ABSTRACT

The aim of the research reported in this thesis is to investigate the 'ways and means' that non-native speakers (and in particular, Greek learners of English) as well as native speakers of English make use of to communicate and solve problems of unhearings, mishearings, misunderstandings and lack of shared knowledge as they negotiate meanings in order to do a problem solving task. A number of taped conversations were discoursally analysed. It was found that all participants have used similar communicating/learning strategies to organize and manage interaction in English. These strategies are distinguished into two categories: the constitutive features and the regulative features of communication. The former are made up of the overall interaction structure strategy, topic development strategy and the minimal communicating strategy. The latter are made up of strategies that regulate interaction organization and management when crises in communication arise. Participants use similar strategies to communicate because the cognitive processes that language users rely on to communicate and learn through language seem to be similar. Actually they seem to be part of the 'knowledge and experience' language users develop when mothers/adults interact with them to help them mature cognitively/perceptually/socially/linguistically in order to become competent members of the society. L2 learners seem to have transferred this 'knowledge and experience' from L1 to L2 communication. The findings suggest that processes and strategies should make up the category of communication universals. They may also lead to 'learn-as-you-communicate' developments in ELT where learners may actively use their 'knowledge and experience' as processes and strategies to communicate and learn, inside or outside the classroom. Exploitation of processes and strategies
may also influence syllabus design, teaching materials, teacher/learner roles and classroom methodology in an EFL situation in particular.
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Introduction

Recent developments in ELT have stressed the need for developing not only the learners' linguistic skills but also their communicative abilities in the L₂ so that they may become able to use the foreign language as a tool to communicate. It is common knowledge, however, to all practising teachers that L₂ learners do manage to find ways to communicate in the foreign language, no matter how poor their knowledge of the foreign language might be. The ways and means, however, that learners make use of to achieve this end are not clear to us. This has led Rivers and Temperley, 1978 - when they are discussing criteria for evaluating learners' interaction - to write:

"... The quality of the interaction will be judged by other criteria: ability to receive and express meaning, to understand and convey intentions, to perform acceptably in all kinds of situations in relation with others. The means by which the student attains these desirable goals will be a function of personal learning strategies.* We can allow these full play through the provision of a wide choice of activity options, but we cannot determine for others what they shall be."

(Rivers & Temperley, 1978:60)

(* The emphasis is mine.)

The present research is directed towards discovering what these ways and means are and what decides the selection of one over the other. In other words, the research aims at discovering the strategies foreign language learners (with particular reference to the Greek learner of English) make use of to sustain interaction with native speakers as well as non-native speakers in a verbal encounter. Especially I hope to locate the strategies interactants resort to in order to get messages across, negotiate meanings and keep the conversation going in face-to-face interaction.

In Chapter 1 I briefly discuss recent developments in ELT, namely, the notional/functional and the discourse-orientated
developments, and concentrate more on reservations expressed about these developments. My main argument is that these developments have overlooked the fact that communication is a psychological as well as a sociological phenomenon. The sociological aspects have outweighed psychological considerations which can lead to such questions as how people learn to communicate and what is the nature of communication beyond the sociological perspective.

In Chapter 2 I discuss how children learn to communicate non-verbally first, and later on verbally, within the context of the interactionist approach. Verbal communication presupposes a certain cognitive and perceptual maturity in children. During the non-verbal stage of communication, children develop their communicative intent which serves functions that are not culture-specific and learn many rules of communication, not as overt linguistic behaviours but as psychological cognitive processes. In his/her efforts to learn to communicate, the child is greatly aided by the strategies mothers use in mother-child interaction. These strategies are as much learning strategies as communicating strategies. The same strategies the child makes use of later on when talking to younger children.

In Chapter 3 I discuss the nature of communication in terms of purpose of communication and communicative backgrounds of successful communication; also in terms of development of communication in face-to-face interaction and meaning in communication from the point of view of a participant in an event, as well as of an outsider to the event as a function of selection and application of strategies by speakers/hearers in natural communication. The discussion about learning to communicate (Ch.2) and about the nature of communication (Ch.3) leads to the argument that communication is
the outcome of the interaction of two types of knowledge: knowledge as product (i.e. linguist code, ritual culture-specific considerations, knowledge of the world at large) and knowledge as process (i.e. psychological cognitive processes) that decide on the selection and application of one strategy over another to achieve cohesion and coherence in communication. Communication can be realized in actualized language behaviour verbally or non-verbally. Knowledge as process and strategies constitute a language user's 'knowledge and experience' of how to communicate and learn through language. As such they are universal and, therefore, transferable from one language to the other. Consequently, native and non-native speakers are expected to make use of similar strategies to communicate. And, indeed they do!

In Chapter 4 I discuss the Experimental Design. Pairs of non-native speakers, as well as pairs of non-native and native speakers were asked to construct a jigsaw puzzle. Participants, however, did not share the same factual and possibly linguistic information about the jigsaw. Consequently, they were expected to reveal the strategies they make use of to bridge information gaps, to sustain communication and negotiate meanings as they would be cooperating to do the task they were assigned, namely, to reconstruct the jigsaw puzzle.

In Chapter 5 I briefly discuss approaches to communication analysis and the difficulty discourse analysts face in order to incorporate all features involved in communication in one model for pedagogical purposes. Next I discuss a model of analysis of foreign language communication as a model of competence in organizing and managing discourse. The model is a modified version of Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) model of classroom interaction.
analysis. I discuss the structural and functional aspects of the strategies participants (non-native speakers as well as native speakers) make use of to communicate and learn through language. The strategies identified are distinguished into two kinds: macro-strategies and micro-strategies. The macro-strategies are: topic development, overall interaction structure and the minimal communicating strategy. They constitute what I have called the constitutive features of foreign language communication. The micro-strategies are strategies the participants make use of when there are crises in communication such as unhearings, mishearings, misunderstandings, lack of shared knowledge or silences, and constitute what I have called the regulative features of foreign language communication.

In Chapter 6 I discuss the functional properties of micro-strategies in terms of the general and specific functions they serve; the interpretive procedures that become suspended in the course of interaction; how normalization of interaction is achieved, by picking up the appropriate strategy; who initiates, who acts; their place in interaction and how they can be recognized. Micro-strategies help interactants to regulate and sustain communication.

In Chapter 7 I discuss the pedagogical implications of the findings reported in the present research. The findings support learner-centred, 'learn-as-you-communicate' developments in LT. Such developments require a change in syllabus design, classroom methodology and teacher and learner roles in the classroom, especially the EFL classroom.

In Conclusions and Further Research I summarize the findings, I discuss the short-term and long-term consequences of the research
reported here and I suggest areas where further research might be undertaken.
1.1 New Developments in ELT

It has long been accepted that knowing a language does not just involve knowledge of linguistic forms. Language is always used in a social context and cannot be fully understood without reference to it. Choice and understanding of linguistic forms depend on features of the social situation and the social conventions held in a particular society, as is shown in the work done in the philosophy of language (Austin, 1975; Searle, 1965), the sociology of language (Fishman, 1972; Gumperz, 1968); the ethnography of speaking (Hymes, 1972b, Labov, 1972b), and interaction analysis (Sacks et al. 1974; Goffman, 1976; Schegloff, 1971).

Searle, for instance, discusses the conditions that must hold true for certain speech acts to be realized as such, basing his concept on the general notion of authority. He is mainly concerned with the meaning of the sentences and focusses more on the intentions of the speaker and the conventional linguistic devices he might use to put across his intentions. Labov, on the other hand, sets up his conditions as discourse rules and attempts to show how utterances can be interpreted as actions by reference to them. The rules have to do with social constraints like rights and obligations. His orientation is sociological whereas Searle's is philosophical.

Also Hymes argues that we cannot talk about language in terms of linguistic competence only, as is advocated by Chomsky, 1965, but we must talk about a language user's communicative competence, that is, his ability to use language appropriately. As Hymes (1964, 1972a) maintains, language users learn what to say to whom, when, and where. For Hymes, communicative competence means the
speaker's ability to produce appropriate utterances, not only grammatical sentences, because as Hymes observes, "A person who chooses occasions and sentences suitably, but is master only of fully grammatical sentences is at best a bit odd. Some occasions call for being appropriately ungrammatical." (Hymes, 1972a: 272)

In short, language is now viewed as a powerful instrument for doing things with words (as argued by the philosophers of language), as well as an accurate exemplification of the social conventions, beliefs and class divisions of a society as argued by sociologists, sociolinguists and ethnomethodologists.

ELT has been influenced by this shift of emphasis from the code to the language in use. The new developments are the notional/functional approach and the discourse-orientated approach. I shall briefly refer to them and concentrate more on reservations expressed about the functional/notional developments as well as the discourse-orientated developments.

1.2 The Notional/Functional Developments in ELT

In the realm of ELT the notional/functional approach was the first outcome of the new explorations in the nature of language.

This shift of emphasis from the situation in the situational approach to the intentions and purposes of the speaker in a more communicatively orientated approach to ELT was based on the research done by a team of experts under the auspices of the Council of Europe, (cf. Wilkins, 1973b, 1976b; Trim, 1976; Van Ek, 1975). The philosophy behind this approach to teaching and learning has been that the individual uses language (be it his L_1 or L_2) to express his intentions and purposes, to say
what he has chosen to say. He does not choose linguistic realizations imposed on him by the external situation as is the case with the situational approach. If this were not the case, then individual speakers would not be able to go against the situation and social constraints if they chose to do so. As a result, communicative acts, such as humour, irony, disrespect and so on, would not be known to us if choices of linguistic realization were merely imposed by the physical and social conventions of a situation.

The exponents of the notional/functional approach maintain that syllabuses and teaching materials should not be based on linguistic grading but on the learners' needs, that is, what purposes the learners want to learn the L₂ for. The learners needs will tell us what notions/functions they want to express in the L₂ for communication purposes and in which situations. Then it can be decided what forms are appropriate for the realization of these notions/functions. Finally, the appropriate linguistic realizations may be presented cyclically around certain themes and topics. Teaching materials of this type, for instance, can be found in Strategies (Abbs B. et al.) 1975; Encounters, (Jupp T. et al.) 1980, among many others. (For further discussion about notional syllabuses see Wilkins, 1976b.)

However, this may be the case in ritualized routines such as those reported by Labov, 1972c; Watson, 1975; Frake, 1964, among others. Labov, for instance, has worked out the rules for ritual insults, a language game Negro boys play in Harlem, New York. The participants in the game call names at each other as well as at each other's close relatives. In choosing the names the boys follow the rules of the game, starting from bad language and gradually moving to the worst possible language, as if on a scale of delicacy. The steps to follow are determined by the situation.
The aim of the notional/functional approach is to ensure that the learners know how functions and notions relevant to their needs and the situations they are expected to be involved in are realized. The learners are then expected to use this knowledge to express their own intentions and purposes in situations they may be personally involved in.

Reservations, however, have been voiced about the notional/functional approach as a basis for communicative language teaching. (cf. Widdowson, 1978a; Brumfit, 1978a; Hill, 1977). The main points that have been argued against it are:

a. the difficulty in devising a taxonomy of functions/notions that will feed back in syllabuses and teaching materials.

b. the lack of sound grading of functions and their linguistic realizations lead to language-like rather than real language behaviour, and

c. the insufficient attention paid to learner's own learning strategies.

Besides, I would argue here, the notional/functional approach to ELT stresses the learners' active role as speakers, that is, the learners' productive abilities, since it primarily aims at developing the learners' ability in how to ask questions; how to invite; how to refuse and so on. The other side of the communication process, that is, the receptive abilities of the learner in the context of the 'listener who will become the next ratified speaker' has not been seriously considered. Generally speaking, this issue has been overlooked by all other approaches to ELT, too.

Communication, however, is a cooperative enterprise between participants in a speech event, who are members of the same
linguistic community. It involves a give-and-take process from one individual to the other, as a speaker and listener interchangeably, where negotiation of meaning and compromise between participants constantly takes place. This process is based on an interaction of topic, the biographies of the participants, their role, status and setting where taking the other's perspective into account is crucial for understanding communication. A communicative approach to ELT, therefore, ought to consider both productive and receptive abilities of participants in a communicative event as complementary, not as two individual skills. In Chapter 3 I shall discuss in detail why I think this is important for a communicative approach to ELT.

1.3 The Discourse-Orientated Developments in ELT

The above mentioned reservations on the notional/functional developments led some scholars to look at coherent discourse as a basis for communicative language teaching.

The exponents of discourse-orientated development in ELT (cf. Widdowson, 1972a, 1976b, 1978b; Candlin, 1975, 1976a, 1978) are especially concerned with the ways in which the nature of communication as an active process might be made clear to the language learner, that is, how

"the exchanges between interlocutors are theoretically patterned and how understanding of these exchanges, and in particular their internal sequencing, depends on understanding the cultural, interpersonal and dynamic components of the speech situation." (Candlin, 1975 : 73)

It is hoped, therefore, that by discoursally analysing a number of interactions relevant to the needs of the learners and the setting, one can reach some conclusions on how functions and their linguistic realizations are interrelated in the act of communica-
tion. This knowledge may feed back into syllabuses, LT materials and communicative exercises (simulations, role-playing).

Candlin et al., 1976, for instance, describe how taped doctor-patient cubicle consultations were discoursally analysed. The resulting function networks were then fed back into teaching materials and communication practice exercises for foreign doctors who came over to Great Britain for postgraduate studies. Also in Fox, 1978, it is reported how Anglophone Canadian Public Servants' telephone conversations were discoursally analysed. The results of this analysis fed back into teaching materials and communication practice exercises, where emphasis is given in the interplay of functions in coherent discourse. The materials were prepared for Francophone Public Servants in the government of Canada who must have a competent knowledge of English to handle telephone inquiries.

1.4 Reservations about the Discourse-Orientated Developments in ELT

I would suggest, however, that there might be several reservations about the discourse-orientated developments in ELT, similar in scope to those expressed about the notional/functional developments.

First, what is the nature of discoursally analysed materials? Can discoursally analysed materials make clear to the learner the dynamic process of communication that constantly involves negotiation of meaning in a purposeful collaboration of the participants? It seems important to carefully consider the nature of discoursally analysed interactions for teaching purposes in the context of face-to-face interaction. And this I will attempt to do in Chapter 3, Section 3.4.2 pp. 89-93.

Second, this approach to ELT is concerned with the pattern-
ing of function networks and the interplay of functions in coherent discourse, in other words, strategies for handling communication.

Do we really need to teach the learners communicating strategies or are they part of the 'knowledge and experience' the learners learned while learning their L₁, as argued by the interactionist approach to language learning? I shall discuss this issue in detail in Chapter 2. Suffice it to say now that the present research has come to the conclusion that interaction organization is part of the 'knowledge and experience' language users have of what language is used for and how it is used. This 'knowledge and experience' the L₂ learners learned through L₁ and is transferred from L₁ to L₂ communication. This issue is discussed in detail in Chapter 5.

Third, as with the audio-lingual, situational and functional/notional developments in ELT, the discourse-orientated developments have paid insufficient attention to learners' own learning and communicating strategies in the act of communication. The former refer to the strategies learners employ in learning what they do not know but need to know in order to communicate; in other words, the way in which they handle lack of shared knowledge. The latter refer to the ways and means learners make use of to communicate, as well as how learners overcome such communicating problems as unhearings, mishearings or misunderstandings in the act of communication. Generally speaking, the discourse-orientated developments like the functional/notional ones rely heavily on the sociological aspects of language in use in actual communication. As a result the psychological aspects of language in actual communication are overlooked. "The generation of
communication," however, "is a psychological and sociological phenomenon, operating within a cultural field and contextual constraints" as Blount remarks (Blount, 1975: 6). The discourse-orientated developments, therefore, can be better seen as a methodological approach to developing the communicative abilities of the L₂ learners rather than a learning theory. However, as the present research indicates, the very communicative abilities this approach is aiming at developing in the L₂ learners are the learners' own communicating and learning abilities. I shall discuss these issues in detail in Chapters 2 and 3. See also Chapters 5 and 6.

Of course, the importance of handling problems in communication and of advancing the learners' knowledge of the L₂ has already attracted the attention of several scholars. However, it has been seen simply as a problem of metacommunicative activities and as a teaching device, and not as an integral part of the communicating process.

Kimball and Palmer, 1978, for instance, argue that there are two kinds of output in the communicative activity they call 'dialog game':

---

Kimball & Palmer, 1978, report a communicative activity of theirs, which they call 'dialog game'. The 'dialog game' is an activity where a pair of learners is given a network of functions relevant to a specific situation with specific roles, such as, for instance, a clerk and a customer in a shop. The learners are expected to reproduce the dialogue, supplying the correct linguistic realizations. The choice depends on the situation, the roles the learners play and the actual meaning of what the previous speaker has said. In the 'dialog game' either the functions to be performed are given and the learner-participants supply the actual linguistic realizations for each function, or a list of possible linguistic realizations for each function for the learners to choose from, are supplied.
"a. The Formal Output which constitutes the dialogue that the players construct.

b. The Informal Output which constitutes the 'talk' about the information in the dialogue.

The players must engage in this kind of talk either to answer the question or when something has gone wrong, such as when one does not understand the other or feels the other has selected the wrong alternative." (Kimball & Palmer, 1978 : 20)

Kimball and Palmer, therefore, make a distinction between the dialogue, i.e. the formal output, in other words, what has run smoothly in the dialogue game, and the 'talk' i.e. the informal output, in other words, what went wrong in the dialogue game.

Candlin, 1975, on the other hand, stresses the need for a 'metalanguage' that will allow the learners to talk about the language they are learning. Talking about the L₂ formally and functionally, he argues, is a technique to improve the learners' knowledge of the L₂ so that they can understand "the cultural, personal, and dynamic components of the speech situation." So at Lancaster, he adds, the doctor students were encouraged to talk about discourse development in teaching materials and to criticize what was wrong in their performance or their fellow students' performance in communicative activities such as role-playing and simulations.

These scholars stress the importance of metacommunicative talk as a teaching device so that learners can improve their knowledge of the L₂ in terms of grammaticality and acceptability of utterances as well as pragmatics of language use. However, as research in mother-child, child-child interaction analysis has shown (I will discuss this issue in detail in Chapter 2), meta-
communicative talk, which I would define as 'talking about what went wrong and how not to do it again, in other words, learn what you do not know in terms of grammaticality and acceptability of utterances as well as pragmatics of language use in the context of a natural verbal encounter', is part and parcel of the actual interaction. It is not something one deals with after one has finished the conversation. Suffice it to say now that the ability to deal with metacommunicative talk in interaction, is part of a language user's communicative competence both as communicating and learning abilities and is part of the 'knowledge and experience' the learner has already learned while learning the L₁. As the present research indicates, L₂ learners do transfer their ability to learn and communicate as 'knowledge and experience' from L₁ to L₂ communication as a first basis of learning and communicating through language. I would define, therefore, a language user's 'knowledge and experience' as 'knowledge and experience about how to communicate and learn through language'. The reasons why metacommunicative talk needs to be an integral part of the foreign language learning-teaching process and not simply metacommunicative activities or a teaching device will be discussed below, in section 1.5.

Finally, how can teaching materials based on discoursally analysed interactions be graded for classroom presentation? This question does not seem to have been positively answered yet.

1.5 Metacommunicative talk: an integral part of the language learning and communicating process

When the language user is engaged in a communicative situation he is expected to use language (be it L₁ or L₂) in context in order to exchange messages. The notion of context has been
broadened to include the linguistic and the cultural norms of the community (in terms of accuracy and appropriacy, Hymes, 1972b), the communicative intent of the participants in the event, their personality and attitude to both the topic and each other interchangeably playing the roles of speaker/hearer, as well as their roles and status in society.

The information exchanged between participants in an event can be classified into three different types. The first is sometimes referred to as cognitive information (i.e. exchange of messages) (Laver & Hutcheson (eds.) 1972). This, they write, is "the propositional or purely factual content in the linguistic signals exchanged."

(Laver & Hutcheson (eds.) 1972 : 11)

The content and the form of the linguistic signals, they argue, evoke in the listener a particular moral, cognitive and affective awareness and allow him to respond appropriately. This awareness is the result of the listener's socialization within the norms and constraints of his society, his sensitization to various orderings of society as these are made substantive to various roles he is expected to play. Participants in an event structure and perceive the world through the language they have learned to use as a means of communication (Bernstein, 1972a).

The second kind of information exchanged is the so-called indexical information (i.e. expression of attitudes) (Abercrombie, 1967, reported in Laver & Hutcheson, 1972 : 11). This is information about the speaker himself. The listener uses this information to draw inferences about the speaker's identity, attributes, attitudes and mood. Participants in conversation use all the communicative strands - linguistic, paralinguistic, extralinguistic - of conversation for a variety of purposes. They use these strands
"to announce their individual identity and personal characteristics, as well as to state their view of the social and psychological structuring of the conversation."

(Laver & Hutcheson (eds.) 1972 : 12)

Participants usually project indexical information

"in order to define and control the role they play during the conversation."

(Laver & Hutcheson (eds.) 1972 : 11)

The third kind of information exchanged in conversation is called interaction-management information. (Laver & Hutcheson (eds.) 1972) Participants exchange interaction-management information in order to initiate and terminate the interaction in a mutually acceptable way, as well as to indicate the transitions within the conversation from one stage to another. This exchange enables the participants to control the time-sharing of the conversation, in terms of who should get or keep the floor and when he should yield it to the other participant (Sacks et al., 1974).

All this information is exchanged in communication by participants in an event. The L₂ learners already know how to handle the exchange of information as 'knowledge and experience' of how to communicate from L₁. The important issue of what constitutes a language user's 'knowledge and experience' about how to communicate and learn in the context of L₁ learning will be discussed in detail in Chapters 2 and 3. Suffice it to say here that communication is a dynamic process that requires the listener and the speaker to constantly engage themselves in the act of interpretation and production. Correct interpretation and production, however, can only be achieved if participants engage their knowledge of use and usage of the language and their communicative experience with reference to the situation in which the utterances are spoken,
the preceding linguistic context, their knowledge of each other and the topics they might discuss with each other and bring these to bear in the act of interpretation and production. The key to successful communication is the participants' sharing information relevant to the event they are participating in and using it appropriately for production and interpretation purposes. (cf. Chapter 3 for a detailed discussion on this issue.) The ability to participate in communication as a competent speaker/listener constitutes a language user's communicative competence.

It is not, therefore, too difficult to identify the crucial problem that the language learner constantly faces in L2 communication. When he attempts to communicate in the foreign language, he discovers that he does not yet know that society's cognitive orientation, nor the linguistic and cultural norms which are used to express 'cognitive information', 'indexical information' and 'interaction-management information' linguistically.

Does that, then, mean that he is not expected to engage in free face-to-face communication because his knowledge of the L2 is poor in all respects? We cannot ask him to engage in a communicative situation after he has learned the necessary repertoire for a particular communicative situation. Such an approach to language teaching will be frustrating to the learner. What the learner really wants is immediate results, otherwise he lacks adequate motivation and he considers L2 learning a waste of time. Frustration, as studies have shown (Gardner & Lambert, 1972) leads to dropping out of courses and to negative attitudes towards L2 learning.

What the learner urgently needs, I would argue here, is to
be able to bridge the gaps and solve problems of lack of shared knowledge of the L₂ as well as problems of unhearings, mishearings and misunderstandings on the spot, if communication is not to break down. In other words, he needs to handle metacommunicative talk as he communicates. The gaps and the problems over knowledge not shared by both hearer and listener might refer to substantive information (i.e. a matter of content of the conversation) or to L₂ linguistic and ritual norms, such as norms of sequencing (Labov & Fanshel, 1977), participants' rights and obligations (Labov, 1972a), background expectancies (Garfinkel, 1967) role and status (Cicourel, 1973), linguistic code, appropriacy (Hymes, 1972b) and so on, which act as constraints and resources for correct interpretation to function. For as Hymes puts it

"One and the same sentence, the same set of words in the same syntactic relationship may be now a request, now a command, now a complaint, now an insult, depending upon tacit understanding within the community. These understandings...involve recognition by the speaker and hearer of certain utterances as conventional ways of expressing or accomplishing certain things...pertaining to certain genres...and involve specific ways of interpreting speech in relation to its verbal and social context."

(Hymes, 1972b : XXIX)

It is obvious that the whole spectrum of the foreign language in terms of accuracy and appropriacy, cannot be taught, nor learned, to the level of a native speaker's competence. This is not feasible pedagogically, if the learner is ever going to use the foreign lang-
uage to communicate.

On the other hand, no language programme, no matter how it is specified, can really foresee the actual needs of the learner in every communicative situation he may be involved in. The learner, and in particular the EFL learner, will only be able to acquire bits and pieces of the L₂ for communication purposes through his formal teaching classes, assuming, of course, that a more cognitive communicative approach is followed. Therefore, unless the learner manages to bridge gaps as they crop up, in accordance with the situation demands, he will never manage to communicate effectively. Thus we come to the point where the learner's knowledge of the L₂ is limited, whereas his needs to use the L₂ as a means of communication may be limitless. It is important for him to avoid possible pitfalls as he has done and still does in his mother tongue (I discuss this point in detail in Chapter 2) when problems arise, namely, using appropriate strategies to talk about language. The strategies facilitate communication are as much communicating strategies as learning strategies. (I shall discuss this issue in detail in Chapters 2 and 6).

These communicating and learning strategies will allow the learner to modify and enlarge his knowledge of the L₂ of all three types of information exchanged in communication, and facilitate his communicative ability in the L₂ in the light of each new situation he is involved in, thus turning a communicative situation into a learning situation. So the learner is able to learn as he communicates what he needs, when he needs it, from whoever he interacts with, which makes such a 'learning-while-you-communicate approach to ELT' a truly learner-centred
one. (I shall discuss this point in detail in Chapter 7).

Furthermore, the question of what constitutes a standard language (British English, American English, Australian English and so on) and consequently the factors involved in a sociolinguistic definition of language in use (Hymes, 1972b; Fishman, 1972) cannot be predetermined as a kind of "fixed formality of linguistic etiquette to which all must conform". What is a norm in a community reflects the experiences, history, life style and interaction problems (in the ethnographic sense) of that community. Therefore norms of this kind cannot be established for ELT. Variation is to be accepted as influenced by other standards. Learners may come across a variety of native speakers of English, coming from different communities. They need to be able to learn on the spot the use and usage differences inherent in these varieties of English in order to communicate successfully. The $L_2$ learner will always be a life-long learner by definition. He will know less than his $L_1$ co-interactant and possibly his $L_2$ co-interactant in the ELT classroom. Therefore he needs to have at his disposal such communicating and learning strategies that will allow him to make use of his limited knowledge to cater for his limitless aim: to communicate in a variety of communicative situations and with various co-interactants whose knowledge of the $L_2$ may be better than his or worse than his.

It is important, therefore, for an approach that aims at developing the $L_2$ learners' communicative competence, to prepare them to cope with the unpredictable, that is, the new information they may come upon as they are interacting, be it a new linguistic form or a new cultural constraint and so on, as the case arises in interaction. In other words, it is important for the
learner to become aware of the communicating/learning strategies which will help him to bridge the gaps of 'shared rules of interpretation' (Cicourel, 1973), of 'common sense shared knowledge' (Garfinkel, 1967).

It is common knowledge, however, that learners do manage to communicate in the L₂ when the occasion arises, no matter how awkwardly. Rivers and Temperley have this to say about it:

"Linguistically gifted students will always develop confidence (in using the L₂ in true communication) with or without special guidance."

(Rivers & Temperley, 1978 : 17)

Only the learner himself can teach us how he does manage in the end to communicate in the L₂. In other words, what strategies he makes use of to communicate and learn, what strategies he uses to talk about language and thus develop his existing knowledge of the L₂ and expand it.

The identification of these communicating and learning strategies and their possible application in the EFL classroom is the central issue of the present research (cf. Chapters 5, 6, 7). However, in order to understand the nature of these strategies I shall first try to define how the child learns and develops his ability to communicate, and especially the role of mothers/caregivers and the ways and means, that is, the strategies, they make use of to help the child to learn and to develop his ability to communicate. This I will attempt in Chapter 2. In Chapter 3, however, I shall try to define the nature of communication.
Chapter 2

Learning to Communicate and Learn through Language

In this chapter I shall first briefly try to define how the child learns and develops his ability to communicate. In other words, I shall try to define the 'knowledge and experience' the L₂ learner has had from learning to communicate and learn with other members of the society he lives in. Second, I shall review the strategies mothers/adults and eventually the children themselves use to communicate and learn while they are communicating.

It is the argument of this thesis that the 'knowledge and experience' language users have from learning to communicate and learn in the L₁ can be positively transferred from L₁ to L₂ to facilitate L₂ learning and communication.

2.1 Approaches to Language Learning

Three basic approaches to language learning have been developed so far: the behaviourist, the nativist, and the interactionist approach. Although the two terms 'language learning' - 'language acquisition' have been taken to mean the same thing, Halliday, 1975b, points out that the two phrases are not synonymous in all senses but indicate two different approaches. To talk of 'language acquisition', he argues, is to imply that there is something 'out there' which the child must add to its possessions while remaining itself neutral to the process involved. This 'something' is usually conceived in terms of the structures of the adult language. On the other hand, Halliday argues, to talk of 'language learning' is to put the emphasis upon the process itself and to see the child as an active participant in the process. The distinction proposed by Halliday has
important consequences for ELT.\textsuperscript{4} I shall discuss this issue in detail in Chapter 7.

Of the three approaches behaviourism and nativism could be viewed as approaches to language acquisition (see below), whereas the interactionist approach, with its emphasis on process and the child's active participation, could be viewed as an approach to language learning (see below).

The exponents of the Behaviourist approach maintain that the environment heavily influences the child (cf. Skinner, 1957). Children acquire the linguistic behaviours presented and reinforced by the environment.

The Nativist approach is advocated by such theorists as Lenneberg, 1967, and Chomsky, 1965, among others. These theorists maintain that children learn to talk because they are either biologically or innately prepared to do so.

The main criticism against these two approaches to language acquisition is that they take the child's role to be a passive one. Language is something 'out there' that the language learner child is expected to acquire either because he is influenced by the environment or because he is biologically or innately prepared to do so.

The Interactionist approach, on the other hand, has attempted to explain language learning by emphasizing the active participation of the child in terms of the child's strategies for actively interacting with linguistic and non-linguistic aspects...

\textsuperscript{4} In the context of L\textsubscript{2} acquisition, Krashen, 1976, also makes a distinction between language acquisition and language learning. I shall discuss his views in Chapter 7, section 7.1.
of the environment in the course of his development. Language learning is largely determined by the active engagement of the child in using the linguistic signals of communication he is exposed to (as he does with the non-linguistic signals) and by the ways in which individuals in the environment respond and react to what the child says and does. This approach to language learning takes the child to be an active seeker and processor of new information, selectively paying attention to the environment as he communicates. Learning to communicate through language involves a natural two-way process where the child and the environment (human and physical) interact and influence each other in a reciprocal way.

Interactionist psychology (cf. Bruner, 1975b, 1977, 1978; Ryan 1974) has mainly dealt with the 'ways and means' i.e. strategies mothers/caregivers as well as children, make use of to communicate non-verbally as well as verbally. Verbal communication, however, presupposes a certain perceptual, conceptual and cognitive maturity in the children (cf. Section 2.3). It is cognitive psychologists like Piaget and his followers who have mainly dealt with the learning and development of perceptions, concepts, cognitive structures and abilities, as well as thought and reasoning in children. These two psychological approaches seem to be complementary. Indeed, several psychologists (cf. Sinclair de Zwart, 1973; Bloom & Lahey, 1978; Sinclair, 1978; Karmiloff-Smith, 1979) are clearly pointing the way towards blending these two approaches into a unified theory. I believe that this unification may have important consequences for EFL, since EFL learners are perceptually/conceptually/cognitively/ (and linguistically) developed when they get into learning the T.L.
2.2 The Interactionist Approach: Basic Assumptions

Snow, 1977b, discusses three basic assumptions that hold true about language learning in the interactionist approach. Firstly, she argues, language learning is the result of a process of interaction between mother and child as they attempt to communicate. Communication takes place in a context of content/form/use (Bloom and Lahey, 1978) which begins in early infancy and to which the child makes as important a contribution as the mother. This contribution is crucial to the child's cognitive, emotional and social development, as well as to his language learning. Learning to communicate is characterized by two basic stages: the non-linguistic stage, where other means but verbal presentation are used by the child for communication purposes, such as vocalizations, gestures, eye-movement etc; and the linguistic stage where the child more and more relies on language as phonological presentation to express his communicative intent.

The second assumption that underlies this approach is that the child's ability to express his communicative intent verbally largely depends on his cognitive and perceptual development (cf. Section 2.3 for a detailed discussion). This development takes place during the sensorimotor period (cf. Piaget, 1954) of the child's development (also Dore, 1978; Bruner, 1978; Halliday, 1975b).

The third assumption that underlies this approach refers to the child's producing simplified registers (a result of the child's active processing of content/form/use in an interactive situation). Interactionist psychologists consider it a communicative ability, the learning of which by the child is as interes-
ting and important as the learning of adult patterned syntax and phonology.²

Acceptance of these assumptions has been furthered by the results of mother/child interaction research. Much of the mother's speech to babies and young children can be explained as an attempt to establish a conversation and to keep the conversation going by giving the child the maximum opportunity to function as a participant in the interaction, aiming at helping him to develop cognitively/perceptually/socially/linguistically (Snow, 1978). Mothers, that is, help the child to develop his/her capacities so that he/she can eventually become a competent member of the society.

Language learning, therefore, is the result of the relationship between the speech children hear and what they see and do; in other words, it depends on the interaction of content/form/use in the social context (Bloom & Lahey, 1978). Bruner defines it thus:

"Language acquisition⁶ occurs in the context of an 'action dialogue' in which joint action is being undertaken by infant and adult."

(Bruner, 1975b: 55-56)

2.3 Learning to communicate in the interactionist approach

2.3.1 The development of a child's communicative intent as 'knowledge and experience'

Bruner, 1978 argues that many of the conventions that under-

⁵ Schumann, 1975, 1978, has emphasized this process of simplification for the acquisition of the L₂ in his pidginization hypothesis. See also Ervin-Tripp, 1974.

⁶ Bruner does not follow the distinction between language learning and language acquisition argued for by Halliday, 1975b.
lie the use of language are learned prior to the onset of the phonological presentation of language, because the child must be first cognitively and perceptually mature enough before he attempts to articulate. As Bruner points out, "speech makes its ontogenetic progress in highly familiar contexts" that have already been well conventionalized by the infant and his mother/caregiver. I take these familiar contexts to mean not only the physical environment, where mother-child interaction is taking place, but also all cognitive, indexical and interaction-management information (cf. Chapter 1, section 1.5 for definition of terms) relevant to the activity mother and child are engaged in. In this sense, Bruner goes on "it is not extravagant to say that initial language at least has a pragmatic base structure" (Bruner, 1978: 22). Also Dore, 1978b, discussing the ontogenesis of speech acts, considers the child's prelinguistic communicative experience and conceptual development along with the grammatical input (which he views as "linguistic hypotheses") as necessary conditions for learning to express speech acts linguistically. For Dore grammar in this sense is a formal marking of a prior semantic intention.

Bates, 1976, also strongly argues that pragmatics is the first and primary structure in the ontogenesis of language. Psycholinguistic research (cf. Brown, 1973) has suggested that syntax might be derived ontogenetically from semantics. Bates, however, carries this suggestion a step further, proposing that semantics is derived ontogenetically from pragmatics. Charles Morris, 1946 defined pragmatics thus: "Pragmatics is that portion of semantics which deals with the origin, uses and effects of signs within the behaviour in which they occur" (reported in
Moerk, 1977: 29); in other words, it is "the relation of signs to interpreters". (Charles Morris, 1946, reported in Moerk, 1977: 7).

Bates, 1976, however, considers Morris's definition rather narrow and focuses on "the multiple epistemological levels in language use", shifting from action to mental object and agrees with the pragmatist philosopher Charles Pierce's (1932) original distinctions of icons-indices-symbols. She defines pragmatics as "the study of indexical rules for relating linguistic form to a given context" and adds that these rules are of particular interest for the study of cognitive development in children (see especially Bates, 1976: 2-3). Bates argues that if, as Austin, 1962, notes "to say something is to do something" then the content of the child's early utterances is built out of the "child's early procedures or action schemes". Semantics, therefore, is derived from efforts to do things with words. And Bates concludes:

"Language is a powerful and complex tool, an artificial system that is created by the child in the same way that it evolved historically (...) in an effort to make meaningful things happen."

(Bates, 1976: 354)

Similarly, Halliday argues that the child develops his meaning potential to express his communicative intent through an interaction with his environment, physical and human. He maintains that any child has learned to express it in infancy and has used it to serve him in

"functions which exist independently of language as features of human life at all times and in all cultures."

(Halliday, 1975b: 66)

Halliday has distinguished two basic Phases in a child's func-
tional language development. In Phase I Halliday (1975b) argues a child's communicative intent is expressed through functions of language which can be identified separately in individual utterances. He distinguishes six different developmental functions in infants and young children expressed by different vocalizations or utterances. These functions are: Instrumental - Regulatory - Interactional - Personal - Heuristic - Imaginative. Later on, Halliday argues, that a seventh function must be added, the Informative function of language, which is a dominant function in the adult use of language. These functions, Halliday argues, serve two generalized ones: the pragmatic and the mathetic functions. Utterances of instrumental or regulatory nature serve pragmatic functions, whereas utterances of personal or heuristic nature that contribute to the child's learning about his/her environment serve mathetic functions. In Phase II, however, already in the second year, Halliday argues, both pragmatic and mathetic functions, the two generalized ones, are served by the same utterance. Thus children can satisfy their material needs and regulate the behaviour of others around them, while at the same time they use language to represent what they see and hear around them as they learn more about the relations of objects and of the social conventions in their environment. Eventually, Halliday argues, as the child develops into adolescence and adulthood he learns to use the language to express the three basic metafunctions identified in adults. Thus the individual functions converge in three major ones: the Ideational, the Interpersonal and the Textual.

As the research indicates, a child (and for that reason
the $L_2$ learner) has 'knowledge and experience' (of which he may not be conscious, of course) that his communicative intent has developed because of a pragmatic need for it. It was not determined solely by the language used in his environment. Consequently, I would define communicative intent as 'a child's pragmatic need to do things and learn through interacting with and manipulating the environment (human and physical) around him.'

2.3.2 The Verbal presentation of a child's communicative intent

Every child, however, is reared in a society where linguistic and social norms as overt behaviours differ from one another. The matching of the appropriate linguistic realizations and culture-bound ritual constraints (Goffman, 1976) with the child's expressing his communicative intent verbally is the work of the adults who, as Bruner, 1978, argues, "generally and often unconsciously impute communicative intent to the cries, gestures, expressions and postures of newborns as well as vocalizations and utterances of infants and children" (Bruner, 1978 : 25). This interpreted intent may be any of the Jakobsonian functions, Bruner, 1978, argues, expressive-poetic-conative-phatic-metalinguistic-referential. (cf. Halliday, 1975b; also pp.29-30).

Working along similar lines, Ryan, 1974 argues that what a child utters in early stages is difficult to understand, if not unintelligible within a context of interaction with adults. Adults, however, are motivated to understand the child's utterances, so, Ryan argues, "Children experience verbal interchanges with their mothers. During these the mother actively picks up, interprets, comments upon, extends, repeats and sometimes misinterprets what the child had said", (Ryan, 1974 : 99). All this
in an attempt to build up shared knowledge between herself and the child on which mutual understanding may be based. Bruner, 1978, reports that observations would confirm that Ryan's View holds true of even 3-month-old babies and their mothers. Ryan, 1974, emphatically states that the grammarians' adherence to well-formedness and semantic sense has obscured the role of these interpreted exchanges in preparing the child for language use. Ryan, 1974, also argues that mothers not only interpret the child's gestures and vocalizations in conative terms .... what he wants .... but also in terms of Grice-like maxims like 'sincerity' (i.e. "He is really faking when he makes that sound.") and 'consistency' (i.e. "Won't you please make up your mind what you want.") And all this, she adds, takes place in a social environment where sequencing, turn-taking and feedback are all relevant at the earliest stages of language development (cf. Bruner, 1975a, 1977; Shatz & Gelman, 1977) and eventually are necessary conditions for linguistic communication. (Ryan, 1974 : 99-100) (cf. Chapter 3 for a detailed discussion about the communicative backgrounds of successful communication).

To sum up, the child develops his communicative intent out of a pragmatic need for it in an attempt to discover and interact with the social and physical environment around him. And this is characteristic of all human beings. In this search the child is greatly helped by the doings and sayings of the adults around him. So the primary function of the speech of adults directed to a developing child is to help him discover the world around him (social and physical) and the conditions and inter-relationships that hold it together and to provide social, cognitive and linguistic information about it. All this takes place
in an attempt to build up a common ground for sharing knowledge that will allow communication (non-linguistic and later on linguistic) to function. Eventually the child learns to express his communicative intent linguistically, within the context of the linguistic and social norms prevailing in the society in which he is reared, for mutual understanding.

2.3.3 The components of communicative competence

In the context of the interactionist approach, learning to communicate non-linguistically as well as linguistically is taken to be the result of the interaction of these three basic domains of knowledge: linguistic-social-cognitive which the child learns in highly familiarized activities. These domains of knowledge are interrelated and interdependent since all are aspects of the same unitary development of the individual. Lewis and Cherry, 1977, present the following two versions of this interaction (see Figures 1. and 2. below), that exemplify well enough the philosophy of learning to communicate through language that underlies the interactionist approach.

(From Lewis & Cherry, 1977 : 231)
Version a. defines the interrelationship of linguistic, social and cognitive knowledge the individual is constantly learning as a result of his interaction with his environment. This knowledge is presented as a dynamic flow, in a state of constant change which exists within and without the individual since learning never stops (cf. Grimshaw, 1977). This version of the model covers both the pre-linguistic and the linguistic stages of a child's developing ability to communicate.

In version b. the relationship of linguistic-social-cognitive knowledge exists as the interaction of the three domains. The outcome of this interaction is the communicative competence of the child, that is, the child's ability to use language as a means of communication in the society in which he is reared.

In terms of the present research, I take cognitive knowledge to mean the cognitive orientation of an individual in terms of structures, abilities, processes and strategies as defined in the works of Piaget, 1954; Piaget and Inhelder, 1968, 1973; also in Sinclair de Zwart, 1973; Bruner, 1975b, 1978, among others. I take social knowledge to mean knowledge of the social norms and beliefs that are accepted and respected in a society. And, finally, I take linguistic knowledge to mean knowledge of the formal phonological and linguistic presentation of language in terms of a language user's knowledge of linguistic rules and phonological rules as accepted in a particular society.

Within this unified framework, Lewis and Cherry argue, important developmental linguistic phenomena can be observed. This development, they maintain, is "conceptualized as a gradual differentiation among the various domains and an awareness of the way
they are expressed through language" (Lewis & Cherry, 1977: 233). Children, of course, do not learn passively the conventional forms of adult language through which the three domains of knowledge are expressed; rather they are engaged in structuring the conventions in the process of interaction heavily relying on semantics and pragmatics, as research in L1 child-child interaction has shown (cf. Keenan & Klein, 1975; Keenan, 1977b, Shields, 1978).

In this active reconstruction of the social reality around them they are greatly helped by the strategies mothers/caregivers use to facilitate communication between the developing child and his environment, human and physical. These strategies I shall discuss in the next section.

2.4 Mothers'/Caregivers' Strategies

In this section I shall discuss the strategies mothers/caregivers use to help their children develop cognitively/perceptually/socially/linguistically through sharing knowledge with them, so that children can become competent members of the society. By using appropriate strategies mothers do not only, as Ryan, 1974, observes, interpret the child's gestures and vocalizations in conative terms, but also in terms of Grice-like maxims. So mothers/caregivers teach the children ways and means to achieve a common ground of shared knowledge so that communication can take place. Eventually, children themselves make use of these or similar strategies when they attempt to communicate to achieve the same end, a common ground between themselves and their listeners.

All strategies discussed in this section are semantically related to the child's utterances in an interactive situation.
Cross, 1977, labels such strategies as expansions, maternal
self-repetitions etc. discourse features since they become an
integral part of interaction where they are employed by mothers.
Cross's view that strategies become an integral part of inter-
action has important consequences for the real function of these
strategies in natural communication. Suffice it to say now that,
as the present research suggests, mothers/caregivers' strategies
are overt learning strategies but covert communicating strate-
gies.

2.4.1 Simplicity and Redundancy

As research in L1 mother-child interaction has shown,
mothers/caregivers' speech to children is characterized by flexibility. It is always well-tuned to the child's needs in differ-
rent contexts and is progressively modulated to the child's dev-
loping capacities, which may refer to the cognitive/perceptual/
social/linguistic abilities of the child relevant to a given
communicative situation. (cf. Ervin-Tripp, 1978). This flex-
ibility results in two important strategies: simplicity and
redundancy of mothers' speech to children. These are the effects
of specific modifications to the child's needs necessitated by
what he says or tries to say, as much as by his attentiveness
and comprehension (cf. Snow, 1977b). On this issue Shatz &
Gelman, 1977, argue that mothers/caregivers talking to children
modify their speech because they take into account the context/
sensitive constraints operating in such a conversational inter-
action. The constraints are conditioned by the developing capa-
cities of the other participant, i.e. the child, as well as by
the situation.
This adjustment, I would argue, is relevant to the cooperative principle in communication and is an exemplification of it (cf. Chapter 3, section 3.3.2 for a detailed discussion). In other words, a participant in a communicative event must take the other's perspective into account; here the adult participant takes the child's perspective into account. Unless the participants cooperate and constantly keep in mind each other's orientation, communication cannot take place because the two participants represent two divergent worlds that do not have a common ground to interpret each other's messages (cf. Gumperz, 1977). By bearing in mind each other's perspective, participants allow their two worlds to become convergent and thus communication becomes possible. Shatz, 1974, reports that children also make use of these strategies. As early as four years old they are able to make use of them and do modify their speech accordingly when talking to two-year-olds along the same lines as adults do.

2.4.2 The 'here-and-now' strategy

Another learning strategy exemplified in mother's speech to children is its here-and-nowness. Mothers talk to their children about their immediate context. Mothers/caregivers refer to what the child is already attending to, or direct the child's attention to something in the context. By doing so, they effectively limit themselves to discussions of what the child can see and hear, what he has just experienced or is just about to experience, what he might possibly want to know about the current situation. When the mother and the child are engaged in a joint action they purposefully collaborate to determine what can be taken for granted as an intersubjective shared knowledge (Rommetveit, 1978;
that is, as old information. What cannot be taken for granted is the new information (i.e. cognitive/perceptual/social/linguistic) which the child is expected to learn at the 'here and now' of a conversational exchange where all learning takes place, as Kjolseth, 1972, has argued. (cf. Chapter 3, section 3.4.1) This strategy serves a double function. On one hand, the child learns the new information relevant to a particular activity, and, on the other hand, he learns a basic communicating principle, the need to share the other's perspective for communication to function. (cf. Chapter 3, section 3.3.2 for a detailed discussion).

The important result of these interactions between children and adults is the insights the children gain about how to apply the rules of linguistic and social norms in an interactive situation. In other words, they learn the language along with the way their society cognizes the world and the social and linguistic rules it adheres to.

The same strategy is also employed by children to make themselves understood. Lily Fillmore, for instance, argues that children "did not talk much about topics which were not directly related to the current play activity and they (the children) generally created contexts to make what they were saying clear and interpretable. They did this by means of gestures, demonstrations, sound effects and repetition." (Lily Fillmore, 1976 : 695)

2.4.3 The Expansion Strategy

Mothers' speech to children is also characterized by what has been referred to as the expansion strategy. (Cross, 1977). When employing the expansion strategy mothers/caregivers seem to be doing two things. On one hand, they acknowledge the child's
utterance through repetition, and, on the other hand, they expand on it from their own perspective. Brown & Bellugi, 1964, also Lieven, 1978, consider such an expansion primarily interpretative of the child's utterance. Mothers, they argue, aim at providing the child with precise information for them to learn rather than correcting; explicit corrections, they found, were extremely rare. Bloom et al., 1976, also argue that children pay attention to and learn from input that is slightly more advanced than their own speech. Expansions, however, I would argue here, also draw the child's attention to the rules of interaction such as the "maxim of quantity" (Grice, 1967) that is, supply enough and well documented information. (cf. Chapter 3, section 3.3.2 for a detailed discussion).

Arguing along similar lines, Blount, 1977, reports two strategies, or features as he calls them, he has identified in adult-child communication in Luo. These are exaggerated intonation and repetition. By repetition he actually means expansion, as discussed here, rather than exact repetition.

2.4.4 Maternal Self-repetitions Strategy

Another learning strategy mothers make use of is the so-called maternal self-repetitions strategy (Cross, 1977). Mothers, Cross argues, use this strategy in an attempt to draw the child's attention or to help the child understand them. Ervin-Tripp, 1978, on the other hand, argues that repetition also functions as

2/ This strategy can be also found in English as well as in Greek adult-child discourse. To my knowledge, however, intonation in general has not been fully researched yet as a learning/communicating strategy in the context of L1. For the importance of intonation in ELT, see Brazil et al, 1980.
control over turn-taking to sustain a dialogue rather than a monologue. (cf. Sacks et al., 1974; Cicourel, 1973).

Savić, 1978, also reports a similar strategy employed by mothers/caregivers in an attempt to help the child understand them and keep the conversation going in Serbocroatian (see especially Savić, 1978: 223).

It seems that this strategy serves a double function, too. On one hand, mothers make use of it to help the child learn relevant new information whenever they are not sure the child has understood them; on the other hand, they make use of it to open up or keep open the channel for effective communication to function.

2.4.5 Self-answer Strategy

Another strategy mothers make use of in mother/child interaction is that of self-answer, where mothers supply an answer to the immediately preceding maternal question in an attempt to help the child comprehend the preceding maternal question (Cross, 1977). So mothers want to make sure that, on one hand, knowledge is shared for communication to proceed, and, on the other hand, the channel is kept open, so that they can sustain a dialogue, not a monologue.

2.4.6 Semantic Extensions Strategy

Another strategy isolated in mother-child interaction is the so-called semantic extensions strategy. This is a strategy that primarily focuses on the topic of the child's utterance and extends it linguistically, thus functioning as reinforcement and additional input to the topic. (Cross, 1977 after Cazden, 1972).

Corsaro, 1977, discusses a similar strategy that aims at
extending and clarifying the topic of the child's utterance. He calls them 'topic-relevant acts' (cf. Corsaro, 1977). In that the adult participant in an exchange goes beyond the utterance and offers an interpretation in line with the established topic. Corsaro, 1975, calls this type of topic-relevant acts 'leading questions'. He considers them as a type of 'normative expansion'. The adult participant expands the child-participant's interpretation of a specific event to an adult normative perspective. The expanded interpretation is then offered to the child for confirmation (Corsaro, 1977).

It can be argued, that semantic extensions strategy is a learning as well as a communicating strategy. The function of semantic extensions or topic relevant acts is to reconfirm that both participants are within the 'joint action' and share all information relevant to the topic well enough to continue their conversation. On the other hand, they adhere to and exemplify the cooperative principle. The adult wants to make sure that his perspective is somehow similar in scope to the child's perspective.

2.4.7 Clarification Requests Strategy

Corsaro, 1977, discusses the structural features, the form and the function of the so-called clarification requests strategy as he has isolated them in interactions between children and adults. The analysis of their function and form provides insights into how interactants manage to maintain ongoing interaction and develop a common ground for mutual understanding.

Corsaro, 1977, has worked out a classification scheme of the linguistic form and function of clarification requests involving
four distinct types. The first type of a clarification request has to do with communicative difficulties which arise when one participant does not clearly hear the speech of the other participant, when the channel, that is, is not clear.

The second type of a clarification request is to gain a clarification or repetition of an utterance heard but not clearly understood. Merritt, 1976, calls this type of clarification requests 'replay sequences'. Jefferson's (1972) 'side sequences' may also be classified as clarification requests of this type, but which serve a different function: the listener corrects a mistake made by the speaker.

In the third type, the adult participant marks or fills in the child participant's turn or place in interaction e.g.

B-F*: I got this (= shoebox)
F-B: Oh, you want to buy some shoes, huh?
B-F: Yes.
F-B: O.K.
(............)

(Corsaro, 1977: 189)

The fourth type of clarification request is a reaction to the speech of another interactant which was not expected. In this case the clarification request specifies surprise on the part of its employer, i.e. M-B: You don't? as in the following example:

M-B**: It's their anniversary.
B-M: Oh.
M-B: A long long long time.
B-M: I don't believe this.
M-B: You don't?
B-M: No.

(Corsaro, 1977: 190)

* B stands for Bill, F stands for father
** M stands for mother, B stands for Bill
It is not only adults that make use of this strategy, but also children, as young as 2 years old, do so, as Garvey, 1975, reports. Garvey studied pairs of children aged between 2 and 4 years in natural interactions. She also found that even the youngest children when they bothered to answer clarification requests addressed to them, did not answer at random, which suggests that they already knew many of the conversational rules (cf. 'Be relevant').

Clarification requests serve a double function. On one hand, interactants make sure that they are within the joint activity, sharing relevant information; on the other hand, they adhere to and exemplify the importance of the maxims of "manner", "quality" and "relevance" for children.

2.4.8 Prompting, Prodding, Modelling and Rhetorical Questions Strategies

Moerk, 1975, 1976, for English, and Söderbergh, 1974, for Swedish (cf. Bloom & Lahey, 1978, especially Ch.IX; also Gaies, 1977) report that parents also use prompts, prodding, modelling and rhetorical questions as strategies to monitor communication with children in an attempt to keep the interaction going, as well as to find out how much they know or have comprehended of the relevant information, i.e. cognitive, social, linguistic for the successful accomplishment of the joint activity.

By employing the prompting strategy, for instance, mothers/caregivers invite the child to supply the linguistic expression for something s/he knows by asking questions such as "What's this?" or "This is what?". By employing the prodding strategy mothers/caregivers make it verbally clear that they want the child to participate in the joint activity by asking such questions as
"Can you say ..." or "Say ...". By employing the modelling strategy mothers/caregivers supply the linguistic expression that a child may not know, in order to facilitate his/her verbal participation in the joint activity. Finally, by employing the rhetorical questions strategy mothers/caregivers open up the channel, make it verbally clear that they want the child to participate in the joint activity while at the same time they suggest the topic/game they will be involved in in the joint activity.

To sum up, the discussion about the functions of the learning strategies mothers/caregivers make use of indicates that these strategies are overt learning strategies since mothers/caregivers make use of them to help the child develop his capacities cognitively/perceptually/socially/linguistically. However, they are also covert communicating strategies since they facilitate communication in a given situation. (cf. Chapter 3 for a detailed discussion). Mothers/caregivers use these strategies to help the child develop his communicative abilities. I would define communicative abilities in the context of oral communication as a 'language user's abilities to communicate as well as learn what is relevant, appropriate and intelligible for the successful accomplishment of communication as he is interacting'.

All activities where mothers and children participate in the joint action take place in context. There the child actively selects what is relevant, appropriate and the like, thus slowly building up his world, which is also the world of the society in which he is reared.

Now that I have examined how children develop their communicative intent and learn to communicate non-verbally and later on verbally, as well as what strategies mothers make use of to help
them achieve this end, I shall discuss communication in an attempt
to define more precisely the nature of communication through which
language is learned.
In this chapter I shall try to define the nature of communication. In particular I shall examine the purpose of communication, the factors and processes involved in successful communication, as well as the strategies which are the outcome of the interaction of the first two in the act of communication; in other words, the communicative backgrounds of communication. I shall also examine the development of communication in face-to-face interaction and meaning in communication as a result of selection and application of strategies interactants make use of in the act of communication. All this will be examined in an attempt to define the constituents of the 'knowledge and experience' a language user has about how to communicate through language in the context of a (cognitive) interactionist approach as defined in Chapter 2.

3.1 General aim of communication

Communicating in the L₂ as compared with communicating in the L₁ is similar from the point of view of the general aim of communication. People of all cultures communicate when they want to exchange messages (thoughts and opinions) or express feelings and attitudes, in other words, to exchange cognitive and affective information. The exchange of messages and expression of feelings is a sharing of information, i.e. sharing of knowledge. And all this takes place in a give-and-take process where participants in an event interchangeably become a speaker and a listener.

The purpose of communication is not simply to exchange some information but also worthwhile information. Otherwise speakers simply do not indulge in talk, as awkward silences suggest when people get together but do not have anything worthwhile to impart.
to each other. Sacks, 1972, in particular, considers "newsworthiness of messages" a communication rule in American-English society (cf. Goffman, 1976).

The general aim of communication is at the heart of any communicative event and goes beyond cultures and societies (cf. Hymes, 1972b; Bauman & Sherzer (eds.) Introduction, 1974). And as such I would take it to be part of the 'knowledge and experience' of what language is used for, that the $L_2$ learner brings with him from $L_1$.

3.2 Behavioural means of communication

This sharing of information relies on all channels of communication through which information is exchanged by participants in a face-to-face communicative event. As Abercrombie, 1968/1972, put it:

"We speak with our vocal organs, but we converse with our entire bodies; conversation consists of much more than a simple interchange of spoken words."

(Abercrombie, 1972: 64)

Other forms of communication interwoven with speech include
facial expressions; eye-contact; gestures and postures; body orientation, proximity and physical contact.

The behavioural means for communicating information at our disposal could be broadly classified as follows:

:: Vocal versus non-vocal behaviour.
:: Verbal versus non-verbal behaviour.

Vocal behaviour consists of all the actions involved in producing speech. Non-vocal behaviour includes such factors as gestures, posture and so on. Verbal behaviour is the use of actual words; non-verbal is all vocal and non-vocal conversational
behaviour which is not verbal in the sense given above. (Laver & Hutcheson (eds.) 1972 : 12).

In this present study, however, when I talk of conversation in face-to-face interaction I refer to vocal and verbal behaviour only, that is, a restricted type of conversation. The aim of the research is to identify the strategies L2 learner-speakers make use of to communicate orally. The experimental design, therefore, emphasizes reliance on the spoken language only for communication purposes and excludes any other channel of communication.

3.3 The communicative backgrounds of successful communication

The communicative backgrounds of successful communication have been defined differently by different scholars. There is a common point of reference for them all, however. They all consider sharing of these backgrounds a prerequisite to successful communication (cf. Chapter 2, especially mothers' strategies). For as Gumperz, 1977, rightly argues:

"How can we be certain that our interpretation of what activity is being signalled is the same as the activity that the interlocuter has in mind, if our communicative backgrounds are not identical?"

(Reported in Candlin, 1978 : 9)

Kreckel, 1978, for instance, defines the circumstances under which communication is accomplished. She argues that communication is accomplished when interactants share the same code in a particular domain and have the same shared knowledge of the world at large. (See especially Kreckel, 1978 : 97-101). She defines code as

"the external product of cognitive processes structuring different communicative situations and regulating the selection and organization of specific communicative acts out of a repertoire of available ones.

(Kreckel, 1978 : 100)
Kreckel, if I understand her correctly, considers code as the external product of an internal interaction of cognitive processes for interaction organization and management over the knowledge that a speaker has of different communicative situations and of specific communicative acts. She considers communication as the outcome of the interaction of the other two variables on each other. In short, she sees three variables involved in code, making up along with domains and knowledge of the world at large the communicative backgrounds of communication. These communicative backgrounds must be shared between participants in the act of communication if participants in an event are to understand each other.

In my opinion, Kreckel's definition for the accomplishment of successful communication demonstrates the psychological and the sociological aspects of communication. For I take cognitive processes for interaction organization and management to represent the psychological variable of communication, whereas knowledge of communicative acts and events in the broader context of domain, and knowledge of the world at large as conventionalized socially accepted norms, rules and conventions, to represent the sociological variable of communication. However, it is not quite clear which way code goes, which she considers as the external product of communication. I shall deal with this point again in relation to Hymes' definition of communicative competence which I shall discuss presently.

---

8/ Kreckel, 1978, defines communicative acts as "socially meaningful units of verbal and/or non-verbal behaviour which transmit a particular message." (See also p.47 for a classification of behavioural means for communicating information.)
Hymes defines communicative competence as follows:

"I should take competence as the most general term for the capabilities of a person (....). Competence is dependent upon both (tacit) knowledge and ability for use. Knowledge is distinct, then, both from competence (as its part) and from systematic possibility (to which its relation is an empirical matter)."

(Hymes, 1972a : 282)

The three variables involved in his definition are: (tacit) knowledge, ability for use and competence which depends on the first two. In terms of Kreckel's definition I take Hymes' (tacit) knowledge to mean a speaker's knowledge of different communicative situations, communicative acts, domains, knowledge of the world at large and so on (see also section 3.3.1 this chapter). I take Hymes' ability for use to mean relevant cognitive processes for interaction organization and management, (see also section 3.3.2 this chapter) whereas I take Hymes' competence to mean the outcome of the interaction of the first two on each other as internal procedures, (see also section 3.3.3 this chapter) not as the external product as Kreckel defines it. Of course, Hymes discusses communicative competence from an ethnomethodologist's point of view. He, therefore, ignores the psychological aspects of communicative competence. I shall not, however, consider it far fetched if I try to make the connection between the psychological and the sociological aspects of communicative competence. I believe that we may distinguish between competence as internal procedures and verbal or non-verbal behaviour as the external manifestation of competence.

Hymes himself (1971/1972a) makes a similar point when he writes that verbal behaviour is a manifestation of a language user's communicative competence and has both grammatical and prag-
matic aspects; it is a "reflection of implicit knowledge or competence both of grammar and of use." Hymes' view supports the argument proposed here that competence is the internal procedures which are the result of the internal interaction of knowledge and ability (in Hymes' terms) or knowledge and cognitive processes (in Kreckel's terms) on each other. Kreckel does not seem to make this distinction clear. Her argument that code is "the external product of an internal interaction" seems to overlook competence as a psychological cognitive ability. However, the distinction between competence as internal procedures and verbal behaviour as a manifestation of a language user's communicative competence seems very important. For it allows us to accommodate both verbal and non-verbal behaviour as manifestations of communicative competence, which manifestations of course may differ from society to society.

Although there may be some epistemological objections about it, I will hereafter use the following terms to denote these four variables in the context of oral communication.

Knowledge as product 2/ to mean a language user's knowledge of culture-specific linguistic and social norms and conventions as substantive information;

Knowledge as process 2/ to mean a language user's cognitive orientation, cognitive processes and abilities for interaction organisation and management for face-to-face interaction;

2/ The terms 'product' and 'process' have already been used by Garfinkel, 1967, in the context of meaning in communication (cf. section 3.4.2 this chapter for a detailed discussion) as well as by Candlin and Breen, 1979, in the context of teaching materials for EFL/ESL (cf. Chapter 7, section 7.11). In both cases the terms are used to mean different things from each other and from the meanings employed in the present research.
Strategies to mean the internal procedures activated by the interaction of knowledge as process and knowledge as product on each other. Strategies demonstrate a language user's ability to organize and manage the communication process in a natural communicative encounter.

Actualized language behaviour to mean the external outcome of communication which demonstrates a language user's knowledge of and ability to use his/her $L_1$ accurately and appropriately, in other words, his/her communicative competence. This external outcome can be recorded, studied and analysed and it is the means through which we may investigate and examine the other three variables involved in actual communication.

It must be stressed, however, that there is no hierarchy of importance to be established among the four knowledge systems in a verbal encounter. They are all equally essential for participants to achieve situated meaningful communication. This interaction is exemplified in Figure 3 on p.53.
The three top circles A, B, C represent the three knowledge systems of product, process and strategies. The arrows indicate how these knowledge systems constantly interact with each other in the act of communication. This interaction is dynamic and is in constant flow while participants are communicating, indicated in the figure with the broken circle. Strategies may be the result of the interaction of knowledge as process and product on each other, but they also become part of them and are taken into account for the next step forward in interaction. They are all constraints and resources for the development of interaction. Internal procedures may be verbalized as actualized culture-specific language behaviour. They may be also manifested as non-verbal behaviour, such as silences, physical actions (i.e. attacking somebody, and so on) or movements as in the case with playing
games like chess and so on. In either case they indicate the participants communicative competence, that is, their ability to participate in coherent interaction or their ability to play a game well enough, and so on. (cf. Chapter 5, section 5.6.1, also Footnote 19, p.129).

To sum up, I would suggest that in the context of a (cognitive) interactionist approach to learning to communicate through language, the four basic variables identified as communicative backgrounds to successful communication should be divided into two basic categories, namely, psychological and sociological since communication is a psychological and sociological phenomenon. (cf. Blount, 1972). The psychological categories are: cognitive processes for interaction organization and management and internal procedures, a language user's competence to communicate to some purpose. The sociological categories are: knowledge of usage, of communicative acts, events, settings domains, knowledge of the world at large and so on as substantive culture-bound information and verbal as well as non-verbal behaviour as a manifestation of a language user's communicative competence always culture-bound. In non-verbal behaviour, I include para-linguistic and extralinguistic behaviour as well as making the right moves when one is playing a game like chess. In this case non-verbal behaviour may not be culture-bound.

As research indicates, knowledge as process and strategies seem to be universal (ch. Chapters 5 and 6), whereas knowledge as product as well as actualized (verbal and non-verbal) language behaviour seem to be culture-specific and different from society to society.
I shall now attempt to discuss in some detail the first three variables as communicative backgrounds involved in successful communication. I shall not deal with the fourth variable because it is not the aim of the present research to identify the actual of linguistic realizations, the strategies.

The discussion of the first three variables will be mainly based on the work of Garfinkel, 1967, Hymes, 1964, 1972, Labov, 1972, Sacks et al., 1974, Cicourel, 1973, Grice, 1967, Kjolseth, 1973, Goffman, 1971, 1976 and Widdowson, 1976, 1978, 1979. They all deal with different aspects of the properties of shared knowledge as product, process, or strategies, and their interaction in natural communication. However, with the exception of Cicourel, all other scholars who have dealt with aspects of the properties of what I have called 'knowledge as process' have dissociated it from cognitive psychology where it rightly belongs. (cf. section 3.3.2 this chapter).

3.3.1 Background knowledge as product

Successful communication is accomplished when participants in an event share knowledge as product, as process and strategies. Participants use this shared knowledge for production and interpretation purposes. As argued, shared knowledge as product is the accumulation of a language user's linguistic competence (in the Chomskyan sense), social competence in the ethnomethodological sense, as well as knowledge of the world at large as defined by Labov, 1972a. This knowledge constitutes what 'everyone knows' (Garfinkel, 1967) who is a member of a particular speech community. Kjolseth, 1972 calls it background knowledge and defines it thus:
"Background knowledge is what anyone knows is always relevant anywhere and any time."
(Kjolseth, 1972 : 61)

Kjolseth argues that this knowledge is equally relevant to any communicative exchange in any setting in a society. Kjolseth, 1972, proposes three important and essential variables of background knowledge:

1. It is possessed and sanctioned by a more or less inclusive population of members.
2. It is known in a particular mode of relevance.
3. It has socio-temporal locus of relevance.
(Kjolseth, 1972 : 61)

But what are the constitutive components of this background knowledge in the context of face-to-face interaction? I would argue that these components are: knowledge of the linguistic rules of usage, of the sociolinguistic rules of use, as well as knowledge of communicative situations as speech events (Hymes, 1964, 1972), domains (Fishman, 1972), networks of communicative acts, i.e. discourse patterning and relevant culture-specific, as well as non-specific, information of the world at large.

Rules of usage represent the language user's knowledge of the formal linguistic system of his language, his linguistic competence in the Chomskyan sense (Chomsky, 1965). For Chomsky (1965) linguistic competence is concerned with tacit knowledge of language structure. This knowledge, Chomsky argues, is not commonly conscious or available for spontaneous report, but necessarily implicit in what the ideal speaker-listener may say. This knowledge allows a speaker
to produce and understand an infinite set of sentences, which makes his language, as performance, creative.

Sociolinguistic rules of use refer to the conditions and constraints that apply to individual speech acts and networks of speech acts to achieve a specific function and can be said to constitute a language user's basic communicative source of reference (Widdowson, 1976, 1979). The work of Austin, 1975, Strawson, 1964 and Searle, 1969, on the illocutionary force of sentences and the felicity conditions for a speech act to be taken as intended is directed towards a formulation of such rules of use. The philosophers of language focus more on the intentions of the speaker and how they are manifested through his choice of language. Searle, like Austin, maintains that in speaking a language we attempt to "communicate things to the hearer by means of getting him to recognize our intention to communicate just those things." (Searle, 1969 : 43). Meaning, however, as Searle argues, is more than "a matter of intention, it is also a matter of convention". (Searle, 1969 : 45). Here I would like to point out that conventions result in institutionalized background knowledge, 'what everyone knows' (Garfinkel, 1967). When communicating, participants rely on conventions to make their intentions clear. And as Searle points out in an analysis of illocutionary acts, "we must capture both the intentional and the conventional aspects of them, and especially the relationship between them". (Searle, 1969 : 45). Searle, Austin and others in this line have mainly worked with decontextualized data. Others, however, have worked out sociolinguistic rules of use in longer stretches of discourse.

Labov, 1972a, for instance, discusses the conditions that should prevail for an utterance to be heard as a request for
action (or command). Such rules, which are shared by all members of a linguistic community, take into consideration roles, duties and obligations as they are accepted by all members of the community. These considerations constitute part of the background knowledge that all members share. These rules contain "the social construct of the shared knowledge" which Labov, 1972a, argues is not normally part of a linguistic rule. These are the rules of interpretation and production which will eventually relate "what is said" .... questions, statements, imperatives .... to "what is done" .... requests, refusals, assertions, demands, insults, challenges, retreats, and so on. (Labov, 1972a : 254).

A language user's background knowledge also includes knowledge of what constitutes a speech event as defined by the ethnography of speaking. Any instance where language is used as a means of communication Hymes calls a "speech event". He defines a speech event thus:

"The term speech event will be restricted to activities that are directly governed by rules or norms for the use of speech. An event may consist of a single act, but it will often comprise several."

(Hymes, 1972b : 56)

He then works out the factors involved in a speech event which influence the selection of linguistic items by the speaker. These are: setting, participants, purpose, key, channel, message content, genre of discourse. These variables can constitute a matrix against which any speech event may be examined and analysed, regardless of the language and the cultural background. (cf. Bauman & Sherzer (eds.), Introduction, 1974). In other words, these features seem to be common characteristics of different languages and cultures.
Choice of topic and language in a speech event is always conditioned by the broader context of domain. Fishman, 1972, defines domains sociologically "in terms of institutional contexts or socio-ecological-co-occurrences". School, family, neighbourhood, church, work, for instance, are characterized as domains, that is, recognizable units within a community that share their own norms of interaction and interpretation. Domains, Fishman argues, enable us to understand how language choice and topic are related to socio-cultural norms and expectations. Both, he adds, are appropriate for analysing an individual's behaviour in face-to-face verbal encounters.

Domains have also been characterized at a different level, that of socio-psychological analysis. Fishman, 1972, reports that Bomer, 1947, and Barber, 1952, have characterized domains along the following matrix: intimate-informal-formal-intergroup based on a socio-psychological analysis. The domains defined in this fashion were then correlated with domains at the societal-institutional level, as defined by sociology. The formal domain was found to coincide with religious-ceremonial activities; the intergroup domain consisted of economic and recreational activities as well as interactions with governmental-legal authority, etc. (Fishman, 1972 : 19-20).

Domains may differ in their detailed characteristics from setting to setting and from society to society. Domains of a multilingual society, for instance, may be different from those found in an immigrant-host context or a bilingual context (Gumperz and Blom, 1972). However, domains are common features of societies, no matter how institutionalized they may be. Relevant research, for instance, has shown that the dimension of social distance,
i.e. formal-informal and so on, appears to be universal in language as in social life. (cf. Brown & Levinson, 1978).

Interactants also have knowledge of all the rules of interaction that are sanctioned and accepted in their society, (cf. Frake, 1964; Sacks & Schegloff, 1973; Sacks et al., 1974). Participants in an event know the rules of turn-taking, of interrupting, of getting, holding and relinquishing the floor and so on, as they are accepted in their society.

The last but not least constituent of background knowledge as product is that of shared knowledge of the world at large. Knowledge of the world at large refers to substantive culture-bound information about role-relationships and status, institutionalized routines and situations which are not normally part of linguistic rules (cf. Labov, 1972a), interpersonal verbal rituals (cf. Goffman, 1972) and so on. Of course, it goes without saying that this culture-specific information differs from society to society, but I would argue here that its indispensability for the accomplishment of successful communication is part of any language user's 'knowledge and experience', as is the knowledge of domains discussed above, for instance.

As mentioned, Labov, 1972a, has argued that shared knowledge of the world at large is not always part of linguistic rules. To exemplify his point, he quotes the following example and discusses the complex relationship holding between the following pair of sentences:

A : Are you going to work tomorrow?
B : I am on jury duty.

(Labov, 1972c, reported in Coulthard, 1977 : 65)
For Labov the rule operating here for B's utterance to be heard as an answer to A's question depends on shared knowledge of the world, as content always culturally-bound and known by all members of the society and to which a speaker can allude or appeal. In this case, Labov writes, A will assume that there is a proposition known to both which connects B's utterance to A's question, that is, if someone is on jury duty he cannot go to work. "Failure to locate such a proposition," Labov argues, "may reflect a real incompetence." (Labov, 1972c, reported in Coulthard 1977: 65).

To sum up, knowledge as product constitutes a language user's knowledge of the "rules" of the language in terms of usage and use, that is, knowledge of "what to say to whom, when and where" as substantive information. (cf. Widdowson, 1976, 1979).

3.3.2 Background knowledge as process

Knowledge as product makes up one aspect of the background knowledge that participants in an event bring with them in a communicative situation. The other aspect of the background knowledge that activates the process of selection of 'what is relevant, appropriate and intelligible' for a particular communicative event out of the vast resources of a language user's knowledge as product, is what I have called knowledge as process. Labov and Fanshel, 1977, I would argue, make reference to it when they argue that the application of sequencing rules between the actions performed in communication depends upon "particular knowledge" shared among participants in the event. (Labov & Fanshel, 1977: 73). This particular knowledge I take to be the participants' shared knowledge as process.
I would suggest that the constituents of this knowledge as process should be the cognitive processes and cognitive structures that are sanctioned and accepted in a society, in other words, the way a particular society is cognizing the world as structure and process. (Piaget, 1954; also Bruner, 1975, 1978; Sinclair de Zwart, 1973; Bloom & Lahey, 1978); (cf. Chapter 2 for a detailed discussion on learning to communicate in the context of the (cognitive) interactionist approach.). However, which are the processes that decide the selection of 'what is relevant, appropriate and intelligible' for a particular communicative event in a natural verbal encounter? I would argue that the work done by ethnomethodologists, sociolinguists and philosophers of language deals with the properties of these processes.10/ They are well exemplified by the work of Cicourel, 1973; Grice, 1967; Labov, 1972a and Goffman, 1971, 1976. I shall briefly discuss the nature of this aspect of background knowledge making reference to their work.

A. Cicourel, 1973

Cicourel, 1973, defines knowledge as process, or as he calls it, interpretive procedures, thus:

"They are not "rules" in the sense of such general policies or practices like operational definitions or legal and extra-legal norms, where a sense of 'right' and 'wrong' pre-or prescriptive norm or practice is at issue. Instead they are part of all inquiry yet exhibit empirically defensible properties that advise the member about an infinite..."
collection of behaviour displays and provide him
with a sense of social structure."

(Cicourel, 1973 : 51)

Cicourel has isolated six properties of interpretive proce-
dures. These are:

1. The reciprocity of perspectives
2. The et cetera assumption
3. Normal forms
4. Retrospective-prospective sense of occurrence
5. Talk itself is reflexive
6. Descriptive vocabularies as indexical expressions.

Cicourel maintains that "interpretive procedures prepare and
sustain an environment of objects for inference and action vis-à-vis culture-bound world view and the written and "known in common" surface rules" (Cicourel, 1973 : 52). He takes them to be inne-
rate in the human being. Thus he argues they make up the deep
structure of communication whereas the culture-bound world view
and the written and "known in common" that differ from society to
society (and even from group to group within a society) make up
the surface structure of communication.

His approach, distinguish between interpretive procedures
and surface rules is influenced by generative linguistics where
semantic properties are attached to deep structure. Thus he man-
gages to maintain in cognitive sociology the Chomskyan distinction
of surface structure - deep structure in linguistics (Chomsky,
1965). Cicourel argues that both the acquisition of linguistic
rules and of norms presupposes interpretive procedures.

Cicourel's approach, that interpretive procedures are innate
and make up the deep structure of communication, is not followed
in this research, rather as I have argued in Chapter 2, interpretive procedures as cognitive processes are learned and developed as the child learns how to communicate non-verbally first and later on verbally. It is the main aim of communication as well as the factors involved in successful communication that renders features and properties of it pancultural, rather than innate predisposition. (See section 3.5 this chapter for a detailed discussion on this issue).

The very properties Cicourel attributes to interpretive procedures are important for us here. These properties are based on and make explicit the importance of "background expectancies", "common sense shared knowledge" (Garfinkel, 1967) that participants in an event must share if they are to understand each other. Thus they determine which aspects of background knowledge as product are relevant, appropriate and intelligible in the act of communication. In terms of the present research I take Cicourel's interpretive procedures to describe properties of what I have called knowledge as process, whereas "the culture-bound world view and the written and known in common" to describe what I have called knowledge as product (see section 3.3.1). The present research indicates that the properties of the processes Cicourel describes seem to be common in all languages but they may differ as substantive information (cf. Keenan, 1977a).

The first property Cicourel describes is that of the reciprocity of perspectives. Cicourel, 1973, describes this property as follows: (after Schutz, 1953, 1955)

a. "Speakers in an event take for granted that each would probably have the same experience of the immediate scene if they were to change places, and

b. (unless it is proved otherwise) the speaker and hearer both assume that each can disregard, for the purpose at hand, any differences originating in their personal ways of assigning meaning to, and deciding the relevance of, everyday life activities, such
that each can interpret the environment of objects (actual verbal behaviour) they are both attending in an essentially identical manner for the practical action in question."

(Cicourel, 1973 : 52-53)

Thus interactants can assume that "their descriptive accounts or utterances will be intelligible and recognizable features of a world known in common and taken for granted". (Cicourel, 1973 : 53). Cicourel does stress the importance of some common ground shared between participants in an event. This common ground can be as much a matter of cognitive processes i.e. knowledge as process, as a matter of "known in common and written down" culture-bound information i.e. knowledge as product. Unless there is a common core to start with, communication is unintelligible. (cf. Chapter 2, especially section 2.3.2).

The second property is that of "the et cetera assumption". As Garfinkel, 1964, suggests, understanding requires that a speaker and a hearer assume the existence of common understandings (i.e. shared knowledge) of what is being said "when the descriptive accounts are seen as obvious and even when not immediately obvious" (Cicourel, 1973 : 53). This assumption, Cicourel argues, serves the important function of "allowing things to pass despite their ambiguity or vagueness, or allowing the treatment of particular instances as sufficiently relevant or understandable to permit viewing descriptive elements as appropriate." (Cicourel, 1973 : 53).

Cicourel maintains that this property relies upon particular elements of language itself, for instance, lexical terms, phrases, idiomatic expressions or "double entendres" and paralinguistic features of exchanges for indexing (Garfinkel, 1967) the course of
meaning of the conversation. Language, therefore, verbal as well as non-verbal carries meaning that goes beyond the three distinct layers of phonology, morphology/syntax and semantics per se and is conventionalized by society to serve its purposes for efficient communication to function among its members. Searle also argues along these lines when he writes that meaning is more than "a matter of intention, it is also a matter of convention". (Searle, 1969 : 45).

The third property Cicourel, 1973, discusses is what he calls "normal forms" which is expressed through verbal behaviour. For Cicourel, the first two properties presume the existence of certain "normal forms" of acceptable talk upon which participants in an event rely for assigning sense to their intentions and purposes. Competent members of society, Cicourel argues, recognize and employ normal forms in daily interaction under the assumption that all communication is "what everyone knows". (Garfinkel, 1964 : 237-8).

The property of normal forms is invariant to a given society, but always culture-bound, and includes "commitments to a normative or value-oriented conception of appropriateness". (Hymes, 1971). In terms of this research I take the property of normal forms to be exemplified in actualized language behaviour as linguistic realizations employed by the participants in an event (see section 3.3.4).

The fourth property Cicourel attributes to interpretive procedures is that conversation also depends "on speaker's and hearer's ability to postpone deciding what was intended before until later". This property enables the speaker and hearer "to maintain a sense of social structure despite deliberate or presumed vagueness on the part of the participants in an exchange." (Cicourel, 1973 : 53).
Practical examples of this property are, for instance, a speaker's ability to talk on topic and be understood, instead of talking on the previous speaker's utterance (Sacks, 1972) or participants' ability to understand overt or covert violations of maxims in conversation (Grice, 1967).

The fifth property Cicourel discusses is that of "talk is reflexive". Cicourel does not refer to the content of talk but "simply to its presence during speech and the expectation that particular forms of speech will give a setting the appearance of something recognizable and intelligible". (Cicourel, 1973 : 55).

Features of reflexivity for Cicourel are:

a. "the timing of speech (as opposed to deliberate or random hesitation and alterations of normal forms, intonational contours).

b. the timing of periods of silence or such occasional reminders of normal speech, like "uh, huh, I see, ah," which reflexively guide both speaker and hearer throughout exchanges."

(Cicourel, 1973 : 55)

Practical examples of the reflexivity of talk on turns and turn-taking are to be found in Sacks et al. (1974), on points of possible completion in Jefferson (1973) and on conversational rules of turn-taking in Duncan (1972, 1973, 1974).

The sixth property Cicourel attributes to interpretive procedures is that of "descriptive vocabularies as indexical expressions". Cicourel draws on Garfinkel, 1967, to support this property. Garfinkel, 1967, argues that members in a society rely upon the existence and use of descriptive vocabularies for handling exchange of information and description of activities. He considers these vocabularies as an index to the society's experience.

Cicourel, 1973, argues that the significance of conversational
(or written) indexical expressions is not merely a problem of pragmatic context, but it must also be part of the common knowledge, of "what everyone knows" (Garfinkel, 1967) in order to decide the indexicality or value (Widdowson, 1978b) of an utterance or some part of the utterance. It is this commonly shared oral dictionary that allows members of a society to carry on conversation. Although realizations of this property as well as of normal forms are culture-specific, as cognitive processes they are a necessary pre-requisite to any successful verbal communication. As such I would argue here that they are part of the 'knowledge and experience' a language user has learned while learning his mother tongue.

To sum up, with regard to the properties of interpretive procedures that Cicourel, 1973, describes, I take them to be descriptions of cognitive processes language users learn and develop while learning a language, their mother tongue. The function of these cognitive processes which are indispensable to any natural communicative event is to decide what is within and without the joint activity in a communicative event. The interaction of these processes over knowledge as product results in strategies (see section 3.3.3). It seems that it is knowledge as product that renders actualized language behaviour culture-specific and different from society to society.

Cicourel, however, not only describes properties of interpretive procedures but he also indicates what interactants might do if interpretive procedures are suspended. He observes that "When the appearance of the speaker and hearer or talk is not viewed as recognizable and intelligible such that the et cetera assumption cannot overcome discrepancies or ambiguities,
efforts will be made by participants in the event to normalize the presumed discrepancies." 11/ (Cicourel, 1973: 53-54).

Cicourel's observation has important implications for $L_1$ and $L_2$ learning. The question that immediately arises is "How do members of a society manage to normalize the presumed discrepancies and allow the interaction to proceed?" In other words, what "strategies" do they make use of to achieve this end in the course of interaction? Goffman has also raised this point of corrective action in Goffman, 1971, 1976. Whereas Goffman explicitly states what this corrective action participants may have at their disposal is (see pp. 75-76), Cicourel does not pursue the matter any further. I shall refer to this point again in detail in section 3.3.3.

B. Grice, 1967

Grice, 1967, on the other hand, discusses some other properties of knowledge as process which are also prerequisites to successful communication. These conventions, as he calls them, are also common sense knowledge among members of a society. They reflexively guide participants in an event to decide how much of the overall background knowledge they have, they can make use of in a specific communicative situation as the interaction unfolds. Participants in an event are obliged to look not only for ways of expressing themselves, but also for ways of making sure that the vast expressive resources of face-to-face interaction (cf. Labov, 11 Cicourel's sociologically oriented view about participants' efforts to normalize the presumed discrepancies is similar in sense to the reduction of dissonance or incongruity in psychology. (cf. Festinger, 1957; Brown, 1962, 1965) (Reported in Cicourel, 1973: 54).
1972b; Cicourel, 1973; Garfinkel, 1967) are not employed to convey something unintended and irrelevant to what preceded or to what will follow. The overriding convention, for Grice, is what he calls the "cooperative principle" which requires the speaker to be cooperative since communication is a cooperative effort. This cooperation Grice represents in four general principles (or in Cicourel's terms, properties) which he calls maxims. These are:

1. The Maxim of Quantity: Make your contribution no more and no less informative than is required.
2. The Maxim of Quality: Say only that which you both believe and have adequate evidence for.
3. The Maxim of Relation: Be relevant.
4. The Maxim of Manner: Make your contribution easy to understand.

For Grice the maxims are normative rules that can be violated without violating the cooperative principle. In this case, however, the speaker must make the violation overt so that the listener can realize that the maxim has actually been violated intentionally. Intentional overt violations, Grice maintains, lead to conversational implicatures. If the speaker violates a maxim covertly or unintentionally and therefore the listener does not realize it, then accurate and effective communication breaks down because events are no more AB-events but A-events and B-events (Labov, 1972b), or in other words, knowledge is not shared. Intentional covert violations, Grice argues, produce lies, whereas unintentional violations lead to a less malevolent breakdown in communication.

The cooperative principle and the four maxims, Grice argues, constitute a type of social contract that influences the very
interpretations the listener attaches to what a speaker has said. And on these interpretations the listener builds his own productions when he himself becomes the ratified speaker. This type of social contract functions in the same way as Cicourel's properties and Labov's 1972b, AB-events. I take them all to describe properties of the same shared knowledge as process, that is, of cognitive processes, that participants in an event bring with them as sources for interpretation and production in natural communication.

C. Goffman, 1971, 1976

Goffman, 1976, has also looked at properties of knowledge as process but he has described them from a different point of view. In natural communication he distinguishes two basic variables interacting on each other: the system constraints and the ritual constraints.

He defines system constraints as "the transmission requirements for utterances and the arrangements made in terms of conditions to facilitate an extended flow of talk." (Goffman, 1976: 263). Goffman argues that system constraints refer to such features of conversation as turn-taking, signals that include a rerun, holding of channel requests and interrupting a speaker in process (cf. Sacks et al., 1974; Jefferson, 1973, 1972; Duncan, 1973); back-channel feedback cues (cf. Duncan 1972, 1973, 1974); initiating and terminating a conversation, introducing new topics (cf. Sacks and Schegloff, 1973; Schegloff, 1972) as well as norms that respondents to reply "obligate honestly with whatever they know that is relevant and no more" (cf. Goffman, 1976: 264).

Goffman, 1976, maintains that system constraints are culture-
free formulations, they are pancultural. Sacks et al., 1974, also tend to support this view. I would like to argue here that Goffman must take system constraints to be pancultural, not as substantive information, but as cognitive processes. Goffman, of course, does not make the distinction clear because his orientation is sociological, not psychological (see also Chapter 2, section 2.3 and 2.4 for a detailed discussion on the issue from the point of view of psychology).

Goffman also argues that participants in an event not only make sure that their utterances convey the intended meaning and are understood, but they are also "motivated to preserve everyone's face" and by doing so "they then end up acting so as to preserve orderly communication". For Goffman, 1976, preserving everyone's face makes up the category of ritual constraints in communication. Goffman, 1976, defines ritual constraints, that is, the feelings of participants for each other, as the considerations that

"sustain and protect through expressive means what can be supportively conveyed about persons and their relationships."

(Goffman, 1976 : 303)

Ritual constraints, Goffman argues are culture-specific. Here again I would like to distinguish between ritual constraints as cognitive processes and ritual constraints as substantive information. Ritual constraints as cognitive processes seem to be part of any language user's cognitive orientation and knowledge as process which reflexively guide him what to say, to whom, when and where without violating interactants' status, rights and obligations to each other. Ritual constraints, however, as substantive information are culture-specific and part of a language user's knowledge as product (cf. Brown & Levinson, 1978, where they
discuss "process" and "product" aspects of politeness across cultures and languages. However, they do not make clear the distinction proposed in the present research).

To exemplify his views on ritual constraints, Goffman, 1976, quotes the following example and discusses the ritual constraints operating on this interchange.

(i) A : Do you have the time?
(ii) B : Sure. It's five o'clock.
(iii) A : Thanks.
(iv) B : (Gesture) It's okay.

(Goffman, 1976 : 265)

The first utterance, Goffman argues, serves as a request but it also functions to neutralize the potentially offensive consequence of a demand on somebody else. Goffman calls this utterance a 'remedy'.

The second utterance, he argues, demonstrates that the potential offender's effort to nullify offense is acceptable and he calls it a 'relief'. An item that particularly attends to ritual constraints is B's "Sure". By employing it, B indicates his willingness to answer the request immediately. This is necessary because by the time B looks at his watch and tells the time there has been a short lapse of time filled in with silence. Silence is one of the options open to a potential speaker if he does not want to take the offered floor. B wants to avoid this awkward situation by using "sure" before he gives his answer. Had he not done so, Goffman argues, A might have considered that he took the request offensively by letting silence prevail until he gave his answer. The third utterance is a display of gratitude for the service rendered and for its provider not taking the claim on himself. It can be called 'appreciation'. The last utterance, Goffman
argues, demonstrates that "enough gratitude has been displayed and thus the displayer is to be counted off as a properly feeling person" who has adequately attended to the ritual constraints imposed on such an occasion by their culture. This final utterance Goffman calls 'minimation' (Goffman, 1972: 139-43; also reported in Goffman, 1976: 265).

Participants in face-to-face interaction, therefore, do not merely attend to and accomplish the doing of actions, that is, they do not merely operate on system constraints but they also attend to the ritual constraints as they are determined by their culture. Successful communication, Goffman maintains, depends on the necessary balance between system and ritual constraints as the occasion demands it. Distinguishing between system and ritual constraints is, of course, a convenient way to talk about them. In fact, any act performed during talk will carry ritual significance, some indirectly (see, for instance, utterance (i) in Goffman's example, p.73), others directly. Those that carry direct ritual significance, Goffman argues, seem to be specialized for this purpose - ritualized in the ethnological sense - and play a special role in conversation (see, for instance, utterance (iii) in Goffman's example cited on p.73). The controlling purpose of these utterances is to give praise, blame, thanks, support, affection, or show gratitude, disapproval, dislike, sympathy, or greet, say farewell and so forth (Goffman, 1976). Goffman argues that part of the force of these utterances comes from the feeling they directly convey, and that only little of the force derives from the semantic content of the words.

As pointed out already (cf. pp.68-69) participants in an event will make efforts "to normalize presumed discrepancies if 'the
et cetera assumption' cannot overcome discrepancies or ambiguities" (Cicourel, 1973). Cicourel's normalization of discrepancies, I would suggest, refers both to system constraints and ritual constraints (in Goffman's terms) when he writes "When the appearance of the speaker and hearer or talk is not viewed as recognizable and intelligible.... efforts will be made by participants in the event to normalize the presumed discrepancies". (Cicourel, 1973: 53-54).

Goffman, 1971, indeed, discusses the corrective action at participants' disposal when the speaker's biography of himself and the image of himself that seems to have just been expressed, willingly or unwillingly, contradict each other. At such times, Goffman argues, the individual is likely to try to integrate the incongruous events by means of certain strategies and tactics.

He distinguishes two basic categories of corrective action: the "defensive practices" when the participant employs the strategies to protect his own projection of self, and the "protective practices" or "talk" when a participant employs them to save the definition of the situation projected by another.12/

This remedial work, Goffman, 1971, argues, is achieved through:

1. Accounts, such as explanations, excuses, pretexts.
2. Apologies, they may occur before or (usually) after the offence has taken place.

12/ Goffman, 1971, also distinguishes supportive rituals. He defines them as "phenomenally different acts that seem to have some sort of formal features in common, some sort of shared interpersonal theme." He distinguishes different classes in accordance with the function they serve, for instance, congratulation, commiseration, condolences, greetings, leave-takings etc.
3. Excuses and disclaimers. Through these acts participants in an event try to save face. (Goffman, 1961)

4. Requests, they typically occur before the questionable event or at the latest, during its initial phases. Goffman, 1971, defines a request as consisting of "asking licence of a potentially offended person to engage in what could be considered a violation of his rights. The actor shows that he is fully alive to the possible offensiveness of his proposed act and begs sufferance. At the same time he exposes himself to denial and rejection."

To sum up, system and ritual constraints as cognitive processes are part of the 'knowledge and experience' language users have and are part of their knowledge as process (cf. Brown & Levinson, 1978). But as substantive information that is, knowledge as product, they may be different from society to society.

D. Labov, 1972b

Labov, 1972b, discusses the importance of the knowledge both participants equally share, i.e. AB-event, or may have independently of each other, i.e. A-event, B-event for the production and interpretation of utterances. So, he argues, the rule for an utterance declarative in form to be interpreted as a request for confirmation depends on the distinction of A-events and B-events. In other words,

"If A makes a statement about a B-event it is heard as a request for confirmation."

(Labov, 1972b : 254)

I would take Labov's rules for interpretation and production based on AB-events to describe properties of the shared knowledge as process that interactants bring with them in a communicative situation. This shared knowledge helps them to interpret a speaker's utterances and produce their own so that communication can proceed
smoothly.

In this section I have outlined some of the properties that describe a language user's knowledge as process. This knowledge as process helps him to selectively choose out of his vast resources of knowledge as product what is relevant, appropriate and intelligible for a particular communicative event. Selection processes are activated as a result of the interaction of background knowledge as process over background knowledge as product in the context of a given communicative event where all parameters, human as well as physical, are taken into account. This interaction results in strategies, the internal procedures for interpretation and production. I shall discuss strategies in the next section.

3.3.3 Strategies: the internal procedures

Strategies are the internal procedures of communication realized in actual performance. This performance is the external product of communication and can be studied by an analyst, whether oral or written. I take strategies to mean "the way we realize the communicative import of language in use". (cf. Widdowson, 1976, 1978, 1979). I would suggest that my strategies should be similar in scope with those Widdowson, 1976, 1979, calls procedures. The strategies are distinguished in two broad categories in accordance with their function in actual communication. These are cohesive strategies and coherent strategies.

In distinguishing between cohesive and coherence strategies, I also follow the distinction as is proposed and defined by Widdowson, 1976, 1979. By cohesive strategies, that is, I mean
the way "language users may employ rules of usage to realize the propositional development of language in use" (Widdowson, 1978) in a specific communicative event. The work of Sacks, 1972, for instance, on 'membership categorization devices' or that of Halliday and Hasan, 1976, on grammatical cohesion, describe some of the rules of usage the selection of which exemplifies cohesion strategies in the act of communication. By coherent strategies I mean the way in which "language users realize what communicative act is being performed in the expression of particular propositions and how different acts are related to each other" in actual communication. (Widdowson, 1979: 146). The work of Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975; Frake, 1964; Goffman, 1976; Mishler, 1975a, 1975b; Merrit, 1976; Corsaro, 1977; Labov & Fanshel, 1977, among many others, refers to different types of coherent strategies participants make use of in communication. Some coherent strategies refer to the overall interaction structure of communication in relation to the topic and the biographies of the participants. Others refer to the segmentation of interaction in a step-by-step development, as the participants interchangeably become speakers and listeners. Still others are used to restore normality in interaction either because participants do not share relevant information or because of mishearings, unhearings or misunderstandings. This corrective action may refer either to system or ritual constraints.

I would suggest, therefore, that coherent strategies should be distinguished into two categories. The distinction can be based upon the overt or covert function they serve in actual communication. So coherent strategies such as overall interaction structure, segmentation of interaction etc. I would classify as
overt communicating strategies. However, as the main aim of communication is to impart worthwhile information, in other words, new information, these overt communicating strategies are also covert learning strategies (cf. Chapter 5 for a detailed discussion). Yet, some of the strategies participants in an event use to restore normality because of lack of shared knowledge, I would classify as overt learning strategies and covert communicating strategies since they mainly aim at developing shared knowledge as well as at restoring the shaken equilibrium between participants. And in this category there also fall the strategies mothers make use of to help their children develop their learning and communicating abilities, and which children themselves will eventually use for the accomplishment of successful communication. (cf. Chapter 6 for a detailed discussion). For as Grimshaw, 1977, argues, L1 learning never stops though we are sometimes less attentive to the facts of continuing phonological change and of continuing learning of both appropriateness rules (Hymes, 1972a) and of strategies for getting things socially accomplished with talk.

Depending on the functions these strategies serve in natural communication I will classify them as follows: communicating strategies (such as overall interaction structure, topic development, minimal communicating strategy) may make up the macro-strategies or constitutive features of interaction, because they are "sine qua non" for interaction relevant anywhere and any time. (See chapter 5 for a detailed discussion on the constitutive

---

13/ By strategies he means things like firing someone, breaking with a sweetheart, expressing condolences and so on.
features of \((L_2)\) communication). On the other hand, communicating strategies to restore normality because of lack of shared knowledge, unhearings, mishearings and/or misunderstandings may make up the micro-strategies or regulative features of interaction. Their function is to regulate the communication process at the 'here and now' of a conversational exchange whenever there is a crisis. (See Chapter 6 for a detailed discussion on the regulative features of \((L_2)\) communication). Knowledge of strategies, along with knowledge as product and process, make up a language user's background knowledge which he brings with him in any communicative event as a first source of interpretation and production.

3.3.4 Actualized language behaviour

Actualized language behaviour is the linguistic realizations or vocal behaviour employed by participants in an event to express their communicative intent. It is culture specific and differs from society to society, and from subgroup to subgroup within a broader society. As already stated I will not discuss actualized verbal or vocal language behaviour because it is outside the scope of the present research.

3.4 Selecting and applying strategies

The nature of interaction, however, which involves a step-by-step development, renders background knowledge insufficient for an understanding of interaction in progress where participants interpret, produce and negotiate meanings interchangeably, selecting and applying strategies as the development of interaction demands it. It is necessary, therefore, for a better understanding of interaction in progress, to try to define the rela-
tionship of shared knowledge and developing interaction. This relationship is the result of the application of strategies for interpretation and production by the participants, and demonstrates the communicating and learning nature of interaction. Then, it is important to try to define meaning in interaction from the point of view of the participants in interaction who apply strategies for communication to function, as well as from the point of view of an outsider in interaction who watches others' doing things with words. Finally, I shall relate them both to L2 participants' knowledge and experience as language users.

To define the relationship of shared knowledge and developing interaction I shall base the discussion on a model worked out by Kjolseth, 1972. To define meaning in communication I shall refer to the writings of Garfinkel, 1967; Schutz, 1967 and Labov, 1972a.

3.4.1 Shared knowledge and developing interaction

Language users do not make use of all this background knowledge as product, process and strategies in every communicative event they are involved in as the interaction develops. On the contrary, they selectively choose out of this vast shared knowledge what is relevant, appropriate and intelligible for a particular communicative event. This process of selection is the result of the application of appropriate strategies relevant to a specific communicative event and the participants' "self-role" and "other-role". This process of selection, I think, is well exemplified in a model proposed by Kjolseth, 1972. Kjolseth discusses the relationship of shared knowledge for interpretation and production with developing natural communication. He
sees this relationship as a dynamic but narrowing down process. This narrowing down process is the result of the selection and application of strategies strictly relevant to a particular setting as a whole, as well as from conversational exchange to conversational exchange and from speaking turn to speaking turn as the interaction unfolds.

So Kjolseth, 1972, argues that while background shared knowledge is essential, it is itself insufficient "for members' methods of making situated sense of occasional indexical performances", in other words, this background shared knowledge is not enough for participants to interpret and produce context-dependent utterances. Further knowledge, Kjolseth, 1972, argues, is essential and participants do have shared knowledge other than background, which is relevant to a specific setting. Kjolseth, 1972, calls this foreground knowledge. He defines foreground knowledge thus:

"Foreground knowledge is what anybody knows is categorically relevant for the duration of this setting."

(Kjolseth, 1972 : 62)

So language users who are about to participate in an event select out of the vast resources of their background knowledge these coherence and cohesion strategies which are relevant, appropriate and intelligible for the duration of this setting. This process of selection is the result of the interaction of participants' knowledge as process and product on each other where setting, roles, rights and obligations are taken into account. This interaction determines the overt communicating strategies of interaction structure, overall topic development and minimal communicating strategy of communication for a specific communica-
tive event, that is, the constitutive features of communication. The constitutive features of communication are realized in actualized language behaviour and are available for examination as coherent macro-strategies. (cf. section 3.3.3 this chapter, as well as Chapter 5 for a detailed discussion on this issue).

Kjolseth, 1972, however, argues that foreground knowledge (that is, as process, product, strategies) may be good for making sense of a communicative event as a whole, but it is not enough for making sense of communication from conversational exchange to conversational exchange. So Kjolseth proposes two other aspects of knowledge also shared by interactants, the emergent grounds knowledge and the transcendent grounds knowledge.

Kjolseth defines emergent grounds knowledge thus:

"Emergent grounds knowledge is 'what we know is specifically relevant here and now at this episode'."

(Kjolseth, 1972: 65)

This is knowledge relevant to a particular exchange and is restricted to participants only because as Kjolseth writes, "we" the participants are "witnesses and representatives of this knowledge" and each use of the emergent grounds exemplifies this "we". (See also section 3.4.2 this chapter for a detailed discussion on meaning in communication). This dimension of knowledge, Kjolseth argues, has its domain of relevance sharply restricted to an occurring exchange here and now, whereas background and foreground knowledge are essential only for coming to terms with what the other's performance means at the beginning of the inter-

14 A conversational exchange is here defined as a minimal conversational unit usually made up of three turns (cf. Chapter 5, section 5.6 for a detailed discussion on conversational exchanges).
action and overall throughout it. Emergent grounds knowledge as process, product, strategies is reorganized and evolved by each new exchange and is essential for making sense of the other's performance at the level of conversational exchanges. This process of reorganization and evolution is the result of the application of appropriate coherent and cohesion strategies relevant to a specific conversational exchange. Selection of an appropriate strategy depends on topic development, role and status of participants, the physical and cultural constraints of the exchange and what was said before or what will follow. These strategies are available for examination as coherent micro-strategies, that is, the regulative features of interaction. (cf. Chapter 6 for a detailed discussion on this issue.)

The intimacy and uniqueness of emergent grounds shared knowledge for understanding a conversation has also been stressed by Garfinkel, 1967. Garfinkel maintains that interaction is dynamic evolving around "you and me" who are interacting and who may share knowledge that is not to the understanding of an outsider although all of us (you and me and him) may be members of the same speech community and we do share "what everyone knows" or in Kjolseth's terms, background and foreground shared knowledge. (See section 3.4.2 this chapter for a detailed discussion.)

The actual contents of the emergent grounds in a setting at a specific exchange have been characterized in a number of ways. Turner, 1962, for instance, speaks of "the situated evolution of tentative roles"; Van de Vate, 1966, speaks of "the situated language usage collectively legislated"; Moerman, 1968, notes that in natural conversation "context is built up by aligning actions and actors"; Kjolseth, 1968, depicts the emergent grounds as "a conversational resource composed by a structure population of relevances with variable degrees of tolerance"; Cicourel, 1970, refers to "unfolding contingencies"; Collins, 1967, speaks of "the development of a situational culture". (Reported in Kjolseth, 1972 : 65)
The emergent grounds of conversation evolve very rapidly as the interaction unfolds and unless a participant in an event is a skilled enough co-interactant his interpretation of the performance will be slow. Kjolseth himself stresses the fact that L₂ speakers will face even more problems in interpreting and producing from conversational exchange to conversational exchange because they will participate in the emergent grounds t when their L₁ co-interactants are already sharing emergent grounds t + 2 or 3. (Kjolseth, 1972: 67)

Kjolseth, however, argues that the three types of knowledge discussed so far are still insufficient for making sense of real performances in interaction at the level of speaking turn to speaking turn. Kjolseth maintains that there is also a fourth type of knowledge shared between participants on the grounds that "normal events have a retrospective-prospective sense of occurrence for members" (cf. also Cicourel, 1973; Grice, 1967). He calls this type of shared knowledge transcendent grounds shared knowledge.

Kjolseth, 1972, gives the following definition for transcendent grounds shared knowledge:

"Transcendent grounds shared knowledge 'is what we know is potentially relevant here and now at this episode'."

(Kjolseth, 1972: 67)

Kjolseth maintains that transcendent grounds knowledge, like emergent knowledge, is situationally redistributed and reorganized as well as equally variable. The distinguishing feature between emergent and transcendent knowledge is that the former is real and objective (and, of course, available for examination in actualized language behaviour), whereas the latter is unrealized and potential. However, Kjolseth argues, when transcendent grounds shared knowledge
is adequately realized, it passes into emergent grounds knowledge. This knowledge is not unlimited, but only situationally transcendent or "what is for members potentially relevant, appropriate and intelligible here and now". (Knolseth, 1972). For each speaking turn, Kjolseth argues the potential transcendent grounds are "actually a list of alternative, limited yet relevant responses of potential intelligibility, relevance and appropriateness". In terms of the present research, I would argue here, that transcendent grounds are actually a list of alternative cohesion and coherent strategies that may be applicable in a particular conversational exchange from speaking turn to speaking turn. For Kjolseth the fact that the inappropriate response or rather strategy realized in actualized language behaviour would be evident to both parties demonstrates that the members of a speech community "share defining criteria determining what is within and without the bounds of potential relevance". (Kjolseth, 1972 : 70) Transcendent grounds, for Kjolseth, like emergent grounds, are shared. These defining criteria are conditioned by the constraints of the preceding interaction, the current topic, the facts of the situation such as status and role, the current speaker's intentions, the biographies of the participants, norms of interaction and the like, in other words, participants' transcendent grounds knowledge as product, process and strategies.

Kjolseth maintains that there is no hierarchy of importance to be established among these separate grounds. All grounds are constraints and resources and are all equally essential for the meaningful development of interaction. Similarly, as I have argued in section 3.3 this chapter, there is no hierarchy of import-
ance to be established among the contents of these grounds, namely, product, process, strategies, and of course, actualized language behaviour as a manifestation of communication. For, they are all equally essential for participants to achieve situated meaning as are the grounds of shared knowledge.

The relationship of these grounds exemplify a macro-strategy of a narrowing down process for the successful accomplishment of communication. However, when participants in an event communicate, in principle, they also impart to each other (in other words, they learn from each other) new cognitive, indexical and interaction-management information. Step-by-step negotiation of meaning and learning is a matter of participants' sharing product, process, strategies at emergent grounds. Kjolseth maintains that as soon as a conversational exchange is over all new knowledge exchanged passes into foreground knowledge for the duration of this setting. (cf. pp.52-54 where the relationship of strategies, processes and product for the development of communication is discussed.) Whereas as soon as the interaction is over all new knowledge exchanged passes into participants' background knowledge. Although Kjolseth does not make it clear his suggestion indicates the learning nature of communication.

I would argue, therefore, that participants in an event achieve negotiation of meaning through a narrowing down process of selection and application of strategies, but they achieve learning through a reverse process of expansion of their respective shared knowledge (of all four types) as the interaction comes to its conclusion. Figure 4 on p.88 schematically indicates these reciprocal processes that demonstrate the two-fold aim of any interaction: overt communication and covert learning, as argued
tries to explain common understanding in communication in socio-
logical terms. As a result, he overlooks the psychological pro-
cesses involved in natural communication. I raised this point
again in section 3.3.2 where I discussed the properties of the
cognitive processes that make up participants' knowledge as pro-
cess in natural communication.

Garfinkel, 1967, then distinguishes two types of meaning in
communication, the "product" meaning and the "process" meaning
of common understanding. The terms product and process are de-
fined differently by Garfinkel and by myself for the purposes
of the present research. (See pp. 51-52 for a definition of the
terms knowledge as product and process).

Garfinkel, 1967, has based this distinction on Weber's con-
cept of Begreifen and Verstehen, each with its distinct character
as method and knowledge (cf. Schutz, 1967). As "product" common
understanding is thought to consist of a shared agreement on
culture-specific substantive matters; as "process" it consists
of various methods whereby something that a person says or does
is recognized to accord with a rule. The process meaning of
common understanding, Garfinkel argues, is presumably based on
background expectancies, that is, shared knowledge as substan-
tive information and as rules of interpretation.

To exemplify the distinction between product and process,
Garfinkel, 1967, reports an experiment he conducted with his
students. He asked them to report what was actually talked about
by a husband and wife in a piece of conversation. He attributes
his students' failure to report what was actually talked about,
to the two different meanings of common understanding that exist
in communication. One is the "product" meaning "what everyone
knows" and the other is the "process" meaning which is dynamic and evolves around "you and me" who are interacting and who may share knowledge which is not understandable by an outsider although all of us (you and me and him) may be members of the same speech community and we do share "what everyone knows". Therefore, Garfinkel argues, interactants in the process of communication develop their own intimate shared knowledge, on which their methods as communication strategies (see p.52 for a definition) depend and to which an outsider cannot have access. In terms of the present research I take this intimate knowledge to be what Kjolseth calls emergent and transcendent grounds shared knowledge in natural communication (cf. section 3.4 this chapter), and to decide the regulative features of interaction.

Schutz, 1967, on the other hand, distinguishes three different meanings for the same action. He writes ".... the meaning is necessarily a different one (a) for the actor; (b) for his partner involved with him in interaction and having thus with him a set of relevances and purposes in common; and (c) for the observer not involved in such relationship". (Schutz, 1967 : 24-25). Schutz's interpretation of meaning for the actor, for his partner and for the observer leads to two important consequences: firstly, we have but a chance to understand the other's action sufficiently for the purpose at hand and secondly, to increase this chance, we have to search for the meaning the action has for the actor. Schutz then postulates the "subjective interpretation of meaning" as a principle of constructing "course-of-action types", that is, strategies in communication. Schutz specifies the subjective meaning thus:
"the subjective meaning an action has for an actor is unique and individual because it originates in the unique and individual biographical situation of the actor".

(Schutz, 1967: 35)

In terms of the present research I would argue that subjective interpretation of meaning depends on the actor and his partner sharing emergent and transcendent grounds knowledge and thus selecting and applying strategies which may not be to an understanding of outsiders.

Similarly, Labov, 1972a, makes a distinction between interaction in process and discourse as a finished product in the hands of the analyst. He writes that we rely mainly upon our intuition to distinguish coherent discourse from incoherent discourse. Labov, then, argues that the problem discourse analysts face is to show how one utterance follows another "in a rational, ruled-governed manner" in order to form "sound judgements and interpret sequences of utterances" as the participants in conversation do. (Labov, 1972a: 252). The observer, therefore, and for that reason the discourse analyst, cannot really say what was talked about since they did not share the "you and I" and "here and now" (Garfinkel, 1967; Schutz, 1967; Kjolseth, 1972) intimate shared knowledge developing in the unfolding communication.

In terms of the present research, I take the product meaning of common understanding, based on the constitutive features of communication, to be accessible to both participants and outsiders (and for that reason the discourse analyst) because it depends on background and foreground knowledge as product, process and strategies shared by all. The process meaning of understand-
ing, however, based on the regulative features of communication, is accessible only to the participants in an event because it depends on their emergent and transcendent grounds knowledge (Kjolseth, 1972) as product, process and strategies shared only by the actor and his/her partner. This distinction bears important consequences for ELT. I shall discuss this issue in Chapter 7.

3.5 Communication Universals

Successful negotiation of meaning depends on an interaction of the two types of knowledge (knowledge as product and knowledge as process) which result in coherent and cohesive strategies. Strategies, as argued, become actualized through culture-specific language behaviour. These knowledge systems all language users possess. It is knowledge as process and strategies, however, that oblige the participants to make sure that the expressive resources of face-to-face interaction are not employed to convey something unintended but that they accomplish the doing of something as the circumstances require it. Shared knowledge as product, process, strategies and actualized language behaviour allows participants in an event to interpret and produce verbal and non-verbal behaviour accordingly and conduct themselves in accordance with their interpretation and production. In interacting with each other participants in a communicative situation are continually giving each other instructions as to the intentions, social character, their biographies and the like. Understanding of these instructions depends on the knowledge they share as substantive culture-bound information, cognitive processes and strategies.
Although vocal/non-vocal, verbal/non-verbal realizations are culture-specific, the principles operating behind them as processes and strategies seem to be universal/pancultural (cf. sections 3.3 and 3.3.2 this chapter; also Chapter 2). This leads to the argument that although knowledge as product and actualized language behaviour may be different from society to society, knowledge as process as well as strategies as internal procedures may be common to all of them. Bruner suggests that what might be innate about language learning is not linguistic innateness, as Chomsky, 1965, has argued, but "some special features of human action and human attention that permit language to be decoded by the uses to which it is put". (Bruner, 1975b). Thus knowledge as process and strategies, the psychological categories of communication, may make up what I would like to call 'communication universals'. This view seems to be supported by relevant research in cognitive psychology, interactionist psychology, functional development of language, social psychology and ethnomethodology. However, further research is required to prove this point. (cf. Chapter 2, 3, 5, 6 and Conclusions.)

With reference to the L₂ learner, it is obvious that the learner gets into learning the L₂ knowing how to use language (his L₁) to communicate. He has learned all the necessary knowledge as process and strategies for face-to-face interaction for learning and communicating purposes. Consequently the learner may transfer this 'knowledge and experience' from L₁ communication to L₂ communication as a general strategy for communicating and for learning any new linguistic, social and cognitive information he might not know as he communicates. It is only after we
make this assumption that we can accept Rivers and Temperley's conclusion that "Linguistically gifted students will always develop confidence (in using the L₂ in true communication) with or without special guidance". (Rivers & Temperley, 1978 : 17) (See also Introduction.) Consequently native speakers and non-native speakers are expected to make use of similar strategies to communicate and learn.

In order to prove this hypothesis right, I set up an experiment which would allow the participants (non-native speakers and native speakers) to get involved in the joint activity where natural verbal and vocal communication is required to accomplish the joint action, and where information gaps between participants in the event need to be bridged if they were to do the task. The participants (non-native speakers as well as native speakers) were expected to make use of appropriate strategies for communicating and learning purposes. The aim of the present research is to identify these strategies and try to define the processes that decide the selection of one strategy over the other as a system of options. However, I shall first discuss the experimental design in the next chapter.
Chapter 4

The Experimental Design

4.1 Purpose of the Experimental Design

The purpose of the experiment was to collect free interaction data of Greek learners of English in natural L₂ communicative situations or mixed communicative situations.

A natural communicative situation is defined as a situation where genuinely newsworthy cognitive and affective information is exchanged between participants. An L₂ communicative situation has been defined as a situation where L₂ learner-speakers interact among themselves in or outside an EFL classroom situation. A mixed communicative situation has been defined as a situation where L₂ learner-speakers interact with L₁ speakers. It was decided to set up an experiment to elicit conversational data which could then serve as the basis of an 'interaction analysis' of non-native communication in an attempt to discover how L₂ learners (with particular reference to the Greek learner of English) communicate with other native speaker as well as non-native speaker co-interactants. As already stated, the present research aims at discovering the strategies learners make use of for communicating and learning purposes in natural L₂ communication. I will then try to define these strategies in the light of the discussion in Chapters 2 and 3 and compare them with the strategies used by native speaker participants.

To achieve this goal, pairs of subjects were asked to do a problem-solving task. The task was to put together a jigsaw puzzle using the L₂ as a medium of communication. The task was so designed as to create information gaps of factual information between the subjects. The subjects were also expected not to share all relevant background, foreground, emergent and transcendent
grounds knowledge as product, possibly knowledge as process (especially in mixed communicative situations) and strategies relevant to the task in question. It was hoped that the Greek learners of English would reveal the learning strategies they make use of to bridge gaps over non-shared factual or non-factual information, as well as the communicating strategies they make use of to monitor and sustain communication in the L₂. It was expected that these strategies would be similar to those L₁ speakers use in order to communicate (cf. Chapters 2 and 3). For verification purposes the experiment was also replicated with two native speaker subjects (see also section 4.4.1).

4.2 Real-life situation characteristics and their relevance to the experimental design

A game-playing situation was decided upon as the best way to collect natural interaction data because it shares all basic characteristics with real life situations. These characteristics (after Goffman, 1961) are as follows:

(a) First, game-playing involves a step-by-step development of "meaningful happenings" (Goffman, 1961) in order to achieve the final goal. In our case, the subjects had to identify the pieces and slowly reconstruct the jigsaw puzzle. They could go about it either from top to bottom or from bottom to top; or from left to right, or from right to left, or from the frame to the centre or from the centre to the frame (see Appendix I a', b', c').

(b) Second, game-playing also involves a "schema of expression and interpretation" (Goffman, 1961) which depends upon the steps to follow for the successful completion of the game, as is the case, for instance, with a game of chess.
In other words, the subjects will have to negotiate meanings for production and interpretation strictly relevant to the situation, in order to do the task.

(c) Third, in playing a game participants also take up the "game-generated roles or identities" (Goffman, 1961) and conduct themselves in accordance with their roles as participants in communicative events do in real-life situations. In our case the subjects play the roles of two partners of equal status in the joint activity. They will both be seeking genuine and worthwhile information from each other in order to do the task. The subjects would not simply be playing roles assigned to them by the experimenter, as is usually the case in role-playing activities and simulations. In Turner's (1962) terms the subjects would be role-making, they would not be role-taking. Turner defines role-making as the case where the individual imposes on the role(s) his personal characteristics, motivations, intentions, experience in relation to other roles and the situation as a whole; whereas in role-taking the individual simply enacts, brings to light the role(s) assigned to him by the society or the role(s) he has willingly undertaken "as if roles had unequivocal existence and clarity". (Turner, 1962 : 21-23).

To sum up the first three characteristics, games are world-building situations and they seem to display in a simple way the structure of real life situations. Game-playing is built around an interaction of context, meaningful language in use and roles that involve role-making processes. It is for these three basic characteristics of game-playing that educators and language acqui-
sition researchers consider game-playing activities important for the cognitive/perceptual/social/linguistic development of the children (cf. Piaget, 1951; Bruner, 1977, 1978; Ryan, 1974 and others, for mother-tongue learning; Peck, 1978 for second language learning.).

(d) A fourth important characteristic of game-playing is the spontaneous involvement of the participants in the act of playing. Goffman has this to say about what he calls the "organismic psychobiological nature" of spontaneous involvement:

"When an individual becomes engaged in an activity whether shared or not, it is possible for him to become caught up by it, to be spontaneously involved in it. A visual and cognitive engrossment occurs, with an honest unawareness of matters other than the activity. By this spontaneous involvement in the joint activity, the individual becomes an integral part of the situation, lodged in it and exposed to it."

(Goffman, 1961 : 40)

Game-playing activities will help the subjects concentrate on the problem to be solved and not on the language itself. Because of the given context the subjects are expected to be highly motivated to attend to the precision, adequacy, appropriacy and relevance of what they say in relation to the context and their partner's performance. Long & Castanos, 1976, as well as Allwright, 1976, have similar things to say about their learners' performance in lego construction experiments.

(e) Finally, this type of game was decided upon because of the information gaps it could create for the subjects. The information gaps were of two kinds:
(i) lack of shared knowledge as factual information, thus rendering the task worth doing for the participants because of the newsworthiness of messages to be exchanged;

(ii) lack of shared knowledge of the L₂ as product, possibly as process and/or strategies. This type of non-shared knowledge cannot be pre-determined; nor is it something to be desired.

The task is expected to look more like a natural joint activity than an experiment. The subjects themselves are expected to find out how much they share of the relevant but necessary knowledge as product, process and strategies and then find 'ways and means' (i.e. relevant strategies) to bridge the gaps of non-shared knowledge.

All characteristics of games discussed here are similar to those found in real life communicative situations, that is, the types of situation the learner-subjects may encounter in L₂ communicative situations and in mixed communicative situations inside and outside the classroom.

4.3 The Subjects

The subjects participated in the experiments on a voluntary basis. No pre-test was administered to them to discover the extent of their knowledge of English. The experimental design aimed at discovering the communicating/learning strategies the learners would employ to achieve maximum communicative effect with whatever knowledge of English they might have in a problem-solving situation. It is the main hypothesis of this thesis that the learners regardless of age, classroom methodology, teaching materials,
non-native speaker teacher or native speaker teacher, contact with the language outside the classroom and so on, will use similar strategies to negotiate meanings in L₂ communication. Learners will transfer their communicative ability as 'knowledge and experience' about how to communicate from L₁ communication to L₂ communication. To verify the hypothesis the subjects who participated in the experiment came from different schools. Teaching materials and classroom methodology were different. Some had had non-native speaker teachers only, others had had native speaker teachers too. Some had had contact with the language outside the classroom, others none at all. Some had known their partners in the experiment for a long time, others for a few minutes. Almost half of them were adolescents, the other half were adults. Most of the experiments were conducted with pairs of Greek learners of English. Some, however, were conducted with pairs of Greek learners and native speakers of English. (See also 4.4.1).

The age of the subjects ranged from 12 years to 40 years old. It was decided to use only adolescent and adult learners in the experiments because they are fully developed cognitively/perceptually/socially/linguistically in L₁. They have mastered communication in the L₁ and, consequently, have had all 'knowledge and experience' of norms of interaction, norms of interpretation and production as well as all substantive culture-bound information and knowledge of the world at large. These are necessary factors to successful communication as research in learning to communicate and communication has shown (cf. Chapters 2 and 3).

The subjects' exposure to English as a foreign language ranged from two years to ten years of instruction in an EFL situation. I would define the EFL situation as 'the teaching of English
as a foreign language which is most often conducted by a non-native speaker teacher when the L₂ is not the L₁ of the social milieu nor a lingua franca, but rather a three-to-four-hour-a-week classroom language'. Broadly speaking, they could be described as of second year beginners level to advanced level.

The subjects came from various schools of English. Some attended state high schools where English is taught as a foreign language, others attended private evening schools of English. Still others attended such schools as the British Council Institute in Athens and the Hellenic-American Union School of English, also in Athens. Others were students at the English Department, University of Athens. The subjects had been exposed to a variety of teaching materials and classroom methodology ranging from the traditional grammar-translation methods and materials to audio-lingually and situationally orientated methods and materials. Most of the subjects had had non-native speaker teachers, some, however, had had native speaker teachers, too. Most of them had had no contact with the English language outside the classroom; very few had had some contact with the language outside the classroom, either through reading for pleasure, or travelling in an English-speaking country or making occasional acquaintances with some English-speaking tourists in Greece.

Finally, the length of time the participants in an experiment had known each other varied. In the L₂ communicative situations most subjects knew their partners for a short or long period of time. Some had known each other for a few weeks, others for several years. The subjects were either classmates or attended the same school and had met each other during breaks. In the mixed communicative situations the participants had not known
each other before. They met some time before they were to do the
task.

4.4 Description of the experimental design

Two subjects took part in each experiment. The subjects
were sitting at either end of the table with an opaque screen in-
between. The purpose of the screen was to exclude any other
channels of communication (such as gestures, eye-contact, and
so on) and to reinforce reliance on the spoken language only for
communication purposes (cf. Chapter 3, p. 47). A telephone conver-
sation, for instance, would also involve the same parameters in
order to achieve effective communication (cf. Schegloff, 1972).

As argued in Chapter 3, communication can only take place
if participants in an event share the same knowledge as product,
process, strategies and actualized language behaviour (cf. Chap-
ter 3, pp. 51-80). The task was designed in such a way
as to create information gaps between the participants, which
they would be expected to bridge in order to do the task.

So one of the participants had the complete picture of the
jigsaw puzzle as it appears on the cover of the box (see Append-
ix I, a, b, c.). In the transcriptions (see Appendices II, III,
IV) this participant is designated by the letter X. The other
participant had the broken jigsaw pieces (see Appendix I, a', b',
c'). In the transcriptions, this participant is designated by
the letter Z. Z did not know what the complete picture looked
like, nor did X know which part of the complete picture each jig-
saw piece showed. There were, therefore, information gaps between
the participants. If the subjects were to do the task, they had
to make use of appropriate strategies to bridge these gaps of
factual information. Apart from that the Greek subjects were also required to use the L₂ to negotiate meanings. But they could not know in advance whether they and their co-participant (be it a native speaker or a non-native speaker) shared the necessary knowledge of the L₂ for production and interpretation purposes relevant to the task in question. In other words, they could not know in advance whether they shared relevant background, foreground, emergent and transcendent ground knowledge as product, process and strategies (cf. Chapter 3). Whenever the subjects did not share such knowledge of the L₂ they were expected to use appropriate strategies to bridge gaps of shared knowledge to complete the task. The Greek subjects were expected to transfer these strategies from L₁ communication to L₂ communication as part of their 'knowledge and experience' about how to communicate and learn through language.

4.4.1 Total number of experiments

The total number of experiments is 34, distributed as follows:

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adolescents</th>
<th>Adolescents</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L₂ communicative situation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixed communicative situation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L₁ communicative situation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the total number of experiments, 28 experiments were performed by pairs of Greek learners in an L₂ communicative situation
(see Appendix II, for instance, for sample transcriptions of such an experiment). 5 experiments were performed by pairs of one Greek learner of English and one native speaker of English in a mixed communicative situation (see Appendix III for sample transcriptions of such an experiment). Finally, one experiment was performed by adult English native speakers (see Appendix IV). The last experiment was conducted for verification purposes. The aim was to identify and compare the communicating/learning strategies the native speakers would use between themselves with those they would use with their non-native speaker partners. Suffice it to say now that all participants, native and non-native speakers, used similar strategies to bridge information gaps as well as to monitor and sustain communication. (cf. Chapters 5 and 6 for a detailed discussion on these issues).

4.4.2 Instructions

The following instructions were given to the subjects before they started on the task. The instructions were given in English. They were given in Greek on the subjects' request only, whenever some of them did not understand the instructions because their knowledge of English was poor.

"You and your partner are going to play a game. You are requested to use only English in order to communicate. You will sit at opposite sides of the table. Between you there will be the screen so that you cannot see each other. You will be given a jigsaw puzzle. One of you will be given the complete picture of the jigsaw puzzle as it appears on the cover of the box, the other will be given the jigsaw pieces at random order. Whoever will have the complete picture won't know which part of the picture each piece shows. Whoever will have the jigsaw pieces won't know what the complete picture looks like. You are asked to reconstruct the jigsaw puzzle picture. The person with the complete picture will help the other to fit the jigsaw pieces together. All pieces must be used. Agree with each other how you would like to play the game by giving instructions, for instance, or asking for help and so on."
Most of the subjects did not know much about jigsaw puzzles. It is a kind of game that had been recently introduced to the toy shops in Athens. Most subjects, therefore, were not familiar with these unless they had had younger brothers and sisters.

After the instructions were given, the experimenter left the room. It was decided it would be inhibiting for the participants if the experimenter, whom they met for the first time, was present. And as most of the subjects admitted later, it was the first time they used English to communicate in a natural situation.

4.4.3 Place

The experiments took place in one of the unoccupied classrooms of the schools the subjects attended. The conversations were taped in a portable Sony tape-recorder.

4.4.4 Time

The experiments lasted from about a quarter of an hour to thirty-five minutes. Mean length of experiments, twenty-five minutes. The length of time depended on the amount of shared meanings the subjects happened to have about the jigsaw puzzle picture (factual information) as well as knowledge of the L2 to interpret and produce utterances in coherent interaction in the L2 relevant to the task in question. It seems that the more participants in an event know in common the better and quicker they can negotiate meanings to achieve the desired goal of the conversation. Whereas the less participants share in common the more time they will spend to advance the necessary shared know-
ledge if they are to do the task. In other words, they will have to employ relevant strategies to advance the missing shared knowledge.

4.5 Transcription of conversational data

Transcripts were made of the conversational data. In deciding the type of transcription to employ, I was guided by three considerations: clarity of presentation; ease of reference for the type of interaction analysis discussed in Chapter 5; and the need to preserve in the transcript such conversational features as hesitation, interruption, self-correction and simultaneous speech.

No reconstruction of the data has been attempted. The data have been numbered from speaking turn to speaking turn for ease of reference.

The symbols used in the transcript are as follows:

```
/   self correction
(....) hesitation
II  interruption
[ ] simultaneous speech
```

X:: or Z:: Two pairs of double dots after X's or Z's numbered speaking turn indicate that the ratified speaker continues his/her utterance uninterrupted while the other participant in

---

Relevant to this point made here are Wall's (1968) and Chafe's (1970) findings reported in Bruner, 1978: 42. Wall found that the mean length of dialogues between children and parents was shorter than that of dialogues between the same children and strangers. Chafe argued the difference found in the mean length by Wall can be explained in terms of new non-shared information and old or shared information between participants in interaction, children and parents, on one hand; children and strangers on the other. Chafe maintained that old and new information is handled grammatically in different ways.
the game comes in not to get the floor but to monitor conversation through back-channel cues, these 'much appreciated interruptions' (cf. Duncan, 1972, 1973; Goffman, 1976).

Interactant is not a ratified speaker, he monitors interaction through back-channel cues.

To distinguish two moves played in the same turn from each other.
5.1 Approaches to Oral Communication Analysis

A short review of the literature clearly shows that a single approach to oral communication analysis cannot fully account for all features involved in communication to achieve negotiation of meaning in interaction in the making. Some researchers, for instance, have looked at isolated structural features of conversation such as adjacency pairs (Sacks, 1967, 1968; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973); turn-taking (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974); side sequences and their function (Jefferson, 1972); insertion sequences and their function (Schegloff, 1972); couplet linkage in counter service interaction (Merritt, 1976); or clarification requests, their form and function in monitoring interaction between children and adults (Corsaro, 1977). Others have looked at the sociolinguistic variables operating and influencing the structure of the basic unit in their data, especially one type of an act of communication, namely, questioning as an exemplification of power and authority relationships (Mishler, 1975b). Other researchers, however, have considered the topic variable as the most important feature in interaction and based their analysis on it (Dore, 1978a; Clancy, 1972).

Still others have looked at conversation from a shared knowledge point of view, namely, what and how much participants in an encounter must know in common if they are to understand each other and negotiate meanings (Psathas & Kozloff, 1976 on direction giving instructions; Labov & Fanshel, 1977, on therapeutic discourse). Labov & Fanshel also attempted to write sequencing rules operating from action to action in the production of cohe-
rent discourse.

Some other researchers have also looked at the structural side of whole chunks of oral communication. They examined interaction beyond the segment of two-item pairs, couplets or small chunks in an attempt to incorporate in their analysis such important features of oral communication as topic, tactics or roles, and tried to work out complete models of discourse analysis (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, on classroom interaction; Goldberg, 1975, on giving cooking instructions over the telephone; Frake, 1964, on drinking in Subanun).

The variety of approaches and the different features of communication each one deals with indicate the multifaceted character of interaction and the plurality of the variables interacting on each other in the act of communication. These variables are the system and ritual constraints as defined by Goffman, 1976; (cf. Chapter 3) the topic, especially change of topic and topic development (Clancy, 1972; Dore, 1978a; Sacks & Schegloff, 1973); the situation, physical and cultural (Hymes, 1972; Gumperz, 1970); and the biographies of the participants, which include role, status, their knowledge of the language (be it L₁ or L₂ if they are communicating through the medium of L₂) and knowledge of the world at large; (cf. Labov, 1972a; Schutz, 1967).

Hence it seems rather difficult to come down with an interaction analysis model for pedagogical purposes that could capture the dynamic interaction of these variables on each other, that is, the process meaning of communication via an examination of the product of interaction. In Chapter 3, pp.89-93 I have discussed the two meanings of interaction as process and product and the difficulties an analyst faces in defining the process through the product.
Consequently, the model of interaction analysis I will present in this chapter is only a descriptive model for the conversational data in question, and is, of course, based on the product meaning of interaction. As such, the proposed model is not an a priori model that can fit well enough each possible L₂ interaction. The number of variables involved in interaction in general as well as the unpredictability involved in the L₂ participants' knowledge of the foreign language do not allow us to work out a model of interaction analysis good enough to fit any communicative situation our learners will be involved in. The proposed model indicates the way the present analyst sees interaction development in the data and can be useful for theoretical speculation as well as for drawing pedagogical implications for ELT (cf. Chapter 7 for pedagogical implications). However, before I discuss the proposed descriptive model, I shall first briefly discuss the background knowledge that a non-native speaker participant brings with him when he sets about communicating through the medium of L₂ (cf. Chapter 3 for the background knowledge an L₁ language user has). And second, I shall briefly discuss the domains of knowledge the interaction of which results in L₂ communication in the context of a (cognitive) interactionist approach to communicating through language (cf. Chapter 2).

5.2 The non-native speaker participants' background knowledge

The non-native speaker participants have already learned one language, their mother tongue. In terms of the interactionist approach of learning how to communicate through language, it means that the participants are perceptually and cognitively developed (cf. Chapter 2). Their cognitive orientation is of
course built around a sense of social structure as it is recognized and considered appropriate in their society (Cicourel, 1973). They have learned to verbalize their communicative intent in the L₁ conforming to all system and ritual constraints as norms of interaction organization and rules of interpretation and production, as well as to the appropriate and relevant normal forms and oral vocabularies for the indexing of experience which are specific to their society (Cicourel, 1973) (cf. Chapter 3). The participants have also developed conceptual schemata (cf. Bloom & Lahey, 1978, especially Part II) of how to handle particular topics for topic development and topic change, in our case how to go about games of the type they were asked to play (cf. Chapter 4), though they might or they might not have played this particular game before. Furthermore, they also have knowledge of the world at large as substantive information.

All this constitutes their background knowledge as product, process and strategies which is relevant any time and anywhere in L₁ natural communication. When the non-native speaker participants get engaged in foreign language communication, in this background knowledge of theirs there is also included whatever knowledge of the L₂ as product, process, strategies and actualized language behaviour they may have about how to express themselves.

It will be misleading to assume that when learners get engaged in L₂ communication they leave their personality, their communicating and learning strategies, as 'knowledge and experience' behind and can put on a different personality or learn new strategies altogether. Suffice it to say now that as the present research indicates L₂ learners transfer their communicating and learning strategies as
'knowledge and experience' from L₁ to L₂ communication. Furthermore, both L₂ learners and native speakers have made use of similar communicating and learning strategies.

5.3 The domains of knowledge in foreign language communication

As stated in Chapter 2, in a (cognitive) interactionist approach L₁ natural communication is the result of the interaction of the three domains of knowledge i.e. cognitive, social, linguistic, with the environment (physical and human) (cf. Chapter 2, pp.33-35).

In foreign language communication, I would argue that L₂ natural communication is also the result of the interaction of the following three domains of knowledge systems, participants in an event have, namely, of cognition, of the foreign language as linguistic rules and of the foreign language as sociolinguistic rules of language use relevant to the event they are involved in (see Figure 5 below). The interaction of these three results in foreign language communication.

Figure 5.

Legend: cog = cognition
L₂-use = L₂ as sociolinguistic rules of use
L₂-usage = L₂ as linguistic rules of usage

17/ Children have been excluded from my research because they are not yet fully cognitively and perceptually developed.
As the research indicates, of the three domains the domain of cognition is transferred from L₁ communication as 'knowledge and experience', about how to communicate and learn through language.

The domain of cognition, therefore, can be defined in terms of (a) the cognitive abilities participants have as 'knowledge and experience' for interaction organization and management, and (b) in terms of the decision-making processes of which strategies are appropriate, intelligible and relevant for the successful and orderly completion of a social verbal encounter that participants have as 'knowledge and experience' from learning to communicate in L₁ (cf. Figure 1, p.33; also Footnote 19, p.129).

The domains of the foreign language of the participants can be defined in terms of the foreign language as usage and use, L₂ learners may use to express their communicative intent in a particular L₂ communicative event.

The domain of cognition mediates between the domains of L₂-use and L₂-usage. Their interaction results in foreign language communication as coherent macro-and micro-strategies participants employ for the negotiation of meaning (cf. Chapter 3 for a detailed discussion on these issues). As already stated, it is the aim of this research to identify these strategies, discover the processes that help the speaker to decide upon the functional value of these strategies and suggest possible applications of these in the ELT classroom. These strategies, however, do not only indicate how participants communicate but also how they learn (cf. Chapter 3, section 3.3, pp.48-55). Consequently, such an approach to communicating and learning can also lead to a model of foreign language learning. However, a detailed investigation of this issue is outside the scope of the present
research.

5.4 The model of analysis

The model of analysis I have decided upon has been based on that proposed by Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975. However, it has been modified to suit the needs of an interaction pattern where both participants have equal rights and obligations for the smooth development and successful completion of communication. I have decided to use a rank scale descriptive system because of its flexibility and its basic assumption.

5.4.1 Summary of the levels and ranks in the model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content categories</th>
<th>Interaction organization and management categories</th>
<th>Categories of the foreign language of the participants as linguistic realizations in grammatical terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>topic</td>
<td>overall interaction structure</td>
<td>sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtopic</td>
<td>conversational exchange</td>
<td>clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>turn</td>
<td>group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>move</td>
<td>word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>act</td>
<td>morpheme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The levels and ranks of content and interaction organization and management describe the coherent macro-strategies, that is, the constitutive features of communication, that participants selected and applied as appropriate, intelligible and relevant out of a number of potential ones in order to make sense. The
third level and ranks of the foreign language of the participants in the model describe the cohesive and coherent strategies participants selected and applied out of a number of potential ones as actualized verbal language behaviour.

5.4.2 Explanation of levels and ranks in the model

(a) The level of content is defined in terms of topic development, shifts in topic and topic change. For the data under consideration there are two ranks in the level of content:

1. **topic** or subject of conversation (here the topic is the reconstruction of the puzzle).
2. **subtopic** each one of the discrete points that make up the topic (here each part of the jigsaw that is being gradually reconstructed).

Participants may reconstruct the jigsaw starting from top to bottom or from left to right and vice versa. They may also move from the centre to the frame or from the frame to the centre. It is up to them to decide how they will go about the non-linguistic organization of their interaction.

(b) The level of interaction organization and management is defined in terms of the macro-strategies employed for the overall organization and management of conversation, as well as in terms of the micro-strategies employed by participants for the step-by-step development of conversation as one utterance initiates and the other proceeds to achieve the end result of a particular communicative situation, here, to reconstruct the jigsaw puzzle.

The level of interaction organization and management is made up of five ranks. The highest rank is that of the overall
interaction structure. It is made up of three distinct phases:

1. The opening phase.
2. The negotiation phase
3. The closing phase

(See section 5.5 for a detailed discussion.)

The overall interaction structure is a macro-strategy that reflects the coherent organization of interaction into smaller units easily recognizable and demonstrates the negotiating nature of interaction. This rank depends on and exemplifies the participants' foreground shared knowledge (cf. Chapter 3, p.82). This top rank corresponds to the topic rank of the level of content. In principle the phases of the overall interaction structure of a conversation may be predicted in advance, but not the length, the subject-matter and the strategies the participants might use in each phase.

The next rank below is that of the conversational exchange (see also 5.6 for a detailed discussion). Dore defines conversational exchanges as

"a series of speaking turns which share a topic and in which reciprocal illocutionary relations are displayed."

(Dore, 1978a : 276)

Conversational exchanges may be short or long (Cole et al., 1978). In the model conversational exchanges deal with discrete points of the topic i.e. the subtopics. The rank of conversational exchange corresponds to the second rank of the level of content that of subtopic. The micro-strategy employed in a conversational exchange depends on the communicative intent of the speaker and the pragmatics of the situation in relation to the topic, the partici-
pants' knowledge of the L₂ and their roles in the "here and now" and reflects the participants' emergent grounds shared knowledge (cf. Chapter 3, p.83). Topic development, that is, selection and order of subtopics to accomplish the task, however, is unpredictable and uncontrollable. It is up to the individual participants in an event to decide and negotiate between themselves the topic development that suits them best. Topic development (here, how to play the game) depends on the conceptual schemata the participants have learned and share about how to handle this topic, the knowledge of the L₂ they share relevant to the topic in question and that of the world at large. It is impossible, therefore, to predict participants' micro-strategies both as internal procedures and as actualized language behaviour at the rank of a conversational exchange.

The next rank below is that of turn, two or more turns (at least one for each participant) make up the higher rank of a conversational exchange. The rank of turn constitutes a participant-subject's speaking turn. A speaking-turn is defined in terms of a speaker's utterance issued when the speaker is holding the floor (Sacks et al., 1974). This rank of the level of the interaction organization and management corresponds to the rank of the sentence in the level of the foreign language of the participants. The rank of turn is made up of one or more moves, that is, the next below rank. I retain Sinclair's et al., 1975, definition for the rank of move. They define move as the smallest free unit, smaller than an utterance, although it has
a structure in terms of acts. 18/

Moves can be coexistent with utterances i.e. speaking turns, or an utterance may contain two moves, one facing backwards finishing off the latest conversational exchange, and the other facing forwards initiating a new conversational exchange. This rank is necessary to accommodate such micro-strategies in conversational exchanges as in coupling, for instance (see section 5.6.5).

The lowest rank of the level of the interaction organization and management is the act. One or more speech acts make up a move.

(c) The level of the foreign language of the participants as linguistic realizations is made up of five ranks. The rank scale of grammar categories suggested by Halliday, 1961, seems to suit best a rank scale descriptive system of interaction. The top rank of the grammar categories corresponds to the rank of turn in the level of interaction organization and management.

To sum up, the levels and the ranks of content and of the interaction organization and management describe the macro-strategies participants employed to negotiate meanings in the act of communication. The level of content reflects the participants'
ability to handle topics, that is, the non-linguistic organization of communication. The level of interaction organization and management reflects the participants' knowledge of and ability to use the (foreign) language functionally and coherently in $L_2$ interaction. The level of the foreign language of the participants reflects their knowledge of and ability to use the formal properties of the foreign language as normal forms and indexical expressions correctly in terms of usage and cohesion in $L_2$ interaction. Putting it another way, a language user's communicative competence (be it $L_1$ or $L_2$) is manifested through the accurate use of the system of the language as well as through the appropriate use of the functional properties of it in coherent discourse. These three levels and their ranks are realized in actualized language behaviour, are accessible to examination and demonstrate the product meaning of communication.

In the next two sections I shall discuss in some detail the macro-strategies employed in the two top ranks of the level of interaction organization and management, that is, the overall interaction structure and the structure of the type(s) of a conversational exchange encountered in the data, namely, the constitutive features of (foreign) language communication. In this chapter, I shall deal with the interactive acts performed by the speakers in the conversational exchanges. In Chapter 6, I shall discuss the functional properties that the different structural types of a conversational exchange take on as communicating and learning micro-strategies for the smooth development of $L_2$ interaction.
5.5 Overall Interaction Structure

As stated, the conversations share a similar structure as a whole. I have called this macro-strategy overall interaction structure. The overall interaction structure is made up of three distinct phases:

1. The opening phase
2. The negotiation phase
3. The closing phase

In the opening phase the participants, native speakers and non-native speakers alike, share information about what the jigsaw puzzle looks like overall. Either participant can start the conversation, there is no hard and fast rule about who would open up the communication channels. So, in some cases it is the participant who has got the complete picture in front of him/her (always marked with the letter Z in the transcriptions) who will start the conversation (see examples 1, 2 and 3 below).

Ex 1 Zografos School of English 19/1-3 * (Adolescents, non-native speakers)

1Z: Well, I think that you must take the pieces that they have a line at the end **

2X: A line?

3Z: Yes. So that you can make the square in the (inaudible)

It's a picture of Donald and Scrooge that they found a big box of gold coins and they are to the roof-room

* In each example there is included the name of the school where the experiment took place, then the coding number that the experiment has, and after the dash the numbered speaking turns quoted as examples.

** In Chapter 4, pp.107-8 there is a list of the symbols used in the transcription and their explanation.
Ex 2 Experimental High School 14/1-3 (Adolescents, non-native speakers)

1Z: Well, it's a picture that it might be a garden and we have a house that we make some (...) (...)

2X:

Z:: and we have a duck and a car with three other ducks.

Ex 3 Hellenic-American Union School of English 2/1-4 (Adults, X = non-native speaker Z = native speaker)

1Z: Oh, Maria

2X: Yes.

Z:: This picture shows two ducks, Donald Duck. Do you understand what a duck it?

3X: Yes.

4Z: O.K. There are two Donald Duck pictures.

In other cases, however, the participant (always marked with the letter X in the transcriptions) who has the jigsaw pieces initiates the conversation requesting his/her co-participant to give him/her a quick general description of the jigsaw puzzle picture (see examples 4, 5 and 6 below).

Ex 4 Zografos School of English 5/1-8 (Adolescents, non-native speakers)

1X: Uhm, uhm. Τι είναι αυτό; (What's the picture about?)

2Z: One duck he is speak / she is speak in / to the three duck / the three ducks. Three ducks are on a car.

Car is in the road. Opposite the / inside the road is a field (...) and a tree.
Ex 5 Gogos School of English 1/1-5 (Adolescents, X = native speaker, Z = non-native speaker)

1X: Tell me what to do.
2Z: Yes.
3X: What is the picture about?
4Z: It's a train on the (...) besides the train it's a road.
5X: O.K. A road, let me see.

Ex 6 Adults, native speakers 1/1-3

1X: Let me put the pieces with the coloured sides up so that
2Z: O.K. I'll tell you more or less what's happening in the picture. It's just a Donald Ducky picture with the two ducks / two ducks in a loft looking at a treasure chest of gold coins.
3X: O.K.

In the negotiation phase the two participants negotiate the reconstruction of the jigsaw puzzle piece by piece either working from top to bottom, or from left to right, or from the frame to the centre. This phase is usually long. The total number of turn-takings varies from 50 to about 150 turns (see, for instance, Appendix II a) tt 4X - 140X; Appendix III a) tt 5X - 141X; Appendix IV a) tt 6Z - 118Z).

In the closing phase the two participants bring the task to an end. This phase might be short, a total of a few turns (see for instance Ex 7, Ex 8, Ex 9).

Ex 7 Experimental High School 1/135-136 (Adolescents, non-native speakers)

136Z: O.K.
Ex. 8 Gogos School of English 1/141-142 (adolescents, 
X = native speaker 
Z = non-native speaker)

141X: Oh, O.K. Never mind. And then (laughter) I
finished it.
There is a / Oh, alright. There is room.
O.K. Right.

142Z: Yes.

Ex 9 Zografos School of English 21/89-93 (Adolescents, non-
native speakers)

89X: I finished.

90Z: All of it?

91X: Yes.

92Z: Great!

Sometimes, however, the closing phase might be long. After the 
reconstruction of the jigsaw pieces some participants recycled 
the exchanged information to make sure that the reconstructed 
picture matched the complete picture (See for instance Ex 10).

Ex 10 Zografos School of English 19/73-89 (Adults, non-
native speakers)

73X: It's O.K. I found it.

74Z: We finished. Check.

75X: It's Donald and Scrooge at the middle. They are 
in front of an open box with / with gold coins. There 
are two windows at the roof. That's it. It's O.K.

76Z: Is it any ladder down on the floor?

77X: Yes, at the left.

78Z: Is there any candlestick near Scrooge?

79X: Yes. The first window on the left is opened.

80Z: [and the]

X : [and the] other.

81Z: Yes.
82X: Some book at right? III
83Z: Is there any toy?
84X: What? Any toy?
85Z: Yes.
86X: What's that?
87Z: Toy.
88X: An, yeah, near Scrooge.
89Z: I guess it's O.K.

In such cases the closing phase is long.

The overall interaction structure exemplified a macro-strategy the participants (non-native as well as native speakers of English) selected out of a number of potential ones in order to make sense across the interaction as a whole in this particular setting. This is part of the participants' foreground shared knowledge, "what anybody knows is categorically relevant for the duration of this setting" (Kjolseth, 1972, also Chapter 3). The L2 learner-subjects have transferred overall interaction structure for this setting from L1 communication to L2 communication as part of their 'knowledge and experience' about how to communicate.

The overall interaction structure, as it is described here, is similar to Dore's (1978) 'phase structure' of taped interactions between teachers and nursery pupils doing tasks, to Candlin's et al., (1976) 'operational phases' of interactions in cubicle consultations, as well as to Sinclair & Coulthard's (1975) discourse category 'transaction' (cf Golderberg, 1975; Frake, 1964; Psathas & Kozloff, 1976).

5.6 The conversational exchange

In order to better understand the minimal communicating stra-
t strat egy at the rank of conversational exchange participants selected out of a number of potential ones, I shall first discuss convergence of two divergent worlds and how convergence i.e. advancing shared knowledge, takes place through interaction (cf. section 5.6.1).

In section 5.6.2 I shall discuss the structure of the minimal communicating strategy of a conversational exchange as one macro-strategy participants have made use of in order to achieve convergence of knowledge. This minimal communicating strategy of a conversational exchange exemplifies how participants make sense in the 'here and now' of a conversational exchange in relation to the pragmatics of the situation (physical and social).

In section 5.6.3 I shall discuss an analysis of the minimal communicating strategy interactive acts.

In section 5.6.4 I shall discuss the features of types of communicative strategies encountered in conversational exchanges other than the minimal communicating strategy. I shall discuss in terms of these strategies interactive acts. These other types of communicative strategies are not only the result of the participants' negotiating meanings but also of their need to overcome crises in communication such as mishearings, unhearings, misunderstandings and/or bridging information gaps other than gaps referring to content. However, the functional properties of these strategies for the management of interaction will be discussed in detail in Chapter 6.

5.6.1 Convergence of knowledge

As argued in Chapter 3, communication is possible if participants share the same communicative backgrounds (cf. Chapter 3, section 3.3). The experiment is so designed as to create information
gaps between the participants. The participants (native speakers as well as non-native speakers) can only communicate if they bridge these gaps. Information gaps refer to the topic, that is, the jigsaw puzzle. X, for instance, has the jigsaw pieces at random order. He/she does not know what the complete picture looks like. Z has the complete picture. He/she does not know which part of the jigsaw each piece shows. Information gaps may also concern gaps in knowledge of the foreign language the participants need in order to express meanings relevant to the topic. Neither can know in advance how much of the foreign language they share when negotiating meanings relevant to the topic. For each non-native speaker participant brings with him his own background knowledge of the L2. Participants in a communicative event must find out how much they share and bridge the gaps of non-shared information as the interaction unfolds. If they are to do the task X to know as much as Z and Z as much as X.

The development of shared knowledge of factual and linguistic information about the jigsaw between the participants as they are reconstructing the jigsaw puzzle bit by bit can be clearly shown in the following schema (cf. Figure 6, p.128)
Figure 6.

The two top circles a.X and a.Z indicate the two different worlds that participants represent. This lack of shared knowledge may refer to the background, foreground, emergent and/or transcendent grounds knowledge that participants bring with them to a communicative event as factual and/or linguistic information. Divergence, therefore, may refer either to the setting as a whole, here how to do the jigsaw, or to a particular exchange, here how to do a particular bit of the jigsaw, as the interaction unfolds. On the other hand, convergence of knowledge, that is, sharing of information, takes place smoothly as the interaction proceeds. This is schematically shown in Figure 6. The darkened parts of the circles indicate convergence of knowledge, that is, the information that is now shared between the two participants. The white parts indicate the non-shared information between the
participants. At the end of the task both participants share all information relevant to the setting. Their worlds, therefore, become convergent as d.X and d.Z in Figure 6 (p.128) indicate. This achievement is shown in the structure of interaction. Sharing of knowledge in this experiment can only be achieved through language since the subjects cannot see each other (cf. Chapter 4). Language is a means of achieving interaction, it is not interaction itself. In order to achieve this end participants employ whatever strategies they consider appropriate for successful communication. I have defined strategies in oral communication as the way we employ our background knowledge as product, process and strategies in realizing the communicative import of language in use as a specific contribution to a developing interaction (cf. Chapter 3, pp.77-80).

As the research indicates, both native and non-native speaker participants knew how to achieve convergence of two divergent worlds. They have indeed used similar strategies to achieve this end (cf. sections 5.6.2 and 5.6.3). For this is part of the 'knowledge and experience' the subjects have from how to communicate and learn in L1. The strategies the participants employed to achieve this end are as much communicating as learning strategies, that is, participants use the same

---

19/ Interaction i.e. exchange of messages can also take place through body language, facial expressions, signals etc. where no language as such is used (cf. Chapter 3, p.47 "Behavioural means of communication"; also Chapter 4, p.103). Goffman, 1957, for instance, refers to the social conditioning that allows people not to collide when they are walking in the street. The behaviour to follow, he argues, depends on the shared knowledge/common sense knowledge walkers have concerning this particular activity. If, however, something goes wrong and walkers do collide, push or elbow each other etc., they may resort to language with an "Oh, I'm sorry" and so on or they may nod to each other to restore the shaken equilibrium. Language is just one of the means of sharing information, possibly the most refined one.
strategies to facilitate communication between themselves as well as to achieve convergence of two divergent worlds. This need for convergence of knowledge in interaction guides the participants to select appropriate strategies that can best suit their purposes in the “here and now” of a conversational exchange where learning takes place, as has been argued in Chapter 2.

5.6.2 The minimal communicating strategy (i.e. overall interaction strategy)

Convergence of knowledge is sustained and achieved through questioning. Snow, 1978, argues that questions are posed in mother-child interaction in order to establish joint attention and to confirm that experiences are being shared in the immediate context. The importance of questioning for the development of shared knowledge has also been stressed by other researchers in child cognitive/perceptual/social/linguistic development (cf. Bruner 1975b, 1977, 1978; Bloom & Lahey, 1978).

The participants in the experiment were also seeking convergence of knowledge. The minimal communicating strategy that emerges is that of the "Question-Answer" type, where participants are questioning one another to achieve convergence of knowledge.

On closer examination, however, it became clear that it would be wrong to take a two-turn conversational exchange as the minimal communicating strategy for data analysis at the rank of a conversational exchange. A conversational exchange either short or long is not only a linguistic unit, it is also a unit in an interaction sequence, and as such each speaking turn is not simply an utterance but also a social action (Merritt, 1976). As a result, the minimal communicative unit of analysis will have to be explained
both in terms of system constraints (Goffman, 1976), that is, as a linguistic unit as well as in terms of ritual constraints (Goffman, 1976), that is, as a social unit where participants in the event also aim at sustaining interpersonal relationships and their society's sense of social structure through the language they choose to make use of, as well as the interactive sequences they employ. Researchers (cf. Sacks, 1972a, Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) have considered adjacency pairs as the minimal unit for interaction analysis. However, the need to explain the minimal communicative unit in terms of both system and ritual constraints renders adjacency pairs of the Question-Answer type topically orientated as minimal communicative units rather irrelevant.

I would rather argue that the minimal communicative unit is a three-part one, not a two-part one. This three-part minimal communicative unit can be made up either of purely linguistic turns only or of a combination of linguistic turns and non-linguistic ones. It seems that only a three-part minimal communicative unit can be explained both in terms of system and ritual constraints.

To prove my point I shall discuss the following hypothetical examples.

Let's consider first a Q-A adjacency pair or two-turn conversational exchange, a hypothetical example:

1. A: Can you help me move the cupboard, George?
   B: Yes, of course.

This exchange can be perfectly explained in terms of system constraints. A requests B's help. A's utterance is in an interrogative form. B responds positively to that by employing appropriate linguistic expressions (cf. Labov, 1972b). However, this two-utterance unit cannot indicate the ritual constraints opera-
ting in such a situation. In a real life situation A is expected to say something to acknowledge the service kindly offered when requested. So something in the line of:

A: Thanks / Oh, good / Come on. Let's do it now, then.

would follow if the speaker were to obey the social norm that states: if you are given help/service, you ought to acknowledge it (cf. Goffman, 1954, 1959, 1976). The first speaker (A) also has the option to acknowledge the service kindly offered by using body language (i.e. gestures or eye contact etc.) instead of using verbal language. This option, however, does not render the three-part minimal unit invalid (see also p.135).

If we go back to our example and instead of an acceptance following the request for help we replace it with a refusal, then we will have:

2. A: Can you help me move the cupboard, George?
   B: Sorry, I'm in a hurry
   or
   I'm so sorry. I'll miss my bus if I'm late.

or something similar to that. In this case it is important that A makes it clear he understands and there are no hard feelings left because he did not get the help he expected. In Goffman's terms, A will have to make use of a strategy of 'protective practices' or 'talk' to save the definition of the situation projected by the other participant. A might say something like:

A: Oh that's all right. We can do it some other time.

and so on. The function of the third part is to reduce tension, establish good will and avoid hostility (Goffman, 1957, 1959,
1976). It is true, however, that A has, of course, the option of saying nothing at all. This, however, would make it crystal clear that he was hurt by B's refusal to help him, in other words, it is a "silence to be heard" (Sacks et al., 1973).

I would like to suggest, therefore, that the basic unit for interaction analysis should be a three-part one. Otherwise, an adjacency pair type of unit will not be much different from the Q-A pair of the structural approach (cf. Stimulus/Response in behaviourism) where only the system of the language is attended to, but not the social aspects of it.

The view that the basic interaction analysis unit at the level of the conversational exchange should be a tri-part one is also supported by other researchers. Mishler (1975b), for instance, argues that a question requires a response, but the response demands a further response to terminate the exchange. Mishler found that in question-initiated and sustained conversations the "dialogue minimal unit" consists of three successive utterances:

1. Question
2. Response utterance
3. Confirmation from first speaker

He considers the third element necessary since the questioned has the right to know how his answer was received (also Soring, 1977). Dore, on the other hand, takes the matter a step further and argues that the sequencing of conversation in a three-part unit topically orientated not only demonstrates the essentially negotiating nature of conversation "it also brings into relief the kind of rights one takes and moves one makes in our mutual
manipulation through talk" (Dore, 1978a: 277). Dore, therefore, takes sides with Goffman who argues that conversational sequences should be explained both in terms of system constraints and ritual constraints.

Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, also argue that the minimal unit of analysis at the rank of conversational exchange is a tripartite one.

Finally, Goffman, 1976, questions the utility of adjacency pairs as the minimal unit of analysis, but takes a different road. He quotes the following brief encounter:

A: (enters wearing new hat)
B: (shakes head) No, I don't like it.
A: Now, I know it's right.

(Goffman, 1976: 290)

and argues that in this encounter we can see spoken "moves" (see Footnote 18, p.119 for a definition of the term) and non-linguistic ones interacting. Therefore, he concludes, it would be misleading to accept the notion of adjacency pairs and ritual interchange as the basic unit of conversation. What is basic to natural talk, he goes on to say, might not be a conversational unit at all but an interactional one, something of the order of:

1. mentionable event
2. mention
3. comment-on-mention

20/ Ritual interchanges have been defined in the literature in terms of such social encounters as greetings, leave-takings and so on. (cf. Sacks & Schegloff, 1973).
This sequence, he argues, gives us a three-part unit, the first part of which may not involve speech at all.

It seems that Goffman excludes the purely three-part linguistic unit as discussed above in favour of what he calls an interactional unit. I would argue, however, that both are two sides of the same coin, i.e. variations of the basic communicative unit that can demonstrate the working interrelationships of both system and ritual constraints. A minimal communicative unit can be made up of purely linguistic moves or a combination of mentionable event(s) and linguistic moves as defined by Goffman. In fact, the minimal three-part communicative unit, identified in the data, is either a purely linguistic unit or an interactional unit as defined by Goffman, 1976. Furthermore, I would like to suggest that, contrary to what Goffman, 1976, argues, ritual interchanges are also three-part communicative units. I would consider that the interactants' coming face-to-face when they meet or before they leave each other, constitutes the first part of the sequence what Goffman has called a "mentionable event". The ritual interchanges that follow, for instance, are actually made up of three moves. The first one is non-linguistic.

1. (participants' meeting each other - "a mentionable event")
   
   2. A: Hi.
   
   3. B: Hi.

Participants employ ritual interchanges as a means to sustain interpersonal relationships and reinforce the sense of social structure their society adheres to. In this sense ritual inter-
changes fulfil the basic aim of communication, that is, they convey worthwhile information and sustain convergence of two worlds.

5.6.3 Analysis of the minimal communicating strategy

The minimal communicating strategy is made up of three parts that comprise three different moves. Following Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, I will label them as follows:

1. the opening move (O)
2. the answering move (A)
3. the follow-up move (F)

See pp.141-43 for an analysis of some examples of conversational exchanges.

In a purely linguistic communicating strategy the first and the third move are played by the same speaker. Only the second move is played by the other participant (cf. Ex.11, Ex.12, Ex.19, pp.141-43). In a communicating strategy where linguistic and non-linguistic moves are combined, either the first move or the third move can be non-linguistic, that is, "mentionable events" (cf. Ex.18, Ex.15, pp.141-43).

In this minimal communicating strategy each move coincides with a speaking turn. Each speaking turn is made up of one act (cf. Ex.11, 19X, p.143), or a series of acts (cf. Ex.12, 61X, p.141). These acts, which will be described in this chapter, are different in kind from Austin's illocutionary acts and Searle's speech acts. They are defined principally by their function in the discourse by the way they initiate succeeding discourse activity or respond to earlier discourse activity (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). They are interactive acts in the sense described by Widdowson:
"Interactive acts are essentially ways of organizing the discourse itself and are defined by their internal function."

(Widdowson, 1979:138)

In labelling the acts I will follow Sinclair & Coulthard's (1975) terminology. However, some acts may be defined differently.

**Mentionable events** are here defined in terms of the physical situation (cf. Goffman's example quoted on p.134, also my definition of pauses as silences to be heard, see p.140), or the social situation relevant to an event. The role, the status, the rights and obligations of the participants, their interpersonal relationships and their sense of social structure, I think, may constitute mentionable events in their own right.

**The Opening Move**

As already stated, the opening move may be realized linguistically or non-linguistically. When realized linguistically the speaker very often performs the act of elicitation. The function of this interactive act is to elicit factual or linguistic information about the topic or the organization and management of interaction. In grammatical terms an elicitation is realized as an interrogative or as an affirmative followed by a realized or understood tag question. (cf. Ex.11, 19X, Ex.13, 118X, pp.141, 142).

The opening move, however, can also be realized non-linguistically. The situation, physical and/or social, initiates the conversational exchange. See, for instance, Ex.14, 20Z – 21X, p.142. Z, who has got the whole jigsaw picture, is actually responding to the situation that obliges him to give instructions to X so that they can do the task.
To sum up, the opening move can be realized as an act or as an event:

1. elicitation (el)
2. a mentionable event

The Answering Move

The answering move is usually realized linguistically in the data. It may be made up of one of the following acts:

1. a reply (rep)
2. a directive (d)
3. an informative (inf)

A reply is an act performed by the second ratified speaker. Its function is to provide appropriate linguistic response to an elicitation. Grammatically it is usually realized by an affirmative or by short lexical items, such as "Yes," "No," or by phrases such as "I don't know".

A directive is an act performed by the first ratified speaker in the conversational exchange in response to the situation. Its function is to direct and guide the listener about what to do next so that they may complete the task. Grammatically it is usually realized by an imperative or an affirmative including an appropriate modal verb (see Ex.14, 20Z; Ex.15, 12Z, p.142).

Finally, an informative is an act performed by the first ratified speaker in the conversational exchange in response to the situation. Its function is to provide more factual or linguistic information to the listener relevant to the subtopic or the organization and management of interaction. Grammatically, it is usually realized as an affirmative. (See, for instance,
The Follow-up Move

The follow-up move is either realized linguistically or non-linguistically. When realized linguistically it is usually realized as one of the following acts:

1. an accept (acc)
2. an acknowledge (ack)
3. a reject (rej)

An accept may follow a reply, an informative or a directive. Its function is to indicate that the listener has heard what the previous speaker has said and considers the reply, the informative or the directive appropriate. It is realized by a small class of items such as "Yes", "I see (it)", "We are going (= doing) very well", or a repetition of the previous speaker's utterance, see, for instance, Ex.12, 63X; Ex.13, 120X; Ex.14, 21X; Ex.16, 23X; pp.141-43.

However, if the speaker has heard what the previous speaker has said but considers the reply, the informative or the directive inappropriate, he employs a reject (see Ex.27, 103X, p.151).

Finally, an acknowledgement may follow a reply, an informative or a directive. Its function is to show that the speaker has heard and understood what the previous speaker has said. And if it is a directive the speaker will do as directed. (See Ex.11, 21X; Ex.15, 13X; Ex.17, 77X, pp.141-43).

The follow-up move may also be realized non-linguistically. It is somehow replaced by pauses (see for instance, Ex.18, 43X; p.143). In example 18, for instance, X neither acknowledges nor rejects nor accepts 42Z. His pause and change
of subtopic seem to be due to pragmatic reasons. It seems that X has not yet identified the pieces of the jigsaw for which he has been given information in 42Z, so he leaves the matter open. He proceeds to initiate a new exchange by introducing another subtopic, hoping it will thus be easier for him to identify the pieces. (See also section 5.6.5 on coupling).

Considering these pauses in context, they seem to mean something in the line of "Wait till I check my pieces once more and then I'll tell you if your answer is appropriate or inappropriate". In other words, it's "a silence to be heard" (Sacks et al., 1973). In a way, it is a pseudo-two-part sequence. A series of such two-part sequences should be distinguished from a chaining sequence where there are no pauses intervening (cf. p.144).

To sum up this section, the minimal communicating macro-strategy in the data can be a purely linguistic one or a combination of linguistic and non-linguistic moves. The chart below indicates the minimal communicating macro-strategy as a system of possible options available to participants in an event and the decisions they may make in the act of communication after they have taken into consideration the pragmatics of the situation, their communicative intent and their rights and obligations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moves</th>
<th>Opening</th>
<th>Answering</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>elicitation</td>
<td>reply</td>
<td>ack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
<td>directive</td>
<td>acc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>or mentionable event(s)</td>
<td>informative</td>
<td>reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall interaction structure and the minimal communicating strategy make up the macro-strategies of a particular interaction in natural communication. Macro-strategies are - sine qua non - features of natural communication and may be predetermined.

Hence I have called them constitutive features of communication (cf. Chapter 3, p.77). They make up the product meaning in communication (cf. Chapter 3, section 3.4.2) and are accessible both to participants in an event and outsiders to the event.

Some examples from the data:

Ex.11 Zografos School of English 5/19-21 (adolescents, non-native speakers)
19X: Is there a house?  O  el
20Z: Yes, is / is the / is an old house  A  rep
21X: Mhm.  F  ack **

Ex.12 Zografos School of English 14/61-63 (adolescents, non-native speakers)
61X: What's this with the blue colour and white? What's this? Door?  O  el
62Z: It's the sky.  A  rep
62Z: Ah, the sky.  F  acc

* The initials I.A. stand for interactive acts..

** The arrows indicate that the interaction may continue and may take any form from the point of view of interaction organization and management.
Ex. 13 Experimental High School	 1/118-120  Moves I.A.
(Adolescents, non-native speakers)

118X: In the picture we can see all the train or part of the train? O el

119Z: The whole train. The whole engine. Only the engine. A rep

120X: Ah, only the engine. F acc

Ex. 14 Zografos School of English	 15/20-21
(Adolescents, non-native speakers)

20Z: You can start from the sky which is at the top and left. O M.E.*

21X: Yes, I see it. ὅπο, γὰρ ὅτι, ὅπως ταῦτα ἂν ζητήσω. (i.e. Where on earth can I put it, it does not fit)
Oh, yes. F acc

Ex. 15 Zografos School of English	 7/12-13
(adults, non-native speakers)

12Z: First you make the Scrooge O M.E.

13X: Yes. Where the scones on the head? F O ack el

Ex. 16 Zografos School of English	 15/22-23
(Adolescents, non-native speakers)

22Z: There is a little car in the left. A inf

23X: I know I have / Oh, yes. We are going very well. The grass where is this? F O ack el

* The initials M.E. stand for mentionable event(s).
5.6.4 Analysis of other types of communicating strategies

The flow of interaction, however, is not always carried out in conversational exchanges that are made up of strategies as short and clear-cut as the three-move ones discussed so far. Nor is transition from conversational exchange to conversational exchange always taking place when a three-move exchange is completed. Conversational exchanges can be longer or shorter. Moves, too, do not always coincide with a speaking turn. On the contrary, in a speaking turn
there may be more than one move played. The structure of these communicating strategies may look more complex than the structure of the minimal communicating macro-strategy. The functional properties of these strategies for convergence of knowledge or interaction organization and management to solve crises in communication, are of equal if not of more importance for the successful completion of communication. Participants make use of them to regulate natural communication when problems arise. Hence, I have called them regulative features of interaction in natural communication. They make up the micro-strategies of a particular interaction (cf. Chapter 3, p.77). Selection and application of these depends on the intimate shared knowledge that participants in an event develop and they make up the process meaning in communication (cf. Chapter 3, section 3.4.2). In this section I shall discuss their features as interactive acts. In Chapter 6, however, I shall discuss their functional properties in natural communication.

These other communicating strategies encountered in the data are:

1. chaining
2. insertion sequences
3. coupling

1. **Chaining sequences**

Chaining is a strategy made up of a number of pairs of opening and answering moves usually finishing off with a follow-up. The opening moves are usually realized as elicitations, the answering moves as replies and the follow-up move as an ack or an acc. See, for instance, Ex.20 and Ex.21 on p.145.
### Ex. 20 British Council Institute
1/124-134
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moves</th>
<th>I.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>124X: What colour is the floor?</td>
<td>O₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125Z: Brown.</td>
<td>A₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126X: What colour is the money?</td>
<td>O₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127Z: I / I don't know.</td>
<td>A₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128X: What colour's the box?</td>
<td>O₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130X: The piece of paper?</td>
<td>O₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131Z: White</td>
<td>A₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132X: The books?</td>
<td>O₅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133Z: Red, uhm, uhm, red and green</td>
<td>A₅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134X: Yeah.</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ex. 21 Zografos School of English
7/111-116
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moves</th>
<th>I.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111Z: Have you made the gold box / books / boxes?</td>
<td>O₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112X: Yes.</td>
<td>A₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113Z: Donald Duck, Scrooge, ladder?</td>
<td>O₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114X: Yes.</td>
<td>A₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115Z: Windows?</td>
<td>O₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116X: Yes.</td>
<td>A₃</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chaining sequences may be of the following format structurally:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moves</th>
<th>I.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0₁</td>
<td>el₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>rep₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0₂</td>
<td>el₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>rep₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0₃</td>
<td>el₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₃</td>
<td>rep₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>[ack·acc] (optional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The follow-up move in chaining (when there is one) is played by the first ratified speaker and initiator of the exchange. This also supports the argument that the minimal communicative unit cannot be a two-turn one, but a three-turn one. Chaining sequences serve different functions in natural communication for convergence of knowledge and the organization and management of interaction. The functional properties of chaining sequences I shall discuss in Chapter 6.

2. Insertion sequences

Insertion sequences make up an important type of communicating and/or learning strategies at the rank of conversational exchange that serve a variety of functions for convergence of knowledge and the organization and management of interaction whenever there are crises in the communication process. See, for instance, Ex.22, 202-21X; Ex.23, 56X-57Z and especially Ex.25, 44Z-45X and 45X-47Z, where one insertion sequence follows the other:
Ex.22 Zografos School of English (adolescents, non-native speakers)

19X: Can you say / can you tell me how many pieces is the car? 01 el
20Z: What how many pieces? 02 el
21X: You think A2 rep
22Z: I can't help in that case.... A1 rep

Ex.23 Zografos School of English (adults, non-native speakers)

55Z: The box is open. A1 rep
56X: The box? 02 el
57Z: Is open. A2 rep
58X: Yes. Where is the box? F 03 ack I el

Ex.24 Adults, native speakers

14Z: ...on the floor there is lying something that looks like a golf bag, possibly. A1 rep
15X: A golf bag? 02 el
16Z: Is a bag of some kind. A2 rep
17Z: And
Ex. 25 Experimental High School  1/43-47  Moves  I.A.  
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

43X: It's near the train a felt?  0_ el  
44Z: Uhm? Can you repeat the pond / the  0_ el  
question?  
45X: I told you / I ask you if you have /  0_ rep  
if a felt is near the train.  
46Z: A felt?  0_ el  
47X: I feet / a feet is near the train.  0_ rep  

Ex. 26 Hellenic-American Union  3/1-4  
School of English  (adults,  X = non-native speaker  
Z = native speaker)  

1Z: Oh Maria  0  M.E.  
2X: Yes  
3Z: This picture shows two ducks, Donald  0 2  el  
Duck. Do you understand what a duck  
is?  
3X: Yes.  0_ rep  
4Z: O.K. There are two Donald Duck  0_ rep  
pictures.  

Insertion sequences capture the important notion that the  
embedded or inserted sequence(s) is relevant and subordinate to  
the primary sequence. The presupposition is "if you answer my  
question I will answer yours", or "if you make your point clear  
or you clear up the channel, I will tell you if I agree or dis-  
agree with you." Once the embedded sequence is completed, the  
conditional relevance of an answering move or a follow-up move  
to re-establish the flow of interaction where it was halted is  
automatically reinstated.
Structurally, insertion sequences may be of the following formats:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moves</th>
<th>I.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$O_1$</td>
<td>$el_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_2$</td>
<td>$el_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_2$</td>
<td>$rep_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_1$</td>
<td>$rep_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_1$</td>
<td>$[ack \cdot acc \cdot rej]_1$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moves</th>
<th>I.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$O_1$</td>
<td>$[el_1 \cdot M.E.]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_1$</td>
<td>$[rep_1 \cdot [d \cdot inf]]_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_2$</td>
<td>$el_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_2$</td>
<td>$rep_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_1$</td>
<td>$[ack \cdot acc \cdot rej]_1$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moves</th>
<th>I.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$O_1$</td>
<td>$M.E.$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_1$</td>
<td>$[inf \cdot d]_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_2$</td>
<td>$el_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_2$</td>
<td>$rep_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_2$</td>
<td>$[A_1 \cdot O_3]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_2$</td>
<td>$[acc \cdot acc]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_2$</td>
<td>$[inf \cdot d]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_2$</td>
<td>$[el_2]$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where moves $O_1 \cdot A_1$, $A_1 \cdot F_1$ and $A_1 \cdot [A_1 \cdot O_3]$ make up the primary sequence and moves $O_2 \cdot A_2$ or $O_2 \cdot A_2 \cdot F_2$ make up the inserted or embedded sequence. The charts above indicate a system of possible
options for communicating/learning strategies available to participants and the decisions they may make in the act of communication after they have taken into consideration the pragmatics of the situation, their communicative intent and their rights and obligations.

This type of communicating/learning strategies has come into the literature under different terminology. Schegloff, 1972, calls them insertion sequences (I have also retained this term). Merritt, 1976, calls them embedded sequences; Corsaro, 1977, calls them clarification requests, whereas Jefferson, 1972, calls them "side sequences". Some of these scholars have dealt with the structural features of certain types of these strategies only, others with their functional properties, too.

Although these strategies share similar structural features, they take on different functional values as the participants employ them to regulate the actual interaction. I shall discuss the functional properties of them for the smooth development of natural communication in Chapter 6.

3. **Coupling**

However, important phenomena with special functional value take place not only across the conversation as a whole (cf. section 5.5) or within a conversational exchange from speaking turn to speaking turn (cf. sections 5.6.3 & 5.6.4), but also within a speaking turn. A speaking turn may contain more than one proposition, either related to each other (cf. Chapter 6, The Expansion Strategy, section 6.3.3) or one proposition finishing off the last exchange whereas the other starts off a new one. This strategy has come into the literature as coupling (Merritt,
Coupling is a communicating strategy defined in terms of transition from one conversational exchange to the other. It enables the ratified speaker to play two moves in the same turn; in other words, to do two things: to respond to the previous speaker's utterance and then to become an initiator himself (cf. Merritt, 1976), see for instance Ex.27, 104X; Ex.28, 140X; as well as Ex.18, 43X; Ex.16, 23X; pp.142-43.

Ex.27 Experimental High School (adolescents, non-native speakers) 1/100-104 Moves I.A.

100X: What is between the train and the el
101Z: Tank.
X: Tank?
102Z: Nothing/ Oh. A blue /
103X: Impossible.
Z: A part of a blue thing.
104X: A part of a blue thing! And the car / the blue car is near the / the businessmen?

Ex.28 British Council Institute (adolescents, non-native speakers) 1/138-140

138X: What / what behind Scrooge?
139Z: Nothing.
140X: Nothing. Behind Donald?

The ratified speaker either introduces a new subtopic altogether or deals with a different aspect of the same subtopic. In

* The symbol \_\slash \_ separates the two moves from each other played by a participant in the same turn.
Ex. 27, 104X, for instance, X indirectly rejects Z's answer and then initiates an elicitation on another subtopic himself. In Ex. 28, 140X, however, X accepts Z's reply and goes on to initiate an elicitation on another subtopic. (See also Ex. 26, 4Z, p. 148).

Coupling, however, may not be introduced only after the third move in the conversational exchange but also after the second move, see, for instance, Ex. 29, 8Z; Ex. 30, 8Z; also Ex. 15, 13X; Ex. 16, 23Z and Ex. 18, 43X, pp. 142-43.

Ex. 29 Zografos School of English 21/5-8 Moves I.A.
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

5X: There are three men in the picture, two of them are close.
6Z: Yes.
X: One is far.
8Z: Yes. What are they doing? Is there any car in the picture?

Ex. 30 Zografos School of English 2/7-8
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

7X: And the children?
8Z: They are in the car. Anything else?

Selection of the coupling strategy depends on pragmatic grounds. It speeds up the conversation and allows both participants in interaction to initiate conversational exchanges and the put to a test of relevance and appropriateness shifts in topic or rather subtopics. Merritt, 1976, reports that she has identified similar sequences in her counter service data.

To sum up, the charts on p. 153 indicate a system of possi-
ble options for coupling moves available to participants and the decisions they may make in the act of communication after they have taken into consideration the pragmatics of the situation, their communicative intent and their rights and obligations.

In Chapter 6 I shall discuss the functional properties of the micro-strategies which make up the regulative features of natural (foreign) language communication.
6.1 Communicating and learning micro-strategies

The regulative features of foreign language communication have been defined as communicating and learning micro-strategies which hearer-speakers make use of to advance shared knowledge and/or to restore normality in communication where there is the possibility of a potential break-down in communication or when one has actually occurred.

The importance of strategies to restore normality in communication has been repeatedly emphasized in the literature. Cicourel, for instance, stresses the fact that "when the appearance of the speaker and hearer or talk is not viewed as recognizable or intelligible.....efforts will be made by participants in the event to normalize the presumed discrepancies." (Cicourel, 1973: 53-54; also Chapter 3, pp.68-69). Goffman, 1976, 1971, also emphasizes that when discrepancies arise participants in an event resort to certain "repairs" to restore the "shaken equilibrium". Goffman argues that the appropriate use of repairs in communication is regulated by the ritual constraints operating in a society (cf. Chapter 3, pp.75-76).

As argued in Chapter 1, it is very important for L2 learner-participants in an event to be able to bridge gaps of information over shared knowledge as product and process in interaction whenever there is a need for it as the communication unfolds. Some of the strategies identified in the data regulate the communication process and restore normality through learning when there is a need to advance shared knowledge as product and/or process in communication. Others open up communication after silences, or restore rapport and "save face" between interactants
when any unhearings, mishearings, misunderstandings or lack of shared linguistic knowledge of the \( L_2 \) appear. The strategies discussed in this chapter are seen in the context of a social encounter where participants in an event interchangeably become listeners and speakers. These strategies are communicating strategies because they are employed to monitor interaction, but they are also learning strategies because they are employed to negotiate new meanings in the context of a social encounter (cf. Chapter 2, section 2.4). The choice of one strategy over the other depends on pragmatic grounds, that is, on the immediate communicative needs of the speaker and/or the hearer in the act of communication as they negotiate meanings to exchange messages. To make such decisions interactants in an event need to make judgements about the situation, as well as about what they both know or need to know to understand each other. They also need to decide what is relevant, appropriate and intelligible in \( L_2 \) use and usage in order to produce and interpret the exchanged messages. The ability to take the listener's perspective into account when formulating messages is a major requirement for the development of language use and its communicative potential. And it is exactly in the development of language use and its communicative potential that these strategies can help a language user (here an \( L_2 \) language learner user) to further his knowledge of the language, thus changing a communicative situation into a learning situation. Non-native speaker participants learned to make such decisions to achieve coherence in communication while learning to communicate in the \( L_1 \) and have transferred them as processes and strategies from \( L_1 \) communication to \( L_2 \) communication (cf. Chapter 3, espe-
cially sections 3.3.2, 3.3.3, 3.4, 3.5). In fact, both native speaker participants and non-native speakers made use of similar strategies.

Here I would like to open a parenthesis and briefly comment on the "communication strategies" discussed by such scholars as Tarone et al., 1976, and Varadi, 1973, (see also Kellerman E., 1978; Tarone E., 1977; and Corder S.F., 1978a). Tarone et al., 1976, define communication strategies as "a systematic attempt by the learner to express and decode meaning in the target language in situations where the appropriate systematic target rules have not been formed" (reported in Hamayan E. and Tucker G., 1979: 78). I would suggest that the strategies referred to by these scholars are not similar in scope to those discussed in the present research. "Communication strategies" as defined by the above-mentioned scholars are actually either production or comprehension strategies seen in the context of the individual learner as he tries to express or decode meanings.

On the other hand, the strategies discussed by Hatch in Hatch ed. 1978 and Hatch et al., 1978, are seen in the context of a verbal communicative encounter, but they are considered from a rather limited point of view. They are taken to be the strategies native speakers employ to facilitate communication with non-native speakers. As the present research indicates, however, the same strategies are used by non-native speakers and native speakers to facilitate reciprocal communication.

Also Schwartz, 1980, discusses repair work for the negotiation of meaning between non-native speakers. She deals with self-repair and other-repair both as linguistic and extralinguistic
behaviour. Some of the linguistic repairs she discusses are similar to those discussed in the present research. However, she simply discusses the structural features of them and the sources of trouble, be it phonological, syntactic, lexical and so on. Her scope of discussion is different from the scope and purpose of the present research. However, her research supports the view of communication universals in conversation proposed here. This is because her subjects, non-native speakers of non-European background, have used similar strategies to negotiate meanings. The processes therefore that govern selection of one over another ought to be similar (see also Conclusions). She has also emphasized the teaching nature of other-repair, which supports the view taken in this research that communicating strategies are also learning strategies.

The strategies identified in the data are as follows:

1. the building-up strategy
2. the summing-up strategy
3. the expansion strategy
4. the elaboration strategy
5. the replay strategy
6. the repetition strategy
7. the back-channel cues strategy
8. the clarification request strategy
9. the interruption strategy
10. the restatement strategy
11. using the L₂ strategy
12. using the L₁ strategy

In this chapter I will discuss the functions the regulative features of foreign language communication serve in natural commu-
nunication in the light of the discussion in Chapters 2 and 3. I will define them in terms of

(a) their focus in the event in the light of Hymes' (1964, 1972) components of a communicative event (cf. Chapter 3, section 3.3.1).

(b) their function for sustaining Grice's (1967) maxims in action (cf. Chapter 3, section 3.3.2).

(c) their function in developing interaction and shared knowledge as defined by Kjolseth, 1972 (cf. Chapter 3, section 3.4.1).

(d) their function for sustaining and restoring Cicourel's (1973) interpretive procedures (cf. Chapter 3, section 3.3.2).

(e) their function in serving system and ritual constraints as defined by Goffman (1971, 1976) (cf. Chapter 3, section 3.3.2).

I will also define the strategies in terms of

(a) who initiates, who acts (cf. Chapter 2, section 2.4).

(b) whether they are overt communicating strategies and covert learning strategies, or vice versa (cf. Chapter 2, section 2.4).

(c) their place in interaction and how they can be recognized (cf. Chapter 5).
6.2 An overview of strategies and their function in natural communication

6.2.1 Summary of strategies from the point of view of their general function as overt communicating/covert learning strategies and vice versa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies serve</th>
<th>Overt communicating strategy, covert learning strategy</th>
<th>Covert communicating strategy, overt learning strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. the building-up strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. the summing-up strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. the expansion strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. the elaboration strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. the replay strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. the repetition strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. the back-channel strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. the clarification request strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. the interruption strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. the restatement strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. using the L₂ strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. using the L₁ strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.2 **Summary of strategies from the point of view who initiates, who acts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies serve</th>
<th>Speaker-initiated</th>
<th>listener-initiated</th>
<th>speaker-acted upon</th>
<th>listener-acted upon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. the building-up strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. the summing-up strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. the expansion strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. the elaboration strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. the replay strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. the repetition strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. the back-channel cues strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. the clarification request strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. the interruption strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. the restatement strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. using the $L_2$ strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. using the $L_1$ strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.3 Summary of strategies from the point of view of their focus in a communicative event (Hymes, 1964, 1972).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies serve</th>
<th>Focus on addressor</th>
<th>Focus on addressee</th>
<th>Focus on channels</th>
<th>Focus on codes</th>
<th>Focus on settings</th>
<th>Focus on message form</th>
<th>Focus on the event</th>
<th>Focus on topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. the building-up strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. the summing-up strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. the expansion strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. the elaboration strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. the replay strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. the repetition strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. the back-channel cues strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. the clarification request strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. the interruption strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. the restate-strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. using the L_2 strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. using the L_1 strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.4 Summary of strategies from the point of view of their function with reference to Grice's four maxims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies serve</th>
<th>The maxim of quantity</th>
<th>The maxim of quality</th>
<th>The maxim of relation</th>
<th>The maxim of manner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. the building-up strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. the summing-up strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. the expansion strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. the elaboration strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. the replay strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. the repetition strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. the back channel cues strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. the clarification request strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. the interruption strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. the restatement strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. using the $L_2$ strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. using the $L_1$ strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6.2.5 Summary of strategies from the point of view of their function with reference to Kjolseth's (1972) shared knowledge in developing interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies serve</th>
<th>Foreground shared knowledge</th>
<th>Emergent grounds shared knowledge</th>
<th>Transcendent grounds shared knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. the building up strategies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. the summing up strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. the expansion strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. the elaboration strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. the replay strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. the repetition strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. the back-channel cues strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. the clarification request strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. the interruption strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. the restate-ment strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. using the L₂ strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. using the L₁ strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.6 Summary of strategies from the point of view of their function with reference to Cicourel's (1973) interpretive procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies serve</th>
<th>The reciprocity of perspectives</th>
<th>The et cetera assumption</th>
<th>Normal forms</th>
<th>Retrospective - prospective sense of recurrence</th>
<th>Walk-talk interaction</th>
<th>Descriptive vocabularies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. the building-up strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. the summing-up strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. the expansion strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. the elaboration strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. the replay strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. the repetition strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. the back-channel cues strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. the clarification strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. the interruption strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. the restatement strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. using the $L_2$ strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. using the $L_1$ strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.7 Summary of strategies from the point of view of their function with reference to Goffman's (1971, 1976) system and ritual constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies serve</th>
<th>System constraints overtly</th>
<th>Ritual constraints covertly defensive strategies</th>
<th>protective strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. the building-up strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. the summing-up strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. the expansion strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. the elaboration strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. the replay strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. the repetition strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. the back-channel cues strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. the clarification strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. the interruption strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. the restatement strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. using the L2 strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. using the L1 strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 The strategies

In this section I will discuss each strategy separately within the framework suggested in 6.1, p.158.

6.3.1 The building-up strategy

The building-up strategy is topic or event orientated. In Hymes' (1964, 1972) terms the focus is on the topic of the event and entails functions having to do with content or the event. This strategy mainly serves the functions of topic/event priming and topic/event continuing. Focus on the event itself, Hymes argues, entails whatever functions are comprised under meta-communicative types of function.

This is a speaker initiated, listener acted upon strategy. The speaker sees suspended the following properties of interpretive procedures (Cicourel, 1973): the reciprocity of perspectives, the et cetera assumption, the retrospective prospective sense of occurrence, because he and his listener do not share content/event information of which to build succeeding interaction. By employing this strategy the speaker aims at advancing detailed shared knowledge on factual information as foreground knowledge (Kjolseth, 1972) relevant to the topic as a whole, or at advancing detailed shared knowledge of factual information as emergent grounds knowledge relevant to the subtopic of a particular conversational exchange (Kjolseth, 1972). He thus orients himself to his partner in communication and makes sure that he knows as much as his partner about the topic or the event so that they can communicate freely. By doing so the speaker observes the overall cooperative principle that implies respect and mutual observance to all four maxims (Grice, 1967).
This strategy is an overt learning strategy and a covert communicating strategy. The speaker requests information from the listener or supplies information to the listener. This strategy helps them share the same environment (physical, social, factual), which is a necessary prerequisite for successful communication (cf. Chapter 3). As Shield (1978) maintains, it is as important for learners to learn how to share the same environment as to learn to differentiate between environments and viewpoints. As such it is a strategy that serves the system constraints overtly and the ritual constraints covertly (Goffman, 1971, 1976). Otherwise, potential lack of shared knowledge may lead to a communication breakdown which the speaker tries to avoid at all costs, unless he makes use of it as a potential way of terminating the interaction. It is, therefore, a protective strategy the speaker employs to save the situation.

Structurally, the building-up strategy is of two types. It may be made up of a series of elicitations the value of which is that of requests for information. I take value to mean "the meaning sentences or parts of sentences assume when they are put to use for communicative purposes" (Widdowson, 1978: 11). They are followed by replies the value of which is to supply responses to the requests usually terminated with an ack or an acc initiated by the first ratified speaker in the exchange (cf. Chapter 5, section 5.6.4: Chaining) who thus indicates his gratitude for having been supplied with enough information through his participant's responses. This type is of the format:

\[ X: \text{el}_1 \rightarrow \text{response for information} \]

\[ Z: \text{rep}_1 \rightarrow \text{information granted} \]
X: e12 \rightarrow request for information
Z: rep2 \rightarrow response: information granted
X: [ack - acc] (optional) \rightarrow gratitude and termination of exchange

A building-up repair strategy might also be a series of informatives the value of which is to supply content information to the listener. The listener accepts, acknowledges or rejects it (cf. Chapter 5, op.cit.), whereas sometimes s/he expounds on his response, adding relevant information. This type is of the format:

X: inf1 \rightarrow information given
Z: rep1 \rightarrow information accepted/acknowledged or rejected
X: inf2 \rightarrow information given
Z: rep2 \rightarrow information accepted/acknowledged or rejected
X: inf3 \rightarrow information given
Z: rep3 \rightarrow information accepted/acknowledged or rejected
X: [ack - acc] (optional) \rightarrow gratitude and termination of exchange

Examples from the data:

Ex. 31 British Council Institute 1/124-134
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

124X: What colour is the floor?
125Z: Brown.
126X: What colour is the money?
127Z: I / I don't know.
128X: What colour's the box?
129Z: Brown, brown and white.
130X: The piece of paper?
131Z: White.
132X: The bookses?
133Z: Red, uhm, uhm, red and green.
134X: Yeah.

Ex. 32 Zografos School of English 21/18-23
(adolescents, non-native speakers)
18X: I can see a green car. Is there another one?
19Z: No. It's the only one at the picture.
20X: Are there any horses, anyone in the picture?
21Z: No. There is only the three men and the train.
22X: Because I see some (inaudible).
23Z: Uh? Uh? No. You can see another one on the train.

Ex. 33 Hellenic-American Union School of English 1/20-25
(adults, X = native speaker
Z = non-native speaker)
20X: ...Are there some books in the right hand bottom corner?
21Z: Yes, there are.
22X: Is there a ladder in the bottom left?
23Z: Yes, there is.
24X: How many people are there in the picture?
25Z: Two Donalds.

Ex. 34 Adults, native speakers 1/10-14
10X: The next piece / the next piece probably continues
the ladder and leads on to the floor of the loft
with an old bag lying
11Z: Yes, a green thing, sort of a skirting load, isn't it?
12X: Yeah, around the entrance to the loft.
13Z: Yes, and what comes next to the ladder?
14X: That's / the hole comes up in the loft and then on
the floor there's lying something that looks like a golf bag possibly.

6.3.2 The summing-up strategy

The summing-up strategy is also topic or event orientated. In Hymes' (1964, 1972) terms the focus is on the topic or the event and entails functions having to do with content or the event. This strategy mainly serves the function of topic/event continuing. As with the building-up strategy, focus on the event itself also entails whatever functions are comprised under meta-communicative functions.

This is also a speaker initiated, listener acted upon strategy. The speaker sees suspended the following properties of interpretive procedures (Cicourel, 1973): the reciprocity of perspectives, the et cetera assumption, the retrospective-prospective sense of occurrence because he and his listener (his co-participant in interaction) may not share enough content/event information on which to build succeeding interaction. By making use of this strategy the speaker wants to ascertain that knowledge of factual (content/event) information, as foreground knowledge (Kjolseth, 1972) relevant to the topic/event as a whole, or as emergent grounds knowledge (Kjolseth, 1972) relevant to a particular conversational exchange, is actually shared. Thus the speaker orients himself to his listener and makes sure that both share the same environment as topic or event. It is after this possible information gap has been closed that interpretive procedures can work again and allow the participants in the event to communicate uninhibited. By doing so the speaker observes the overall conversational principle that implies respect and mutual observance of all four maxims, and expects his listener and part-
ner in the joint activity to comply with it too, so that they can both share the same world view in order to sustain and develop interpretive procedures.

Like the building-up strategy, the summing-up strategy is a covert communicating strategy, but an overt learning strategy. The speaker wants to ensure that foreground or emergent grounds knowledge (Kjolseth, 1972) is shared for interpretive procedures to function. As such it is a strategy that serves the system constraints overtly. But it is also a protective strategy which speakers may employ to save the situation and thus serves the ritual constraints covertly. (Goffman, 1971, 1976).

Structurally the summing-up strategy is made up of series of elicitations the value of which is that of requests for confirmation. They are followed by replies the value of which is responses for confirmation or for rejection. It is usually terminated with an accept or acknowledgement initiated by the first ratified speaker who thus shows his gratitude for the information provided and considers it enough for communication to function at this point. The speaker usually employs this strategy in order to recapitulate what has been done or said so far (cf. Chapter 5, section 5.6.4). The format of this strategy is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
X: \ & e_1 \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{request for confirmation} \\
Z: \ & \text{rep}_1 \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{response: confirmation/rejection} \\
X: \ & e_2 \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{request for confirmation} \\
Z: \ & \text{rep}_2 \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{response: confirmation/rejection} \\
X: \ & e_3 \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{request for confirmation} \\
Z: \ & \text{rep}_3 \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{response: confirmation/rejection}
\end{align*}
\]
Examples from the data:

Ex. 35  
**Zografos School of English  14/107-112**
(non-native speakers, adolescents)

107X: Under the grass there is a wooden box.
108Z: Yeah.
109X: Under / near the wooden box is Donald Duck.
110Z: Yeah.
111X: Up to Donald Duck there is the sky.
112Z: No.

Ex. 36  
**Zografos School of English  14/195-200**
(non-native speakers, adolescents)

195X: Donald Duck is trying to stop the car, right?
196Z: Yes.
197X: Inside the car there are two children.
198Z: Three children.
199X: You can see them?
200Z: Yes, three faces.

Ex. 37  
**Gogos School of English  1/44-48**
(adolescents, Z = non-native speaker  
X = native speaker)

44Z: The one of them is below but there is one which is not below the train.
45X: So there are two of them.
46Z: Yes, there are two.
47X: And there is one above and one below.
48Z: Yes.
6.3.3 The Expansion Strategy

The expansion strategy is topic orientated. In Hymes' (1964, 1972) terms the focus is on the topic and entails functions having to do with content. This strategy mainly serves the functions of content-advancing.

This is a speaker initiated, speaker acted upon strategy. The speaker fears that the factual or semantic information conveyed in his proposition may not be understood by his listener because of bad syntax or wrong choice of vocabulary or possible lack of shared knowledge. He may fear that his listener may not share transcendent grounds knowledge of what is potentially relevant to the "here and now" (Kjolseth, 1972) from speaking turn to speaking turn in this conversational exchange. As a result, he sees suspended the following properties of interpretive procedures: the reciprocity of perspectives, the et cetera assumption, normal forms and descriptive vocabularies (Cicourel, 1973). The speaker, then, employs the expansion strategy in order to provide the listener with additional general or specific information related to his proposition on a particular subtopic in a conversational exchange to facilitate communication. So the first part of his proposition may carry general factual or semantic information whereas the proposition(s) that follow, the number of which can be anything from two propositions to n propositions, may carry more specific factual or semantic information shifting down analytically from the whole to the parts e.g. Ex.39, 19X: Side? The opposite side? In other cases, a specific proposition or propositions may be followed by a general proposition shifting upwards from the parts to the whole, e.g. Ex.38, 49X.
The speaker thus adheres to the maxims of quantity and relevance phenomenally contradicting the maxims of quality and manner (Grice, 1967). This strategy is an overt communicating and a covert learning strategy. The speaker wants to make sure that transcendent grounds knowledge or emergent grounds knowledge is shared for interpretive procedures to function, as such it is a strategy that serves the system constraints overtly and the ritual constraints covertly, because potential lack of shared knowledge may cause a communication breakdown. It is therefore a defensive strategy the speaker employs to protect his own projection of self (Goffman, 1971, 1976).

Structurally, the expansion strategy may be

either A

\[ X: \quad e_1, e_2, e_3, \ldots, e_n \rightarrow \text{requests for information} \]

\[ Z: \quad \text{rep } \rightarrow \text{response to supply information} \]

\[ e_1, e_2, e_3, \ldots, e_n \]

or B

\[ X: \quad e_1 \rightarrow \text{request for information} \]

\[ Z: \quad \text{rep } 1, 2, 3, \ldots, n \rightarrow \text{response to supply information} \]

Where a proposition of \( e_1 \) or \( \text{rep}_1 \) may carry general factual or semantic information load followed by propositions of \( e_2, e_3, \ldots, e_n \) or \( \text{rep}_2, \ldots, \text{rep}_n \) which may carry more specific factual or semantic information load. (See Ex. 38, 49X; Ex. 39, 19X; Ex. 40, 49Z). It may also be the case where proposition of \( e_1 \) or \( \text{rep}_1 \) may carry specific information whereas the last proposition of \( e_n \) or \( \text{rep}_n \) may carry general information. (See Ex. 41, 16-18Z; also cf. Chapter 2, section 2.4, especially 2.4.3).
Examples from the data:

Ex. 38 Zografos School of English  14/47-50
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

47X: The wooden box is / where is it?
    Because I think I have found it.

48Z: Where is it?

49X: Is beside the car, behind the car?
    Where is it? Under the grass?

50Z: Yes, under the grass.

Ex. 39 Zografos School of English  2/17-20
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

17X: Where is the tree?

18Z: It's at the top.

19X: Side? The opposite side?

20Z: No, at the same side with the basket.

Ex. 40 Hellenic American Union School of English  2/49-52
(X = non-native speaker; Z = native speaker)

49Z: What do you see when you look at Scrooge?
    You see his hat, his eyes?

50X: Yes.

51Z: Do you see / he has a red coat. Do you see his red coat?

52X: Yes, yes.

Ex. 41 Adults, native speakers  1/13-19

13X: ...and what comes next to the ladder?

14Z: That's / the hole comes up in the loft and then on the floor there's lying something that looks like a golf bag possibly.

15X: A golf bag?

16Z: A bag of some kind

17X: and
18Z: something discreet on the ground.

19X: I've got a piece of that. It's sort of a browny colour continuing to pinky red.

6.3.4 The elaboration strategy

The elaboration strategy is topic orientated. In Hymes' (1964, 1972) terms the focus is on the topic and entails functions having to do with content-advancing. This is a speaker initiated, speaker acted upon strategy. The speaker sees suspended the following properties of interpretive procedures: the reciprocity of perspectives, the et cetera assumption, the retrospective sense of occurrence, and normal forms (Cicourel, 1973). Suspension of interpretive procedures leads to a breakdown of communication. The speaker fears that his communicative intent may not have been understood, and as a result his listener may not share emergent grounds knowledge of "what is relevant at the 'here and now'" (Kjolseth, 1972). So he elaborates on the previous message of his by adding relevant more specific factual or semantic information about it although it has already been acknowledged or accepted (see Ex.42, 32; Es.43, 412; Ex.44, 287Z; Ex.45, 302). Thus the speaker indicates his willingness to co-operate with his partner in the negotiation of meaning by overtly adhering to the maxims of quality and quantity (Grice, 1967). He therefore contributes whatever information he thinks is necessary in order to get meanings across to his partner in conversation.

The elaboration strategy is an overt communicating strategy since it sustains and develops interpretive procedures and a covert learning strategy since it contributes to developing a shared environment and a common world view between the participants. This strategy attends to system constraints overtly and ritual constraints covertly (in Goffman's (1971, 1976) terms).
It is a defensive strategy the speaker employs to protect his own projection of self and indicate his willingness to cooperate in order to achieve the desired goal of the conversation.

Structurally, it is an utterance semantically relevant to the previous utterance issued by the same speaker. It usually follows after an ack or an acc. (cf. Chapter 2, section 2.4, especially 2.4.6). As an interactive act I consider it a reply or an informative since it is an elaboration on the speaker's first reply or informative. The format of an elaboration strategy is as follows:

```
either A                                         or B
\begin{align*}
X: & \text{el} \\
Z: & \text{rep}_1 \\
X: & [\text{ack-acc}] \\
Z: & \text{rep}_2 \\
M.E. & \text{inf}_1 \\
& \text{ack-acc} \\
& \text{inf}_2
\end{align*}
```

where \text{rep}_2 or \text{inf}_2 \longrightarrow a semantic or factual elaboration of \text{rep}_1 or \text{inf}_1

Examples from the data:

Ex. 42 Experimental High School 1/1-3
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

1Z: It's a railway station with a tank.
2X: Yes.
3Z: It's a railway station with a tank, a big tank.

Ex. 43 Zografos School of English 14/39-41
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

39Z: It's an old car.
40X: An old car. Yes, I see.
41Z: An old type of car.
Ex. 44 Hellenic American Union School of English 4/285-287
(adults, X = non-native speaker
Z = native speaker)

285Z: Above that is a tank.
286X: There is a tank. That's what it is.
287Z: An oil tank. Have you found it?

Ex. 45 Adults, native speakers 28-31

28Z: ...The corner / the next corner pieces: carrots, looks like carrots and books.
29X: Carrots and books. Oh, there are some

The basic structural difference between the expansion strategy and the elaboration strategy is that the expansion strategy is employed across one speaking turn, whereas the elaboration strategy presupposes a new speaking turn.

6.3.5 The replay strategy

The replay strategy is message-form orientated. In Hymes' (1964, 1972) terms it entails functions having to do with the message itself or the form of the message. It is a listener initiated, speaker acted upon strategy. The speaker rephrases his message shifting from general information to more specific information when he realizes from his listener's reaction that he has not understood his communicative intent. Because of this lack of understanding the speaker sees suspended the following properties of interpretive procedures: the reciprocity of perspectives, the etcetera assumption, the retrospective-prospective sense of occurrence and normal forms (Cicourel, 1973). This is because transcendent grounds knowledge, what is potentially relevant, appropriate
and intelligible at the "here and now" (Kjolseth, 1972) is not shared between speaker and listener. As a result communication breaks down.

The speaker as a co-operative co-interact overtly adheres to the maxims of quality and quantity (Grice, 1967) making sure, each time he paraphrases his message, his contribution is as informative and true as is required shifting down the scale from a general information message to a specific proposal information message.

This is an overt communicating strategy and a covert learning strategy. The speaker employs this strategy to avoid a potential breakdown in communication when he realizes that his message has not come across. It is a covert learning strategy because it also helps interactants to share the same environment, the same world view as product on which interpretive procedures as process depend. This strategy sustains and develops system constraints overtly and ritual constraints covertly (Goffman, 1971, 1976), since the speaker employs it as a protective strategy to save the definition of the situation projected by another and allow communication to continue uninterrupted.

Structurally, the replay strategy is made up of a number of el-rep pairs. The value of the elicitations may be that of requests for information or confirmation. The value of the replies is that of responses to requested information or confirmation. Elicitations or replies shift down the scale from general propositions to more specific ones. See, for instance, Ex.46 where proposition 3X: Who is in the car? does not propose a particular response, whereas specific propositions e.g. Ex.46, 5X: Who is the driver? shifting down to 7X: The driver is Duck? propose
an element of related general proposition's answer-set as a correct response.

General propositions in replies may also create problems of association of meaning between the utterance and the situation (here the jigsaw puzzle) either because of the non-native speaker's limited knowledge of the L2 or because the listener was busy sorting out his/her jigsaw puzzle pieces, see Ex.47, 100Z: ...looking at the treasure chest. Proposition 102Z is shifted down to a semantically paraphrased proposition as is 102Z: They are looking at the big box with the money (cf. Chapter 2, section 2.4, especially 2.4.4).

The format of a replay strategy is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
  X : & \quad e_1 \\
  Z : & \quad r_1 \\
  X : & \quad e_2 \\
  Z : & \quad r_2
\end{align*}
\]

where \( e_2 \rightarrow a \) replay of \( e_1 \), where \( r_2 \rightarrow a \) replay of \( r_1 \)

Examples from the data:

Ex.46 Zografos School of English 5/3-8 (adolescents, non-native speakers)

3X: Who is in the car?
4Z: The car is in the road.
5X: Who is the driver?
6Z: Uhm, the driver?
7X: Mhm. The driver is duck?
8Z: The old duck is in the road.
Ex. 47  Hellenic American Union School of English  1/99-102
(adults, X = non-native speaker
         Z = native speaker)

99X: Where are the two Donalds? Are they in front of the big box?

100Z: They are in the middle.
Yes, they are in the middle of the picture looking at the treasure chest.


102Z: They are looking at the big box with the money.

Ex. 48  Hellenic American Union School of English  1/99-102
(adults, X = non-native speaker
         Z = native speaker)

......

56Z: Then you've got a skylight.

57X: Yes, I see. Yes.

58Z: And then II

59X: No, I haven't. Sorry.

60Z: You haven't got a skylight?

61X: No, sorry. I'm trying to see / What colour is the skylight?

62Z: Well, you've got a blue frame, then there is a light blue on this white sky.

63X: Yes, I've got that.

The basic structural difference between the elaboration strategy and the replay strategy is that the elaboration strategy presupposes one speaking turn, whereas the replay strategy presupposes two or more turns.

6.3.6  The repetition strategy

The repetition strategy is channel orientated. In Hymes' (1964, 1972) terms it entails functions having to do with the channels. Its main function is to clear the channel and maintain
contact and control of noise, both physical and psychological in relation to other components of the communicative event. It is a listener initiated, speaker acted upon strategy. The listener employs this strategy to indicate that the previous ratified speaker's message was not heard and requests a repetition of it. He thus declares that emergent grounds knowledge "What is relevant in the 'here and now' at this episode" is not shared for communication to proceed and a breakdown is inevitable (Kjolseth, 1972). The listener sees suspended the following properties of interpretive procedures: the reciprocity of perspectives, the et cetera assumption, and the retrospective-prospective sense of occurrence (Cicourel, 1973). Because of unhearings speaker and listener cannot share the same environment and world view on which interpretive procedures for the negotiation of meaning depend. By employing the repetition strategy the listener has at his disposal a means to avoid a breakdown in orderly communication and re-establish social contact between the participants in the event. Consequently it is an overt communicating strategy and a covert learning strategy. It is a learning strategy because it facilitates sharing of emergent grounds knowledge. As such it is a strategy that overtly attends to the overall co-operative principle which implies respect and mutual observance of all four maxims (Grice, 1967) and attends to system constraints overtly and ritual constraints covertly (Goffman, 1971, 1976). The listener usually employs one of a number of linguistic realizations such as "I didn't hear you", "Sorry", "Can you repeat it again?" and so on to indicate he has not heard the speaker's utterance and requests a repetition of it. The interrogative pronoun "What?" is extensively used by non-native speakers, especially in begin-
ners' levels to request a repetition of the speaker's utterance, because they may not be familiar with appropriate linguistic realizations to request repetition. The listener makes use of the repetition strategy as a defensive strategy to protect his own projection of self (Goffman, 1971, 1976).

Structurally, a conversational exchange with a repetition strategy employed by the listener may be of the following formats:

either A

\[ \begin{align*}
X: & \; e_{1} \\
Z: & \; e_{2} & \text{request for repetition} \\
X: & \; e_{1} \\
Z: & \; \text{rep}_{1} \\
\end{align*} \]

or B

\[ \begin{align*}
X: & \; e_{1} \\
Z: & \; \text{rep}_{1} & \text{request for repetition} \\
X: & \; e_{2} \\
Z: & \; \text{rep}_{1} \\
\end{align*} \]

As an interactive act it is an elicitation, the value of which, however, is that of a request for repetition. It is usually realized in specific linguistic realizations such as: "Can you repeat the question?" or "What did you say?" and so on. (cf. Chapter 2, 2.4.8, especially the Prodding strategy). The utterance that follows the request of repetition is either a verbatim repetition of \(e_{1}\) or \(\text{rep}_{1}\), or it is slightly rephrased. (See Ex.49, 45X; Ex.50, 15X; Ex.51, 13X).
Examples from the data:

Ex.49 Experimental High School 1/43-45
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

43X: Is it near the train a felt?
44Z: Uhm? Can you repeat the pond / the question?
45X: I told you / I ask you if you have / if a felt is near the train.

Ex.50 Zografos School of English 15/13-15
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

13X: Is right of the Donald this? The door.
14Z: What did you say?
15X: The door it is right of Donald?

Ex.51 Gogos School of English 1/11-14
(adolescents, Z = non-native speaker, X = native speaker)

11X: Are the tracks near the bottom or are they near / where are they in the picture?
12Z: What?
13X: Where / where are the tracks in the picture?
14Z: Down II

6.3.7 Back-channel cues strategy

The back-channel cues strategy is code orientated. In Hymes’ (1964, 1972) terms it entails functions having to do with the code in relation to other components in communication. The main function that this strategy serves is the identification of an element of the code used in conversation.

This is a speaker initiated, listener acted upon strategy. As the speaker speaks he comes to an unpredictable stop. Either because he does not know or does not remember the appropriate
linguistic realization(s) to express himself, he hesitates trying to think of the relevant linguistic realization or an appropriate equivalent one. As a result the listener sees an imminent breakdown in communication and suspension of the following properties of interpretive procedures: normal forms and descriptive vocabularies as well as the reciprocity of perspectives, the et cetera assumption and the retrospective-prospective sense of occurrence (Cicourel, 1973). Thus the listener gets the floor faithfully adhering to the overall co-operative principle that implies respect and mutual observance to all four maxims (Grice, 1967) and supplies the appropriate linguistic realization(s). He does not keep the floor for himself. As soon as he has supplied the appropriate linguistic realization(s) the first ratified speaker gets the floor back and continues from where he had stopped.

If the listener does not make use of this strategy at his disposal, emergent grounds knowledge will not be shared of what is relevant to the "here and now" in this conversational exchange on which to build succeeding interaction (Kjolseth, 1972). It is, therefore, an overt communicating strategy and a covert learning strategy. It is a learning strategy because the first ratified speaker will learn this new code item on the spot or if he has simply forgotten it he will bring it back to memory in context. The back-channel cues strategy overtly serves system constraints but covertly serves ritual constraints since the listener makes use of it as a protective strategy to save the definition of the situation projected by another (Goffman, 1971, 1976). This strategy strongly supports Kjolseth's (1972) argument that transcendental grounds knowledge is shared; otherwise, the listener will not be able to exercise this capacity. See Ex. 52, 121Z, 122Z;
Ex. 53, 80X, 86X. (cf. Chapter 2, section 2.4, especially 2.4.8: The Modelling strategy).

This strategy may be employed by the listener half-way in any interactive act performed by the speaker (such as elicitation, directives, informatives, replies and so on). It may be of the following format structurally:

\[ X: \quad Y \]

where \( Y \rightarrow \) any interactive act, half-way realized linguistically.

\[ Z: \text{back-channel cues} \]

\[ X:: \]

where \( Y_1 \rightarrow \) X continues his utterance after Z supplied not-known or remembered linguistic realization(s).

Examples from the data:

Ex. 52 Zografos School of English 7/120-122 (adolescents, non-native speakers)

120X: Donald and Scrooge near the books / the box. Uhm, uhm.

121Z: Look

X:: Looks at the box. Uhm, uhm.

122Z: of coins

X:: Yes.

Ex. 53 Hellenic American Union School of English 3/79-86 (adults, Z = non-native speaker X = native speaker)

79Z: ...Donald's hat is blue with uhm, uhm and the yellow uhm, uhm

80X: Yes, the yellow scarf.

Z:: Yes. His hands are white.

81X: Mhm.
The back-channel cues communicating and learning strategy discussed in this section should be distinguished from the purely communicating strategy discussed by Duncan (1973, 1974) (see, for instance, Ex. 53, 81X and 85X). This communicating strategy is used to monitor interaction. The participant in the event employs it to make clear to his co-participant that he is within the joint activity and urges him to continue. It is usually linguistically exemplified by a small set of lexical items, such as "Yes","Right" or vocalizations such as "Uhm", "Mhm" and so on.

6.3.8 Clarification requests strategy

This is a topic orientated and channel orientated strategy. In Hymes' (1964, 1972) terms it entails functions having to do with the context or with the maintenance of contact and control of noise, both psychological and physical. It may be a speaker initiated, listener acted upon or a listener initiated, speaker acted upon strategy. Its specific function is to clear up lack of shared background expectancies, misunderstandings, unhearings, mishearings or lack of back-channel cues as defined by Duncan, 1973, 1974.

Lack of shared background expectancies or misunderstandings can arise for a number of reasons such as lack of shared cultural interpretations between interactants (as is especially the case in a mixed communicative situation where one participant in the
event is a native speaker and the other a non-native speaker); differences in social perspectives where one participant is a child and the other is an adult (Corsaro, 1977) as well as differences in the interpretive competence of the interactants to accomplish the "joint activity", that is, to maintain focus on the event itself (Hymes, 1964) (cf. Ex. 61, 41Z). The listener may have heard the speaker but he may not have understood the value of his utterance or he may have misunderstood it.

The clarification requests strategy is also employed to clear up unhearings, not of whole utterances, as is the case in repetitions (cf. section 6.3.6) but of a part of it. In a way the listener has heard and understood part of the speaker's proposition but requests a clarification of the other part either because he has not heard it clearly or because he has not understood it. The speaker may also request a clarification if the listener has not provided him with a feedback (i.e. back-channel cues) that the speaker's message has come across to the listener and is comprehended.

Due to the factors discussed above, the general drift of conversation is halted at an unpredictable point. As a result, the speaker or the listener (whoever initiates the clarification request) sees suspended the following properties of interpretive procedures: the reciprocity of perspectives, the et cetera assumption, the retrospective-prospective sense of occurrence (Cicourel, 1973) which will lead to a breakdown in communication. After the clarification request has been granted an answer, the conversation picks up again where it left off and interpretive proce-
dures are put back to work again.

(a) The speaker-initiated, listener acted upon type of clarification request specially functions as topic priming/topic continuing and/or channel opening/opening-up-closings after silences. In the case of topic priming/topic continuing the speaker aims at finding out whether the listener shares the same assumptions and presuppositions on the topic as foreground emergent grounds knowledge (Kjolseth, 1972) on which to build the succeeding interaction. (See Ex.54, 105X; Ex.55, 60X; Ex.56, 482). In the case of channel opening/opening-up-closings after silences the speaker makes use of this strategy to establish or re-establish a common point of reference and open up social contact with his prospective partner in communication. (See Ex.57, 83Z; Ex.58, 20Z; Ex.59, 126X). Children also use the same strategy when they want to start a conversation with an adult. They usually initiate a conversation with a clarification request as follows: "Daddy, do you know what happened to my dolly?" Thus they open up the channel, establish the topic and initiate the conversation. To achieve the same end other speakers may employ such linguistic expressions as "Do you know...", "Have you heard..." or "Can I help you...", and so on.

When a speaker employs the speaker-initiated, listener acted upon clarification request strategy he adheres to the cooperative principle that implies respect and mutual observance of all four maxims and expects his partner to respond appropriately in the context of the social encounter (Grice, 1967). It primarily functions as a communicating strategy, but it is also an indirect learning strategy since it does not only open up or
keeps open the possibility of social contact but also the sharing of a common environment for the partners in the act of communication. The speaker initiated, listener acted upon clarification request strategy attends to system constraints overtly and ritual constraints covertly and functions as a defensive strategy which the speaker employs to protect his own projection of self (Goffman, 1971, 1976).

Structurally, the topic priming/topic continuing, speaker initiated, listener acted upon clarification request strategy is of the following format:

X: \[ e_1 \cdot \text{inf} \cdot \text{d} \] \[ e_2 \]
Z: \( \text{rep}_2 \)
X: \( \text{acc} \) \[ \text{[rep}_1 \cdot \text{inf} \cdot \text{d}] \]

As an interactive act, the utterance is an elicitation; its value, however, is a request for clarification. The speaker initiated, listener acted upon clarification request and the response granted to it by the listener make up a sequence that sets a common point of reference topically orientated for the participants in the event. The speaker builds succeeding interaction on this common knowledge. (See Ex.54, 105X; Ex.55, 60X; Ex.56, 482). Schegloff's (1972) insertion sequences are similar to this type of strategy.

Examples from the data:

Ex.54 Zografos School of English 21/103-109
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

103X: I see green car, a wall and a big field with nice colours and trees.
*104Z: Trees? Where do you see the trees?

*105X: That's uhm / Do you see where is the car?
106Z: Yeah.
107X: Over it.
108Z: Really?
109X: Yes.

Ex. 55 Gogos School of English 1/60-62
(adolescents, Z = non-native speaker  
X = native speaker)

60X: O.K.
The is a fence. Where does the fence go, to
the left, to the right or what? The fence / Do you
know fence?

61Z: No.
62X: No. Fence uhm, uhm, O.K.

Ex. 56 Adults, native speakers 1/47-49

47X: Yeah, that's it. Yes, I've got some gold coins now.
48Z: You've got some gold coins / Are you still working
outside?
49X: No. I've got the / two pieces in the right hand
side and still grow up.

The speaker initiated, listener acted upon clarification
request strategy for opening-up-the-channel/opening-up-the-chan-
nel after silences is structurally of the following format:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{SILENCE} \\
X: & \quad \text{el} \\
Z: & \quad \text{rep} \\
\text{where an el} & \quad \rightarrow \text{a} \\
\text{clarification request}
\end{align*}
\]

* Note that whereas 104Z is a listener initiated, speaker
acted upon clarification request strategy (cf. p.193), 105X
is a speaker initiated, speaker acted upon clarification
request strategy.
The value of the interactive act elicitation is that of a clarification request, the function of which is to open the channel, establish social contact and set the topic for discussion.

Some examples from the data:

Ex.57 Experimental High School 1/81-85
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

81Z: ...He is like a businessman, a fat businessman.
82X: Yes.
83Z: high hat etc.
SILENCE
83Z: What have you done to the moment?
84X: I have made the tanker.
85Z: Yes.

Ex.58 Zografos School of English 19/18-21
(Adolescents, non-native speakers)

18Z: Over the ladder Scroo ge.
19X: Just a minute.
SILENCE
20Z: Would you like some more details?
21X: No. I'm working, trying the roof, the centre.

Ex.59 Hellenic American Union School of English 4/125-128
(adults, Z = non-native speaker; X = native speaker)

125X: It's kind of green, too.
SILENCE
126X: I can't find that one. Can we move on to something else?
127Z: O.K. On the left hand side of the face
128X: Yes.
Z:: There must be a very dark piece.
The opening-up-the-channel after silences clarification request strategy mainly functions as an interaction-management strategy (cf. Sacks & Schegloff, 1973) and especially exemplifies the property of interpretive procedures: "talk itself is reflexive" (Cicourel, 1973).

(b) The listener initiated, speaker acted upon type of clarification request strategy functions as topic continuing (Hymes, 1964, 1972). The listener requests a clarification from the first ratified speaker either because he has not heard part of his utterance, so he has not understood his communicative intent, or he did not understand the value of his utterance although he had heard it.

The listener because of unhearings or misunderstandings sees suspended the following properties of interpretive procedures: the reciprocity of perspectives, the et cetera assumption, the retrospective-prospective sense of occurrence which lead to a breakdown in communication (Cicourel 1973). The listener makes use of the clarification request strategy in order to question the speaker's adherence to the maxims of manner and relation and at the same time to request of him to be more co-operative (Grice, 1967). Listener initiated, speaker acted upon type of clarification request strategy primarily functions as a communicating strategy. However, it also functions as a learning strategy since listeners make use of this strategy to clarify differences in interpretive competence, social perspective or assumptions and presuppositions and thus share the same environment, in other words, learn what they might not have known in common so far. Thus, emergent grounds knowledge of what is relevant to the "here and now" in this conversational
exchange is shared between the interactants (Kjolseth, 1972) and the flow of interaction can continue uninterrupted. This type of clarification request strategy serves both system and ritual constraints in interaction. It serves system constraints because it helps the listener to share new information with the speaker and ritual constraints because it is a means for the listener to avoid a breakdown in communication. The listener makes use of it as a defensive strategy to save his own projection of self (Goffman, 1971, 1976).

Structurally the listener initiated, speaker acted upon strategy is of the following format:

\[
\begin{align*}
X &: [el_1 \cdot inf \cdot d] \\
Z &: el_2 \\
X &: rep_2 \\
Z &: [rep_1 \cdot ack \cdot acc \cdot rej]
\end{align*}
\]

where \( el_2 \rightarrow a \) clarification request

where \( rep_2 \rightarrow a \) response to it

The listener initiated, speaker acted upon clarification request and the answer granted to it make up a pair of an inserted sequence that comes in between the primary pair of

\[
[el_1 \cdot inf \cdot d] [rep_1 \cdot ack \cdot acc \cdot rej]
\]

Only after the second ratified speaker's request is satisfied is he ready to grant a response to the first speaker's initial utterance and continue the interaction from where it was left off. (cf. Chapter 2, section 2.4.7).
Examples from the data:

Ex. 60 Zografos School of English 19/27-30
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

27X: The piece with the lamp, where is it?
28Z: The ?
29X: The lamp
30Z: The lamp is in the roof.

Ex. 61 Zografos School of English 16/40-42
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

40X: Yes, there is a tree, trees better. Clear sky and everything round are beauty.
41Z: Are beauty?
42X: My picture is very nice. It has many colours, beauty colours.

Ex. 62 Gogos School of English 1/94-96
(adolescents, Z = non-native speaker
X = native speaker)

94X: Where does the green part go?
95Z: The green?
96X: There is a greenish yellow and some bricks but I don't know / here I have something ....

6.3.9 The interruption strategy

This is also a topic or event orientated strategy. In Hymes' (1964, 1972) terms, it has to do with functions relevant to content and the organization of the interaction. This is a listener initiated, listener acted upon strategy. This strategy serves two specific functions: first, the listener may make use of it in order to interrupt the speaker and let him know that a part of his message was not heard or understood and therefore emergent grounds knowledge of what is relevant to the "here and now" of
this conversational exchange was not shared (Kjolseth, 1972). As a result communication cannot go on. The listener then requests a recycling of the information from a certain point onwards. By interrupting the speaker, the listener invites him to adhere to the maxims of relevance and manner in his performance (Grice, 1967). The listener's interruption suggests that he sees suspended the following properties of interpretive procedures: the reciprocity of perspectives, retrospective-prospective sense of occurrence and the et cetera assumption (Cicourel, 1973). Thus a breakdown in communication has occurred. The listener makes use of this protective strategy to save the definition of the situation projected by another (Goffman, 1971, 1976) as an overt communicating strategy and a covert learning strategy. (See Ex.63, 3X).

The strategy serves a second function, too. A listener may make use of it in order to interrupt the speaker, get the unrelinquished floor and move the conversation in another direction, introducing a new subtopic. In this case the interruption strategy mainly functions as an overt communicating strategy for interaction management (cf. Sacks & Schegloff, 1973). (See Ex.64, 63X; Ex.65, 392).

Structurally, the interruption strategy is of the following format:

\[
\text{either } A \quad \text{X:} \quad \left[ \inf_{1}. \text{el}_{1}. \text{d}_{1}. \text{rep}_{1} \right] \quad \text{where interruption strategy } \overset{\text{appropriate}}{\longrightarrow} \text{linguistic realization followed by an el} \\
\text{Z: interruption strategy + el} \quad \text{X:} \quad \left[ \inf_{2}. \text{el}_{2}. \text{d}_{2}. \text{rep}_{2} \right]
\]
The listener usually initiates the interruption employing such linguistic expressions as "Just a minute, please", "Wait a second", and so on. Then, there follows an elicitation the value of which is to request recycling of the whole message or part of it.

\[
\text{or B} \quad X: \begin{bmatrix} \text{inf}_1 \cdot \text{el}_1 \cdot \text{d}_1 \cdot \text{rep}_1 \end{bmatrix} \\
Z: \text{ interruption strategy} \\
+ \begin{bmatrix} \text{d} \cdot \text{inf} \end{bmatrix} \\
X: \begin{bmatrix} \text{ack} \cdot \text{ack} \cdot \text{rej} \end{bmatrix}
\]

where interruption strategy appropriate linguistic realization followed by a d or an inf

In the second case, the listener usually initiates the interruption employing such linguistic expressions as "Just a minute, please", "Wait a second", and so on. Then, there follows an informative or a directive the value of which is to introduce a new subtopic in the conversation. (See Ex.65, 39Z; Ex.64, 63X).

Some examples from the data:

Ex.63 Zografos School of English 14/1-3 (adolescents, non-native speakers)

1Z: Well it's a picture that might be a garden and we have a house that we make some (....) some (inaudible)

2X: What?

Z: and we have a duck and a car with the three other ducks

3X: Just a minute. Where are you? You first said that it might be a garden and then what did you say?

42: Uhm. There is a house.

Ex.64 Zografos School of English 14/62-63 (adolescents, non-native speakers)

62Z: I don't know his name. I see only his doors.

63X: Just a minute, please. I see some pieces blue. What's this with blue and white?
Ex. 65 Gogos School of English 1/36-41
(adolescents, Z = non-native speaker
X = native speaker)

36X: Bricks is / after the train there is a road,
after the road there is some stones.

37Z: Oh, O.K. After the train. Mhm.

38X: Uhm

39Z: Wait a second. O.K. There is a ladder.

40X: Where is the ladder?

41Z: Yes. Where does the ladder go?

The difference between the repetition and the listener
initiated, speaker acted upon clarification request strategies,
on one hand, and the interruption strategy on the other is that
in the former the listener requests a repetition or a clarifica-
tion when he becomes the ratified speaker. In the latter the
listener interrupts the ratified speaker, gets the floor and
requests recycling of information or initiates a new subtopic.

I have grouped together the last three strategies to be
discussed and I have called them metacommunicative strategies
because they deal with the metacommunicative functions of lang-

I have grouped together the last three strategies to be
discussed and I have called them metacommunicative strategies
because they deal with the metacommunicative functions of language overtly. Participants in an event employ them to talk about
language (cf. Candlin et al., 1976).

These communicating and learning strategies are:

The restatement strategy
Using the $L_2$ strategy
Using the $L_1$ strategy

6.3.10 The restatement strategy

This is a message-form orientated strategy (Hymes, 1964,
1972). It is a listener initiated, listener acted upon strategy. The listener is not quite sure about the value of the speaker's utterance. As a result, he sees suspended the following properties of interpretive procedures: the reciprocity of perspectives, the et cetera assumption, the retrospective-prospective sense of occurrence (Cicourel, 1973). Because of the suspension of interpretive procedures due to the listener's inability to understand the value of the speaker's utterance, a breakdown in communication is inevitable. The listener, therefore, restates the illocutionary force of the speaker's utterance before he proceeds to respond appropriately. In this way the listener wants to make sure that emergent grounds knowledge in this conversational exchange is shared (Kjolseth, 1972). The listener also questions the speaker's adherence to the maxims of manner and quality (Grice, 1967), because his utterance did not seem intelligible enough. By restating the utterance, the listener reinstates interpretive procedures and the co-operative principle in communication. After reinstating the semantic meaning of the previous speaker's utterance and being proven right (otherwise, the first ratified speaker would have objected to the listener's restatement) the listener considers the previous speaker's proposition old information to be taken for granted as emergent grounds shared knowledge and builds the succeeding interaction on it. This strategy is an overt communicating strategy and a covert learning strategy. The listener by making use of it attends to system constraints overtly and ritual constraints covertly as a protective strategy to save the definition of the situation projected by somebody else (Goffman, 1971, 1976). (See Ex.66, 402; Ex.67,
Structurally, the format of the restatement strategy sequence may be

either A

\[ Z: \text{el} \]

\[ X: Y \cdot \text{rep} \]

\[ Z: [\text{ack. acc. rej}] \]

where Y \rightarrow \text{restatement strategy interactively realized as an el.}

or B

\[ Z: [\text{inf. d}] \]

\[ X: Y [\text{ack. acc. rej}] \]

When the listener, say X, restates the value of the Z's utterance he employs an elicitation, the value of which is a request for confirmation of the restated utterance. Hatch, 1978a, in Hatch ed., 1978, has also identified a similar strategy in her native speaker - non-native speaker interaction data. However, she considers it a strategy primarily employed by native speakers in order to make sense of the non-native speaker's utterances. As the research indicates, however, native and non-native speakers make use of it for similar reasons and purposes. (See Ex.66, 40Z; Ex.67, 135X; Ex.68, 38Z).

Some examples from the data:

Ex.66 Zografos School of English 15/39-42
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

39X: Where is the upside of the picture?

40Z: What is it? There must be a tree.

41X: A tree?

42Z: Yeah.
Ex. 67 Zografos School of English 21/134-137
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

134X: I can't understand the red thing because of the kind of shape.

135Z: Well, what is it, eh? Maybe is a road under the ground, you know.

136X: Yes, but a road in this place!

Ex. 68 Gogos School of English 1/37-40
(adolescents, Z = non-native speaker
X = native speaker)

37X: .....O.K. There is a ladder.

38Z: Where is the ladder?

39X: Yeah. Where does the ladder go?

Z: It's down the train.

6.3.11 Using the $L_2$ strategy

This is a code orientated strategy. In Hymes' (1964, 1972) terms, focus on the code entails such functions as are involved in learning and checking on the identity of an element of the code used in conversation and the like. It may be a speaker initiated, speaker acted upon strategy, or a listener initiated, speaker acted upon strategy.

(a) A speaker in an event is often placed in a situation where he cannot express himself appropriately either because he has not learned the relevant linguistic realization or because he does not remember it. As a result, he cannot put across an idea or a feeling he wants to communicate to his listener and a breakdown in communication is imminent, accompanied by the suspension of the following interpretive procedures: the reciprocity of perspectives, the et cetera assumption, the retrospective-
prospective sense of occurrence, normal forms and descriptive vocabularies as indexical expressions (Cicourel, 1973). To avoid this awkward situation the speaker resorts to explanations, definitions, descriptions, synonyms, paraphrasing or erroneously extending the meaning of known linguistic realizations semantically relevant to what he wants to say in order to convey and negotiate meanings. Very often he accompanies his utterance with a "Do you understand?" or "You know what I mean" addressed to the listener to make sure that his communicative intent has been conveyed (cf. Ex.69, 108Z; Ex.70, 97Z; Ex.71, 217X; Ex.72, 94Z; Ex.73, 52Z). and, therefore, emergent grounds knowledge in the "here and now" in this conversational exchange (Kjolseth, 1972) is now shared as old information and on which to build the succeeding interaction. This is an overt communicating strategy and a covert learning strategy where the speaker is showing his willingness to observe the overall conversational principle that implies respect and observance of all four maxims (Grice, 1967). Although it serves system constraints overtly, it also serves ritual constraints covertly. Speakers use it as a defensive strategy to save face (Goffman, 1971, 1976).

Some examples from the data:

Ex.69 Zografos School of English 15/107-108
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

107X: What about the grass?

108Z: There is the thing we put the things we don't need. (i.e. bin) Do you understand?
Ex.70 British Council Institute 1/97-100
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

97X: It is one Hoover (i.e. broom)
You understand Hoover? Where are they / Where are this / Where is it?

98Z: Yes.

99X: Where?

Z:: Yes. Yes. On / of / in one box.

Ex.71 Zografos School of English 14/217-224
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

217X: Because I see something it might / there might be wheels. You don't understand the word "wheels"?

218Z: Yes. Will you describe?

219X: Oh, no I can't, / the car is running

220Z: Yes.

X:: With what is running every car? In every car there are four. Two in one side and two in the other.

221Z: Yes.

X:: What / how we call them? I think, I'm not sure, I think we call them wheels. W-H-E-E-L-S.

222Z: Well, I / Yes, I have understood.

Ex.72 Hellenic American Union School of English 2/94-95
(adults, X = non-native speaker Z = native speaker)

94Z: .... / Above the box I can see some books and the books are red, green and purple. There is also

95X: 

Z:: a broom. Do you know what a broom is? Well, a broom is something you sweep with, you clean with.

Ex.73 Adults, native speakers 1/50-53

50Z: .... a diagonal beam or something like that (...) and a broom.

51X: And a broom? (...) Oh, Yes (...) I can't find that one.
52Z: A brush handle, you know what I mean.


(b) Very often, however, the listener may not understand the meaning of a lexical item in the speaker's utterance. He then puts forward a request for an explanation of the meaning of that item. He employs such linguistic realizations as "I don't understand so-and-so" or "I don't know so-and-so", (see Ex.74, 34Z) to make his intentions clear.

Ex.74 Gogos School of English 1/31-35
(adolescents, Z = non-native speaker, X = native speaker)

31X: Mhm. What's he holding?

32Z: What?

33X: What's the man holding?

34Z: Uhm, I can't understand 'holding'.

35X: O.K. ............

The implication of the utterance is "Can you explain it, please."
This is because lack of shared knowledge of the meaning of this lexical item results in a suspension of interpretive procedures. After an explanation of the semantic meaning of the lexical item is granted interpretive procedures return to normal, emergent grounds shared knowledge is shared and communication can continue.

Structurally, the listener initiated, speaker-acted-upon L₂ strategy is of the following format:

\[
X: \left[ e_1 \cdot \inf_1 \cdot d_1 \cdot rep_1 \right] \quad \text{where } e_1 \rightarrow a \text{ request}
\]

\[
Z: e_2 \quad \text{for explanation}
\]

\[
X: rep_2
\]

\[
Z: \left[ e_2 \cdot \inf_2 \cdot d_2 \cdot \text{ack - acc - rej} \right] \quad \downarrow
\]
As an interactive act, the utterance is an elicitation, its value, however, is that of a request for explanation. The request for explanation and the response granted make up an inserted sequence. After the response is granted shared knowledge as process, product and strategies is restored and communication can continue uninhibited.

This type of using the $L_2$ strategy is an overt learning strategy and a covert communicating strategy. The listener uses it as a defensive strategy to save face, because otherwise his lack of understanding the speaker's communicative intent will lead to a communication breakdown. Consequently it is a strategy that attends to system constraints overtly and ritual constraints covertly. The difference between a speaker initiated, listener acted upon clarification request strategy (cf. section 6.3.8) and a listener initiated, speaker acted upon using the $L_2$ strategy lies in the value of the utterances. The utterances are also realized differently linguistically.

6.3.12 Using the $L_1$ strategy

This is also a code orientated strategy (Hymes, 1964, 1972). It may be speaker initiated, listener acted upon (cf. Ex.75, 43Z; Ex.76, 51X) or listener initiated, speaker acted upon (cf. Ex.77, 171X). Finally, it may be speaker initiated, speaker acted upon (cf. Ex.78, 21X). In the last case, the speaker wants to express personal feelings, emotions and attitudes such as anger, distrust, boredom etc. but he has not yet learned the appropriate linguistic realizations for these acts in order to express himself in accordance with the situated constraints. Thus he resorts to his $L_1$ to express his personal feelings and emotions but quickly
shifts back to the $L_2$ after having used the $L_1$ as a means to avoid contrived language and a breakdown in natural communication (See Ex. 78, 21X).

Both speaker and listener make use of this strategy to avoid suspension of the following interpretive procedures: the reciprocity of perspectives, the et cetera assumption, the retrospective-prospective sense of occurrence, normal forms and descriptive vocabularies as indexical expressions (Cicourel, 1973) and allow communication to proceed uninhibited in the "here and now" of a conversational exchange making sure that emergent grounds knowledge is shared (Kjolseth, 1972). This is a covert communicating strategy and an overt learning strategy. Both speaker and listener observe the overall co-operative principle (Grice, 1967). They make use of any means that are at their disposal to negotiate meanings so that they can complete the task.

By employing this strategy participants attend to system constraints overtly and ritual constraints covertly. It is used as a defensive strategy to save face and keep the conversation going (Goffman, 1971, 1976). The speaker initiated, speaker acted upon and listener initiated, speaker acted upon strategies are employed by native speakers as well, when they happen to know the equivalent Greek lexical item and made use of it to negotiate meanings with their non-native speaker interlocutor (cf. Ex. 79, 222; Ex. 80, 35X).

In data reported by Long, 1977, also Hatch et al., 1978, there is also a similar use of the mother tongue by non-native speakers. However, these scholars discuss use of mother-tongue from the point of view of interference only, not as a communicating and learning strategy.
Some examples from the data:

Ex.75 Zografos School of English 16/42-43  
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

42X: ....What did you see again from these things?

43Z: A house, a small house. (How do you say "roof" in English?)

Donald, what type writing.

44X: I notice writing W.D. Donald Duck Wooden Jigsaw Puzzle.

Ex.76 Zografos School of English 7/51-53  
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

51X: O.K. In the corner down left there is 

52Z: Ladder.

53X: O.K.

Ex.77. Zografos School of English 14/167-172  
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

167X: You can't tell it?

168Z: Because I don't know this name.

169X: You don't know. Can you tell me in Greek?

170Z: I have told you.

171X: What? The house is μόρι; (purple)

172Z: Yes, the door.

Ex.78 Zografos School of English 15/20-21  
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

20Z: You can start from the sky which is at the top and left.

21X: Yes. I see it. Ἠσθ, γαμματί, δέῳ ταλριζεῖ (Where on earth do you mean? It doesn't fit here)

Oh, yes. We are going very well.
Ex. 79 Hellenic American Union School of English 2/20-25
(adults, X = non-native speaker
Z = native speaker)

20X: ....After the books

21Z: Yes.

X: What (....) uhm.

22Z: There is a box, uhm (laughter) Κουτί. (box)

23X: Yes.

24Z: O.K.?

25X: Κουτί. What colour is the box?

Ex. 80 Gogos School of English 1/35-38
(adolescents, non-native speakers)

35X: ....Do you know where the bricks are? Bricks.

36Z: Yeah.

X: Stones. Πέτρες. Where do they go? (= stone)
Because I have some bricks but I can't uhm

37Z: Bricks is / after the train there is a road, after
the road there is some stones.

38X: Oh, O.K. ........

In short, there are communicating and learning micro-
strategies that participants, native speakers and non-native spea-
kers alike, have made use of to regulate interaction and learn
what they do not know in the act of communication as the inter-
action unfolds.

In the next chapter I shall discuss the pedagogical impli-
cations of the research reported here for foreign language teach-
ing with particular reference to English as a foreign language.
Chapter 7
Pedagogical Implications

The discussion of the nature of communication and the communicative backgrounds of communication, the discussion of learning to communicate in the context of a (cognitive) interactionist approach, as well as the discussion of the constitutive and regulative features of foreign language communication have allowed us to define more clearly what is the 'knowledge and experience' language users learn as they try to communicate with other members of their society.

As the findings of this research indicate, all language users develop (psychological) cognitive processes, abstract cognitive structures and concepts. They also develop their communicative intent, they become aware of the communicative potential of their language and learn appropriate learning and communicating strategies both as 'knowledge and experience' and as substantive culture-based information. For each language user these strategies are realized in different linguistic codes and ritual constraints as they are accepted in their society. The language user's 'knowledge and experience' of how to communicate and learn through language constitutes what I have called communication universals (cf. Chapters 2 and 3, also 5 and 6). The cognitive processes that guide a language user to express his communicative intent by selecting one learning and/or communicating strategy over another as the occasion demands it, may be transferred from one language to another as a first source of interpretation and production. Consequently, when the adolescent or adult language learner comes to class to learn a foreign language he also brings with him the pragmatics of his communicative intent, as well as of his learning and communicating strategies as 'knowledge and experience' of how to do things with words. This 'knowledge and experience' is part of the learners' communicative competence.
(Hymes, 1972). An approach that considers L₂ teaching as an alternative way of doing things one can do in his mother tongue (Widdowson, 1978, 1979) may use this 'knowledge and experience' as a basis on which to build foreign language learning.

I shall now discuss how the findings of the present research may develop into a learner-centred approach to ELT in the context of EFL. In my discussion I will refer to syllabus design, the teacher's and the learner's role as well as classroom methodology.

7.1 Syllabus Design

A language teaching syllabus should conform to three basic principles: firstly, what the teaching-learning objectives of the course are; secondly, how these objectives are to be achieved; and thirdly, to what extent the objectives have been achieved and whether they have been appropriate. So, the basic components of a syllabus are: Purposes, Methodology and Evaluation. (Breen and Candlin, 1980).

To decide on the teaching-learning objectives of the course we have to consider four points:

1. the learners, their needs, and the teaching situation;
2. the implicit theory of language and language learning in the course;
3. the materials that will exemplify target performance;
4. the communicative activities that will give learners a chance to participate in actual and natural communication.

In order to define learners and their needs it is important to have such information as age and possibly sex, interests and reasons for learning the language, (cf. Van Ek, 1975), previous knowledge of the L₂ learners might have, and so
on. As for the teaching situation, a syllabus designer will have to consider matters such as number of teaching sessions per week, number of pupils in class, teacher's knowledge of and abilities (i.e. competence) in $L_2$, classroom arrangement, and possible provision of media to be used in class. All these are questions that the syllabus designer has to take into account in defining the objectives of his syllabus. The syllabus designer will also decide on the implicit theory of language and language learning which will underlie the objectives. The view of language taken in the present research as a basis for syllabus design is that of language as communication, which is characterized by variable relationships between form and function in terms of a dynamic process of sharing and negotiating meanings, where participants in a communicative event learn what they do not know of the $L_2$, in terms of accuracy and appropriacy, as they communicate. This view takes into account the language learner's cognitive/perceptual/social development as processes, not as substantive culture-bound information. Actual linguistic production (be it $L_1$ or $L_2$) is the external representation of a language user's previously developed abilities. Miming or sign language, for instance, are other ways of doing just that.

The crucial and constant variable in a view of language as communication is shared knowledge. This shared knowledge (cf. Chapter 3) is basically of four types: shared knowledge as product, process, strategies and actualized language behaviour. As I have argued in this thesis, shared knowledge as process and strategies is part of the 'knowledge and experience' that any language user learns as he communicates. Knowledge as product,
and actualized language behaviour, however, are culture-specific, they contain such matters as the code, sociolinguistic rules, ritual constraints, substantive information, and the like (cf. section 3.3.1 and 3.3.4). A syllabus designer will make provisions that teaching materials help learners develop and practice sharing all types of shared knowledge as well as both types of meaning in communication. Each type of meaning aims at developing different aspects of shared knowledge. Teaching materials that exemplify the product meaning of communication aim at developing the learners' shared knowledge as product and as actualized language behaviour, whereas teaching materials in the form of activities where the learners are personally involved exemplify the process meaning of communication and rely heavily on the learners' shared knowledge as process and strategies. Teaching materials, therefore, can be seen as instances of target repertoires that can exemplify to the language learner how knowledge as process, interacting on a different knowledge as product, produces instances of coherent communication in the L2. They can precisely make clear to the learner how similar learning and communicating strategies can be realized in the L2 code while attending to the social conventions of the L2 society; in other words, how native speakers of the language "negotiate meanings and make sense of the environment adhering to the rules of cohesion and coherence in discourse relevant to their language and their society." (Widdowson, 1978). Thus it becomes clear to the learner how others have handled a particular conversation under certain situational constraints.

Teaching materials, as representations of target communication, are instances of communication as a finished product,
that is, how others have managed negotiation of meaning under certain constraints. In Garfinkel's terms the learner plays the role of an outsider who is watching and listening but he cannot have access to the actual process meaning of communication. Teaching materials, no matter of what degree of authenticity, cannot supply the learner with the process meaning of communication but only with the product meaning of communication. Authenticity is taken to mean materials authentic to a native speaker's communicative knowledge and abilities as well as to the learner's abilities and expectations (Widdowson, 1979). The learner can only develop and understand process meaning in communication if he himself is involved in communication, and is, therefore, sharing the intimate shared knowledge that develops between "you and me" who are interactants in a communicative event (cf. Chapter 3, section 3.4.2).

Following the distinction advocated by Halliday, 1975b, between language learning and language acquisition, I would like to suggest that teaching materials which represent the product meaning of common understanding result in language acquisition since the learner as an outsider is passively watching what others are doing or have done in a communicative situation. Thus language is something "out there" that is offered to him as school knowledge (Barnes, 1976). I would suggest that there should also be a parallel to that in L₁. Children do not only actively participate in events, they also listen and watch others doing things with words. This I would consider as language acquisition. Language learning (in Halliday's terms) takes place when the learner himself is involved in communication and makes use of the necessary communicating/learning strategies.
Thus school knowledge becomes action knowledge (Barnes, 1976) as it is tried out in actual communication where the language learner exercises his abilities as 'knowledge and experience' on a different code and ritual constraints in order to negotiate meanings. Krashen, 1976, 1977a, also distinguishes between language learning and language acquisition. Krashen's distinction is in a way similar to Halliday's but he uses the terms the other way round from Halliday. Krashen argues that language acquisition seems to occur when the learner is exposed to natural or informal linguistic data and he is actively involved with it. In terms of the present research I take Krashen's active involvement to mean instances of natural communication where the language learner freely exercises his own abilities on the L2 code and ritual constraints for communicating and learning purposes. On the other hand, language learning, he argues, occurs in artificial or formal linguistic environments where rule isolation and feedback are attended to. In formal environments (such as a grammar lesson) the learner develops a monitor, Krashen, 1977b, argues, that helps him feed acquired chunks with correct rules if he has enough time to do so. In terms of the present research I take Krashen's monitor to mean a language learner's L2 knowledge as product which feeds external behaviours as cohesive and coherent strategies with accurate and appropriate L2 linguistic realizations.

The findings of the present research point to an overall approach to ELT which I would call a 'learn-as-you-communicate' approach to ELT.
7.1.1 Syllabus content

It is important that the syllabus provides for both meanings of common understanding in communication: the product meaning and the process meaning. These are the two axes around which a syllabus for the teaching of language as communication can evolve. Teaching materials, as texts and exercises based on discoursally analysed target repertoires, will provide for the product meaning of common understanding that results in L2 knowledge as product. Communicative activities, however, which require personal involvement in terms of learners' attitudes, values and emotions, can allow them to communicate and learn through language based on the ideational, interpersonal and textual functions of language (Halliday, 1975b) that are universal as processes but culture-specific as product (cf Chapters 2 and 3). In such an approach, L2 learning is considered an alternative way of handling the 'knowledge and experience' the learner has had from learning his mother tongue. Teaching materials aiming at exemplifying to learners the product meaning of common understanding I would call product materials; whereas teaching materials aiming at making the learners aware of the process meaning of common understanding in the L2 I would call process materials.

Candlin and Breen, 1979, have already suggested a distinction between product materials and process materials. As product materials they classify materials used so far for teaching purposes because these materials (they argue) are based on finished discourse and have mainly exemplified the end product of teaching and learning. Communicative language teaching, they argue, needs to be based on process materials where interpreting and
expressing meanings as well as negotiating meanings in the L₂ are exemplified and practised. These materials only can serve the process of teaching and learning. However, as the discussion of discourse meanings in Ch. 3 has shown, any discoursally analysed target repertoire, either authentic or contrived, cannot be considered except as a finished product where the product meaning of common understanding can be exemplified. The process meaning of common understanding is only known to the participants who take part in an event. Target repertoires cannot make clear the subjective meaning in interaction nor can they teach it to the learners. Subjective meaning is unique and individual, it can only develop out of participation in unfolding communication where the learner can test and expand his "inner criteria" of accuracy, appropriacy and relevance in using the L₂. The research reported here on the nature of interaction leads us to conclude that communicative language teaching based on discoursally analysed target repertoires still covers only one aspect of L₂ communication, that of the "product" meaning of common understanding, in other words, background expectancies, (Garfinkel, 1967) background knowledge (Kjolseth, 1972). Learners, of course, do need this background knowledge of the L₂ if they are to communicate through the L₂. It will serve them along with their knowledge as process and strategies as a first source for interpretation and production in a communicative event.

As argued in Chapter 3, the "process" meaning of common understanding cannot be predetermined and therefore it cannot be taught to the learner. It only develops in actual interaction, based on emergent and transcendent grounds knowledge, and it is only shared by the participants in an event (cf. Chapter 3). Eventually the process meaning of common understanding
becomes part of the individual's background expectancies (Garfinkel, 1967) or background knowledge (Kjolseth, 1972) after the speech event is over. Consequently, it is only through actual participation in L₂ interaction that the learner learns how to handle the L₂ as a means of communication. In doing so he actively engages his learning and communicating strategies in order to develop the shared-by-the-L₂-speech community "inner criteria" of accuracy, relevance and appropriacy.

In the light of the present research, teaching materials such as discoursally analysed target repertoires and exploitation exercises for the development of the four skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing, as well as extensive reading materials, will constitute the product materials in the syllabus and will help the learners to develop their L₂ knowledge as product. Task-orientated activities and games can make up the process materials in the syllabus where the learner can bring to bear his knowledge as process to interact on his L₂ knowledge as product in order to express, to interpret and to negotiate meanings. The four skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking), the product materials aim at developing in learners, are the means through which the abilities to interpret, express and negotiate will be manifested later and gradually become refined.

To sum up, the content of the syllabus is expected to demonstrate and exemplify the following four principles:

1. firstly, to help the learners discover how native speakers negotiate meanings through cohesion and coherence strategies and how these are realized linguistically.
2. secondly, to help the learners become aware that they already have the necessary competence (knowledge as process and strategies) to participate in natural communication;

3. thirdly, to help them to acquire the necessary L₂ knowledge as product in all four skills relevant to their needs, inside or outside the classroom, in order to do things in an alternative way; and

4. fourthly, to help them to practise making use of the relevant strategies to communicate and learn when they are actually involved in the act of communication, activating their knowledge as process.

7.1.2 Product materials and their content for the development of the product meaning of common understanding - knowledge as product

As I have argued earlier, the product meaning of common understanding depends on the participants' background knowledge as product. The aim of product materials in the syllabus is just that. To provide learners with L₂ background knowledge as product (cf. Chapter 3, section 3.3.1). Product materials, therefore, should provide the learners (as outsiders in a communicative event) with the following information:

(i) the varying relationships of forms and functions and the meaning potential of these linguistic forms.

(ii) the ways in which exchanges between co-interactants are cohesively and coherently patterned and how an understanding of these exchanges, and in particular their internal sequencing, depends on understanding the semiotic system of the foreign language through which the ideational, interpersonal and textual
functions of language are expressed. In other words, the learner is invited to associate his existing knowledge as process (his 'knowledge and experience' of what it is to use a language for communicating and learning purposes) with a new code and new ritual constraints (which are culture-specific). This association may also require some reorientation of his knowledge as process as conditioned by the L₂ cultural and societal constraints.

(iii) behavioural and conceptual patterns as well as cultural presuppositions and assumptions exclusively related to the foreign culture and how they are expressed and related linguistically. All this, related to the speech situation in the broad social sense and the "relevant other" (Turner, 1962) in terms of role, status and how they influence the development of interaction and choice of one alternant over the other to convey communicative value. Thus syllabus content aims at helping learners become aware of the appropriate devices and conventions that are part of the requirements for getting things done in the L₂ and develop a sensitivity for picking these up through conscious knowledge.

(iv) characteristics of native speakers' spontaneous speech, such as hesitations, ellipsis, redundancies, elisions, abandoning of sentence structure due to expression difficulties or lack of relevant factual information; shifts of topic, function and speech acts; competing for the floor, regaining the floor, relinquishing the floor, feedback cues, and the relevant linguistic forms in L₂ to achieve these ends.

(v) linguistic realizations of intentions, attitudes, emotions and role relationships; supportive, defensive and protective rituals and how they are expressed through language in
terms of cohesion and coherence strategies.

(vi) No matter how detailed an inventory for specific learners' needs might be, it cannot possibly foresee them to the last detail. Consequently, materials should also demonstrate the use of strategies to solve crises in communication (cf. Chapter 6). The processes that condition these strategies, as I have argued, are part of the learner's 'knowledge and experience' transferred from L₁. The learner, however, needs to become aware that similar processes to tackle crises in communication may be applied in L₂ communication as well. However, an overuse of such strategies in teaching materials will render the materials inappropriate. Native speakers of any language do not face crises in communication as often as L₂ learner-speakers do because of their limited knowledge of the L₂. What's more, comedy writers make use of these very strategies to make a situation sound funny and cause laughter. It is here, however, that the teacher can play an important role as a user and demonstrator of these strategies in the EFL classroom (cf. section 7.2 this chapter).

(vii) The syllabus should also provide a metalanguage for learner and teacher to share in order to talk, comment or gloss about the L₂ (Candlin, 1975) in an attempt to make them aware of that part of language behaviour that any native speaker holds in his unconscious. So the learner can rationally move towards that "common sense" (i.e. knowledge as product - knowledge as process - strategies - actualized language behaviour) on which native speakers draw, and thus come to be aware of the necessary culture-bound preconditions for the understanding of
natural L₂ communication. For it is important for the learner to learn, when he is confronted with a piece of spoken or written discourse, not only what the interactants (or the writer) achieved, but how they managed to achieve what they have achieved. In other words, what cohesion and coherence strategies have been employed and how they are demonstrated through language.

For a general course the syllabus designer should aim at developing the learner's background knowledge in all four skills. This knowledge will make up the communicative backgrounds of background knowledge as product and actualized language behaviour on which the learner-interactant will rely to participate in actual communication.

Last, but not least, a syllabus designer should make sure that learners get enough practice in the L₂ linguistic code. After all, it is also, or rather mainly through appropriate selection of linguistic realizations that appropriacy in language use is demonstrated.

7.1.3 Process materials for the development of the process meaning of common understanding - knowledge as process

A syllabus should not only provide for the product meaning of common understanding and knowledge as product, but it should also provide for the process meaning of common understanding and knowledge as process. Communicative activities and games where the learner is intentionally and emotionally involved as an active participant in the event can constitute the other part of the teaching materials, materials as process (cf. Chapter 4, section 4.2). Process materials will emphasize the learners' making active use of their knowledge as process and strategies for
communicating and learning purposes in the context of the listener who will become the next ratified speaker and vice versa. In other words, the receptive and productive abilities of learners in L₂ should be regarded as complementary, not as individual skills (cf. Chapter 1). They can be based on problem-solving activities with overt information gaps such as factual information gaps determined by the teacher, as well as covert information gaps such as linguistic matters of accuracy and appropriacy which should be bridged for effective communication to function. Covert information gaps are uncontrollable and may differ from learner participant to learner participant since they depend on their background knowledge of the L₂. Materials as process may evolve around the two basic axes of: role-taking activities and role-making activities characterized in terms of the controlled and uncontrolled variables encountered in the activities.

7.1.4 Role-taking activities — Role-making activities

When the learner is simply enacting a role assigned to him by the teacher or the teaching materials, he is role-taking. However, when the learner is expressing his own intentions, motivation and linguistic choice interpreting, producing and negotiating meanings, he is role-making (cf. Chapter 4, section 4.2).

Role-taking activities could be further distinguished into two categories. In the first category there fall activities that require memorisation and enactment of a dialogue or conversation. Rivers, 1972, considers enactment of memorised conversation important. She argues that as soon as the learner acts out the dialogue, as soon as "he becomes John or Peter", he is communicating, not merely repeating. In terms of the present
research, I would argue that acting out dialogues will help the learners develop an awareness of linguistic realizations relevant to particular role identifications, turn-taking, back-channel cues and so on. In other words, the learner is practicing and developing his foreground shared knowledge of the L2, that is, how roles, topic, setting and communicative use of language interact on each other to exemplify the native speaker's way of handling communication in a particular setting.

In the second category there fall activities that allow the learner a relevant freedom of choice. Freedom of choice may mean the right to select among alternative realizations an appropriate one that best suits self-role, other-role, topic and the situation as a whole. Or it may mean a recombination of known material, i.e. a dialogue, to express similar meanings while self-role, other-role, topic and the setting remain the same. Such role-taking activities will help the learner to exercise his own processes which are exemplified through the strategies he uses in order to develop sensitivity and inner criteria for transcendent and emergent grounds knowledge of what is potentially relevant to the "here and now" or specifically relevant here and now at a particular conversational exchange. When the learners are engaged in such activities, they can be overtly encouraged to promptly correct each other by picking up the right strategy to do so whenever participants have selected or might select a wrong alternative. (See section 7.3.1 this chapter).

Role-taking activities prepare the learner for role-making activities and games. In role-making activities and games the learner practises and develops all four types of shared knowledge on which interpretation, production and negotiation of meaning
depend. He and his partner in the joint action decide on topic development, and communicative use of \( L_2 \), taking into account each other's roles and perspectives as well as the physical and cultural constraints of the situation. The learners make free use of the constitutive and regulative features of foreign language interaction as the need arises, thus making each communicative situation a learning situation.

I shall now proceed to discuss some role-taking and role-making activities and games in terms of the controlled and uncontrolled variables that characterize them. An analysis of the variables involved in these activities and games will help the teacher develop a better understanding of the communicative potential of them for teaching and learning purposes. He will be aware of which meaning of communication the learners are practising and which type of knowledge they are developing.

a. **Role-taking activities**

I have divided role-taking activities into two categories in accordance with the characteristics they share.

**CATEGORY I**

The following activities fall into this category:

2. Open ended dialogues) ) (Littlewood, 1978b)
3. Cued dialogues  )
5. Film strips (reporting what happened) )

The above-mentioned activities and many other similar ones share the following characteristics:
1. The setting is given
2. The roles are given
3. The intentions are given
4. Function networks are given
5. Form is given
6. The topic is given

The learners enact or play their dialogues and base their performance on recently taught materials. These types of exercise and activities help the learner to practise foreground knowledge relevant to a particular setting, namely:

1. Overall structure development
2. Overall interaction strategy (i.e. minimal communicating strategy)
3. Turn-taking (i.e. when and how to get, to relinquish or compete for the floor, making use of appropriate L₂ linguistic cues).
4. Topic development.
5. Function networks and corresponding linguistic forms in relation to role relationships and cohesion and coherence strategies related to a particular setting, as the L₂ native speakers understand, interpret and use them through the medium of L₂.

These activities will allow the learners to draw inferences about what ritual constraints and linguistic forms (i.e. knowledge as product) to associate with the knowledge as process and strategies they have learned through their L₁. They will also help the learners to associate L₂ culture-bound roles with ritual constraints, functions and forms. At the same time they will also be developing their speaking skill in L₂ (cf. Widdowson, 1978 : 67). All that knowledge eventually becomes part of the learner's background knowledge of the L₂ to which they will
turn whenever they are involved in real communicative situations. As such it is a valid learning strategy for the development of the learner's background and foreground knowledge of the $L_2$ and for drawing inferences about the interrelationship of the transferred knowledge as process and strategies, with the $L_2$ ritual constraints and the linguistic code.

**CATEGORY II**

The following activities and games fall into the second category of role-taking:

1. The dialogue game (Kimbal & Palmer, 1978)
2. Function games (Fox, 1978)
5. Playing games such as
   (a) Twenty questions
   (b) What's my line (involves a two-turn dialogue) (Shaw & Wilkinson, 1978; Giunchi, 1978)

The above-mentioned activities and games and many other similar ones share the following characteristics:

1. The setting is given
2. The topic is given
3. The roles are given
4. The intentions are given
5. Function networks are given
6. A list of alternative linguistic forms for each participant in the interaction is given. Participants are expected to choose the appropriate realization, basing their judgement on knowledge previously acquired/learned.
The learners still practise and develop foreground shared knowledge but in these activities the appropriacy of the linguistic realization to be chosen is to be decided upon by the learner-participants in interaction. When this potential transcendent grounds shared knowledge is actualized, it becomes emergent grounds knowledge. The choice they are requested to exercise at the transcendent grounds knowledge gives the learners the opportunity to associate setting, roles and functions with actual linguistic realizations. This freedom allows the learner to move towards role-making. It also gives the learners the opportunity to make use of strategies to regulate and keep the flow of interaction going when a wrong potential option is actualized as emergent grounds knowledge by the other participant or the speaker participant himself.

b. Role-making activities and games

Role-making activities and games allow learners to be themselves. Some role-making activities and games are:

1. Combining arrangement techniques (Nation, 1979)
2. Jigsaw games (Geddes & Sturtridge, 1978; Byrne, 1979)
4. Constructing a model from pieces, such as Lego games (Long, 1976; Allwright, 1976), or jigsaw puzzle construction (as in the experiments) (cf. Chapter 4: The experimental design)
6. Sorting out pictures into logical sequence (Corder, 1978b)
7. Group activities (Byrne, 1979)

The above-mentioned activities and games and many other
similar ones share the following characteristics:

1. The setting is given
2. The topic is given

Apart from setting and topic the learner-interactants will have to negotiate between themselves and decide upon:

1. Overall interaction structure
2. Overall interaction strategy (i.e. minimal communicating strategy)
3. Turn-taking
4. Topic development
5. Cohesion and coherence strategies

basically relying on their communicative intent, their cognitive development and on their general background knowledge of the L₂ and of the world at large, as well as on their knowledge as process and strategies transferred from L₁. Furthermore, they will also have to negotiate between themselves role relationships (i.e. self-role, other-role, cf. Turner, 1962), intentions, function networks and linguistic forms as the interaction unfolds from conversational exchange to conversational exchange, and from speaking turn to speaking turn, in other words, as potentially transcendent grounds shared knowledge is actualized as emergent grounds shared knowledge. Whenever there is lack of shared knowledge and interpretive procedures are suspended, the learner-interactants can bridge the gaps by resorting to regulative strategies as the need arises (cf. Chapter 6).

Authentic problem-solving activities and games where solution of the problem is discovered by means of talk, may be ideal activities for a learner-centred learn-as-you-communicate
approach to language learning and language development. Learners may help each other learn, in a way teach each other, while indulging in a co-operative activity (cf. Chapter 2 about mother-child interaction; also Chapter 6 - Regulative features of foreign language interaction). Peck, 1978, argues that her findings from her research in \( L_1 \) child-\( L_2 \) child discourse support the view that \( L_2 \) children learners in ESL learn syntax and function from teacher-child discourse, whereas they learn function and semantics from \( L_1 \) child-\( L_2 \) child discourse. I would like to suggest that there might be a parallel situation in EFL. The \( L_2 \) learners may acquire function and syntax through product materials but they may really learn function and semantics through process materials. When engaged in activities and games they may have the choice to try out their acquired hypotheses about the meaning potential of the foreign language they are learning and confirm or reject them.

Role-making activities and games, therefore, will allow the learners to practise real learner-centred interaction in the classroom. The teacher can control setting and topic in communicative activities and games but s/he cannot control the process of interaction as is the case with role-taking exercises and activities. There is no way for her/him to control topic development, behavioural patterns, strategies, functions and forms down to every detail. The learners will decide on the relevant and appropriate constitutive and regulative features of (foreign language) interaction basing their judgement on the pragmatics of the situation, topic development, shared knowledge as process, product, strategies and actualized language behaviour as the interaction unfolds.
Thus the learners will develop their $L_2$ communicative competence, that is, their ability to use the $L_2$ as an alternative way to do things with words (Widdowson, 1978). In role-making activities and games emphasis falls on the communicative purpose of language in use, and not so much on the social purpose of language in use, since the social context of the classroom is rather limited. However, role-making communicative activities and games will help the learners become aware of the tools, i.e. strategies that can be relevant to an $L_2$ communicative situation anywhere and any time. So it is through communicating/learning strategies that the learner will be able to expand and develop his knowledge of the $L_2$ beyond the knowledge offered to him by the teaching materials and classroom teaching practice.

To sum up, the content of the syllabus will reflect the objectives set for the course from the point of view of the learners' needs and expectations, the theory of language and theory of language learning implicit in the syllabus. An approach that emphasizes 'learn-as-you-communicate' processes and attempts to deal with language as communication requires a classroom methodology that is compatible with it. It can view the classroom as a speech community where teacher and learners are co-participants and co-interactants in the teaching-learning process. The teaching-learning process is viewed as the sharing of new information, (i.e. factual, cognitive, affective, social) as it is expressed through the actual use of the ideational, interpersonal and textual functions of language in $L_2$ between teacher and learners; learners and learners, and learners and materials.

As for evaluation, it can be implicit in the materials and the methodology. Communicating to purpose, results in success
or failure in achieving this end. In communicative language teaching evaluation is not an outside measure for success or failure but is presupposed in the process materials to be used and the teaching-learning process which is viewed as sharing new information between teacher and learners, learners and learners, learners and materials.

7.1.5 Grading

Grading of syllabus content can be based on learning behaviours the learners are expected to learn. The minimal language teaching unit is the 'speech event' where both cohesion and coherence strategies can be exemplified. Choice of units may depend on learners' needs, abilities, experiences and expectations developing cyclically around relevant and appropriate themes. Grading is to take place on two levels, one level can deal with the product meaning of common understanding i.e. L<sub>2</sub> knowledge as product, and the other level with the process meaning of common understanding i.e. knowledge as process. These two levels do not run parallel to each other, but they interact with each other and result in cohesion and coherence strategies of normal communication as well as in regulative strategies, in case there should appear crises in the communication process. Product materials can provide the learners with the necessary background and foreground knowledge, in terms of linguistic forms, sociolinguistic rules and knowledge of the world at large which is specific to the foreign language and relevant to the learners' needs.

As the present research indicates, the new knowledge that the learner is required to learn from scratch is the L<sub>2</sub> linguistic code and how the social reality of the L<sub>2</sub> society is express-
ed through language. This seems to be necessary, for although communicating and learning strategies may be universal as processes they are culture-specific as overt linguistic realizations. To incorporate regulative strategies in teaching materials, however, it is necessary that relevant research is undertaken to identify the forms in which strategies are realized in the act of communication. The correlation between forms and strategies may vary in a scale of delicacy indicating, for instance, solidarity, mitigation, aggression, hostility and so on. The choice of the appropriate form may depend on the situation, role relationships and the biographies of the participants. Research on conditions for speech act analysis (cf. Searle, 1965, 1975) and discourse analysis (cf. Labov and Fanshel, 1977; Spolen, 1972; Schwartz, 1980) can open up insights and indicate practices to follow for linguistic grading in the language classroom.

Linguistic grading is not to be strictly grammar-based, as has usually been the practice so far, but is to be balanced between grammar difficulty in terms of morphology and syntax, sociolinguistic usefulness in terms of learner needs, abilities, experiences and expectations, psycholinguistic potentiality in terms of learner learning strategies as well as pedagogical feasibility and applicability in terms of classroom methodology. So far linguistic grading has been mainly considered in terms of grammatical difficulty and frequency (cf. Alexander's "Look and Say", "Practice and Progress" among a plethora of situational and audio-lingual textbooks). The other variables have not been taken into account in linguistic grading. However, a cross-
reference of grammatically graded linguistic forms with the other variables suggested may provide us with a more useful inventory of graded linguistic forms for teaching purposes.

7.2 The teacher's and learner's role in the EFL classroom

Recent developments in communicative language teaching have repeatedly emphasized the need for the language teaching classroom to move from a teacher-dominated one where the teacher controls pupil learning, to a pupil-centred classroom where the non-intrusive teacher is expected to encourage active formulation of learning and help the learners develop their communicative ability in the $L_2$. Consequently a higher proportion of class time is expected to be devoted to communicative activities, the use of games and simulation techniques, role-playing and group work (Valdman, 1978) where there is purpose and meaning in doing something. In such a learner-centred classroom the teacher's role has been broadly defined as that of a flexible resource centre characterized by non-intrusion in the process of learning. However, it has already been pointed out that this non-dominant role of the teacher requires careful interpretation so as not to be associated with teacher passivity or lack of commitment (Buckley et al., 1978).

As argued in section 7.1, teaching materials as product exemplify to the learner rules of usage and of the social and cultural conventions of the target language. The learner is thus helped to acquire background knowledge of the linguistic code, settings, situations, role-relationships and so on relevant to his needs. Product materials are usually expected to be based on $L_2$ target repertoires. Whether these repertoires will be
authentic to L₂ actual discourse or authentic to purpose (Candlin et al., 1979), that is, whether they may be edited in accordance with the needs of the learners and the new language behaviours to be presented, is up to the syllabus designer to decide. In either case the learner is confronted with L₂ discourse (written or oral) for input purposes. The learner, therefore, and the model of language presented to him through materials occupy the two ends of a continuum (see Figure 7 below).

**Figure 7.**

LEARNER  
Target repertoires  
(L₁ speaker's discourse)

This type of relationship has been involved in all teaching developments in ELT, be it audio-lingual, situational, notional/functional, or discourse-orientated. Depending on the approach to follow, the teacher's role has either been that of a strict controller (cf. the structural approach) or that of a more flexible, non-intrusive resource centre (cf. the communicative approach). However, the teacher is not directly involved in the continuum, but only as a good conductor who makes sure that the strings between learner and model are working properly. In the light of the present research I would like to suggest that the teacher in the EFL classroom should be part of the continuum and should occupy a very important place on it. For the relationship of learner and target repertoires exemplified in Figure 7 has two weak points.

First, contrary to L₁ language learning where there have been identified developmental stages in the appropriate use of lang-
uage as well as input strategies employed by mothers/caregivers and aiming at the development of shared knowledge for interpretation purposes (cf. Chapter 2, section 2.4), the $L_2$ learner is directly presented with adult $L_1$ speaker discourse (Cook, 1969). In teaching materials negotiation of meaning both at the level of cohesion and coherence usually creates no problems for the participants as is usually the case with all native speakers whatever language they may speak. It is true, however, that some current textbooks functionally and discoursally-orientated try to utilize discourse network exercises and make use of such conversational features as hesitations, pauses and requests for clarification or confirmation (though they are not actually dealt with as communicating/learning strategies, cf. Chapter 6) in the conversations presented as models to the learner. (See, for instance, Abbs et al., 1978).

The learner, however, faces all sorts of problems whenever he attempts to use the $L_2$ he is learning in novel situations inside or outside the classroom where manipulation of the communicative potential of language is constantly required, along with the changing roles of listener-and-speaker. These problems mainly refer to lack of shared knowledge as product. They may be phonological, syntactic, lexical or semantic problems. Lack of shared knowledge results in communication breakdowns. The learner has been given no help how to manage things when he has reached such a point in conversation. He has been presented with no "ways and means" of how to solve problems through appropriate language use over lack of shared knowledge in natural communication. (It is true, however, that at the end learners do find
out how to solve problems by transferring their 'knowledge and experience' from $L_1$ communication to $L_2$ communication, as the present research indicates).

Second, the learner cannot identify himself with the models presented to him because there is a discrepancy between the learner's real situation and the $L_1$ speaker target repertoires in teaching materials. The use of language presented in teaching materials mirrors the ultimate aim - the product of teaching. The in-between stages are not indicated, nor considered. In a way, it is as if the child learning his mother tongue were required to use adult language as soon as he attempts to communicate verbally. This discrepancy between learner reality and model conversations in teaching materials leads him to frustration and lack of motivation since he cannot manage negotiation of meaning in the same way as the models he has been exposed to. Thus psychological and social distance (in Schumann's, 1978, terms) between learner and teaching materials increases and this may be extended to native speakers of the language.

To make up for the weaknesses of the model discussed in pp. 234-36, I would like to suggest that there should be an intermediate stage between target repertoires (which mirror the learner's desired terminal behaviour) and the $L_2$ learner's developmental behaviour when he is learning to communicate in the $L_2$. The intermediate stage is that of the non-native $L_2$ language user, who can come in-between the language learner and the $L_2$ speaker discourse. In an EFL classroom (or any other foreign or second language classroom, for that reason), the non-native speaker teacher can play the role of the non-native language user. The teacher can become the link - the mediator-between $L_1$ native
speaker discourse and the learner. So the continuum presented in Figure 7, p.234, can be amended as follows:

Figure 8

| Learner | non-native L₂ language user (= teacher) | target repertoires (= teaching materials) |

In the light of the present research I would argue that the continuum presented in Figure 8 modifies a new pair of role-relationships between teacher and learner. Corder, 1977c, who discusses role relationships of teacher and pupil as approaches to language teaching have changed, writes that in the grammar-translation approach and the structural approach, the teacher played the role of the informant, whereas the learner played the role of the information-seeker. In the communicative approach the teacher plays the role of the producer and the learner that of the actor. So, he goes on to say, teacher and learner become more equal partners in a co-operative enterprise where the learner becomes increasingly responsible for the conduct of his own learning and less dependable on the teacher. Expanding on Corder's pairs of role-relationships I would suggest that the teacher should play the role of the non-native language user and the learner the role of the non-native language learner user. Both can be equal partners in the language teaching-learning game and can help each other to further their respective linguistic skills and communicative abilities using the L₂ as a medium of communication.
7.2.1 Advantages of the suggested role-relationships

The suggested role-relationships between learner and teacher have important advantages for the foreign language classroom. The teacher's role can be somehow similar to that of the mother/caretaker in mother/child interaction (cf. Chapter 2). I see the teacher's role as an active participator in the classroom interaction modelling out strategies for the learners, indicating how language games in expressing, interpreting and negotiating meanings may be played, signalling how problems caused by lack of shared L₂ knowledge as product, mishearings or unhearings, and misunderstandings may be solved on the spot while they are communicating. In other words, the teacher can actively exemplify use of regulative strategies to solve communicating and learning problems (cf. Chapter 6). Native speakers face similar problems too. However, use of strategies is rather casual and rare. Strategies mainly refer to context and learning problems. They may also refer to problems of conceptual schemata or the linguistic code if participants in an event come, say, from different regional areas or different professions (Churchill, 1978). Although English native speakers and Greek L₂ learners make use of similar strategies, teaching materials with an overuse of these strategies will not sound authentic.

Furthermore, like mother's talk, teacher talk can also exhibit a constant adaptation to the present capacity and knowledge of learners and a high degree of relevance to the ongoing activity in the classroom. Teacher talk may demonstrate all characteristics of spontaneous speech such as hesitations, ellipsis, redundancy, elisions, abandonment of utterances half-way and
shifts in topic, function or speech acts if the teacher has difficulties in expressing, interpreting or negotiating meanings. The appropriate use of these characteristics of spontaneous speech as well as of the regulative strategies will depend on pragmatic grounds conditioned by the classroom social context, the activity and the learner's knowledge of the L₂. Of course, there is a fundamental difference between mother-child situation and teacher-pupil situation. The mother is seeking to help the child develop cognitively/perceptually/socially/linguistically; whereas the L₂ learner is already cognitively/perceptually/socially/linguistically developed through his mother tongue, which may make their job easier since the L₂ learner (adolescent or adult) can process highly abstract relationships, in syntax, semantics and pragmatics of the L₂ and put cognitions on the map easier. The non-native teacher can also help the learner become aware that the knowledge as process he should make use of in the act of L₂ communication (whereby it interacts with knowledge as product), he has already had as 'knowledge and experience' from L₁. So the learner becomes aware that he can dissociate L₁ knowledge as product from knowledge as process and strategies and associate knowledge as process and strategies to L₂ knowledge as product. On the level of knowledge as process and the resulting communicating and learning strategies, there is a positive transfer from L₁ to L₂. This transferable knowledge can constitute the basic ground on which to build language learning as an alternative way for doing things with words.

Furthermore, the non-native speaker teacher can set up a model for the learner to identify himself with. Thus, the
The intermediate stage of the non-native language user diminishes the psychological and social distance (in Schumann's terms) which exists between the learner and the target language and culture (see p. 236). The teacher's linguistic skills and communicative abilities, since he relies on regulative strategies to express, interpret and negotiate meanings, can easier be within his/her reach than the native speaker's linguistic skills and communicative abilities. So far the teacher who knows the language well has been considered to be the best. The present research, however, suggests that a non-native speaker teacher who may not know the language well but has experience and can skillfully use a full range of communicating/learning strategies might be a better teacher than a native speaker. Of course, the learner definitely needs a native speaker model that can exemplify L2 usage and social conventions for him, but he also needs a non-native L2 language user model that can exemplify transfer of knowledge as process and appropriate use of a range of communicative/learning strategies to facilitate communication and learning. Appropriate use of strategies will allow him/her to manipulate his/her limited knowledge of the L2 and expand it as the situation demands it. Thus s/he learns as s/he communicates.

L2 communicative competence, therefore, should not simply mean to make use of known and practised functions and forms (cf. notional/functional developments) or to handle function networks (cf. discourse-orientated developments) in a novel or similar situation. In the first case the learner can express his intentions and purposes, in the second case provision is taken that he can also understand his interlocutors' intentions and purposes provided that he knows the relevant linguistic
realizations. The learner, however, cannot handle intended input or output information as form or function that exceeds his knowledge either as a speaker or as a listener. Handling of new information, however, is part of an L₁ language user's communicative competence (cf. Chapters 2 and 3), and it may also become part of the L₂ learner's communicative competence. Consequently, I would define an L₂ learner's communicative competence as 'the ability to manipulate known knowledge of the L₂ as well as the ability to handle new information that exceeds his knowledge either as a speaker or a listener'.

7.3 Classroom methodology

7.3.1 Regulative strategies and error correction

The discussion of the advantages of the suggested role relationships of the learner and the teacher leads to the question of how the teacher can demonstrate the appropriate use of strategies to learners in the classroom so that they may become aware of them and make use of them when they want to communicate. I would argue here that error correction could be the classroom way of trying to solve crises in communication. An unintelligible utterance, for instance, either addressed by the learner to the teacher or another learner, or by the teacher to the learner(s) creates suspense i.e. a crisis in communication, and requires further communication in order to solve the problem.

Errors are always exploited for learning purposes. Long, 1977, for instance, suggests a model of a decision-making process for error correction. First, he defines errors as:

1. any phonological, morphological, syntactic or lexical deviance in the form of what students say from a standard variety of English which is attributable
to the application by the learner of incorrect rules.

2. recognisable misconstrual of or lack of factual information.

3. a breach of rules of classroom discourse, and

4. a bit of student language behaviour treated as an example of 1, 2, or 3 by the teacher.

(Long, 1977 : 279)

Long then suggests that the decision-making process can be divided into three operational stages: input to decision-making, decision-making process, output overt behaviours. Long argues that the decision to be made in the second stage depends on certain factors that the teacher carefully considers before he corrects an error. These factors guide the teacher to select the right option for error correction.

Finally, to exemplify his point Long provides us with some examples of overt behaviours realizing the options he suggests, e.g.

S: He go to the park on Saturdays.

Teacher options for error corrections:

a. T: No
   or T: He go to the park on Saturday? (i.e. the student utterance repeated with rising intonation, probably accompanied by some non-verbal cue such as raising eyebrows).

b. T: He go to the park on Saturdays?
   or T: He what to the park?

c. T: go or goes?
   or T: You missed the third person 's' off 'goes'.

(Long, 1977 : 290)

I would argue that these options for error correction which are realized as overt behaviours in the example above only manage
to establish the teacher's authority. The content checking, correcting, testing and so on tend to perpetuate the distinction between first learn through teaching, then practise. Long seems to consider error correction as a teaching device, more in line with punishment than an unexpected and unforeseeable break in the process of communication.

In learn-as-you-communicate approach to language learning, however, language teaching may eventually get away from the distinction of learning and teaching as two separate entities. Language learning and teaching can be seen as one process that takes place through social verbal interaction where learning, teaching and practising the language is a reciprocal experience for both participants: teacher-learner/learner-learner. A practical example of such a methodological approach in EFL can be error correction. Error correction may be looked upon as a message clarification element that aims at restoring the communication process by bridging the gap over shared knowledge due to ignorance, misunderstanding, unhearing, or mishearing, as is the case in natural communication. This view leads to the question whether classroom interaction can be considered as genuine communication. Different scholars hold different views. Valdman, 1978, for instance, argues that classroom verbal interactions are fully predictable and cannot be considered as instances of the communicative use of language, especially at the beginning and intermediate level. At best, he writes, the use of the TL in the FL classroom represents simulated communicative use.

I cannot agree entirely with such a view. I would like to suggest that classroom interaction should be viewed as a genuine communicative situation, since the general aim of communication
can apply here as in any other natural setting. Since language learning is viewed as an alternative way of doing things with words which heavily relies on the 'knowledge and experience' the learner has had from L₁, the learning of this new way becomes newsworthy because genuine information on all four levels, cognitive-perceptual-linguistic-social, is sought and given where learner and non-native speaker teacher can be seekers of this alternative knowledge on equal terms. Then errors can be treated as breaks in communication, where teacher and learner alike are at pains to clarify messages in order to secure shared knowledge and restore communication. I would suggest, therefore, that error correction by the teacher or other learner participant in a verbal encounter should be treated in the same way as mother/caregivers treat breaks in communication between themselves and their children (cf. Chapter 2). So error correction options (cf. Long, 1977, also p.242) can be replaced by regulative strategies which are part of the 'knowledge and experience' the learner has had from L₁. The examples below demonstrate use of regulative strategies as overt behaviours to eliminate crises in communication (i.e. in more traditional terms 'error correction').

S: He go to the park on Saturdays. (I also use Long's example.)

Teacher options:

a. T: Pardon?
Can you repeat it, please?
Sorry, I didn't hear you.
(A repetition strategy can be used to signal there is trouble instead of a blunt "No" or repeating the sentence with a rising intonation accompanied by a non-verbal cue of, say, disapproval, as suggested by Long.)
b. T: He does what on Saturdays?  
(A clarification request strategy can be used to signal to the speaker that there is trouble. Notice also that the use of "does" may ring bells for 'goes' the correct item. Compare with Long's suggestion "He what to the park?")

c. T: What do we say in English - "he go" or "he goes"?  
(Using the L₂ strategy can signal to the speaker that there is trouble which may cause a crisis in communication.)

Mother/caretakers use similar strategies when interacting with children to help them develop cognitively/perceptually/socially/linguistically. Snow, 1977a, refers to these sequences as mini lessons in themselves, whereas Moerk, 1972, refers to them as language teaching sequences. The interactions, for instance, quoted by Moerk, 1972: 241-242, Table 6, contain phonetic, semantic and grammatical instruction for the child to help establish shared knowledge for expression, interpretation and negotiation of meaning.

e.g. Mother: What is Aida doing?  
Suzie (3,6): She is doing her clock.  
Mother: No, honey, she is winding her clock.  
(from Moerk, 1977: 240, Table 5)

It is interesting to compare the effect that strategies and choice of appropriate lexical items i.e. "honey" in Moerk's example, have on listener and the situation overall where error correction is treated not as a teaching device but as a breach in the communication process.

1. Mother: No, honey, she is winding her clock.  
   (from Moerk, 1972: 240, Table 5)

2. c. T: What do we say in English - "go" or "goes"?  
   (using the L₂ strategy to signal trouble in communication, see above.)
3. c. T: "go" or "goes"?
   T: You missed the third person 's' off 'goes'.
   (Long, 1977: 290, also p.242)

In all three cases, the aim of the speaker is to indicate that an error has occurred and ought to be corrected before communication can proceed. Errors that relate to morphology, syntax, lexis, assumptions, presuppositions etc. result in crises in communication, halting interpretive procedures. Although the aim of all three speakers is the same the overt behaviours they have decided upon indicate a different rationale behind error correction. In the first example, the mother is correcting the child's wrong choice but the use of 'honey' has a mitigating and un-authoritative effect on her utterance and the situation as a whole. Similarly, the function of the pronoun 'we' in the second example indicates solidarity and includes addressee (i.e. teacher-learner) thus eliminating psychological and social distance (cf. Schumann, 1978) between teacher and learner. On the contrary, the overt behaviours suggested by Long perpetuate the teacher's authority in the classroom and increase the distance between teacher, who knows all the answers, and learner, who is there only to learn.

The second example indicates a way towards changing classroom methodology from a means to impart knowledge from the teacher to the learner, to real communication where language learning can take place through a process of social verbal interaction as in L₁. Such an approach to language learning heavily relies on the learners' 'knowledge and experience' from L₁. It seems reasonable to suggest that foreign classroom methodology should
thus develop towards a more unified teach-learn-practice free interaction process. Thus the polarization of the present-day practice, first teach for the learner to learn, then he may use this knowledge to practise it in communicative activities could be eliminated.
Conclusions and Further Research

In this section I would like to summarize the long-term and short-term consequences of the present research and make suggestions for further research.

a. As the research indicates, L₂ learners transfer their 'knowledge and experience' i.e. their knowledge as process on how to communicate and learn from L₁ to L₂ communication as a first source of interpretation and production. Furthermore, non-native speakers as well as native speakers (at least, those who took part in the experiments) have used similar strategies as internal behaviours to negotiate meanings, to sustain communication and solve crises in communication. These findings have led to the argument that although the participants' L₁ knowledge as product and actualized language behaviour are dissimilar, their L₁ knowledge as process and strategies may be similar. Knowledge as process and strategies seem to constitute what I have called communication universals which are realized in different codes and ritual constraints. To prove this point valid, however, further research is needed across languages and cultures that are not so akin as Greek and English.

b. The discussion of the nature of communication (cf. Chapter 3) as well as the model of oral communication analysis (cf. Chapter 5) presented in this thesis clearly indicate that it is rather difficult for a researcher to provide the teacher with an a priori model of communicative competence for pedagogical purposes. It seems rather more plausible to suggest that L₂ teaching and learning should heavily rely on the learners' 'knowledge and experience' of how to communicate and learn through language.
Such an approach to language learning may lead to 'learn-as-you-communicate' developments in ELT which take language learning and teaching as an alternative way of doing things with words. What's more, the distinction between language acquisition and language learning seems to offer a workable hypothesis, especially for foreign language learning/teaching. It may be argued that the learner acquires the foreign language through teaching materials as "school knowledge". However, when he is actively engaged in activities and games he turns "school knowledge" to "action knowledge" (after Barnes, 1976). So learning does take place, it may be argued, when the learner tries out his acquired hypotheses in the act of communication. Further research, however, is needed in language learning/acquisition and language development as an alternative way where the perceptual and cognitive development of the learners, as well as their communicating and learning abilities as 'knowledge and experience', are taken into account.

c. As already stated, the regulative features of communication are realized in a variety of linguistic forms in English. Each form may be differently conditioned in terms of situational constraints, ritual constraints, role relationships and the biographies of the participants. Obviously, further research is required in this direction. It is necessary to identify the linguistic realizations the strategies are expressed in and the felicity conditions (to use Searle's term) language users attend to when they use them. Furthermore, strategies may be cross-referenced across L₁ and L₂ languages and cultures. It may be that some societies favour certain strategies more than
others. This type of research may provide us with an inventory of linguistic realizations to feed into the teaching materials where both sociolinguistic considerations in terms of the research reported in Rintell, 1979, Keenan, 1977a and/or Schwartz, 1980, and, psycholinguistic considerations in terms of the research reported in mother-child interaction (cf. Chapter 2) will be taken into account. Such an inventory will go beyond the purely linguistic inventory used so far in audio-lingual and situational materials or the type of inventory that primarily aims at satisfying the social needs of the learners (cf. Van Ek, 1975). It will be primarily based on psycholinguistic aspects of language use for learning and communicating purposes. This inventory may not be used for materials development and foreign language classroom application unless it is cross-referenced with learners' learning and communicating strategies, their needs, abilities, experiences and expectations as well as classroom methodology in terms of feasibility and applicability. These, I think, are the long term consequences of the identified communicating and learning strategies in the context of communication universals.

However, there are also short-term consequences of the research reported in this thesis. Teachers and learners alike may consider the teach/learn process as a mutual exchange of newsworthy information, which may influence their attitude to language learning and teaching overall. The teacher may make direct use of the communicating and learning strategies in the classroom, say, when s/he is error-correcting (as suggested in Chapter 7, section 7.3.1) or when s/he is communicating with learners in short verbal encounters inside or outside the classroom. All this,
regardless of the actual teaching materials s/he may be currently using. S/he may overtly draw the learners' attention to their own 'knowledge and experience', make them aware of the importance of strategies for communicating/learning purposes and finally encourage them to make use of them when they communicate in order to facilitate communication and learn. It goes without saying, of course, that the teacher will also provide the learners with the appropriate linguistic realizations to express these strategies as overt behaviours in English. After all, it seems that the most important aspect of foreign/second language learning and teaching still is how we can help our learners to do through the medium of the foreign/second language what they can do through their mother tongue, that is, how to negotiate meanings accurately and appropriately in the target language.
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Appendix I a' (jigsaw pieces)
Appendix I b' (jigsaw pieces)
Appendix II a

School: The University of Athens Experimental High School

Participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mother tongue</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Z: It is a railway station with a tank.
2 X: Yes.
3 Z: It's a railway station with a tank, a big tank.
4 X: Wait a minute, but I don't find the tank.
5 Z: It must be in more than one puzzles / pieces.
6 X: What's the colour?
7 Z: Orange.
8 X: Yes.
9 Z: In the picture has a high / tall.
10 X: Can you tell me something else about this picture?
11 Z: There are three people. One on the train, one else has his hand on the tank.
12 X: Where is his hand?
13 Z: On the tank.
14 X: Ah! On the tank.
15 Z: On the tank, on the bottom of the tank.
16 Z: There is a car.
17 X: Wait a minute.
18 Z: What?
19 X: Wait a minute.
20 X: And what else is in this picture?
21 Z: Em, a car.
22 X: A car?
23 Z: It's.
24 X: Near the train?
25 Z: In the left of the picture.
26 X: Ah! (Silence) A car.
27 Z: It's on the road parallel to the railway. The car is on the road parallel to the railway.
28 X: What's the colour of this car?
29 Z: Green. The train's colour is turquoise (silence) in the red lines.
30 X: Ah! Yes, yes.
31 Z: The train in his front has a figure.
32 X: A figure?
33 Z: It's a train with a figure. I think it's from a story for children. (Silence)
34 X: I can't find the piece of the (inaudible)
35 Z: It's doesn't matter. Perhaps do something interest.
36 X: It's very difficult for me to / to make the tank.
37 Z: I'm sorry.
38 X: Can you tell me some informations?
39 Z: What else? It's orange. Em(...)
40 X: It's blue, I think.
41 Z: No, no. The tank? No. The train is blue.
42 X: Ah! Yes.
43 Z: turquoise, the red lines on it, the train.
44 X: It's near the train a feet?
45 Z: Em, can you repeat the pond / the question?
46 X: I told you / I asked you if you have / if a felt is near the train.
47 Z: A felt?
48 X: A felt / a feet is near the train.
49 Z: Um, the base of the tank also blue place.
(Silence)
50 X: Yes. Anything else? Can you tell me where is the / this field?
51 Z: Which field?
52 X: The field which is near the station.
53 Z: There is no field.
(Silence)
54 X: Yes.
55 Z: and a car / a grey car on the road and the main railway is
another railway, em (...)

56 X: Where is the other railway?
57 Z: Crossing the main railway.
58 X: Ah, ah. Yes, I understand. I understand. The train is near the tanker,
59 Z: Eh?
60 X: And the car?
61 Z: Is on the road which is parallel to the railway.
   (Silence)
62 X: You told me
63 Z: Yes.
   X: that a man is near the tanker. Eh(...)
64 Z: A man is near the tanker and another man has his hand on the bottom of the tanker / of the tank.
   (Silence)
65 Z: The orange wall is parallel to the street
66 X: Yes.
   Z: and the street is parallel to the railway.
67 X: The street is pa..... to the ....?
68 Z: Parallel
69 X: Yes
   Z: the railway.
70 X: To the railway.
71 Z: And the orange wall is parallel to the street. Right?
72 X: Yes.
   (Silence)
73 X: Eh, eh, I think you see / you see a man who is waiting
II
74 Z: Who is?
75 X: Waiting the train.
76 Z: I don't think so.
77 X: He is near the tank.
78 Z: Yes. He is near the tank. As I see in
79 X: Near the tank
   Z: the picture he is on the right of the tank.
80 X: Ah!
   Z: He is like a businessman, a fat businessman.
81 X: Yes.
   Z: High hat, etc.
   (Silence)
Z: What have you done to the moment?
X: I have made the tanker.
Z: Yes.
X: but I haven't made the little piece of this tanker. I can't find the piece.
(Silence)
X: But I think I shall be able to make this tank.
(Silence)
Z: The fat man has cigar.
X: Yes, ah, yes.
Z: in his mouth, a high hat.
X: It's important information.
Z: In the picture he has a hat of (inaudible)
(Silence)
X: Can you see man(...) who has the cloths(...) of a policeman?
Z: Yeah. There is one.
X: Yes.
Z: I think this is the man who has his hand on the tank, in the bottom of the tank. In the picture I can see three men / three men. The one who is like a businessman with a cigar in his mouth,
X: Yes.
Z: the second with / who has a costume like a policeman's
X: Yes.
Z: having his hand on the bottom of the tank and the third on the engine of the train.
(Silence)
X: And the business man is near the
Z: In the right of the tank
(Silence)
X: I want to tell me if the businessman is near the man who has his hand
Z: Yes, he is.
X: Ah. Yes.
Z: The tank is on the blue / something blue but I can't see what it is. The man who has his hand in the bottom of the tank is
also in this blue thing.

(Silence)

99 X: And [ ]
100 Z: Eh? [ ]
   X:: what is between the train and the [ ]
101 Z: Tank . [ ]
   X:: tank?
102 Z: Nothing. Oh. A blue [ ]
103 X: Impossible! [ ]
   Z:: a part of a blue thing . [ ]
104 X: A part of a blue thing: And the car / the blue car is near
   the / the businessman?
105 Z: No, he is on the road and on left / on the left part of the
   picture.
106 X: And in one side of the picture [ ]
107 Z: Yeah. [ ]
   X:: we have the businessman [ ]
108 Z: Yeah. [ ]
   X:: The man who has his hand on the [ ]
109 Z: tank. [ ]
   X:: tank and [ ]
110 Z: The tank and the part of the orange wall [ ]
111 X: But near the tank [ ]
112 Z: Yeah. [ ]
113 X:: What is?
114 Z: What else?
115 X: Yes. [ ]
116 Z: It's a / I don't know with what to say it.
   (Silence)
117 X: In the picture we can see all the train or a part of the train?
118 Z: The whole train/ the whole of engine/ only the engine.
119 Z: Ah, only the engine.
120 X: But there is no / it's only the engine, there is no anything
   else on the railway [ ]
   Z:: We can see the whole engine. And the part of the railway
   behind the engine.
121 X: What is between the car and the tank?
122 Z: Between the car and the tank?
123 X: And the tank.
124 Z: They are too far. On the picture there is a head between them. There is the head of the man who is on the engine.
125 X: Ah, ah. Can you tell me
126 Z: Yeah.
127 X: the colour of the train?
128 Z: I told you. It's blue turquoise with some parts black
129 X: What? Excuse me, what's colour has the train on it?
130 Z: Yes.
131 X: and the blue parts
132 Z: have red lines on them. In the front part of the train there is a man-like face with eyes, nose, mauve
133 X: The big figure
134 Z: Yeah, in the front of the train of the engine
135 X: The train has a window?
136 Z: Yeah. Black, black window
137 X: Yes, yes, it's a black window. It's near the figure?
138 Z: Which figure?
139 X: The figure.
140 Z: Oh, no, no. Perhaps you see the two eyes of the train. I think to be easier if you continue now to
140 X: I think I finished. Yes, I finished.
Appendix II b

School: English Department, University of Athens.
4th year Students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Mother tongue</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td>X - Greek</td>
<td>X - female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Z - Greek</td>
<td>Z - male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 X: Would you like to tell me now what is this picture about?
2 Z: This picture is about, em, em, about Donald Duck and his cousin, I think.
3 X: What?
4 Z: Donald Duck and his cousin.
5 X: Oh, I see. His cousin? Is she girl or is he a boy? His cousin, I mean.
6 Z: Is a boy.
7 X: Boy, all right, mhm. mhm, all right.
8 Z: There are also dollars. (Laughter)
9 X: Dollars?
11 X: Would you like to tell me how is the picture from the corner? The first.
12 Z: Em, there is a closed room, I think / no / yes. There is a window on the left
13 X: On the left? All right. Just a moment, to find something, to be like a window.
14 Z: This window is cut by two pieces of wood/ three pieces, I think.
15 X: Mhm. Is cut?
16 Z: I mean, eh, eh
17 X: All right. I am on here. Mhm. Right now.
18 Z: You understand what I mean?
19 X: Uhm, uhm. But I can't find the window. Ah, I found now the piece / I am finding the pieces of the window here. It is the colour of the window, eh, eh, like something red and rose. Pink?
20 Z: Yeah. You can find it easily because there is a blue
21 X: What?
22 Z: There is a
23 X: Blue. [Yeah. The outside.]
24 Z: [Yeah. The outside.]
X: of the window. Yeah.

(Silence)

25 X: I found a piece of the window but I can't reconstruct it.
26 Z: The two persons are at the middle of this picture, so.
27 X: In the middle of the picture?
28 Z: Yes. Donald.
29 X: Mhm.

Z: is on the left, eh, below the window.

30 X: Donald is on the left?
31 Z: Yes. Under the window.
32 X: Mhm, mhm. What else?
33 Z: His cousin's next to him.
34 X: Mhm.

Z: There is a ladder, eh, eh, exactly at/

35 X: A ladder?

Z: below / under Donald.

36 X: Under Donald?

X: Just a minute now, to find it / the ladder.

(Silence)

38 X: I think it's very difficult for me to find out the right pieces.

39 Z: I said to you that this ladder is not complete.

40 X: Ah, ah. Just to find two pieces and two went wrong. Then everything will go right I think. But I can't find those two pieces.

41 Z: Do you find the pieces of Donald and his uncle / his cousin?
42 X: Yes
43 Z: O.K.

X: and his cousin. Yes, I found it. Now here the head of Donald is not completed. Just a half of it. I want to find the other.

44 Z: The other head?

X: Ah, I found it now.

45 Z: O.K.

X: All right, I found Donald, then / all right I found and his uncle I think it's his uncle, not his cousin. Then

46 Z: Uncle is the big one. O.K.?

47 X: Yeah, with the red.

45 Z: O.K.
X: Ah, I found all the / his uncle. Now I must find all Donald.
Z: And near Donald.
X: Uhm, uhm.
Z: is the case with the gold coins.
X: Uhm, uhm.
Z: with shine, a white shine.
X: Just a moment, I think I found/that's not. I've seen somewhere(...)
Z: If you see a white colour you must /
X: A white colour? I've seen a white colour. Oh, here, with a lamp near it?
Z: Lamp?
X: No.
Z: I don't see any / Oh, the lamp is above the picture / is on /
not above /
X: Where is it?
Z: On the top of the picture.
X: Uh, uh.
(Silence)
X: Above whom?
Z: It's exactly above, eh, eh, one piece of wood(...)
X: The piece of wood, where is it? Em, it's, em, on the top of this picture, but below this lamp.
Z: Below?
X: All right. I mean under / under this lamp. O.K.?
Z: Mhm, under this lamp. Wait, I found one more piece that suited the right place.
X: Eh, eh, what have you found?
Z: I found all his uncle and half of Donald.
X: I think.
Z: I found them here but don't know where to put it.
X: Em, em.
Z: Oh, I found it all right. Now uncle and Donald. That's all right.
X: Did you find the ladder which /
Z: The ladder? No, not yet.
X: which goes under
Z: Under whom?
X: Donald
73 Z: Under Donald?
    (Silence)
74 X: Is there any book near the treasure?
75 Z: Yes, on the right there is one red book.
76 X: Uhm, uhm.
    Z: and another one.
77 X: Uh, uh, green one.
    Z: on the right side.
78 X: On the right.
    (Silence)
79 X: This treasure is under Donald, isn't it?
80 Z: Em, I think it is under.
81 X: Under, uh?
82 Z: Not under his body but as you see the picture it's under.
83 X: His hant / his hand?
    Z: Under his foot.
84 X: Under his foot?
85 Z: Not exactly under. You understand what I mean.
86 X: Uhm, uhm. I am trying to understand. I can't find the treasure / the pieces.
87 Z: Exactly. Just a moment. Is there something, I don't know what it's name which has connection with the (inaudible)? No, it hasn't.
88 Z: I think there is a(....) Wait a minute. What'd you think? What 'd you mean that
89 X: It had connection with the horses?
90 Z: Yeah.
91 X: It depicted on the horses that they ride on them.
92 Z: Is it(....)I don't think so. What can you see(....)
93 X: Uh? Wait, wait. Now(....)I must find something else.
    (Silence)
94 Z: (inaudible) there is the roof.
95 X: I found one more piece now. There's something behind his uncle.
96 Z: Behind his uncle?
97 X: Behind Donald's uncle, I mean.
98 Z: That's a wood / another wood which stands, eh, eh
99 X: One more fits the new piece.
100 Z: Did you find the new (inaudible)
110 X: Any, any? What? Any? What did you see?
111 Z: What do you call these which we use for cleaning the room?
112 X: Cleaning the room?
113 Z: A floor.
114 X: Uh, Yes, I found it.
115 Z: O.K.?
116 X: Where is it now? Where (inaudible)
117 Z: Em, em, above the case with the coins but a little in the right / in the right side.
118 X: Wait a minute now.
119 Z: It's exactly above another wooden case, all right?
120 X: How many wooden case / wooden case are there?
121 Z: There are this case with the gold coins and next to it on the right there is another case, wooden case which you can't see it(...)very easily because there's this case with the coins in front of it.
122 X: O.K. I found something now, this / I found the case with the treasure.
123 Z: I think it is very easy to find the wooden case
124 X: Don't say it. If you were me you couldn't / you could understand how easy it is.
   (Silence)
125 X: I found one more now. What about / what about above Donald?
   I haven't found it yet. There must be (inaudible)
126 Z: This piece of wood.
127 X: Mhm, his left / Donald's left hand is not completed and I want / ah, I found it. All right. Now it is completed.
128 Z: There's something of the kitchen exactly under the left hand / Donald left hand / under Donald's left hand.
129 X: Donald's left hand?
130 Z: There's something we use in the kitchen.
131 X: Uhm, wait now. One more piece in the right place let's put.
132 Z: Oh, sorry. This is under the right hand, not under the left hand. O.K.?
133 X: Mhm, mhm.
134 Z: Of Donald.
135 X: What is there on the other hand / on the right hand of Donald?
136 Z: This / this one we use it in the kitchen, on the right hand.
137 X: Mhm, mhm.
138 Z: And there are some yellow things I can't say what they are,
139 X: Mhm, mhm.
140 Z: above this thing.
141 X: Maybe I found the piece but I haven't tried to put it in the / from the right(..)Wait, wait now. Near the red book what is there / oh, I found one more. There is a green / a green book. There is one more case.
142 Z: Yeah, there is another case.
143 X: Yes, one more.
144 Z: which we use it maybe in the army.
145 X: (inaudible)
146 Z: for / to carry
147 X: I am near to complete the picture.
(Silence)
148 Z: I found / I think he is / he is Scrooge McDuck / his uncle's name is Scrooge McDuck. And now I found
149 Z: Ah, O.K. and the cousin's is Donald.
150 X: Mhm, mhm.
151 Z: Ah, all right. (inaudible)
152 Z: Is his uncle. Now I found this
153 Z: Scrook / Scrooge is his / his uncle, all right?
154 Z: O.K.
155 X: What did you say the / Now I found his / Scrooge foot.
156 Z: Did you find anything strange between them?
157 X: Anything strange?
158 Z: I think(....)
159 Z: A small doll?
160 Z: All right.
161 X: I found it. All right. Now I want to reconstruct the other piece who are above and under Donald and Scrooge McDuck.
162 Z: Above and under Scrooge.
163 X: Mhm.
158 Z: Have you a piece of wood?]
159 X: Don't ask.
  Z:: and which]
160 X: Don't ask now. I think one, two, three, four, five, six,
      seven eight, nine, ten. Ten more.
161 Z: Ten?
162 X: Mhm.
163 Z: Did you find the left window?
164 X: The ?
165 Z: The left window of the room]
166 X: The left window?
  Z:: exactly above Scrooge, uncle.
167 X: The left window?
168 Z: Yeah.
169 X: I found a window but it is in pieces and I cannot(...)]
170 Z: It is in pieces and there are(...)
     X:: and I cannot reconstruct it.
171 Z: three pi (...)
172 X: Are there the pieces?
     (Silence)
173 X: No, in. I have found II
174 Z: Sorry, is there anything saying (inaudible) Donald Duck
       wooden puzzle twenty-five pieces?
175 X: No.
176 Z: No?
177 X: No. There is not such a piece. Now I found something II
178 Z: The two windows are middle open.
179 X: What are they?
180 Z: They're middle open. And the left one has / has something]
     Z:: yellow which(...)
181 X: Mhm
182 X: The left has the yellow?
183 Z: Yes. Which maybe(...)stay open, let's say.
     (Silence)
184 Z: Did you find the II
185 X: I don't know for the pieces are here.
186 Z: The pieces of wood / here, the pieces of wood.
187 X: Mhm. 
Z: Which are above the left window
188 X: Mhm
Z: more the shape of letter K. All right?
189 X: Of letter?
190 Z: K.
191 X: K? Where are the letters? Where is it? Wait. Just tell me now what is near the lamp.
192 Z: Near the lamp?
193 X: On the right.
194 Z: Eh, eh.
195 X: The window?
196 Z: Of course, there's the window
197 X: With the / the(...)
198 Z: With the (inaudible) under it.
199 X: The yellow window now. No.
200 Z: Not the yellow window. There's no yellow window.
201 X: There is no yellow window?
202 Z: No. You can find the windows very easy, I think, because there is
203 X: I found it now. 
Z: a blue colour outside of it.
X: I put more pieces on the time we were speaking.
204 Z: May I help you? Above/
205 X: One more
Z: above Donald there's a wood which goes exactly to the top of this room. O.K.?
206 X: The wood?
207 Z: Yeah. Wood which goes exactly to the top
208 X: Yeah
Z: and near the lamp.
209 X: I found it.
210 Z: O.K. Under the lamp there is another wood which goes from left window to the right window of the room.
211 X: Mhm.
212 Z: O.K.?
213 X: Yeah.

(Silence)

214 X: Yes. I've seen it.

215 Z: And there is another one which goes opposite the window so we can't see the window very well / the left window. We see it but we cannot II

216 X: Mhm. Yes. Just a moment with the Scrooge. I think I am(...) finished.

217 Z: You finished it?

218 X: Ah. Yes. I finished now. Two more pieces to put and then everything is all right.

219 Z: Where / then tell me II

220 X: All right. I found the other and the last one is easy. All right. I found all the picture now.

221 Z: O.K.

222 X: All right. How much time it took? But I am not very clever for those(...) 

223 Z: Puzzles?

224 X: Ah? Yes.

225 Z: So am I.

226 X: Puzzles. You don't know yet because you've not tried.
Appendix IIIa

School: Gogos School of English (a private evening school in a suburb of Athens)

Participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mother Tongue</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>X - English</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z - Greek</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 X: Tell me what to do.
2 Z: Yes.
3 X: What is the picture about?
4 Z: It's a train on the (...)besides the train it's a road.
5 X: O.K. A road. Let me see. O.K. I see some train tracks.
6 Z: Yes.
7 X: Where do the train tracks go?
8 Z: It stopped.
9 X: Oh, it stops. What else is there?
10 Z: It's a man on the train.
11 X: Oh. I have a face.
12 Z: What?
13 X: Where / where are the tracks in the picture?
14 Z: Down.
15 X: The train tracks.
16 Z: Yes, yes.
17 X: Where are they?
18 Z: Down the train.
19 X: Down?
20 Z: Down the train.
21 X: Ah. O.K. Where is / it looks like bricks. Where do the bricks go?
      Tell me what is in the picture, anyway.
22 Z: It's a train.
23 X: Yeah.
24 X: On the train there is a man.
25 X: O.K. I see. There is a face on the front of the train. What else is there?
25 Z: The man is holding, em, something.

26 X: Oh. O.K. Where does the man go? I mean, where is the man in the picture? Is he in the right, in the left, near the top?

27 Z: In the centre.

28 X: In the middle

29 Z: In the middle. Yes.

30 X: Um. What's he holding?

31 Z: What?

32 X: What's the man holding?

33 Z: Um, I can't understand "holding".

34 X: O.K. Do you know what the bricks are?

35 Z: Bricks?

36 X: Yeah. Stones. Перп. Where do they go? Because I have some bricks but I can't em, em

37 Z: Bricks is / after the train there is a road, after the road there is some stones.

38 X: Oh, O.K. After the train. Um. Em. Wait a second. O.K. There is a ladder.

39 Z: Where is the ladder?

40 X: Yeah. Where does the ladder go?

41 Z: It's down the train.

42 X: You mean below it?

43 Z: Yes.

44 X: Are you sure?

45 Z: The one of them is below but there is one which is not below the train.

46 X: So there are two of them.

47 Z: Yes. There are two.

48 X: And there is one above and one below.

49 Z: Yes.

50 X: Is there / O.K. One of the ladders I have has a man next to it. Does that go above or below? No, I can't

(Silence)

51 X: Is the train in the left hand corner?

52 Z: No, it's in the middle of them/
Z: of the picture
54 X: How big is it? How big is the whole picture?
55 Z: Too big.
56 X: Too big. O.K. (laughs)

(Silence)
57 X: There is a fence. A fence. This goes. Yes, yes. How wide is the picture? Is it ten inches or what? Here.

(Silence)
58 X: O.K. There is a fence. Where does the fence go - to the left, to the right or what? The fence. Do you know the fence?
59 Z: No.
60 X: No. Fence, em. O.K. The ladder has /
61 Z: Yes.
62 X: has a man standing next to it.
63 Z: Yes.
64 X: Where do the man and the ladder go? Em, in relation to the train? Is it near the train or (inaudible)
65 Z: The man is on the train.
66 X: On?
67 Z: He is on the train.

(Silence)
69 Z: I don't see any man on the train. On the train that I have is in the left hand corner II
70 X: There are three mens.
71 Z: There are three men. Oh. Oh.
72 X: One is holding a case.
73 Z: Oh, I see. Is he in the right hand corner?
74 Z: Yes.
75 X: O.K.
76 Z: Have you found the car?
77 X: Car? You mean ,
78 Z: A green car.
79 X: Oh, this is what you mean. O.K. A green, Yeah O.K.

And / that's it.
So there are three men.
80 Z: Yes.
X: One of them is standing with his hand up, his left hand up, and he is right behind the train.

80 Z: Yes.

81 X: O.K. Now, there is another man by the ladder. Where does the top of the ladder go?

(Silence)

82 X: O.K. Are there two trains?

83 Z: No.

84 X: No. O.K. There is a man with his hand up. If you go more to the right there is a man standing by the ladder and if you go more to the right there is a man holding a case.

85 Z: Yes.

86 X: O.K. Ah, a car. Where does the car go?

87 Z: The car is in the left corner up.

88 X: Up in the left corner. O.K. O.K. I got that now. Where is the field, you know, the (inaudible) with the sky.

89 Z: Where is it?

90 X: Where does the green part go?

91 Z: The green?

92 X: There is a greenish yellow and some bricks but I don't know / Here I have something. No, doesn't go there. Oh, here. No, wait. The, em, there are some bricks, some stones. Where do they go? I don't see IT

93 Z: Stones?

94 X: Some bricks. Like a rock, a big rock.

95 Z: Oh, yes.

96 X: Where?

97 Z: Is after the car.

98 X: Ah, O.K. On the left hand.

99 Z: Yeah.

100 X: I've got a piece that has a straight edge, so that means, I guess, it is near the top. But it has orange, it looks like an orange swimming pool, or something. Do you know what I mean?

101 Z: Orange?

102 X: It looks like it has water in it.

103 Z: Oh yes. It's a / it's after the train.
O.K.

In the right / in the left after the train.

Up in the corner?

No, in the middle.

Oh, I see. I've got it.

After the trains

Right. Right. O.K. (inaudible) the car. O.K. Still, I can't figure out where the ladder goes. Oh, I've got it now. O.K. The ladder is to the right of the big pole / post.

Yes.

Does the post go all the way up the picture?

Yes.

It does. Alright. O.K.

And the man is too near the post.

O.K. I have the man. This, I have that. In the left hand corner, is there a green field?

Green field?

Grass, you know, grass and trees.

No.

No. What's in the left hand corner? In the left / up on the top.

Is the car.

The car.

(= It's em, (...))

Is there anything above the car?

Above?

On top of the car?

No.

No. Alright

Above(...)

O.K. I don't figure what that is. O.K. Does the ladder go all the way to the top of the picture?

Does the ladder?

Yeah.

Yes.
134 X: It does. O.K. Hm. O.K. I see. These are bricks. I have a piece that's got an orange thing in it, and it's got the stones, the bricks, and it's got kind of H or S shapes in it. Where does that go? I can't see where / O.K. O.K. I got it. (Silence)

135 X: Oh, that's the steam coming out of the train. Yeah. O.K. I got it. (Silence)

136 X: Yeah. And then, did you say the ladder was going all the way up to the top?
137 Z: Yes, Yes.
138 X: O.K. What's the / O.K. And then there was / Where does the water go?
139 Z: The water?
140 X: Yeah. Where is the water? Is it at the top or the bottom of the picture?

(Silence)

141 X: Oh. O.K. Never mind. And then (laughter) I finished it. There is a / Oh, alright. There is room. O.K. Right.
142 Z: Yes.
Appendix IIIb

School: Hellenic-American Union School of English
(a private evening school in Athens)

Participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mother tongue</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>X: Greek</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z: English</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Z: Oh, Maria
2 X: Yes

Z: This picture shows two ducks, Donald Duck. Do you understand what a duck is?
3 X: Yes
4 Z: O.K.

There are two Donald Duck pictures. Let's start from the corner. Find one corner piece.

(Silence)

5 Z: Do you understand what a corner piece is?
6 X: Yes. How is the corner?
7 Z: Well, 
8 X: What it seems in a corner?
9 Z: My picture shows only three of the corners. The lower left hand corner has a green and brown piece of wood in it. It shows a door in the floor.
10 X: A door?
11 Z: Yes, in the floor.
12 X: Yes.
13 Z: Yes. A door in the floor with some steps, a ladder coming through it. Can you find that piece?
14 X: No.
15 Z: O.K. The other corner at the bottom, the right hand corner, shows some books - a red, a green and some yellow markings on. Did you find that?
16 X: Yes. I found. I found the books.
17 Z: O.K. Now. The books above the books, em, there is a, em, the lease, a chest.
18 X: Chess?
A chest, a box. It's a, ah, a wooden box, a box made of wood, with metal pieces at the edges of the box. Do you understand that?

X: No. After the books

Z: Yes.

X: What(...)

Z: There is a box, em (laughter) Κουτί.

X: Yes.

Z: O.K.?

X: Κουτί. What colour is the box?

Z: Yes. It's, ah, ah, it's a, ah, ah, it's maroon, it's reddish brown, brown red.

X: Brown.

Z: And in the box there is / there are gold coins. Ah, ah, You know coins? Ah, Ah, change. So there is a wooden box and in the box are golden or yellow coins. Do you understand that?

(Silence)

Z: Have you found it?

X: No.

Z: O.K. To the left of the books you had the corner piece with books in it, ah, to the left of that there is a sack and the sack is reddish.

X: Sack? Want is

Z: Sack.

X: Sack?

Z: Sack. Σάκκο.

X: Ah.

Z: There is a container of some kind which has a reddish colour to it. Do you find that?

X: Yes. Let's start from the ducks(...) the ducks

Z: O.K. let's start from the ducks.

X: Yes

Z: What do you see? You have a piece that shows the ducks?

X: I have the Scrooge and Donald Duck.

Z: O.K. Good.

(laughter)

Z: What do you see when you look at Scrooge? You see his hat, his eyes?
44 X: Yes.
45 Z: Do you see / he has a red coat. Do you see his red coat?
46 X: Yes. Yes.
47 Z: Do you see his feet?
48 X: Under the Scrooge, what is it?
49 Z: Do you see his feet? Scrooge's feet?
50 X: No.
51 Z: O.K. He has feet. Two feet with brown shoes partly (inaudible)
      Do you see his / the feet with shoes on them?
52 X: Yes. The picture starts with the two ducks?
53 Z: Yes. And going, ah, you see their faces, you see the faces of
      the ducks.
54 X: Yes.
55 Z: O.K. Underneath the faces Scrooge has a red coat and more
      down he has two feet and on the feet are brown shoes covering
      part of his feet. Do you see that?
56 X: Over the Scrooge and the Donald, what is it?
57 Z: Above that place is a wall. It is grey.
58 X: Above?
59 Z: Above.
60 X: But that
61 Z: Its surface is grey. It seems to be made of stones, blocks of
      stones. They are grey. And above them there is a white bulb,
      an electric light, and above them to the left there is a window
      and the window is pink and through the window you see a blue
      sky.
62 X: Wait a minute.
63 Z: O.K.
       (Silence)
64 Z: Did you find the windows?
65 X: Not all the windows
66 Z: There are two in the picture, one one the left and one on the
      right.
       (Silence)
67 Z: The ducks are looking at, ah, a container - nou - in which
      there is money, gold money. Do you see the gold money?
68 X: No.
Describe the picture you have so far. Tell me what you see.

Donald Duck, Scrooge and / I can see the window over the (...)

Above Scrooge?

Yes.

O.K. In front of the window there is a piece of brown wood. Do you see that?

Yes.

O.K. Then as you go to the right there is a piece of brown wood. It goes all the way across the picture, a straight strip of brown wood. Do you find the brown wood? If you start from the window to the left II

Excuse me. The picture starts from the window?

If you look at the window on the left and go across the picture there is a piece of brown wood,

A piece of?

A piece of wood which is coloured brown. Do you understand what I mean?

No.

Ah, δέντρα. (=trees)

Δέντρα - leaves (=woods)

Yes. O.K. It goes across the picture (inaudible) to the right and there is another window there. So perhaps if you find pieces with wood on, brown II

I can't find pieces of wood.

Can you find them?

No.

Ah, O.K. In the middle of the top there is an electric bulb, an electric light. Do you understand electric light?

No.

Electric light - φωτιά. (=fire)

Yes

O.K. Ask me about the picture. Ask me / Tell me where you are and what comes next. O.K.?

Under the Donald there is a box and near the box I can't find what is.

The box / Above the box I can see some books and the books are red, green and purple.
X: Just a minute.

Z: There is also a broom. Do you know what a broom is? Well, a broom is something you sweep with, you clean with.

X: I think I have a piece and there is a light.

Z: O.K.

X: Lamp.

Z: A lamp.

X: Yes, where is it?

Z: Yes, O.K. It is at the top, in the middle. At the top of the picture, in the centre, at the top. What else do you see, what other pieces do you have?

X: What do you find the place from the right?

Z: You can find, ah, tell me the colours.

X: O.K.

Z: You find.

X: Well, near the right what is the piece?

Z: To the right or the left (inaudible)

X: Right

Z: To the right, O.K. The brown wood piece continues and then there is a window with a pink frame. Through the window you see the blue sky.

X: I must find the window?

Z: Yes. The window on the right side. There are two windows, one on the left, one on the right of the picture. Do you have anything pink? There is a pink frame. A rose frame. Can you describe pieces that you have had? What colour are they?

X: I want to find the window. I can't

Z: It'll be white and pink with a piece of brown.

X: Yes, I have the piece but I can't find the correct place.

Z: O.K. It should be in the top right corner of the picture. It should be at the edge of the picture. It should have a straight edge.

X: I have Scrooge with one leg.

Z: O.K. Scrooge has two legs.

X: Yes, but I can't find the other.

Z: Ah, they look the same, the same colour.
119 X: I can't find the piece.
120 Z: Mm, Mm. Which way do you have
121 X: Ah, I have a piece with, ah, I can't find the word,
122 Z: Does it have a shoe on it?
123 X: It, eh, you can find to the church. There is a place you can
take the(...) 
124 Z: Yellow, yellow colour? What colour is it? Is it gold?
125 X: Gold
126 Z: O.K. That is
127 X: Behind the hand?
128 Z: Behind his hand. Yes. Candlestick, that's a candlestick.
To hold the candle. And beneath his foot there is an opening
in the floor. You knew the floor? He's standing on the floor
of the room, and there is a door, or opening in the floor and
the edge of that opening is green. Do you find a piece with
some green on it?
129 X: No. I want, eh, all the Scroo ge. I haven't all the Scroo ge.
I haven't the leg and the hand, the left / the right.
130 Z: His foot looks just like the other foot. It has yellow brown
and the hand is white and behind his hand is the yellow candle-
stick and a solid blue pan cooking pan. So you have white and
yellow and some blue and pieces of his foot perhaps. I
Tell me / describe to me the pieces that you have used.
131 X: Near the light / the lamp(...) 
132 Z: Yes. Under the lamp it's
133 X: Exactly near the lamp, what is the piece?
134 Z: Beneath, to the left or the right?
135 X: Right.
136 Z: Yes. I think it's very much white, with a brown piece of wood.
But my picture doesn't show that. So it might be different.
137 X: And left?
138 Z: And to the left, the left of the light it looks white, and
there are brown, there is a brown piece up and down and then
there is grey. It shows the wall of the room.
Ask me some other questions.
139 X: About the box. Under (inaudible) there is a box.
140 Z: Yes.
141 X: I have the piece which starts the box.
142 Z: O.K. And II
143 X: Near this piece what I can't find, eh, eh
144 Z: Does the piece that you have show money, gold money?
145 X: What?
146 Z: Does the piece that you have show that the box holds money?
147 X: No.
148 Z: The box is full up with yellow coins, money.
149 X: I must find the box then.
150 Z: O.K.

(Silence)

151 Z: Ask me some other questions.
152 Z: Mm, Mm.
153 Z: Do you have the picture nearly done?
154 X: I beg your pardon?
155 Z: Is the picture nearly complete?
156 X: Yes.
157 Z: Where are pieces missing?
158 X: In the box.
159 Z: Ah, the box, I think.
160 X: O.K. I finished.
So, let's be (inaudible)
He has got a red jacket and a white waistcoat.

Yes. Right. I've got hold of the Duck.

O.K. including his hat, a blue hat, a blue top hat.

A blue top hat. Part of this top hat I just see if I can
find the rest of his hat. Em. Yeah. No. That's wrong.

I see.

Yes, it's getting difficult.

That's possible enough.

Yeah. That's it. Yes. I think I've nearly finished now.

O.K. You've got all the red jacket, have you?

Em, yes. I've got the / I've got all the right hand and his
hat and the half of the other duck as well, its hand stretched
out.

O.K. Then the next best thing to do is probably to complete
the duck with the blue shirt.

Yes, I have completed the duck with the blue shirt and

and the treasure chest?

Yes. I've got the whole treasure chest. I've just got to
finish off a bit of the window and then finish off that bit.

Right. Complete.

O.K.

O.K.