequences from the data cited as examples in the presentation of the study appear in a completely different context and are no longer data for analysis. Hereby one may choose a form for transcription starting from the fact that we are engaged in written communication and make relatively far-reaching adaptations to written language norms. Covering the transcripts with spoken language characteristics that have no conventional counterpart in writing is justified only to the extent that their representation is critical to understanding the point to be illustrated. Otherwise, there is only a risk that the reader's task is made unduly difficult and unpleasant. This is to say that transcripts should enable the reader to read the transcripts fluently and make him/her readily come to a global comprehension of what is said, to get a flavour of how it is said and to see the point they are to illustrate, without having to crack a special code of transcription technicalities.

As hinted at above, all analyses in the present study have been carried out using the audio-tapes directly and continuously, broad but verbatim transcripts serving only as a support. I repeat that this means that transcriptions are not to be regarded as the primary data. Furthermore, for the presentation of the study, examples are cited in as non-technical ways as possible. The spoken language of the dialogues is rendered in a way reminiscent of a written theatre play or a film scenario. This means that quite a large step towards written language norms has been taken. In orthography some conventionally used means to give a flavour of spoken language are used. For punctuation and other devices specific for writing, conventional norms are not followed in order not to exaggerate the impression of written language. Detailed descriptions of transcription conventions used are given in the next section.
5.2 Transcription conventions

Transcriptions are given verbatim, i.e. all audible words spoken are transcribed, including e.g. repetitions, restarts and hesitation noises. Normal orthography is used in a way that requires three particular comments:

— Some words have alternative forms in writing, e.g. <mig>, <dig>, <sig>/<mej>, <dej>, <sej> (me, you, him/her); <sådan>/<sån> (such); <litt>/<lits> (little) and several others. The former are required in most written registers, the latter are closer to the way they are normally pronounced and can be used in informal written style. It is the latter, "the spoken language forms", that will be used here, in order not to give an unnecessarily strong flavour of formal written language. (Of course, if any of these words should actually be pronounced in the more literate or elaborate way, e.g. when someone is reading aloud, this will be reflected in the transcription.)

— Other words are regularly written in a way that differs from their habitual pronunciation, and do not have any conventional "spoken language forms" in writing, e.g. <vara> (be), normally pronounced /va:/, <vad> (what) and <var> (was), both also in most cases pronounced /va:/; These will be transcribed in their written forms. (The form "va" is reserved for use as a question tag and as a (casual speech) form of asking for repetition, i.e. "what?", "what did you say?"). Another example would be /ja/ which is the normal pronunciation of both <ja> (yes) and <jag> (I, i.e. 1st person singular pronoun). The reason for choosing standard orthography is immediately clear when we look at the examples above: such a transcription avoids creating a number of homographs which would lead to a loss in terms of readability that is in no way compensated by the gains.

— The word(s) regularly pronounced /å/ create a particular problem. Sometimes it is unclear whether it should be restituted as <och> (and) or <att> (infinitive mark). Therefore, the transcription "å" is used. (Evidently, there are occasions when the speaker actually says /åk/, in which case it will be transcribed "och".)

Punctuation marks are not used according to written language standards. Capital letters are used only together with turn-internal . ? or !. Instead the following conventions are introduced:

— is used within turns when some unit is clearly brought to completion and another unit follows. Normally, at the end of a completed turn, no punctuation mark is used (in order not to counteract the desired impression that a dialogue is a continuous flow of utterances; however, see below about cases where ?! .. or ... are needed).

— is used when the speaker finishes one turn-constructional unit but signals by means of prosody or timing that (s)he has not completed his/her turn but goes on to a next unit. The difference between cases where . and , respectively are used, thus lies in the strength of the speaker's demarcation between units building up his/her turn.
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... stands for non-completion, e.g. in connection with interruptions or other breaks in the flow of speech such as hesitations or the speaker's abandoning one construction, possibly doing a restart.

... also stands for non-completion of a unit but of another kind. The difference between ... and .. lies in the impression that the former is more controlled (and occasionally even pre-planned) by the speaker, while the latter is the result of difficulties with constructing an utterance or holding the floor. A particular case where ... is used are the so-called fill-in questions ('proxy completion', in the terms of Clark & Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986; see also chapter VI, section 4.2.2.4), where the speaker leaves an uncompleted unit to the co-conversationalist to complete in his/her next turn.

? is not regularly used for all questions, but when the interrogative function of an utterance is emphasized through prosody or other paralinguistic means, especially when there are no other markers of interrogative function in the transcription.

! is used when an utterance is pronounced in a particularly expressive way, indicating e.g. enthusiasm or astonishment.

// is used to render unspecified noises, e.g. in connection with eagerness, by which the speaker takes the floor, or holds his turn but without producing words or fragments of words that are interpretable.

Filled pauses are transcribed as "eh" (or "äh", "øh", "ah", according to their phonetic quality; in the English translation this variation is disregarded, all filled pauses are translated as "er"). Particularly long pauses, in practice approximately two seconds or more, and other significant stretches of silence are measured. The approximate length is indicated within parenthesis, e.g. (3s), i.e. in chronometrical time. When the floor has been clearly given to one of the participants (after a "soliciting initiative", see chapter V, section 2.2) and a pause follows, it is considered as belonging to his/her turn; when no such initiative has been taken, silences are marked between the turns at the level where symbols for speaker occur.

Important prosodic or other paralinguistic features of various kinds within or around utterances are given in capital letters within strokes as "stage directions", in the way they have been globally interpreted, e.g.: /WHISPERS/, /SHOUTS OUT/, /YAWNS/, /LAUGHS/, /SCORNFULLY/, /HESITANTLY/, /WRITES/, /RUBS OUT/ etc.

Interruptions and simultaneous talk are also marked as stage directions. In cases of overlapping, all audible words have been transcribed. No exact marking of where the overlapping starts and finishes is given, except in cases where such exactitude is crucial to the point to be illustrated. When a speaker's utterance is inserted within what is considered as an uninterrupted turn of the conversational partner, the second part of the uninterrupted turn is transcribed with the left margin somewhat drawn to the right. Such a case is illustrated in (1) above, turns e-f.

Back-channel items are transcribed with small letters within strokes and preceded by a speaker symbol, e.g. /P:yes/, /T:mm/, approximately where they
occur in the co-conversationalist's turn. This is to indicate that back-channeling is not considered as interrupting the partner's turn (see further chapter V, section 2.3).

When turns are cited only in part, omissions are marked by (...)

All names of persons, schools, places etc are fictitious.

Sequences from the data cited in the text have been translated as faithfully as possible into English and the translation is displayed immediately after the original, using the conventions described above. Of course, several examples used to illustrate the discussion, include phenomena that are language specific, i.e. their interpretation and, perhaps, even occurrence are dependent upon e.g. phonetic similarity or semantic relatedness between words and expressions, particular grammatical constructions and so on that are not the same in English as in Swedish. In such cases, no effort has been made to invent a corresponding example in English; instead, the Swedish item is given within strokes, a literal translation and an explanation in English given within parenthesis. When items from a cited sequence are discussed in the text, the English version is used, except for untranslatable items, where the Swedish word is cited within strokes and the English translation and/or a comment given within parentheses.
IV LANGUAGE AT TWO LEVELS IN THE LANGUAGE LESSON

1 Introduction: the level concept

According to the theory of language outlined in chapter II above, linguistic activity is situated, i.e. takes place under specific, concrete circumstances to which language is reflexively and inextricably tied. By the same token, language is fundamentally a means for carrying out purposeful activities. Through language we convey messages, perform actions, construct and structure reality around us. When so doing in everyday life, we adopt a natural and unreflective attitude towards language; language is typically transparent — only when there is a hitch of some kind do we look at language rather than through it. Language use, as well as other modes of action, is characterized by "seen-but-unnoticed" (Garfinkel, 1967) procedures.

In language teaching, too, there is a level at which language functions as an implicit, transparent tool for the performing of the tasks that constitute the activity. To explicate this function one has to consider the activity specific context in terms mainly of its purpose, actors and their roles, subject matter, time, place and salient features of the environment.

As described in chapter II, these coordinates, the why, who, what, when and where, constitute the activity type in which activity specific premisses for communication are brought to bear. The activity type supplies the context within which language is understood by the participants and should be understood by the observer. For the purpose of the analysis to be undertaken in this chapter, I shall refer to this function of language as level 1 use of language.

However, language is present in the language classroom not only at level 1. Language is also the subject matter of the activity. This I shall refer to as language at level 2. One fundamental difference between the two levels is that whereas level 1, as described above, is implicit, level 2 is explicit. Aspects of language that in everyday use of language (level 1) are "seen-but-unnoticed", transparent, implicitly working, are brought to focus, explicitly talked about and consciously manipulated in their own right and in a particular perspective during language lessons (level 2).

In the analysis to be undertaken in this chapter, I shall make use of the level concept, introduced above, in two ways. Firstly, I shall try to capture the essence of language as it is conceived at level 2, i.e. analyse what language is taken to be in language teaching, how it is conceptualized, what is taught and expected to be learnt about language. In order to do this, I can exploit precisely the fact that language is explicitly talked about during lessons. Staying very
close to the data, the discourse of the eight lessons recorded, I shall try to detect what counts as true or false, relevant or irrelevant, important or unimportant about language as it is talked about in the language lesson. The resulting description is an attempt at uncovering the premises for communication maintained in language teaching and it constitutes a map of language teaching as a minor province of meaning.

Secondly, and most important, I shall analyse further the interactional consequences of the fact that language functions simultaneously at two levels. The relationship between the two levels as it emerges in the lesson will be explored and an analysis of specific dialogue processes that seem to be due to the complex relationship between the two levels will be suggested. In so doing, I shall try to unfold the consequences of the confrontation between a naive, natural attitude to language and the specific attitude to language and the particular perspective on language on which the lessons rely; I shall describe the conflict between everyday experiences of language use and the specific knowledge about language that counts in the language lesson.

First, some comments upon the choice of the term 'level' may be appropriate. The term 'level' is used in order to emphasize that the two functions of language we are dealing with represent a major shift of perspectives, a qualitative difference, as it were. Switching between level 1 and level 2 amounts to more than a mere topic change, more than a shift of domains of reference or "context spaces" (the term from Reichman, 1978). Such changes are indeed very frequent in the lessons, e.g. switching in and out from the context of a text read in the text-book (cf chapter V, section 3.2.7), but they do not entail the problems typical of shifts between levels. In level 1 use of language, topics develop successively or may be changed through overt marking: a discussion of topic A may through its own dynamics lead to topic B (for a discussion of topic, topical frameworks and "speaking topically", see Brown & Yule, 1983a, chapter 3) or topic A may be more or less explicitly closed and topic B opened. The different topics however are placed at the same level and in some sense sequentially ordered. Level 1 and 2, on the other hand, may potentially be simultaneously present and whether one or the other should apply to an utterance depends on the choice of focus. A metaphor may perhaps illustrate the point of the argument: Imagine we were making a film presenting e.g. the university campus. The different buildings may be filmed either by a sweeping camera or by first filming one building, then stopping the camera, then another building — the buildings as subjects in the film would then correspond to topics in a dialogue. If, instead of looking at our subjects through the camera lens, we start focusing on the camera itself, this shift of attention represents a qualitative shift that is of a radically different character than letting the camera go from one subject to another. This metaphor obviously may lead us to think of level 2 as meta-language and meta-communication. The difference between the level concept and meta-activities in communication is further dealt with in section 2.4.

Finally in this section, I shall give a few notes on the method of analysis. The analysis consists of discursive reasoning upon dialogue sequences from the data, selected for their pertinence to various aspects of the two-level phenomenon. The method thus is a close scrutiny of how the conversational-
ists on a turn-by-turn basis display their understanding of what the talk is about (cf Heritage, 1984:259). Thereby, the analysis will have to draw heavily on sequences where problems occur, where the dialogue exhibits temporary, partial or complete break-down of understanding. This is simply because cases of unproblematic intersubjective understanding are less informative. However, through the illustration provided by the problematic features we may also gain insight into what the prerequisites are for a smooth functioning of interaction in the activity type in question. Abundant illustration from the data will be given and the examples will be drawn from many different dyads and activities where the phenomena under discussion are found, in order to indicate some of their generality. Concepts for the analysis will be introduced successively, in the context where they are used, and summed up at the end of the chapter.

2 Level 2

2.1 Decontextualization as a prerequisite for level 2

In order to establish language itself as the core content of the lesson, the language as talked about must be kept separate from the level 1 context of the lesson. This means that language at level 2 must be decontextualized, or, put otherwise, that level 2 language must be protected from being directly contextualized in the level 1 context. In order to talk about language, one needs to create a room, a shelter for the linguistic items talked about. To refer to this detachment of level 2 language from the level 1 context, I shall, later in this chapter, introduce the concept of 'linguistic enclosure'.

Let us take an invented example: if a teacher during a lesson of English for foreigners should say, with distinct articulation and great emphasis “You bloody fool!” in order to illustrate the fact that phonetic /u/ may be spelled in different ways, and double <o> in spelling pronounced in different ways, this is not to be taken as if (s)he were insulting her/his pupils — the utterance is uttered at level 2, and is thus not to be contextualized as a normally used utterance. Instead, it must be treated as a decontextualized linguistic item to be looked upon, considered and, possibly, manipulated differently.

When talking about decontextualization, I obviously do not mean decontextualization in an absolute sense. No utterance can ever be uttered and interpreted without any context at all. Indeed, the decontextualization we are about to investigate typically takes place within a highly specific context, namely that of the language lesson. There, paradoxically enough, linguistic expressions are subject to a kind of contextualization which involves its very opposite, decontextualization. This was precisely what was formulated as 'the decontextualization paradox' in chapter 1. Some may prefer to think of the phenomena about to be studied in this chapter as recontextualization of utterances. In a sense, given what was said above about the impossibility of uttering something that is out of any context in an absolute sense, such a term would be more correct. However, in the view of the present author, the term 'decontextualization' has
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the advantage of capturing both the fact that linguistic items are recontextualized and the fact that language, when thus recontextualized, is looked upon in particular ways, namely as detached from its normal referential and descriptive anchorage, i.e. as decontextualized.

Deliberately, and for the sake of clarity, "You bloody fool" — a simple-minded, invented example — was chosen above to illustrate the decontextualization needed for level 2 language. Obviously, it is part of the competence needed for participating successfully in a language lesson to know of the separation of levels. Perhaps, one can occasionally find mistakes akin to the invented example above:

(11) /T tries to explain the meaning of the word damm (dam) to P/

L7:451 T: ja, damm det blir det när man bygger upp vägg så här, å stopper upp vattnet, då får du liksom en konstgjord sjö
452 P: mm
453 T: du har ordnat en sjö, då..
454 P: /SAMTIDIGT/ nåt
T: får du en damm, det kallar man en damm, vad är alltså en damm Yousuf

(11) /T tries to explain the meaning of the word damm (dam) to P/

L7:451 T: yes a dam that's what one has when one builds up a wall like this, to stop the water, then one has like an artificial lake
452 P: mm
453 T: you have made a lake, then..
454 P: /SIMULTANEOUSLY/ no!
T: you have a dam, that's what one calls a dam, so what is a dam Yousuf

One possible interpretation of this sequence is that P takes 453 not as a level 2 utterance, "du" (you) meaning man (one), i.e. an indefinite pronoun, but to contextualize the utterance within the level 1 context, "du" (you) referring to himself as being T:s interlocutor, and protests against the assertion he thereby mistakenly attributes to T.

However, when the demarcation between the two levels is so obvious, there rarely are any difficulties. In actual lessons though, the relation between the levels is far more intricate and the problem of separating them considerably more subtle. This is the most important aspect of the analysis to follow. The interesting thing is not merely the existence of two levels of language — which would be a fairly trivial finding — but the entanglement between them in the unfolding dialogue process, the opacity of levels, as it were.

2.2 The linguistic enclosure

Language use is characterized by an organic and dynamic relation between the linguistic expressions and the activity context in which they are integrated. The organic element is that a specific part of the meaning potential of a linguistic item is realized in a specific context (Rommetveit, 1983, 1987a, b) and that an utterance is context-shaped, i.e. depending for its design as well as its interpre-
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tation on the actual stage of the activity in which it participates. The dynamic element is that an utterance affects the context so that the context for the next utterance is changed by its having been uttered. Communicative action is "doubly contextual" (Heritage, 1984:242). To see how level 2 works in this respect and how it differs from level 1, let us look at an example:

(12) /P has read a text from the reader; the exercise he is now doing is labelled "Search for the word! It can be found in the text about engine-driver Näslund."

L8:226 T: (...) Växeln hade frusit...
227 P: /SKRIVER/ f... a... st

(12) /P has read a text from the reader; the exercise he is now doing is labelled "Search for the word! It can be found in the text about engine-driver Näslund."

L8:226 T: (...) The points had frozen...
227 P: /WRITES/ s... o... lid

In (12), we are clearly confronted with language at level 2. However, first let us consider what would happen if somebody used a sentence like The points had frozen solid at level 1. Then the utterance would have an immediate organic and dynamic relationship to the context in which the utterance occurs — no matter if it were railroad workers discussing what they should do to ensure the circulation of trains or somebody telling a (true or fictive) story about something that happened at a railway station. In such a case, the reference of "the points" would be immediately related to the verbal or non-verbal context; through the description something would be made known that directly altered the context. Thus, the linguistic expressions — point, freeze, solid and the purely grammatical elements — and their meaning potentials would be brought into use to make something known, to refer to a reference situation and to bring into focus aspects of it, i.e. to give a description. In ordinary use of language, each utterance is based on the earlier established context and, at the same time, develops it.

When the utterance is uttered at level 2 as in (12), this real-world type of contextualization must not be made. Reference is not made to any "points" at all — asking "what points?" would be, so to speak, pointless — and therefore nothing is made known about "them". In this sense, the utterance is decontextualized; reference and description do not work in the ordinary way, i.e. in immediate relation to context.1

1To be on the safe side, I repeat that this decontextualization takes place within the very context of the language lesson. To that extent, the utterance is both context-shaped and context-renewing; what is made known through the utterance is e.g. that the pupil can find or remember a linguistic item, the verb particle fast (solid). Obviously, when P utters "fast" (solid) in 227 above, this is closely related to the question posed by T in the preceding turn and it changes the context in the sense that his solving of the task means that he can now turn to the next one. However, the point is that this does not have the ordinary relation to the conventional meaning or any meaning-in-context of "Växeln hade frusit fast" (The points had frozen solid), when the sentence is used for reference and description.
At level 2 a linguistic item is not used, it is quoted, displayed, exhibited. This has also been pointed out by Edmondson (1981) who labels such displays of linguistic items "sayings". The fact that reference and description do not work in the ordinary way in the case of sayings — level 2 utterances — is demonstrated by Edmondson (1981:132) in the following way:

As there is no operant possible world in which the utterance functions other than as a saying, we cannot meaningfully refer to the situationally-appropriate assignment of stress here.

Another way of showing this difference would be to say that anyone who utters something at level 2 is not committed to what (s)he says in the same way as when (s)he uses it in the ordinary way. In the invented example above, T does not endorse the commitment connected to a coarse insult; in (12) T and P do not commit themselves in the same way as if e.g. they reported something they knew, or had heard of, or even had imagined. (On speakers' and listeners' responsibilities and commitments in ordinary communicative contexts, see Rommetveit, 1985.)

Using a metaphor, the phenomenon of language detached (level 2), could be compared to what happens to articles of everyday use when they are placed in a museum. An armchair still is an armchair when we admire it at the museum, but from the moment it was taken away from its normal environment, it is no longer an article of use. Its use, certainly, may still be one aspect that we think of; its exhibition, however, make salient other aspects. The same goes for linguistic items uttered at level 2. They are no longer used, they are exhibited and looked upon differently.

To make it possible to utter linguistic expressions that are exempt from the organic, dynamic relation to context, i.e. to make it possible to utter linguistic expressions without the immediate real-world type contextualization, linguistic items at level 2 have to be enclosed. The linguistic enclosure created for level 2 language is supposed to inhibit level 1 reactions to level 2 utterances. When confronted with an enclosed utterance, one is supposed not to make use of everyday interpretative devices, viz. immediate contextualization of the utterance.

Sequences where linguistic items are uttered within linguistic enclosure, rather than used with normal contextualization, abound in the corpus. Here, I shall give just one illustrative example:

(13) /P has read a Nordic folk tale. For the exercise, the direct speech of the tale has been transformed into indirect speech in the exercise book. P's task is to retransform the sentences into direct speech/


225 T: num, nu ska vi se, du kan läsa det här
226 P: /LÄSER/ Gudbrand säger att han har bytt kon mot en häst. Hustrun säger att de kan köra till kyrkan med hästen.
227 T: num, det är det här som dom säger, det har dom ändrat om då
/P:mm/ så att det är pratbubblor så att han säger det va /P:mm/

228 P: vad ska jag skriva där?
229 T: nu ska vi skriva det i prathubblan först, men vi får läsa vad det är för nåt vi ska skriva om
230 P: /GÄSPAR, LÄSER/ Hustrun säger att barnen alltid ska gå och ställa in hästen.
231 T: mm hustrun säger till barnen
232 P: mm
233 T: vad säger hustrun nu då, kommer du ihåg vad hon sa där i hoken, gå...
234 P: ä
235 T: vad ska vi skriva här då
236 P: /OHÖRBART/

237 P: vad kan det bli
238 T: hustrun säger till barnen att dom ska gå å ställa in hästen
239 P: barnens..nåå
240 T: å så ska frun säga det, hustrun ska säga det
241 P: /SAMTIDIGT/ det kan inte jag, s...ska dom säga...
242 T: joo, hon säger att barn...
243 P: (2s)
244 T: gå och...
245 P: /SAMTIDIGT/ gå in..gå och ställ in hästen
246 T: gå å ställ in hästen barn
247 P: jaa

/P has read a Nordic folk tale. For the exercise, the direct speech of the tale has been transformed into indirect speech in the exercise book. P's task is to retransform the sentences into direct speech/

L5:224 P: /READS/ What do the man and his wife say? Write down what Gudbrand and his wife say. First look at the examples. I have bartered the cow for a horse. We can go to church by horse.
225 T: mm, now let's see, you can read this
226 P: /READS/ Gudbrand says he has bartered the cow for a horse. His wife says they can go to church by horse. 
227 T: mm, this is what they say, then they've changed it /P:mm/ so that it is bubbles so that he's saying it, right /P:mm/ I have bartered the cow for a horse and the wife says, now we can go to church by horse. Now we can go on reading there
228 P: what shall I write there?
229 T: now we shall write it down first in the bubble, but we have to read what it is that we'll write about
230 P: /YAWNS, READS/ The wife says that the children should always lead the horse into the stable.
231 T: mm the wife says to the children
232 P: mm
233 T: and now what does the wife say, do you remember what she said in the book, lead...
234 P: and
235 T: so what should we write here
236 P: /INAUDIBLE/

(3s)
237 P: what could it be
238 T: the wife says to the children that they should lead the horse into the stable
239 P: the children's..no
T: and then the wife is to say it, the wife is to say it
P: /SIMULTANEOUSLY/ I don't know, a., are they to say...
T: listen, she says children...
P: (2s)
T: lead...
P: /SIMULTANEOUSLY/ lead in..lead the horse into the stable
T: lead the horse into the stable children
P: yes

Here "Lead the horse into the stable, children" is not used as it originally was in the — fictive — context of the tale. The sentence is cited from the tale and when it is uttered by P in 245, it does not add to the story, nor does it convey a real-world type message whatsoever (cf below 'message-orientation' vs 'item-orientation').

2.3 Level 2 perspective

Language at level 2 is thus characterized by ordinary devices for contextualization of linguistic expressions being non-operative. This decontextualization is connected to a certain perspective on language, to certain attitudes and certain conceptions and treatments of language that are alien to a natural attitude and to everyday experiences of language use. This perspective consists of the following four traits: item-orientation, dominance of the prototypical, preference for paradigmatic relations and striving for general, abstract descriptions.

2.3.1 Message - item

In ordinary use of language, there is message-orientation, i.e. language itself is transparent and communicators concentrate primarily on the message that is conveyed through language. When linguistic items are uttered at level 2, there is item-orientation: the potential messages that are conventionally conveyed by the item talked about, and possibly specified by the context from which the item is taken, are not to be considered. The linguistic item is abstracted from the message-potential that it would carry in a situation-specific utterance:

(14) L7:317  T: ja, å det fanns en hel del ord här som man kanske behöver känna till, å det stod här att det var..kustlandet var mest lämpligt för jordbruk /P:ja/ vet du vad en åker är
318 P: (3s)
319 T: vad är en åker
(...)
340 T: och marken som han kör på då, det är åker
341 P: marken som han kör på det är åker
342 T: här har du ordet åker, ta å läs vad som står om det
343 P: /LÄSER/ Bonden har en stor åker där han odlar råg
344 T: jaa, odlar..

The term 'item-orientation' is preferred to e.g. 'medium-orientation' (Butzkamm & Dodson, 1980), since it hints at the emphasis on linguistic expressions — words, phrases, sentences — in isolation.
345 P: /AVBRYTER/ odla han bara råg
346 T: näa, det...ma...man odla olika saker, man kan...förresten vad kan man odla, det kanske du kan tala om

(14) L7:317 T: yes and there were quite a lot of words that you perhaps need to know, here it said that it was...the coastal area was the most suitable for agriculture /P:yes/ do you know what a field is
318 P: (3s)
319 T: what is a field
(...)
340 T: and the ground that he's driving on, that's the field
341 P: the ground that he's driving on that's the field
342 T: here's the word field, please read what is said about it
343 P: /READS/ The farmer has a big field where he cultivates rye
344 T: yes, cultivate...
345 P: /INTERRUPTS/ does he only cultivate rye
346 T: no, that...he...one...one cultivates different things, one can...by the way what can you cultivate, perhaps you could tell that

The aim of the activity that starts in 317 is to get at the abstract, general, lexical meaning of the word field (cf below, 2.3.4); the sentence read in 343 is thus not to be taken in this connection as a message about a concrete, specific farmer. It functions merely as a sentence-item to illustrate another item, the word field. The message-oriented question from P in 345 is thus beside the point and he is taken back to level 2 by T asking in general terms (note the indefinite pronoun "man" (one, you) in 346) about the meaning of cultivate and, a couple of turns later to the original problem:

(15) L7:350 T: så rågen mognar ja, alltså, om jag frågar dej nu, vad är en åker
351 P: sån där som traktorna håller på å planterar till exempel eh vad ska jag eh säga
(2s)
352 T: ja vad är själva åkern
(15) L7:350 T: so the rye ripens yes, okay, so if I ask you now, what is a field
351 P: kind of where tractors are planting for example er what should I er say
(2s)
352 T: well what is the actual field

2.3.2 Potentials - prototype

Words and expressions in natural language have a meaning potential, part of which is realized in each situated use of the word or expression. Which aspect(s) of meaning that is/are made prominent depends on the specific context of use (Rommetveit, 1983, 1987a, b; see also Heritage, 1984, chapter 6). Since level 2 treatment of language is characterized by decontextualization, it cannot rely on any specific context to hint at what, or how much, of the
potential is to be realized. At level 2 it is the prototypical\(^1\) that prevails over other potentials.

This phenomenon is most easily exemplified by the exercises on antonyms (L4, L5, L6, L8), since they present a double predilection for the prototypical. The Nordic folk tale read in L5 contains ten adjectives: **stor** (big), **bra** (also in the form **bättre** (good, better), **läng** (long, tall), **hungri** (hungry), **lät** (light, easy), **smäll** (kind), **arg** (angry), **duktig** (clever), **fin** (nice), **tidig** (early). Out of these, eight are taken up in the exercise and paired with their prototypical antonyms. The two left out, **arg** (angry) and **duktig** (clever), are those for which no prototypical antonym exists in the lexicon. Thus, the first way in which the prototypical prevails is in the choice of linguistic material to deal with.

If we then look closer at the exercises in question, we find that the prototype is proposed as the solution even in cases where a non-prototypical potential of the meaning of a word is the one realized in the context from which the word is taken. (This has to do with the item-orientation (cf above) of the exercise — the word has been taken out of its context as an isolated item, and its specified meaning is no longer to be considered.) In the tale about Gudbrand we read:

(16) — Ja, men jag har inte någon gäs heller, sade mannen. Jag byte gåsen mot en tupp.
   — Så fin! sade husvun. När vi har tupp, kan vi komma upp tidigt om morgonen.

(16) — Well but I don't have a goose either, the man said. I bartered the goose for a rooster.
   — How nice! his wife said. When we have a rooster, we can get up early in the morning.

(The tale is cited from the book to spare the reader from errors of pronunciation, corrections etc that occur as this passage is read in L5:27-29.)

The antonyms of **fin** (nice) and **tidig** (early) given as correct answers, the prototypes **sul** (ugly) and **smäll** (late), prove not to fit in easily in this context and the opposite (inverse, negated) proposition does in no way result from the operation of substitution. The same goes for (17), where many other alternatives than **styg** (evil) and **dålig** (bad) are as suited, or more so, if we should state the opposite of

(17) — Jodå, min fru är så smäll, sade Gudbrand. Hon tycker att allt som jag gör är bra.
(17) — Oh yes, my wife is so kind, Gudbrand said. She thinks that everything I do is fine.

In L4, P suggests sometimes to be the antonym of **never**, a suggestion that is rejected. Out of several possible ways of "saying the opposite" (not only

---

\(^1\)The term 'prototypical' is used here in its everyday sense, i.e. not the way it has been specified by Rosch (1973). Another possible way of characterizing the phenomenon would be to use Johnson-Laird's (1987) notion 'default value' (cf Rommetveit, 1987b).
sometimes but also often, once, seldom ...) of the sentence given as a cue, it is the prototypical word always that is searched for:

(18) L4:27 T: (...) jaa så var det dina motsatsord, då ska vi se  
28 P: bred, smal, svart, vit, aldrig, ibland /T:mm/ är det inte så  
29 T: hur är det med det, jag har aldrig... /OHÖRBART/  
30 P: ofta, nej  
31 T: mm, jag har aldrig godis med mej i skolan, för det får vi ju inte  
32 P: nåå  
33 T: nåå...  
34 P: /SAMTIDIGT/ ne...  
T: vad kan motsatsen vara till det  
35 P: (4s) inte alltid va?  
36 T: jo, just det

(18) L4:27 T: (...) well then we had your antonyms, so let’s see  
28 P: broad, narrow, black, white, never, sometimes /T:mm/ isn’t that so  
29 T: what about that, I never have... /INAUDIBLE/  
30 P: often, no  
31 T: mm, I never bring sweets to school, ‘cause we aren’t allowed to  
32 P: no  
33 T: no...  
34 P: /SIMULTANEOUSLY/ ne...  
T: what could be the opposite of that  
35 P: (4s) not always is it?  
36 T: yes, it is

2.3.3 Paradigmatic relations

Another pertinent trait of level 2 treatment of language is the preference for paradigmatic, within-language relations of the linguistic items that are talked about: paradigms proper, synonymy, hyponomy, antonymy. In everyday use of language, other formats of human experience such as motives, intentions, chronology, cause-effect relations and other experience-based associations of different kinds are likely to play a more central role than paradigmatic relations within the language system. In (19) we see how such formats are outflanked by the verb paradigm that is to be found:

(19) L4:359 T: kan du säga nåt annat verb som vi kan använda  
360 P: åta (5s) inte sover, hän  
361 T: joo visst kan vi göra det, sover, vilken form av verbet är det  
362 P: det är vahetere det, ver...prisens  
363 T: presens, jag skriver det där, jaa  
364 P: sååå...  
365 T: vad heter det i imperfekt  
366 P: sovde, nåå  
(5s)  
367 T: det är ju sånt där verb som vi brukar kalla för...att det följer inte reglera /P:tmn/ nåå  
368 P: somnade  
369 T: jag sover, igår...
370 P: sov
371 T: javisst
372 P: sov..nej, sover, sov
373 T: jag sover, då gör jag det nu /P:mm/ igår..
374 P: /SAMTIDIGT/ somnade jag
T: jag sov, men eh jag har inte somnat ännu, jag ska lägga mej å sen så...
375 P: /VISKAR/ somnar jag
376 T: ska jag sova, ja just det /SKRIVER PÅ TAVLAN/. Jaa

(19) L4:359 T: could you say another verb that we could use
360 P: noo (5s) not sleeping, no
361 T: certainly we can, sleeping, what form of the verb is that
362 P: that's what'sitsname ver..present
363 T: present, I'll write that here, well
364 P: sleeee...
365 T: how do you say that in the past
366 P: slepted, noo
(5s)
367 T: it's the kind of verb that we call..it doesn't follow the rules
/P:no/ no
368 P: fell asleep
369 T: I sleep, yesterday...
370 P: slept
371 T: that's it
372 P: sleeeno, sleep, slept
373 T: I sleep, then I do it now /P:mm/ yesterday..
374 P: /SIMULTANEOUSLY/ I fell asleep
T: I slept, but er I haven't fallen asleep yet, I'll go to bed and then I shall...
375 P: /WHISPERS/ fell asleep
376 T: I shall sleep, that's it /WRITES ON THE BLACKBOARD/. Okay

If the task were not to find the paradigm of one particular verb, but to describe a real or possible state of affairs (cf 'message' vs 'item', above), P's suggestions that "the one who sleeps has fallen asleep" would be perfectly reasonable — here they don't count.

An exercise of vocabulary in L6 (and used also in one of the lessons in the pilot study) can serve as another example. Expressions describing a state of mind or a trait of character and including comparisons with animals ('hungry as a wolf etc) are listed. In the exercise, nothing is stated about anyone being hungry (if this were the case, "syntagmatic" associations like 'Why is he hungry?','Is he also thirsty?','Tired?', 'Will he find something to eat?', 'What will happen to him next?' would be relevant); the expression hungry as a wolf is taken with as cunning as a fox and other expressions of the same form, for, as it were, paradigmatic reasons.

The preponderance of paradigmatic relations is also manifest in lots of other exercises: an array of prepositions (adjectives etc) are put together for their belonging to the same category of parts of speech, though in level 1 use of language they may well go together/contrast with expressions built with other linguistic material. To take a last example of the paradigm phenomenon, we turn to L1. Here P demonstrates that he knows what it means to compare in everyday terms:
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(20) L1:305 T: ja och jag var en sextiåtta /P:ja/ så jag var ganska mycket länge /HARKLAR SIG/ Det är ju så här att när man...

306 P: /AVBRYTER/ såhär kan jag

307 T: ja, vad bra, du får inte titta på det ån ser du /SKRATTAR/ /P:nej/ det är ju så här att man kan ju jämföra, hur gör man när man jämför

308 P: då säger man så här, om man vaheter på teven brukar det ju vara såna här.. (6s) om man vaheter jämför vilka som är starkast så här /T:mm/ då har man ju dragkamp så att man tar dragkamp, sen är det står det nära barn på den andra sidan så nära barn på den andra sidan, sen har dom ett rep...i mi...emellan /T:mm/ sen dra...sen är det när domare som säger, dra, å så drar dom ända till nära ger upp, å då är dom...det andra laget vunnit /T:mm/ så jämför man om...om vilka som är starkast /T:mm/ å vilka som är svagast /T:ja det kan man göra/ sen kan man ha..

309 T: om jag skulle visa dej dom här pennorna, (5s) hur tycker du att den här pennan är

310 P: lång

311 T: mm, eh, hur tycker du att den här pennan är då

312 P: lång

313 T: ganska lång också?

314 P: mm

315 T: ja, om vi säger att den här är lång

316 P: ja

317 T: ha, då lägger vi den där. Å så tar vi den här

318 P: /SAMTIDIGT/ längre

319 T: ja

320 P: längst

321 T: just det. Men om jag då säger att om jag viser dej den här, den är ju...

322 P: störst

323 T: ja den är väldigt lång den här, då tycker jag vi säger...

324 P: längst

325 T: ja, då säger jag att den här tycker jag är ganska kort /P:ja/ då säger jag den här är kort

326 P: kort, kortare, kortast /T:ja/ eller om man tar, så här, kort, kortare, kortast

327 T: just det (3s) det säger man ja, nu kan vi titta på sidan nio, och eh...det här ordet stark, det talar ju om hur nån är vs /P:ja/ ja, å såna ord brukar man kalla för adjektiv, det har du hört förut

(20) L1:305 T: yes and I was one hundred and sixty-eight centimetres /P:yes/ so I was quite a bit taller. /CLEARSTHROAT/ Now what we do is that when one..

306 P: /INTERRUPTS/ this kind of stuff I know

307 T: oh, that's fine, you mustn't look at it yet you see /LAUGHS/ /P:no/ now what we have is that one can compare, how do you go about comparing

308 P: then you say like this, if you what'sitsname on TV there are those.. (6s) if you what'sitsname compare who is strongest you know /T:mm/ then you have a tug-of-war so you go for a tug-of-war, then there is...there are some children on the oth...the one side and some children on the other side, then they have a rope between...in the mi...between /T:mm/ then pull...then there is a judge who says, pull, and then they pull until some give up, and then they are...the other team has won /T:mm/ that's how you compare who...if...who is strongest
Interestingly enough, P's demonstration in 308 of what it means to compare, comprises the opposition between strongest and weakest. Such comparisons using different adjectives are very natural to level 1; Thorell (1973) labels the phenomenon 'contrary comparative' (Sw.: konträr komparativ). In a paper discussing the relationship between grammatical descriptions and actual use, Hedquist (1978:96, my translation) states:

With a somewhat sharp formulation one could say that the comparative form of an adjective is virtually never related to the positive form of the same adjective, i.e. it is somewhat unnatural in practical use of language to talk about something being cheap, something else cheaper and a third item cheapest.

What Hedquist claims, thus, is that the paradigm of one single adjective does not play the important role in actual use of language that it is given in grammatical descriptions (and exercises), but that, instead, it relates to conjugated forms of other adjectives (and possibly words other than adjectives). This is as far as level 1 is concerned. At level 2, however, the adjective is not used to say something about anything; the aim of such an exercise is to treat of the paradigm of a word-item in isolation.
2.3.4 General, abstract descriptions

When, in everyday use of language, a particular word or expression is used, we are of course faced with a concrete instance of it and its meaning is specified by the actual, activity-bound context of its use. Words and expressions when they are talked about at level 2 are conceived of as having an abstract, general, lexical meaning that is delimited and existing out-of-context. What counts as descriptions of word meanings in language lessons is typically such lexical definitions and/or synonyms (dictionary-type definitions). When P uses examples, concrete instantiations and experience-based associations to describe word meanings, these are typically not bluntly rejected by T, but treated as insufficient.

In Gustavsson (1985a), a sequence that illustrates this phenomenon was discussed. It is taken from a lesson belonging to the pilot study; a teacher-pupil dyad, P is an 11-year-old Finnish girl (cf also Juvonen, 1987).

(21) /P has read a passage from a well-known Swedish childrens' book/

LP1:69 T: du det står så här, den elakaste katten heter Måns, vad menar man med det
  70 P: ja han är sån att han kan lura
  71 T: mm men om man är elak hurdan är man då
  72 P: han är sån att han tycker inte om Pelle
  73 T: näe men...men om...om någon är elak, hurdan är den då
  74 P: (4s) vet inte
  75 T: det vet du inte, ska vi slå upp det får vi se /P:mm/ om vi kan hitta en förklaring på det
  (13s)
  76 P: elak /OHÖRBART/
  77 T: /AVBRYTER/ man kan nästan säga att man är dum, man är stygg /P:ja/ om man är elak, du kan skriva det, elak är... lika med stygg, det vet du vad det var för nånting va /P:ja/ man är stygg mot någon när man är dum mot någon, då är man elak mot den personen

(21) /P has read a passage from a well-known Swedish childrens' book/

LP1:69 T: you know it says like this, the nastiest cat is called Måns, what does that mean
  70 P: well he's the kind that can cheat
  71 T: mm but if one is nasty how is one then
  72 P: he's the kind that doesn't like Pelle
  73 T: no but...but if...if someone is nasty, what's he like then
  74 P: (4s) don't know
  75 T: you don't know, let's look it up and see /P:mm/ if we can find an explanation of it
  (13s)
  76 P: nasty /INAUDIBLE/
  77 T: /INTERRUPTS/ you can almost say someone is unkind, one is evil /P:yes/ if one is nasty, you can write that down, nasty is... the same as evil, you know what that is don't you /P:yes/ one is evil to someone when one is unkind to someone, and then one is nasty to that person
The instantiations given by P refer to the context of the book in which the word *nasty* occurred. She refers to this context through the use of the personal pronoun *he*, talking about Måns, the cat in the book, and relating what she has found "nasty" in his behaviour. However, these are not accepted as sufficient descriptions of the meaning of *nasty*. Instead, leaving the context of the book, T rephrases the question in general terms — using indefinite instead of personal pronouns — and gives the solution as two synonyms. Thus, T's descriptions of word meaning stay within the language system; they are level 2 descriptions, decontextualized, general and abstract. P's suggestions are level 1 like; at level 1, i.e. actual language use, the normal way of explaining a word (e.g. in a meta-linguistic phase) is to point to what motivates the use of the word on that concrete, specific occasion by reference to non-linguistic, contextual or situational factors.

In the corpus of this study, this striving for formulating abstract, general descriptions of word meaning and/or finding synonyms is most clearly manifest in L7. One example, the word *field*, has been cited already, (14) above (see also (31) below). Another example from another lesson:

(22) /P has read a passage from "The Tugboat" that goes "At the same moment Eta found the glasses. More precisely, she stepped on them."

L6:27 T: mm, tack du, gör vi ett litet uppehåll där. Vad var det nu jag tänkte på här, ja, det står så här, hon trampade på dom närmare bestämt, förstår du det..inhållet där

28 P: /SAMTIDIGT/ ja hon trampade på dom

29 T: /SAMTIDIGT/ ja, egentligen var det..exakt så var det att hon trampade på dom va (…)

Despite its formulation, the question in 27 does not seem to concern primarily "the meaning" of the passage — in which case P's answer would be perfectly alright — but rather to ask for a (rough) synonym of *more precisely*. The question then, seems to concern a purely linguistic meaning of the phrase rather than how it should be interpreted in the specific context within which it was used (situated meaning or interpretation). This is but another facet of the decontextualization involved in the level 2 perspective. While in everyday use of language, the answer to a question like *What does that mean* is likely to contain the explanation of situational meaning, implications and implicatures of an *utterance*, the "same question" in a level 2 activity asks for the lexical meaning of a word, phrase or *sentence* (cf Lyons, 1977; Brown & Yule, 1983a for a discussion of the difference between 'sentence' and 'utterance').
A comparison between level 2 and meta-linguistic activities at level 1

What has been said until now about language at level 2 in the language lesson, does not distinguish it clearly from whatever sort of meta-linguistic or metacomunicative activities, which are frequent also in everyday use of language. When in ordinary conversation there are signs of communicative problems, misunderstandings, lack of understanding etc, one can recur to a meta-level: What do you mean by X, What is such a thing called, You said X, could you explain that a bit more and number of other devices and expressions. However, making language visible and assigning attention and awareness to the "seen-but-unnoticed" procedures of language use, typically have no value per se in everyday activities where language is integrated as a tool. Also the meta-level is principally a means of getting on with an activity other than talking about language. That is why the meta-level is recurred to only when the need is apparent, the problems are solved with any means available and the meta-level left as quickly as possible.

This can be illustrated by some sequences from the lessons where level 2 is not present, as well as, of course, by the non-didactic conversations of the corpus. In L3, the main activity is the construction of a kite. In this activity, language serves, as in any everyday activity, as a tool only, and the level 2 phenomenon does not come into play:

(23) L3:362 P: tack, sen drar vi ut en sån hårn form å sen lite förstorning
363 T: lite för stort?
364 P: ja /T:mm/ det skulle ju vara för stort, // komma luft i, nej, vänta, nu har jag gjort fel

(23) L3:362 P: thank you, then we cut out a form like this and then some enlargement
363 T: a bit too large?
364 P: yes /T:mm/ it had to be too large, // get air into it, no, wait, now I've made a mistake

When the meaning of P's somewhat odd expression "and then some enlargement" is not immediately clear to T, she seeks confirmation of what she thinks P might have meant. When this confirmation is given, she solely gives a back-channel signal and then there is nothing more to it. The problem of understanding has been solved with minimal means so that the principal activity can continue.

(24) below is drawn from a sequence in a lesson classified as "other teaching activities" — a discussion, parted from the text, about P's visit to the dentist. There is a hitch since T cannot understand a particular detail of P's story. The problem is very quickly passed over as P, by an inserted "mm" at the beginning of 145, accepts the understanding that T exhibits in 144, and the discussion can continue. To the outside observer, the sequence might rather appear as a misunderstanding; P is probably referring to dentists' current practice of painting children's teeth with a liquid that makes plaque appear in red (or "gold", see 143 below). However, what is important is that the acceptance of signs of minimal mutual understanding is enough to terminate the meta-
sequence. (Since it is a matter of finding the proper word or expression, the sequence is characterized as being at a meta-level, although no typical meta-linguistic devices are used.)


142 T: vad gorde dom sa du
143 P: ja så hår tog guldet på dom
144 T: ja dom röntgade dina tänder
145 P: så..mm.. Å så vahetere visade dom att jag..om jag inte borstade dom här ordentligt så kommer jag å få hål
146 T: har du eh är du noga med det nu, att du borstar

(24) L4:141 P: yes /T:yes/ once /T:yes/ there they brushed my teeth like that..and me..and taught how to brush /T:yes/ then they said..and I went another time to what'sitsname to her that..this..they make fillings between teeth

142 T: what did you say they did
143 P: well like this took gold on them
144 T: ah they X-rayed your teeth
145 P: so..mm..and the what'sitsname they showed that I..if I didn't brush these carefully then I will get holes
146 T: have you..er are you careful about that now, about brushing

In the non-didactic conversations, problems of understanding (that may be caused, as in (25) below, by P’s lack of linguistic skills) are solved in the same way:

(25)Ch8: 96 P: älgspåren, nej vahetere /VISKR/ älgspåren
97 C: nu måste vi hitta på nåt här, snabbt snabbt snabbt snabbt /GÖR LJUD/ vi måste hitta på nåt
98 P: vänta älgspåren
99 C: ellerjusspåren?
100 P: mm
101 C: ja..ri..rita ellerjusspåren, där man springer å åter skidor, /P:mm/ tie har vi, vad ska vi hitta mer /HARKLAR SIG/

(25)Ch8: 96 P: /älgspåren/ (elk tracks), no what'sitsname /älgspåren/ (elk tracks)
97 C: now we gotta think of something here, quick quick quick /MAKES NOISES/ we gotta think of something
98 P: listen /älgspåren/ (elk tracks)
99 C: /ellerjusspåren/? (the lit-up track)
100 P: mm
101 C: yeah! dr..draw the lit-up track, where you go jogging and skiing, /P:mm/ that's ten, what else can we find /CLEARS THROAT/

In 96, P utters something that is not taken up at all by C, perhaps because he did not hear it, perhaps because it was unintelligible. (Though it later becomes clear that P refers to a lit-up running track, it is not at all obvious from the outset what P actually pronounces. To make this clear, I stick to my initial interpretation, the phonetically similar word "älgspåren" (elk tracks).)
However, as P repeats his proposal, C guesses what he might mean, seeks for confirmation and when this is given, "the lit-up track" is immediately accepted as a subject for the picture book and the activity can continue: "what else can we find". No effort is spent beyond ensuring minimal mutual understanding.

To talk about language is, on the contrary, a substantial part of the language lesson as an activity type, its distinctive feature, as it were. In a language lesson, language and linguistic procedures are made visible even when they seem to work smoothly, even those practices that are routinely performed in a correct way by the pupil (cf Samuelsson, 1986, who shows in an analysis of the present corpus, that several of the grammatical phenomena that are actually taken up in exercises during the lessons do not seem to show up as problems in the pupils' spontaneous use of Swedish):

(26) /Exercise on comparison of adjectives. P has correctly given the three forms of bred (broad), smal (thin) and svår (difficult)/

L1:370  T: alla dom här tre första, vad kan du säga om dom
371  P: (4s) vad då säga
372  T: aa s..tycker du att det är..hur dom till dom här lite krängligare eller hör dom till den här vanliga lättare
373  P: lättare
374  T: jaa, för hur gör man när man höjer dom här... tre
375  P: man tar smal smalare /OSÄKERT/ smalast
376  L: jaa, vad är det du gör, du lägger till nåt
377  P: r e a r e, a s t
378  T: jaa. Ha, då ska vi fortsätta på fem, det är samma

(26) /Exercise on comparison of adjectives. P has correctly given the three forms of bred (broad), smal (thin) and svår (difficult)/

L1:370  T: all these three first ones, what can you say about them
371  P: (4s) what do you mean say
372  T: well s..do you think it is..do they belong to these tricky ones or do they belong to these ordinary easier ones
373  P: easier
374  T: yes, 'cause how do you go about it when you inflect these... three
375  P: you take thin thinner /UNCERTAINLY/ thinnest
376  L: yes, what is it you do, you add something
377  P: r e t e r e s t
378  T: yes. Okay, then we'll continue with five, it's the same

The task is not only one of inflecting adjectives, P must also be able to analyse and talk about, make explicit, what he is doing when manipulating the adjectives, or, as in (27) below, from the same exercise, to reflect upon possibilities of errors that can be made, although they have in fact not been made, at least not on this occasion:

(27) L1:405  T: javisst /SKRIVER PÅ TAVLAN/ mm å så ska du få det här /SKRIVER PÅ TAVLAN/
406  P: gammal äldre äldst
407  T: vad duklig du är. /SKRIVER PÅ TAVLAN/ Vad skulle man kunna göra för fel här, på gammal
408  P: såh, man skulle så..man kan skriva så här gamlare gamlast, fast...
Thus, an overall and essential feature of linguistic exercises in lessons is the conscious reflection upon and explicit phrasing of linguistic phenomena, and, sometimes even, the taking into account of possibilities that are not to be realized since they constitute errors. Another couple of examples:

(29) /Exercise on congruence of adjectives. Swedish nouns have gender: neutral and non-neutral. Adjectives in indefinite NPs with neutral nouns take the ending -t. The gender categories are often referred to as ett-ord (ett-words) and en-ord (en-words) respectively, ett and en being the indefinite articles. Below, "ett-ord" is translated as "neutral", though it is the somewhat less technical term that is actually used by both P and T/
Exercise on congruence of adjectives. Swedish nouns have gender: neutral and non-neutral. Adjectives in indefinite NPs with neutral nouns take the ending -t. The gender categories are often referred to as ett-ord (ett-words) and en-ord (en-words) respectively, ett and en being the indefinite articles. Below, "ett-ord" is translated as "neutral", though it is the somewhat less technical term that is actually used by both P and T.

L6:707 P: a pitch-dark house
L6:708 T: mm, and what did you have..what did you get as the ending there
L6:709 P: /kolmörk/ (pitch-dark, with the ending -t in congruence with a neutral noun)
L6:710 T: mm, it's t, why should we have a t on the ending..why should we have a t on the word there
L6:711 P: // because er...there was..it's /ett/
L6:712 T: it's a neutral word yes /P:yes/ and then it's inflected according to that // the neutral noun /P:mm/ that's fine, then we'll go on, number two

(The preterite form var of the verb vara (to be) looks like the present form of a regular verb of parallel phonological shape, e.g. infinitive köra (drive), present kör, while the present form of vara is är/)

L8:295 T: (...) eh..verbet vara..år lite speciellt med, för ja..det heter alltså inte jag var som första form då utan då heter det jag...
L8:296 P: är
L8:297 T: men igår så...
L8:298 P: var
L8:299 T: å jag...
L8:300 P: har varit
L8:301 T: ja just det

(The preterite form var of the verb vara (to be) looks like the present form of a regular verb of parallel phonological shape, e.g. infinitive köra (drive), present kör, while the present form of vara is är/)

L8:295 T: (...) er..the verb to be..is a bit special, 'cause well..it doesn't have /var/ as its first form but it has...
L8:296 P: am
L8:297 T: but yesterday...
L8:298 P: was
L8:299 T: and I...
L8:300 P: have been
L8:301 T: that's it

In an analysis of a dyadic S2L-lesson of the same kind as those of the present study, Juvonen (1987:42, my translation) points out: "One could answer the question of what characterizes the interaction between a pupil and her teacher during a language lesson in the following way: repairs."
Juvonen further claims (ibid, p 40) that the sources of repairs need not necessarily be problems from a strictly communicative point of view, but that the teacher may decide, unilaterally, that something is to be considered as a problem to be repaired. Edmondson (1986) can be said to go one step further, when he analyzes teaching as a way of "bringing errors into being":

We may claim then that particular teaching strategies exert interactional pressure on the learner to produce error. Not surprisingly, such strategies are often successful in that the teacher thereby brings about errors, which are then interpretable by the teacher as justifying his teaching strategy. (p 119)

To sum up, the fundamental differences between the meta-level in everyday use of language and level 2 in a language lesson are the following:

1. The cause of meta-activities in everyday use of language is typically a hitch of some kind, through which language, normally transparent, becomes visible. In other words, a problem occurs that needs to be solved before continuation is possible (see (23), (24) and (25) above; cf examples discussed in Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977 and in Allwood & Abelar, 1987). Such a problem need not be, and often is not, the starting point of a level 2 sequence.

2. The means to solve a problem by recourse to a meta-level comprise devices that are not appropriate for level 2 activities and vice versa. So e.g., as we shall see later, examples and instantiations, even if — in an everyday context — they would be quite to the point, are typically not taken to be sufficient explanations in level 2 sequences, though they would probably do in an everyday meta-sequence. Also, at level 2, the importance of (verbal) explicitness in level 2 activities is likely to disqualify solutions by other means than linguistic. In everyday communication, unsuccessful referential acts may sometimes be repaired simply by pointing to what is referred to; failure to communicate descriptive meaning may perhaps be remedied by iconic gestures and so forth (cf Strömqvist, 1983).

3. The meta-activity is typically brought to an end as soon as there are signs of mutual understanding sufficient to continue at the point where the problem occurred. Such minimal mutual understanding typically is not enough to end a level 2 sequence.

4. Since level 2 treatment of language is an end in itself in the language lesson, while meta-sequences in everyday activities are means subordinate to ends other than talking about language, there is also a difference in what follows a level 2 sequence. Phrasing it differently: a level 2 sequence has another structural status in the ongoing conversation than a meta-sequence.

(31) can be used to illustrate all four differences:

(31) P has read a passage from his geography book and is then invited to retell what he has read. His retelling is followed by T's question in 236/ L7:236 T: jaa, då frågar jag dej, vad är lämplig för nämning
237 P: jag vet vad det är, men det är så himla svårt å säga
238 T: nu kan du förstå å tala om för mej vad lämplig är
239 P: /VISKAR, OHRBART/
240 T: att jorden är lämplig för jordbruk?
241 P: alltså bra och...
242 T: just det, den är bra å det passar. Vad är industri
243 P: industri det är som..jaa som ett..som till exempel SUN (fabriksnamn)
244 T: jaha, kan du säga ett annat ord för industri

(31) /P has read a passage from his geography book and is then invited to retell what he has read. His retelling is followed by T’s question in 236/

L7:236 T: okay, then I’ll ask you, what is suitable
237 P: I know what is is, but it’s so awfully hard to tell
238 T: um can you try and tell me what suitable is
239 P: /WHISPERS, INAUDIBLE/
240 T: that the soil is suitable for agriculture?
241 P: well good and...
242 T: that’s it, it’s good and it fits. What is industry
243 P: industry that’s like well like a..like for example SUN (name of a factory)
244 T: yes, can you say another word for industry

The way the question is asked in 236 and, more evidently, the way it is rephrased in 238, shows that it is not (only) a question of solving a local problem, explaining what lämplig (suitable) means as the word is instantiated in the text where it originally occurred ("Där är jorden mest lämplig för jordbruk" (There the soil is the most suitable for agriculture), read by P in 223). The question is rather something like "What does the word suitable mean in general?" Note that the solution added to P’s "den är bra" (it’s good) by T is "det passar" (it fits) and not "den passar" (it fits). Here, the English translation cannot render the difference between den, a pronoun that could refer to jorden (the soil) and det, which cannot, since jord (soil) is a non-neutral noun. Since T uses the neutral form in 242, she does not give a phrase that can easily be fitted into the context where suitable was picked up, but rather a general paraphrase.

T’s original question does not seem to emanate from any local sign of lack of common understanding, but rather to be asked in its own right (point 1 above). Note the clear demarcation of new subgames (see further chapter V) in T’s initiating turns 236 and 242 (point 4). P’s declaration that he knows what the word means is not accepted, thus not taken to be sufficient to leave the problem of the meaning of lämplig (suitable) (point 2). The demonstration given by P in 243 that he has a practical grasp of the meaning of industri is not taken at face-value; T asks for a synonym (points 2 and 3). In passing, we note P’s very striking formulation of the difficulty of complying with the demand for explicitness in level 2 treatment of language and his expression of the distance between knowing what a word means well enough for practical purposes and being able to spell out this knowledge: "I know what it is, but it’s so awfully hard to tell".

Before leaving this discussion, I wish to stress that I would not claim there to be no overlapping between a meta-linguistic activity in everyday use of lan-
guage and a level 2 activity in a language lesson (see also section 2.5). There are several resemblances and they share several properties. So, e.g. in (31), like in many other similar sequences, there is ambivalence between the abstract, general, lexical meaning that is aimed at, and the concrete instance from which the word is taken, a sort of zigzag or vacillation between level 1, where the meaning of the word as it occurred in a specific message is important, and level 2, where the relevant matter is a general meaning of the word, abstracted from context. Furthermore, it is often the case that sequences like (31) actually are initiated by signs of locally manifested, linguistic problems of different kinds: a word may be taken up because P has mispronounced it, he may have hesitated or given other cues to indicate that a problem may be at hand. What the preceding discussion should have pointed to is that level 2 is partly different from everyday meta-linguistic activities and goes far beyond them.

2.5 Various aspects of level 2

In the preceding characterization of level 2, it is clear that the notion covers several partially different phenomena. However, this is not due to lack of analytical precision. Rather, it points to the complexity of the reality to be accounted for.

Firstly, 'level 2' is supposed to be a cover term for language as it is talked about in language lessons — and language is talked about in several, partially similar, partially different ways, all of which, however, are more or less alien to the ways language is used in everyday communication. Secondly, there is a sort of common denominator, or at least family resemblance, that holds together the various uses I have made of the level 2 concept in the characterization so far.

One could distinguish (at least) three partially different phenomena to which, in this study, the notion of 'level 2' is applied.

1. Reflexive use of language (see e.g. Lyons, 1977:5ff). This phenomenon is commonly referred to as 'mention' as opposed to 'use'. Clear examples of this are e.g. (26) and (27) above, drawn from exercises on comparison of adjectives. There the words bred (broad), smal (thin), svar (difficult) and gammal (old) are used to refer to themselves.

2. What could be labelled "topicless utterances". The contrived example used above as an illustration — "You bloody fool!" — could serve as an example; an authentic example is given below as (37), where the words used in training the pronunciation of specific sounds, nog (probably), godis (sweets), kul (fun), do not refer to themselves, but are pronounced as mere sound gestals.

3. Contrived, auxiliary mini-contexts for word-items talked about. This may be exemplified by (19) above, where T tries to prompt P to find the correct tense-form of the verb sleep, saying "I haven't fallen asleep yet, I'll go to bed and then I shall...", certainly without referring to herself in the actual situation or stating anything about her actual intentions (as would be normally understood, given e.g. verb tenses in the sentence).
For the purpose of analysis to come, as I see it, there is no real point in separating these different aspects of level 2, these different ways of talking about language in the language lessons. Firstly, though the distinctions seem analytically clear, actual utterances during lessons would often be extremely hard to classify. This would introduce an additional difficulty for the analysis, without there being any corresponding gain in subtlety or clarity. As the major point of the analysis is the unclear boundaries between different uses of language — the uncertainty in the separation of levels — there is no need for making sharp distinctions between aspects of the phenomenon when, empirically, it is characterized precisely by its lack of sharp boundaries. Secondly, level 2 could still be thought of as a unitary phenomenon to the extent that there is a clear relatedness between its various aspects: the fact that level 2 utterances should not be contextualized as ordinary utterances when these are used for reference and description. This is the important distinction, level 1 as utterances to be contextualized in the ordinary way, level 2 as utterances decontextualized from the level 1 context.

2.6 Summary

To sum up what we have found so far about language at level 2 in the language lessons of the corpus, we could say that it differs in several respects from the way language works in everyday situations. At level 2, language is not an implicit, transparent tool used and integrated within an ongoing activity, it is explicitly talked about. Thus, level 2 language is not actual use, instead linguistic items are mentioned, displayed, exhibited, examined and manipulated. This leads to substitution of item-orientation for the message-orientation of level 1. Level 2 treatment of language is based on a certain perspective on language and is furthermore connected with a certain attitude, due, at least partially, to the fact that language is subject to decontextualization when it is no longer used, but talked about. This perspective can be described as a system-view of language, characterized by predilection for the prototypical at the cost of other meaning potentials that are, or may be, realized in situated language use, for paradigmatic relations within the language system at the cost of other formats based on everyday experience, for the general and abstract at the cost of the specific and concrete.

Thus, language lessons form a specific type of communicative event, a specific cultural domain, characterized by the presence of these features that, together, form part of the meaning province of language teaching. This culture is not immediately accessible; competent membership is not warranted unless one is able to substitute the "language-teaching-perspective" for the naive, natural perspective on language, or more precisely, to take the perspective that is appropriate at different phases in the process of a language lesson. When there is discrepancy between the participants as to what perspective is the relevant one to adopt at a certain moment, there is a disturbance in communication. The characterization of such phenomena is the topic of the next sections.
Establishing level 2

The existence of level 2 in a language lesson creates a double problem of transition. The first problem concerns how to be a competent member in the culture of language teaching, i.e. how to be able to leave the naive, natural attitude to language and work within the level 2 perspective when this is required in the language classroom. The second problem concerns how knowledge about language gained through level 2 instruction can be made use of at level 1, i.e. how it can be spread to everyday situations of language use.

3.1 Itemization, abstraction and reduction

The former of the two problems mentioned above, that of transition from a natural attitude to a level 2 attitude is the topic of this section. Attaining level 2 involves a double difficulty. The first one is that of separating level 2 language from level 1 contextualization, i.e. of establishing a linguistic enclosure within which linguistic items can be uttered without being actually used in a level 1 context. In other words, the items should be contextualized and understood only within the enclosure. The second difficulty is that of taking on the proper attitude, of having the appropriate perspective on language, i.e. the system-view that favours general, abstract and/or prototypical descriptions and concentrates on linguistic items and their paradigmatic, within-language, relations. The two problems are cognate in that they both involve decontextualization, i.e. abstraction via itemization and reduction.

Abstraction is involved in two ways. Firstly, there is abstraction, since, in order to establish a linguistic enclosure linguistic expressions have to be abstracted from concrete circumstances of use. This phenomenon is most obvious in cases where items to be manipulated at level 2 are drawn e.g. from texts where they were originally used in the ordinary way. Secondly, one can talk about abstraction since the very level 2 attitude is one of abstract descriptions. Itemization is at hand since language must be taken to be a system of abstract linguistic items rather than a means of communication under concrete circumstances. Reduction occurs in the sense that the valid descriptions of items (words, expressions, structures) are reduced to the general, prototypical at the cost of the dynamics and open-endedness of their message potential.

In L5, a folk tale has been read, telling of Gudbrand who went to town in order to sell one of his cows, but who, instead of selling it, started making repeated barter transactions that finally led him to come home empty-handed. The exercise book uses the story as material for an exercise on definite/indefinite forms of nouns. The exercise has the form of a summary of the tale where the nouns have been replaced by a drawing; P is supposed to fill in a slot using the correct form of the noun that corresponds to each drawing, i.e. he has the choice between e.g. a cow and the cow.

Let's think of a situation of actual use which would correspond to the exercise. We can easily imagine such a situation: someone has told a rather long and complicated story and in order to make his/her point clear (s)he gives a
summary of the crucial details. In this case, the beginning would look something like this:

(32) Thus, Gudbrand went to town in order to sell the cow/a cow/his cow (depending on what exactly precedes the utterance) but nobody in town wanted to buy it, so he had to go back home with it.

However, in the lesson, the summary is a manipulation of linguistic items at level 2, and in order to do it correctly, P has to carry out those operations of decontextualization pointed out above. Firstly, he must not use the nouns in question in the level 1 context. If he uses them normally, the level 1 context will interfere and give partly different forms than expected in the text that is to be the result of the manipulation. So, e.g., in the first slot, Gudbrand's cow, which has been talked about, on stage, for quite a while in the actual context of the lesson (during the reading and during the first exercise "Do you remember what you read?") is now supposed to be treated as a new referent, demanding an indefinite article. Hence, in order to do the task correctly, the linguistic items treated in the exercise must be abstracted from the level 1 context and a linguistic enclosure be created in which "the cow" is actually a new referent in the first slot.

Secondly, the exercise is built upon a system-view that reduces the more common choice between indefinite/definite form of a noun or a (possessive or anaphorical) pronoun to the — paradigmatic — choice between the two forms of the noun (i.e. pronouns will not be accepted):

(33) L5:119 T: mm, åkej, får du läsa det
120 P: /LÄSER/ Vad är detta för djur? Läs följande text. När du kommer till en teckning ska du läsa djurets namn. Tänk på att du ibland måste använda obestämtd form i.. och ibland bestämd form så du måste tänka efter om en ko e..å..eller..
121 T: tänka efter om en ko eller kon passar
122 P: bäst i texten
123 T: mm, du måste alltså böja ordet lite grann /P:jaha/ beroende på hur det står
124 P: /LÄSER/ Gudbrand gick till stan för att sälja, aa!
125 T: mm vad ska du ta in för ord här då, Gudbrand gick till stan för att sälja...
126 P: kon
127 T: mm, du..du behöver inte skriva nånting, bara ta det muntligt
128 P: /LÄSER/ men ingen i stan ville köpa, kon
129 T: kon, ja just det
130 P: /LÄSER/ han måste gå hem och..hem, han måste gå hem med kon, kon... et
131 T: kon
132 P: konen
133 T: mej vi har en kon
134 P: ja, kon
135 T: han måste gå hem (..)

(33) L5:119 T: mm, okay, you can read this
120 P: /READS/ What kind of animal is this? Read the following text. When you come to a drawing you have to fill in the name of the animal. Don't forget that sometimes you will have to use
the indefinite form s...and sometimes the definite form and for example you will have to decide whether a cow o...or

T: decide whether a cow or the cow fits
P: into the text
T: mm, so you will have to inflect the word a little /P: I see/
depending on its position
P: /READS/ Gudbrand went to town in order to sell, yes!
T: mm and what word should you fill in here, Gudbrand went to
town in order to sell...

P: the cow
T: mm, you...you don't have to write anything, just do it orally
P: /READS/ but nobody in town wanted to buy, the cow
T: the cow, that's it
P: /READS/ he had to go home and...home, he had to go home
with the cow, /kon... et/ (P adds a second definite article -et
i.e. neutral singular, to the word already carrying the ending -en
for non-neutral singular)
T: /kon/ (the cow)
P: /konen/ (P puts a double ending, as if the uninflected word
were kon)
T: no we have /en ko/ (a cow)
P: okay /kon/ (the cow)
T: he had to go home (...)

In this example we see that the text that results from the level 2 manipulation becomes, if not completely unacceptable, at least strange-looking if we look at it as a normal text: "Gudbrand went to town to sell the cow, but nobody wanted to buy the cow." In the second case a pronoun would have been expected.¹

3.2 Enclosing a linguistic item

Every task that is not explicitly presented as a level 2 task will be potentially ambiguous. Whether it works as intended or not depends principally on to what degree P is capable — and willing — to make use of his tacit knowledge about what one is expected to do in a language lesson. On the other hand, even tasks that actually are quite explicitly presented as having level 2 character risk running into problems if P remains to a certain degree within the natural attitude or if he simply relapses. And, as will be shown in the following sections, most typically, tasks are not explicitly presented as belonging to one or the other level, but rather in an ambivalent and ambiguous way. However, first, in this subsection, problems related to enclosing linguistic items to be treated at level 2 will be studied more closely.

Everyday use of language is characterized by a certain degree of allusiveness and indeterminacy. What is said is usually open to a range of more or less

¹The fact that T accepts the form "kon" (the cow), proposed by P in 126, for the first slot, must probably be seen as an error from T in the perspective of the exercise: the indefinite form would have been expected. However, this does not affect the argument that it is not actual use but mere manipulation: cow is an enclosed linguistic item and the choice of form is not dependent upon the dynamics of the preceding level 1 discourse, i.e. whether "the cow" is actually on stage or not.
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divergent interpretations. Conversely, several expressions and wordings are always available for conveying roughly the same meaning. At the same time, a state of affairs is never exhaustively caught through language alone, new and different aspects are always possible to attend to (Rommetveit, 1983, 1987a). This dynamic openness in the relation between language and situations of use, inherent in everyday use of language, must be eliminated when particular aspects of language are to be in primary focus. When one, and only one, particular linguistic item is to be uttered and treated in the level 2 perspective, i.e. mentioned, displayed, examined and/or manipulated, the relations to contexts of its use must, at least partially, be cut off. This entails that enclosing cannot rely on level 1 use and a level 1 attitude.

The problem of enclosing a particular word, originally occurring in a level 1 context but intended for ensuing level 2 treatment, is clearly demonstrated in (47) below (p 104ff): what happens when you put a sponge into water is not unequivocally that "it swells". Several aspects of the state of affairs are possible to pick up and there are several expressions available to make any of these aspects prominent.

Another example:

(34) L5:333 P: /LÄSER/ Gudbrand slog...eh korsord, Gudbrand slog, om att hans hustru inte skulle bli arg
334 T: vad var det han slog för nånting
335 P: pengar
336 T: säger man så? Vad var det han gjorde med grannen, han slog...
337 P: om
(4s)
338 P: han slog om...ska vi slå vad...
339 T: mm vad slog han alltså
340 P: frågade Gudbrand, na han slog om pengar
341 T: dom slog vad
342 P: dom slog vad om pengar
343 T: ja det ska slå...stå vad här, vet du vad det är för nånting när man slår vad
344 P: ja
345 T: det förstår du, vad är det för nånting då
346 P: man sätter
347 T: mm, om du..
348 P: /AVBRYTER/ man säger att han har rätt å jag säger att jag har /T:mm/ rätt /T:mm/ då satsar..
349 T: /AVBRYTER/ då säger vi att...att om jag har rätt så får du tie kronor, har du rätt så såhå? eh så får du tie kronor av mej /P:mm/ då slår man vad
350 P: mm
351 T: förstår du?
352 P: ja

(34) L5:333 P: /READS/ Gudbrand made...er crossword, Gudbrand made a, that his wife would not get angry
334 T: what did he make
335 P: money
336 T: is that the way you say it? What did he do with his neighbour, he made a...
337 P: /om/ (about)
(4s)
338 P: he made a...shall we make a bet...
339 T: mm so what did he make
340 P: Gudbrand asked, well he betted money
341 T: they made a bet
342 P: they made a bet with money
343 T: yes you should make...write bet here, do you know what that is when you make a bet
344 P: yes
345 T: you understand that, so what is it
346 P: you put
347 T: mm, if you...
348 P: /INTERRUPTS/ you say that he's right and I say I'm /T:mm/ right /T:mm/ then you stake...
349 T: /INTERRUPTS/ then we say that...that if I'm right you'll get ten crowns, if you're right then then you'll get ten crowns from me /P:mm/ then you make a bet
350 P: mm
351 T: do you understand?
352 P: yes

Here the word **väd** (bet) must be enclosed and treated as the only correct alternative, the only valid description.¹ Not only does the enclosing imply that P's talk about money — an indication of his understanding on some level of what betting is all about and of the relevant aspect of what went on in the context of the story about Gudbrand — becomes irrelevant, later on (346 and 348) his giving of idiomatic synonyms **sätta** (put) and **säss** (stake) does not get through at all.

The example cited as (12) above, where P's task was that of filling in a verb particle in a slot, is also a very clear-cut case of enclosing. No contextualized understanding of what was depicted in the story is needed or warrants the solution of the task. It is more important to remember the exact wordings of the text where the word(s) in question was/were initially used. Such recall is enhanced by the enumeration of a restricted range of alternatives. This is the case in several exercises in the corpus, e.g. the antonym exercise in L5, cited in (64) below. However, this is not always sufficient. This is clear if we look at (35):

(35) L6:592

352 P: after his glasses. He was wearing warm clothes, and er
353 T: vänta nu lite, nu är det två ord du ska sätta in där, på grund av att, därför att det var kallt, då har vi två ord som vi kan sätta in där, välj utav dom orden här
354 P: utan /T:mm/ nått var det på, tjocka kläder på sej mot kylan, för
355 T: /SAMTIDIGT/ för kylans...
356 P: /SAMTIDIGT/ kylans skull
357 T: ja, för skull, därför att det var kallt va, mm

(35) L6:592 P: for his glasses. He was wearing warm clothes, and er
353 T: now wait a bit, now there are two words you have to insert, since it, because it was cold, then we have two words we can insert there, choose among these words here

---

¹By the way, we can note that crosswords represent a situation where enclosing of isolated word-items is needed also outside the language classroom.
594 P: without /T:mm/ no was it on, was wearing warm clothes because.

595 T: /SIMULTANEOUSLY/ because of the...

596 P: /SIMULTANEOUSLY/ of the cold

597 T: yes, because of, because it was cold right, mm

At least one of the alternatives appearing among those presented, mot (against), is highly plausible and suitable as long as only contextual meaning is taken into account. Therefore the enclosing must be attained through reference to formal characteristics and even accidental features of the words and sentences in question; i.e. P is supposed to make use of the cue given by the fact that the sentence contains two slots:

(36) Han hade tjocka kläder på sj... kylans...
(36) He was wearing warm clothes ... the cold.

3.3 Tension between the levels

In the previous sections, the differences between level 1 and level 2 were characterized. Though in the examples given so far with the purpose of characterizing level 2, I have tried to represent the level 2 perspective as occurring distinctly — as being present, or not, at a given stage in a lesson — it should be stressed that what one comes across most often is various degrees of presence of a level 2 perspective. As a matter of fact, the most typical and frequent sequences are those which are best characterized as hybrids: linguistic items are manipulated at level 2, not used at level 1, and the descriptions and interpretations favoured are those which exhibit the prototypical, the paradigmatic and the general, abstract aspects, but, simultaneously, this is done as if they were used in the ordinary way.

3.3.1 Overt ambiguity in the formulation of tasks, questions and cues

The hybrid-like character of the teaching activities is manifested as an ambiguity. In some of the examples cited earlier, such ambiguity is at hand. In (31), the solution given by T to the problem of the meaning of suitable comprises both "den är bra" (it is good) referring to the level 1 context where the word was initially found, and "det passar" (it suits), which is a general, prototypical paraphrase that is not immediately transferable to the level 1 context in question. In (18), the solution searched for is the prototypical antonym of the word-item never, i.e. always, yet the sentence given as a cue seems to be not only a sentence-item, but especially the second part of the utterance seems simultaneously to be used, as T seizes the opportunity of reminding about regulations that should be followed: "I never bring sweets to school, 'cause we are not allowed to". It is doubtful whether the same thing can be said about the cue given in (19) "I haven't fallen asleep yet, I'll go to bed
and then I shall..."; it is best interpreted as a sentence-item mentioned that looks as if it were used. In (21) and (22) we can note the ambiguity, or even fallacy, of T's questions; they are asked as if they had a bearing on the content, the message conveyed in a specific context by the items picked up, but judging from how P's answers are taken up, one would rather assume that they are aimed at level 2.

Clearly, there are passages in the lessons that seem totally unambiguous. This is the case of non-teaching activities, category NON, to use the classification presented in chapter III, since they represent a kind of use of language where the level 2 phenomenon does not come into play. It is also the case with several OTHER-activities, other teaching activities, where little or no focus is on language: the drawing of figures in L1, the construction of a kite in L3, or the talk about the chemist's shop in L8. There might also be unambiguous sequences of level 1 character in TEXT-activities, so the extent that they focus primarily on the meaning and content of a text — the questioning that follows the reading of the text both in L4 and L6 are examples of such activities which are not imbued with level 2 attitude and thus not ambiguous.

On the other hand, there are sequences as well that are unambiguously of a level 2 character, i.e. words and sentences are manipulated without any sign of being used and without the as if-flavour pointed to above:

(37) L4:240 T: mm (3s) Well then I think we'll leave that... text for a moment, and we'll have a little look at our vowels once again, we'll listen... to oooo, say it

(37) L4:240 T: mm (3s) Well then I think we'll leave that... text for a moment, and we'll have a little look at our vowels once again, we'll listen... to oooo, say it
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Here, none of the participants show any sign whatsoever that they do more than manipulate isolated word-items: nog, godis, kul, hus. The same goes for sequences of the spelling/pronunciation exercise in L7:

(38) /P is to give examples of words with a /çi/ spelled with <k>/

L7: 122 T: å /çi/ då, kan du hitta nåt på nåt på /çi:/
123 P: kika
124 T: kika
125 P: /SKRIVER/ (3s)
126 T: å /cy:/?
127 P: kyckling
128 T: mm

(38) /P is to give examples of words with a /çi/, spelled with <k>/

L7:122 T: and then /çi:/, can you think of something with /çi:/
123 P: /kika/ (peep)
124 T: /kika/
125 P: /WRITES/ (3s)
126 T: and /cy:/?
127 P: /kyckling/ (chicken)
128 T: mm

This state of affairs is, however, very fragile, as will be seen in section 4.2. As soon as words and expressions are presented not as isolated items but integrated in sentences that exemplify possible uses, the ambiguity is potentially at hand. This is partly due to the fact that the relation between language and context is reflexive; language is not only context-shaped, it is also context-creating. Even a short sentence starts building up a context; one need only to think of the first sentence of, for instance, a novel. This seems to be a general problem with cueing or prompting P to help him find the solution to a level 2 problem. An example of this was given in (19), where the cue "I haven't fallen asleep yet, I'll go to bed and then I shall..." is ambiguous by the fact that it works as if the finding of the solution "shall sleep" were not submitted to the prerequisite of a level 2 attitude, that of prevalence of paradigmatic relations (note that the cue also contains the verb "fall asleep"). The same goes for a number of other questions, cues and prompters. It is, e.g., not explicitly stated in the comparison exercise in L1 cited as (20) that a comparison of the level 2 kind is to be made; the question "and what do you think of this pencil?" is thus ambiguous.
and, incidentally, P finds both pencils to be compared “long” (see further 3.3.2).

This problem with cues, prompters and examples is close to what Säljö (1982) calls “the fallacy of horizontalisation”, which, in his study, amounts to the loss of the vertical dimension of a text. The process of horizontalisation distorts the relationship between, on the one hand, the message of the text, i.e. its central claims and its line of reasoning, and, on the other hand, concretizations and examples used to underpin the argumentation. Examples are not taken to point to a more general principle that is central to the text, but as equally important as its message(s). Transposed to the context of this study, "the fallacy of horizontalisation" would mean that words, phrases and sentences displayed as examples of a linguistic phenomenon (level 2) are taken to be actual use and interpreted in the level 1 perspective.

3.3.2 Covert ambiguity in connection with situational indeterminacy

As shown in the previous paragraph, the formulation of tasks, questions and cues may sometimes be said to be overtly ambiguous or fallacious, as in (22) above, where T asks for a synonym of "more precisely" by formulating her question "Do you understand the meaning there?", "there" apparently referring to situated use of a whole sentence. However, what often makes P incapable of complying with the tasks assigned by T, is an ambiguity of another kind. The last two examples in 3.3.1 point in the direction of what I shall call covert ambiguity — ambiguity that is not located in the formulation of a particular utterance, but is connected with the very definition of the situation.

Except for the first part of L3 (see above page 39ff), there are no signs whatsoever that teacher and pupil are not trying their very best to cooperate. The teachers do their utmost to make pupils understand, the pupils show great willingness and even eagerness to comply with what is demanded of them. Hence, there is no reason why one should assume that the Cooperative Principle (Grice, 1975) is not operating. Taking the CP as point of departure, the phenomenon alluded to above as covert ambiguity is possible to explore. Grice (1975:45) formulates the Cooperative Principle as follows:

Make your conversational contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.

However, in the language lesson as well as in virtually every other situation, there is a considerable amount of indeterminacy as to what exactly is "the direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged". Ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1967; Heritage, 1984) has provided us with the insight that situations do not occur prespecified, neat and ready for situation-specific rules to apply. Instead, the situation is constantly negotiated, i.e. "the acceptance" of the purpose or direction of the talk exchange, in Grice’s formulation of the CP, is made, in principle, on a turn-by-turn-basis. A highly concrete manifestation
of this is that, within stable circumstances as far as location, conversational partners etc are concerned, as in the lessons and conversations that constitute the corpus of this study, the activity type may change, seemingly without any explicit marking. The situation may thus be redefined, the "direction of the talk exchange" may be accepted as changing or having changed:

(39) L4:164 T: mm. Jaa det var Jan det. Erik, har han många hål i tänderna
165 P: nåa, det har han inte
166 T: vad tycker Jan om det
167 P: det är konstigt, han åter..han åter lika mycke som han godis å så är det..han tycker att det är konstigt att han inte har /T:jaha/ att han inte har hål i tänderna
168 T: jaa, vad tycker du, vad kan det bero på
169 P: jo det beror på om man borstar ordentligt
170 T: jaa, det kan det göra, kan det va nåt annat
171 P: mmm..ja om man åter till exempel vahetere bara vahetere godis å godis å inte borstar å bara går å lägger sej /T:mm/ då kommer han också få hål
172 T: jaa å sen är det ju inte bara godis utan..det kan ju bero på andra saker också
173 P: ja saft å sånt
174 T: jaa
175 P: till exempel då som när vahetere eh söta såna där som finns socker i
176 T: mm, Erik kanske..han kanske åter eh
177 P: /AVBRYTER/ men fröför..va eh..vahetere fick vi inte hålar i tänderna när vi var i Turkiet då
178 T: hade ni inga hål då
179 P: nå jag hade inga /T:nå/ när jag kom hit så fick jag
180 T: men du, du äter kanske annan mat, du kanske inte ät så sånt mat

(39) L4:164 T: mm. Okay that was Jan. Erik, has he got lots of holes in his teeth
165 P: no, he hasn't
166 T: what does Jan think about that
167 P: it's strange, he eats..he eats as much as him sweets and then it's..he thinks it's strange that he has got /T:mhn/ no holes in his teeth
168 T: yes, what do you think, why is that
169 P: well it depends on if you brush carefully
170 T: yes, it may be that, could it be something else
171 P: mmm..well if you eat for example what'sitsname only what'sitsname sweets and sweets and don't brush and just go to bed /T:mm/ then he'll have holes too
172 T: yes and then it's not just sweets but..it can depend on other things as well
173 P: yes lemonade and such things
174 T: yes
175 P: for example that when what'sitsname er such sweet things with sugar in
176 T: mm, Erik maybe..maybe he eats er
177 P: /INTERRUPTS/ but Miss, why, wha..er what'sitsname didn't we get holeses in our teeth when we were in Turkey
178 T: didn't you have any holes then
179 P: no I had no /T:no/ when I came here I got
180 T: but listen, maybe you ate other kinds of food, maybe you didn't eat such sweet food
At the beginning of this sequence, there is no doubt that we are dealing with a questioning on the text about Jan and Erik that has been previously read. Then, the focus changes, at first gradually to a discussion on dental hygiene in general — still with much the character of a questioning — then more definitely, as P takes up his personal experiences (turn 177). (By the way, all three coders (see above, chapter III, section 2.1.2) were sensible to this change.) Thus, "the accepted purpose and direction of the talk exchange" has shifted, at first gradually, then more abruptly, as the result of tacit negotiation of relevance on a turn-by-turn-basis.

In Ad5, we find a sequence that presents a shift in the opposite direction, from a non-didactic conversation (as was planned) to a short lesson-like sequence:

(40) Ad5: 79 P: det är bara två bilder
80 A: är det bara två bilder vi har tagit
81 P: hur mycket..hur många bilder har vi
82 A: ja vi tog massor med bilder
83 P: mer än tjugo?
84 A: alla klasserna /P:jaaa/ det var nio bilder /P:jaaa/ tre gånger tre å sen hade vi skolan, det är tie, lärarrummet elva
85 P: /AVBRYTER/ det är tre femmor med va, nej tre sexor med va?
86 A: mm, jaa vi är uppe i en femton bilder i alla fall
87 P: jaaaha
88 A: mm, som tycker jag att vi ska ha nånting ligger på det hållet också, som är en ganska viktig del utå skolan och skulle vara svårt å klara sej utan den
89 P: källaren
90 A: jaa för all del, nere i vilka salar tänker du på då
91 P: där..filmerna...
92 A: jaa filmsalen kanske vi ska ha /P:jaaa/ ja det är ju fin filmsal, mm, det går bra
93 P: biblioteket med
94 A: biblioteket jaa
95 P: å sen..nå det finns inget mer nu
96 A: joo
97 P: /SAMTIDIGT/ syslöjden ja
98 A: syslöjden ja ll...
99 P: /SAMTIDIGT/ tritslöjden där
100 A: mm
101 P: "OHORBART/"
(3s)
102 P: nu finns det inte mer
103 A: där man har gymnastik
104 P: gymnastiksalen ja
105 A: mm tycker du inte vi ska ha med det
106 P: joo
107 A: det tycker jag också, å sen nänting som delar dagen mitt itu, skoldagen mitt itu /P:aa/ som vi skulle ha svårt å klara oss utan, vi skulle inte orka med annars, vad tänker jag på då tror du
108 P: (6s) maten

(40) Ad5:79 P: that's only two pictures
80 A: is that only two pictures we've taken
81 P: how much..how many pictures have we got
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A: well we took lots of pictures
P: more than twenty?
A: all the classes /P:yes/ that makes nine pictures /P:yes/ three times three and then we had the school, that's ten, the staffroom eleven
P: /INTERRUPTS/ there are three fifth-forms too eh, no three sixth-forms too eh?
A: mm, well we've got up to fifteen pictures in any case
P: ooh
A: mm, then I think we ought to have something which is in that direction too, which is a fairly important part of the school and would be difficult to be without
P: the cellar
A: well all right, down in what rooms are you thinking of then
P: where...the films...
A: yes the film-room we could perhaps have /P:yes/ yes it's a nice film-room, mm that's fine
P: the library too
A: the library yes
P: and then...no there is nothing more now
A: yes
P: /SIMULTANEOUSLY/ well needle work
A: needle work yes and...
P: /SIMULTANEOUSLY/ woodwork there
A: mm
P: /INAUDIBLE/

As the conversation is progressing, A comes up with a proposal (turn 88) that seems to have a "guessing-game" (Heltoft & Paaby, 1978) character, typical of certain forms of teaching. In his reply, however, P comes up with an unexpected answer that A accepts. Again, this is an example of negotiation on a turn-by-turn-basis. Consequently, A's introduction of the guessing-game fails and the conversation continues as before with A and P, alternatively, giving proposals for the picture book. In 107, A comes back to the guessing-game, still making explicit only at the end of the turn ("What do you believe I'm thinking of") that this is, at this very point, how she intends the direction of the talk exchange.

We could not expect each utterance to spell out explicitly a neat specification of the direction it is intended to give to the conversation. The same indeterminacy is inherent in each utterance when it comes to its illocutionary force, which might be a source of mishearings and misunderstandings (Grimshaw, 1980). It is this indeterminacy that gives rise to covert ambiguity. In the formulation of a question there may be nothing that explicitly marks whether the task is assigned in the level 1 or the level 2 perspective. In such a case, only
the definition of the situational demands, based on tacit knowledge and previous experiences of this and other situations, can guide the speaker when he tries to "make his conversation contribution such as required".

Frankel (forthc.) has shown how the doctor's question "How are you?" at the beginning of a medical encounter may be interpreted in two radically different ways. It may be heard as social talk with a predominantly phatic function, in which case the expected and socially accepted answer is "Fine, thank you". It may also be heard as part of, or a preface to, the examination, in which case the answer "Fine, thank you" is bewildering, since the most probable reason for the patient's presence is that he actually does not feel well at all. Rather, the question should be answered by a description of the state of health of the patient. The point of this is that it is not explicitly spelled out in the formulation of the question which one of the alternatives that holds (though its sequential placement normally gives a cue). The patient has to rely on his implicit understanding and definition of the situation and his estimation of what stage the encounter has reached by the time the question is asked.

If we look at the lessons, we find several examples of a similar kind of ambiguity:

(41) L5:261 P: /LÄSER/ Gudbrand säger att han har bytt hästen mot en get. Vad ska jag skriva där då

262 T: mm, vad sa Gudbrand när han sa det till hustrun..hustrun

263 P: (3s)

264 T: ska du titta i boken

The exercise is on transformation of indirect speech to direct speech — a task with which P never really comes to grips. If we look at T's question in 262 it cannot be said to be ambiguous per se. Once one has understood that the purpose of the exercise is to report what Gudbrand and his wife said in the form of direct speech, the question is perfectly clear. However, in lots of other situations where anyone reports what someone has said, one has the choice between direct or indirect speech. In other words, a question like What did X say when telling his wife may be answered either by citing X (direct speech) or by transforming his utterance to indirect speech — the latter alternative seems maybe to be the least marked. Thus, the problem with T's question in 262 is not that it is particularly ambiguous, but rather that it does not disambiguate between an interpretation suitable in everyday situations and the interpretation it has to be given for the exercise to be properly done. Such disambiguation has to be done by reminding P that he should search for the solution in the book (turn 264); this is also done on a previous occasion in the same exercise:

(42) L5:233 T: vad säger hustrun nu då, kommer du inåg vad hon sa där i boken, gå...
Another example that shows covert ambiguity is the following where a question fails to disambiguate between an interpretation including specific demands related to the level 2 perspective and other, less specific interpretations:

P's description of what he has been doing in the comparison exercise is not fully accepted, since the level 2 perspective of language (as one facet of the paradigmatic view) demands that you think of words and word-stems to which you add, for instance, suffixes. This cannot be simply read off from the question — the question is perhaps as unambiguous as possible — but has to do with the tacit premises on which it rests. Thus, the ambiguity is covert.

Of course, covert ambiguity as a result of situational indeterminacy is at hand not only in those cases where it leads to misunderstandings. It is for the clarity of the demonstration that such sequences have been picked out and cited. Upon reflection, we note the same phenomenon if we look at sequences where the participants understand each other perfectly well:
4 Communicative processes connected with the complexity of levels

4.1 Introduction

As we have seen in the previous sections, the dialogue during the language lessons of the corpus is characterized by specific types of communicative dysfluencies: misunderstandings, mistakes and errors of particular kinds, ambiguities or abrupt shifts as well as a certain degree of mismatch between the parties' contributions to the dialogue. In the previous sections, these processes were not fore-grounded per se, they were utilized as clues in finding those areas where discrepancies were to be found between, on the one hand, a naive, everyday perspective on language and, on the other hand, the perspective valid when language itself is focused in language lessons. Hence, thus far, I have been preoccupied with characterizing level 2 in, as it were, its 'ideal' shape. In the sections to follow, I shall more clearly focus upon and analyse the communicative practice during lessons. I shall try to identify particular dialogue processes and try to characterize and explain them with reference to the two-level phenomenon described above.

Obviously, the processes about to be focused upon constitute only a part of the "non-successes in talk" (Grimshaw, 1980) that occur in the data. "Trivial" dysfluencies, as e.g. the unsuccessful "reference-identification game" (Severinson Eklundh, 1983) in (45) below, certainly occur but have nothing to do with the complexity of levels:

(45) /P and T are discussing what the different parts of the telephone are called/

L3:35 T: vet du vad det dår heter som du... hur dår
36 P: hur
37 T: jaa men eh den här snurrade
38 P: dår?
39 T: mm
40 P: hm
41 T: det är sladden

(45) /P and T are discussing what the different parts of the telephone are called/

L3:35 T: do you know what that is called the one you've... got there
36 P: receiver
37 T: yes but er this coiled thing
38 P: there?
39 T: mm
40 P: no
41 T: it's the cord

Such a difficulty in establishing common reference does not concern the phenomenon of levels and such cases of communicative problems will not be
considered at all. Nor shall I be concerned with the kind of ignorance displayed by T e.g. in (19) above, where he proposes *sōvde (*slept) as the preterite form of the verb sleep. It is the other kind of error occurring in the "sleep/slept/shall sleep"-sequence cited as (19) above that is of interest, i.e. where P mixes up, as it were, the verb paradigm of sleep and uses of the verb fall asleep.

As we have seen, in language lessons there is typically a tension between level 1 and level 2. In general terms, one could say that the level 2 treatment of language is constantly threatened by one of the participants (no doubt that the least experienced, least competent of them, i.e. the pupil, runs the bigger risk) relapsing into the natural attitude towards language. Trévide (1979) studied how the solutions to specific tasks in language lessons reveal the difficulties that students (the subjects in her study were French university students studying English) have in handling the complexity of the language teaching situation where linguistic structures have to be produced with reference not to the actual situation of utterance (the "noi-ici-maintenant", p 45), but to a fictive — simulated or otherwise "translated" — situation. Trévide found that the balancing the students had to do between the two situations — corresponding fairly well to the two levels in the present analysis — lead to errors of interpretations of two kinds, based on two different attitudes that the students could adopt:

Le premier type d'attitude semble être une manipulation à vide des structures qui mène au non-sens. (...) L'autre type d'attitude relevé dans les données montrait une appropriation réelle qui ne répondait pas aux exigences de l'exercice, mais qui témoignait d'une activité de signification. (p 471)

In the examples already cited from the present corpus, we can see similar phenomena. (33) above, the manipulation of indefinite and definite forms of nouns, corresponds to the first type identified by Trévide; (21), where P tries to make sense of the word nasty by relating it to the specific context where the word occurred instead of taking it as a word-item in abstracto, is reminiscent of the second type. In general, then, the coexistence of the two levels creates a constant need for balancing between them and disentangling them. What is of interest now, more specifically, are dialogue processes related to shifting up and down from one level to the other, or of vacillating between them during the lessons.

At times during the course of a lesson, something that was uttered at level 1 is lifted up to level 2, in which case a linguistic enclosure must be immediately created (the relevant aspect of) the utterance and protect it from level 1 considerations. This happens frequently as texts are used to give material for linguistic exercises (e.g. in L4, L5, L6 and, less directly, in L7 and L8). When the material for level 2 treatment of language is not directly taken from the texts read, but presented as isolated sentences e.g. in exercise books or on separate sheets, there may also be shifts. On yet other occasions, a linguistic phenomenon treated at level 2 is suddenly lowered to level 1, which, analogically, implies immediate opening of the linguistic enclosure. Apart from such shifting between levels, the tension takes the form of different kinds of ambiguity, discussed at length in section 3.3 above.
This tension between levels may result in communicative disturbances of different kinds. Generally speaking, these disturbances consist of lack of tuning, to a greater or lesser degree, between the communicative partners; to put it simply, they can be said to speak of different things, totally or partly. Krumm (1981:264) found that a lot of misunderstandings and student errors in language teaching can be interpreted by this difference between communicative or functional and drill functions of language — the teacher expecting a drill type of utterance whereas the student struggles to answer from a personal point of view, to answer a "real" question.

As will be noticed, the existence of the two levels, with their qualitatively different basis for contextualization of utterances, may lead to misunderstanding and student errors also the other way around, i.e. the teacher expecting a "real", in some sense, answer and student providing a response that would be adequate in the language exercise-function. This section will focus precisely on such phenomena and analyse them within the notional apparatus introduced in this chapter. I shall distinguish between three different kinds of manifestation of such tension: level shifts, level conflicts, and level fuzzyness.

4.2 Level shifts

Level shifts may, in principle, either take place momentarily, i.e. be located in one single turn, or gradually, i.e. develop over several consecutive turns. Parallel to descriptions of topic shifts (Crow, 1983; Adelswärd, forthcoming), these two types could be described as switches and shadings, respectively. In this study, no effort is made to distinguish between these two types of level shifts.

First of all, we note that, of course, level shifts may go either from level 1 to level 2 or from level 2 to level 1. Such shifts in both directions can be identified in the macro-structure of a lesson. E.g. in L2, the lesson starts by T's trying to create conditions for actual, level 1, use of the two words planned to serve as material for the lesson on spelling. She has brought a can of water and a sponge in order for P to start out, in a very concrete and labortative fashion, from actual use of the word *slight* and she asks P to remind himself of his experiences of hunger and starvation, thereby making him use the homophone *swell* (starvation) (see (47), below, page 104ff). Thereafter, the two words are supposed to be enclosed and treated at level 2 during the spelling exercises, but at the very end of the lesson, T comes back to the sponge and invites P to come up with sentences where the word *swell* is used. Thus, the macro-structure of this lesson reflects a shift from level 1 to level 2 early in the lesson, and a shift back to level 1 at the end of the lesson. In the following, however, we shall be preoccupied principally with micro-processes, i.e. the local management of level shifts (and other micro-processes connected with the two-level phenomenon).

Secondly, we must realize that there is a fundamental difference between those level shifts that are initiated by the teacher and those initiated by the pupil, due to the unequal distribution of rights and duties in the particular situ-
ation. As T, in principle, is in control of the kinds of activities that are to take place within the lesson, her level shifts are a priori legitimate, whereas P, who does not have the corresponding power to decide which are the relevant matters to treat, is supposed to adapt to the shifts initiated by T, but cannot a priori expect the corresponding adaptation to his own initiations of level shifts. Therefore, it is of particular interest to study what happens when the level shift appears to be located in P's contribution to the dialogue.

One such case is when P makes an item which is enclosed and treated at level 2 escape from the linguistic enclosure and become actually used with its normal referential content. In other words, the conventional and/or context-specified meaning of the item is exploited in starting to build a wider coherent context. This must not always be interpreted as a level conflict (cf below), such pupil-initiated level shifts are often marked as side-steps, e.g. P does first answer the question or solve the task assigned to him, then adds a reaction that is not contextualized within the enclosure but comprises his reactions based on the level 1 attitude.¹

(46) provides an example of such a level shift. P suddenly does not take the sentence containing the word starvation wages only as a sentence-item to manipulate at level 2, but comments upon it as if it were a sentence used:

(46) /T is listing derivatives and compound words containing the morpheme svält (starve) and explains at the same time the meaning of each word (or asks for it); P is supposed to analyze them into constituent parts and write them down in a special manner according to the spelling method that is followed/ L2:199 T: ja å sen har vi nånting..eh man säger att vi får svältlön, vad tror du att det kan betyda
200 P: att när man svältar får man lön
(3s) 201 T: tror du det
202 P: näj
203 T: näj, man har det som..eh för å tala om att man får dåligt med lön, med lite lön, man får svältlön, så att man närar..svältar. Svältlön. Skriver du svält där uppe på haken å lön en trappa ner
204: P: /SKRIVER/ (7s) svält
(4s) 205 P: i Sverige får man inte lite lön

¹In a preliminary, short version of this study (Gustavsson, 1987), this particular phenomenon was labelled opening, a term that referred to the fact that the linguistic enclosure was opened so that the enclosed item could be used at level 1. In the same paper, level conflicts and (particular kinds of) level fuzzyness (see sections 4.3 and 4.4 below) were labelled clashes and leakage, respectively. Since the publication of that paper, I have felt a need to clean up among the metaphors and also to try to find a descriptive apparatus that is less exclusively oriented towards the pupil's problems with levels and is more apt to handle the dialogue as a collective process.
write them down in a special manner according to the spelling method that is followed.

L2:199 T: well then we have something..er one can say that we receive /svältlön/ (starvation wages), what do you think that means

200 P: that when you starve you get paid

(3s)

201 T: do you think so

202 P: no

203 T: no, we have it to..er to say that you get little pay, with poor wages, you receive starvation wages so that you nearly..starve. /svältlön/ (Starvation wages). Write /svält/ (starve) upstairs and /lön/ (wages) downstairs

204: P: /WRITES/ (7s) starvation

(4s)

205 P: in Sweden you don't get poor wages

In 205, P reacts to the talk about starvation wages by expressing his personal opinion. This, of course, is of limited relevance for the ongoing level 2 activity; he reacts in a level 1 like manner. His everyday experience of language as well as his everyday personal beliefs and assumptions interfere with what was uttered at level 2. Thereby, the word starvation wages is no longer contained in the linguistic enclosure as a word whose meaning one talks about and whose formal properties one examines and manipulates, but becomes actually used. The linguistic enclosure is opened and a level shift occurs.

In L2, level shifts of this kind are quite frequent, which might have to do with the particularly ambiguous character of this lesson: numerous sentences are mentioned that contain svält(swell) or svält(starve); these sentences are cited as examples of possible uses of the two words, and, as examples typically are, they are ambiguous as to which level they belong to. Clearly, the superordinate topic of the activity is the problem of the spelling of the words. However, the lesson starts out from concrete experiences or reactualized experiences of what the two words stand for; there is much energy spent before arriving at this:

(47) L2: 3 T: du ser att jag har med mej lite grejer här idag
4 P: jaa
5 T: mm, om jag lägger den här svampen här i, vad tror du händar då
6 P: svampen blir blöt
7 T: jaha, stämmer, å vad händar mer, lägg i den får du se
8 P: den flyter
9 T: ja det gör den (3s) men vad händar sen tror du
10 P: den blir inne blöt
11 T: blir den inte?
12 P: nå
13 T: doppa ner den får vi se
14 P: (3s) nu blev den blöt
15 T: mm (4s) men om du tittar på storleken, vad händar med den då
16 P: (5s) en sida är hög å en sida är inte hög

(3s)
17 T: m varför bubblar det så där tror du
18 P: den sjunker
19 T: varför sjunker den då
20 P: /SAMTIDIGT/ det finns en massa hål där
21 T: ja men varför sjunker den då
22 P: när jag trycker ner den
23 T: nja har det hänt nånting nu... med den
24 P: den är full med vatten nästan
25 T: ja visst, men om du ser på storleken då, märker du inte nånting
26 P: jo, den är lite högre...
27 T: ja, den är lite högre, den har... den har svällt, den har blivit större, mm?
28 P: den gör så i vatten /T:visst/, vi diskar med en sån hemma
29 T: det gör ni ja
30 P: hjälpa till å torka?
31 T: ja jag har en handduk där. Förstår du idag ska vi ch tala om dom här två ordparen, svällt i två olika betydelser, jag skriver här med blå krita som jag brukar göra /P:mm/. Svällt i den betydelser att det har blivit större, som på svampen där som du ser /SKRIVER PÅ TAVLAN/ blivit större så, att sen andra ordet svällt som är... detsamma som hunger (4s). Har du varit hungrig nån gång
32 P: jaa
33 T: har du sett nåra människor som har svällt
34 P: jaa
35 T: som inte har fått nån mat?
36 P: i Afrika finns det på teve
37 T: mm det är riktigt
38 P: dom blir smala
39 T: m det gör dom, kanske, å sen en... eh men deras magar, en del barns magar har du sett hurdana dom blir
40 P: jaa
41 T: ja dom blir alldeles uppsvällda /P:mm/ det är samma ord här också som vi ska jobba med idag. Då så... tar du å läser dom här
42 P: /LÄSER/ svällt svällt

(47) L2: 3 T: you see I've brought some things with me here today
4 P: yes
5 T: mm, if I put this sponge in here, what do you think'll happen
6 P: the sponge'll get wet
7 T: okay, right, and what else happens, put it in to see
8 P: it floats
9 T: yes it does (3s) but what'll happen later do you think
10 P: it doesn't get wet
11 T: it doesn't?
12 P: no
13 T: dip it down and we'll see
14 P: (3s) now it got wet
15 T: mm (4s) but if you look at its size, what happens to it
16 P: (5s) one side is high and one side is not high
17 T: m why does it bubble like that do you think
18 P: it sinks
19 T: and why does it sink
20 P: /SIMULTANEOUSLY/ there are lots of holes in it
21 T: yes but why does it sink
22 P: when I press it down
23 T: well has something happened now... to it
24 P: it's full of water almost
25 T: of course, but if you look at its size, don't you notice something
26 P: well yes, it's a bit higher...
27 T: yes, it's a bit higher, it has...it has **swelled** it has become bigger, mm?
28 P: that's what it does in water /T: certainly/, we wash the dishes with one like that at home
29 T: you do yeah
30 P: help you mop up?
31 T: well I've got a towel there. You see today we're going to talk about these two pairs of words, /sväll/ (swelled, starvation) in two different meanings, I'll write here with blue chalk like I usually do /P:mm/. /Sväll/ in the sense that it has become bigger, like with the sponge there as you see /WRITES ON THE BLACKBOARD/ become bigger okay, and then the other word /sväll/ which is...the same as hunger /4s/. Have you ever been hungry
32 P: yes
33 T: have you seen people starving
34 P: yes
35 T: who haven't anything to eat?
36 P: in Africa it's on TV
37 T: um that's right
38 P: they get thin
39 T: m they do, perhaps, and then some...er but their stomachs, some children's stomachs have you seen how they become
40 P: yes
41 T: well they become completely swollen /P:mm/ it's the same word here too that we'll work with today. Then s...then you start reading these
42 P: /READS/ /sväll sväll/

The sequence is a particularly good example of the difficulty of enclosing a particular word-item (see above, section 3.2, page 88ff). However narrow T tries to make the possible range of answers to what happens to the sponge, P happens to pick out other reasonable aspects of the state of affairs than to say that the sponge swells.

After this introduction, the rest of the lesson is devoted to the spelling problem that is the topic of the lesson, but on several occasions we encounter level shifts:

(48) L2:180 T: mm ä dom människorna eh som inte får tillräckligt med mat å äta, dom får **svällkost** säger man
181 P: **sväll** å kost
182 T: visst **sväll**... kost
183 P: får dom pengar då

(48) L2:180 T: mm and those people er who don't get enough food to eat, they are put on a **starvation diet** one says
181 P: **sväll**/ and /kost/
182 T: certainly /sväll... kost/
183 P: do they get money then
Obviously, level shifts do not have the same character of a communicative disturbance as level conflicts or level fuzzyness (see below). A level shift of the kind exemplified above can have the function of initiating a shorter or longer sequence of unambiguous level 1 use of language:

(49) /The sentence to be underlined ("it is no fun"), originally refers to Jan's, the main character of the text that is treated, feelings about going to the dentist's/ 

L4:230 T: /SAMTIDIGT/ nej å det stryker vi under, ja just det, det är inte kul 
231 P: alla tycker att det är inte kul fröken, varför då 
232 T: ja jag vet inte, vad tror du 
233 P: ja dom hatar kanske borra, dom vill inte göra hål i sina så här /LÅTER SOM EN BORR/ borr /T:nånt/sånt, men jag tycker inte det är.., jag tycker det är roligt 
234 T: jaa, det kan ju vara så att man känner sej li... te grann rådd då å... 
235 P: /SAMTIDIGT/ inte jag 
236 T: tror att det eh ska vara farligt, men du är inte det? 
237 P: nånt 
238 T: nå vad skönt. Mm, jaa, längst ner, den sista raden /P:mm/ (...) 

(49) /The sentence to be underlined ("it is no fun"), originally refers to Jan's, the main character of the text that is treated, feelings about going to the dentist's/ 

L4:230 T: /SIMULTANEOUSLY/ no and that we underline, yes you're right, it is no fun 
231 P: everybody thinks it's no fun Miss, why 
232 T: well I don't know, what do you think 
233 P: well perhaps they hate drilling, they don't wanna make holes in their like this /MAKES THE SOUND OF A DRILL/ drill /T:no/ such things, but I don't think it's..I think it's fun 
234 T: well, it may be that you feel a bit... scared then and... 
235 P: /SIMULTANEOUSLY/ not me 
236 T: think that it er could hurt, but you're not? 
237 P: no 
238 T: what a relief. Mm, well, at the bottom, the last line /P:mm/ (...) 

In 230, the sentence to be underlined is just cited as a sentence-item, not used to convey a message. However, it is picked up and commented upon by P in 231 as if it had been really used. As this is accepted by T, this level shift leads to a short sequence where the referential content of the sentence is integrated in a level 1 context.

In the next example, P does not succeed in establishing his topic. During the discussion of the meaning of field (cf (14) and (15) above), P and T come to talk about tractors and T has to explain the word plough. This apparently makes P think of his toys and, eagerly, he starts talking about his tractor. Thereby, tractor is no longer a word-item talked about in order to clarify the meaning of another word-item, field; instead, P starts referring to a specific tractor. Thus, the word is no longer contained in the enclosure: a level shift has occurred. However, as T does not take up this thread, the shift is without consequences for the ensuing dialogue.
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L7:326 T: plöjer, vet du vad han gör när han plöjer då
327 P: när han äker..nåte
328 T: nåt, när han plöjer, då sätter han ner nåt vass i jorden, som
skär ner i jorden så vänder på jorden så här, har du sett det?
329 P: /SAMTIDIGT/ så blir det som..som ett hål
330 T: det blir som..
331 P: /AVBRYTER/ å jag har fått en bärningstraktor /OHRBART/
332 T: /AVBRYTER/ ibland kör han..med traktorn å så har han en..en
plog heter det, med flera plogbillar, alltså såna här som vänder
på jorden, å då blir jorden aldeles randig, har du sett det
333 P: mm
334 T: då säger man att han plöjer jorden, såg det
335 P: han plöj.,
336 T: /AVBRYTER/ bonden plöjer jorden
337 P: bonden plöjer jorden

In connection with this example, we may again note an aspect of covert ambiguity (cf above, section 3.3.2). When T uses the pronoun "he" throughout the sequence, up to the moment when she reformulates the sentence that P has to repeat (turn 336), there is no overt difference between language at level 2, where he is not used to refer, and a corresponding level 1 discourse where reference would he made to a specific farmer, or used with generic reference. Analogically, "the farmer" can either be used for reference (level 1) or used without reference (level 2) (cf (14) above).

(51) L4:281 T: mm, det är tisdag idag, idag är det tisdag, vi ska titta lite på
dom här meningarna Yousuf ä se om vi kan ändra på dom, på
samma sätt, du kan läsa tvåan
282 P: det var må..måndag i..går /T:ja/ ja det var det
283 T: kan vi säga det på ett annat sätt, kan vi vända på det
284 P: igår var det måndag
285 T: mm, vi fortsätter
it's Tuesday today, today is Tuesday, we'll have a look at these sentences Yousuf and see if we can change them, in the same way, you can read number two.

282 P: it was Mo..Mo..Monday ye..yesterday /T:yes/ yes it was
283 T: can we say that in another way, could we turn it around
284 P: yesterday was Monday
285 T: mm, we'll go on

The commentary P adds in 282 is beside the point of the ongoing activity, the manipulation of word order in sentences. It is a mere coincidence that the exercise is done on a Tuesday — it is supposed to look exactly the same, also if it were done on a Friday. For a short moment, the sentence leaves the enclosure in which it has to be contained in order to be manipulated as mere structure, without referring to the day on which the exercise is done and thus without being contextualized in the actual level 1 context.

4.3 Level conflicts

A level conflict occurs when the participants operate at different levels, one of them at level 1, the other at level 2. Level conflicts obviously lead to flagrant misunderstandings and tend therefore to be momentary; either they pass unnoticed, or they are repaired immediately.1

(52) The subject of the preceding dialogue is the meaning of the word coast; the solution is arrived at in 275:

L7:275 T: bra, där land och hav möts, där får vi kast å titta här ska du se...
276 P: /ÖHÖRBART/
277 P: utanför?
278 T: mm
279 P: hav
280 T: här, vid norra Norrland, vad heter..vad heter...
281 P: Bottenviken

(52) The subject of the preceding dialogue is the meaning of the word coast; the solution is arrived at in 275:

L7:275 T: good, where land and sea meet, there we have a coast and look here all along northern Norrland you have a long coast, look, it's coast all the way..
276 P: /INAUDIBLE/
277 P: outside?
278 T: mm

1Certainly, when not attended to and repaired by the participants, the existence of a level conflict is disputable since the sequence in question is interpreted as such only by the observer; (11) above is such a — possible — case.
In 279, P gives an answer to the question that would be appropriate if the question were a level 2 question, i.e. he gives the word-item "sea" for the abstract, general description "the water outside the coast". Thus, he continues to operate on level 2, but in the meantime, T has left level 2 — hence a teacher-initiated level shift — and her question is at level 1, contributing to the geography lesson from which the coast-sequence has originally parted. Hence, (52) is a level conflict — the two parties contextualize their utterances in completely different ways. The level conflict is repaired immediately: T rephrases her question and P gives the correct answer. By the way, one can note how the typical ambiguity is reflected in T:s summing up move; though, apparently, her last question was not a level 2 question, the sequence is summed up in typical level 2 terms. It is also noteworthy that the level conflict results from the teacher operating at level 1, the pupil at level 2, which is perhaps unexpected (cf the citation from Krumm above), but happens also in (54) below.

In order to show that the distinction between levels entails a qualitative shift of perspectives and that, hence, a level conflict is qualitatively different from an ordinary, erroneous answer to a teacher question, we may look at a sequence in L8 that perfectly well parallels and contrasts with (52):

(53) L8: 19 T: ja, just det...
   20 P: /OHÖRBART/
       /SAMTIDIGT/ vet du vad havet heter som ligger utanför där
   21 P: Östersjön
   22 T: vad kan det heta
   23 P: Bottenviken
   24 T: det är just vad det heter

(53) L8: 19 T: yes, that's it...
   20 P: /INAUDIBLE/
       /SIMULTANEOUSLY/ do you know what the sea is called that is outside there
   21 P: the Baltic
   22 T: what can it be called
   23 P: The Gulf of Bothnia
   24 T: that's precisely what it's called

Though P's answer in 21 is wrong and not accepted by T, the error does not involve any problem with contextualization. Both operate clearly at level 1, talking about geographic names with specific reference. This is radically different from what occurs in the level conflict found in the otherwise almost identical sequence cited above as (52). Another example of a level conflict:
(54) /When T is about to note in her calendar at the end of the lesson, she asks for today's date, which leads to the following:/

L8:308 T: mm, and what year
309 P: nineteen-hundred-eighty-five
310 T: yes, could you say something else instead of /sjätte i femte/ (literally: the sixth of the fifth; dates are often expressed in Swedish as ordinal numbers)
311 P: (3s)
312 T: you could also say...
313 P: tenth of er
314 T: well you could also say sixth of sixth...
315 P: (3s)
316 T: what month is it
317 P: five
318 T: yes what month is that actually
319 P: January..I mean May
320 T: May yes, what comes after May

(55) /When T is about to note in her calendar at the end of the lesson, she asks for today's date, which leads to the following:/

L7:149 T: (...) sen skriver du skiva, å så tänker du efter om det är /$/$ eller /fc/, om jag säger skiva
150 P: (7s) det är s k
151 T: det tycker du, det var rätt. Å nu säger jag skynda dej
152 P: (3s)
153 T: kan du skriva det också (2s) schschynnda dej
154 P: /SKRIVER/ (7s) så där

(55) L7:149 T: (…) then you write /skiːva/ (slice), and you try to find out if it is /ʃ/ or /ʃ/ if I say /skiːva/ (slice)
150 P: (7s) it is s k (<sk> being the most frequent spelling of /ʃ/)
151 T: that's what you think, you were right. And now I say /skynda dej/ (hurry up)
152 P: (3s)
153 T: can you write that too (2s) /schṣhyn da dej/ (hurry up, with very extended articulation of the initial consonant sound)
154 P: /WRITES/ (7s) like that

Here, P seems not to take skynda dej (hurry up) as a word-item to be written down, but — possibly — as a word used and T has to make explicit the task that is implicitly given in 151. If this interpretation is valid, (55) represents a level conflict.

Level conflicts may also be found that are due to the covert ambiguity between a level 1 perspective and a level 2 perspective:

(56) L2:308 T: ja vi ska ta å skriva nu meningar om dom här, kan du hitta på nån mening, om du tittar på den här svampen nu /P:mm/ hurdan ser den ut nu
309 P: (3s) stor
310 T: den är stor ja, vad kan du skriva då (2s) svampen har...
311 P: svällt
312 T: javisst kan du göra det, bra

(56) L2:308 T: well now we'll write sentences about these, can you think of a sentence, if you look at this sponge now /P:mm/ what does it look like now
309 P: (3s) big
310 T: it's big yes, what can you write then (2s) the sponge has...
311 P: swelled
312 T: of course you can, good

In this example, T’s formulation of the task is very explicit, “these” in 308 referring to the words /svällt/ (starvation) and /svällt/ (swelled) that have been the topic of the entire lesson. Still, this does not prevent P from interpreting the question as a real level 1 question, not asking him necessarily to come up with a sentence containing the word-item swelled, but to report on how he finds the sponge. The enclosing of the word-item is not successful and the result is a level conflict.

4.4 Level fuzzyness

In the case of level shifts and level conflicts, analyzed above, the boundaries between the levels are clear-cut — the enclosure, as it were, rather well-established (though, in the case of a level conflict, for one of the parties only). The most frequent kind of mismatch between the participants, however, is that when the boundaries are not very neat, when the enclosing is incomplete and unclear. This phenomenon will be labelled level fuzzyness.
As for level shifts, there are good reasons to distinguish between the teacher and the pupil with regard to their contributions to level fuzzyness. The frequent ambiguities in the teacher's formulations of tasks, questions and cues, closely analyzed in section 3.3 above, are to be seen as T's principal contribution to level fuzzyness: T seems to aim at level 2, but her formulations are reminiscent of ordinary level 1 use of language. Level fuzzyness in the perspective of the pupil's actions is that often he is more inclined than the teacher to remain closer to level 1.

In (52) and (54) above, T's switching to level 1 leads to level conflicts, but this does not seem to have to do with level fuzzyness. Whereas in the case of a level conflict, the separation is complete, the communicative partners clearly operate each at a different level — a difference of kind, as it were — level fuzzyness is a matter of degree. Whereas the level conflict tends to be momentary, level fuzzyness can endure, giving rise to longer sequences of partial mismatch between the conversational partners in the sense that the dialogue is imperfectly tuned. In contradistinction to level shifts from level 2 to level 1, level fuzzyness does not have the character of a side-step. In the case of such a level shift, the enclosure is temporarily abandoned; when there is level fuzzyness, the enclosure is not abandoned but is not sufficiently tight.

The examples that have been given of word definition tasks — field in (14) and (15), nasty in (21), more precisely in (22), suitable in (31) — can be said to exhibit level fuzzyness as P seems more inclined to remain within the level 1 context where the word was used, than T, who strives for further decontextualization, i.e. word definitions in more general and abstract terms, though this is not necessarily obvious in her original formulation of the question. Also (19), where it is a question of the paradigm of the verb sleep, P's "mixing up" sleep with fall asleep because of their close relationship in everyday experience, should be interpreted as level fuzzyness. P is striving to do the task and give a verb paradigm; the linguistic enclosure, however, is not tight enough to exclude his everyday thinking about related matters and he is not able to treat sleep as an isolated word-item.

To give a another couple of examples of level fuzzyness, let us first return to the sequence in L4 where P is to underline useful phrases:

(57) L4:216 T: jaa, just det, å eh då tänker han att...det var nog dumt, näm­ligen det att han inte gav henne nånting, /P:mm/ det var nog dumt, det stryker vi under
217 P: /STRYKER UNDER/ (5s)
218 T: vad menar han med det, det var nog dumt
219 P: ah, han slarvar till exempel han kom inte ihåg henne jämt, han bryr sej inte sej om henne
220 T: näa just det, det var...det var nog dumt /P:mm/ det var inte så bra, /P:mm/ eh, vi stryker under nästa rad också, jag kom inte ihåg det
221 P: /STRYKER UNDER/ (6s) så
222 T: kan du tänka dej å säga det på ett annat sätt
223 P: (3s) eh jag glömde
224 P: ja bra Yousuf. (...
L4:216 T: yes, that's right, and or then he thinks... that was kind of silly, namely that he didn't give her anything. /P:mm/ that was kind of silly, we'll underline that

217 P: /UNDERLINES/(5s)
218 T: what does he mean by that, that was kind of silly
219 P: ah, he neglects for example he didn't always remember her, he doesn't care about her
220 T: no that's right, that was... that was kind of silly /P:mm/ that was not so good, /P:mm/ er, we'll underline the next line too, I didn't remember that
221 P: /UNDERLINES/(6s) okay
222 T: can you think of another way of saying that
223 P: (3s) er I forgot
224 P: yes that's good Yousuf. (...)

In spite of T's formulation in 218 "What does he mean by that", the task is not primarily one of interpreting or talking about the content of the text, in which case natural paths of everyday thinking such as developing, motivating and explaining what has been said with reference to intentions, motives, cause-effect etc would be appropriate to follow (cf above, p 71f). The task is rather one of giving a precise, prototypical synonym or paraphrase. However, T's referring by means of "he", but apparently preferring a more pure level 2-answer, imbeds the question with ambiguity. In 224 T gives praise to P for having found a single synonym, while his more eloquent interpretation of what the phrase "it was kind of silly" might mean in the context of the text read, is received with less enthusiasm and completed by a paraphrase "that was not so good". P's answer in 219 — "he doesn't care about her" — is the kind of inference one would draw at level 1, but it does not correspond very well to level 2 demands. The sequence is an example of level fuzzyness, both through the ambiguity of T's question and the level 1 flavour of P's answer. In 233, however, P is perfectly on par with the task: note that he does no longer talk about "he", referring to the main character of the text, but renders the sentence with the pronoun unchanged. One could also interpret T's question in 222 as more explicitly asking for level 2 treatment of the item talked about.

In L5, there is an interesting tension between P's message-orientation (level 1 tendency) and the item-orientation of the exercise book followed by T (level 2 tendency). The point of the tale about Gudbrand that P has read is (at least in one possible interpretation), that although Gudbrand did lose everything when bartering during his journey to town, he regains the corresponding sum from his neighbour, through a bet on his wife's expiatory character. After all, his journey to town had been a success.

In the exercise that follows the reading of the story, interpretation of the tale is needed only at a very superficial level. P is to answer yes/no on a sentence-to-sentence, or paragraph-to-paragraph, basis. To each such item, in the order they occur in the tale, corresponds an isolated question:

L5:102 P: nu är jag på nian, /LÄSER/ Tyckte grannarna att det hade gått bra för Gudbrand i stan? Nå, Jo, efterhit.

103 T: mm, men om vi tänker på det här?
104 P: nej
L5:102  P: now I'm on number nine /READS/ Did the neighbours think that Gudbrand had been successful in town. No. Yes, afterwards.

103  T: mm, but if we think of it here?
104  P: no

In 102 P seems to give an interpretation of the point of the story that is message-oriented ("afterwards", the neighbour has to change his mind, though initially he thought that Gudbrand's trip to town had been a failure). In so doing, he acts in a level 1 manner, drawing inferences and interpreting the message of what he has read. Hereby, he breaks the course of the exercise, which — in level 2 manner — concentrates on the story as isolated sentences to which a yes- or a no-answer, and nothing more, applies. Via T, however, he is immediately drawn back to the course of the exercise, and answers a simple "no". The question in the exercise book does not disambiguate between such an item-oriented reading and an ordinary reading, where the answer is dependent upon a more global interpretation of the story. The level fuzzyness consists of this uncertainty between item-orientation and message-orientation, two opposing aspects of level 2 and level 1, respectively.

A couple of other examples of level fuzzyness:

(59) /P has read a passage from "The Tugboat"/

L6: 62  T: mm thank you very much. Listen, was there anything here that you found strange, any word that you haven't heard before
63  P: yes tow
64  T: mm I see tow /P:yes/ th...perhaps one doesn't think of a boat taking in tow another boat, that you don't think of that so often, 'cause then we've talked about something else, what doe...if it's a small boat pulling a big ship, what do we call such a small boat..
65  P: /SIMULTANEOSLY/ eeem T: what does the small boat do
66  P: so that it doesn't run into the quay
67  T: yes okay so that it doesn't...in order to...big ships cannot /P:yes/ drive into the harbours /P:no/ al...'cause then...they
can't slow down... in time right /P:yes/ but then they must have a small.

68 P: INTERRUPTS/ lifeboat
69 T: well you could say that but it's not exactly a lifeboat
70 P: tugboat
71 T: yes that's what it is you see, one...one that pilots (....)

T apparently expects the word-item pilots as the answer to her second question in 64. As it is formulated, though, the question is ineviditably ambiguous between item-orientation, i.e. asking for a particular synonym, and message-orientation. The sequence represents a case of level fuzzyness, since P seems not to fully reach level 2; his answer is an example of remaining in the natural attitude: the boat that pulls another boat makes it avoid running into the quay.

(60) /P works with the "Search for the word! It can be found in the text"-exercise/

L8:241 T: så sönder då, om man slår sönder nåt, kan man också säga att man...
242 P: gå igenom
243 T: jaa man kan ju göra...mos av det hela, man kan säga att man...
244 P: krossar

(60) /P works with the "Search for the word! It can be found in the text"-exercise/

L8:241 T: and break, if you break something, you can also say that you...
242 P: go through
243 T: well you can smash...the whole thing into pieces, you can say that you...
244 P: crush

P's first answer, "go through" is not drawn verbatim from the story he has read and where the word-items counted as the only correct solutions have to be taken (break = crush; the latter word is used in the text). The word go through, on the contrary, is not in the text but is fully compatible with the course of events evoked, though not explicitly stated in the story:


(61) A couple of seconds later the engine broke the wooden gate. Further in the shed there was another, bigger engine. There it came to a stop.

Thus, P remains in message-orientation, giving an answer based on how he interpreted the story, instead of searching for a particular word-item; there is level fuzzyness, since he has to deal simultaneously with word-items in abstracto and concrete instances of use of these words in the story read.

(62) /Exercise on transformation of reported speech to direct speech, cf (13), (41), (42) above/

L5:312 P: /LÄSER/ Hustrun säger att han är duktig och att de kan få ull och kläder när de har få. Jaa, hon säger att han är duktig
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In 312 P answers by stating the message of the sentence-item to be transformed — in a tone that seems to reveal the tiredness and impatience you feel when you have to state the obvious. He thereby remains at level 1, as if he were actually reporting to T what Gudbrand's wife said. The task, though, has level 2 character: it is a matter of displaying direct speech.

The last example of level fuzzyness shows how the lack of tuning can endure for quite a long sequence. The problem encountered in (63) is again the difficulty of obtaining enclosing for a word-item that is to be subjected to level 2 treatment in an exercise. When a linguistic item has to be enclosed, i.e. that this one and only item is to be uttered, reliance on level 1 use and level 1 attitude are at the best unfruitful, at the worst misleading. This means that when T's questions are ambiguous and P remains in the level 1 perspective, prolonged sequences of level fuzzyness may appear:
forst innan du sätter in det, för då får du kanske inte klart för dej hur det är
578 P: aa två gatlykt..utan..nä mellan två
579 T: bra

(63) /An exercise on prepositions, taking as point of departure the text read/

L6:565 T: mm. Then there are an awful lot of small words, /P:mm/ here's something to blow your nose in, blow hard
566 P: /INAUDIBLE/
567 T: mm, and those can be tricky, there it says for example in the evening, where was he..wha..how was he creeping, he was creeping...
568 P: (Zs) under
569 T: yes, he was creeping...
570 P: /SIMULTANEOUSLY/ no on his knees
571 T: on his knees yes and where was he creeping
572 P: on..on the flo...
573 T: if you think of me
574 P: on the ground
575 T: yes that's it and...when he's got the streetlamps, where by the streetla..
576 P: /INTERRUPTS/ on the road
577 T: yes and by the streetlamps it was... bbb...between the streetlamps right. /P:mm/ Can you..here are those small words and it's not certain you'll need to make use of..to look at them /P:no/ but perhaps you only need read, but actually you'll have to read the sentence first before you insert it, 'cause then you don't perhaps /P:yes/ realize how it is
578 P: well two streets..without..no between two
579 T: good

An enclosure of the word-item between can scarcely be construed through mere precision of the content described. T's question in 567 ("how was he creeping?") does not disambiguate between an interpretation where it can be answered by reference to the story, and a level 2 interpretation where the solution consists of finding a particular word-item. In fact, all P's suggested answers are compatible with the scenery depicted in the story. However, to be able to solve the task one has to remember the exact wording of the text where between was initially used. It has to be treated in the level 2 perspective as a word-item. The whole sequence exhibits level fuzzyness.

4.5 Summary

I have tried to demonstrate how the distance between, on the one hand, an everyday perspective on language and linguistic communication (level 1 perspective and attitudes) and, on the other hand, a system-view of language underlying language lessons (level 2 perspective) creates ambiguities and leads to tension of various kinds that may result in communicative dysfluencies in the course of a lesson — level shifts, level conflicts and level fuzzyness. It should be clear that the boundaries between the three dialogue processes that have been identified are not always perfectly sharp: the notions of level
conflict, level shift and level fuzziness are used to capture some partially different, partially similar phenomena in the communicative process of a language lesson. The differences, as I have tried to show above, lie in the fact that level conflicts lead to serious misunderstandings which are usually detected and repaired. This is not necessarily the case when it comes to level fuzziness and level shifts. Level fuzziness rather leads to a certain degree of mismatch between the two conversational partners and their contributions to the dialogue. Level shifts, finally, need not be the result of, or lead to misunderstandings or to mismatch, they just temporarily alter the focus of the activity.

The similarities between the three phenomena lie in the fact that they all have to do with the way utterances are contextualized. More specifically, they have to do with discrepancies in the way in which the linguistic enclosure, created in order to make it possible to talk about language in the level 2 perspective, is handled by the conversational partners at a particular stage in the dialogue process.

Obviously, the difference between the two levels does not obligatorily lead to problems — whether it does or not depends primarily on the degree to which the pupil is capable of taking the right attitude at the right moment, how willing he is and how familiar with the demands of the situation. In the lessons of the corpus there are certainly sequences where the tuning is perfect, P manages to do his tasks and the dialogue runs smoothly:

(64) L5:198 T: mm, bra. Ha, ska vi träna lite grann på..
199 P: /SAMTIDIGT/ motsatsen
200 T: motsatsord där ja, ska du låsa
201 P: /LÅSER/ Dra en linje mellan de ord i..ord som är motsatsen till
202 T: mm, bra dålig är motsats
203 P: /SAMTIDIGT, OHÖRBART/
204 T: du vet vad motsatsord är för nät?
205 P: ja jag vet /T:mm/ linjal då?
206 T: nä det behöver du inte /P:nå/ det blir så små streck du drar så
207 P: /DRAR STRECK/
208 T: nå så får du inte göra
209 P: nå men det var inte meningen, jag skulle dra dit så..
210 T: blev det lite längre ner /P:ja/ än du ville, lång & kort, du kan
gott tala om...
211 P: /SAMTIDIGT/ hungrig... mätt
212 T: /SAMTIDIGT, OHÖRBART/mm
213 P: lätt, svår
214 T: ja
215 P: småll, stygg
216 T: mm
217 P: stor, & liten
218 T: mm
219 P: udig, sen
220 T: hja
221 P: fin å ful
222 T: ja, det är bra, det där var inga svårigheter
223 P: nå

(64) L5:198 T: mm, good. Okay, let's train a bit with..
199 P: /SIMULTANEOUSLY/ opposites
200 T: antonyms yes, can you read
201 P: /READS/ Draw a line between the words i...words which are each other’s opposite, look at the example
202 T: mm, good bad are antonyms
203 P: /SIMULTANEOUSLY, INAUDIBLE/
204 T: you know what antonyms are?
205 P: yes I know /T:mm/ the ruler?
206 T: no you won’t need it /P:no/ the lines you’ll draw are so short
207 P: /DRAWS LINE/
208 T: no you can’t do it like that
209 P: no I didn’t mean to, I was drawing a line over there and...
210 T: it came a bit further down /P:yes/ than you wanted, long and short, you can very well tell...
211 P: /SIMULTANEOUSLY/ hungry... /mätt/ (satisfied; there is no word in English exactly corresponding to Swedish mätt, meaning ‘having had enough to eat’)
212 T: /SIMULTANEOUSLY, INAUDIBLE/mm
213 P: easy, difficult
214 T: yes
215 P: kind, evil
216 T: mm
217 P: big, and small
218 T: mm
219 P: early, late
220 T: yes
221 P: nice and ugly
222 T: okay, that’s fine, there were no problems
223 P: nope

However, the fact that P goes through this exercise (discussed above, page 70f), without any occurrences of level shifts, level conflicts or level fuzzyness, does not mean that the difference between the levels is annihilated — the distance between negating or saying the opposite of something uttered at level 1 and giving prototypical antonyms to word-items out of context, is as huge as ever — only that this time, the problems have been surmounted.

Earlier I called attention to a double problem of transition, connected with the existence of two levels in the language classroom. Only one of them, that of substituting the level 2 perspective for a naive, everyday attitude towards language has been investigated in this chapter. In this connection, I would like to stress that the question, as it has been posed in this chapter, does not concern whether the pupil is capable or not in an absolute sense of handling language at level 2 or of working within the level 2 perspective. A growing body of literature on children’s meta-linguistic awareness (e.g. Hakes, 1980) rather suggests that, by the age of 10-12, they would be — at least under favourable circumstances. Especially bilingual children have been shown to be already capable of meta-linguistic observations at an early age (Aronsson, 1981; Hakuta & Diaz, 1985). As should have been clear, however, the preceding investigation concerns how the level complexity is handled in the actual course of the dialogue, in a situation which is characterized by ambivalence and ambiguity. Thus, to take up Hundeide’s (1977) distinction: the study has been carried out in a perspective of communication rather than a perspective of competence.

The second problem, how level 2 knowledge can be transferred to everyday situations of language use, cannot be treated here, since the data does not per-
mit any conclusions about what happens after the lesson. Different authors have expressed radically different convictions on the matter (see chapter II, section 2). In this study, there is no need to take a stand in a debate on the effects of teaching. Instead, the aim has been to work out a thorough description of how language works and is used during lessons and to relate this to what is talked about and to different activities that take place in a language classroom. Hopefully, such a characterization can constitute the ground for pondering on what might be learnt or not through teaching. In this respect, the study aims at making that ground more solid, in that it procures more precise knowledge about the language lesson as a communicative event.

In the next chapter I shall carry out a different kind of analysis of the discourse that is connected with different activities during lessons and conversations. Instead of picking out selected, pertinent sequences of dialogue and submitting them to a qualitative analysis, I shall engage in a quantitative analysis that includes every single turn at talk in the lessons and the non-didactic conversations of the corpus and make comparisons between activity types across situations as well as between subtypes of activities within the lessons.
V DYNAMICS, COHERENCE AND DOMINANCE IN THE DIALOGUE

1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, an analysis was undertaken of particular dialogue processes specifically connected with the way language is treated as a topic in the language lessons, i.e. with the content of the lessons. Though I was able to show that level conflicts, level fuzzyness and level shifts appear to a greater or lesser extent in all of the lessons in the corpus where language per se is the focus, i.e. treated at level 2 in the terms introduced in this study, the analysis proceeded only through commenting upon selected, illustrative examples picked out here and there in the lessons. In this chapter, I shall turn to a completely different method of analysis. Now, I shall scrutinize the totality of the corpus; each single turn will be classified in terms of its contribution to the dialogue as it unfolds. The method to be used is the "Initiative-Response Analysis" (henceforth called the IR analysis) presented in Linell & Gustavsson (1986, 1987).

Obviously, when replacing discursive commentaries of a limited subcorpus by a comprehensive, classificatory analysis of the corpus in its totality, we can no longer expect to uncover such subtle details or delve as deeply into the description of particular dialogue processes as was attempted in the previous chapter. Instead, the aim is to give an overall analysis of characteristics of the dialogue in different activity types, mainly in quantitative terms. Together, the two methods of analysis are intended to make the picture of the language lesson as a communicative event more complete, as each of them is designed to capture partially different aspects of the dialogue process, partially the same aspects from different angles.

What is of interest in this chapter is to investigate whether teacher dominance, regularly observed in interaction analyses in classrooms, is more important in the lessons than in the non-didactic conversations and whether teacher dominance varies as a function of different activity types within the confines of a lesson. I will also be concerned with possible variation between activity types concerning coherence in dialogue: fragmentary vs locally coherent, oblique vs straight progression of the talk, and finally I shall pay attention to features of dialogue dynamics such as tempo and fluency. In order to do this, I shall operate with quantitative measures of dialogue characteristics, measures applying to sequences of dialogue, or to activity types in their entirety.

Before I present the hypotheses examined and the results of the analysis, I shall give a relatively detailed account of the method as such, its theoretical
foundations, its aims and its scope, which, of course, includes a presentation of
the categories of classification, with dialogue material from the corpus used as
an illustration. The data will be related to the variation in situation represented
in the corpus by the different activities; on the one hand lessons versus
conversations, on the other hand different didactic and non-didactic activities
within the lessons.

2 The Initiative-Response Analysis

2.1 Theoretical foundations and methodological characteristics

The method for conversation analysis presented in Linell & Gustavsson (1986; 1987) — the IR analysis — is designed to be applicable in principle to all
kinds of dyadic conversations. It has been worked out and tested on a rather
wide range of discourse types: court trials (for a description of this corpus, see
Adelswärd et al, 1987), police interrogations (Jönsson, forthe.), doctor-patient
consultations (Aronsson & Säterlund Larsson, 1987) dialogues in experi­
mental settings, in social psychology (Blakar, 1984) and in communication studies
(Adelswärd, 1983), on casual conversations between colleagues and between
husband and wife (Noren & Lofström, 1977), on lessons and conversations of
the kind used in this study, namely those collected in the pilot studies, as well
as, of course, fragments of other scattered conversations observed and written
down by the authors.

The theoretical conception of language and conversation underlying the work
is identical to the one of this particular study, already presented in chapter II.
To recapitulate briefly, it owes a great deal to ethnomethodology, to particular
variants of language game theory and to those works in pragmatics and
conversation analysis that emphasize the importance of accounting for the
activity-embeddedness of language and the process character of linguistic
communication.

The most marked difference between the IR analysis and the sources of the­
oretical inspiration referred to above, is the attempt to let such a conception of
language form the basis for a classificatory analysis of complete corpora and to
use quantitative methods of analysis. By doing this, the authors by no means
wish to depreciate qualitative approaches to conversation analysis, not even to

1 The entire coding, as well as the reliability testing, has been carried out on the
basis of Linell & Gustavsson (1986). In the following version, Linell &
Gustavsson (1987), the category system and the guide-lines for the coding have
undergone only minor changes and slight refinement: a couple of definitions
have been sharpened, some precisions added, some lacunae filled. When, how­
ever, it comes to the use of coded data in deriving global measures of different
dialogue dimensions, the latest version is considerably more elaborate and that
is why it will be followed here, in those respects.
question their primacy, but rather to supplement what is known about language use in different settings. Building upon the insights gained through thorough qualitative analyses, the quantifications should make it possible to study to what extent various features of interaction are present or absent in various contexts.

Classificatory analyses are also used in the linguistic branch of discourse analysis (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, and a number of scholars taking the work of "the Birmingham school" as point of departure, e.g. Lönsecher, 1983; Stenström, 1984; cf also Stubbs, 1983), and in communication and interaction studies springing from behavioural sciences (e.g. Thomas, Bull & Roger, 1982; D'Andrade & Wish, 1985). In the latter category of research, quantitative methods have traditionally been used. The same can hardly be said about the former category, where the major research interest is one of working out a descriptive apparatus for discourse structure.

Traditionally, the gap is huge between research traditions using qualitative methods and those using mainly quantitative methods. Since, in order to fulfil the aim of a study like this one, it is necessary to compare dialogue processes and features of conversation across situations, and since it is desirable to describe to what extent there is variation and how much variation, the need for quantitative estimates is self-evident. On the other hand, the theoretical foundations of the study, taken from research traditions where quantification is not brought under cultivation, must not be betrayed. In these respects, the IR analysis provides a possibility to bridge the gap.

In comparison with most other classificatory analyses of conversation, the IR analysis is less atomistic, since it is based on the "doubly contextual" (Heritage, 1984:242) character of each contribution to the dialogue. Furthermore, the classification reflects the fact that acts can have several functions at the same time (e.g. have both initiative and response properties), whereas in many classificatory analyses one would have to treat them as uni-functional, or resort to a more abstract level of analysis. Secondly, to the extent that other classificatory methods tend to treat conversation as static — "the text-as-product" view, in the terms of Brown & Yule (1983a) — the IR analysis is more apt to preserve throughout the analysis the dynamic character of conversation (Brown & Yule, ibid: "the discourse-as-process" view), since the classification is intended to capture the local dynamics of the communicative acts at the stage of the interaction at which they are performed. Thirdly, in the IR analysis an attempt is made to approach the participants' perspective on their reciprocal actions (cf Gustavsson, 1985a), where most types of discourse analysis, at least those which have their roots in linguistics, do not seem to bother about the differences in perspective between observer and participant, or among the participants themselves. These three features of the IR analysis — non-atomism, process orientation and perspectivization — all correspond to fundamental aspects of the nature of linguistic interaction, emphasized in those research traditions which have served as its theoretical bases. A fourth important feature of the IR analysis is that the categories of classification are placed on a six-step, ordinal scale, i.e. that results of the analysis do not turn out only as frequencies and unrelated quantifications, but also as global scores which can
be used to compare symmetry, coherence etc between dialogues and dialogue sequences.

2.2 Characteristics of dialogue to be captured through the analysis

Before presenting the categories of classification, I shall discuss discursively a couple of sequences from the lessons and conversations of the corpus, in order to draw attention to those dimensions of dialogue processes that the IR analysis is intended to measure. The extracts have been selected for their ability to illustrate maximally what is meant by discourse dynamics, coherence and dominance in the sense in which these terms will be used later on. As far as possible, material from these commented sequences will also be used to exemplify the category system, as well as the measures derived from the coding into these categories.

Two things should be added about the example sequences. First, a methodologically important matter: It is only for practical and pedagogical reasons that I use material from the corpus under investigation in the presentation of the method. As pointed out before, the method as such has been tried out on independent data and is intended to be applicable to a wide range of discourse types (see e.g. Adelswärd & al, 1987, where the IR method has been applied to a large corpus of court trials). Thus, it has not been developed primarily for the kinds of communicative activities which constitute the subject matter of this study. If this had been the case, the results would have been of considerably less value. Second, though very useful for illustrative purposes, the two extracts must not be taken as representative of their respective situation types in the corpus: the smooth and fluent dialogue exemplified here by an extract from a lesson, is actually more typical of the non-didactic conversations, and the disharmonious, non-fluent dialogue, exemplified by an extract from one of the non-didactic conversations, is more similar to the average language lesson in certain respects.

To begin with, the two sequences will be presented and some impressionistic remarks made. The first sequence is taken from a lesson, L6. P has just finished reading the story from "The Tugboat" (see chapter III, p 34f), corrections of his reading have been made and those words with which P was not familiar have been explained:

(65) L6:117 T: ja, Du, Yousuf, vad var det Eta skulle göra den här kvällen
118 P: (3s)
119 T: ska du försöka berätta för mej /P:jaha/ vad du minns nu då, vad var det hon skulle göra den här kvällen
120 P: hon sprang till eh ner till eh Pressbyrkiosken
121 T: Å vad skulle hon göra där
122 P: å köpa cigaretter till sin mamma
123 T: jättebra, eh du det... hurnt år det ute, hurnt år vädret ute den här kvällen
124 P: a kall, det var eh vänta, det var väl tretton grader, kalk
125 T: ja, det är kallt ute för vilken årstid år det
126 P: det var sexton grader kallt
127 T: /SMÅSKRATTANDE/ det var det ja, mera exakt var det sexton grader kallt, nå vilken årstid är det fråga om då
128 P: februari
129 T: ja men årstiden, det är månaden det är riktigt /P:mm/ men vilken årstid, är det sommar, vinter eller
130 P: ja vinter

(65) L.6:117 T: yeah! Listen, Yousuf, what was it that Eta was going to do this evening
118 P: (3s)
119 T: you try and tell me /P:oh/ what you remember now, what was she going to do this evening
120 P: she ran to er down to er the news agent's
121 T: to do what
122 P: to buy cigarettes for her Mum
123 T: very good, er listen now it..what's it like out there, how's the weather this evening
124 P: sh cold, it was er wait, it was about thirteen degrees..below
125 T: yes, it's cold 'cause what season is it
126 P: it was sixteen degrees below
127 T: /LAUGHING A LITTLE/ yes it was, more precisely it was sixteen degrees below, and what season is that then
128 P: well February
129 T: yes but what season, that's the month that's right /P:mm/ but what season, is it summer, winter or
130 P: well winter

The second extract is drawn from an adult-child conversation, Ad3. P has fallen back into his clearly non-cooperative attitude with which he started the lesson, but which he changed completely during the work with the kite (see chapter III above, p 31ff). He has just finished the conversation with his class-mate and he seems to grasp immediately that the tasks in the two conversations are the same, and hence he anticipates a great deal. However, his teacher knows nothing apart from what is given by the researcher in the preceding instruction:

(66) Ad3: 1 A: jaha det var inte lätt du, jag har jobbat här ett helt år..
2 P: /AVBRYTER/ jag ska ha den, jag ska ha den
3 A: ska du ha den, då tar jag den då, då jag hittar inte än på skolan
(4s)
4 P: /SKRIKER/ kastar snöboll
5 A: vad sa du
6 P: kaster snöboll
7 A: kasta snöboll?
8 P: mhm
9 A: jaha vi ska ta kort på det menar du. Får man kasta snöboll på skolgården
10 P: (3s)
11 A: får man det
12 P: hnå, vi skriver eh..
13 A: då kan du inte kan visa det..
14 P: /AVBRYTER/ vi skriver fel här då
15 A: fel?
16 P: (3s) så då, vi skriver..fem rrr..fem fel och..fem rätt, skriver vi, fem bra om Lillskolan & fem dåliga om Lillskolan
17 A: /TVEKSAMT/ jaa
18 P: kasta snöboll
A: ja men eh kan vi...
(5s)
20 A: jag funderar alltid på var vi ska börja, precis som när du skulle beskriva det där rummet vet du, vad som kan va...
21 P: /AVBRYTER/ du ska inte göra' t sju fel
22 A: nå vi skulle göra tjugofyra bilder
23 P: nä vi måste inte göra tjugofyra bilder
24 A: nä vi men ungefär
25 P: äh men /STÖN AR IRRITERAT/
26 A: vi får väl se hur många vi kommer på, jag tror inte jag kommer på så många, jag ritar till tolv så länge då
(5s)
27 A: vi skulle berätta om skolan för nån som inte har sett den eller som inte har varit här

(66) Ad3: 1 A: okay, this wasn't easy, I've worked here for a whole year..
2 P: /INTERUPTS/ I'll have that one, I'll have that one
3 A: you'll have that one, then I'll take this one, and I still don't always find my way around in the school
(4s)
4 P: /SHOUTS OUT/ throwing snowballs
5 A: what did you say
6 P: throwing snowballs
7 A: throw snowballs?
8 P: mhm
9 A: I see we'll take a photo of that you mean. Are you allowed to throw snowballs in the schoolyard
10 P: (3s)
11 A: are you allowed
12 P: no, we write er..
13 A: then perhaps we can't show that...
14 P: /INTERUPTS/ so we write wrong here
15 A: wrong?
16 P: (3s) that's it, we write five rrr..wrong five times..and right five times, we write, five good ones about Little School and five bad ones about Little School!
17 A: /HESITANTLY/yes
18 P: throw snowballs
19 A: yes but er can we..
(5s)
20 A: I always think about where to start, just like when you were to describe that room you know, what could be..
21 P: /INTERUPTS/ you shall't do it seven times wrong
22 A: no we were to take some twenty four pictures
23 P: no we don't have to take twenty four pictures
24 A: no but approximately
25 P: sh but /GROANS EXASPERATEDLY/
26 A: we'll see how many we can think of, I don't think I'll think of that many, so I'll draw twelve so far
(5s)
27 A: we were to describe the school for someone who hasn't seen it or who hasn't been here

The general impression of the two dialogue extracts is strikingly different. In (66), the beginning of the picture book task in Ad3, the conversationalists seem to have considerable problems in finding a common wave-length and thus in getting started with the work in an ordered and concerted fashion; the dia-
logue is fragmentary, disharmonious, and disrupted. There are interruptions and silences, clear signs of lack of understanding, starts and restarts and a competitive atmosphere. In the first extract, (65), from the beginning of a questioning on a text that has been read, no such symptoms of difficulties in interaction seem to be at hand. Instead, the dialogue progresses very smoothly, questions are asked, immediately answered and the answers positively evaluated. Finally, there is also the difference between the two extracts that in the first one, there seems to be a clear division of labour: T is asking and P is responding, whereas in the second extract neither of the participants seems to take, or be given, a leading role. Rather both try to impose their view on things and put forward their own perspective on the task. In the following, the IR analysis will be applied to the two extracts, presenting the notions of the system and the coding categories and finally showing how the two dialogues turn out in the dialogue measures provided by the IR analysis.

In the following, the two dialogue extracts will be discussed, turn by turn, and the discussion will serve to introduce the distinctions that are made in IR coding. It is important to realize that, from now on in the text, the terms introduced as technical terms in the IR analysis will be used in their technical sense, e.g. 'inadequate' and 'soliciting' respectively mean 'inadequate/soliciting as defined in the IR analysis in connection with particular IR categories, not necessarily inadequate/soliciting in any other, less specific sense'. The symbols for the IR categories used for coding are displayed for each turn (succinct category definitions grouped together are given on page 141).

(65a) L6:117 <••> T: ja! Du, Yousuf, vad var det Eta skulle göra den här kvällen
 P: (3 sec)
 T: ska du föröka berätta för mej /P:jaha/ vad du minns nu då, vad var det hon skulle göra den här kvällen

(65a) L6:117 <••> T: yeah! Listen, Yousuf, what was it that Eta was going to do this evening
 P: (3 sec)
 T: you try and tell me /P:oh/ what you remember now, what was she going to do this evening

At the very beginning of the sequence, T makes a structuring move (cf Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). Very emphatically pronounced, the "yeah!" that starts turn 117 is the ending of the preceding activity, that of vocabulary explanations, and then she starts a new activity with a shift in intonation and by using a vocative, "Listen, Yousuf". All this is interpreted as T's marking of a struc-

1 Though in the comments to the two dialogue extracts, descriptions are given in terms that may appear normative, I would like to stress the obvious point that these characterizations by no means are to be interpreted as evaluations of what is going on in the two dyads. Rather I would like to have these characterizations accepted as descriptions of features of the dynamics, coherence and dominance patterns in the two dialogues. Whether the one or the other could be functional or dysfunctional in an absolute sense is dubious; of course any evaluation depends on the standards against which it is made. These standards, in turn, depend on the purpose(s) the dialogues are to serve — for the respective parties.
tural boundary in the course of the lesson: 'we are now leaving one activity and starting another'. After the vocative, T asks a question. Obviously, a question, as the first part of an adjacency pair (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), has proactive qualities; it is an initiative. Furthermore, in the terms of the IR analysis, it is a soliciting initiative as opposed to an assertive initiative or a submitting initiative (see below), since it solicits from the conversational partner that (s)he introduce semantic substance specified by the content of the solicitation.

However, P remains silent. His period of silence is by no means just any absence of vocalization; since T has asked him a question, thereby requesting him to furnish the second part of an adjacency pair, it is an example of what in conversation analysis is labelled "significant (or attributable) silence" (Levinson, 1983:299). T has given the floor to P, and during his silence he has the floor, though he fails to make anything out of his turn. In the IR analysis, his silence is counted as a turn, as can be seen from the numbering.

In 119, T makes explicit what she expects P to do: retell what he remembers from the story. P gives a signal of agreement which, however, is not considered as interrupting T's turn as she immediately continues by repeating her question, word by word, only replacing the proper name Eta by a pronoun. P's "oh" is a typical back-channel signal; in the analysis it is not given the status of a full-fledged turn at talk and is left out of the IR classification (therefore, it has not been given a separate number in the transcription). T's act is one of renewing her initiative (repeated initiative), thereby signalling that P's silence is not accepted as an adequate act (inadequate response).

In 120, P answers the question in such a way that T in her next turn can go on to the next question. This means that she treats P's answer as adequate. We note also that P does not use his turn to add anything that goes beyond what was requested in T's question; accordingly, his turn has no proactive, only retroactive, qualities. In terms of the IR analysis it is a minimal, adequate response.

The next couple of turns are exactly parallel — a soliciting initiative followed by a minimal, adequate response. The only difference is that T in her next turn, 123, makes explicit her positive evaluation of P's answer. This follow-up move, by the way, has been shown to be a typical feature of didactic discourse (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Mehan, 1979); unless it is very marked as the termination of an activity or a subgame, it is treated simply as a response in the IR analysis. Thereafter, before asking the next question, T makes some hesitation noises and, just as in turn 117, she uses a vocative, but
this time considerably more restrained. This difference is one reason for not treating 123 in the same way as 117, i.e. as a turn containing a boundary between two subgames. Another argument is that there is continuity in the questioning — the question in 123 also contributes to the same ongoing activity that was explicitly introduced in turn 119 as retelling of the story.

(65c) 124  
<^> P: a cold, it was er wait, it was about thirteen degrees.. below

125  
<^> T: ja, det är kallt uge for vilken årsid är det

126  
<^> P: det var sexton grader kallt

In 124, T first gives what could have been a minimal, adequate response. However this time, unlike in his preceding two answers, he wants to add something in addition to a minimal response. This turns out to be a mere precision. Nevertheless, in the IR analysis, 124 represents an expanded response since it contains more than would be accepted as minimally adequate. An expanded response has proactive qualities, it introduces semantic substance beyond what has been requested by the interlocutor in a preceding initiative. There is one important difference, however, between the kind of initiative taken by P in 124 and those initiatives from T that we have encountered earlier in this sequence: while T's initiatives were soliciting, i.e. explicitly requesting a response, this is not the case in 124. Instead, P's expanded response is an assertive initiative.

In 125, T accepts P's contribution and asks her next question, i.e. takes another soliciting initiative. In his next turn, P acts in a completely different way compared to what he has done earlier in this sequence. Instead of complying with T's latest request, he builds upon what he was talking about in his last turn. Thus, he ignores T's current initiative. In the terms of the IR analysis, his conversational contribution this time is self-linked, as opposed to alter-linked. Of course, his initiative is assertive, not soliciting.

(65d) L6:127  
<^> T: /SMÅSKRATTANDE/ det var det ja, mera exakt var det sexton grader kallt, å vilken årsid är det fråga om då

128  
<^> P: aa februari

129  
<^> T: ja men årsiden, det är månaden det är riktigt /P:mm/ men vilken årsid, är det sommar, vinter eller

130  
<^> P: ja vinter

(65d) L6:127  
<^> T: /LAUGHING A LITTLE/ yes it was, more precisely it was sixteen degrees below, and what season is that then

128  
<^> P: well February

129  
<^> T: yes but what season, that's the month that's right /P:mm/ but what season, is it summer, winter or

130  
<^> P: well winter
Both in 127 and 129, T repeats her question, first asked in 125. The two turns thereby also exhibit self-linking, as was the case in P's turn 126. However, there is an important difference in that T, before renewing her initiative, actually does accept and thus respond to P's immediately preceding contribution. Hence, her turns are alter-linked as well. Obviously, she does not consider P's answer in 128 as the correct and expected answer. Nevertheless she does not dismiss it completely, e.g. by ignoring it. In the IR coding, alter-linking is given priority over self-linking in such cases where both kinds are at hand. 127 and 129 are thus analysed in a different way than 119 and 126 where there is self-linking, but where the alter-linking is missing.

In 130, P is able to give the expected answer ("winter") to the question and the dialogue continues for another 83 turns in almost exactly the same way as we have seen until now, P's recall of the story read being checked through this kind of questioning. We can therefore bring our examination of it to an end and proceed to some generalizations. These would then be valid for the whole activity. Before that, however, I will recapitulate important notions and distinctions in the IR analysis that I have been able to demonstrate through this sequence.

The unit of analysis is the turn of each participant. A turn can have exclusively proactive qualities, i.e. have no links backwards in the dialogue, but set up conditions for the contributions to come. Such a turn is a free initiative. A turn can also have exclusively retroactive qualities, i.e. be linked to a preceding initiative without in itself constituting an initiative. Such a turn is a minimal response. Minimal responses can be adequate, i.e. accepted by the partner as fulfilling the demands of his/her initiative, or inadequate. Initiatives can be of different kinds; in the commented sequence, the difference between soliciting initiatives and assertive initiatives was shown. In its response aspect, a turn in conversation can be alter-linked, i.e. linked to the immediately preceding contribution from the partner, or self-linked, or both, in which case the alter-linking is given priority in the classificatory analysis. A couple of other dimensions of the analysis will be demonstrated and commented upon when we turn to the second sequence to be used as an illustration.

The IR analysis is intended to reflect the dynamics of the verbal interaction (and, exceptionally, non-verbal, in cases where non-verbal actions are integrated in a mainly linguistic communicative game) in dialogues and to give measures of coherence and dominance patterns. When we look at the sequence cited and commented upon above as (65), we find that it represents a kind of discourse that is fluent; the communicative partners succeed fairly well in linking their contributions to one another, there are few mishearings, misunderstandings or hitches, though there are some exceptions to such a perfect harmony (P's failing to answer in 118, the absence of alter-linking, i.e. of reciprocity, in 126). Measures of dynamics and coherence should be capable of characterizing such a discourse as fluent, coherent and harmonious. At the same time, we note that there is an uneven distribution of initiatives (and of kinds of initiatives) between the two parties. T is the one who is responsible for pushing the dialogue forward and for its direction, while P restricts himself to the role of the follower. The interaction thus is asymmetric, a fact which has to be reflected by any reasonable measure of dominance.
Next in the illustration of the IR analysis, I shall turn to the other dialogue sequence, cited above as (66), which appeared to be completely different. There, we do not find one dominant and one submissive party and neither do the conversationalists seem to reach common understanding; rather each of them follows a line of his/her own, and hitches and other dysfluencies are legion.

(66a) Ad3: 1  ▲ A: jaha det var inte lätt du, jag här jobbat här ett helt år...
    2   > P: /AVBRYTER/ jag ska ha den, jag ska ha den
    3  ▲ A: ska du ha den, då tar jag den då, å jag hittar inte tän på skolan
    (4s)
    ▲ P: /SKRIKER/ kastar snöboll
    5  ➔ A: vad sa du
    6  ▲ P: kastar snöboll
    7  ➔ A: kasta snöboll?
    8  < P: mhm

(66a) Ad3: 1  ▲ A: okay, this wasn’t easy, I’ve worked here for a whole year...
    2   > P: /INTERRUPTS/ I’ll have that one, I’ll have that one
    3  ▲ A: you’ll have that one, then I’ll take this one, and I still don’t always find my way around in the school
    (4s)
    ▲ P: /SHOUTS OUT/ throwing snowballs
    5  ➔ A: what did you say
    6  ▲ P: throwing snowballs
    7  ➔ A: throw snowballs?
    8  < P: mhm

It is A who starts the interaction by commenting upon the task and then she apparently starts to talk about how she finds the school (I remind that the task is to find subjects for a picture book to present the school). However, she is immediately interrupted by P, who claims the right to something (one would guess a pencil or a pen, but from the audiotape it is not possible to tell exactly what “that one” refers to). P’s first turn, number 2, is in no way linked to A’s preceding contribution. Hence, we find that the conversation starts out with two free initiatives, the one taken by A clearly assertive, while the one taken by P has been considered as soliciting, as he seems to request a non-verbal action, that something be given to him by A. A’s first turn is interrupted before finished and is therefore a borderline case between a full-status turn and a turn miscarriage. A turn miscarriage in the IR analysis is a turn that is interrupted either by the speaker him/herself or by his/her partner, before it has had any possibilities of influencing the course of the dialogue. In the case of 1, it has been considered that such an early interruption is not at hand, and, furthermore, A herself links up with it in her next turn.

A’s next contribution, turn 3, exhibits alter-linking since she complies with P’s request, and then she links back to her own preceding turn and continues it. This is done in an unmarked way, i.e. without structuring moves or specific markers to signal that she returns to something that is no longer on-stage. Therefore, 3 is an ordinary expanded response, ending in an assertive initiative. Again, P does not give any sign whatsoever of taking into account his inter-
locutor's contribution. Instead, he throws out what seems to be his first proposal for the picture book. Obviously, this is linked to what has been said in the researcher's instruction. However, the instruction does not form part of the interaction between A and P; in their interaction there is no preceding turn to which 4 is linked and it has to be considered as another free initiative.

In 5, we encounter a particular kind of conversational contribution, the deferring question. It is not a minimal response, since it has a certain proactive aspect in that it solicits a response. However, it is not proactive in the same sense as the soliciting and the assertive initiatives we have encountered earlier. Instead, such a question brings the conversation to a temporary standstill, it requests a "time-out" to clear out a mishearing, a minor misunderstanding or any other slight hitch. A deferring question usually starts a repair sequence (Schegloff & al, 1977). In the sequence we are looking at, A is forced to use a deferring question twice, in turns 5 and 7, the first time as she cannot hear, the second time maybe because she is still not certain of what P said, maybe she hears but fails to understand, or does not want to believe that this is what P proposes. In 6, we see the typical thing happening after a deferring question, i.e. that the speaker repeats (or, in many cases, makes more clear) what (s)he has said in his/her last turn, the one that led his/her partner to ask the deferring question. Hence, contributions like 6 are both self-linked and alter-linked; again the classification will give priority to the alter-linking. We can also note a difference in strength between A's two deferring questions. The second one can be — and is, in this case — responded to by a minimal confirmation, while the first one must be responded to in a more elaborate fashion. This is reflected in the IR analysis in such a way that 6 is coded as an expanded response, 8 as a minimal response. Incidentally, the fact that P gives only a minimal response in 8 is revealing; a more cooperative conversationalist would presumably have tried to make himself more clear, giving e.g. a motivation for his proposal, since his partner shows such obvious signs of difficulties in following.

(66b) Ad3: 9 <> A: jaha vi ska ta kort på det menar du. Får man kasta snöboll på skolgården
10 — P: (3s)
11 => A: får man det

(66b) Ad3: 9 <> A: I see we'll take a photo of that you mean. Are you allowed to throw snowballs in the schoolyard
10 — P: (3s)
11 => A: are you allowed

When A finally acknowledges the fact that P proposes the throwing of snowballs as the first subject for the picture book, she seems to prepare an objection by asking a question that should remind P that the activity in question is forbidden. The sequence cited in (66b) is of a kind that we are familiar with from (65a) above: a soliciting initiative, a significant silence that is analyzed as an inadequate response and then the repeated, self-linked initiative.

(66c) Ad3: 12 X P: hml, vi skriver eh.
13 => A: då kanske vi inte kan visa det.
14 <= P: /AVBRYTER/ vi skriver fel här då
In 12, P gives a minimal response, then starts an expansion. However, the expansion vanishes in a hesitation signal and is interrupted definitely as A takes over and continues her line of reasoning: that "throwing of snowballs" is an unacceptable subject in the picture book. 12 is a turn miscarriage, 13 a self-linked assertive initiative.

The objection presented by A in 13 is not taken into account by P; he interrupts and continues his last turn, the one that was aborted. Once again, we are confronted with a self-linked turn. When comparing 13 and 14, both characterized as self-linked, we find that with regard to the preceding contribution from the interlocutor — in this case one is tempted to say from the adversary — there is a difference in strength. In 13, A solely takes advantage of P's hesitation and his abortion of his turn, while, in 14, P more ostensibly ignores a substantial contribution from A. Hence, 14 is a more offensive move. If the classification of conversational turns is to form the basis for a valid measure of dominance in interaction, such a difference in degree of offensiveness has to be represented in the system of categories. Therefore, the IR analysis differentiates between = and <= categories H and J, respectively (see below p 141).

In the next turn, A again signals that she has problems with following P's line of reasoning. By means of a-deferring question, she asks for clarification. (With his talk about five good ones and five bad ones, P is probably alluding to the second part of the picture book task, where the task is actually to select five subjects from the many proposals that have come up. At this stage, however, A knows nothing about what will be the next task.) However, no clarification is provided by P. Instead, there is a period of silence during which P goes on with what he has in mind and when he takes the floor again, it is just to settle things his way — "That's it" — as if A had all the time been following and agreeing with the course of the events. Thus, in 16 there are no signs of alter-linking; again a conversational contribution is classified as exclusively self-linked. In 17, A very hesitantly agrees; had it been judged only on the way it was pronounced, it is doubtful whether it would have been counted as a full status turn, i.e. it is a borderline case towards a turn miscarriage. However, P acts as if A were giving a minimal adequate response and takes this as an opportunity to return to the activity of giving proposals for the picture book.
(actually, he insists upon his earlier proposal). P's turn is taken as an example of a particular category of turns in the IR analysis that we have not yet encountered in this illustration: the non-locally linked turn. The term non-local link refers to a link to a specific turn located further back in the ongoing dialogue than the speaker's own or his/her partner's last turn. It is considered that since a non-locally linked turn does not continue the current (local) course of the dialogue, it represents a stronger action than a locally linked turn; it is designed to force the interlocutor to leave the current topic and return to something which has been off-stage for a while. On the other hand, it is considered as not as strong as a free initiative, since, instead of opening up a completely new path, it ties up with a thread that already exists in the history of the ongoing interaction and, therefore, possibly in the interlocutor's mind.

(66d) Ad3:19  X  A: jaa men eh kan vi...

(5s)

20 ..  A: jag funderar alltid på var vi ska börja, precis som när du skulle beskriva det där rummet vet du, vad som kan va...

21 :>  P: /AVBRYTER/ du ska inte göra' sju fel

22 <^  A: nå vi skulle göra tjugo fyra bilder

23 <^  P: nå vi måste inte göra tjugo fyra bilder

24 <  A: nå men ungefär

25 <  P: såh men /STÖNAR IRITTERAT/

26 <^  A: vi får väl se hur många vi kommer på, jag tror inte jag kommer på så många, jag ritar till tolv så länge då

(5s)

27 ..  A: vi skulle berätta om skolan för nån som inte har sett den eller som inte har varit här

(66d) Ad3:19  X  A: yes but er can we...

(5s)

20 ..  A: I always think about where to start, just like when you were to describe that room you know, what could be...

21 :>  P: /INTERUPTS/ you shalln't do it seven times wrong

22 <^  A: no we were to take some twenty four pictures

23 <^  P: no we don't have to take twenty four pictures

24 <  A: no but approximately

25 <  P: ah but /GROANS EXASPERATEDLY/

26 <^  A: we'll see how many we can think of, I don't think I'll think of that many, so I'll draw twelve so far

(5s)

27 ..  A: we were to describe the school for someone who hasn't seen it or who hasn't been here

In 19, A starts to object once again but then abandons her attempt. After some silence she tackles the problems from a completely different angle: she starts the whole thing once again, claiming that her problem is where to start, as if there were no proposal at all for a first picture. 19 is a turn miscarriage. Her restart in 20 gives us another example of a non-locally linked turn.

When talking, she is, following P's suggestion, occupied with making up a list with numbers on which she will note the proposals as they are agreed
upon. When P takes over, once again interrupting A, it is not to build, or comment, upon what she is saying but to protest against the way she carries out her accompanying activities. Thus, his turn is not linked to the focus of her current contribution to the interaction and therefore 21 provides the opportunity of presenting the remaining distinction of the IR analysis not yet encountered, that between focal links and non-focal links. 21 furnishes an example of non-focal linking. It is, perhaps, not an example of the most frequent kind; most non-focal links are meta-linguistic or meta-communicative comments or questions, challenging the form, function or any of the premisses of the interlocutor's turn.

In the rest of this extract from Ad3, the dialogue is quite fluent. All turns between 22 and 26 have been interpreted as alter-linked, 22, 23 and 26 as expanded responses, 24 and 25 as minimal responses. One important point to note in this connection is that a fluent dialogue, with subsequent local and focal alter-linking between turns, does in no way presuppose that the conversational partners agree upon the substance of the matter they are discussing. Obviously, there is no agreement at all in the sequence we are studying. However, for a short while, A and P are cooperating at the dialogue level in a way that they, or at least P, were not doing at the beginning of the sequence. They take into account what the partner says and argue against (more or less eloquently, less in the case of 25 which is at the limit of a non-focal link, i.e. in this case a meta-communicative comment). A disrupted, non-fluent dialogue results from completely different actions than simply arguing on the basis of factual disagreement: there has to be perseverence in one's own way of putting things, and, at the same time, disregard or interruption of the partner's contributions, unwillingness or incapability of complying with what is requested by the partner, and links to peripheral aspects of his/her activities and utterances instead of their focus etc.

The dialogue sequence we have just studied, (66), shows exactly this pattern. On measures of dialogue dynamics and coherence, it should come out as a non-fluent, non-coherent, i.e. fragmentary, disharmonious, dialogue, while the first sequence we had a close look at, the one from a lesson, showed very few of these characteristics. On the other hand, in the first dialogue sequence we noted a clear asymmetry that is absent in the second. Here, neither of the two conversationalists can be said to dominate the other, as both of them, more or less successfully, try to impose his/her way of handling the task. When, in the next section, we present the global measures of dialogue that can be derived from the IR analysis, we shall return to the two extracts and look at their different outcomes.

Through (66), I have exemplified the following categories and distinctions of the IR analysis: the turn miscarriage i.e. a turn that is interrupted or overruled and thereby does not contribute to the dialogue; the deferring question which momentarily makes the dialogue halt and initiates a repair; the non-locally linked turns, i.e. turns that are linked to turns further back in the dialogue than the local co-text, defined as the speaker's own or the interlocutor's immediately preceding turn, the non-focally linked turns, which take up a

---

1As a matter of fact, physical distance between a turn and the one(s) it links back with is not always sufficient for the turn in question to be coded as non-
peripheral aspect of the interlocutor’s contribution rather than being linked to its substantial focus, and, finally, the difference between more or less offensive self-linking, the difference lying in whether or not an interjacent substantial contribution from the partner is ignored.

2.3 The category system

In the two dialogue sequences dissected in section 2.2, all the important distinctions represented in the IR analysis were presented and some principles for coding were exemplified, though, of course, in a brief and cursory manner, the coding instructions in Linell & Gustavsson (1987) being far more detailed. I

locally linked; there is also the so-called immediate non-local linking. When there has been a shorter, or longer, digression or an embedded subgame (e.g. a repair game) and a speaker in his/her turn returns to the ongoing activity, or the topic that preceded the inserted sequence, the turn is coded as if it were locally linked, provided that the following two conditions are met:

- The inserted subgame is finished or has tuned out.
- The speaker does not produce any specific markers or structuring moves.

An example:

(67) C3:65 P: å dagisen
   66 C: hur stavar man till squash... jag måste tänka, squash...så
   67 P: hur stavar man det
   (...)  
   83 P: squash
   84 /SAMTIDIGT/ två i hallen
   (4s)
   85 å dagisen
   86 det är ju inte så bra...men det har vi skrivit här

(67) C3:65 P: and the day nursery
   66 C: how do you spell squash... I have to think, squash..like that
   68 C how do you spell it
   (...)  
   83 P: squash
   84 C: /SAMTIDIGT/ double 1 in hall
   (4s)
   85 C: and the day nursery
   86 P: that’s not so very good...but we’ve written that up here

In 65, P makes a proposal for the picture book. However, C does not respond to this but returns to an earlier proposal, since he hesitates about how to spell the word squash. The ensuing discussion about the spelling of the word is quite long, but in 84 all the problems are finally solved, the inserted sequence finished, there is a pause, and in 85, C can link back, in a completely unmarked and unproblematic way, to the proposal he made 20 turns further back. Note both the similarity and the difference between 85 in (67) and Ad3:18 in (66) above. In the latter case, the turn was coded as non-locally linked since in the way it is pronounced and the way it relates to the immediately preceding discourse, it has much less of the unmarked continuation of a topic left open.
shall now proceed to the presentation of the category system and, once this is done, to the introduction of the dialogue measures based on the IR classification of turns in conversation.

The system consists all in all of 22 categories. Three of them represent utterances that, once they have been assigned to one of these categories, are left out of further consideration. These are:

- Back-channelling signals, as by definition they are uttered by the party in a dialogue who does not have the floor at the moment (nor does (s)he request it), and back-channelling signals thus do not constitute turns at talk.

- Turn miscarriages, i.e. utterances that are masked, interrupted early, abandoned, or uttered in such a fashion that they do not at all influence the immediately ensuing course of the interaction. One example was given in section 2.2:

\[(68) \text{Ad3:12 X P: } \text{hnn, vi skriver eh..}\]

\[(68) \text{Ad3:12 X P: } \text{no, we write er..}\]

Turn miscarriages are symbolized by an X.

- Inaudible contributions, i.e. those inaudible or totally incomprehensible to the analyst. These are assigned to a category marked ?. It should be stressed that ? is reserved for cases where the analyst is irremediably lost; it is not used for a contribution, to which the reaction displayed by the co-conversationalist is sufficiently clear for the turn in question to be classified into another category, even if it is not audible or comprehensible to the analyst in its entirety.

The remaining 19 categories are built up of six basic features, the absence, or presence, of which characterize conversational contributions. These are:

a) Proactive vs retroactive qualities, i.e. initiative vs response. In the IR notation, the basic features are represented by more or less iconic symbols. Proactivity is symbolized by >, an arrow pointing forward, or \(\text{\textasciitilde}}\), an arrow pointing upwards (concerning the distinction between the two types, see b) below). Retroactivity is symbolized by <, an arrow pointing backwards (with the condition that the turn is adequate, locally and focally altered-linked, cf c) - f) below).

b) Among initiatives, there is the distinction between soliciting initiatives on the one hand, and assertive and submissive initiatives on the other. Above, quite a few examples of the distinction between soliciting and assertive initiatives were given. The submissive initiative remains to be illustrated. A submissive initiative has features in common with the soliciting initiative as well as with the assertive initiative. Like a soliciting initiative it is response soliciting, like an assertive initiative it introduces in itself semantic substance, instead of being a request directed to the partner that (s)he should introduce semantic substance. Here is an example:
A couple of elements in this conversational contribution are clearly response soliciting, particularly the final question tag. However, there is no doubt that the main function of the turn, rather than to request something from the partner, is to suggest something to him/her. The question element, the response solicitation, is not a sign of an effort to dominate the partner and to steer the dialogue, rather it has to be interpreted as mitigating the assertion involved. Submissive initiatives are stronger than assertive ones in one respect, i.e. as far as response elicitive force is concerned — they more explicitly invite the conversational partner to make a move — but are weaker than assertive initiatives in another respect, namely in that they leave the choice for him/her more open as to content. Since the first property is considered to be outweighed by the latter, submissive initiatives are categorized together with assertive initiatives.

The symbol for soliciting initiatives is the $>$, as they strongly point forward, and for assertive and submissive initiatives the $\bowtie$, as they principally come up with something that the conversational partner is free to react upon more on his own conditions; responses are invited rather than demanded.

The remaining four basic features of the IR category system have to do with retroactivity and correspond to different aspects of the way conversational turns can be linked to preceding turns in the dialogue.

c) There is the difference in adequacy of the way a turn is linked to the preceding turn. Adequate responses are those which are accepted by the initiator, e.g. the one who produced the first part of the adjacency pair, as fulfilling the conditions defined in his/her initiative. Inadequate responses are those which are not produced at all (the "significant silence", cf. above) or responses that are not taken up $\bowtie\bowtie$. There are three things to note about the category inadequate response. First, for a period of silence to be counted as an inadequate response, it must be preceded by a soliciting initiative and followed by some kind of reaction that shows that the partner treats the silence as the absence of an expected response. Second, the distinction between an adequate and an inadequate response is overruled in the case of expanded responses. Accordingly, the distinction between adequate and inadequate responses is operative only in the category of "pure", i.e. minimal responses. Third, the mere fact that a minimal response is not considered as expected, correct, true etc by the initiator does not suffice to make it an inadequate response; it has to be ignored or bluntly rejected by him/her. As soon as a response is taken up as a possible response, built upon or argued against, it is considered as adequate. One example of this was given above, section 2.2:

(70) L6:127 $<$T: (...) å vilken årstid är det fråga om då
128 $<$P: aa februari
129 <> T: ja men årstiden, det är månaden det är riktigt
/P:mm/ men vilken årstid, är det sommar, vinter eller

(70) L6:127 <> T: (...) and what season is that then
128 <> P: well February
129 <> T: yes but what season, that's the month that's right
/P:mm/ but what season, is it summer, winter or

Had T's reaction in 129 been only to repeat her question without taking up P's proposal to discussion, 128 would have been classified as an inadequate response (the routinized turn-initiating "yes but" does not on its own count as an acceptance of the preceding contribution, namely if it is followed by a contribution that does not take into account what the partner has just said).

Adequate responses are symbolized by the backward-pointing arrow, <, inadequate by a dash, -. The dash is used also in the global symbol for the deferring question, —>. 

d) The second feature of retroactivity is the difference between local and non-local linking. The local linking is the unmarked case, i.e. conversational contributions are normally linked to the partner's, or, in the case of self-linking (cf below) to the speaker's own immediately preceding turn. When there is non-local linking instead of local, the retroactive aspect of the turn is marked in the coding by two points, replacing the backward-pointing arrow. A couple of examples of non-local linking were given and discussed in section 2.2.

e) Third, there is the distinction between alter-linking and self-linking, demonstrated on several occasions in section 2.2. Alter-linking, as being the unmarked case, is contained in the symbol <, while a turn that is not alter-linked, but linked to the speaker's own preceding turn only, is marked by the symbol =. As demonstrated in (66) above, there are two types of self-linking: a more offensive one, which goes together with the ignoring of a substantial, interjacent turn from the interlocutor, and a less offensive one, which is at hand when the interlocutor has not had the floor, or has produced only a minimal response. The two types of self-linking are coded into two different categories (see below, categories I and J vs G and H).

f) Finally, there is the distinction between focal links and non-focal links. The latter category comprises meta-linguistic and meta-communicative comments and other turns that change the course of the dialogue by bringing into focus peripheral aspects of the partner's preceding contribution. The symbol < presupposes focal linking; non-focal linking is symbolized by a colon.

In addition to these six basic features, the IR analysis comprises the marking of two discourse structuring moves. These are subgame boundary markers, one that is the explicit termination of a subgame and one that is preparatory, i.e. a premonition that the speaker is about to take an initiative (in his/her next turn). The first one was illustrated in (65a) in section 2.2, where T's first contribution contained such a structuring move. The preparatory initiative is a
turn, whereby a speaker signals his/her intention, or asks for permission, to say something substantial in his/her next turn. This pre-initiative does not in itself contain semantic substance, it functions merely as a summons. The termination move is symbolized by a right parenthesis, the pre-initiative by a left parenthesis. When the right parenthesis is immediately followed by a new initiative in the same turn, the turn is counted as if it were made up of two separate turns.

On the basis of the features described above, a system of 19 turn categories is built up:

A. \( \) free, soliciting initiative
B. \( ^{\wedge} \) free, assertive or submissive initiative

Henceforth, categories containing initiative symbols are paired; each time it is this distinction between soliciting vs assertive/submissive initiative that is referred to.

C. \( \ldots \) non-locally linked initiatives
D. \( \ldots^{\wedge} \)

E. \( \langle \) "classical" turns, exhibiting a local, focal, alter-linked response
F. \( ^{\wedge}\langle \) and an initiative

G. \( = \) self-linked initiatives
H. \( =^{\wedge} \)

I. \( =\ldots \) same as G and H, with the difference that the conversational
J. \( =^{\wedge}\langle \) partner has had a turn containing an initiative that is not taken up at all but ignored, disregarded or bluntly rejected

K. \( =\) non-focally linked initiatives
L. \( =^{\wedge} \)

M. \( < \) minimal, adequate response

N. \( \ldots< \) non-locally linked, minimal response. The category is used in cases where the speaker does not respond to an initiative in the partner's immediately preceding turn, but to an earlier initiative, or, when after a digression or a side-track, a speaker in a marked way links back to an earlier initiative.

O. \( =< \) minimal response to the speaker's own question. (In the latest version of the method, Linell & Gustavsson, 1987, this category has been collapsed with category H.)

P. \( \ldots \) inadequate response
Q. \( \ldots= \) deferring question
R. \(<\) the marked termination of a subgame. \(<\) may be followed within the same turn by a free initiative or a non-locally linked contribution. In such cases, the whole turn is treated as if it consisted of two units.

S. \((>\) pre-initiative

2.4 Measures of dialogue characteristics based on the IR analysis

As stated in the introduction to this chapter, the IR analysis aims at diagnosing various aspects of entire dialogues, or dialogue sequences of a certain length, in a variety of aspects: symmetry, coherence, straightness in progression and fluency. This is done by means of global measures of dialogues, computed on the basis of the IR coding. The measures will be presented in this section, with the two example sequences, (65) and (66), the coding of which was shown in the previous section, again serving as illustrations.

When a dialogue has been coded, several measures can be calculated on the basis of the coding, measures which, as pointed out above, serve as a diagnosis of the dialogue in different aspects and which can form the basis for comparisons between different types of dialogues under various circumstances.

The measures are:

1. The IR profile, which is merely a summary of the raw data in terms of the incidence of all the turn types for each participant. The profile is the basis for computing all the other measures.

2. The IR index, which is a numerical value, the mean strength of the conversational contributions on a scale from strong initiatives to pure responses.

3. The IR difference, which is a measure of difference in dominance in the dialogue, calculated on the basis of IR indices.

4. The O-coefficient, which is a measure of obliqueness in dialogue.

5. The R-coefficient, which is a measure of the frequency of (certain kinds of) repairs.

6. The F-coefficient, which is a measure of fragmentization.

7. The S-coefficient, which is a measure of the degree to which the dialogue proceeds through the conversationalists soliciting responses from each other, rather than just offering something for the partner to react upon.

8. The S-difference, which is a measure of asymmetry, calculated as the difference between the S-coefficient for the two interlocutors, respectively.

9. The B-coefficient and the B'-coefficient, which are measures of the frequency with which the turns in the dialogue are balanced between proactivity and retroactivity.
2.4.1 The IR profile

The IR profile is formed simply by setting out the 19 categories (plus possibly the categories X and ?, to the extent that these carry any information), and indicating for each of them the number of turns per participant that has been classified under each category. The profiles of the two sequences that serve as illustration material are presented in table 5; for Ad3 only the 27 turns cited, for L6 also the continuation of the lesson activity from which it is drawn, as it is totally similar to the cited sequence.

Table 5  IR profiles for the two sequences used as illustrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>L6</th>
<th>Ad3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . &gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: &gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= &gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: ^</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= ^</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= &gt;</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;= &gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= ^</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= ^</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= &lt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= &lt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= &lt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= &gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are a couple of things that strike one immediately when the two profiles are compared. Though the extract from L6 is four times longer in terms of the number of turns, there are only 10 categories represented against 13 in the short extract from Ad3. This has proved to be typical of the difference between smoothly running dialogues and dialogues where such fluency is not at hand. The difference becomes even more clear when one considers the clusters represented in the profile of L6: 82 out of 98 turns fall within the three categories <, <= ^ and <= >, i.e. those who are characterized by adequacy, local and focal alter-linking in the retroactive aspect.

The second thing that stands out in the profile of L6 is that the clusters are placed within different categories for the two parties in the dialogue. Whereas
the most frequent category in P's profile is <, the minimal (adequate) response, followed by \:<\:>, the expanded response with an assertive or submissive initiative, T has very few turns in these categories. Her cluster is very distinctly placed in the category \>:>, turns linked to the partner's preceding turn and containing a soliciting initiative. These differences in the profiles of the two parties are the reflection of the huge asymmetry between them: T pushes the dialogue forward by solicitations, thereby deciding its direction. P follows, most of the time by giving nothing more than what was requested, occasionally by exceeding the minimally requested but never going so far as to solicit anything in his turn. No signs of such distribution of roles are present in the profile for Ad3. There, both parties have their contributions widely spread over the whole spectrum of categories.

Clearly, a great deal of information can be immediately gained only by looking at the IR profile. However, for more specific information to emerge, measures of particular aspects of the dialogue as it is represented in the profile may be useful. The first such measures I shall introduce are the dominance measures: the IR index and, particularly, the IR difference.

When, in the following, I present the various coefficients and the way they characterize the example sequences, I shall also include the values obtained for another discourse type to which the method has been applied on an extensive corpus, namely court trials (Adelswärd & al, 1987). The aim of this is mainly to give an idea of the range of variation of the various coefficients and to be able to relate the isolated values of the two sequences to something else than each other.

2.4.2 IR index and IR difference

The idea behind the IR index is that the IR categories can be ranked on a numeric, ordinal scale, one extreme representing the most proactive turns showing the least dependence upon the preceding dialogue, the other extreme representing the most dependent turns with the least of proactive qualities. The scale which forms the basis for the two measures has six steps, i.e. the categories are assigned an IR value ranging from 1 to 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
<th>Turn categories and interactional strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;:&gt;</td>
<td>:&lt;:&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:&lt;:&gt;</td>
<td>:&lt;&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:&lt;&gt;</td>
<td>:&lt;:&lt;&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:&lt;:&lt;&gt;</td>
<td>:&lt;:&lt;:&lt;&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:&lt;:&lt;:&lt;&gt;</td>
<td>:&lt;:&lt;:&lt;:&lt;&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:&lt;:&lt;:&lt;:&lt;&gt;</td>
<td>:&lt;:&lt;:&lt;:&lt;:&lt;&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turns independent and strongly proactive</td>
<td>turns totally dependent and not at all proactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As should be clear from the table above, there are some general principles of symmetry guiding how the categories are set out on the scale between the poles, in order to give internal coherence to the scale. So e.g. are the "classical turns", those with balance between proactivity and the unmarked forms of retroactivity, placed in the middle of the scale, on levels 3 and 4 respectively. Soliciting initiatives are placed one step higher in value than the corresponding assertive/submissive initiatives. Non-local linking is placed between no retroactive linking and local linking. Changing the focus of the ongoing interaction via non-focal links is considered to be a stronger act than the corresponding focal linking. Inadequate responses are placed lower on the scale than adequate ones, since they do not permit the dialogue to proceed immediately. Self-linked turns are placed at the same level as the corresponding alter-linked turns insofar as they are not of the offensive kind, i.e. ignoring a substantial contribution from the partner, in which case self-linked turns move one step up the scale.

Though, in this way, the scale seems internally coherent, the absolute values may still not be considered as being at interval level; there is no a priori basis for regarding e.g. the step between 6 and 5 as equal to the step between 2 and 1. Until further testing of the validity of the scale has been undertaken, it is used as an ordinal scale. Therefore, the mean computed and presented below as the IR index is the median, not the arithmetic mean.

Now, if we think of a prototypical conversation that progresses straightforwardly via the sequencing of expanded, affirmative or submitting initiatives, or, with constant or changing role specification, via questions and minimal, adequate responses, it would have an IR index situated at 3,00. In general, IR indices around 3,00 could be expected. A higher index for a particular dyad would indicate rapid progression and/or high interactional temperature. By rapid progression I refer to a situation where new content would be successively introduced at a high rate by the two partners, i.e. none of them remaining passive and sticking to minimal responses mainly, content that would be immediately integrated and built upon without standstills and hitches. High interactional temperature would be at hand when both parties made frequent use of "strong" acts (e.g. introducing new topics, asking many questions) and, also, of competitive moves such as non-focal linking and particular types of self-linking. Low IR indices would result from one (or both) of the conversationalists refraining from taking (strong) initiatives, giving mainly minimal responses, especially if these are treated as inadequate. Also hitches leading to standstills in the dialogue through deferring questions that have to be responded to before the dialogue can go on, would contribute to a low IR index. The indices pertaining to the examples are displayed in table 7 below. "CT" in tables 7-15 stands for court trials, namely those investigated by Adelswärd et al (1987); "mean" stands for the mean value for the 40 dialogues in court trials, "max" for the highest value obtained in any of the 40 trials, "min" for the lowest value. The results from the court trial investigation will only occasionally be commented upon; the values are incorporated only to give a rough idea of the relative level on which the two example sequences from the present corpus are situated.
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Table 7  IR index for the dyad as a whole in the example sequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L6</th>
<th>Ad3</th>
<th>CT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>max</td>
<td>min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This measure seems to reveal a fairly high value for both the example sequences. Furthermore, the value is rather similar for the two dialogues, though this must be interpreted differently in the two cases. In L6, it is the fluency of the interaction that leads to rapid progression; in Ad3, it is rather the competitive atmosphere and the frequent use of strong moves by both parties that is reflected in the high IR index for the dyad as a whole. If, on the other hand, we compute the IR index for each part of the two dyads, there is no longer a similar picture.

Table 8  Individual IR indices and IR differences in the example sequences

(Leg = legal professionals, Def = defendant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L6</th>
<th>Ad3</th>
<th>CT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>max</td>
<td>min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR index</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR diff</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In L6, the IR difference is as great as 1.69, which, as can be seen in table 8, is somewhat higher than the mean obtained for the interrogation in the court trials. This is the global quantitative measure given by the IR analysis to mirror the asymmetry between T and P that was informally discussed when the extract was presented, in section 2.2. As was said then, no such obvious asymmetry seems to be present in the extract from Ad3. Actually, this is indicated by the indices. The perfectly symmetric, "ideal" dialogue, obviously, would have the IR difference 0.00. Low differences, i.e. dialogues between equal parties, are certainly found also in the real world, although the exact value of 0.00 would, of course, be much of a coincidence. When the IR difference is as low as 0.33, the conversational partners are contributing to the dialogue on relatively equal terms. (As can be seen in table 8, the lowest IR difference found in a court trial is considerably higher.)

2.4.3  Fragmentization; the F-coefficient

One dimension which differentiates between dialogues is whether the interaction proceeds step by step via locally coherent turns, or via contributions that lack the coherence-creating links to the immediately preceding turns. In other words, dialogues can be characterized by a high degree of local coherence.
or by fragmentization. The IR analysis provides a measure of this property, the F-coefficient (F for fragmentization). The F-coefficient is the percentage of turns out of the total number of turns that do not exhibit links to the speaker's own, or the partner's immediately preceding, turn. The following six categories are therefore considered to contribute to fragmentization: $>\wedge$, $\ldots>\wedge$, $(>\wedge$ and $\ldots<$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F-coefficients in the example sequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>Ad3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L6, thus, is characterized by an extremely low degree of fragmentization, or, alternatively, by local coherence. As could be seen from the extract, T drives the dialogue forward by acknowledging P's latest contribution, then asking the next question, to which P in turn responds, whereupon P links her next question to this answer and so on. This kind of local linking is to a great extent absent in the extract from Ad3. There, instead, unrelated issues are raised on several occasions and the conversationalists go back to, and persist in, what they have said earlier. This results in a highly fragmented dialogue; its F-coefficient is extremely high.

### 2.4.4 Obliqueness; the O-coefficient and the R-coefficient

Dialogues can proceed along a straight track insofar as the dialogue partners link their contributions to the focus of what the partner advances at each stage of the dialogue process. When such progressive linking is less frequent and, instead, conversationalists often link their contributions to peripheral aspects of the partner's utterances, e.g. commenting upon how something is said rather than what is said, challenging what is presupposed rather than accepting it etc, or when they both follow their own line of reasoning, failing to take into account the partner's contributions, the dialogue has no such straight track. Rather, it is characterized by a high degree of what may be termed obliqueness.

The measure of obliqueness in the IR analysis, the O-coefficient, is defined as the percentage of turns out of the total number of turns exhibiting non-focal links or self-links, i.e. those categories that contain either of the symbols : or $\wedge$. The O-coefficients for the examples are presented in table 10.
Table 10 O-coefficients in the example sequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L6</th>
<th>Ad3</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>max</th>
<th>min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The non-cooperative character of Ad3 is reflected in a high O-coefficient, the smooth, straight character of the dialogue in L6 in a low O-coefficient.

There are other properties of dialogues that could be seen as signs of obliqueness but which are left out of the O-coefficient, e.g. the presence of turn miscarriages, inadequate responses and repairs. The turn miscarriages are left out since the category X in the coding is not a very neat one. It comprises utterances that are incomplete, interrupted, masked etc and the reasons for a turn to be assigned to the category X are heterogeneous. However, in cases where a turn is aborted through an offensive action by the partner, this is typically reflected in the coding in such a way that this latter turn is coded with =, which makes the sequence as a whole contribute to the O-coefficient.

Inadequate responses and repairs are also symptoms of problems in the dialogue. The inadequate responses contribute indirectly to the O-coefficient to the extent that they are followed by a turn classified with = (when followed by —>, they indirectly contribute to the R-coefficient, see below). Repairs in a restricted sense, i.e. deferring questions, in contradistinction to the categories included in the basis for the O-coefficient, are not offensive moves. Their incidence is therefore given as a separate coefficient, the R-coefficient. Thereby, the O-coefficient is kept as a more pure measure of offensive obliqueness. The R-coefficient is simply the percentage of the category —> out of the total number of turns. For the two sequences that serve as illustration, the R-coefficient, too, points to the lack of fluency in Ad3 compared to L6.

Table 11 R-coefficients in the example sequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L6</th>
<th>Ad3</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>max</th>
<th>min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obviously, the different kinds of dysfluency measured by the O-coefficient and the R-coefficient respectively, can be collapsed by simple addition to an OR-coefficient.
2.4.5 Soliciting or offering; the S-coefficient and the S-difference

As has been pointed out on several occasions, a dialogue can proceed by two different mechanisms. Either one party (or both) request(s), or demand(s), contributions from the interlocutor, or else the two of them, or occasionally only one party, voluntarily provide(s) contributions, thereby perhaps implicitly inviting the partner to respond and to give something in return. It seems plausible that the former type of progression in dialogues should be connected with a high degree of goal-orientation and often found in institutional settings with distinct role repartition, while the latter would correspond to informal situations where equals interact without far-reaching role specialization or with less specified goals.

The S-coefficient is the percentage of turns out of the total number of turns that contain a soliciting initiative, i.e. those where the symbol > is represented (except the deferring question, —>, which, in contrast to other categories containing >, brings the dialogue to a temporary standstill rather than pushing it forwards). In this dimension, there is also a huge difference between the two sequences extracted from L6 and Ad3.

Table 12 S-coefficients in the example sequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L6</th>
<th>Ad3</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>max</th>
<th>min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, soliciting initiatives are not always distributed in the same way between the two parties in the dialogue, which is indicated by the S-difference.

Table 13 Individual S-coefficients and S-differences in the example sequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L6</th>
<th>Ad3</th>
<th>S-coeff</th>
<th>S-diff</th>
<th>T-P</th>
<th>A-P</th>
<th>Leg</th>
<th>Def</th>
<th>Leg</th>
<th>Def</th>
<th>Leg</th>
<th>Def</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Ad3, the S-coefficient is at the same level for both parties (low S-difference). In L6, T's S-coefficient is not far from the maximal value, whereas P's value is zero — he has no soliciting initiatives at all, and the S-difference is consequently high. This is another reflection of the asymmetry already revealed by the IR difference. Obviously, a high S-coefficient on the part of the individual tends to go together with a high IR index and a low S-coefficient.
with a low index. The correlation, thus, between the S-difference and the IR difference in this case, has nothing surprising in it. (However, there are, of course, other means by which IR differences can be obtained.)

2.4.6  Balanced turns; the B-coefficient and the B'-coefficient

Finally, I shall introduce two measures that occasionally yield information not contained in the measures already presented. As pointed out earlier, in the discussion of the S-coefficient in section 2.4.5, a high frequency of soliciting initiatives is often connected with role differentiation and specialization. What seems to be a characteristic feature of ordinary conversation between equals in informal settings is a relatively low frequency of soliciting initiatives (something which may be explained in terms of "face-preservation", Brown & Levinson, 1978, since frequent asking of questions is potentially face-threatening behaviour). Therefore, a measure of the degree to which a dialogue is "conversation-like" is the B-coefficient: the percentage of turns out of the total number of turns belonging to the category $<$A, i.e. turns with local, focal alter-linking and an assertive or submissive initiative. The B-coefficient for the two examples is very similar — neither of them bear a close resemblance to ordinary conversation in this respect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14</th>
<th>B-coefficients in the example sequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>Ad3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The B'-coefficient is the percentage of both types of balanced turns out of the total number of turns, i.e. the "classical" turns, those which contain local and focal alter-linking in the retroactive dimension as well as proactive qualities, irrespective of the kind of initiatives. A high B'-coefficient would be characteristic of a fluent, coherent, cooperative dialogue and a low B'-coefficient would mirror the fact that lots of energy is spent on other interactional work rather than on making the dialogue progress in a straightforward direction. According to this, the B'-coefficient comes out with a clear difference between the examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15</th>
<th>B'-coefficients in the example sequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>Ad3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It should be clear that the different measures presented above are to some extent interdependent. So e.g., high F-coefficients, O-coefficients and R-coefficients lead to a corresponding lowering of the B-coefficients. A high S-difference should lead to a high IR difference. This is a necessary consequence of the way these measures are constructed. The covariation, on the other hand, in the samples from a dozen different discourse types, reported in Linell & Gustavsson (1987), between high B-coefficients (not so much the B'-coefficient as the B-coefficient) and a low IR difference and, also, between a high S-coefficient for the dyad as a whole and a high IR difference, are empirical facts. That is the way interaction seems to work — in the types of situations studied — but it is not a priori given that this must be the case. Low IR differences can be obtained by other means than frequent use of balanced turns (cf e.g. the extract from Ad3 above), S-coefficients can be equally high, or low, for both parties (= low S-difference) and not leading to high IR differences. However, all the values computed on the basis of the IR coding obviously cannot be used as independent measures of completely different aspects of a dialogue.

2.4.7 Summary

In section 2.4, some of the dialogue measures that can be computed on the basis of the IR coding have been presented and applied to the two extracts that were informally commented upon and reproduced with their coding in section 2.2. Mean values, maximal and minimal values found in an investigation of another discourse type, court trials, were given in order to locate the relative level in the different measures for the two example sequences and to give an idea of the range of variation.

The asymmetry between teacher and pupil in the lesson showed up in a high IR difference, while the impression that both parties tried equally hard to impose their way of viewing the task in the adult-child conversation, was reflected in a relatively low IR difference, somewhat surprisingly in favour of the child. The impression that the lesson presented a well-functioning, fluent type of discourse whereas the picture book task confronted the conversationalists with huge initial problems of cooperation, was mirrored in the O-coefficients, the measure of obliqueness, that was low for L6 and high for Ad3, as well as in the R-coefficients — R symbolizing repairs in the form of deferring questions — that showed the same picture, high for Ad3, low for L6.

The fact that the participants fail to agree upon a basis as to how to go about solving the picture book task, leading to frequent fresh starts, restarts and initiatives thrown out in various directions, is taken care of by the F-coefficient. This measure of fragmentation showed a high value for Ad3, while the smooth dialogue without dramatic shifts or breaks in L6 comes out with a low F-coefficient.

The goal orientation in the lesson led to a relatively high S-coefficient, measuring the degree to which the dialogue is driven forward through solicitations rather than offers. The S-coefficient in Ad3 turned out to be considerably lower. Furthermore, neither of the two interactants in Ad3 seemed to be conducting the activity, which was very clearly the case in the lesson. This role
specification is measured by the S-difference; whereas the S-coefficients in Ad3 were similar for the two parties, the teacher's S-coefficient in the lesson was not very far from maximal and that of the pupil actually zero. The B'-coefficient, corresponding to the frequency of turns where there is balance between proactive elements and the typical retroactive elements, which is a measure of coherence and fluency, was considerably higher for L6 than for Ad3. Finally, the B'-coefficient, showing the degree of resemblance to an aspect of ordinary conversation in everyday life, namely to what extent the conversationalists offer something to the partner which is built upon his/her latest contribution, was similarly low for both dialogues.

2.5 Coding practices

2.5.1 Introduction

The most basic theoretical foundation of this study is that language, i.e. the way linguistic utterances function, are designed and interpreted, is connected with the type of activity in which the utterances serve. This creates a problem when it comes to comparing dialogues from different activity types, which is the ultimate aim of the IR analysis. If an utterance has to be interpreted, let us say, as a question in activity type A, but the "same" utterance typically does not function as a question in activity type B, one is faced with a dilemma when having to decide whether it should be coded as a question or not. Either, it seems, one must build this sensitivity to situational variation into the category definitions, in which case results indicating differences between the situations become analytic. Or can one try to make the coding neutral to situational variation, in which case one, at times, will have to code against better judgement. It is clear that a principled position towards this problem needs to be taken. It will be discussed in section 2.5.2.

A second problem is that, as should have been clear in the presentation of the method in section 2.2, utterances are coded globally and, to a certain extent, intuitively. Linell & Gustavsson (1987) stress that a complete specification of categories is in principle impossible to work out and, furthermore, that a far-reaching operationalization of categories entails a risk for over-emphasis on formal, viz lexical and grammatical, features at the cost of less well-described and less palpable features of utterances such as prosody and function in context, features that are equally important. "Many conversational contributions are interactionally ambiguous, and the borderlines between categories --- no matter what they are --- must be partly vague and indeterminate" (Linell & Gustavsson, 1987:112, my translation). I insist upon the impossibility of making conversational analysis into an exact science nor because the IR analysis should necessarily be more subjective and intuitive than other, in certain aspects comparable, methods. Instead, the reason for this insistence is to be found in the conception of linguistic communication from which the IR analysis starts out. Vagueness and indeterminacy are, according to this view, inherent characteristics of human language.
In practical coding, one is sometimes annoyed with a degree of uncertainty and at times one can easily see more than one interpretation of a turn, or a sequence of turns. This is inevitable. On the other hand, there is no reason to exaggerate these difficulties. In most cases, conversationalists do actually provide the analyst with converging signals as to how they interpret each others' contributions. As Levinson (1983:321) puts it:

Conversation, as opposed to monologue, offers the analyst an invaluable analytical resource: as each turn is responded to by a second, we find displayed in that second an analysis of the first by its recipient. Such an analysis is thus provided by participants not only for each other but for analysts too.

Especially when the dialogue leaves the expected, unmarked type of progression this is typically signalled (cf Vuchinich, 1977). When there are no such signs, the analyst must stick to a "normality assumption", i.e. that there is nothing for the moment that breaks the ordinary, routine-like course of the interaction, which means, in IR terms, that the dialogue progresses via the "classical" categories of contributions. In this connection, it should be pointed out that such far-reaching interpretations of what is going on in a dialogue, as those given in connection with the above presentation of the extract from Ad3, are by no means necessary for the IR classification to be carried out. They are to be taken more as an informal, post-hoc discussion of the extract when it was presented, in order to illustrate the various dimensions taken care of by the IR analysis and the different measures of dialogue that it offers.

However, the problem of the intersubjectivity of a particular analysis is continuously raised. In section 2.5.3, I shall proceed to an analysis of the interrater tests of the IR coding that have been conducted within this study.

2.5.2 Comparing dialogues across situations

In section 2.5.1, it was pointed out that, for instance, what is a question in one type of situation or context, would not be a question in a different context. Obviously, this has consequences for the IR analysis and for the way comparisons are made by means of the IR measures between dialogues taken from different contexts. As pointed out by Linell & Gustavsson (1986:162), the context dependent nature of linguistic communication creates something of a dilemma for any interaction analysis with a claim to more general applicability:

On the one hand, the definitions in the coding system must be sufficiently precise, which leads to a striving for setting up formal criteria for the coding. On the other hand, it is a well-known fact that the same forms are interpreted differently in different situations. (my translation)

For practical purposes, the solution recommended for this dilemma is that special rules may be formulated for the treatment of phenomena specific for the particular situation under investigation, special rules that specify how the gen-
eral rules should be applied to particular cases. It is self-evident that the minimal exigencies in such a case are that the special rules are as much as possible in harmony with the general principles of the IR analysis, and that the considerations leading to the choice of particular rules, or a particular set of rules rather than others, are presented and accounted for.¹

In the corpus of the present study, there are a couple of such phenomena for which the general coding manual (i.e., Linell & Gustavsson, 1986, in this case) was not sufficient and for which specific principles had to be laid down. One such problem with the lessons is, generally speaking, the existence of teaching materials, readers and exercise books, from which part of what is uttered in the dialogue is fetched, indeed often directly read. This means that often the propositional content of what is uttered does not have the same (relatively) direct relationship to the illocutionary and interactional act as in ordinary conversation (cf chapter IV above, the discussion of language at two levels in the language lesson). Let me show an example:

(71) /P has just finished an exercise on antonyms/

L5:222 < > T: ja, det är bra, det där var inga svårigheter
223 < P: nu
  (11s)
225 < > T: mm, nu ska vi se, du kan läsa det där
226 < P: /LÄSER/ Gudbrand säger att han har bytt kon mot en häst. Hustrun säger att de kan köra till kyrkan med hästen.
227 < > T: mm, det är det här som dom säger, det har dom ändrat om då /P:mm/ så att det är pratbubblor, så att han säger det va /P:mm/ jag har bytt kon mot en häst & hustrun säger, vi kan ju köra till kyrkan med hästen. Då ska vi läsa vidare där
228 : > P: vad ska jag skriva där?
229 < > T: nu ska vi skriva det i pratbubblan först, men vi får läsa vad det är för nåt vi ska skriva om
230 < P: /GÄSPAR, LÄSER/ Hustrun säger att barnen alltid ska gå och atolla in hästen.
231 : > T: mm hustrun säger till barnen
232 A P: mm
233 < > T: vad säger hustrun nu då, kommer du ihåg vad hon sa där i boken, gå...
234 — P: å
235 = > T: vad ska vi skriva här då

(71) /P has just finished an exercise on antonyms/

L5:222 < > T: OK, that's fine, there were no problems

¹Comparisons of IR measures across widely different dialogue types must be used with caution, namely if activity types contain a considerable amount of mutually incommensurable elements. Such important differences are not considered to be at hand between the three situational types in the present corpus.
There are several things in the type of discourse represented by (71) that complicate the analysis and the extract is well suited for the illustration of how the lessons have been coded (see also appendix B).

In 226, P reads two sentences from the exercise book. They comprise several references to different referents and one proposition each. However, the interactional act performed by P is not one of asserting something about Gudbrand and his wife, he is merely complying with the request made by T in her immediately preceding turn that he should read a passage. What is coded is, of course, the interactional acts; hence, 225 is a soliciting initiative, <>; 226 a minimal, adequate response, <. This is by far the most frequent situation in the lessons as far as reading is concerned: the teacher asks the pupil to read a passage, the pupil does so and nothing more during his turn.

In 224, however, we are confronted with a completely different case. There, no request has been made and P starts reading on his own initiative (the possibility that T actually has made a request by nodding, pointing or in any other non-audible way, is, of course, conceivable; since the kind of data I am working with, the audio-taped lesson, does not provide any indications whatsoever that this is the case, postulating such an act is not justified). In this case, P's reading is coded as a free, assertive initiative, ▲. Through the reading he is introducing a new topic, more precisely a new exercise. Reading, thus, is not coded on the basis of what is read, but according to what the act of reading stands for in the local context where it is performed. This, of course, is applied to both parties in the interaction. In one case, actually the sequence that had to be omitted in the inter-rating tests (cf below, section 2.5.3), T and P read a dialogue together. Both T's and P's contributions to the dialogue read are then
treated as minimal responses (as far as they do nothing more than read during their turn).

In (71) there are also a couple of non-focal links in the typical form they take in lessons. In 231, T's correction of a mistake in reading is coded :<—— colon for the aspect-changing character of the correction, upwards-pointing arrow since the correct form is offered by T. Only when T asks P to correct himself, is the turn classified as a soliciting initiative. In 228, P's question has been treated as non-focally linked; T has asked him to go on reading but, instead, he asks what he is supposed to write when doing the exercise.

A more intricate problem is the way in which the tasks formulated in the teaching materials relate to the teacher and the pupil, respectively. Often a question is directed to P e.g. in the exercise book. His answer, however, is evaluated by T. The most adequate way of analysing such a sequence is to treat T as the representative of the exercise book, or perhaps the other way round, to consider the exercise book as a representative of the teacher. This means that, in principle, the tasks are given by T and that having them pre-printed in the exercise book for P to read, is just another way of presenting the task. Such an analysis is supported by what we can see in (71). There, T clearly takes over the task as it was formulated in the exercise book; it is her right (and duty) to repeat the task, to reformulate it if necessary, to break it down into smaller parts, give clarifications and cues and, finally, to evaluate the answer. In the coding, this may lead to sequences where T's first intervention on a particular task is a repeated initiative:

(72) L5:311 < T: nu suddar du ut det här då, jag har bytt geten mot ett får punkt, punkt också hja

(2s)

312 — P: /LÄSER/ Hustrun säger att han är duktig och att de kan få ull och kläder när de har får. Jaa, hon säger att han är duktig

313 => T: hur säger han då då, hur säger hon då då, när hon säger det till honom

314 — P: /SAMTIDIGT/ han är duktig

315 => T: säger hon så, han är duktig, säger hon...

316 < P: /AVBRYTER/ du är duktig

317 < T: num, vad säger hon mer då

(72) L5:311 < T: and now you rub out this, I have bartered the goat for a sheep full stop, full stop also, that's it

(2s)

312 — P: /READS/ His wife says he is clever and that they can have wool and clothes now that they have got a sheep. Well, she says he's clever

313 => T: and how does he say it, and how does she say it, when she says it to him

314 — P: /SIMULTANEOUSLY/ he is clever

315 => T: is that how she says, he is clever, is that how she...

316 < P: /INTERRUPTS/ you are clever

317 < T: mm, and what else does she say

In 311, the solution to one of the tasks involving transformation of indirect speech to direct speech is arrived at and T marks the termination of a subgame
(coded as a terminating turn). The next (sub)task is not overly formulated by T, but read from the exercise book by P. He answers and it is T who evaluates his answer. As a matter of fact, she does not take it up as adequate and this is reflected in the coding. The whole sequence is coded as if the question in the exercise book were T’s question, with the difference that the turn in which T performs the act of questioning is non-existent. She only intervenes as the response has been provided in order to close the initiative by accepting the response, or to renew the initiative, thereby rejecting the response.

In the non-didactic conversations, there is also a problem with written tasks, namely the instruction for the discussion given by the researchers. The reading of these tasks has to be treated in the same way as when something is read during the lessons. However, there are some fundamental differences between the lessons and the conversations in this respect. In the conversations, neither of the participants functions as the representative of the person who formulated the tasks, i.e. the researcher. Instead, any of the two interactants can start reading, or ask the interlocutor to read and the task that appears through the reading is assigned to both on equal terms. This, of course, does not prevent the task from being immediately taken over by any of the participants who may start to request an answer from his/her partner. This is actually the case in Ch3 (from which a sequence is cited below as (73) in order to show how the coding works); what is principally important yet, is that such asymmetry is not part of the definition of the situation, but created on the spot in the interaction between the interlocutors.

(73) /C and P are just finishing the picture book task/

Ch3:127 <>) C: mm, då öppnar du
128 < P: /ÖPPNAR KUVERT/
129 <^ C: vänta ska jag öppna' t, jag vet hur det är
(2s)
130 < P: ja just det, så där ja
(15s, VARUNDER DET PRASSLAR OCH NÅGON SÄGER NÅGOT OHÖRBART)
131 <^ C: ska jag läsa för dej
132 ^ P: ett brev vill /OHÖRBART/
133 ? C: /OHÖRBART/
(11s)
134 <^ P: vi gör så här då
(19s)
135 ^ C: nu börjar jag å läsa det här
136 <^ P: ikkej då, då läser jag det här då
137 <^ C: /LÄSER HÖGT HELA INSTRUKTIONEN/ lås inte det där /OHÖRBART/ ja nu ska vi göra så här, gjorde läraren rätt, tycker du att han gjorde det
138 — P: hjä
139 —> C: det tycker du?
140 <-> P: aa /C:mm/ gissa varför
141 —> C: va?
142 =^ P: det blir ju så här va, om man erkänner då blir det ju...(2s)
143 < C: /SKRIVER/ ja det...
144 <^ P: men jag skriver bara...ett å sen rätt
C: ... gjorde... han... mm. Hur ska man göra då när ingen erkänner, om man ska uttrycka som läraren gjorde då?

P: null

C: men hur gjorde läraren rätt då?

(C and P are just finishing the picture book task/

Ch3: 127 <) C: mm, you open.
128 < P: /OPENS ENVELOPE/
129 < C: wait I'll open it, I know how to do it
(2s)
130 < P: I see, like that
(15s, PAPERS RUSTLE; SOMEBODY SAYS SOMETHING INAUDIBLE)
131 < C: shall I read to you
132 < P: another letter /INAUDIBLE/
133 ? C: /INAUDIBLE/
(11s)
134 < P: let's do like this
(19s)
135 < C: now I'll start reading this
136 < P: okay, so I'll read this
137 < C: /READS THE ENTIRE INSTRUCTION ALoud/ don't read that /INAUDIBLE/ now we're to do it like this, did the teacher do the right thing, do you think he did
138 < P: yes
139 => C: you think so?
140 < P: yeah /C:mm/ guess why
141 => C: what?
142 <= P: this is how it is right, if you admit then it'll be...(2s)
143 < C: /WRITES/ yes... he...
144 <= P: but I write just... one and then right
145 <= C: ... did... mm. What should one do when nobody admits, if one should use blackmail like the teacher did?
146 < P: no
147 => C: but all the same did the teacher do the right thing?

Here, C acts in a very dominant way (actually, Ch3 is the one out of the eight child-child conversations that comes out with the highest measures on asymmetry; cf 3.1.3 below). After having read the instruction in 137, he immediately directs the question to his partner; in 145 he closes the discussion on the first subtask and, again, puts a question to T. Neither in 139 nor in 147, does he accept the responses given by T. As a matter of fact, C acts very much like a teacher in a lesson. (The fact that the asymmetry as measured by the IR difference does not reach the level it normally reaches during the lessons, seems more to be due to the way P acts: the kind of contributions given by T in 140 and 144 very seldom occur in lessons, where P typically remains passive.)

The point of the above demonstration is the following: when adapting the IR analysis to the lessons and conversations of this study, I have tried to establish principles for treating similar phenomena — like the reading of pre-
printed tasks — in a principally similar fashion across the different situations. When doing this I have still tried to respect basic features in the very make-up of the situation — such as the fact that there is asymmetry by definition between teacher and pupil in the way they relate to e.g. exercise book tasks in the lessons, but not to the experimental tasks in the conversations. Additionally, through the extracts cited, I have tried to show that the outcome of the analysis is not a priori given only through the principles of coding adopted, and the results thereby are by no means simple artefacts of the method of analysis. In the lesson, (71) above, it was shown that reading from the exercise book may well be an initiative from P — even a very strong one — and in (73), the extract from a child-child conversation, it was shown that though, in principle, the specific task is equally directed at both participants, an asymmetric situation can immediately be brought about.

The special rules concerning reading in lessons and conversations and concerning the exercise book as a representative of the teacher, as well as a couple of other specific solutions to minor but frequently recurrent problems, were written down and given to the person who did the coding intended for the inter-rater tests. These instructions are reprinted in appendix.

2.5.3 Reliability of the coding

2.5.3.1 Procedure

A sample of 800 turns, i.e. approximately 10% of the corpus, was taken out for tests of inter-rater reliability of the IR coding. An undergraduate student of linguistics with no previous experience of conversation analysis studied the method (the preliminary version; Linell & Gustavsson, 1986) and practiced coding on samples drawn from different activity types until she became sufficiently acquainted with the method to obtain the same level of agreement with any of the two authors as these usually could reach when checking with each other. The procedure for the reliability test of the present corpus was the following:

When the material had been coded by myself, a series of numbers between 1 and 3,878 for the lessons, between 1 and 2,440 for the adult-child conversations and between 1 and 1,512 for the child-child conversations were randomly sampled. These numbers served as starting points for the sequences to be tested for inter-rater reliability. If e.g. number 175 came out for lessons, the coding was to start at L1:175, if it came out for child-child conversations, the coding would start at Ch2:18 and be pursued 100 turns ahead, turns coded X and ? excluded (see below). The only restriction introduced was that no dyad should be represented twice in the sample (if this was the case, the following number in the series was used instead). Four sequences from lessons and two sequences each from adult-child and child-child conversations were tested.

The coder was provided with the special instructions (cf above, section 2.5.2), audio-tapes and transcriptions where the turns to be coded were marked with their numbers and the turns belonging to the categories X and ? already coded. Thus, inter-rater tests have been carried out only for categorization, not
for unitization in Guetzkow's (1950) terms. This may call for some comments. Theoretically, the actual inter-rater reliability amounts to the level of reliability of unitization multiplied by the level of reliability of categorization. As far as the IR coding is concerned, this is not the case in practice. Firstly, as a general argument, I claim that cases where problems with unitization may occur, i.e. where there may be difficulties in determining whether some utterance, or fragment of utterance, should be given the status of a turn, are accumulated towards the weak pole of a scale of conversational contributions: incomplete, restrained, faint utterances and possibly utterances situated in a zone between minimal responses and back-channel items. If these are given turn status, the range of possible categories into which they can fall is extremely restricted. This means that units which may be difficult to identify reliably are correspondingly easy to categorize and thus the difficulty of obtaining a reliable result is not a multiplication of two difficulties.

Secondly, as a more specific argument pertaining to the present corpus, the division into speakers' turns is less of a problem in orderly, task-oriented, dyadic conversations in institutional contexts of the kind represented in the corpus, than in most other kinds of everyday conversations. Together, these two arguments lead to the conclusion that the risk that problems with unitization should distort the general pattern of results may be considered as negligible; the time and energy that reliability tests on unitization would have cost could be saved (though the possibility of having to carry them out was seriously considered — in contradistinction to what seems to be the case in many other traditions within discourse and conversation analysis).

When it comes to the categories X and ?, the problem was raised as to whether these should, or should not, be part of the reliability test. First, we note that these two categories are different from the others to the extent that once a turn has been assigned to any of these categories, it is excluded from further treatment and thus not included in the basis for any of the dialogue measures.

The aim of the inter-rater test, of course, is to come to an appreciation of the degree of intersubjectivity with which the coding system can be applied and used, an appreciation as correct as possible. To include the peripheral categories X and ? would possibly entail risks for underestimation of the reliability of the categories actually used in the IR analysis as they increase the number of choices. On the other hand, the reliability may possibly be overestimated since some X-turns and especially ?-turns are particularly unproblematic in coding. There is no guarantee that the risks for overestimation would be counterbalanced by the risk for underestimation. Therefore, X and ? were pre-coded in the transcriptions on which inter-rater tests were carried out.

In the analysis of inter-rater agreement, 17 turns had to be excluded. They consist of the two text-book dialogues that T and P read aloud together in L8. According to the special directives for coding lessons (see above, section 2.5.2), turns that consist of mere reading aloud cannot be coded as if they were ordinary contributions to the dialogue, but must be coded according to the interactional status that the act of reading takes on in the context where the reading occurs. In the sequence in question, T gives a directive to P and to herself that they should read the dialogue together:
2.5.3.2 Results

Results from the inter-rater tests will first be given as the percentages of common codings for each of the eight sequences and some comments on these results will be given. Secondly, I shall analyse the degree of concordance in the different dialogue measures for which the coding is later to be used.

Table 16 Percentage of common codings for the eight sequences randomly sampled for tests of inter-rater agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L5</th>
<th>L7</th>
<th>L8</th>
<th>Ad1</th>
<th>Ad2</th>
<th>Ch5-6</th>
<th>Ch7-8</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that only complete agreement is counted. Many codings are partially common, e.g. one coder may have classified a turn as > where the other has classified it ..>, in which case there is partial agreement, viz in the initiative aspect, but disagreement on whether the turn exhibits a (non-local) retroactive link or not. Therefore, the most informative results from the reliability analysis are those where the effects of the coding divergences on the various dialogue measures are displayed (table 17, below).

We can see from table 16 that child-child conversations present the lowest degree of inter-rater agreement, whereas the lessons, with one exception, reach considerably higher values. The over-all picture seems to place reliability in IR coding at approximately the same level as is usually reported in dialogue studies which use coding techniques (see e.g. Donohue & al, 1984; D'Andrade
& Wish, 1985; McLaughlin & al, 1985), in spite of the fact that the number of categories in the IR system is comparatively high.

When looking closer into the nature of the coding discrepancies, a couple of clusters can be discovered, i.e. some pairs of categories that are more often involved in disagreement than others. These are < vs <A , < vs — and —> vs <>. Generally speaking, it seems as if I myself had worked with, so to speak, a lower threshold for what should count as expanded responses, <A , as opposed to minimal responses, <, from the pupil, than did the co-judge — maybe as an unconscious exaggeration of an attempt not to code in favour of my specific hypotheses (which were known to me but not to the co-judge). Actually, as will be seen below, the IR differences are somewhat less to P's disadvantage in all eight dyads (and there is a clear tendency towards higher B-coefficients) when they are calculated on the basis of my own codings rather than on the co-judge's codings. The effect of the two other clusters does not seem to be systematic in the same way.

The global picture of results from this analysis is satisfactory. For the most important measure to be used in the study, the IR difference as a measure of interactional asymmetry, the rank correlation between the two codings is complete, i.e. they make exactly the same predictions about differences between activity types as well as between different dyads within the same activity type. The same goes for the B'-coefficient. For the other measures, the correlation is lower, lowest for the measures based on the less frequent turn categories, the F-coefficient and the R-coefficient.

Table 17  IR measures for the eight sequences, calculated on the basis of the two codings used for inter-rater reliability tests. Reliability expressed as rank correlations (Spearman) and, when applicable, by means of Pearson's correlation coefficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>the dyad's index</th>
<th>IR diff</th>
<th>B-coeff</th>
<th>B-coeff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad1</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad2</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch5-6</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch7-8</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r rank</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applicable</td>
<td>applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Results

#### 3.1 Aggregated IR profiles

In this section, the results of the complete IR analyses of the twenty-four dyads — the lessons (L1-8), the adult-child conversations (Ad1-8) and the child-child conversations (Ch1-8) — will be presented. This will be done in two subsec-

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F-coeff</th>
<th>O-coeff</th>
<th>OR-coeff</th>
<th>R-coeff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch5-6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch7-8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r Rank</th>
<th>Pearson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S-coeff</th>
<th>S-diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch5-6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch7-8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r Rank</th>
<th>Pearson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tions. First, I present eleven hypotheses — or rather conjectures\(^1\) — concerning the differences between the discourse connected with the three situational types which I will investigate. This will be followed by a discussion of asymmetry and dominance in interaction, of the ways in which one party's dominance in the dyads is expressed and how different dimensions of dominance in IR terms relate to each other. Before presenting the particular hypotheses, however, I shall give an overall picture of the results of the IR analysis by means of the aggregated IR profiles for the three situations, lessons, adult-child conversations and child-child conversations.

### Table 18  Aggregated IR profiles for the three situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Lessons</th>
<th>Adult-child conversations</th>
<th>Child-child conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥&lt;</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤&gt;</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤=≤</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤&gt;</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤&lt;</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤≤≤</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=≤&gt;</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤≥</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤&lt;≤</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=&lt;≤</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→≤</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤&lt;</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Since the present study is explorative and thus not conducted in a perspective of formal hypothesis-testing, it is rather a question of conjectures that guide the investigation. Nevertheless, this reservation made, I shall use the term 'hypothesis' in the following.
3.2 Eleven hypotheses

The asymmetry in teaching situations in terms of power, responsibility and also in the use of language is well documented in literature (cf chapter II). Hence, it could be expected that measures of dominance should show decreasing asymmetry as we move from lessons to conversations. However, the relationship adult-child, also one of dominance, could still be expected to be reflected in such a way that adult-child conversations exhibit more of asymmetry than the child-child conversations. This expected pattern, measured by the IR difference, is formulated as hypothesis 1:

**Hypothesis 1**: The IR difference will indicate child-child conversations as the most symmetric situation, the lessons as the most asymmetric situation and adult-child conversations as situated between the two.

The content of a conversation obviously affects the possibility for participants with various background knowledge, experiences and interests to contribute. In chapter IV it was shown how the language teaching activities are, to a great extent, based on a perspective of language that is alien to everyday experiences of language use. The pupil presumably has the least experience of looking at things this way and will have to rely more exclusively on his experiences of language outside the classroom. The teacher is the professional expert when it comes to lesson activities, the pupil the layman who is present in the lesson because of his needs to acquire some of the knowledge that the teacher already possesses. This gap between the two roles is presumably accentuated by how much bigger the difference is between the perspective normally taken in everyday activities and the specific perspective valid in lesson activities. This is expected to affect negatively the pupil's opportunities of influencing the course of the events in the language lessons.

The different lesson activities, characterized and used for classification of the lessons in chapter III, can be ordered on a scale ranging from that which is most similar to language use outside the classroom to that which is most distant. The latter would be those activities where, most clearly, language is the focus per se and not used to convey messages about anything but language itself, i.e. where message-orientation (cf chapter IV, section 2.3.1) is reduced to a minimum and the most abstract aspects of language itself are prominent. At the other extreme, "similar to language use outside the classroom", we find, of course, the non-teaching activities (category NON), followed by other teaching activities (OTHER), where we enter the classroom but where language is still primarily a means for creating and conveying messages that refer to phenomena outside the language system. The next step leads to TEXT, text-related exercises. Here, the activity is oriented towards language itself, but as the focus lies on whole texts and the messages they contain, the reduction and abstraction typical of the level 2 perspective (cf chapter IV) are not yet too pervasive. In WORD, vocabulary exercises, the semantic content of the vocabulary is still relevant, though, instead of concentrating on global messages in texts, the abstraction and reduction is driven a bit further through itemization. In grammar exercises, category GRAM, the meaning potentials of linguistic items are backgrounded and leave the room for a more abstract perspective, where lin-
guistic items are manipulated primarily in terms of form and structure. In spelling and pronunciation exercises, finally, viz categories SPELL and PRON, words and phrases can be uttered and manipulated completely vacuously. This is the other extreme, where the distance to ordinary use of language is the greatest. The expectation that the asymmetry between teacher and pupil should reflect this scale of closeness - distance to everyday use of language is formulated as hypothesis 2:

**Hypothesis 2:** In lessons, the IR difference reflects the closeness - distance between lesson activities and typical language use outside the classroom.

Since a six-graded scale NON - OTHER - TEXT - WORD - GRAM - SPELL/PRON is very fine-cut and all these activity types actually do not occur in all lessons (or only in very short sequences), I will have to collapse some categories when testing the hypothesis, and use a tripartite division of lesson activities:

**Hypothesis 2b:** In lessons, the IR difference is higher in lesson activities classified as SPELL, PRON or GRAM than in WORD and TEXT and lowest in OTHER and NON.

As the pupil, taking part in all three conversations, is an immigrant child with Swedish as a not yet fully developed second language, one would expect his language deficiencies to make him play the more passive role also in the dyad, equal in principle, with a Swedish class-mate (cf Glahn, 1985, and Holmen, 1985, who studied Danish children in conversations in English with British native speakers). Furthermore, as taking part in a discussion on relatively intricate matters intuitively must be seen as a more demanding task than just inventing subjects for a picture book and introducing proposals (even if the proposals at times have to be defended and motivated), the immigrant child's possibilities of holding his ground should diminish in the discussion task compared to the picture book task. These suppositions form the basis for hypotheses 3 and 4:

**Hypothesis 3:** In child-child conversations, the IR difference is in favour of the native speaker.

**Hypothesis 4:** The IR difference is more clearly in favour of the native speaker in the discussion task than in the picture book task in both adult-child and child-child conversations.

The same reasoning as that which led to the formulation of hypothesis 2 leads to the next five hypotheses. Misunderstandings, lack of tuning between the conversationalists, ambiguities and abrupt shifts in the dialogue were seen to appear here and there in the language lessons as the result of a conflict between two perspectives on language (chapter IV). One could wonder whether the lessons as a whole are characterized by a less fluent dialogue than the non-didactic conversations between the same participants. (As the child-child con-
versations consist of other constellations of actors, they cannot be included in this comparison.) By the same token, one could expect problems and dysfluencies to increase along the scale that takes us from non-teaching activities to activities the most distant from everyday conversation. These expectancies form the basis for hypotheses 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9:

**Hypothesis 5:** Measures of obliqueness (O-coefficient, OR-coefficient) point to a less fluent dialogue in lessons than in adult-child conversations.

**Hypothesis 6:** In lessons, O-coefficients and/or OR-coefficients point to a less fluent dialogue in teaching activities classified as SPELL, PRON or GRAM than TEXT and WORD, which, in turn, are less fluent than OTHER and NON.

**Hypothesis 7:** The IR index for the dyad as a whole is lower in lessons than in conversations as a result of lack of such fluency that would permit a rapid progression of the dialogue.

**Hypothesis 8:** In lessons, the IR index for the dyad as a whole follows the scale of closeness - distance to language use outside the classroom, i.e. decreases as we move from NON and OTHER via TEXT and WORD to GRAM, SPELL and PRON.

**Hypothesis 9:** Lessons are characterized by a more fragmented dialogue than the conversations, i.e. have a higher F-coefficient.

If, as suggested above, in the non-didactic conversations the discussion is a more demanding task than the picture book task, one could expect more of communicative problems and dysfluencies to appear in the discussion:

**Hypothesis 10:** The O-coefficient and/or the OR-coefficient is higher in the discussion task than in the picture book task in both adult-child and child-child conversations.

Finally, one could expect that, although all three situations are task-oriented, the institutionalized roles of teacher and pupil should lead to a dialogue that is to a higher degree driven forward through questions and answers in the lessons than in the non-didactic conversations, where instead a pattern with the two participants offering something for each other to respond to, without explicitly soliciting a response, would be more likely to occur. Such a conversation-like pattern could be expected to be the most frequent in child-child conversations:

**Hypothesis 11:** The S-coefficient is higher in lessons than in adult-child conversations and higher in adult-child conversations than in child-child conversations.
3.2.1 Degree of asymmetry in conversations and lessons

My first hypothesis predicted that the IR difference would be low in child-child conversations, high in lessons, and somewhere in between in adult-child conversations. In the presentation of dialogue measures below, I shall present the results from the lessons in two variants: one labelled L which is the entire lesson regardless of which lesson activities the lessons contain, another labelled LL (language lesson), i.e. what remains of the lessons when non-teaching activities and other teaching activities than language teaching have been omitted, hence those parts of the lessons where the focus is on language. This makes it possible to make comparisons between results from language lessons proper and other lesson activities as well as non-didactic conversations. It should be stressed that LL is a (smaller or larger) part of the whole lesson (L). The parentheses around the values of LL in R2 and R5 mean that in those two cases there were no other activities than language teaching activities (see table 3, p 42) and, hence, that the values of L and LL cannot be compared since they represent exactly the same dialogue. Numbers written in italics in the tables below are those which run counter to the hypotheses. Plus values are in favour of the native speaker, minus values in favour of the immigrant child. Median values are given for each measure; the most interesting comparisons, however, are those within each recording, i.e. dyads with exactly the same, or partially the same individuals.

Table 19  IR differences in the three situation types, plus language lessons proper (LL), i.e. those parts of the lessons where the focus is on language per se.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ch</th>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>(1.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>(1.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The predicted pattern is very clearly manifested. There are only two values in the opposite direction from what was predicted: the low values in L1 and L3. Apart from these two, there is not even overlapping between the three situations; the highest IR difference in Ch is that of Ch3 (0.35), the lowest in Ad is that of Ad3 (0.68) and the highest that of Ad1 (1.18), whereas the lowest value in L, if we ignore, for the moment, the two deviant cases, is that of L4 (1.56).
Through the addition of LL, the language lessons proper, we can also see that the predicted pattern is reinforced when we omit from the lessons non-teaching activities and other teaching activities than language teaching — this is the case in all the six lessons where such a comparison is possible (see further section 3.2.2).

If we then look closer into the two exceptions from this regular pattern, we first find R1. There, the IR difference in the lesson is considerably lower than in the adult-child conversation. Recalling the content of this lesson, we can easily understand why: in L1, 214 turns out of 420 (51%) consist of the figure-drawing exercise, designed especially to make it possible to give a dominant role to the pupil in a lesson, training him in giving instructions, not only in receiving instructions. Actually, in this part of the lesson, the dominance is reversed, the IR difference being -0.23 (table 20, below). If, instead, we look at LL1, the remaining 49% of the lesson, where there is a short sequence of vocabulary training, one grammar exercise and one text-related exercise, the expected pattern reappears (though the difference is not particularly great, as it is in R1 that we find the highest IR difference in adult-child conversations and the lowest IR difference in lessons — except, of course, L3).

R3 is also an exception to the expected pattern. Again, we should not be surprised; the exceptional character of this dyad has been commented upon several times in the preceding chapters. The lesson is almost entirely devoted to the construction of a kite, interspersed with casual conversation about the teacher's freezer — activities that have nothing in common with what goes on in the other lessons. During the remaining 11% of L3 that were actually classified as language teaching activities, P moves around in the classroom searching a pretext for not having to work with the task proposed by T. Furthermore, in the adult-child conversation, P is extremely non-cooperative. In section 2.2 of this chapter, we followed the beginning of Ad3, showing the offensive way in which P avoids cooperation (which, as we saw in table 8, page 146, gives him a positive IR difference); later on, he will choose a radically different strategy, that of saying nothing or just the absolute minimum (giving him a low IR index).

3.2.2 Degree of asymmetry in different activities within the lessons

My second hypothesis predicted that the IR difference would follow the scale of similarity - distance to ordinary conversation on which the seven categories of lesson activities were placed. When using the tripartite division of lesson activities, presented in hypothesis 2b, which gives fewer empty squares and avoids having to rely on very short sequences, the following results appear.
Table 20  IR differences in different activity types within the lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NON OTHER</th>
<th>TEXT WORD</th>
<th>GRAM SPELL/PRON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pattern is the hypothesized one. Only one comparison runs counter to the hypothesis. Of course, the fact that some of the differences are quite small and that a couple of squares are empty, will make some reservation necessary when the finding is claimed. The "perfect pattern" is the one found in L4 (impressionistically described above in chapter III as the most classical language lesson): not only are all six kinds of lesson activities represented and all the sequences reasonably long¹, the intervals between the IR differences are distinct: NON: 0.70; OTHER: 1.07; TEXT: 1.35; WORD: 1.61; GRAM: 1.76; SPELL: 2.30.

3.2.3  Native speaker vs second language speaker

The immigrant children in the corpus do not have fully developed skills in Swedish — so to speak by definition, as the reason for their participation is that they are considered to be in need of instruction in Swedish as a second language. It was hypothesized, firstly, that their linguistic inferiority would assign to them the role of the subordinate party in the otherwise relatively equal child-child conversations (hypothesis 3, above), secondly, that they would be particularly disadvantaged in the more demanding task of the conversations, the discussion, both in the child-child conversations and in the adult-child conversations (hypothesis 4).

¹The different types of lesson activities consist of 32, 25, 118, 66, 107 and 34 turns respectively. That the total, 382, exceeds the total number of turns given for L4 in chapter III is due to the way turns with an internal boundary are counted in the IR analysis.
The results are not decisive. The tendency in child-child conversations as a whole to show an IR difference in the favour of the native Swedish child, i.e. in the hypothesized direction, seems to be corroborated by the second hypothesis: we can see from table 22 below, that in six of the child-child conversations, the native child is clearly more dominating in the discussion than in the picture book task, while in two of the dyads, there are very small differences, one in favour of the hypothesis, the other against. Thus, there is a tendency that the native child is dominating, sometimes, as in the discussion task, clearly dominating. When it comes to the difference between the two tasks in the adult-child conversations, there is no clear pattern at all (table 23, below): sometimes the IR difference is higher in the picture book task, sometimes in the discussion. Obviously, it is possible that the degree of difficulty as a means of measuring variation in the possibility for the second language speaker to come to his rights, is not a very good one (in which case the second hypothesis is not motivated), or that in clearly asymmetric situations, such differences are outruled. As we shall see later (section 3.3 of this chapter and especially in chapter VI), the adult’s interactional dominance in adult-child conversations is built up differently and functions otherwise than teacher dominance in lessons and dominance by one of the children in child-child conversations.

Table 21  IR differences in child-child conversations

| Ch1  | 0.24 |
| Ch2  | 0.14 |
| Ch3  | 0.35 |
| Ch4  | 0.20 |
| Ch5  | -0.03 |
| Ch6  | 0.28 |
| Ch7  | -0.29 |
| Ch8  | 0.00 |
| Md   | 0.17 |

Table 22  IR differences in the two different tasks in the child-child conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Picture book task</th>
<th>Discussion task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ch1</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch2</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch3</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch4</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch5</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch6</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch7</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch8</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.4 Obliqueness in lessons and conversations

My next hypothesis predicted that obliqueness in dialogue would be more widespread in lessons than in adult-child conversations. The hypothesis was formulated in two variants, either obliqueness as measured uniquely by the O-coefficient, or obliqueness as the sum of the O-coefficient and the R-coefficient. The reason for introducing this latter measure is that the two coefficients correspond to two completely different ways of handling communicative problems: one offensive and insisting, the other defensive and complying. In the samples investigated by Linell & Gustavsson (1987:230), the two coefficients proved to show no correlation. It is likely that, as hitches occur, a domineering party will more easily resort to the offensive moves (self-linking and non-focal linking), whereas submissive, dominated parties will only have recourse to repairs. Therefore, as lessons are clearly asymmetric situations, the OR-coefficient of the dyad might — to the extent that the above assumption is correct — be a more adequate measure of obliqueness than the O-coefficient alone.

### Table 23 IR differences in the two different tasks in the adult-child conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Picture book task</th>
<th>Discussion task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad1</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad2</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad3</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad4</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad5</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad6</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad7</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad8</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 24 O-coefficients in adult-child conversations and lessons, language lessons proper presented separately

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once again, R3 turns out to be exceptional. Otherwise, the expected pattern is present as a tendency. In R1, R2, R4 and R5, the differences are quite large, in R6 and R7 considerably smaller. In R8, the OR-coefficient shows no difference; the O-coefficient even is slightly counter to what was expected. The comparison with the category LL indicates that, in contradistinction to what was found concerning the IR difference, the somewhat higher measures of obliqueness cannot be attributed as clearly to language teaching activities particularly; other teaching activities seem to exhibit as much of communicative dysfluencies — measured by the IR analysis — as the language teaching activities. This will be further investigated in the next section.

3.2.5 Obliqueness in different activities within the lessons

As for the IR difference, it was predicted that increasing distance from ordinary conversation outside the classroom would show up in increasing obliqueness, measured by the O-coefficients and/or the OR-coefficients of the different activity types within the lessons. The picture that emerges from such an analysis is the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results give no clear support for the hypothesis. A slight tendency appears in the hypothesized direction for the O-coefficients, but not at all for the OR-coefficients. A couple of speculations as to why this is so could be put forward. First of all, one possibility is that, instead of following the scale of closeness-distance to ordinary use of language as did the measures of symmetry/asymmetry, measures of obliqueness would rather reflect the kind of ambivalence and ambiguities which were discussed in chapter IV. In such a case, the finding that there is actually almost as much of obliqueness in other activities in lessons as in GRAM, SPELL and PRON, may be interpreted as a reflection of a tendency for the most abstract manipulation of linguistic items to be less ambiguous than those which are situated somewhere between ordinary use of language and pure manipulation of linguistic items (we recall e.g. that spelling and pronunciation exercises were given in chapter IV as examples of unambiguous level 2 activities, examples (37) and (38) above, page 92f).

Such a speculation is supported by the fact that the R-coefficient shows a tendency to be lower in GRAM, SPELL and PRON, than in the rest of the lessons (table 28, below). This could be interpreted to say that simple requests

### Table 26 O-coefficients in different activity types within the lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON OTHER</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>GRAM</th>
<th>SPELL/PRON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 27 OR-coefficients in different activity types within the lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON OTHER</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>GRAM</th>
<th>SPELL/PRON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for clarification (by means of deferring questions) are not much called for, it is relatively clear what is the point of the activity. Instead, obliqueness in these types of language lesson activities is made up of meta-linguistic comments and corrections (cf Juvonen, 1987), which is mirrored in the O-coefficient.

Table 28 R-coefficients in different activity types within the lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NON OTHER</th>
<th>TEXT WORD</th>
<th>GRAM SPELL/PRON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.6 IR index in the dyads as a whole

Among the three situations investigated in this study, the dyad's IR index tends to form a regular pattern, differentiating between the non-didactic conversations on the one hand, the lessons on the other (table 29, on the next page).

First, we can see that there are no systematic differences between the two non-didactic conversations. There the dyad's IR index is fairly stable; it is situated around 2.90 with just a couple of exceptionally low values in the adult-child conversations. In R3 and R6, there are small differences (but they run counter to the hypothesis); in the other six dyads there is a quite sensible fall in the IR index as we move from conversations to lessons, especially if we look at language lessons proper. Thus, in spite of the fact that, in the language lessons, the teacher makes frequent use of strong moves — the individual IR indices for the teachers range from 3.87 to 3.55, exception made for the short, atypical sequence of language teaching in L3, where it is no higher than 3.00 — the IR index is systematically lower in the language lessons than in the non-didactic conversations.

When we look within the lessons, making use of the same tripartite categorization as in section 3.2.2 and 3.2.5 above, we also find the pattern clearly manifested (table 30). This should remove the hypothesis that the result presented in table 29 is an artefact, due to the fact that reading from text-books often comes out in the coding as minimal responses, which, of course, lowers the IR index. Reading is a frequently occurring activity also in OTHER-activities and, especially, in TEXT-activities during the lessons. By the way, reading also occurs in the conversations, where the written instructions have to be read (cf 2.5.2 above).
Table 29  IR index, dyads as a whole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ch</th>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>(2.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>(2.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30  IR index for the dyad as a whole in different lesson activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NON OTHER</th>
<th>TEXT WORD</th>
<th>GRAM SPELL/PRON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate: the more of focus on language per se, the lower the IR index for the dyad as a whole. What was manifested as a tendency in the comparison between lessons and conversations, comes out as a clear difference in the comparison between activities within the lessons. One might assume that this is because of the teacher making use of many pure follow-up moves, i.e. accepting and evaluating P's responses, which, if she does nothing more during her turn, would lead to a high frequency of minimal responses in the teachers' IR profiles and lower the index. However, no such strong and regular pattern can be found. Furthermore, this would be outlawed by the higher frequency of free or non-locally linked initiatives in the teachers' profiles (leading to a higher index as well as a higher F-coefficient), a feature I shall return to later. Also the somewhat more frequent use of non-focal linking in the lessons (cf. the higher O-coefficient, table 24 above), and the teachers' high S-coefficient would rather contribute to a higher IR index.

Having thus removed the hypothesis that the lower IR index in the lessons is caused by the teacher making less powerful moves, we must conclude that this feature of lessons is due to the pupils' extremely modest contribution to the progression of the lesson. Not only does he very rarely expand his
responses beyond what was solicited in the teacher's immediately preceding turn (giving him IR value 2 instead of 3); his contributions are also often treated as inadequate (IR value 1 instead of 2 for a minimal, adequate response). Actually, inadequate responses are more frequent than expanded responses if we take the total of the pupils' IR profiles in the language teaching activities (213 and 181, respectively). The median for the pupil's individual IR index in language lessons proper is as low as 2.07.

In less technical terms, we can say that the slower rate at which the dialogue in the lessons progresses is due to the passive role in general that the pupil plays in the interaction, as well as to his failure to play this role successfully by making his contributions fulfill the demands set up by his conversational partner.

### 3.2.7 Fragmentization

In hypothesis 9, it was predicted that the F-coefficient would be higher in lessons than in conversations. The variation in F-coefficients, the measure of fragmentation, takes place within a quite restricted range as far as the absolute level is concerned. Nevertheless, there seem to be two clear patterns in the results, only one of which, however, is in harmony with my hypotheses. Here is the complete picture of results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>Ch</th>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all cases, the F-coefficient of the child-child dyad is higher than that of the adult-child conversation and, with the exception of R6, than that of the lessons (in R6, the F-coefficients of Ch, L and LL are the same). The second point is that, with the notorious exception of L3, the highest F-coefficient in the adult-child dyads is that of the language lesson.

The higher F-coefficient in the children's conversation is easy to account for. In contrast to the adult-child conversations, where the adult very naturally takes on a leading role, there is no such responsible authority in the child-child conversations (although exceptionally there is a tendency for the native child to assume the leadership, most clearly in Ch3, where C acts very authoritatively,
often the children do not keep strictly to the point but make digressions, jokes and rapid comments in a much less orderly fashion than in the dyads with the adult. In Ch4 and Ch7, for instance, the atmosphere is very relaxed and the children repeatedly switch between work with their tasks, and frolics, tittering and bursts of laughter. The resulting F-coefficient is extremely high, compared with the rest of the corpus. It could be retained as a suggestion for future research to investigate whether a high degree of fragmentation in dialogue is a regular feature of juvenile conversational style (cf Nordberg, 1984).

The higher F-coefficient in lessons compared to adult-child conversations must be explained otherwise. Looking closer at the instances of categories contributing to the F-coefficient, at least two factors which jointly could make up an explanation can be distinguished. First there is, to a small degree, a more frequent changing of activities in lessons. Whereas the picture book task and the discussion are pursued for quite a while in the adult-child conversations (picture book 93 turns minimum, 204 turns maximum, Md 165; discussion 64 turns minimum, 151 turns maximum, Md 129), lesson activities tend to be shorter, according to the classification presented in chapter III. For instance, in L8, there are twelve transitions between types of activities, in L4 nine transitions, taking the median length of an activity in these lessons to be 20-25 turns. Obviously, this must contribute to a somewhat higher F-coefficient.

On the other hand, this kind of fragmentation is not at hand in all the lessons. Another determining factor is to be found in the structure of the activities in lessons. Very often, the use of teaching materials leads to switches back and forth between contexts. In L4 and L6, e.g., "today's text", read at the beginning of the lesson, constitutes the ground for almost all the different, subsequent activities. The context of the story in the text is therefore reactualized on a number of occasions; the dialogue develops in one direction for a while, then, starting again in the context of the text, follows another thread that exploits another aspect of the text, then comes back etc. This is a typical feature of the activities that start out from texts or exercises in various kinds of teaching materials or from a specific theme, as the two words svål(1) (starvation/swelled) in L2. It gives a more fragmented structure to lessons of this kind than to activities with a more linear, simple structure, represented by the tasks as they are acted out in the adult-child conversations of the corpus. It should be recalled, however, that the variation in F-coefficients is rather small.

3.2.8 Obliqueness in different tasks in the conversations

Hypothesis 10 predicted that discussions, as being a more difficult task, would contain more of obliqueness than the picture book task in both adult-child conversations and child-child conversations. This hypothesis is borne out.
Table 32 O-coefficients in different tasks in the non-didactic conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ad picture task</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ad discussion task</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ch picture task</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ch discussion task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pattern is the same, if, as we did in sections 3.2.4 and 3.2.5, we consider the OR-coefficient.

Table 33 OR-coefficients in different tasks in the non-didactic conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ad picture task</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ad discussion task</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ch picture task</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ch discussion task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.9 Requests and offers

It is a well-known fact that didactic conversations are to a great extent characterized by question-answer patterns. In this section, I shall investigate the S-coefficients and the B-coefficients, i.e. the measures of the degree to which the dialogue progresses via requests or offers respectively, in the dyads in different situations. Hypothesis 11 was expressed in terms of the S-coefficients: A higher S-coefficient was predicted in lessons than in adult-child conversations, for which, in turn, a higher S-coefficient was expected than in child-child conversations, the latter situation being supposed to be the most conversation-
like. In the B-coefficient, roughly the same phenomenon should be possible to investigate. First, we look at the S-coefficient for the dyad as a whole.

**Table 34** S-coefficients, the dyad as a whole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ch</th>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The S-coefficients within each of the different situations are quite stable. The most clear difference is that between the child-child conversations on the one hand and, on the other hand, the dyads where the adult participates. There is no overlapping at all, the highest S-coefficient in Ch being 16, the lowest in Ad, L (or LL) being 19. There is also a difference between adult-child conversations and lessons, though less regular. With the S-difference, the picture becomes more clear — though L1 still stands out as an exception and, to some extent, L3. In the S-difference, a clear distinction is drawn between adult-child conversations and lessons, in addition to the even more salient difference between child-child conversations and adult-child conversations that was captured already by the S-coefficient.

**Table 35** S-differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ch</th>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The S-difference in Ch is low and, furthermore, it can go in either direction. In all the adult-dyads, the S-difference is very markedly in favour of the adult and (with the exception of L1 and L3) increases as we move from conversations to
lessons to language lessons. Obviously, the teacher's almost exclusive privilege of asking questions is an important factor behind the very high IR differences in lessons (sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 above). In the adult-child conversation, the dyad's S-coefficient decreases, and even more markedly, the S-difference, either by the adult soliciting less, or the child soliciting more, or both. Still, the demarcation line in this respect goes between the children's conversations on the one hand and the dyads with the adult on the other.

The same phenomenon is captured from another angle in the B-coefficients, the percentage of conversational contributions belonging to the category \(<\lambda\), i.e. turns in which the speaker offers, as it were, something which is focally linked to the immediately preceding contribution from the conversational partner, without explicitly soliciting a response (table 36, below). In 3.2.6 above, we noted that such expanded responses from the pupil are relatively rare in lessons, accounting for the high IR difference and, particularly, for the low IR index of the lessons as a whole. It is striking that the category is even less frequent in the teachers' profiles; the teachers' contributions to the educational dialogue are aimed at doing other work than just providing the substantial content: asking questions, correcting, evaluating and structuring the interaction (but cf chapter VI).

As pointed out earlier (section 2.4.6 above), the B-coefficients presented below do not, at this stage, add much new information: they are highly predictable as the complement to S-coefficients, F-coefficients and OR-coefficients. They will only briefly be commented upon as another illustration of the overall picture of the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 36</th>
<th>B-coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C  P dyad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>34 32 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>49 45 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>35 36 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>46 27 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>48 43 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>50 43 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>30 41 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>42 53 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>44 42 41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The B-coefficients are higher in Ch than in Ad, which is the complement to the picture concerning the S-coefficients (though of course other factors also come into play). In both cases, the coefficients are situated at a quite stable level; the variation around 30 in Ad is very small, the variation around 40 in Ch a little bit larger. With the exception of R3, where the cooperative, fluent dialogue occurs in the kite-construction during the lesson and where the adult-
child conversation takes place in an atmosphere of battle, there is a dramatic decrease in B-coefficients in lessons. This kind of conversational contribution, the prototypical one in informal, cooperative dialogues between equals, has very little room in institutional settings like teaching.

3.2.10 Summary

In this section, I have investigated dialogue processes on the basis of eleven conjectures concerning dominance patterns, fluency and coherence in the dialogue of the lessons and conversations. Clear differences in degree of asymmetry were found between child-child conversations (relatively equal dyads), via adult-child conversations (considerably higher degree of asymmetry) to lessons, particularly language lessons in a narrow sense (high degree of asymmetry). Within the lessons, there was also an increasing asymmetry as we moved on a scale from the most conversation-like activities, the non-teaching activities, to the most abstract manipulation of language structure — grammar, spelling and pronunciation — via teaching activities with no focus on language per se, or with moderate focus on language, i.e. text-related exercises and vocabulary training. These findings suggest that teacher dominance is clearly sensitive to types of lesson activities.

There was also a tendency for obliqueness and dysfluency to be higher in lessons than in the adult-child conversation with the same two actors involved. This difference, however, could not be retraced along the scale of lesson activities, as was the case with the measures of dominance. Differences in obliqueness were observed between the two different tasks represented in the child-child and adult-child conversations: the more demanding task, the discussion, came out with higher measures of obliqueness than did the picture book task.

Even though the measures of obliqueness did not differentiate very much between lesson activities, there were other patterns in the results that point to an increasing lack of fluent progression of the dialogue in activities where language per se is focused and manipulated in what was labelled, in chapter IV, the level 2 perspective. The IR index for the dyad as a whole was lower in lessons, especially language lessons proper, than in non-didactic conversations and the decrease in the IR index was shown to follow the scale of focus on language. Since this could not be attributed to the strength of the teacher's interactional moves, it was interpreted as resulting from the pupil's passive role and his increasing difficulties in complying with the demands of the situation, as he could no longer rely on his everyday experiences of language and language use.

The somewhat higher fragmentization of the dialogue in lessons was interpreted as mainly an effect of the frequent switching back and forth from the context of the teaching materials. The most salient result concerning fragmentization, however, was the systematically higher F-coefficient in child-child conversations, which was tentatively explained as a feature of juvenile conversational style.

Clear differences in the way the dialogue progresses were found between, on the one hand, child-child conversations and, on the other hand, the dyads where
the adult participates. Most clearly lessons, but actually also adult-child conversations, progress via soliciting initiatives, i.e. questions and directives and responses to these (high S-coefficient and low B-coefficient), whereas child-child conversations were found to be more conversation-like in that they progress via assertive and submitting initiatives (low S-coefficient and high B-coefficient). Though not completely dissimilar as to the level of the S-coefficient, there was a difference between lessons and adult-child conversations when it came to the S-difference. In lessons the distribution of roles was more clear-cut: it was almost exclusively the teacher who made use of soliciting initiatives, whereas in adult-child conversation the S-difference was found to be lower.

Finally, a tendency could be noted for the native speaker to dominate (moderately) the interaction in child-child conversations, a tendency that was reinforced when moving from the picture book task to the discussion, considered as a more demanding task. However, as far as this second point is concerned, there was no such increase of asymmetry in the adult-child conversations; there, sometimes the picture book task, sometimes the discussion turned out to induce the highest IR differences.

Obviously, eight dyads is a very small sample and, as stressed earlier, the present study is not aimed at formal testing of specific hypotheses — the reason why no statistical methods have been used.1 Principally, this study is to be taken as explorative and the results will have to be considered as preliminary, as suggestions to which confirmation or refutation may be sought in studies in a larger scale. What seems to be the most firm indication according to the results in this chapter, is that the degree of global asymmetry varies very clearly between the three situational types of the corpus and that teacher dominance is not a stable phenomenon within lessons, but that it varies as a function of lesson activities. Through the more specific IR measures, I have been able to give a fairly substantial description of the ways in which these dominance patterns are brought into being and of several aspects of the dynamics and coherence of dialogues under various circumstances in different activity types.

3.3 Dimensions of interactional dominance

3.3.1 The relationship between different types of dominant behaviour

The notion of dominance is a complex one and dominance can be exercised in a number of dimensions and be expressed in different ways (cf Linell, Gustavsson & Juvonen, 1988; Linell, 1988). Dominance can scarcely be totally captured by any single method of analysis. In this section, I shall look into those aspects of dominance in dialogue that are taken into account by the IR analysis.

1 Also, as pointed out when the different IR measures were introduced in section 2.4, these are to some extent interdependent and therefore they could not, in a strict sense, be unproblematically used for testing independent hypotheses.
and explore the relationship between different expressions of dominance as they emerge in the present corpus.

The measures of dominance in the IR analysis is the amalgamation of several dimensions in which the course of a dialogue can be influenced or governed, equally, or unequally, much by the interactants through the contributions they exchange. A high IR index for one party in a dialogue, and as a probable consequence an IR difference indicating his/her dominance, can be attained in several ways. First, there is the general necessity of playing an active role, i.e. of taking initiatives of some kind. The conversationalist who, in the turns assigned to him/her, never, or seldom, gives contributions that go beyond what his/her partner explicitly has solicited, will inevitably come out as the subordinate party. Secondly, among conversationalists taking equally many initiatives, the measures of dominance will be in favour of those who take strong initiatives, i.e. those who explicitly solicit particular contributions from the partner, rather than just offer, or submit, something to him/her, in the latter case less restricting the partner's field of manoeuvre. Thirdly, a conversationalist will emerge as more dominant (or less dominated), if, in his/her initiatives, (s)he shows less of compliance, i.e. if (s)he does not follow straightforwardly the path indicated by the partner's moves, but traces his/her own path and/or challenges the grounds for the partner's contributions and the way they are made, i.e. using self-linking or non-focal linking. Finally, establishing topics of conversation is taken to be more dominant behaviour than just to continue on an already established topics.

The particular conjecture to be investigated in this section, is that these different kinds of dominant behaviour go hand in hand, more precisely that the party in an interaction who, through the analysis, has come out as globally dominant, will be the dominant party not only in one dimension, but in all dimensions. This is the way I shall proceed. For each dyad (except Ch8?) we have a dominant party and a subordinate party in terms of the IR differences presented in section 3.2.1. It is hypothesized that the percentage of minimal responses (adequate and inadequate) — here introduced as the $M$-coefficient --- is lower for the dominant party than for the dominated and that the $O$-coefficients, the $O$-coefficients and the $F$-coefficients are higher for the dominant party than for the dominated. These four measures stand, respectively, for the four dimensions of dominance in IR terms, discussed in the previous paragraph. The results are displayed in tables 37-39.
Table 37 Individual M-, S-, O, and F-coefficients, corresponding to different dimensions of dominance, in lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR diff</th>
<th>M-coeff</th>
<th>S-coeff</th>
<th>O-coeff</th>
<th>F-coeff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>(1.77)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>(0.28)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>(1.56)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>(1.65)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>(1.67)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>(1.64)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td>(1.95)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>(1.65)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In lessons, with their extremely high, global asymmetry, the picture is totally clear: all comparisons but two (the O-coefficient in L1 and the F-coefficient in L3) go in the hypothesized direction, none in the opposite direction. Except for the extremely low O-coefficient of T in L1 and the low F-coefficient of T in L3 (we recall the particular nature of the activities that constitute the major part of these lessons, the figure-drawing exercise and the kite construction), there is not even overlapping. The picture is almost as clear in adult-child conversations, in spite of the fact that asymmetry as measured by the IR difference is considerably reduced, compared to the lessons.

Table 38 Individual M-, S-, O, and F-coefficients, corresponding to different dimensions of dominance, in adult-child conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR diff</th>
<th>M-coeff</th>
<th>S-coeff</th>
<th>O-coeff</th>
<th>F-coeff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad1</td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad2</td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad3</td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad4</td>
<td>(1.01)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad5</td>
<td>(0.69)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad6</td>
<td>(0.78)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad7</td>
<td>(0.82)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad8</td>
<td>(0.97)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>(0.88)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is only for the F-coefficient that the picture becomes somewhat more fuzzy: only five comparisons go in the hypothesized direction, one against and in two cases there is no difference.
Turning to the child-child conversations, it must be remembered that the IR differences are very much smaller, which means that the risk of not being in position of retaining the hypothesis is much greater.

### Table 39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR diff</th>
<th>M-coeff D</th>
<th>S-coeff D</th>
<th>O-coeff D</th>
<th>F-coeff D</th>
<th>M-coeff S</th>
<th>S-coeff S</th>
<th>O-coeff S</th>
<th>F-coeff S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ch1</td>
<td>(0.24) 27 41 14 12</td>
<td>22 6 8 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch2</td>
<td>(0.14) 20 24 11 15</td>
<td>11 6 11 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch3</td>
<td>(0.35) 27 36 19 11</td>
<td>11 9 11 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch4</td>
<td>(0.20) 19 34 9 10</td>
<td>17 13 16 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch5</td>
<td>(0.03) 27 28 13 10</td>
<td>9 10 11 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch6</td>
<td>(0.28) 16 35 15 3</td>
<td>12 10 5 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch7</td>
<td>(0.29) 18 37 13 19</td>
<td>19 11 12 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>(0.24) 20 35 13 11</td>
<td>12 10 11 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ch8 presents the IR difference 0.00 and therefore it cannot be included in the comparison. The coefficients are nevertheless given for the sake of completeness:

| Ch8     | 0.00 21 22 12 11 | 16 6 12 7 |

In this small sample, the tendency still holds for M-coefficients, O-coefficients and F-coefficients, but not for S-coefficients. Interestingly enough, it was the S-coefficient that showed the clearest outcome in the lessons and the adult-child conversations. It could be advanced as a speculation that these different patterns correspond to the different functions of soliciting initiatives in, on the one hand, settings where the asymmetry is given at the outset and even, as in the case of lessons, institutionalized, and, on the other hand, relatively equal situations, represented here by the child-child conversations. We need only think of a phenomenon like the "exam question", which, of course, represents a large portion of the soliciting initiatives in the lessons, while absent in the child-child conversations (but not entirely absent in the adult-child conversations).

Against the above demonstration, someone would perhaps argue that it is a priori given that the IR measures of dominance should coincide and show up as, on the one hand, great IR differences, and, on the other hand, high F-coefficients, S-coefficients and O-coefficients and low M-coefficients, since the latter measures in a sense form the basis of the former. However, such an argument must be refuted. It could very well be that the IR difference was so sensible to any one of the dimensions and so much less sensible to the other that the pattern of the different coefficients was just random. This seems not to be the case; according to what was demonstrated above, it is very clearly the case that
the global dominance measured by the IR difference corresponds to dominance in each of the four particular dimensions identified.

To sum up then, interactional dominance is a function of several kinds of dominant behaviour in dialogue. The IR difference can be taken as a global, comprehensive measure of dominance, while more specific measures can be computed for constituent dimensions. In this section, I have shown that — in the present corpus — a party who is globally dominant is also dominant in each of the following four dimensions of dominant behaviour:

— (S)he is active in general through a vast proportion of initiatives instead of remaining passive and conceding the interactional territory to the partner.

— (S)he is soliciting, i.e. takes many soliciting initiatives by which the partner's field of manoeuvre is continuously controlled and restricted as the soliciting initiatives set up more specific conditions for the next move in the dialogue.

— (S)he is persistent in his/her own initiatives, evading or ignoring the partner's contributions, or challenging their premisses, as opposed to being amenable and compliant.

— (S)he takes initiatives also on the macro-level of an interaction by closing, opening and reopening topics, thus heavily influencing what the conversation will be about.
VI  THE PUPIL'S OPPORTUNITIES FOR TALKING

1  Introduction

This chapter will be devoted to an analysis of the pupil's opportunities for talking under the various circumstances and premisses for communication provided by the different communicative situations in which he is an actor. I shall investigate his amount of speech globally in lessons and conversations and in the different types of lesson activities. I shall also provide a special study of teacher/adult questions and the way they are responded to by the pupils. These analyses, as well as the investigations presented in the previous chapters, are primarily aimed at throwing light upon some ways in which communication and language use are tied to the surrounding activity context. The fact, however, that we are concerned with second language lessons — possibly aiming at promoting communicative competence — lends a particular interest to an investigation of the pupil's opportunities for talking. Though maybe not the only goal to be pursued in second language instruction (cf below, chapter VII), creating possibilities for the pupil to use the target language in (oral) communication during the lessons may be seen as one way of working towards the superordinate goal, that of enabling the pupil to handle communicative situations outside the classroom where mastery of the target language is needed.

Before I continue, I would like to stress that in the conception of dialogue underlying the present study, opportunities for talking must be seen as an interactional phenomenon. Though it was shown in chapter V, through measures of interactional asymmetry, that the pupil is clearly the subordinate party in the lessons (as well as in the conversations, though to a lesser degree), that his interactional territory is restrained by certain acts by his partner etc, this must not be taken as if his opportunities for talking were exclusively determined by his interlocutor and thus to be seen as opportunities given to him. For instance, questions on a given level of openness (in the sense defined below) do not determine, in any mechanistic way, the length of the answer; a question, as well as any other communicative act, always leaves a margin as to its interpretation and the appropriate reaction to it, which is, as it were, negotiable. Thus, opportunities for talking in an interaction are not either given or taken, they are the outcome of the continuous, mutual adjustments of the reciprocal actions of both parties, by which they give and take, offer and accept offers, widen and restrict their own, as well their partner's interactional territory.
2 Amount of speech in different situations

2.1 Method

The total number of running words spoken in the 24 dyads was counted. By running word I refer to what in normal Swedish orthography is written as a separate entity, surrounded by spaces. To this principle there is one exception: phrases like vad heter det (what's its name/what's it called) and till exempel (for example), were counted as just one word when used as "fillers" (but when used in their full sense, so to speak, and pronounced distinctly, they were counted as three and two words, respectively).

Only words appearing in ratified turns were counted, i.e. turn miscarriages (IR coding: X) were left out. For obvious reasons, the same goes for IR category ?, inaudible turns, as well as for inaudible parts of ratified turns. In cases of overlapping speech and interruptions, all audible words were counted:

(74) L7: 1 T: Då ska du alla först ha ett papper Yousuf, för vi ska ta å repetera det här... som vi hade med..
   2 P: /AVBRYTER, OHORBART/ att dom skulle vara här då när /OHORBART/
   3 T: /AVBRYTER/ ja jag trodde det förstår du

in 2, P starts his turn before T has said everything that is rendered in the transcript as clearly pronounced, fully audible words. Hence, there is overlapping. Nevertheless all the words were counted, i.e. turn 1 consists of 21 running words. In contradistinction to this, neither the beginning nor the end of turn 2 could be counted as they are inaudible because of the interruptions and the ensuing overlapping speech; turn 2 consists of 7 words. (That the principles for counting clearly disadvantages P in this particular example — in the counting T ends up with 27 words, though several are spoken simultaneously with P's talking, while P ends up with only 7, though it is obvious that he utters more than that — is a mere coincidence.)

Words uttered as pure back-channelling signals (and thus not given turn status in the IR analysis) were not counted, though words with roughly the same limited feed-back function were counted when they constituted a separate turn or when uttered as integrated parts of a longer turn:

(75) L3:299 T: för då blir ju draken precis plan, då tror jag inte att han flyger, ja det bygger på att han blir lite /RITAR PÅ TAVLAN/ nu ritar jag mer än det kommer å synas /P:mm/ hjä, i verkligheten men
null

As indicated by the numbering, P's back-channeling has not been considered to interrupt T's turn; 299 was counted as a 58 words long turn, during which P does not utter any words that count. The "ja" (yes) that starts 300 counted. Though it may be said to have the same limited feedback function as a back-channel item, it is part of a full turn at talk, six words long. 301 was also considered to be a full status turn and the repeated "mm" was counted as two words.

Hesitation noises, words faltered or interrupted (as in the case of self-repair) were not counted. Such phenomena appear in turns 318 and 322 in (76), where what is written within parenthesis was not counted:

(76) L2:318 T: mm..va sa..om du..(eh)..vi tar dom här först nu då, på den sidan

(76) L2:318 T: mm..what did..if you..(er)..we'll take those first now, on that side

Onomatopoetic "words" (used e.g. by the children in the child-child conversations to imitate the sound of a camera in the picture book task) were counted, as well as separate letters or phonemes e.g. in spelling and pronunciation exercises and separately pronounced syllables e.g. in grammar exercises:

(77) L1:329 T: (...) då tar man ordet som stark, å så lägger man till nänting efter det

(77) L1:329 T: (...) then you take the word like strong, and then you add something to it
330 P: a r, no, r e
331 T: yes, a r e like you said /P:mm a r e/ and then if there's one coming after who is even more so, then you say...
332 P: a st

Here, 330 counted as five words, "a r" and "r e" being pronounced as single letters, and 332 counted as three words. Had the endings been pronounced as syllables, i.e. "ar" and "ast", 330 would have counted as three words, 332 as one word.

What is read aloud from e.g. a text book, an exercise book or a sheet of paper containing exercises in the lessons and, in the conversations, from the written instructions, was omitted in the present analysis. Only corrections and the repetition of corrected items were counted:

(78) L5: 10 P: /LÄSER HÖGT HISTORIEN OM GUDBRAND/ (...) Gudbrand ville hellre ha en häst en ko
11 T: än en ko
12 P: än en kon /FORTSÄTTER LÅSA/ så han byte med mannen. När han hade gått en stund till mötte han en man som skulle till...till stan för att sälja get. Gudbrand ville hellre ha...ha en get än häst
13 T: än en häst
14 P: än en Häst /FORTSÄTTER LÅSA/

Here, 11, 12, 13 and 14 all counted as three words long, i.e. the words that are taken up for correction, first by the teacher then by the pupil, were counted, the mere reading aloud from the text book was not. This goes, of course, for the teacher's reading as well as for the pupil's.

2.2 Results

First, we shall look at the total number of running words spoken by the pupil in the three different situations. The results are displayed in table 40.
Table 40  Total number of running words spoken by the pupil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>Ch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>2166</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These raw values are comparable only as far as the conversations are concerned; in the two conversations, the tasks assigned are exactly parallel. It is clear from the table above that the pupil talks a great deal more in the conversation with the adult than in the parallel discussion with his class-mate — from 20% more in A7 to 153% more in A4 (average: M 82.3%; Md 87%). While in the child-child conversations, solutions to the tasks are settled quite quickly and sometimes in a rather superficial way, the adult, as she takes the role of the responsible part in the adult-child conversations, sees to it that the questions are tackled from several angles and penetrated more deeply. Hereby, more talk is needed to solve the tasks in the adult-child conversations, and we can see that the pupils' opportunities for talking increase considerably as we move from child-child conversations to adult-child conversations.

Next, we shall consider P's proportion of all the talking that is done in the different situations. Table 41 shows the percentage of the total number of running words in each dyad that is uttered by P.

Table 41  P's share of the total number of running words in the different situations, percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>Ch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>(20.3)</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>(24.4)</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall picture is very similar to the one given by the IR difference, measuring the interactional dominance (see above, chapter V, section 3.2.1). It
should be pointed out that there is no necessary correlation between interactional dominance as measured by the IR analysis and quantitative dominance in terms of amount of speech (Linell, Gustavsson & Juvonen, 1988), and that actually, also in the present corpus, the relation between interactional dominance and quantitative dominance is far more complicated than it appears from table 41 above (see section 3 below).

None the less, as was the case with interactional asymmetry, P is strongly dominated in the lessons also in terms of amount of speech, somewhat less in the adult-child conversations and only slightly in the child-child conversations. L1 and L3 are still exceptional and for the child-child conversations we now find a third exception (Ch4) added to the ones that were exceptional already on interactional dominance. We note that, except for L1 and L3, the pupil does not reach one third of the total number of running words, a measure that is often presented as a rough estimation of the pupils' share of the talking in classrooms (Flanders, 1970; Heltoft & Paaby, 1978; Einarsson & Hultman, 1984). Also in the adult-child conversations, P's share is below one third, except for two dyads, which are salient exceptions: Ad2 and Ad4, where P actually does half of the talking. This quantitative symmetry does not at all correspond to what was found concerning interactional dominance, a fact I shall return to and dwell upon in sections 3 and 4 below.

Also when we consider P's quantity of speech in different activity types within lessons, we find a pattern very similar to the one found for interactional dominance.

Table 42 P's share of the total number of running words in different activities within lessons, percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NON OTHER</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>GRAM SPELL/PRON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pattern is less regular than in the case of interactional dominance but still striking: the more concentration on language per se, the less P's share of the talking. At the same time, we can see from the table above that the correlation between interactional dominance and quantitative dominance in terms of amount of speech is far from perfect. In L8, the IR difference indicated a clear increase in asymmetry as we moved along the scale from the left to the right of the table, whereas in terms of P's share of the talking, the pattern is reversed. While in L2 the difference between the two activity types represented was very
small in terms of interactional asymmetry, we can now see that P's share of the talking is considerably less in the spelling exercise than in the vocabulary training. In the small part of L3 devoted to language teaching, P talks most, though the IR difference still indicates T as the dominant party. In L1, the situation is the opposite: though being interactionally dominant in the figure drawing exercise, P is dominated when it comes to amount of speech.

As a matter of fact, a correlation between interactional dominance and quantitative dominance is by no means necessary and does not occur in certain types of situations, though in the lessons of this corpus there is such a correlation (see section 3 below). In an interview, for instance, the interviewer is (typically) interactionally dominant as (s)he is the one who introduces topics, asks questions, evaluates answers, closes topics and so forth, while the interviewee (normally) is dominant in purely quantitative terms — (s)he is the one who does most of the talking. This is true on one important condition: that the interviewee does not restrict his/her participation to the absolute minimum, i.e. responds by extremely short answers and refrains from volunteering information. This, however, is exactly what P, the subordinate party, does in the lessons. T's IR profile (cf above, chapter V, section 3.1) is very similar to what one could also expect to find in the IR profile of an interviewer, i.e. a high frequency of turns that introduce, reintroduce or close topics, many soliciting initiatives and few turns that only introduce semantic substance into the conversation without explicitly requesting from the partner that (s)he introduce something. However, the pupil does not act at all like a prototypical interviewee, but remains very passive; we recall that the proportion of minimal responses in P's IR profiles in lessons varies between 55% and 90%, exception made for L3 (chapter V, table 37, p 185). While, in principle, there is no necessary general correlation between interactional strength in the IR analysis and turn length in terms of number of running words, minimal responses are by necessity short. Thus, the correlation between interactional dominance and quantitative dominance in lessons seems to be principally the reflection of P's extremely high ratio of minimal responses. In the next section, I shall investigate further the relation between interactional dominance and quantitative dominance.

3 The relation between interactional dominance and amount of speech

For each of the three situations, the lessons, the adult-child conversations and the child-child conversations, two ranking lists were made up, one ranking the dyads from the one where P is interactionally most subordinate to the one where he is the least subordinate (or even dominant, as is the case in two of the child-child conversations), the other ranking the dyads according to P's amount of speech, from the one where his share of the talking is the smallest to the one where his share is the most important. The correlation between the two rankings in the different types of situations is the following (table 43).
We notice that the two types of dominance, interactional dominance as measured by the IR difference and quantitative dominance as measured by the percentage of running words spoken, relate to each other in very different ways depending on the type of situation. In lessons, the correlation is almost perfect: the more the pupil talks in the lessons, the less he is dominated. This result is in harmony with the discussion in section 2 above. The fact that P is strongly dominated in lessons, both interactionally and quantitatively, is simply two sides of the same coin; his high ratio of minimal responses is responsible for both kinds of subordination.

In child-child conversations the correlation is positive but fairly weak. The most striking and interesting result, however, is the negative correlation in adult-child conversations between a ranking based on interactional dominance and a ranking based on amount of speech. Thus, the situation in adult-child conversations is quite the opposite of that of the lessons: the more P is interactionally dominated, the less he is dominated in quantitative terms (at least, there is such a tendency; the negative correlation is far from complete). In order to further investigate how this comes about, I shall look closer into those of the adult-child conversations that present the most important discrepancies between the two measures of dominance.

It turns out that the two dyads where P talks the most, i.e. where his share of the total amount of running words spoken is by far the greatest, namely Ad4 (51.3%) and Ad2 (49.3%), are among those where the IR difference is highest (1.01, rank 2 and 0.93, rank 4, respectively). In chapter V, section 3.2.9, it was shown how the teacher's frequent use of questions in lessons accounts for much of the interactional asymmetry. Actually, the different correlation patterns reported above become even more distinct, if amount of speech is correlated not with the measure of global dominance, the IR difference, but with the measure of dominance by means of soliciting initiatives only, the S-difference.

Table 43 Rank order correlation (Spearman) between interactional dominance and amount of speech for the eight dyads in each type of situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>Ch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 44 Rank order correlation (Spearman) between interactional dominance in the solicitation dimension and amount of speech for the eight dyads in each type of situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>Ch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The adult-child conversations where P's share of the talking is important are those which are acted out by the two participants very much like interviews (cf. discussion above), with the adult as the interviewer and P as the interviewee:

(79) 
A2: 196 A: nej men eh fritis ville du ha med, varför tycker du att fritis är bra
197 P: /SAMTIDIGT/ det är roligt
198 A: ja å vad gör ni där då
199 P: spelar schack å sånt, olika spel /A:jaa/ sen var vi med å gri...vi ska få mellanmål, nästa vecka /A:jaha/ fem kronor tror jag det var
200 A: för fem kronor, skulle det kosta fem kronor
201 P: mm
202 A: jaha, vad tror du att ni får då
203 P: ja han sa olika sorters
204 A: ha, eh det är nya ledare på fritis nu väl
205 P: ja jag vet /A:jaa/ Arne det var..eh han hade brutit benet på fotboll
206 A: jaha
207 P: men jag träffade honom i stan /A:jaa/ han går ut på skola å lär gamla
208 A: jaha, men vad heter dom nya pojkarna då

(79) 
A2: 196 A: no but er you wanted to have the play centre, why do you like the play centre
197 P: /SIMULTANEOUSLY/ it's fun
198 A: yes and what do you do there
199 P: play chess and such things, different games /A:yes/ then we had a ba..we're going to have a meal, next week /A:oh/ five crowns I think it was
200 A: for five crowns, would it cost five crowns
201 P: mm
202 A: I see, what do you think you'll get
203 P: well he said different things
204 A: I see, er there are new leaders at the play centre now aren't there
205 P: yes I know /A:yes/ Arne it was..er he had broken his leg at football
206 A: oh
207 P: but I met him in town /A:yes/ he goes out to schools teaching old people
208 A: I see, but what're the names of these new boys then

(80) 
A4: 230 A: ja vad var det som skulle hända nu då
231 P: ja dom skulle vabterere gå på resa till Stockholm /A:mm/ å så läraren sa att dom skulle ha eh femti kronor med sej /A:jaa/ sen är det nåra pojkar som inte ty...dom tykte att det var fel /A:mm/ men de vill att do..alla skulle ta hur mycket dom ville, till exempel hundralapp eller sånt /A:mm/ men jag tycker att dom har fel
232 A: mm, jaa, vad tycker du om det här då, vad tycker du om eh att man ska ha femti kronor med sej
233 P: jaa jag tycker att eh läraren har rätt å po..pojkarna fel
234 A: jaa varför det
235 P: joo, för att det är nåra som är lite så här fattiga till exempel, som inte har så här mycket pengar /A:mm/ så här till exempel jaa.. kan man säga, till exempel..jaa vi har ju inte bott här så
mycke så vi är inte sån hår rika till exempel så det /A:mm/ så att dom där pojkarna dom är rika då /A:mm/ sen vill ha. vill dom ta med sej eh d..mer än dom då, då blir det inte roligt för dom andra då, jag tycker inte det /A:mm/ jag tycker att alla ska ha lika /A:jaa/ mycket

236 A: mm, mm jaa varför det

(80) A4:230 A: well what was going to happen now

231 P: well they were to what'sitcalled go on a journey to Stockholm /A:mm/ and then the teacher said that they should bring er fifty crowns /A:yes/ then there are some boys who don't thi...they thought it was wrong /A:mhm/ but they want to.. everybody could take as much as they wanted, for example one hundred crown note or so /A:mm/ but I think they were wrong

232 A: I see, now what do you think about this, what do you think about er everyone bringing fifty crowns

233 P: well I think that er the teacher is right and the bo..boys are wrong

234 A: I see, why

235 P: well, 'cause there are some who are like a little poor for example, who don't have that much money /A:mm/ like this for example well...you can say, for example...well we haven't lived here for so long so we are not like so rich for example such things /A:mm/ and then there are those boys they're rich /A:mm/ then the..they want to bring er th..more than the others, then it's no fun for the others, I don't think so /A:no/ I think everybody should have the /A:yes/ same

236 A: mm, mm, yes, why

In the cited sequences, A steers the dialogue by asking questions and P follows by answering these questions. In IR terms, A hereby emerges as the dominant party, though moderately dominant as P quite often gives his answers in expanded responses. In terms of quantity of speech, P is clearly dominant. These characteristics give to Ad2 and Ad4 (and, less pronounced, to Ad1) the flavour of an interview.

In a couple of other dyads, the adult tries to act, as it were, in a more conversation-like manner, i.e. instead of interviewing P, she comes up with her own proposals, typically in assertive or submitting initiatives. As suggested in chapter V, this is typical of relatively equal and informal conversations, where reciprocity is often found: when one party proposes something, the other party acknowledges and proposes something in his/her turn. This kind of reciprocity, however, seems difficult to establish in the adult-child conversations, where P very often responds to such implicit invitations by a minimal acknowledgement but gives nothing in return:

(81) A5: 5 A: mm, tycker du inte man ska börja lite grann med..med den här stora entrén hår, man ser hela skolan

6 P: jaa

7 A: tycker du inte det?

8 P: joo

9 A: det tycker jag, då här vi första bilden man kan börja med, ser ganska pampig ut skolan också

10 P: jaa
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A5: 5 A: mm, don't you think one should start a little with..with this big entrance here, you see the whole school
   6 P: yes
   7 A: don't you think so?
   8 P: yes
   9 A: that's what I think, then we have the first picture that we can start with, looks quite grand the school too
  10 P: yes

(82) A8: 19 A: det är inte så dumt, vad ska vi hitta på mer tycker du
  20 P: fotbollsplan
  21 A: det kan vi ju ha är det kan ju också vara då när det är... nåt på gång, ett gång som spelar... (3s) fotboll eller...ja vi kan ju ta...man kan ju ta olika aktiviteter, det kan ju vara så att man kan ta nån gång när det är...nåt vi spelar brännboll eller, när man har friidrott då, det kan vara...man kan ju ha olika bilder
  (2s)
  22 A: eh jag funderar på vad skulle kunna hitta på mer, som vore lämpligt att ta'
  (4s)
  23 A: man skulle ju kunna ha med en vaktmästarn kanske när han håller på
  24 P: mm
  25 A: å sen om man går in i skolan å tittar, har du nåt förslag
  26 P: SIMULTANEOUSLY/ musikrummet
  27 A: musiken jaa
  28 P: bokrummet
  29 A: jaa då // det kan man ju göra om man specialiserar sej så där, ett gång som håller på å få knar böcker ja, man kan ju hålla på inne i hemkunskapen
  30 P: mm
  (2s)
  31 A: när de håller på å bakar sockerkaka kanske
  (2s)
  32 A: så det är klart musikrummet där ja, där kunde man ju eh...man kan ju tänka sej man kan ta en bild av eh jaa...vad ska vi ta, när det är nån som sitter å spelar... trombon eller, fiol eller vad det nu kan vara, som sitter med musiklärare
  33 P: mm

(82) A8: 19 A: that's not a bad idea, what else can we think of do you think
  20 P: the football ground
  21 A: that's okay and that could of course be when there's something... going on, a gang playing... (3s) football or something...well we could take...you could take different activities, it could be that you could take some time when there is...when we play rounders or something, when there is athletics and, it can be...you can have different pictures
  (2s)
  22 A: er I'm thinking about what else we could think of, that could be suitable to take
  (4s)
  23 A: you might have er the school porter perhaps when he's doing something
  24 P: mm
  25 A: and then if you go into the school and look, do you have any ideas
  26 P: SIMULTANEOUSLY/ the music room
27 A: music yes
28 P: the book room
29 A: that's okay // you can do that if you specialize like that, a
    gang borrowing books yes, you can of course visit domestic
    science
30 P: mm
(2s)
31 A: when they are making a sponge cake perhaps
(2s)
32 A: and of course the music room there, there you could er...you
    could imagine having a picture of er well...what shall we take,
    when someone's playing... the trombone or something, the
    violin or whatever it could be, sitting with a music teacher
33 P: mm

In these two sequences, what seems to be A's implicit invitations to conversa-
tion do not result in much beyond minimal responses and restrained feedback
signals from P. Especially in (82), A's turns are mingled with fillers, hesita-
tion noises and even pauses, which for a more active partner could be opportu-
nities for taking over the floor. Even when A clearly marks the termination
of her turn, P does not go beyond a minimal acknowledgement; at times he
does not give even this — turn 31 is followed by a pause (during which P may
of course have given some kind of feed-back signal, e.g. by nodding, that is
not caught on the audio-tape. This, however, would not affect the present
argument). In passages like (81) and (82), A does not steer the dialogue in the
same way as in (79) and (80); in IR terms she is less domineering, though her
quantitative dominance is very strong.

Through the cited sequences, I have demonstrated how the negative correla-
tion between interactional dominance and quantitative dominance comes about
in the adult-child conversations. Certainly, the dialogues in their entirety do
not exhibit these patterns in such a clear-cut way as in the sequences chosen for
illustration, but are rather to be seen as tendencies: in the dyads where A steers
the dialogue, mainly by asking questions instead of giving her own proposals
in assertive or submitting initiatives, P has a more important share of the
talking. However, the striking thing is that this is true only in the adult-child
conversations; in lessons the pattern is completely reversed: the more of solici-
ting initiatives, the less P's share.

As pointed out at the beginning of this chapter, opportunities for talking in
a dialogue are created in interaction. Hence, what is said above must not be
prematurely interpreted in terms of simple, uni-directional causality. For
instance, it is not necessarily the case that T's high solicitation coefficient in
lessons be the cause of P’s small share of the talking. It is as conceivable that
it is P's passivity that forces T to ask questions in order to maintain the inter-
action. What is clear, however, regardless of the direction of causality — the
view preferred by the present author is, by the way, that causality in such cases
is bi-directional and symmetric — is that the different situations represented in
the corpus are clearly different as to patterns of soliciting initiatives and
responses to these. In the next section I shall go deeper into the comparison
between lessons and conversations and investigate whether there are any differ-
ences in the kind of soliciting initiatives taken by the dominant part and, also,
in the way the subordinate party responds to soliciting initiatives of the same kind in the two situations.

4 Questions and answers in lessons vs adult-child conversations

4.1 Introduction

In the previous section it was shown that strong interactional dominance on the part of the teacher/adult goes with low verbal activity on the part of the pupil in lessons, but, on the contrary, with high verbal activity in adult-child conversations. More specifically, the correlation in lessons is almost perfect between dominance in terms of, on the one hand, the ratio of soliciting initiatives and, on the other hand, amount of speech, whereas in the adult-child conversations the same correlation is quite high but negative.

Since in the IR coding the category soliciting initiatives encompasses several different but related types of communicative acts — questions of various kinds as well as directives — I now propose to look into the kind of variation that is not immediately captured by means of the IR analysis, namely variation within one class of turns, undifferentiated in the IR coding. In order to explain the different correlation patterns in lessons and conversations, two hypotheses are formulated:

1) In the non-didactic conversations, the adult asks more open questions than in the lessons.

2) P reacts differently to the same type of questions in the two situations.

According to hypothesis 1, the form of the questions would differ between the two situations; the use of more open questions would enhance P's opportunities for talking in the non-didactic situation, whereas the use of closed questions in lessons would tend to inhibit P's verbal activity (for reservations concerning causality, see above). According to hypothesis 2, P would himself differentiate between the two situations in such a way that questions with the same degree of openness would be responded to more abundantly in the non-didactic situation than in the lesson. Obviously, the two hypotheses are not mutually excluding, both can be valid explanations of the state of affairs described in section 3. As a matter of fact, both hypotheses can be founded on what is previously known about classroom talk. It is commonplace to describe teachers' questions in lessons as very closed, actually often leaving only a slot for the pupil to fill in, which would be in harmony with hypothesis 1. A finding reported in House (1986) (cf. also Grandcolas & Soulé-Subielle, 1986: 304) could be taken as an underpinning of hypothesis 2. House found that pupils' utterances were "linguistically minimal" (ibid, p 48) and "meagre" (p 54) in teacher-led, meta-communicative phases of a communicative language.
course, while more elaborated and native-like in role-plays (especially through the use of 'gambits', the primary focus of House's study).

4.2 Method

All free or non-locally linked or locally, focally, alter-linked soliciting initiatives (for definitions of these terms, see chapter V, sections 2.2-3), i.e. IR categories >, ..> and <->, on the part of the teacher/adult were noted. Non-focally linked initiatives, category :>, were left out, since the category consists almost exclusively of turns pointing out the need for corrections of the form of P's utterances. Self-linked initiatives, => and <=>, were also left out, since they are repetitions of an earlier initiative that has not been responded to satisfactorily. For the same reason, i.e. in order to avoid representing the mere repetition of a soliciting initiative, <->-turns preceded by —— were left out.

4.2.1 Questions vs directives

The soliciting initiatives were first divided into two categories: directives vs questions. To draw this distinction I make use of Ahrenberg's (1987) definition of a question. As Ahrenberg observes, directives "are like questions in setting a frame for the addressee's behaviour" (ibid, p 43) — this is the very reason why directives and questions belong to the same categories in the IR analysis — but what defines the question is that the domain of specification it sets up is "perceived from an ignorant perspective" (ibid, p 66). Whether or not the person who asks the question already knows the answer (as is typically the case with "exam questions", frequent in lessons) is without importance, since the domain is presented ignoratively, i.e. at least as if the answer were unknown to him/her.

Directives typically concern non-verbal actions, such as measuring in (83), rubbing out and writing a punctuation mark in (84):

(83) L3:207 T: jaa du får mäta hur långt pappret är
(83) L3:207 T: well you have to measure how long the paper is
(84) L5:311 T: nu suddar du ut det där då, jag har bytt geten mot ett får punkt, punkt också, hja
(84) L5:311 T: and now you rub this out, I have bartered the goat for a sheep full stop, full stop also, that's it

However, in language lessons, such directives may also solicit (exclusively) verbal actions:

(85) L2:117 T: jag säger så här, svampen sväller /P:mm/ ordet sväller, ska du dela det i två bitar
118 P: svall och er
L2:117 T: I say like this, the \textit{sponge} \textit{swells} /P:mm/ the word /sväller/ (swells) could you divide that into two parts

118 P: /sväll/ (swell) and /st/ (-s)

Here, P's task is obviously to act verbally, i.e. to utter the constituent parts of the word \textit{sväller} (swells). The task, though, is not formulated by T in an ignorative perspective and the soliciting initiative in 117 is classified as a directive. This kind of directives, those which solicit verbal activity, are often connected with mere manipulation of linguistic items, but this is not decisive for their categorization as a directive rather than as a question. Such manipulation may be solicited as well by a question, (86) below, as by a directive, (87) below:

L4: 33 T: nåhh...

34 P: /SAMTTDIGT/ ne...

T: vad kan motsatsen vara till det

L4: 33 T: no...

34 P: /SIMULTANEOUSLY/ ne...

T: what could be the opposite of that

L4:220 T: (...) jag kom inte ihåg det

221 P: /STRYKER UNDER/ (6s) sill

222 T: kan du tänka dej å säga det på ett annat sätt

L4:220 T: (...) I didn't remember that

221 P: /UNDERLINES/ (6s) okay

222 T: could you think of another way of saying that

(Concerning the classification of 222 in (87) see also 4.2.2.2 below, the treatment of questions and directives embedded in idiomatic main clauses like e.g. \textit{kan du} (could you) or \textit{vet du} (do you know), often referred to as "indirect").

4.2.2 Classification of questions

Questions were then classified into one of the following five categories, based (mainly) on utterance form:

a) open questions
b) wh-questions
c) alternative questions
e) fill-in questions
d) yes/no-questions

The above order of presentation is intended to represent a hierarchy from the most open to the most closed questions (see further 4.2.2.6 below).
4.2.2.1 Open questions

Open questions explicitly solicit the telling of a story, the report of an event, the description of an object or a state of affairs or the like, i.e. a single phrase or sentence would, in most cases, be insufficient as an answer — a fairly extended answer seems to be required. So defined, open questions actually have much in common with directives, but the difference that motivates that they, for the present purpose, be included with the questions rather than with the directives, is that the expected response is an elaborated verbal answer, while the directives, as defined above, solicit non-verbal actions or, occasionally, the manipulation of single, specific linguistic items. A couple of examples of open questions:

(88) L1:283 T: (...) Nu låtsas vi, nu är jag elev här i klassen å du, du ska berätta den här historien /P:ja/ för mej, jag har aldrig hört den förut

(88) L1:283 T: (...) Now we'll pretend, now I'm a pupil in class and you, you're to tell this joke /P:yes/ to me, I've never heard it before

(89) Ad3:313 A: då måste du berätta

(89) Ad3:313 A: then you've to tell

(90) L6:310 T: (...) kan du beskriva hur det ser ut i ett rum, eh en vanligt vardagsrum där man bor, på väggar & tak &

(90) L6:310 T: (...) could you describe what it looks like in a room, er an ordinary living room where you live, on the walls and the ceiling and

4.2.2.2 Wh-questions

This category consists of questions posed by means of an interrogative wh-word, which, in principle, is a quite straightforward criterion and the category should need no further description or exemplification. However, there are a couple of points that need to be commented upon.

One problem of demarcation appears when a wh-clause is embedded in a sentence that has the form of a yes/no-question (a special instance of the problem of "indirect speech acts", which has been much debated in linguistics and philosophy of language; for a review, see e.g. Ahrenberg, 1987):

(91) L1:289 T: (...) jaha, kommer du ihåg Yousuf när eh du å jag å Simon måtte oss, hur långa vi var
290 P: jaa
291 T: kommer du ihåg vem som var längst

(91) L1:289 T: (...) okay, do you remember Yousuf when er you and I and Simon measured ourselves, how tall we were
290 P: yes
291 T: do you remember who was tallest
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The questions in 289 and 291 are ambiguous between two interpretations: either they are yes/no-questions as indicated by the syntax of the main clause, or they are wh-questions, in which case the main clause is only a formulaic, conventionalized way of mitigating the question expressed in the subordinate clause. On the basis of the co-text and the context of the question, its prosody as well as semantic criteria, an attempt was made to disambiguate such questions. So e.g., 289 is classified as a yes/no-question, 291 as a wh-question.

The second problem concerns elliptic questions and implicit questions. How such problems are handled is illustrated by (92) below:

(92) L1:353 T: jaa där har dom alltså inte gjort så där att dom har lagt till are
354 P: /SAMTIDIGT, OHÖRBART/
355 T: utan hur har dom gjort här då
356 P: dom har så..lagt till /VISKAR/ större, e..r e
357 T: jaa
358 P: å sen s t
358 T: hja å sen har dom gjort nåt mer, dom har bytt ut en sak

(92) L1:353 T: well there they haven't done this adding of /are/ and /ast/ (endings for comparison of adjectives)
354 P: /SIMULTANEOUSLY, INAUDIBLE/
355 T: but how have they done it here
356 P: they have s..added /WHISPERS/ bigger, e..r e
357 T: yes
358 P: and then s t
358 T: yes and they've done something more, they've changed something

In 358, the soliciting initiative is not formulated as an explicit question (or directive). On the basis of the earlier questions in the sequence and possible answers to it, it has been restituted and classified as a wh-question.

4.2.2.3 Alternative questions

Alternative questions are questions where two (or, exceptionally, more) alternative answers are presented already in the formulation of the question and where the answerer is supposed to choose one of these alternatives:

(93) A7: 8 A: jaa skull..tycker du vi skulle börja utkring skolan eller..inne

(93) A7: 8 A: well shou..do you think we should start outside the school or..indoors

(94) L6:129 T: ja men årstiden, det är månaden det är riktigt /P:mm/ men vilken årstid, är det sommar, vinter eller

(94) L6:129 T: yes but what season, that's the month that's right /P:mm/ but what season, is it summer, winter or
also illustrates another principle for the classification of questions: when a soliciting initiative contains several questions on different levels of openness (cf below, 4.2.2.6), it is classified according to the most closed of the questions. This means that 129 in (94) above is categorized as an alternative question on the basis of the presented alternative answers and not as a wh-question on the basis of the presence of the wh-word \textit{vilken} (what).

### 4.2.2.4 Fill-in questions

Fill-in questions are soliciting initiatives where the speaker leaves his/her utterance incomplete for the interlocutor to fill in (Clark & Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986, label this phenomenon \textquote{proxy completion}). Fill-in questions have declarative syntax — the syntax of an answer, as it were — and are marked paralinguistically for incompleteness and for turn yielding. (If the partner so to speak spontaneously, i.e. when the incomplete sentence is not marked for turn-yielding, fills in a word or a phrase (cf Löfström, forthc.), we are not confronted with a soliciting initiative and such a case falls outside the present classification.) Examples of fill-in questions are found in turns 210 and 214 of (95) below:

(95) L4:208 T: mm i morgen är det onsdag, eh, han tänker på det här med att mamma ska fylla år, å vad är det han ska göra
   209 P: han ska plocka blommor till henne
   210 T: ja, då tänker han, då blir hon...
   211 P: glad
   212 T: glad, det stryker vi under, då blir hon glad
   213 P: /STRYKER UNDER/ (5s)
   214 T: mm, så går vi vidare till nästa stycke å nu tänker han på...

(95) L4:208 T: mm tomorrow is Wednesday, er, he thinks about this with Mummy’s birthday, and what is he going to do
   209 P: he’s going to pick some flowers for her
   210 T: yes, and then he thinks, then she’ll be...
   211 P: happy
   212 T: happy, we’ll underline that, then she’ll be happy
   213 P: /UNDERLINES/ (5s)
   214 T: mm, then we’ll go on to the next paragraph and now he thinks of...

### 4.2.2.5 Yes/no-questions

Yes/no-questions are those questions that can be answered by a simple yes or no. This is also a straightforward definition and we need not dwell upon definitions and exemplification (for a definition, exemplification and discussion of different types of yes/no-questions, in Ahrenberg’s terms \textquote{nexus-questions}, see Ahrenberg, 1987:97ff). It should be reminded though, that utterances with the form of a yes/no-question in which there appear embedded directives or questions of another type (wh-questions, alternative questions etc.), were not automatically categorized as yes/no-questions, but treated as fundamentally
ambiguous and disambiguated according to principles described in 4.2.2.2 above.

No distinction was made between questions where neither yes nor no seems to be preferred ("neutral" yes/no-questions), and "biased" yes/no-questions, in which such a preference is expressed.

Yes/no-questions will be further discussed in 4.2.2.6.

4.2.2.6  Open vs closed questions

As briefly mentioned above, the five types of questions are taken to represent a scale of openness, ranging, in the order they were presented above, from the most open to the least open. As the focus of the present chapter is to investigate whether the questions are likely to enlarge or limit the answerer's opportunities for talking, openness of a question should be interpreted as demands on the length of a complete answer, i.e., in IR terms, on what would suffice for a minimal, adequate response. Similar scales have been used in research on other communicative situations (cf Adelswärd & al, 1987 and references made there), and, of course, the specific research interest may influence the need for diversification of categories. For the study of questioning behaviour in trials, for instance, the distinction between neutral and biased yes/no-questions seems essential (ibid), whereas in this study it is of little importance (and is not made).

I stress once more that the basis of the classification is mainly the syntactic form of the question (with a few exceptions, as the disambiguation of questions with a yes/no-question in the main clause and another type of question embedded in a subordinate clause). Obviously, several other factors would come into play if we were to try to give a classification with ecological validity: e.g. semantic features of the words used in the question and also various pragmatic factors. It seems plausible that questions containing certain verbs rather than others would demand more of a minimal response: compare e.g. What is your name to What do you think about this. Whether the question concerns A-events, B-events or perhaps AB-events (Labov & Fanshel, 1977) may influence what kind of answer is expected. In certain situations an answerer may make use of the indeterminacy and ambiguity between several interpretations of a question in a specific form: we need only to think of journalists' striving to get a politician to answer a simple yes or no, to a yes/no-question. Håkansson & Lindberg (forthc.) report an attempt to create a multidimensional classificatory system for questions used in second language instruction. For the present purpose however, I have preferred to keep the form factor constant. The classification reflects the overt form of the questions; how they are in fact interpreted and reacted to by P, in the different situations, is precisely the point of the investigation.
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4.2.3 Responses to soliciting initiatives

For each soliciting initiative, directive or question, taken by the teacher/adult, the kind of response given by P in the next turn was noted, as well as its length defined as the number of running words spoken. This makes it possible to see to what degree P responds to questions of different types and in different situations by minimal responses, expanded responses or by some other kind of response and also to investigate the length of the answers.

In the case where P's response is a deferring question, IR category $\rightarrow$, and his answer is given in one of his immediately following turns, it was this latter answer that was counted:

(96) A7:10 A: (...) vad skulle vi ha med fö..på den..den allra första bilden
11 P: allra första?
12 A: mm
13 P: (2s) /VISKAR/ vet inte

(96) A7:10 A: (...) and what should we take fir..as..as the..the very first
picture
11 P: the very first?
12 A: mm
13 P: (2s) /WHISPERS/ don't know

In this case, since 11 is a deferring question, turn 13 (a minimal response consisting of two running words) was counted as the response given to the wh-question posed in 10.

Finally, it should be reminded that while the classification of questions as described in section 4.2.2 is based on utterance form, the IR coding is less exclusively form-based (cf chapter V, section 2.5). In (97) below, for instance, turn 50 is classified as a yes/no-question, but 51 coded in the IR coding as a minimal response, in spite of the fact that the answer goes beyond a simple "yes":

(97) A1: 50 A: jaa just det, är det nåt mer rum man skulle kunna ta
51 P: jaa vaktmästarns

(97) A1: 50 A: yes okay, is there any other room we could take
51 P: yeah the porter's room

4.3 Results

4.3.1 Types of soliciting initiatives in lessons and conversations

Before entering into the detailed presentation of the results, I shall give an overview of the size of the material. Table 45 shows the total number of soliciting initiatives identified in adult-child conversations and lessons according to the criteria described in section 4.2. As I did in chapter V, I present the
results for lessons as a whole and for language lessons proper, i.e. parts of the lessons characterized by focus on language per se, according to the classification of lesson activities accounted for in chapter III.

Table 45 Total number of soliciting initiatives taken by the teacher/adult

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>Ad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>(65)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1.1 Questions vs directives

Table 46 shows the percentage of directives of all soliciting initiatives in the different situations.

Table 46 Percentage of directives of all the soliciting initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>Ad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first striking difference that we note is that in lessons, dominance in the solicitation dimension is exercised to a high degree through the use of directives, whereas about 95% of the soliciting initiatives in the adult-child conversations are questions. This pattern seems to be akin to the finding reported in Long & Sato (1983) that imperatives were significantly more frequent in second language lessons than in conversations between native speakers and non-native speakers. As directives typically solicit non-verbal behaviour, manipulation of a few linguistic items or e.g. reading aloud, (mere reading does
not count as words spoken; cf 2.1 above), the high ratio of directives may be part of the explanation of the very high correlation between interactional and quantitative dominance in lessons.

4.3.1.2 Types of questions

Having established the difference between the different situations concerning frequency of directives, we now concentrate on questions. Table 47 on the next page shows the percentage in the different situations of the five types of questions defined in section 4.2.2 (percentages of all questions, directives having been excluded).

To begin with, we note that open questions and alternative questions play an equally unimportant role in lessons and conversations, and with their low frequency they cannot possibly explain the differences in the correlation between interactional dominance and quantitative dominance. Open questions and alternative questions will be disregarded in the following investigation. When it comes to fill-in questions, we can see that they are used almost exclusively in lessons, more precisely in language lessons (actually all fill-in questions in lessons are asked in language teaching activities). However, their use seems to vary a great deal with the individual: while T in LL8 asks almost half of her questions in the form of fill-in questions and they are fairly frequent in LL6, LL7 and LL1, they are infrequent in the four other teachers' repertoire of questions.

The pattern of wh-questions and yes/no-questions varies considerably across the situations. In non-didactic conversations these two types of questions are practically the only types actually used and, furthermore, they are used about equally much. In the language lesson, the percentage of yes/no-questions is very much lower.\(^1\) Wh-questions are somewhat more frequent in language lessons where they are about two or three times as frequent as the second and third most frequent types, fill-in questions and yes/no-questions. This is true for six of the eight dyads; in L5 the distribution of wh-questions and yes/no-questions is similar to adult-child conversations and, as pointed out above, in L8 the fill-in question is the most frequent type (but still the wh-question is more than twice as frequent as the yes/no-question).

This pattern makes the picture somewhat complicated with regard to the first hypothesis, where a higher frequency of closed questions were predicted in the lessons than in the conversations. As far as questions proper are concerned, the pattern shown in table 47 seems to make it difficult to retain the hypothesis. There are, however, two phenomena that still make it plausible that the nature of the soliciting initiatives might contribute to explain why interactional and quantitative dominance go together in the lessons, but not in the non-didactic conversations. Firstly, there is the high ratio of directives reported in 4.3.1.1 above. Secondly, yes/no-questions can be seen as ambiguous in a way that is not treated in the scale of openness that has been used.

\(^1\) Grandcolas & Soulé-Susbielles (1986:302) report a "heavy reliance on yes/no-questions by the teacher", which is clearly not the case in the present corpus.
Actually, there are several difficulties in establishing a hierarchy of questions as the one presented above. The major problem is that of a mismatch between form and (intended) function. A question may in its explicit form belong indisputably to one category and still pragmatically, i.e. in the interactional function it is implicitly intended to have, be much more akin to another category. The problem seems most acute for yes/no-questions, which are very often ambiguous between an interpretation as a "real" yes/no-question, to which a yes or a no is actually the expected answer, and an implicit invitation...
to talk more or less freely on a topic suggested in the question. Let us look at an example:

(98) /The topic of the ongoing conversation is a journey that P's class is planning/

Adl:231 A: mm, Anders kanske inte vill åka själly med er, det blir ju mycke för honom å hälla reda på då. Har ni pratat om vart ni ska åka?

(98) /The topic of the ongoing conversation is a journey that P's class is planning/

Adl:231 A: mm, perhaps Anders doesn't want to go all alone with you, that'll be a lot for him to keep track of. Have you talked about where to go?

The question with which turn 231 ends, is undoubtedly a yes/no-question as to its form, but it may well be an implicit invitation to P to tell about the plans for the journey — especially if A is quite sure that there has been "talk about where to go". In such a case, the simple answer "yes" would seem pragmatically rather inappropriate (whereas a laconic "no" — the answer actually given by P — seems less odd). The question, as it is posed, is ambiguous in this respect and there is no way to decide which interpretation is the most correct. Another example from the same dyad (the issue is whether the picture book should contain a photo of the headteacher):

(99) Adl:140 A: å rektorn, tycker du rektorn är viktig å ha med
141 P: a?a
142 A: varför då

(99) Adl:140 A: and the headteacher, do you think it's important to have the headteacher
141 P: yes
142 A: why

It seems in no way far-fetched to interpret 140 as intended in the following way: "do you think it's important to have a photo of the headteacher and, if so, why?", a fortiori as A immediately asks "why" when confronted with the minimal answer "yes". 140, then, overtly and superficially a yes/no-question, may (but must not) be covertly and implicitly intended as a far more open question. In conversation, participants more or less frequently seem to make use of such a strategy. Compare e.g. the discussion in conversation analysis about the function of pre-sequences (Levinson, 1983:345ff).

Is it possible that a vast proportion of the yes/no-questions in adult-child conversations are not as closed as indicated by their form, but that — covertly, implicitly — they are open questions, or that they function as open questions? In the next section, we shall look at the pattern of responses given to the various types of soliciting initiatives in the different situations.
4.3.2 Responses to soliciting initiatives in different situations

4.3.2.1 The scale of openness

In section 4.2.2.6, a scale of openness was established on which questions of different types were placed. According to this scale, the open questions, or more precisely, the kind of directives that solicit that the answerer tell or retell, describe or report something, should be — as indicated by the term — the most open, followed by the wh-questions, the alternative questions, the fill-in questions and, at the other extreme, the yes/no-questions. One may now ask whether this scale is actually mirrored in the responses given to the different types of questions — situations and dyads collapsed. Since the scale was based on what was presumed to be the demands on the length of a complete answer, the mean length of minimal responses is displayed in Table 48 (directives have also been included, in order to make comparisons possible between questions and directives).

Table 48 Mean length of minimal responses (running words) following soliciting initiatives of different kinds, situations and dyads collapsed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>open</th>
<th>wh</th>
<th>alternative</th>
<th>fill-in</th>
<th>yes/no</th>
<th>directives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>standard</td>
<td>19,0</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>1,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deviations</td>
<td>30,1</td>
<td>3,7</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>1,9</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>2,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the left half of the table, the scale of openness is reflected; on the right half there seem to be no systematic differences in the length of minimal responses.

In the preceding section, I advanced as an alternative hypothesis that yes/no-questions are ambiguous, i.e. that according to their form they are closed, but that pragmatically they may often function as more open questions. If, accordingly, we look at the frequency with which the different question types are followed by expanded responses, the scale of openness changes.

Table 49 Percentage of expanded responses out of all responses following soliciting initiatives of different kinds, situations and dyads collapsed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>open</th>
<th>wh</th>
<th>alternative</th>
<th>fill-in</th>
<th>yes/no</th>
<th>directive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22,2</td>
<td>19,8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>26,0</td>
<td>9,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see in Table 49, the above mentioned prediction is borne out. What we find, actually, is that the yes/no-question, which was seen as the most closed type when the scale was based on the length of a following minimal response, more often than the other types is followed by an expanded response. Thus, the high frequency of yes/no-questions in adult-child conversations must
not be interpreted without reservations as a correspondingly high ratio of closed questions. However, as we shall see in the next section, the difference in the function of yes/no-questions does not account for all of the variation between lessons and conversations.

4.3.2.2 Situational variation in responses given to wh-questions and yes/no-questions

In this section, I shall investigate the type and length of responses given to wh-questions and yes/no-questions, the two types of questions that are relatively frequent in all situations. The percentage of expanded responses out of all responses to wh-questions and yes/no-questions in the language lessons and adult-child conversations is shown in table 50.

Table 50 Percentage of expanded responses out of all responses to wh-questions and yes/no-questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wh-questions</th>
<th>Yes/no-questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ad</td>
<td>LL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be able to account for the different relationship between interactional and quantitative dominance in the two situations, one would have expected a higher frequency of expanded responses in adult-child conversations than in lessons. This appears to be such a tendency for wh-questions; in six of the eight dyads, expanded responses to wh-questions are more frequent in Ad than in LL. The differences are in some cases important, namely in R1, R2 and R4. These are precisely the three adult-child conversations where high interactional asymmetry is connected with high verbal activity on the part of the pupil. Thus, what we see in the left half of table 50 is, now in quantitative measures, the interview character of these three dyads: when A asks a wh-question, P acts like an interviewee and frequently gives a response that goes beyond the minimally requested.

Surprisingly enough, this pattern does not reappear when it comes to yes/no-questions. Though, in table 49 above, it was established that yes/no-questions are the type of question that the most often receives an expanded response, this seems about equally valid for both situations. Actually, if we
collapse the dyads, there are 26.6\% expanded responses to yes/no-questions in adult-child conversations, 22.9\% in language lessons, thus not a very big difference. Furthermore, only in four of the dyads does the difference go in the expected direction, and except for Ad8, the differences are fairly small. It appears that both in lessons and conversations, yes/no-questions are treated as real yes/no-questions: only one out of four is answered by an expanded response; furthermore, 73\% of the minimal responses in lessons and as much as 84\% in adult-child conversations actually consist of one single word.

Another aspect of the opportunities for talking, given or taken, is the length in number of words per turn. Ideally, one would like to investigate whether there is situational variation in the length of the same types of answer to the same types of question. Unfortunately, data does not permit such a far-reaching division; for the expanded responses one would end up comparing the mean length of P's two answers to a particular type of question in one situation to his three answers in the other situation. Only minimal responses are frequent enough in all dyads to make such an investigation meaningful. As pointed out in the preceding paragraph, minimal responses to yes/no-questions show very little variation. They consist to an overwhelming majority of one single word, and only 12\% in lessons and 10\% in adult-child conversations consist of three words or more. When it comes to minimal responses to wh-questions, there is some variation, as shown in table 51 below.

### Table 51 Median length of minimal responses to wh-questions, number of running words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In seven out of eight dyads, the median length of minimal responses to wh-questions is higher in the adult-child conversation than in the language lesson. This means that the same types of responses to the same kinds of questions do not necessarily correspond to the same amount of talk in the different situations.

To sum up this section, we can see, perhaps somewhat surprisingly, that the situational variation is greater and more consistent with wh-questions than with yes/no-questions, though, in principle, yes/no-questions should be the most ambiguous as to their openness/closedness. It is the wh-questions that, in non-didactic conversations, more often receive expanded responses and I was
also able to show that wh-questions receive minimal responses that are longer in terms of number of running words.

5 Summary

In chapter VI, I have investigated how the different situations represented in the corpus vary as to the opportunities for the pupil to talk. We noted that among the two non-didactic conversations, exactly parallel as far as the tasks assigned are concerned, the adult-child conversation presented greater opportunities in this respect — namely if we look at the total number of words spoken, though not when it comes to P's share of all the talking in the dyad. Quantitative dominance, i.e. the difference between the two participants' share of talking in the dyad, showed a pattern similar to what was found in chapter V concerning interactional dominance: P is more dominated in lessons than in adult-child conversations than in child-child conversations and, within the lessons, more dominated the more the focus is on language per se. The pattern was, however, somewhat less regular for quantitative dominance than for interactional dominance. We could also note that only exceptionally did P's share of the talking exceed one third of the total number of words spoken — in lessons as well as adult-child conversations — which places the dyads of the corpus on a par with what has been previously reported as a typical feature of classroom interaction.

While in lessons, interactional dominance and quantitative dominance go hand in hand, the opportunities for P to talk show a radically different pattern in adult-child conversations. There, interactional dominance on the part of the adult seems to enhance P's opportunities for talking. The dyads where P talks the most are those which are carried out like interviews, with the adult steering the dialogue by means of questions.

The finding that strong interactional subordination correlates with low verbal activity on the part of the pupil in lessons but with high verbal activity in non-didactic conversations has to be explained by a conglomeration of factors. In comparison with adult-child conversations, lessons are characterized by:

- A high frequency of directives and fill-in questions, both categories of soliciting initiatives that tend to lead to short, minimal responses. On the other hand, lessons, and particularly language lessons proper, exhibit a high proportion of wh-questions, which demand more of talk to be answered appropriately. Therefore, the closedness of the soliciting initiatives cannot be but a partial explanation. There is also:

- The fact that questions, especially wh-questions, are more seldom responded to by means of expanded responses in language lessons.

- A tendency for answers to be shorter in language lessons than in non-didactic conversations, within the same category of response to the same type of question, viz minimal responses to wh-questions.
Thus, one could summarize the findings in this chapter in the following way: not only is the pupil given fewer opportunities to talk in the lesson, he also refrains from taking the opportunities given.
VII SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

1 The double aim of the study

The aim of the present work has been twofold. First, I wanted to contribute to the study of the relation between language and context, more precisely how interaction and language use depend on the more or less implicit premisses for communication that are associated with the activity types in which communication takes place. The originality of the present work in this respect is that it focuses on a communicative event where the context dependence of language is highlighted in sometimes rather intricate ways. In the language lesson, there is, on the one hand, talk about language through language, on the other hand, and to some extent simultaneously, there is talk going on about other matters. A given utterance or part of utterance or aspect of it may either be focused per se and talked about, or it may actually be used to talk about something else in the way language normally works when it is not itself the primary focus of the activity. I have discussed the two concerted functions of language in the language lesson as two separate levels on which language may occur. The co-occurrence of these levels entails a risk for confusion and hence there will be a continuous need for disentangling them. As the dialogue unfolds, a sufficient degree of consensus must be reached about frames of interpretation, about the ways in which utterances should be contextualized and interpreted. Thus, the incessant contextualization work accomplished by the participants can be brought under scrutiny in the language lesson.

My second aim was to give a description of the language lesson as a communicative event. The originality of the study in this respect, compared to the main stream of research on second language instruction has been:

— To background considerations of the effect of teaching on learning and instead to study the language lesson in its own right, as a special variety of institutional discourse.

— To study interaction between the participants in the dialogue rather than to focus either on the learner in an intraindividual perspective or on the input received by the learner.

— To study variation in dialogue processes and interaction patterns as a function of types of activities that occur within the confines of a lesson.
Summary of the three empirical studies

The first empirical study carried out on the corpus of twenty-four dyads — eight dyadic lessons of Swedish as a second language, eight non-didactic conversations with the same two participants (adult-child conversations) and eight child-child conversations, where the same eight pupils carried out a similar task as in the adult-child conversations, but this time together with a classmate — concentrated on the language lessons. A qualitative, discursive analysis of salient dialogue episodes was carried out and rich exemplification was given by means of extracts from the corpus. Particular dialogue phenomena were identified as indications of a complexity that derives from the fact that language occurs at two separate levels in the language lesson. Language as talked about — language at level 2, in the terms introduced in chapter IV — must not be immediately contextualized in the same way as language usually is. Rather, linguistic items are used as abstract units, as fragments detached, or decontextualized from their normal referential and descriptive ties with the world as experienced in everyday life. In order to capture this phenomenon of isolating language at an abstract level ("level 2"), I introduced the metaphor of linguistic enclosure. Language within the enclosure should not be contextualized as ordinary — level 1 — utterances; normal devices for reference and description are not operative.

Problems with contextualization, viz the way utterances relate to the linguistic enclosure, were seen to lead to a certain degree of ambiguity in lesson activities in general. Furthermore, three partly similar, partly different dialogue processes, labelled level conflicts, level shifts and level fuzzyness, were identified. A level conflict occurs when there is a complete discrepancy between conversationalists in the way they contextualize an utterance. One of them operates at level 1 and takes the utterance as used in the ordinary way for reference and description, as conveying a message, while the conversational partner contextualizes the utterance within the linguistic enclosure, i.e. at level 2. A level shift occurs when the linguistic enclosure is suddenly opened and an item enclosed comes to be used at level 1, which leads to a temporary, momentary, or long-lasting, complete shift of perspectives. Level fuzzyness, finally, is at hand when there is a mismatch in the degree to which linguistic items are lifted to level 2. The teacher's contribution to level fuzzyness is a certain ambivalence; tasks, questions and cues are often to a certain degree imbued with ambiguity between the two levels. Much of what goes on during the language teaching activities can be seen as a hybrid form of language use; the level 2 perspective is more or less established, but, at the same time, this is done as if language were used in the ordinary way. The pupil's typical contribution to level fuzzyness is his tendency to remain in the level 1 perspective and attitude and thus not fully reaching the degree of abstraction and reduction that is characteristic of level 2 treatment of language.

The second study conducted on the corpus was quantitatively oriented. By means of the Initiative-Response Analysis (Linell & Gustavsson, 1987), a characterization of dialogue dynamics and coherence as well as dominance rela-
tions within the dyads was given and related to the variation in activity types within the corpus. The most important results from this investigation, which is based on a complete coding of all the turns at talk in the 24 dialogues, were that the language lesson stood out as an extremely asymmetric situation, where the pupil's role in the interaction is reduced to that of a passive follower, given — and taking — very few opportunities to influence the course of the talk. However, more important, the degree of asymmetry was shown to be systematically related to the kind of lesson activities going on: the more of focus on language per se and the more abstract the aspects of language brought into focus — i.e. the stronger the level 2 perspective — the smaller the pupil's share of the interactional territory. And vice versa, as the specific premisses for communication typical of the language lesson became less pronounced, the pupil's contribution to the interaction was also less restricted.

Communicative dysfluencies as measured by the "obliqueness-coefficients" provided by the IR analysis showed a tendency to increase in lessons in comparison with the non-didactic conversations, though this difference could not be retraced as clearly to language teaching activities as was the case with dominance. Different patterns were found in the way the dialogues are brought forward by the interlocutors, by means of reciprocal, assertive or submitting initiatives in the fairly conversation-like child-child conversations, but by means of soliciting initiatives from the dominant party (i.e. the teacher/adult) and responses in adult-child conversations and, most prominently, in language lessons proper. The expected dominance on the part of the native child in the child-child conversations showed up only as a tendency, though this tendency was seen to be corroborated by the fact that the immigrant child came more to his right in the easier of the two tasks that made up the non-didactic conversations.

In the third study, the interest was first focused upon the opportunities for the pupil to talk — his amount of speech in purely quantitative terms — in the different situations. By means of a comparison between child-child conversations and adult-child conversations, where the tasks assigned were identical, it was shown that the adult performs what could be seen as a piece of pedagogical work in the adult-child conversations, as the child comes to talk in average almost twice as much as in the child-child conversations, and the tasks are penetrated more deeply. The pupil's share of the amount of talk in adult-child conversations, however, remains small, except in a couple of cases, where there is actually symmetry. Interestingly enough, these dyads are among the most asymmetric in terms of interactional dominance as measured by the IR analysis. Actually, it was shown that interactional dominance and quantitative dominance, i.e. dominance in terms of amount of words spoken, go hand in hand in lessons, but that there is a considerable negative correlation between the two measures of dominance in adult-child conversations. This result motivated a special investigation of question-answer patterns in lessons, particularly language lessons proper, and adult-child conversations. It was shown that there is variation in the frequency with which different kinds of soliciting initiatives are used in the two situations. The results indicated that directives and fill-in questions, i.e. types of soliciting initiatives that tend to lead to extremely short answers, were used almost exclusively in language lessons, a pattern that could
serve as a partial explanation as to why interactional dominance is connected to low verbal activity on the part of the pupil in the lessons but not in the non-didactic conversations. On the other hand, the most closed type of question, the yes/no-question, was clearly most frequent in adult-child conversations. It was suggested, though the shortage of material requires some reservations, that the opportunities given to the pupil through the kind of soliciting initiatives addressed to him is not the only factor that is operant, but that also the pupil’s disposition to make use of the opportunities could vary between the situations.

3 Significance of the results — some main aspects

In this section, I would like to discuss some aspects of what appears to be the principal significance of the present research effort. Though the most substantial part of the work has been devoted to the three empirical studies, I claim that the work may be of considerable theoretical significance as well.

One quality which stands out in the data submitted to empirical analysis, and, hopefully, in the analyses provided, is the dynamic character of dialogue, i.e. how language simultaneously builds up dialogue and is shaped by dialogue. This will be discussed in section 3.1. Related to this point is the fact that linguistic meaning is the product of linguistic expressions being embedded in specific activities: what people say, what they mean and how their utterances will be interpreted is inextricably connected with the activity in which they are engaged. Various premises for communication underlie situated use of language; linguistic meaning emerges within the confines of these premisses and is communicated between participants in interaction within specific settings (section 3.2).

In addition to these fundamental theoretical points, the discussion of which may be motivated by the results of the study, I shall return to the characterization that has been given of the language lesson as a communicative event and discuss it somewhat further (section 3.3).

3.1 Dialogue dynamics

Throughout the study — in the qualitative analysis of dialogue sequences in chapter IV as well as in the quantitatively oriented, classificatory analyses presented in chapters V and VI — I have tried to capture properties and features of dialogical interaction as a collective, dynamic process oriented towards specific goals and framed by the purposes of the interaction. Hereby, it has been possible to follow how the meaning of linguistic expressions, as well as interactional patterns of various kinds, are determined by the context of the activity in which they are integrated. It has also been seen that, at the same time, dialogue is not simply a product of external, situational determinants. In the dynamic process between the parties in interaction, activity contexts are created and
maintained, negotiated, changed and recreated — in continuous contextualization work accomplished by the communicators on a turn-by-turn basis.

Hence, the dynamics of dialogue reflect the doubly contextualized character of language: communicative acts — moves in interaction, conversational contributions, linguistic expressions — are simultaneously context-determined and context-creating. Both these aspects were made visible particularly in the analysis of language at two levels in the language lesson (chapter IV). By means of a close scrutiny of how the interactants display their incessant sense-making activities as they relate each others' contributions to one or the other of the two levels, we could catch a glimpse of the — normally attended to but rarely visible, "seen-but-unnoticed" — contextual determination which underlies the interpretation of linguistic utterances.

Paradoxically enough, what made it possible to study the contextual anchorage of language then, was the striving, in the language teaching situation, for treating language as detached from specific contexts, as decontextualized. Particularly revealing were the difficulties in establishing an enclosure for linguistic items; the ordinary function of linguistic expressions, that of alluding to particular aspects of states of affairs with an open-ended, not-yet-fully-described character, was seen to resist to attempts at treating them as self-contained, autonomous items with a pre-determined, lexical meaning. We recall e.g. the efforts which the participants had to make before arriving at enclosing the word *wilt* when a situation was simultaneously at hand where quite a few other, related or unrelated, aspects of what was happening were available and possible to bring into focus, and, similarly, the difficulty of enclosing the word *between* as long as the scenery of the story where "a man was creeping between the streetlamps" interfered.

Now, the other side of the coin, as stated above, is that language also plays a part in building up activity contexts. To give a complex formulation of this complexity, one could summarize part of the present work as follows. Linguistic items, normally contextualized within the frames of specific activities in which they are integrated, are recontextualized in the activity of language teaching and treated as decontextualized. And furthermore, this decontextualization is connected precisely with the language teaching context and is not very likely to occur in other contexts. Such treatment of language is a constitutive element of the activity type of language lessons.

However, by means of their communicative actions only, the actors were seen to be able to define and redefine the activity context within stable external circumstances. A linguistic expression, originally treated as a mere, isolated item could serve as a point of departure for creating a new and wider context around it, thereby being anew recontextualized as well as being assigned new contextual meanings and implying different kinds of commitments endorsed by the actors. Such continuous, reciprocal adjustments of communicative behaviour are yet another aspect of the dynamics of dialogue.

In conclusion, then, I would claim that by adopting a more dynamic and process-oriented view on language, important insights about linguistic form and meaning can be gained, insights which are complementary — at the very least — to what is yielded by an approach to language as an autonomous, structural system traditionally fostered in the language sciences.
As a separate point, I would like to mention that the present study also contains the application of a particular method of conversation analysis, based on the view of linguistic communication advocated above, the Initiative-Response Analysis. Though the method had been independently developed, it has here been exposed to a large-scale application. Particular investigations undertaken, such as the exploration of the relations between different dimensions of dominant, interactive behaviour within a specific corpus, and the situational variation in the relation between interactional dominance and quantitative dominance plainly in terms of amount of speech, can be seen as a development of the method.

3.2 Activity bound premisses for communication

The concept of premisses for communication is taken from Rommetveit (1974) and has been used and elaborated in several studies by Säljö (1982; Säljö & Wyndhamn, 1987, in press). Every activity has its own rationality or set of relevance conditions; there are special, often tacitly taken-for-granted criteria for what is relevant, important or acceptable in the activity in question.

In the present study, we have seen how the activity type of language teaching comprises activity specific premisses for communication, i.e. activity specific criteria for relevant action and activity specific frames for interpretation that differ in several respects from those operant in the non-didactic conversations.

The study has been conducted as an investigation of the participants' behaviour from various angles: their active participation as well as their refraining from activity, the specific design they give to their contributions, the content of the utterances they are allowed and allow themselves to make, as well as the interpretations they display of each others' behaviour. Hereby, it has been possible to uncover several aspects of the premisses for communication valid in the different settings represented in the corpus.

It stands out clearly that linguistic utterances function differently in different activities, that they should be -- and are — interpreted differently according to the purpose and content of the activity in which they are integrated parts. How linguistic expressions function in interaction and how they are endowed with meaning and interpreted when purposefully used in communication is a, perhaps even the, crucial aspect of their semantics. Thus, if we are to account for the meaning of a word, phrase or sentence, we cannot merely abstract from the contexts of its use. Linguistic expressions are routinely associated with contexts, and when we try to understand what their meanings are, we can hardly avoid invoking or constructing contexts for them, be they only fragmentary. In the present study, I have tried to contribute to the demonstration of this fundamental property of language by means of a comparative investigation that highlights one concrete communicative situation: language teaching.

One way of summarizing the results of the study in this respect, would be to show how the meaning of any trivial linguistic expression depends heavily on the context of the activity in which it is uttered. A kind of question which is frequently used precisely in language teaching, but also imaginable in virtually any other dialogue situation, is the following:
"What does X mean?" (X being an arbitrary linguistic expression).

First of all, when posed in a language teaching situation, we might expect its pragmatic function to be different depending on the actor role of the questioner, i.e. whether the question is posed by the teacher or the pupil. In the latter case, it is far from certain that the question be taken as a question to be answered directly; instead, it may be immediately played back to the questioner — something like "what do you think it means?" — or answered indirectly by some hints or clues that serve to make the questioner come up with the answer him/herself (cf (14), page 68f, above). Such a scenery seems rather inconceivable if the question is a teacher question. Thus, actor roles, and rights and duties connected to them, are part of the premises of communication operant in an activity. Specific moves in the dialogue seem more or less exclusively connected with a particular role in a particular situation; when another actor uses a similar expression, it does not count as the same move.

Second, what is an adequate answer to "What does X mean?" depends on tacit relevance criteria which are to greater or lesser extent activity specific. As was shown in chapter IV, references to experience-based, exo-linguistic, specific circumstances that justify the use of X on a concrete occasion — the way (100) would be answered in many everyday contexts — are typically treated as insufficient answers in the language teaching situation. There, X should rather be conceived of as an item of the language system, and answers in general, abstract terms, concentrating on its prototypical, paradigmatic relations to other items in the system, are preferred. This is a demonstration of the fact that linguistic meaning is contingent upon the purpose and content of the activities in which language is used. Relevance criteria of the kind demonstrated above are important parts of the premises for communication in specific situations.

Thirdly, when actually asked by the teacher as a part of a language lesson, questions like (100) tend to be answered minimally and in a linguistically not very elaborated fashion. The question, then, seems to be interpreted as demanding one or two single words in answer, whereas outside the language teaching activities, questions of roughly the same formulation but resting upon different premises, are regularly responded to more extensively and are sometimes taken as a point of departure for more substantial contributions from the answerer (chapters V and VI).

So, what does 'What does X mean?' mean? Within the context of this discussion, the answer would be: different things in different contexts. A reasonably precise answer to the question cannot be given without reference to factors of the context of the activity where the expression is used, the answer taking into account the premises for communication on which it rests.

In conclusion, I would argue that, if we take as the theoretical point of departure that linguistic meaning emerges in situated use of language for purposeful communication within specific activities, we find a huge, interesting and urgent task for empirical research on language: to try to uncover the various premises for communication which are connected with different activity types, and their interplay with the linguistic resources brought to use by communicators.
3.3 The language lesson as a communicative event

Though inherent complexities in the language teaching situation — what was called 'the decontextualization paradox' in chapter I — makes it particularly interesting for a study of the relation between language and context, that issue is, in principle, as relevant for the study of any communicative situation. However, a second aim of this study was to give a characterization of the language lesson in its own right. There are two different results that I would like to emphasize in this connection. The first one is the hybrid character that was found to be a typical trait of language use within language teaching activities (section 3.3.1, below), the second one is the close relationship between dialogue patterns and the content of the lesson activities (3.3.2).

3.3.1 The hybrid character of language use in language teaching activities

In chapter IV, an effort was made to describe characteristic features of the conception of language underlying language teaching activities and the prevailing perspective on language that forms part of the premisses for communication in the language lesson. Though I certainly do not want to dismiss the value of that description of language-as-talked-about, "level 2", I would not emphasize the characterization of level 2 as an analytical construction as the most interesting or noteworthy result of the analysis. Rather, I would like to call attention to the repercussions of the level complexity on the concrete, communicative practices during language teaching activities. The striking thing in the actual dialogue process is not the existence of two distinct levels of language, but, on the contrary, a certain character of continuous vacillation, ambivalence and confoundedness, which may be interpreted as a compromise between the exigencies of — what is analytically conceived of as — the two levels and the particular perspectives connected with them.

This ambivalence shows up e.g. in the following ways: materials for level 2 manipulation of linguistic items are typically fetched from texts where facts are presented or stories told, the interpretation of which calls for the ordinary, level 1, perspective on language and communication. Words and expressions are interpreted in the ordinary way when originally used in these contexts, inferences are drawn, coherent messages constructed and reconstructed on the basis of the texts. However, eventually, when linguistic items are drawn from these texts, recontextualized in the language teaching perspective and treated at level 2, qualitatively different premisses are established in a more or less invisible way. What seems to happen, then, is that the ordinary way of using language, originally applied to the texts where the items occurred, continues to exert an attraction, and, as a result, ambiguity and tension arise between the levels. Let me give another, simple, example where the same thing happens: when real pencils are presented to the pupil as the material for an exercise on the comparison of adjectives. In an everyday perspective, judgments concerning the length of one or two pencils — as well as all other aspects which may be relevant to a description of how one finds them — depend on the particular use of
the pencils one has in mind. Two not equally long pencils may both be considered (sufficiently) long e.g. for writing — especially if the only one I have got is considerably shorter — in which case the difference is irrelevant. The example may seem somewhat trivial. Still, it points very clearly to the important phenomenon under discussion. In an exercise on the comparison of adjectives, carried out in the level 2 perspective, the relevant aspects to concentrate on are the juxtaposition and contrasting of the positive, comparative and superlative forms of a particular word-item, the adjective long, and, possibly, the form of the endings which make up the inflected word-forms. The presentation of real pencils to compare, however, may (inevitably?) activate completely different relevance criteria. The situation is ambivalent, there is ambiguity between comparing adjectives as word-items and comparing real-world objects to which, certainly, the particular adjective that is manipulated may very well apply, but in a different way and in one out of many possible aspects in which they may be seen, described and talked about.

At this point of the discussion, it may be necessary to make explicit an important caveat concerning the aim and scope of the present study. What I have tried to accomplish in my work, given my particular theoretical perspective and the kind of data available, is a descriptive analysis, as sharp and veracious as possible, of pertinent phenomena in the situations under investigation. I have tried to avoid being normative — it is up to the reader to judge whether or not, or to what degree, I have succeeded. What I would like to avoid also is a normative reading. As pointed out in chapter II (p 23f), research on teaching situations is very easily interpreted primarily and directly in terms of "good/bad-for-the-learning". Furthermore, it cannot be excluded that some of my descriptive terms — e.g. ambivalence, ambiguity, confoundedness — suggest a normative reading, and, in that case, be taken as negative terms. This is not the intended effect of the analysis. What I strive for is to present material for critical reflection — critical in the sense of unprejudiced, intellectual activity, not in the sense of negative evaluation (see also section 7, below).

3.3.2 Variation in dialogue patterns connected with types of lesson activities

Though it seems to be an overall feature of the lessons that the pupil remains passive and that the teacher exercises an overwhelming interactional dominance, as well as a huge quantitative dominance, this relation is by no means constant. On the contrary, the pupil's interactional territory seems to correlate with variation in activities within the confines of the lesson. This result is not merely an interesting finding, it may also be an important one for the practice of language instruction.

The ultimate goal of second language teaching is to help the pupil gain mastery of the target language. Certainly, there is no one miraculous way of doing this, nor are there any direct and self-evident ways in which this goal may be broken down into more specific goals for particular lessons or lesson activities. In general terms, however, one could easily think of two such guidelines for the teaching activities:
1) The pupil should be taught about language, i.e. the lessons should provide him with theoretical knowledge about linguistic elements, structures and usage. Such knowledge would then be seen as a necessary, or at the least beneficial, indirect way to proficiency in the target language.

2) The lessons should create opportunities for the pupil to take part in rich and varied interaction using the target language as the medium. This, of course, should be done in a way that is adapted to the student's current stage of development. In this case, the lesson activities are seen as a more direct way to language proficiency: there is teaching of language — teaching which aims at learning by doing — rather than teaching about language.

The role of explicit knowledge in language acquisition has been one of the most debated questions in second language research during the last decade (see e.g. Krashen, 1982; McLaughlin, 1978; Sharwood-Smith, 1981; Bialystok, 1981, 1982; Lightbown, 1985; Felix, 1981; Königs & Hopkins, 1986, just to mention some of the important contributors to this debate). Those who claim that theoretical knowledge is of little or no utility in the acquisition process, would of course quite dismiss 1) as a rational goal for second language teaching, while others would see both 1) and 2) as worthwhile. This study is not directly concerned with the question. Indirectly, however, the results will have some repercussions on the issue.

What the results of the present study seem to indicate is that the two goals can scarcely be pursued simultaneously, i.e. within one and the same lesson activity. In the present corpus, increasing focus on language per se — taken to be the gist of goal 1) above — seems to be incompatible with goal 2). When there is teaching about language in what was called the level 2 perspective, the pupil cannot — or does not — give any relevant contributions to the dialogue, his participation in the interaction suffers greatly and he is actually playing an extremely passive role, his utterances being reduced to scanty phrases and single words. As soon as the focus of the activity is changed — be it by the manipulation of the situation as in the non-didactic conversations, or on the participants' own initiative within the very frame of the lesson — the pupil's participation undergoes a clear shift and it does not seem too risky to say that this is where he could find his opportunities for actual practice of the target language (we are now only talking about language lessons). On the other hand, as there is no longer any particular focus on language, such activities do not differ from ordinary conversation and one dimension of the language lesson as a particular activity created in order to provide special, 'short-cut' opportunities to promote language learning seems to be lost. Hence, the findings highlight the difficulties of reconciling in language teaching the goal of, on the one hand, transmitting theoretical knowledge about language, and, on the other, the goal of training practical language skills. Again, I would like to stress that the statements I make are not per se to be understood in a normative perspective, as evaluations of what goes on in the lessons of the corpus or in second language classrooms in general. Rather, the description could serve as a point of departure for a discussion of goals and means in second language teaching, a
discussion from which I do not wish to withdraw, but for which this study is not a suitable forum.

5 The deviant cases

As a necessary consequence of the projected detailed level of analysis, the corpus of the study had to be kept rather small. Together with the undeniable fact that language teaching is multi-faceted and may vary in lots of dimensions (see e.g. figure in Viberg, 1987:110), this forces one to bear in mind that the results are suggestive rather than conclusive. The study is mainly explorative, i.e. I have tried to uncover dimensions of the communicative event of language teaching, focusing on a notional apparatus for describing what goes on, rather than to test specific hypotheses in a perspective of verification/falsification.

As pointed out in chapter III, the material first gives an impression of heterogeneity, as if nearly all kinds of activities that correspond to what one impressionistically knows about what is offered in S2L-teaching had entered the eight lessons. Through the use of a classification of lesson activities in terms of their purpose and content, however, this initial impression of heterogeneity gives way to a picture of striking homogeneity in the results. It seems thus, that the criterion 'focus-on-language' that forms the basis for the classification, captures a fundamental dimension of language teaching activities in terms of dialogue properties connected to them.

As a matter of fact, the heterogeneity of the material appears to be of two kinds. On the one hand we have the variation in subject matter (i.e. what is meant to be learnt in a specific moment), teaching materials and modes of presentation that takes place within activities where focus is on language per se and where the level 2 perspective is predominant. This kind of variation seems not to influence the dialogue to any important degree. In other words, whether e.g. the task is to manipulate verb forms according to the mode of presentation of exercise book A or to transform sentences from indirect speech to direct speech according to reader B, to treat the spelling of a particular sound, according to one specific method of teaching orthography, or to train a particular difficulty of pronunciation, the dialogue still exhibits the properties typical of grammar and spelling/pronunciation exercises respectively. Only when the focus is shifted away from language, be this shift partial as in text and vocabulary exercises or complete as in non-teaching activities, does the dialogue change, in the latter case radically. Hence, this is the second type of variation that we find in the corpus, most clearly manifested in two of the lessons that strike one as deviant cases.

The existence of these two deviant cases, the first half of lesson 1 and almost the entire of lesson 3, obviously has the disadvantage of making an already small corpus so to speak even smaller. As they are exceptional in virtually all dimensions investigated, this leaves us with six and a half lessons of the ordinary kind. On the other hand, the deviant cases can be seen as strengthening the arguments put forward in this study. Not only do they bring
out in full relief the fact that variation in content of language-centered activities has little impact on the dialogue, they also provide evidence that a shift of focus transforming language from the core content of the lesson to a means for carrying out non-linguistic tasks may lead to far-reaching changes in dialogue processes also within lessons. The result emphasized above in section 3.3.2, that there is a close relation between the content of language lesson activities and dialogue patterns, is thus corroborated by what is found in the two lessons that are radically different in content.

6 On some specific characteristics of the lessons in the corpus

The facts that the lessons of the corpus are dyads, consisting of the teacher and a 10-12 year old child, where — most of the time — there is language teaching going on, and that the language is taught in a second language situation, not a foreign language situation, may necessitate some reflection on three particular points. First, are there any fundamental differences between teaching in dyads and teaching in a whole class? Second, is language teaching different from the teaching of other school subjects such as geography, history, mathematics etc, and more particularly, foreign languages? Third, to what degree are the problems that pupils encounter in coping e.g. with the abstract level 2 perspective due to their young age?

6.1 Dyads vs classrooms

One of the most prominent results of this study is the similarity between communication patterns in the teacher-pupil dyads and what is known from a lot of other studies about communication in classrooms of the ordinary kind, i.e. where there is one teacher and many pupils. This is true for the amount of talk on the part of teacher and pupil respectively (chapter VI) and — even if no numerical values like IR differences are at hand from studies of classroom communication — for the teacher dominance and the pupil's passivity as he sticks principally to minimal contributions to the dialogue (chapter V). These patterns are strikingly reminiscent of studies of communication in ordinary classrooms.

Objectively thus, not much seems to change between classrooms and dyads. Subjectively, however, the difference may be enormous, for the teacher as well as for the pupil. Several teachers have told me that they experience teaching in dyads — for better or worse — as very different from teaching in groups of three or four pupils, not to mention classes of 25-30 pupils. For the pupil, the difference should perhaps be even greater between having, in principle, every second turn at talk in a dyad, and sharing the pupils' turns in a classroom with a number of classmates, then being able to bid for the floor when he feels he has something to say but staying in the background when this is not the case.
In general, one could actually speak of a hybrid character in the very make-up of the situation: a dyadic teaching situation does not have some of the characteristics that make traditional lessons recognizable as lessons, viz. the individual teacher facing the collective of pupils. The dyad per se, as the constellation for a lesson, may activate, or at least give associations to, radically different social encounters, while still sharing other fundamental properties with the traditional frames for lessons. There may be a built-in ambivalence between an ordinary two-persons' social encounter and the classical format of a lesson.

One crucial point as far as parallels between dyads and classes are concerned, should be whether, in a class, there is direct communication between pupils (on the official level of discourse, cf Granström, 1987) or whether each pupil addresses his contributions to the teacher only — a pattern that has been reported in several studies (e.g. Wagner, 1983; Long & Porter, 1985); Anward (1983:55) even formulates such a pattern as a rule for classroom interaction. If that is the case, it does not seem unjustified to conceive of the classroom as a quasi-dyadic situation, the only difference being that the role of the pupil is acted out by several persons jointly, but still remaining one single dialogue role. In the former case, i.e. when pupils can communicate with each other, yield and take the floor without the teacher's intervention, one could expect communication patterns to differ more or less radically from teacher-pupil dyads. Wagner (1983) shows, however, that a merely simulated change of roles in such a way that one or more pupils temporarily act as teachers, may lead to no changes at all in e.g. question-answer patterns.

Another potential dissimilarity concerns the extent to which the pupil can influence the content and course of the lesson activities. In principle, it should be easier for the teacher to take up explicit or implicit suggestions from one pupil with whom (s)he is alone than to do this in a situation where several pupils may have competing interests. For instance, changing from the planned lesson activities to kite construction in lesson 3 was easily done when the only persons concerned were the teacher and a pupil who was very eager to bring about this change. Things would have been far more complicated if there had been many pupils present, some of whom may have preferred story-writing, fill-in exercises or whatever classical lesson activities there are. In the lessons of the corpus, with this salient exception of lesson 3, the particular possibilities in dyads of following the pupil's propositions, suggestions and associations — visible e.g. in level shifts (chapter IV) — are not much exploited. It cannot be excluded that this reluctance to indulge in digressions and, so to speak, freer lesson activities is at least partly an effect of the presence of the tape recorder: as the situation to be recorded was defined as an S2L-lesson, the teachers may have been less disposed than usually to accept deviations from the prototypical format of a language lesson.

6.2 Language lessons vs other subject matters

A central point in my reasoning, especially in chapter IV, is that there is a gap between everyday experiences of language and communication and the conception of language that underlies language lesson activities. The stock of knowl-
edge about language which is transmitted through teaching is characterized by a high degree of abstraction and generalization and is hereby a reduction of the experiences we all gain when using language under concrete and specific circumstances. Similar gaps such as the one investigated in this study, though not specifically concerning language, have been discussed by Anward (1983), who conceptualizes teaching as the reproduction of a canonical text, representing a formalized stock of abstract knowledge for classroom use. The discrepancies between everyday, common-sense thinking about certain phenomena and the theoretical conception of them that prevails in didactic situations are the focus of studies on other school subjects such as physics (Lybeck, 1981) and mathematics (Säljö & Wyndhamn, 1987, in press). The striving for abstraction and generalization, thus, does not seem to be specific for the teaching of language, but tends to appear in school situations in general.

However, what makes the language teaching situation particularly intricate is that it is the very means of communication, language, that is submitted to such a treatment. In the teaching of other subject matters than language, language is still used for reference and description in principally the same way as outside the classroom — though of course constrained by the typical parameters of the classroom situation, e.g. the specification of roles as expert and ignorant. When e.g. in a natural science lesson the topic is space and the planets (cf Anward, 1983), there are certainly lots of restrictions on what counts as relevant contributions to the course of the lesson — as "valid talk" (Bergqvist & Säljö, 1987) — and lots of everyday associations that (especially younger) children may come up with that are disregarded and not ratified, i.e. treated as not worthy of being included in the official discourse of the lesson. In other words, the knowledge that is to be transmitted is a regimented knowledge which to a high degree makes abstraction of concrete and specific experiences, especially of private character (Einarsson & Hultman, 1984:110ff).

In conclusion then, language lessons have much in common with the teaching of other subject matters, the striving for abstract and general descriptions being a common characteristic of educational settings. It seems however, that when this formalization of knowledge concerns language, additional complexities come into play. Particular dialogue processes investigated in this study, viz level conflicts, level fuzzyness and level shifts described in chapter IV, presuppose what was labelled a linguistic enclosure and are therefore specific for teaching activities where language no longer is a mere means of communication but is focused in its own right, and where linguistic items are being uttered which are not to be understood as contextualized use of language. Occasionally, in the literature on other aspects of educational discourse, one can find examples of these phenomena, occurring when language is manipulated as mere structure and empty form. Sjorslev (forthc.) discusses a lesson of Danish as a mother tongue where the subject matter is grammar, more precisely the problem of identifying nouns as a part of speech. The pupils work with a picture and are supposed to suggest nouns and put the indefinite article in front of them. As one pupil suggests "a boat", another pupil protests, pointing out that there are two boats in the picture. However, if the word boat is to be treated as a word-item, it does no longer refer to whatever there is in the picture.
and the comment by the second child is a complete misunderstanding of how the utterance "a boat" should be contextualized.

What I would like to claim is that language teaching activities — be it in foreign language teaching, or in second language teaching, or in grammar, spelling, or reading exercises in mother tongue instruction — create problems that are specific to activities where language is the core content and linguistic items have to be detached from the context in which they are uttered, and no longer be used for reference and description.

However, the second language situation may possibly give a particularly acute character to some of the phenomena investigated. Again, we may speak of a certain hybrid nature of the situation as such. It is clear that much of what we have seen in the lessons of the corpus is modelled on a conception of language teaching which is predominant also in foreign language teaching: the concentration on explicit knowledge of language as a self-contained system. In the foreign language teaching situation, this may be seen as fairly natural and unproblematic, perhaps even the only option given. In a second language situation, however, a great deal of other factors come into play. It is obvious that "natural acquisition" can play a considerably more important role in a second language than in a foreign language. Furthermore, in the second language lesson, seen as a social, communicative encounter between teacher and pupil, the target language clearly can play a part, and often does, in lots of communicative functions where the use of the target language in a foreign language lesson would hardly come into question. Hence, a certain ambivalence between, on the one hand, the ordinary, everyday perspective on language, and, on the other, a specific language teaching perspective, may be built-in into the second language lesson to a higher degree than into a foreign language lesson, where different functions and perspectives of language often are connected with the use of two different languages (i.e. the mother tongue and the foreign language).

### 6.3 Children vs adults

In the society of today, much of the second language instruction at different levels is given to adult people. Apart from all necessary reservation, expressed above on several occasions, concerning the possibilities of generalizing from a small-scale, explorative study like this one, one may ask oneself whether the problems in handling the linguistic enclosure and all the consequences for dialogue and interaction that these entail and which have been studied in detail, are due to the fact that the pupils of the corpus are only 10-12 years old. One might say that it is no wonder that these children have difficulties making the necessary abstraction, e.g. they cannot have reached what, in the Piagetan tradition, is called "the stage of formal operations". This may be so (in which case the fact that the readers, teaching materials, exercise books etc that are used actually have children as target groups seems somewhat bewildering), still I would like to claim that it is by no means a simple question of age and maturity. First of all, as pointed out in chapter IV, the problems with levels have been considered from the point of view of communication, not from the point
of view of the presence/absence of an absolute competence. We saw dialogue sequences where the pupil actually was working at level 2 — even in sequences where the teacher seemed to take another perspective — thus showing signs of such competence. In general, pupils seem perfectly capable of operating at level 2, given that the premises for the language practices are unambiguous (cf Liberg, forthc., who studies very young children's discovery of the abstraction underlying reading and writing). Barring this point, it is clear that studying a subject's competence to perform something, possibly under favourable circumstances, is one thing, investigating communicative practices connected with various premises for communication quite another (Hundeide, 1977). The latter has been the focus of the present study; to the present author, the former question seems of lesser interest in connection with the study of second language lessons as a communicative event.

It is clear that what I have called the level 2 perspective on language rests upon a deeply rooted cultural (and scientific) tradition in Western culture and that the educational system is the primary means for diffusion of this tradition. Hence, we could expect cultural differences as well as differences due to various degrees of socialization into formal schooling also among adults who receive second language instruction, and, therefore, a varying degree of familiarity with such a perspective. This, in turn, may make the situation in adult education similar to what we have seen in instruction for children.

Secondly, and perhaps even more important, once we have learnt to adopt the level 2 perspective when this is needed or the adequate thing to do, this does not mean that we abandon the naive, everyday perspective and attitude towards language. On the contrary, as soon as we start using language the ordinary way, we are bound to rely on normal procedures for contextualizing utterances. In other words, the level 1 perspective cannot be replaced by the level 2 perspective, it can only be temporarily backgrounded. This means that it is always present and may reappear.

Indeed, in lesson sequences cited in other studies on classroom interaction in adult language instruction, one may sometimes find examples of exactly the same processes as those identified in this study. Håkansson & Lindberg (forthc.), in an investigation of questions used in second language lessons for adults, cite a sequence where the teacher introduces an exercise on the comparison of adjectives. When doing this she takes as an example — in the typical ambiguous way discussed in chapter IV — the hair length of two of the students in the group. In my terminology, she clearly works at enclosing the word-item long, but the students' interest eventually is caught by the question how "long, longer, longest" actually apply to the students' hair, to curly hair, to different hair dressing etc. Thus, we have an example of a level shift.

My hypothesis would be that the separation of the two levels of language and the handling of the linguistic enclosure are pervasive problems also in many forms of language instruction for adults. How far this hypothesis will turn out to be confirmed could be an interesting task for future research.
7 On applicability

Research on educational phenomena is traditionally met with high expectations on applicability. Research results are often conceived of as being immediately transferable into recipes for concrete action; politicians and administrators expect educational problems to be solved by means of specific research projects, teachers either expect from researchers the solutions to teaching difficulties, or express their disappointment over the uselessness of research when such solutions are not provided. This attitude may be enhanced by what Säljö (1986:118) describes as a "hypothetico-deductive model of scientific thinking" prevailing in educational sciences, a model in which the role of research is actually "one of inventing new and improved methods of going about teaching and learning and/or establishing what methods are most efficient in a given situation" (ibid, p 117). In the view of the present author, such an ambition is not only, as Säljö (loc cit) points out, likely to fail, it is also dangerous. It is doubly dangerous since the important — and different — tasks of both teachers and researchers in society are jeopardized and thereby their possibilities of jointly bringing about change (cf Schön's, 1983, critical discussion of the dominant model of professional knowledge, which assumes that solutions to day-to-day problems can simply be derived from underlying, basic or applied, sciences).

In the case of the researcher, (s)he will be someone who prescribes guidelines for action to be carried out by other people in situations in which (s)he, the researcher, is not directly involved and of which (s)he has access to knowledge about only a few parameters. To take just one example from the field of second language instruction, Pienemann (1984, 1985), on the basis of his "teachability hypothesis", proposes that syllabuses in language teaching be modelled in accordance with the findings on the order of acquisition of specific linguistic structures. However well-grounded the research findings as such prove to be, and the aim of the present discussion is certainly not to express any doubts whatsoever in this respect, the proposal reveals a fairly mechanistic view on the way research findings apply to the complexities of reality. Emphasis on one particular facet tends almost inevitably to lead to other aspects being overlooked; language teaching runs the risk of being reduced to a question of linguistic structures being taught in one order or another, instead of being considered as a highly complex social event in which a number of factors, many of which are yet to be uncovered, interact in ways, still to a high degree uninvestigated, in order to shape its particular design — or rather designs.

When it comes to the teacher, (s)he will find her/himself in a position of an irresponsible and passive consumer of research results. These results typically have emerged in a striving for generality and cannot be unreflectedly applied to the varying particularities of the different situations in which teachers perform their daily work. In such a position, there is a great risk that teachers will not bring their own creativity to operate on the dynamics of their specific teaching situation. At the worst then, the researchers' suggestions for change based on a scientific perspective that is simultaneously too general and too specific —
general as research has to make abstraction of a certain amount of the complexities inherent in real life situations, specific as research typically deals in depth with one or a few particular aspect(s) at a time — would lead to the inhibition of the perhaps most important potential for change: the teachers' own creativity and responsible action.

Though, actually, utility is often presented as the legitimacy of research, utility in this restricted sense of mechanistic applicability must be seen as a disavowal of the professionalism of both researchers and teachers. The privilege — or the disadvantage — of the researcher's typical position is the non-involvement in the permanently on-going activities, a sample of which (s)he studies. Such a position is obviously ideal for reflection, but not necessarily propitious to influencing practical action. Thus, making use of the particular opportunities for deeper, critical reflection is a most important ingredient in researchers' professionalism. The work of teachers, on the other hand, is action-oriented and may leave little room for distanced reflecting upon the events in which they take part as actors. In consideration of this complementarity of their respective predicaments, the utility of researchers for teachers would rather lie in furnishing careful descriptions of classroom events in which teachers may, or may not, recognize their own experiences and in proposing conceptual tools and developing a language which might facilitate reflection which is, in such a case, integrated in the particular action contexts and thus more likely to be able to lead to actual change — if the need is felt and the conditions for change at hand!

Hence, the arguments sketched above are not to be understood as a plea against the importance of educational research for teaching, or more generally, theory for practice. When applied (sic!) to the present study, the argument means simply that it would be irresponsible and, indeed, a way of downgrading the teaching profession to try to derive from the results more or less categorical prescriptions for how second language teaching should be carried out (cf. Hyltenstam's, 1985, distinction between specific and general applications). Similarly, it would be irresponsible and a way of depreciating the work accomplished, if practitioners expected mainly straightforward solutions and recommendations to result. The possible importance of the work lies elsewhere.

As a matter of fact, to the extent that the characteristics of dialogue in language lessons preoccupy teachers — and my experience is that they do to a high degree — concepts used in this investigation, some of which are certainly not new, but rarely emphasized in connection with language teaching (e.g. the context dependence of language), and others which have actually resulted from the analysis of the lessons of this corpus (e.g. those used to describe dialogue processes in chapter IV), may sensitize teachers as to hitherto overlooked aspects of their work, serve as a tool in articulating these and make it easier to reflect upon, discuss and thereby change practice.
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Appendix A

Instructions for the non-didactic conversations

Child-child conversation, picture book task, oral instruction (example, taken from Ch2)

1. Brain-storming phase

R: // eh en gång när vi var ute i en skola och spelade in på detta sätt att vi alla barn som var i klassen, att dom skulle rita tre bilder, (C:ja) dom ritade en indian, ett slott, ett höstträd, alla pojkarna alla flickorna alla barna här i den klassen gjorde det, så var det en sak när jag tittade på dem som jag blev väldigt förvånad över, dom hade skrivit namnet på baksidan va, /HARKAR SIG/ men när man tittade på teckningarna så kunde man se precis vilka... som en tjej hade gjort, vilka som en kille hade gjort. Man kunde ta en teckning så här titta på den så här, ha måste vara en tjej, så vände man på det att titta, hja, det var det, så t...og man en annan, nå det måste vara en kille, vände på det att titta, ja det var det. Så kollar dom att teckninga precis olika b. bilder va att det där tyckte jag var jättespännande faktiskt, så jag ska fortsätta lite grann med det, då ska jag be en massa barn /SUCKAR/ olika skolor, att dom ska...göra en bildesbok, fast...aa ni ska inte behöva inte göra bilderboken utan ni ska bara eh bestämma vilka bilder ni skulle vilja ha med, så om vi tänker så här då, att eh...ni skulle gå ut med en kamera, att ta bilder här, i Småstad, bör ni här båda två i eh området

C: när jag bor ute på landet

R: bor du på landet där inte

C: hja

R: brukar du vara här ibland att eh efter skolans

C: näa, jag cyklar åt

R: så du känner till det här eh /C:ja/ området också

C: dom fika bor ju här i vår klass

R: ja, just det, jag tänkte det

P: jag bor här

R: du bor här

P: jag ska flytta

R: jaså. Men om vi tänker så här då, att ni...hade en kamera, så skulle ni gå ut att ta bilder på Småstad, det här området å /P:mm/ ställen som dom brukar vara på här /P och C:mm/ då ska det vara bra bilder va, bra motiv, så att man verkligen ser att det är eh Småstad så att man...det ska vara såna saker som ni tycker om här, så dom tycker är bra, samt som ni kanske inte tycker är bra att tycker är dumt å så. Å så ska jag kunna titta bil på bilderna då då ska jag se att det här tycker nu, det här...så här ser Småstad...ut, så ska jag kunna jämföra då om jag lät...två killar göra det att om jag lät två tjejer göra det, dom...om dom tar...samtida bilder. Å då säger vi att ni får ta en hel rull då, jag tror att det är...tycker bilder eller nänting, men ni får tänka på att varje kort kostar pengar då så ska inte sätta bilda under det ska vara...bra bilder va, så att det inte bara är ett bild eller en /SMÅSKRATTANDE/ myra eller nänting /C och P: SKRATTAR/ som kan fannas var som helst va utan det ska vara nänting som å...verkligen då...som är Småstad va, att det kan vara så...både såna bilder som du vill ha med då Yousuf så såna som du vill ha med, så om när kommer med förslag då så får ni diskutera, är det där en...bra bild eller... kan vi hitta nåt hättre
1. Brain-storming phase

R: // er once when we were out in a school recording like this we asked all the children who were in class, to draw three pictures /C:yes/ and they drew an indian, and a castle, and an autumn tree, and all the boys all the girls every...all the children in that class did so, and then there was one thing when I looked at them that made me very surprised, they had written their names on the back right, /CLEAR THROAT/ but when you looked at the drawings you could see exactly which ones...a girl had made, and which ones a boy had made. You could take a drawing like this, look at it like this, okay it must be a girl, then you turned it over and looked, yes, it was, then you took another one, no that must be a boy, turned it over and looked, yes it was. So boys and girls drew completely different pictures right and that I thought was very exciting really, so I'll go on a bit with that, and then I'll ask a lot of children at /SIGHS/ different schools, to make a picture book, but...well you won't have to make the picture book but you'll only decide what pictures you would like to have, and if we think like this, that er you should go out with a camera, and take pictures here, in er Littletown, do you both live here in er the area

C: no I live out /out er in the country
R: do you live in the country out there
C: yeah
R: do you come here sometimes and er after school and...
C: well, I ride my bike and so on
R: so you know this er /C:yes/ area too
C: most of them live here in our class
R: yes, that's right, I thought so
P: I live here
R: you live here
P: I'm gonna move
R: oh. But if we think like this, that you...had a camera, and then you would go out and take pictures of Littletown, this area and /P:mm/ places you often go to /P and C:mm/ and then they should be good pictures right, good subjects, such that you really see that this is er Littletown and that you s...they should be such things that you /like/ here, and that you think are good, things you maybe don't think are good and think are silly and bad and so on. And then I'll be able to look the pic...at the pictures then and then I'll see that this is what you think, this is what Littletown looks like, and then I could compare if I had...two boys doing it and if I had two girls doing it, see if they take the same pictures. And then let's say you can take a whole film, I think it's twenty four pictures or something, but you have to realize that each photo costs money then so you shouldn't waste the pictures but they have to be...good pictures right, so
that it isn’t just a tree or an /LAUGHING A LITTLE/ ant or something /C
and P: LAUGH/ that could be anywhere right but it should be something
which is really...which is Littleton right, and they can both be such
pictures that you want to have Yousuf and such that you want to have,
and then if somebody comes up with a suggestion then you’ll have to
discuss it, is that a...good picture or... can we find something better

(2s)
C: that was tricky
R: that was tricky?
C: yes
R: but you understand what you should do don’t you
C: yes s...
R: right then or you can sit in peace and quiet and do it /C:mm/ talk about it
/P:mm/ and I’ll go out, come in again in a couple of minutes, so you’ll see

P: /SIMULTANEOUSLY/ are you gonna switch that off
R: so we’ll see what you’ve thought of. No it’ll be running
P: mhm
R: mhm /LEAVES/

2. Decision phase

/KOMMER IN/
C: nu har..vi har kommit på sexton nu
R: oohl!
C: ja
R: då kom ni loss då
K: ja...
R: /AVBRYTER/ men vet ni vad jag..tänkte då
C och P: nå
R: att så många som sexton, det var ju jättebra att ni kom på, men om man
skulle göra den där bilderboken då kanske man inte kan ha med alla
sexion /C:nå/ men det är bra att ni har många förslag, men om ni skulle
ta..bestämma er för vilka som är de fem bästa utav dom som ni har
kommit på, å föröka komma överens om det

C: mm
P: eh det vet vi
R: vänta, å sen när ni har gjort det, då ska Yousuf få ett kuvert utav mej här,
å när ni har bestämt dom där /SKOLKLOCKAN RINGER/, nu ringer det, eh
när ni har bestämt dom där fem
P: vi har tjuge minuter kvar
R: javisst, när ni har bestämt dom här fem bilderna som ni tyckte var dom
bästa utav alla förslag ni kom på, då får du öppna det här kuvertet
P: /VRIKT/ nu?
R: nåa, när ni har pratat färdigt om..om bilderna /C:mm/ å så..läsa det å så
står det vad ni ska göra där
P: å tillsammans?
R: mm
P: då lägger jag det där
R: det kan du göra /GÅR UT/

2. Decision phase

/ENTERs/
C: now we have..we have thought of sixteen now
R: ooh!
C: yes
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R: so you really got going
K: yes...
R: /INTERRUPTS/ but can you guess what I...was thinking
C and P: no
R: that as many as sixteen, it was really great that you could think of so many, but if you're going to make this picture book then perhaps you can't have all sixteen /C:no/ but it's great that you have so many ideas, but if you could...decide which are the five best ones out of those you've thought of, and try to agree on that
C: mm
P: er we know
R: wait, then when you've done that, then Yousuf'll get an envelope from me, and when you've decided on those /THE SCHOOL BELL RINGS/, there goes the bell, er when you've decided on those five
P: we've got twenty minutes left
R: sure, when you've decided on those five pictures that you thought were the best out of all those you thought of, then you can open this envelope
P: /EAGERLY/ now?
R: no, when you've finished talking about...about the pictures /C:mm/ and then read it and it says there what you should do
P: and together?
R: mm
P: so I'll put it there
R: you can do that /LEAVES/

Child-child conversation, discussion tasks, written instructions

1. A couple of children stayed playing around in the classroom during a break.
   They smashed a window-pane but sneaked away before anyone had seen them.
   The teacher got terribly angry and tried to find out who had done it. Someone had to pay for the window-pane. But nobody admitted to it.
   Then the teacher said that the class could not go on the excursion they had planned.
   Many children in the class got angry. Why couldn't they go on the excursion.
   They had not smashed the window-pane. But the teacher said they could not go until someone had admitted to it.

   DISCUSS: Was the teacher right? What can you do when nobody admits? What do you think and what does your friend think? Discuss thoroughly different possibilities!

   When you have finished the discussion you can open the small envelope on the back of this sheet!

2. A class had participated in a quiz contest. Anders, Eva and Lotta had been chosen to compete, because they were the best pupils in the class. They were successful. They won 5.000 crowns.
   The class thought that the whole class could go on a journey for the money. But then Anders and Eva said it was their money and that they would keep it for themselves. They were the ones who had competed and won. The others had only been cheering them on.

   DISCUSS: What is best and most fair? That the whole class does something together? Or that Anders, Eva and Lotta get the money for themselves? What do you think and what does your friend think? Discuss thoroughly what you think!
Adult-child conversation, picture book task, oral instruction
(example, taken from Ad2)

1. Brain-storming phase

A: ha ska vi sätta igång då
R: ja det kan ni få göra
P: ska vi göra?
R: ja s...sätt dej ner där..för vi se
A: ska jag sitta här
P: /ÖHÖRBART/
R: ja du kan sitta där. Jo, Yousuf han eh gjorde ju tillsammans med Sven förut här en bilderbok /P:mm/ över eh Småstadsområdet här, jag tänkte att du skulle kunna göra samma sak ihop med Karin nu då, fast eh om ni skulle göra en sån bilderbok över eh skolan här /P:mm/ vad som är...vad ni tycker är bra å eh roligt å vad som kanske är eh trist å dunt, om det /C:mm/ finns nåt sånt, på skolan här, Å då kan det ju vara så att det är lite olika... vad man tycker å vad man tänker på, om man är elev som du, om man är lärare som du va, så ni får diskutera då lite grann eh vad ni skulle vilja ta för bilder som skulle vara... bra bilder på... Lillskolan i Småstad. /P:mm/ Och eh då sa vi förut...det var...eh att ni får ju ta då rätt många bilder va, ja tjufyra stycken sa vi...
P: /SAMTIDIGT/ tjufem...
R: att det fanns på en rulle va...
P: /SAMTIDIGT/ ja tjufyra eller nåt sånt där
R: /SAMTIDIGT/ eller tjufem eller nåt sånt där. Om ni kan komma på så många va
P: /SAMTIDIGT, ÖHÖRBART/ mm
R: men det ska ju vara rätt bra bilder då va så att det inte ser ut som vilken skola som helst, utan att man ser att det är den här skolan det skulle handla om
P: mm
R: likej, då vet ni hur ni ska göra...
P: /AVBRYTER/ hela Småstad?
R: Lillskolan
P: mhm
R: mm /GÅR UT/

1. Brain-storming phase

A: okay shall we get started
R: yes you can do that
P: are we to do?
R: well s...sit down there..we'll see
A: am I to sit here
P: /INAUDIBLE/
R: yes you can sit there. Okay, Yousuf he er together with Sven here just made a picture book before /P:mm/ about eh the Littletown area here, I was thinking you could do the same thing together with Karin now, but er if you could make such a picture book about eh the school here /P:mm/ what is...what you think is good and er fun and what is maybe er dreary and daft, if there /C:mm/ are things like that, in the school here, and then it can be so that it's a bit different... what you think and what you think of, when you're a pupil like you, when you're a teacher like you right, so you'll have to discuss a bit er what pictures you would like to
take that could be... good pictures of... Little school in Littletown.
/P:mm/ And er we said before..it was..er that you'll have to take quite a
lot of pictures right, well twenty four we said
P: /SIMULTANEIOUSLY/ twenty five,
R: that there were on a film right..
P: /SIMULTANEIOUSLY/ well twenty four or something like that
R: /SIMULTANEIOUSLY/ or twenty five or something like that. If you can
think of that many okay
P: /SIMULTANEIOUSLY, INAUDIBLE/mm
R: but they have to be quite good pictures right so that it doesn't look just
like any school, but so you can see that it is this school it's all about
P: mm
R: okay, so you know how to do it..
P: /INTERRUPTS/ all of Littletown?
R: Little school
P: mhm
R: mm /LEAVES/

2. Decision phase

/R KOMMER IN/
R: /MUMBLAR, OHÖRBART/ hitta ni på många bilder
A: jaa
R: håller ni på fortfarande
A: vi håll på fortfarande, ja
R: det gjorde ni
A: mm
R: hur många har ni då
P: matsal, ute, C-huset, expeditionen, syster, hur många var det nu, fyra,
fem /R:ha/ var det nog
(4s)
R: eh (2s) ifall ni har tänkt på flera, så skulle vi göra så då att ni skulle
bestämma er för vilka som var dom fem bästa, om vi nu inte kunde ta
med alla, alla v..i... ni hade haft till den här bilderboken så gällde det
då å... komma på vilka som var dom fem som ni absolut ville ha med å...ni kan ju ta å diskutera igenom det en gång till om ni har dom..dom fem
bästa bilderna, sen får du ett sånt här kuvert igen då Yousuf
P: ja
R: å när ni har diskuterat färdaligt det så får du öppna det så står det där vad ni
ska..
P: aa
R: hm, det gör ingenting att du får sitta inne lite på rasten va
P: det gör inget
R: det är bra det. Åkej

2. Decision phase

/R ENTERS/
R: /MUTTERS, INAUDIBLE/ did you think of many pictures
A: yes
R: are you still working
A: we were still working, yes
R: you were
A: mm
R: so how many have you got
P: dining-hall, outside, the C-house, the office, the nurse, how many did that make, four, five /R: I see/ I think it was

(4s)
R: er (2s) if you've thought of more, then we could do like this that you could decide which ones were the five best ones, now if we can't take them all, all v...the ideas you've had for this picture book then it's a matter of... finding out which were the five that you absolutely wanted to have and... you can well discuss that through once again if you have the...the five best pictures, then I'll give you another of these envelopes

P: yes
R: and when you've finished discussing it you may open it and it says what you're to...
P: yeah
R: hm, you don't mind having to stay a bit during the break do you
P: I don't mind
R: that's fine. Okay

Adult-child conversation, discussion tasks, written instructions

1. A class was going on a journey to Stockholm. The teacher thought that everybody should bring exactly the same sum of pocket-money, 50 crowns.
   But in the class there were some pupils who thought this was wrong. They thought that everybody should be allowed to take as much as they wanted. Why should we care that others don't have that much money, they said.

   DISCUSS: How do you think it should be? What does your teacher think? Discuss thoroughly what is good about everybody having the same sum and what is good about everybody bringing as much as they want. What would you do in your class?

   When you have finished the discussion you can open the small envelope on the back of this sheet!

2. (PICTURE OF A ONE HUNDRED CROWNS NOTE)

ONE HUNDRED CROWNS! That's what we pay for being allowed to make these recordings.
   The whole class has been recorded, but you and your teacher have participated most.

   DISCUSS: How to use the money? What is best? What is most fair? What do you think and what does your teacher think? Discuss thoroughly different possibilities and make a suggestion.
Appendix B

Special rules for the IR coding of the activity type "Lessons of Swedish as a second language"

A. On reading aloud

1. When the task has been given to read a passage, the reading is, in standard cases, to be considered as a minimal response, <, insofar as P does not add e.g. a comment or a question (i.e. goes beyond the reading); then, of course, the coding will be ◄ or ◄.

2. If T, after P's having read a passage, interjects a question or a comment which is ignored by P, who, instead, continues reading, P's turn will be coded ◄ (i.e. P links back to an earlier — non-locally linked, temporary suppressed — initiative). (Note that the category ◄ concerns only (minimal) responses to a question of one's own.)

3. T's inserted corrections of, and remarks on, the reading is to be considered as non-locally linked; thus, the response part will be ◄. The initiative part will be merely assertive, ◄, if the correction is given, soliciting, ◄>, if it only points out that there is an error or what the error is but leaving to the partner to make the correction.

4. Corrections are to be considered, according to point 3, as opening an inserted sequence; P can return to the reading via immediate linking (cf coding manual p 96), i.e. if P after the repair continues reading (but does no more than that) it will be an ordinary minimal response.

5. If P reads a passage but makes a mistake and is corrected, this is not grounds for treating the reading as an inadequate response. In contradistinction to this, it will be considered as an inadequate response if the remark is reiterated because of P's failing to make the correction.

6. However (cf 5), if P starts reading but does not have the time to read anything interpretable before being interrupted, the turn will be considered as X (turn miscarriage).

7. What is said above about reading concerns cases where reading is a task imposed on P. Obviously, situations can occur where (s)he reads something as a means of introducing new substance on his/her own initiative, in which case the reading will be coded as an initiative in the ordinary way.

The principle that the imposed task of reading is a pure response does not apply exclusively to the pupil; the teacher can also be set (or set to him/herself) the task of reading and the coding then will have to correspond to what would have been the case, had P been the one to read. Such reading, however, must not be mistaken for cases where the teacher reads a question or a task, thereby posing it for the pupil to solve. In such cases it is obviously (in normal cases) a matter of a soliciting initiative.

B. Teaching materials

1. A question or a task which is, as it were, posed via the teaching material and on which the pupil starts to work, will have to be considered as posed
by the teacher in cases where (s)he has the right to evaluate (accept/reject) the pupil's answer. A contrived example:

> T: Then we have an exercise here, you can start there
—> P: /READS FROM THE EXERCISE BOOK/ What is the name of the capital of Switzerland? (2s)
=> T: What's its name, B...
—> P: Bonn
=> T: Ber...
< A P: Bern
< A T: that's it
< A P: /READS/ What is the name of the capital of Austria? Vienna.
< T: mm

2. At times the pupil may have a series of consecutive turns (not interfoliated by reactions from the teacher) which are answers to questions posed in the teaching material. These will have to be coded < (or, if expanded, <>).

C. **Other matters**

A "coder's trap" is that the verbal comment accompanying a non-verbal act often sounds exactly like a termination move, of the kind which otherwise would be coded with a right parenthesis:

/lesson of S2L, written exercise on transforming sentences from indirect speech to direct speech/

< 1 P: /WRITES/ I have... I have... bartered... the goat... for... a... horse, no what was it, sheep

: > 2 T: what should you say
< 3 P: a sheep
< 4 T: mm
< 5 P: /WRITES/ okay

In spite of a prosody of termination in turn 5, it will be coded as a minimal response; its function is to mark that the non-verbal act has been carried out, not to terminate a subgame on the level which justifies a coding with <).

**Special rules for the IR coding of child-child and adult-child conversations**

1. In the brainstorming phase (of the picture book task), especially in child-child conversations, quite a few turns occur which are more or less empty fillers: "er what could we have..", "we can have er..". These are coded X (and thus already coded in the transcript used for co-judging) insofar as they are not:

   a) clearly directed to the conversational partner asking him/her to make a proposal

   b) taken up by the partner as a genuine question

   In such cases it is an ordinary, soliciting initiative, <>. 

2. Also, it happens quite often in the picture book task that the participants count how many subjects they have found. Since the task was one of
finding approximately 24 pictures, the counting will have to be considered as a normally integrated part of the task solving, i.e. in the standard case not give rise to a coding with colon (corresponding to a shift of aspects).

Often, indicating the number of the proposal is but a task-specific way of accepting a proposal, in which case it will be coded as if the speaker had said "yes", "okay" or the like, i.e. as a minimal response.

3. The picture book task is to be considered as one task, i.e. a new proposal coming after an inserted sequence will not be considered as a free initiative, but, in accordance with what is written in the manual (the 1986 version) about non-local immediate linking.

4. Principally important is that it is the interaction between the two parties of the conversations that is subject to the coding and that the researcher as "experiment leader" does not take part in their interaction.

This means, firstly, that no linking can be made to the researcher's turns - when instructions have been given, the first turn taken by any of the participants, the one which starts the activity in the dyad, is a free initiative in the interaction between the two parties, and will be coded as such.

Secondly, this has consequences for how to code the reading of the discussion tasks in the latter half of the conversations. The coding cannot be based on the wording of what is read (cf how reading is coded in lessons). Instead, what is to be coded is the reading as an act in the interaction between the two parties. The fact, for instance, that the text read ends in a question ("Was the teacher right?" or the like) is not grounds for coding this as a question posed by the one who reads it; instead it is the researcher's question to both parties. A couple of stylized examples:

(1) > A asks his/her partner to read
< B reads
< A gives his/her standpoint

(2) > A asks his/her partner to read
< B reads and gives his/her standpoint

(3) A reads on his/her own initiative
< B gives his/her standpoint

(4) A reads on his/her own initiative and gives his/her standpoint

(5) > A reads on his/her own initiative and asks the partner for his/her standpoint (i.e. asks a question that goes beyond what has been read)
< B gives his/her standpoint

(6) > A proposes to read him/herself
< B accepts
< A reads

In examples (1)-(5) A's first turn is coded as a free initiative; obviously, whether this is actually the case depends on what preceded in the sequence in question — whether the turn is the one that starts the new activity or whether it is in some way linked to the preceding conversation.

Other sequences than those exemplified may certainly occur. They should be possible to code in analogy with what has been shown.
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