

INVESTIGATING THE COMMUNICATIVENESS OF CLASSROOM TEACHER-STUDENT INTERACTIONS FROM A CONVERSATION ANALYSIS PERSPECTIVE

Linglan Xiao
(linglan.xiao@hotmail.com)
Chongqing University, China

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the communicativeness of classroom teacher-student interactions by using conversation analysis as a research tool. To achieve the aim, I first described the organization of turn taking, sequence, repair and topic development of classroom teacher-student interactions in 3 different classroom contexts (a text-based context, a meaning-and-fluency context and a synthesized context) and then examined how these classroom interactions related to the theory of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). The findings show that although there is a reflexive relationship between organization of interaction and pedagogical focus, teacher-student interactions in 3 different contexts are quite similar in the sense that it is mainly the teacher who initiates, develops topics and directs interaction. The findings also demonstrate that the high degree of communicativeness of interaction isn't necessarily guaranteed by using authentic materials in class. Based on the findings, I suggest that EFL teachers should resist the temptation of playing the role of "director" in classroom interaction. Instead, in order to create an ideal environment to foster the development of communicative competence, there is a need for EFL teachers to perform as "co-communicator", increase student engagement and establish "confluence" with students.

1 Introduction

The term classroom interaction refers to the interaction between the teacher and learners, and amongst the learners in the classroom (Tsui, 2001). A major implication in the communicative approach to the teaching of foreign languages concerns classroom interaction in which students should participate. As Brown argues, "At the heart of current theories of communicative competence is the essentially interactive nature of communication. Thus, the communicative purpose of language compels us to create opportunities for enough interaction in the classroom. As learners interact with each other through oral and written discourse, their communicative abilities are enhanced (Brown, 2001, p. 48)." Pica (1994) and Hall (1993) also promote that interaction creates the opportunity to negotiate, to provide learners with increased chances for comprehension of the target language, and to acquire target discourse conventions and practice higher level academic communicative skills. In the words of Leo van Lier (1996), in the classroom, interaction is the most visible manifestation of learning process at work. Learning arises not through interaction, but in interaction (Ellis, 2000, p. 209). To sum up, classroom interaction is in the heart of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and is considered to be the matrix for communicative competence to develop as well as "the *sine qua non* of classroom pedagogy (Allright, 1984, p. 159)."

While some studies focus on the crucial importance of classroom interaction for fostering

students' communicative competence and see it as the expected outcome of proper communicative teaching (cf. Hedge, 2000; Brown, 2001; Allright, 1984; Ellis, 2000; Van Lier, 1996), Yo-an Lee points out that "classroom interaction itself is an occasion of language use that relies on the competence of the parties to the interaction (Lee, 2006, p. 349)." He argues that L2 classroom interaction itself relies on competent language use for its accomplishment and the competence that is already in the room is a constitutive feature of the work-parties of teaching and learning and that L2 classroom interaction is not just an instrument to accomplish communicative competence as an instructional goal, but is also a practical occasion that exhibits competent language use (Lee, p. 2006). Wash and Li's view of classroom interaction coincides with Lee's to some extent. They argue that appropriate language use (way of interacting) of the teacher (2013, p. 248) will increase students' learning opportunities. For example, when the language used by the teacher is aligned with their pedagogical goals, more learning space will be created for students. Hence, teachers' competent language use as well as their sound knowledge of classroom interaction and CLT will contribute to an ideal environment for developing student's communicative competence.

With the emergence of English functioning as a global lingua franca (Seidlhofer, 2005), the growing need for good communication skills in English has put more emphasis in teaching English for communication than ever before and at the same time increased teachers' responsibility in helping students to use the language with the proficiency required to enhance their prospects in accessing better opportunities in education and employment within their own contexts and/or globally and so on (TESOL White Paper, 2012). In China, in order to make university students more equipped to face the challenges brought about by fast economic expansion and social development, English educational reform in Chinese universities has a special focus on improving students' ability to use English communicatively and also requires EFL teachers create more opportunities for students to practice using the target language and foster such ability. Hence, my study focused its attention on teacher-student interaction in a Chinese university context. The rationale underlying the study is that an understanding of the dynamics of classroom discourse is essential for teachers to establish and maintain good communicative practice and the first step in gaining such an understanding is familiarization with features of classroom interaction (Johnson, 1995). Therefore, the main aim of this study is to examine, from a conversation analysis perspective, the organization of turn taking, sequence, repair and topic development of classroom teacher-student interactions in 3 different contexts and how these classroom interactions relate to the theory of CLT.

2 Literature review

2.1 Definition of CLT

It has been accepted for many years that 'communication' is the proper aim for language teaching (Allright, 1979) and one learns to communicate by practicing communication (Lee & Vanpatten, 2003). Having discovered that the students who were structurally competent still couldn't communicate appropriately and effectively (Johnson, 1979, p. 192), language teachers were getting to realize that it was not enough in language teaching to focus only on language structures, but this needed to be accompanied by a concern to develop the capacity to express meaning (Widdowson, 1979). Consequently, the 1970s saw considerable moves within language teaching to embrace the Communicative Approach (Brumit & Johnson, 1979).

However, CLT has never been explicitly defined. Neither has a single model of CLT been universally accepted as authoritative (McGroarty, 1984; Markee, 1997, as cited in Rao 2000). Brumfit notes that “Communicative Language Teaching thus becomes no more than the name for a shared set of assumptions about the nature of language and language use, and of language learning and teaching (Brumfit, 1987, p. 5).” According to Larsen-Freeman (2000), CLT aims broadly to apply the theoretical perspective of the Communicative Approach by making communicative competence the goal of language teaching and by acknowledging the interdependence of language and communication.

Although no consensus has been reached on the unique definition of CLT, it’s still necessary to describe its eminent characteristics

2.2 Characteristics of CLT

The most obvious characteristic of CLT, as Larsen-Freeman points out is that “almost everything that is done is done with a communicative intent. Students use the language a great deal through communicative activities such as games, role plays, and problem-solving tasks (2000, p. 129).” As far as truly communicative activities are concerned, Larsen-Freeman quotes the 3 features described by Morrow: information gap, choice and feedback (1981, as cited in Larsen-Freeman 2000). When two persons exchange with each other and they hold the information separately which the opposite side doesn’t know, the information gap forms and real communicative exchange come into being. Also, during this information exchange, both of the speakers have a choice of what they will say and how they say it. If the choice is only controlled by the teacher, it is not communicative. The communication between two speakers is purposeful and the speaker can evaluate whether or not the purpose has been achieved based on the feedback from the listener (Larsen-Freeman 2000). Thus, the concern with meaningful communication is based on the desirability of teachers setting up “appropriate patterns of interaction which ensure that the learners...talk to some purpose rather than echo words (Bryne, 1978, as cited in Williams, 1983, p. 173).”

Another salient characteristic of CLT is the use of authentic materials or pseudo-authentic materials (Brumfit 1987; Larsen-Freeman 1986, 2000; Williams, 1983). The reason for favoring such authentic materials is because it is considered desirable to give students an opportunity to develop strategies for understanding language as it is actually used (Larsen-Freeman 1986, 2000). Another similar reason comes from Morrow that learners may eventually have to operate in situations where “no account will be taken of their linguistic level” (Morrow, 1979).

The third characteristic of CLT is “its learner-centered and experience-based view of second language teaching (Richards & Rodgers, 1986, p. 69).” In the traditional language classrooms, teacher always act as the knowledge transmitter while students are always passive knowledge recipients. Teachers often assume too much responsibility in language teaching while students often assume too little. As it is suggested by Lee and Vanpatten (2003) if CLT is to work, this pattern needs to be changed. Teacher should take more responsibility in providing students with opportunities for communication and using the language to interpret and express real-life message. Again, Larsen-Freeman favors that activities in CLT are often carried out in the form of students’ group work and the time should be allotted to each student maximally for them to negotiate meaning (1986, 2000). Similarly, Brumfit (1987) suggests a supportive environment

creates in CLT with a less dominant role for the teacher and a more active and responsible role for the learner. To sum-up, as Li (1984) puts it, “a communicative approach presupposes that students take the centre role in learning and it demands a high degree of initiative from learners.”

2.3 CLT in the Chinese university context

Traditionally, the teaching of English in Chinese University context put its emphasis on English structures and grammar. The preference for linguistic competence with a large area of communicative competence untouched caused the failure of developing an adequate level communicative competence in Chinese EFL learners (Hu, 2002).

English majors, after entering a Chinese University, will normally follow a 4-year program that provides foundational training in reading, listening, speaking, and writing in courses arranged by skill area (Xu & Warschauer, 2004). After they graduate from universities, most of them assume occupation in professional interpreting and translating companies or become professional English teachers in all levels. In view of this, obviously they are highly demanded in communicative competence. But, the teaching before were mainly based on traditional approaches of which the focus were on vocabulary and grammatical knowledge of English. The English class was teacher-centered and teachers always spent a lot of time in carefully analyzing sentence structures, asking students to do translation and distinguish the usage of words etc. After class, the English majors were supposed to memorize a large quantity of vocabulary as they strongly believed words were the most important prerequisite for being an excellent user of the target language and as a result of large accumulated words, they could automatically become communicative competent and fluent in speaking and writing. Actually, after learning language in this way, most English majors still experience stark pragmatic failure in authentic communication (Yan & He 1990, as cited in Xu & Warschauer, 2004).

As for non-English majors at university, they need to pass College English Test Band 4 (CET 4), a national examination, of which the purpose is to evaluate students' English language proficiency, mainly in reading and writing and is also seen as benchmarked level of English competence for a qualified university graduate (Adamson & Xia, 2011). Therefore, a large number of higher education institutions pursue the policy of "no CET-4 certificate, no Bachelor's degree" (Pang et al. 2002; Cheng 2008 as cited in Adamson & Xia 2011) although the Ministry of Education has never made it a requirement that performance in CET should be linked with degree conferral (Adamson & Xia, 2011). So, lots of non-major English students set passing CET 4 as their primary goal in learning English at university and for some, it is the only “stimulant” to inspire them to learn. The students' passing rate of CET 4 was used as a criterion to evaluate the effectiveness of College English teaching in some universities and the results of CET4 were regarded as the main indicator of the quality of College English teaching (Zhu 2003, as cited in Adamson & Xia 2011). In recent years, more and more Chinese universities have stopped the practice of making CET 4 certificate a prerequisite of degree conferral, however, the advantages of having CET 4 & 6 certificates in job hunting still makes achieving a high score in CET 4 & 6 a main goal of non-English majors' English learning. The deep influences CET 4 & 6 have on the teaching and learning process has become the main constraint of adopting a communicative approach and it's not uncommon to find test-oriented teaching still exist in some universities. As a result, Universities have

produced lots of English “readers” rather than capable users of English in real communication (Zou, 1998).

Realizing that the traditional grammar-translation method and audio-lingual method can't produce competent English users to meet the needs of the country's fast socioeconomic development, a top-down movement to reform English language teaching in China began in the late 1980s, of which an important component of this reform was the effort to import CLT in the Chinese context both in the secondary school level and tertiary level (Xu & Warschauer, 2004; Hu, 2002). It is believed that, by introducing CLT, teachers can keep up with developments in English teaching methods outside China and will assist learners to develop greater competence in the use of English for communication and via doing so, they will no longer be “deaf and dumb” in communication (Liao 2000, 2004). As an important component of education reform in China, the reform of University English language teaching also face new tasks and challenges. In the latest revised version of both the Chinese National English Language Curriculum for English majors and College English Curriculum Requirements for non-English majors issued in the year 2000 and 2007 respectively by The Chinese Ministry of Education, a very clear claim was made on the need in changing teacher-centred teaching pattern into student-centred teaching pattern and the revised curriculums require that the emphasis of teaching should be placed on fostering students' abilities to use English in real contexts so as to meet the needs for China's social and economical development as well as the fast-growing international changes. Due to the wide acknowledgement of its advantages in developing students' communicative competence over traditional approaches and potentiality in solving the wide spread problem of students' low competence in using English for communication, CLT as an innovative teaching approach with its focus on fluency, learner-centeredness has been strongly advocated and encouraged in EFL teachers' daily instructional practice by the Chinese government (Liao, 2004; Hu, 2005; Xiao, 2011). The education authorities' publicizing the advantages of using CLT to a large extent has raised teacher's awareness for teaching English for communicative purpose.

Now, more than 3 decades have passed since the introduction of CLT approach in China and substantial progress indeed have been made in EFL classroom (Yu 2001; Fang 2010). However, the implementation of CLT has also encountered various problems and a variety of constraints have influenced teaching practice of CLT. In Ding's survey (2007), he investigates some university English language teacher's attitudes towards CLT and concludes by suggesting that teachers are in great favor of CLT despite they have encountered certain contextual constraints for practicing CLT effectively (Ding 2007, as cited in Xiao 2011). However, Xiao (2011) argues that mere concentration on teacher's attitudes is not enough and whether there is a true match between teachers' positive attitudes to CLT and teachers' teaching practice needs to be investigated. Xiao's research in a Chinese university context was done via classroom observation. The data analysis shows remarkable similarities in the types of instructional activities, class practices and teacher-student interaction in all five classes observed by him. He further categorized class events into text-based and non-text based and found that all teachers adopted the traditional grammar-translation method to deal with text materials. Among the five teachers, only one teacher engaged students in a communicative group discussion. According to Xiao (2011), the results of classroom observation revealed “a deep seated misconception about CLT on the part of the teachers” which in turn significantly influenced their classroom teaching. This is sufficient evidence which shows a lack of proper understanding of CLT led to a less communicative classroom. Xiao is not alone in pointing

out the gap between university EFL teachers' beliefs about CLT and their actual practice in language classroom. Similar findings have been reported in relation to discrepancy between teachers' favorable attitudes towards CLT and their actual classroom practice in other Asian EFL context (cf. Ansarey 2012; Memari 2013). Judging from CLT principles, Xiao drew the conclusion from the observation that one of teacher's classes was relatively communicative in nature while the classes of the other four teachers' were not communicative at all (2011).

2.4 Communicativeness of EFL classroom

According to Cullen (1998), studies which have attempted to assess the communicativeness of classroom discourse are flawed as the criteria they used were taken from what is perceived to constitute communicative behavior in the world outside the classroom (p. 180). In the meantime, the ignorance of the reality of the classroom context and the features which make for effective communication within that context could result in the failure in capturing the dynamics of classroom discourse as the pedagogical aspect of the classroom interaction is automatically ruled out by only comparing the classroom to natural conversation (Cullen, 1998; Gil, 2002, p. 274). Cullen further argues that analyzing and defining what is communicative and uncommunicative should be based primarily on what is or is not communicative in the context of the classroom itself and pedagogical purpose within the classroom context needs to be taken into account (1998).

On the other hand, how communicative the class will be is to a large extent decided by EFL teachers' teaching practice. Designers of syllabuses and materials contribute to the process, but it is the teacher who still has the most direct effect on what then takes place in the class. So, what actually happens in class will ultimately determine how communicative and how successful the teaching is (Andrew, 1983). In view of this, we can see teachers' real practice in everyday teaching have great influence on "communicativeness" of classroom interaction. And the degree of "communicativeness" of classroom interaction in turn is important for teachers to help develop students' communicative competence. Then here comes the assumption that if we want to help EFL teachers to know well about how communicative their classes are and at the same time raise their awareness to create communicative-rich interaction to foster students' communicative competence, first we should have a clear and detailed portrait of current university classroom interaction. Here, a need arises to investigate and describe classroom teacher-student interactions by using an appropriate tool which can capture the dynamics of classroom and help teachers acquire 'microscopic understanding' (Van Lier, 2000, as cited in Walsh 2006) of the interaction organization of the classroom. So, in this study, conversation analysis was applied to examine moment-by-moment teacher-student interactions in 3 EFL classes in a university in China with the aim of investigating the degree of 'communicativeness' of classroom teacher-interactions within a particular context.

3 Research methodology

3.1 Research questions

The research questions are as follows:

- (i) What are the characteristics of turn-taking organization in 3 EFL classroom teacher-student interactions in 3 different contexts?

- (ii) What are the characteristics of sequence organization in 3 EFL classroom teacher-student interactions in 3 different contexts?
- (iii) What are the characteristics of repair organization in 3 EFL classroom teacher-student interactions in 3 different contexts?
- (iv) What are the characteristics of topic development in 3 EFL classroom teacher-student interactions in 3 different contexts?
- (v.) How do these classroom teacher-student interactions in these 3 classes relate to the theory of CLT?

3.2 Subjects

The subjects for this study include 3 EFL College English teachers and their students from a certain University in Southwest China. The 3 teachers share the same first language background with the students (Chinese). All of them have had around 15 to 20 years' rich English teaching experience in that University. In this sense, all of the three teachers are presumably very familiar with both traditional teaching methodology and the gradual application of CLT in China. Three classes involved in this study are with an average of 30 students per class. All of them are in Year 2 of their university studying. In view of this, they are all advanced English language learners who have at least learned English for 7 years. Two of the three classes are English majors while the other one is made up of non-English majors. The three classes are respectively taught by the three teachers. As the aim of the study is to investigate classroom interaction in higher education in China, collecting data from both English-major and Non-major English classroom is considered to be necessary for the study.

3.3 Research design and methodological approach

This study is a study of 3 cases with the focus only on one aspect of classroom interaction, that is, teacher – student interaction rather than student – student interaction in pair or group work. The focus is further narrowed to turn-taking, sequence, repair organization and topic development of classroom teacher - student interactions and investigation on these aspects will serve as the lens to assess the degree of communicativeness of the 3 EFL classrooms. More specifically, all focused aspects in these 3 classrooms are examined within a certain classroom context. They are: 1) text-based context 2) meaning - and- fluency context 3) a synthesized context. However, above these 3 contexts, we have a broader one - the EFL context in a certain university in China. So the three classrooms will be not only investigated separately but also as a whole by using conversation analytical approach.

According to Heritage (1997), the purpose of using CA methodology in an institutional setting is to account for the ways in which context is created for and by the participants in relation to the goal-oriented activity in which they are engaged (Heritage, 1997, p. 163 as cited in Walsh 2006, p. 51). Seedhouse (2004, p. 96) also points out that CA institutional-discourse methodology attempts to relate not only the overall organization of the interaction, but also individual interactional devices to the core institutional goal. Just as other types of institutional interaction, classroom interaction has its own unique “fingerprint” (Drew and Heritage, 1992, p. 26). Seedhouse (2004, p. 83-184) describes three properties which

constitute the unique “fingerprint” of L2 classroom interaction as follows: 1) Language is both the vehicle and object of instruction; 2) There is a reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction; 3) The linguistic forms and patterns of interaction which the learners produce in the L2 are potentially subject to evaluation by the teacher in some way. Richards and Lockhart (1996, p. 154) also think the interactional dynamics of a lesson results from the interplay between teacher’s and the learners’ interactional styles and the moment-to-moment demands of instruction and lessons thus have a constantly changing interactional structure, which can either hinder or support effective language learning. From these views, the classroom context under a CA methodology can never be regarded as a static but a dynamic one which means contexts are not fixed entities operating throughout a lesson, but dynamic and changing processes which vary from one stage of a lesson to another. While other methodology such as discourse analysis can’t reflect this intertwined and reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction, CA methodology is adopted here with expectation to uncover detail of classroom interaction so as to get deeper insights into classroom discourse

3.4 Data collection and data analysis

The video-recordings of the three chosen classes were recorded by specialists in video recording from the News Centre of the university and therefore they are of high quality in both sound and visual effect. This is very important for CA study as the one of key factor concerning reliability in CA study relate to technical quality of recordings which in turn decide the quality of transcripts (Perakyla, 1997 as cited in Seedhouse, 2004). Among the 3 video recordings, one is from College English classroom which is in meaning-and-fluency context and the other 2 are from English-major classrooms of which one is in text-based context and the other one is in a synthesized context. It’s important to investigate classroom interaction in different classroom contexts as there is a reflexive relationship between the pedagogical focus and the organization of turn-taking, sequence and repair. When the pedagogical focus varies, the organization of the interaction varies, too (Seedhouse, 2004).

With the data collected, it was analyzed in the following procedures. First, all video-recordings were carefully transcribed in conventions in Seedhouse (2004). The second step was to follow the CA analytic routine steps to systematically work through the data. Thus, the transcribed data of each lesson was examined in terms of the organization of turn-taking, sequence, repair and topic development. The third step of the data analysis was to relate classroom reality to the theory of CLT in order to get insights about the communicativeness of classroom interaction in each context. So, this study is a qualitative-based study. No statistical or other quantification methods were used.

4 Results of the study

According to teachers’ intended or stated pedagogical focus and meanwhile by referring to Seedhouse’s identification of classroom contexts (1996, 2004), the 3 lessons are approached within a particular classroom context and they are respectively in 3 contexts: Lesson 1 is in text-based context; Lesson 2 is in meaning-and-fluency context; Lesson 3 is in a synthesized context containing both text-based and meaning-and-fluency contexts. Certainly, the real pedagogical focus comes from the interaction itself and contexts can shift with great rapidity and fluidity from turn to turn during a lesson (Seedhouse, 2004).

4.1 The characteristics of turn-taking organization in 3 EFL classroom teacher-student interactions in 3 different contexts

Lesson 1 in text-based context comes from English-major class and is taught by Ms Wang. It operates entirely in a text-based context and the aim of teaching is clearly stated by the teacher in procedural context that the focus of this lesson is to familiarize students with the text by means of listening, then reading. All sub-activities are around the text. Turn-taking organization in Lesson 1 mainly follows a rigid pattern of teacher's initiation of a turn by asking a question and students' taking turns mainly as a result of teacher's nomination, then teacher's evaluation of students' answers. Turn-taking system is quite simple and neat. The responsibility for managing the turn-taking to the largest extent lies with the teacher. Students' volunteering turns to take the speakership appear least time in the whole turn-taking exchange system. IRF/IRE cycle prevails in this lesson. While it is argued by Seedhouse that in a text-based context, this cycle is a most economical way as the pedagogical focus here is to establish and evaluate the learners' understanding of the text (Seedhouse, 1996), it should be pointed out that under the overall pedagogical focus exists sub-pedagogical focus. The turn-taking organization also should be compatible with changing sub-pedagogical focus or the chance for developing students' communicative competence will be decreased as we can see in the following extract.

Extract 1

1 T: and you need to fill in the blanks for where, who, what and how. you need to
2 do it together, in your group(.) after that, you'll be asked to give a presentation.
3 To retell the story based on the timetable. Please do it er::m I think 3 minutes 3 4or 4
minutes Ok?
... (5 lines are omitted here)
9 T: ok, let's stop let's stop (3.0) somewhat difficult?
10 LL: yes
11T: that's a very good task to check so whether you really understand the text or
12 not, whether you really did the preview ok? (2.0) now with the table, with the
13 table just now you filled, and also I'll give you some pictures, I want to you to
14 retell the story. Based on the table, lets' see if you can retell the story(.) of
15Maheegun and I. also I'll give you some pictures to give you some hints about
16 the time. We do not follow you know tell about all the stories, say, we just tell,
17 you know in different period of time, like in spring, summer, fall, winter and(.)
18 L: spring=
19 T: =spring right. who'd like first.(1.0) any volunteers? (4.0) Wulanlan ((calls out a student
name))
20 L5: ((the student stands up))
21 T: what happened in early spring.
22 L5: e:m in early spring in the river, e:m I and my grandfather found found
23Maheegun er: and: er:: by hearing the: a friend's friend's crying (.)((looks at
24the teacher)) so I advise advised that to pick pick him to e:m our house and:
25raise him. ((looks at the teacher))
26 T: good is that right? ok sit down please good. in early spring: where
27 LL: ((speak out different answers))
28 L: maybe near river

- 29 T: are you sure? near river?=
30 LL: =maybe
31 T: maybe a river, or=
32 LL=a lake=
33 T: =a lake. Who
34 LL: I and my grandfather
35 T: grandfather and I right?
36 LL: yes
37 T: what?
38 LL: ((speak out different answers))

In lines 1-3, the teacher gives a clear instruction on what the students are going to do in procedure context. Here we can see two words are important and they can reveal teacher's original pedagogical goal (task-as-workplan) – presentation and retelling. That means students' interpretation of the text in their own way and free expression to some degree should be seen here. And looser organization of the interaction and interaction freedom should be possible within this section. However, from the extract, we can see the turn-taking system is still within IRF/IRE cycle and in a tight control of the teacher.

In line 14 the teacher states again her pedagogical focus — retelling the story in a time sequence. And she offers the interactional space to students by waiting for 4 seconds in line 19, but no one takes the turn from the teacher voluntarily. So, the teacher allocates the turn to a student by nominating one student in line 19. However, the teacher doesn't give the real free speaking right to the student to do a presentation or retelling as the goal stated in line 3, quite opposite, after the student stands up, she takes the turn back to herself and initiates the next turn by asking the question. Obviously, the student interprets her turn as only giving an answer to a question rather than a presentation or retelling. This can also be seen as she pauses twice in lines 23 and 25 to wait for teacher's evaluation of her answer. At this point, the teacher's stated pedagogical focus fails to come into being due to teacher's continuing her speakership as a turn controller. The in situ pedagogical focus here seems to be identical to the first activity of the class – the teacher asks students to listen to the text and then checks students' understanding of the text by asking questions. In that activity the focus is on students' propositional content of the answer and how well it relates propositionally to the question. The failure of intended pedagogical focus shown in this extract becomes more evident in the following lines. In line 26, teacher gives a positive evaluation of L5's answer and initiates the next turn by asking “where” and also in line 33 she uses a “who” question, then in line 37 she asks another question “what”. The result of teachers' where, who, what questions is self-evident: it constrains the students' language production as they just give short answers. The intended sub pedagogical focus hasn't been achieved owing to the teacher's unchanged turn-taking strategy. There is no scope for fluency development in such a rigid lockstep approach and the interactional turn-taking system isn't compatible with teachers' task-as-workplan pedagogical focus. The chance for developing students' language fluency is lost in task-in-process. This lesson operates entirely in a text-context context. The teacher designs different activities to make students familiarized with the text. Different pedagogical sub-focuses emerge from these different episodes. However, the turn-taking organization is almost the same in these different episodes of the lesson. Teacher-student interaction is mainly in the form of IRF/IRE cycle. From this turn-taking system, it can be concluded that the teacher's responsibility is to ask questions, select participants, and keep the interaction

moving while students' responsibility is no more than to answer the question asked. This unchanged turn-taking system to some degree constrains students' contribution and obstruct learner's involvement of classroom interaction.

Lesson 2 in meaning-and-fluency context comes from College English class (non-English-major class) and is taught by Ms Li. She introduces the carrier topic of this lesson in the interaction in procedure context at the beginning of class and makes her pedagogical goal very obvious that she tries to develop a conversation atmosphere and engage in more students in it. From the transcripts, we can see the turn-taking organization is looser than that in the first lesson. Students have more freedom to take turns and seize the speakership. Teacher seldom nominates a certain student to speak and more students are willing to take the turn on their own initiative. The most prominent characteristic in turn-taking organization in this lesson is a large number of latched sentences and overlap utterance showing turns are self selected, seized or held and student's high initiative to join into the interaction.

Extract 2

1 L6: [the house] is a symbol of wealth and you can (attract) more females
2 T: good [((laughs))]
3 LL: [((laugh))]
4 T: so nowadays, the house is a kind of <symbol of the status> You can attract(.) your partners you know. more?=
5 L7: =and little snails(.) own house is(.) is smaller and more easier to(.) to break .hh [yah]
6T: [ya] it's
7 L7 not safe=
8 T: =yah

In this extract, L6 volunteers a turn and expresses her personal opinion – the house is a kind of symbol of wealth and can attract women. It makes her classmates and teacher laugh and shows their interest in her opinion. In Line 7, L7 also seizes the turn from the teacher and a latching occurs here as well. It shows the student has the desire to express his own idea. As the interaction is managed on a turn-by-turn basis, we can find students' and teacher's laughing exist in a lot of space of interaction which can show the interaction between the teacher and students is conducted in a relaxed atmosphere. On the other hand the rapid turn taking, symmetrical roles and absence of turn taking by teacher's nomination can also make people liken it to casual conversation (Walsh, 2006). Another thing which is worth mentioning is that when students take turns from the teacher, they don't stand up to talk to the teacher while this is always the case in the first lesson. This reveals that in meaning-and-focus context, students are very clear the teacher's pedagogical goal – developing a conversation atmosphere and engaging more students in it. In this context, students can enjoy a more equal status with the teacher and they can more easily take themselves as the collaborator in the dialogue with the teacher as the teacher's most questions are open-ended questions asking about their personal opinion rather than a tool of checking something.

Lesson 3 taught by Ms Chen comes from English- major class. It is a lesson in a synthesized context which contains both meaning- and- fluency context and text-based context. According

to Seedhouse (1996). In a synthesized context there is a base context which has ‘grafted’ onto it certain pedagogical and interactional features which are atypical of that context but which are typical of another context. In our data, this lesson has a simultaneous dual focus of which one is on making learners familiar with an L2 text and the other one is on the expression of personal meaning and promoting fluency. This dual focus can be distinguished from the teacher’s monologue in the procedural context at the beginning of class. One of the most prominent characteristics in turn-taking organization in Lesson 3 is after the teacher’s initiation of a turn, the next turn is taken voluntarily by a student. What is different from students’ volunteering turns in Lesson 2 is that latched turns and overlap occurrence from students seldom occur in this lesson in that in this lesson volunteering a turn is in a very formal way conducted by students raising hands and after getting permission from the teacher, students can take the speakership and express opinions after standing up. In other words, there is no competition for the floor and turn-gaining which are typical features of natural conversation (Walsh, 2006). So, what we want to argue here is that this turn-taking system is a very typical one in traditional classrooms in China either in a language classroom or in a content classroom. The students answering the questions most likely address only the teacher and not their classmates and the teacher lets the students know when they complete her turn by giving open bids to the whole class again. Another characteristic is in some parts of the lesson, teacher’s extended turn and long time stay on the floor either in meaning-and –fluency context or text-based context (See extract 3 and 4) which can’t be found in two previous lessons. Occasionally, overlap or latched sentences occur between students and the teacher. Interestingly, overlap or latching in this class shows the highly cooperation from students to echo the teacher’s talk instead of showing their eagerness to grab the turn to express personal opinions. In this case, the teacher acts the role of authoritative knowledge transmitter and the central figure in the classroom interaction and learners can only have very short turn or no turn-taking at all, hence, least interactional space is created for students here.

Extract 3 (in meaning-and fluency context)

T: right love is never setting sun in the sky! So how beautiful love is! everybody, I’ve— really think all of you full of love in the depth of your heart everybody, all right, ((shows another slide))we could see mothers love the kids (.) we could see the childrens love their mother so this’s really very very beautiful image(.)mum’s image in our heart. all right, well when we grow up everybody, we still have different images in our heart about mum see, ((shows another slide)) here is something about our mum 12 years of age-mother doesn’t really know quite everything. ((reads out the lines on the slide))so at that time how about the kids (.) they are seems to be too young to understand the world you know. so fourteen years of age naturally mother doesn’t know that either. Ok we see this is a im(.)mature. and about 16 years of age-mother? ((another slide)) she is hopelessly old-fashioned. 18 years of age that old woman? [She’s way out of date]

LL: [She’s way out of date] ((read together with the teacher))

...

Extract 4 (in text-based context)

T: ...so we could see the generation gap exist here. now let’s see (.)in our text book, the author still have got some lectures to(.) his: kids (shows another slide and reads out) in the past(.) he always said I had developed the habit of lecturing them on the harshness of life in

my day see, <in my day> we ate macaroni and cheese(.) >we ate macaroni and cheese< in my day we didn't have any television(.) ok, this's a sufferance (.)how about his kids'(.). response.(shows another slide) he ga::zed at=

LL:= Tell me how it was in your day, dad?=(read out the sentence on the slide)

T: =right (.) tell me how it was in your day dad? see, we could see this distance indeed he(.) want to argue want to rebel you see, ok, so(.) indeed the author try to discuss the dispute of the time. (another slide) In the past the author between his mother they have some relationship and mother think the author is his what(.) [his future] and this is his hope and he's his great expectation right?=
[his future]

LL: [his future]
T: =and mother surely put quite a lot burden on the children's shoulder see ok this time, I want to say the author grown up(.) grown-up now(.) and: how about his feeling towards his son I think the scene about the hope, the great expectation, the ambition everything put on (.) the shoulder of their kids. right? so here surely there are some burdens on the children and indeed we got this dispute of time exist(.) in our text, the author try to discuss about this topic. See the generation gap not only exist in our text...

In Extract 3, the teacher tries to show students people in different ages have different images about their mums. She projects answers on the screen and reads them out. At this time, students seem highly cooperative withholding their talk and just occasionally read out the answers on the screen together with the teacher. In Extract 4, the teacher tries to show generation gap in the text. And we can see students turn are very short and only function as reception of the teacher's talk and a kind of cooperation. The turn-taking system here is very simple and homogenous. The teacher acts the role of authoritative knowledge transmitter and the central figure in the classroom interaction. And we can also find a lot of pause in the teacher's talk. To sum up, the characteristic of turn-taking here is very much like the one which Seedhouse uses to describe the turn-taking in procedural context. That is, the teacher has the floor and is in little danger of being interrupted. However, this kind of turn-taking must also be viewed as jointly constructed, with the learners actively cooperating by withholding their talk (Seedhouse, 2004).

4.2 The characteristics of sequence organization in 3 EFL classroom teacher-student interactions in 3 different contexts

The common characteristic of sequence organization in these 3 lessons in 3 different contexts is that question-and-answer adjacency pair takes up greatest percentage of all sequence organization. Almost all the questions are asked by teachers and students mainly act role of answering them. According to Lee & Vanpatten (2003), in early CLT, many instructors equated communication with conversation – but conversation of a particular type: the authority figure asked the questions, the students answered them. This can be clearly proved in my data – interaction is mainly seen as a conversation, which takes the form of question-and-answer adjacency pair with the teacher in charge. In the first lesson, IRE cycle is more or less compatible with the teacher's goal as teacher needs to check students' propositional understanding of the text. Evaluation to students' answers is a necessity. On the contrary, in lesson 2, the teacher's pedagogical goal is to allow the freedom of expressing self opinion. So, teacher's follow-up rather than teacher's evaluation is more salient. That is, we can see more IRF other than IRE at work in the lesson in meaning-and fluency context.

Extract 5

- 1 T: yeah good that's the forth one others?
2 LL: price
3 T: price but some some products are very expensive.
4 LL: quality is high.=
5T: =the quality is high so the high price [yap]?
6LL: [yeah]
7 T: any more?
8 L:[good management]
9 L: [the powerful influence]
10 T: powerful influence(.)how does it just make the products(.) have the powerful influence.
L5: just like google=
T: = [hmm?]=

In this extract, we can find question-answer adjacency pair in Line 1 and Line2, Line 5 and 6, Line 7 and 8 together with Line 9. And we can also see teacher's feedback is in the form of repeating students' contribution and they appear in Line 3, Line 5 and Line 10. Teacher's repetition is understood by students as acceptance of their opinion production. Moreover, although it is the teacher who starts question-answer adjacency pair, she doesn't know how students will answer it. It's not the teacher who decide who'll talk and who talk what. The interaction between the teacher and students become less predictable and in a less narrow and rigid pattern even though the sequence organization is still in question-answer adjacency pair. Put differently, there has been to some degree of uncertainty about exactly how the interaction is going to develop and what it is going to mean.

In Lesson 3, we also find a very special sequence organization at work which can't be found either in Lesson1 or in Lesson 2 and it accounts for the second largest percentage of all sequence organization in Lesson 3. It can be called teacher-explanation and student-echo adjacency pair as can be seen in Extract 6. When this kind of adjacency pair is working, teachers act as authoritative knowledge transmitters and the students become their passive audience, receptive vessels into which that knowledge is poured. It is known as "the Atlas Complex" (Lee & Vanpatten , 2003).

Extract 6

- 1 T: ok what time everybody that is(.) teenagers, that is rebellious times, that is the age of really want to know we want to rebel the tradition you know, ok ,we have such kind of im(.)mature impression about our mum. right let's see, as time goes on we come to 25 years of age ((another slide)) well, we have little bit different impressions of about our mum now(.) well she might know a little a bit about it, seems we have a bridge(.) seems we have the link between mum and us ok, alright good and then we come to almost 35 years old at that time we are indeed what coming into the [middle age]now good
2 LL: [middle age]
3 T: so 35 years of age-before we decide let's get mum's opinion viewpoints(.) Let's see how about mum's thought=
4 T:= all right, come to 45 years of age. wonder what mum would have thought about it see times goes on now , come to 65 years of age-what time everybody, seems we're going

to be [retired]=
5 LL: [retired]

...

Due to the space, we can only display part of the interaction here, but even from this part, we can see a little of learner contribution here and it is in the form of echoing what teacher says. We can call this adjacency pair as teacher-explanation or instruction and student-receipt or echo adjacency pair. In these 5 turns, 2 adjacency pair are 1 and 2, 4 and 5.

4.3 The characteristics of repair organization in 3 EFL classroom teacher-student interactions in 3 different contexts

According to Seedhouse, ‘repair is organized differently within the different contexts which occur in L2 classroom and each context has its own particular focus and its own typical organization of repair which is reflexively related to that pedagogical focus’ (Seedhouse 2004, p. 158). In these 3 lessons in different contexts, repairs can generally be described by using Seedhouse (1996, 2004) findings. That is, in text-based context, repair will be undertaken when the required familiarity with an aspect of the text is not displayed by a learner while in meaning-and-fluency context, the focus of repair is on establishing mutual understanding and negotiating meaning. Secondly, repair is mainly initiated by teachers in these 3 lessons. Thirdly, the typical repair trajectory is teacher-initiated self-repair. In the meantime, other repair trajectories are teacher-initiated teacher repair, teacher-initiated peer-repair. The point which is worth pointing out is in Seedhouse’s data (2004), he suggests that teacher-initiated peer-repair may be a context-specific repair which may only occur in form-and-accuracy context while in my data, this kind of repair trajectory can be spotted in both text-based context and meaning-and-fluency context. Another noticeable and important characteristics concerning repair is while Seedhouse never finds repair of linguistic forms in meaning-and-fluency context in his data (1996, 2004) in my data, either in text-based context or in meaning-and fluency context, students’ errors in linguistic forms are always noticeable and repairable. That means what is repairable here is not only ‘closely related to the context of what is being done’ (Van Lier 1988, p. 211) but also is influenced by a broader context – Chinese EFL context. In this broader context, grammar has long been the focus of learning as well as teaching and plays an important role in Chinese examination system. Unarguably, accuracy of language has always been a sign of successful language learning. Thus, it is not surprising to find repair on linguistic forms at work whatever classroom context it is in.

Extract 7

1 T: ok, that’s wolf for section ↑2, questions first question what does this section tell us
2 LL: ((speak out different answers))
3 T: Yanwei ((calls out a student name))
4 L1: ((stands up)) it mainly tell us where do wolf lives.
5 T: it <mainly> [<tell us where >](.) >where do wolves live< or (.)
6 L1 [<tell us where>] [do wolves]
7 LL: [do wolves]
8 LL: where [wolves live]
9 T: [<where wolves live>] right=
10 L1:= I’m sorry.
11 T: >ok it’s ok<

In this extract, the teacher initiates the turn by asking a question then allocates the turn to the student Yanwei. Yan stands up, takes the turn from the teacher and answers the question. From the content perspective, the answer is right. But she makes a mistake in sentence order as can be seen in Line 4. This grammar mistake catches teacher's attention and she initiates a repair in Line 5 by repeating and stressing part of Yan's answer in Line 5. But the noticeable phenomenon here is teacher's intention on correcting the student's linguistic mistake is obviously contradictory to her pedagogical goal which should focus on propositional content of the student's answer and how well it relates to the text. As a result, the repair is unsuccessful due to the student and other students' misunderstanding of teacher's intention. In Line 6 and Line 7, after the teacher's initiation of repair, the repair is conducted spontaneously by the student herself and other students of the class. As we can see overlap occurs in Line 6 and Line 7. But their repair is just in the form of repeating the previous Yan's sentence which is wrong in sentence order. In Line 5, after the very short pause, the teacher again initiates the repair by using "or". As a result, students conduct another repair and this time they fulfill the teacher's aim – the sentence structure is reordered to a right one. In fact, we can see overlap occurs in Line 8 and Line 9. That means after the teacher's initiation of repair, the teacher co-conducts the repair with students. In line 10, the student Yan said sorry to the teacher for her linguistic error. In this extract, we also see a very interesting and unusual repair trajectory. After the teacher initiates the repair for the first time, repair is conducted by the student herself and the third party- other students. And in the second repair, it is co-conducted by the teacher and students. Therefore, we can term the first one as teacher-initiated self and peer repair and the second one as teacher initiated teacher and peer repair. Here what I want to argue is it's better for the teacher to conduct a direct teacher-initiated teacher repair by repeating the student's answer with the change in the sentence order. In such a case, the student can still know that she makes a mistake in structure but the answer she gives is right in content. If the teacher does so, then her repair strategy is more compatible with her pedagogical goal. Furthermore, student's losing face can also be avoidable. Besides, due to teacher's repair, a context shift here occurs. Text-based context shifts to form-and-accuracy context.

Extract 8

- 1 T: yah, it's a short ad and this ads has once won the prize of the advertisements. How do you
2 think about this one?
3 LL: it's funny.
4 T: funny funny, that's the only(.) one feature, any others?
5 L7: surprised ((in a very low voice and T doesn't hear this))
6 L9: impressing
7 T: ((walks close to him)) impressing, impressive
8 L9: ((nods his head))
9 T: ya, why do you think it's impressive?
10L10: ((unintelligible))

In this extract, the teacher is asking students the features of an ad which has won prizes. In Line 5, L7 takes the turn voluntarily and speaks out a word "surprised" which is wrong in grammar. The teacher doesn't hear this as L7 speaks in a very low voice. But, L9 in Line 6 makes an contribution using the word "impressing" which is also wrong in grammar. The

error on the usage of the word is spotted by the teacher and she intentionally walks close to the student and conducts a direct teacher-initiated teacher repair. In Line 8, L9 nods his head to accept the teacher's correction. What is argued here is that teacher's repair strategy is using a direct repair so the progressing of interaction is not really disturbed by the repair as we can see the teacher quickly returns to the topic and initiates the next question in Line 9. But, we don't know whether L9's interlanguage has been upgraded by the teacher's direct teacher initiate teacher repair as the next turn is seized by L10 and L9 loses his speakership in Line 10. The main focus of repair is just as Seedhouse suggests, on establishing mutual understanding and negotiating of meaning. But, in Chinese EFL context, grammar has long been the focus of teaching as well as learning. So, even the misuse of a certain linguistic form doesn't impede communication of meaning or content, it is still noticeable and repairable whatever context it is in.

Extract 9

- 1 L14: e::m as children, we can do something or make decision (.) er:: just like er er as a as a
mm do something or make decisions e::m in::in=
2 T: =in our daily life?
3 L14: in our daily life, em=
4 T: = Ok::that's correct we could decide by ourselves alright? and sometimes we could
choo::se by ourselves alright? and what we should do alright?=
5 L = and we can also regard our parents and children as friends.

In Line 14, L14 has trouble in finding the right word to express her meaning. Communication breaks down at this point. As Walsh (2002) points out that communication breakdown occurs because learners do not know a particular word or phrase or do not possess the appropriate communication strategies and at this time it is the role of the teacher to intervene and feed in the missing language. In Line 3, the teacher conducts a teacher-initiated teacher repair to repair the trouble in the flow of interaction by completing L14's utterance with an appropriate expression. And in Line 3, by repeating it, an uptake of repaired item is displayed by L14. This is a successful repair and just as Walsh argues, the sensitivity to learner needs are of utmost importance (2002).

4.4 The characteristics of topic development in 3 EFL classroom teacher-student interaction in 3 different contexts

In Lesson1, topic management and development is tightly controlled and all round the text according to teacher's task-as-workplan. All sub-topics are nominated by the teacher. When we go through the transcription, we can see all topic nomination is conducted by the teacher and the students mainly assumed the role of respondents. In light of this, it's more like interaction in a traditional classroom. In traditional classrooms, it's always the teacher who decides what to talk and in which way to talk it; it's the teacher who selects and initiates topics and restricts students' response.

Extract 10

T: ok because we do it every day (.) OK that's all for listening information. Now, let's (.) recall and think about(.) what you've learned from this passage about wolves let's

summarize.(2.0) what does this passage tell us (.) a few points (5.0) what are the key points in these passage

LL: wolves=

In this extract, the teacher uses a lexical marker “ok” to change the topic from listening practice to oral practice and she initiates the next turn by asking a question. In a word, all the topics are tightly around the text and developed according to teacher’s task-as-workplan pedagogy. No topic is initiated by students in this lesson in text-based context.

In Lesson 2 in meaning-and-fluency context, students have a certain degree of selecting sub-topics. When sub-topic is nominated by students, they contribute information concerning themselves, their own lives or experiences, that is to say meaning has been personalized and pedagogical goal of focusing on meaning has been achieved here.

Extract 11

1 L6: mm:: I(.) think it’s a(1.0) service, after you sell the products they permits to 2 be any time, any how, you called at if you have any problem, they’ll be down at very soon=

3T: =Mm?=
4 L6: they’ll be—

5 T: how do you know that?

6 L6: because I buy a Hiar (.)washing machine when I was in when I was at home.

7 T: hmm?

8 L6: sometimes it, it I went into some troubles,=
9 T:=yah?=
10 L6:=then I called it I called them and they send some some one to my home in 5 minutes

very quickly I think and their service is actually is very friend.

11 T: =that’s why you know Hiar so much alright?=
12 L6: yah

In previous interaction, the teacher asks students to talk about popular products in China. So the carrier topic here is what product is popular. In Line 1, L6 develops a sub-topic, that is the service of the product and she takes her personal experience as an example in Lines 6, 8, 10 to prove the service of the product is very good. The focus here is completely on personal meaning and L6 succeeds in passing the information to others present in the classroom due to the enough interaction space here. It shows that students have a certain degree of choosing when to talk and what to talk about.

However, this kind of freedom of developing sub-topic is still within the control of the teacher due to teacher’s special status in classrooms. When student’s development of sub-topic is off teacher’s intended topic discussion, this kind of sub-topic development can be ended at any time by teacher’s regaining her control on topic management.

Extract 12

1 T: that’s something you often(.) just say one word you frequently use [alright]?so besides Hiar anything else(.) [you know]

2 LL:

[[((laugh))]]

- 3 L: [Legend]
4 T: Legend, yah=
5 L10: = people adopt some advanced technical from other countries ? I mean the especially=
6 T: =oh it's still on Hiar right?=
7 L10: =yah (sticks out his tongue)=

In previous interaction, student-teacher interaction is around the topic of Hiar. In Line 1, we can see the teacher makes a move to shift the topic and tries to elicit another response from students. In Line 3, L makes a contribution to suggest another famous brand name – Legend. In Line 4, teacher echo shows her positive feedback and at this point, a latching occurs. L10 seizes the turn from the teacher and gains the speakership. He develops a sub-topic on advanced technology. However, the teacher realizes L10's talk still stays on the previous topic of Hiar and is off the current topic – talking about other famous brands besides Hiar. So she produces a latched sentence as well, regains the speakership in Line 6 and initiates a repair by using a confirmation check. Here, two things are worth pointing out. In this lesson in meaning-and-fluency context, students' have initiative to develop topics and express personal meaning as is shown in Line 5. However, when noticing off-topic talk happens, teacher will exert her power to end student's topic development and put the talk on track again.

In Lesson 3, as this lesson is in a synthesized context, there are many times when topic shifts between contexts and also subtopic develops as the interaction develops. The carrier topic of the whole lesson is generation gap. Under this carrier topic, it is still the teacher who is in charge of development of sub-topics and topic management. In other words, the teacher controls what to discuss and when to discuss what. Going through the whole lesson, students are highly cooperative and talk around the topic and no case of off-topic happens in any episodes of the text

To summarize, topic management is mainly controlled by teachers in each of the lesson and only in lesson 2 we can see a certain degree of freedom of students self-selecting sub-topics. Complete freedom of topic management and development is absent in all 3 lessons.

As Ellis (1998, p. 154 as cited in Walsh, 2006) argues 'when students are in control of the topic, the quality of the discourse is markedly richer when the teacher is in control' and according to Walsh (2006, p. 81) 'the process of 'topicalisation' (Slimani 1989, 1992), where learners select and develop a topic, is significant in maximizing learning potential since 'whatever is topicalised by the learners rather than the teacher has a better chance of being claimed to have been learnt' (Ellis, 1998, p. 159) In light of the above reasons, it seems that in these 3 lessons teachers should give more freedom to students to manage and develop topic and in turn it will create more interactional space for students to personalize meaning and contribute more information concerning themselves and thus make interaction more meaningful.

4.5 Communicativeness of classroom teacher-student interaction in these 3 lessons relating to the theory of CLT

According to Seedhouse (1992), attempting to define what is or is not communicative in relation to classroom activities is problematic and it is possible that the communicative 'essence' does not reside in the activity itself, but rather by the interaction produced by it.

Therefore, it is necessary and meaningful to relate classroom reality which emerged from talk-in-interaction in class to the theory of CLT and get some insights from that. Now let's turn to 3 typical characteristics of CLT and relate classroom reality to these characteristics.

Firstly, the most obvious characteristic of CLT, according to Larsen-Freenman (2000, p. 129) is that 'almost everything that is done is done with a communicative intent.' And the most important feature which can reveal this is purposeful communication in class and this requires teachers to set up "appropriate patterns of interaction which ensure that the learners...talk to some purpose rather than echo words" (Bryne, 1978, as cited in Williams 1983, p.173). The information gap between two persons obviously can make the real and purposeful communicative exchange come into being when one person in an exchange knows something the other person does not (Larsen-Freenman, 2000, p. 129).

In Lesson 1 in text-based context, teacher's pedagogical purpose is to familiarize students with the text. In teacher-student interaction in this lesson, students are in an unequal power relationship with their teacher. Completely real and two-way exchange of information seldom exists here as all information is within teacher's hand and more exactly speaking, the teacher is in control of all answers to the questions. As is pointed above, teacher-student interaction in this lesson is mainly in a question-answer adjacency pair, that means the teacher's tasks are to ask questions, select students to answer, while in the meantime, the students' task is no more than to answer the questions asked. In Lesson 2 in meaning-and-fluency context, the pedagogical focus is on maximizing the opportunities for interaction (Seedhouse, 2004). In this lesson, students' have a certain degree of initiating sub-topics at which point it shows students have some information that come from their own personal experience (see Extract 13). In this case, interaction between the student and teacher is meaningful and purposeful.

Extract 13

1 L6: mm:: I(.) think it's a(1.0) service, after you sell the products they permits to 2 be any time, any how, you called at if you have any problem, they'll be down at very soon=
3T: =Mm?=
4 L6: they'll be—
5 T: how do you know that?
6 L6: because I buy a Hiar (.)washing machine when I was in when I was at home.
7 T: hmm?
8 L6: sometimes it, it I went into some troubles,=
9 T:=yah?=
10 L6:=then I called it I called them and they send some some one to my home in 5 minutes very quickly I think and their service is actually is very friend.
11 T: =that's why you know Hiar so much alright?=
12 L6: yah

In previous interaction, the teacher asks students to talk about popular products in China. So the carrier topic here is what product is popular. In Line 1, L6 develops a sub-topic, that is the service of the product and she takes her personal experience as an example in Lines 6, 8, 10 to prove the service of the product is very good. The focus here is completely on personal meaning and L6 succeeds in passing the information to others present in the classroom due to the enough interaction space here.

In Lesson 3 in a synthesized context, we can find in several places teacher's excessive long turns in teacher-student interaction and students' interaction here is mainly in the form of echoing teacher's words (see Extract 4 & 6). Meaning exchange here is absent and in such a case, we can say it is not communicative at all and it is not beneficial to foster students' communicative competence with too much this kind of teacher-student interaction pattern present in the lesson.

Secondly, practitioners of CLT view materials as a way of influencing the quality of classroom interaction and language use. Materials thus have the primary role of promoting communicative language use (Richards & Rodgers, 1986, p. 79). Accordingly, the use of authentic materials or pseudo-authentic materials is considered to be a salient characteristic of CLT (Brumfit 1987; Larsen-Freeman 1986, 2000). The rationale here is, "it is considered desirable to give students an opportunity to develop strategies for understanding language as it is actually used" (Larsen-Freeman 1986, 2000). These materials include language-based realia, such as signs, magazines, advertisements, and newspapers or graphic and visual sources around which communicative activities can be built (Richards & Rodgers 1986, p. 80) In Lesson 1 which is in a entirely text-based context, the text is used as the only material of this lesson and all the topic and sub-topics is closely around it. No authentic material is used and teacher-student interaction is a typical communication in classroom context - anything said here by students is subjected to teacher's evaluation. Teacher's questions in this lesson are all display questions with all answers known to the teacher. Obviously the aim of this kind of teacher-student interaction is not for students to practice language as it is used in real communication in outside world but with the aim of teacher's evaluating and checking students' familiarity of lesson. That is to say, pedagogical focus limits the organization of teacher-student interaction to a rigid IRF/IRE speech exchange system. In Lesson 2, the topic is talking about famous brand names. The teacher does use authentic materials. One is logos of these famous brands and the other is a video recording of a real TV advertisement about a famous beer. Let's take the teacher-interaction based on this video-recording of TV advertisement for example. The sequence organization here is question-and-answer adjacency pair. That means the teacher-student interaction here is still a typical pedagogical form of interaction: the teacher always initiates, the learner only responds (Littlewood, 1981, p. 47). What I want to argue here is that from talk-in-interaction in class, we can see using authentic material doesn't mean the interaction based on it is surely communicative and evidently from the extract , teacher's questions confine the content of students' response leading to just one or two-word production of language.

Extract 14

T: so what kind of product it's trying to promote?

LL: beer=

T: =beer

T: do you know that beer?

LL: yes=

T: =vicer why do you think that(.) the ads use the dog(.) in this film in this video in this ad

L6: ((unintelligible))

T: what?

L6: ((unintelligible))

T: bud? with something to a::related to the dog? That's real. Bud here means what bud, [bud

vicer] alrigh?t

L:

[bud vicer]

T: yah, so(.) what kind of feature other features you may find in this ads, besides it's funny being funny and it's impressive you mentioned it. all right? what else,

L11: and it's very simple everyone can understand it.

In lesson 3, the teacher also uses an authentic material – a video clip in her lesson and the interaction generated from talking about the content of the video seems more communicative than the one in Lesson 2.

Extract 15

T: alright guys, this is the end of video clip, now think about it and try to share with us what could you find about this video clip(.) is anybody want to? all right, the girl please?

L11: em, in our classroom a teacher asks her students to draw(.) a boy paints the whole paper black and then the teacher feels puzzled at him(.)

T: see=

L11 = after he returns home, he continues to draw without saying a word with his parents

T: right=

L11: =em: and then his parents say something to the hospital, because maybe because they think there is something wrong with his brain.

T: em=

L11: =em: when he is in the hospital(.) he continues to draw without saying a word and the doctors also feels puzzled at him(.) and the result (with) that e:m what he draw is a whale and the boy is normal(.) and the reading is that the adults can't understand the boy, em: maybe em: the understanding is the reason that the most important reason of generation gap.

In this extract, question-and-adjacency pair is absent and extended student turns dominate the sequence while teacher's turn is very short. L11 pauses frequently but the teacher doesn't 'fill in the gap' or 'smoothing over' the discourse (Walsh, 2002) to help the student finish her turn showing teacher's tolerance of silence and giving enough interaction space to L11. In this case, meaning has been personalized as L11 has a choice of what she will say and how she will say it. It provides opportunity for L11 to use target language to interpret real-life message. So, it's communicative and meaningful.

Thirdly, a very important characteristics of CLT considers the roles assumed by students and teachers in classroom learning and teaching environment. According to Li (1984) "a communicative approach presupposes that students take the centre role in learning and it demands a high degree of initiative from learners"

In Lesson 1, interaction between teacher and students is mainly initiated by teacher's asking questions and the responsibility for managing the turn-taking to the largest extent lies with the teacher. Direct nomination from the teacher is very common in this lesson. Question-and-answer adjacency pair is the main characteristic of sequence organization and topic management and development is tightly controlled by the teacher. In light of this description, it can be concluded that teacher-student interaction in this lesson is being tightly controlled and teacher-directed and thus, the teacher is still the central figure of the classroom.

Meanwhile, large amount of question-and-answer adjacency pair can be treated as an early form of CLT as Lee and Vanpatten put it, 'in early form of CLT, many instructors equated communication with conversation - but conversation of a particular type: the authority figure asked the questions, the students answer them.

In Lesson 2, Turn-taking is rapid, roles are symmetrical and participants have considerable freedom as to when they speak and when they remain silent. Large amount of overlap utterance and latched sentence produced by students show the competition of floor and speakership and in turn show students' high initiative in joining in the interaction. But students have a less role to play in initiation of turn-taking and topic management. Therefore, it can be concluded that in this lesson students play a more active role than those students do in Lesson 1 in classroom teacher-student interaction.

In Lesson 3, when we can see student have very high initiative to express personal opinions by volunteering turns in some episode of teacher-student interaction, unfortunately, we still find the dynamics of "Atlas Complex" either in meaning-and-fluency context or in text-based context in this lesson. All action and interaction as well as all explanations, are dictated by the instructor whose role is of authority or expert transmitter of knowledge and the students' role is to be taught, to receive knowledge (Lee & Vanpatten 2003, p. 8). Under such circumstances, communicativeness is lost in teacher-student interaction as students' utterance is limited to only echoing what the teacher says.

To summarize, when we relate classroom reality to the theory of CLT, it can be found in Lesson 1 in text-based context, the interaction between students and teacher is more like the early form of CLT when most part of it is in the form of question-answer "conversation". The text is the only material used in this lesson and all the topic and sub-topics are closely related to the text. Teacher's role in this lesson is that of "controller" of the interaction and the central authority of the classroom as she judges and evaluates students' response while the fundamental task for all students is to respond to the teacher. In Lesson 2 in meaning-and fluency context, the turn taking organization is looser and students enjoy more freedom in developing sub-topics at which point information is exchanged, personal meaning is expressed and communication is more purposeful. Authentic materials are made use of in this lesson, however, teacher-student interaction generated from talking about one of authentic material – video recording of a TV advertisement is disappointing with the evidence that student's short turns and less language production caused by the inappropriate sequence organization the teacher creates – question and answer adjacency pair. In general, as a result of looser turn-taking organization and students' competing for speakership, students play a more active role in this lesson and for most part of the lesson the teacher's role is more like a guide rather than a strict director and thus it can be concluded that the teacher is trying to develop a communicative classroom environment in this lesson and we can find communicative teaching is at work in Lesson 2. In Lesson 3 which is run in a synthesized context combining both text-based context and meaning-and-fluency context, we can see students' have initiative to expressing personal meaning by raising hands to get speakership and teacher-student interaction based on talking about an authentic material is successful with the evidence of student's extended turns and teacher's short turns. As can be seen in extract 14, meaning has been personalized and as a result of teacher's tolerance of student's short silence in language production, the aim of developing student's language fluency seems to be achieved here. However, unfortunately, in lesson 3, the classroom dynamic known as "Atlas Complex" is found in several parts of the lesson in which teacher assumes all responsibility

and acts as a role of transmitter and verifier of information while learners assume the role of knowledge recipient (Lee & Vanpatten, 2003). According to Deckert (2004) “the most frequent obstacle to CLT is excessive talk on the part of the teacher and the result of ‘excessive teacher-talk in language classroom is that students end upon doing less talking.” In view of this, teacher-student interaction under dynamics of Atlas complex is not communicative at all.

5 Discussion of research results and implications

5.1 Discussion of research results

According to Gil (2002), there have been many studies aimed at describing the nature and structure of foreign language classroom interaction and many of them compare the classroom to natural conversation and assess the degree of ‘communicativeness’ with criteria taken from what is perceived to be communicative behaviour in the world outside the classroom (Cullen, 1998, as cited in Gil, 2002). Gil (2002) argues that “by comparing the classroom to natural conversation only, this approach fails to take account of the complexity of foreign language classroom discourse, because the pedagogical aspect of the classroom interaction is automatically ruled out as inadequate.” He further suggests that in order to assess the degree of communicativeness of the FL classroom, then, it is fundamental to understand what is or is not communicative in the context of the classroom itself. Tsui (2001) also claims that investigations of specific aspects of classroom interaction often failed to take into consideration the entire context of the situation in which the interaction occurred. Again, Walsh (2006, p. 55) states that “Blanket interpretations of L2 classroom discourse as either ‘communicative’ or ‘uncommunicative’, adopting an invariant view of context, have failed to take account of the relationship between language use and pedagogical purpose. When language use and pedagogical purpose are considered together, different contexts emerge, making it possible to analyse the ensuing discourse more fairly and more objectively. Under this variable view of contexts, learner and teacher patterns of verbal behaviour can be seen as more or less appropriate, depending on a particular pedagogic aim. After a detailed descriptive analysis of two excerpts of classroom teacher-student interaction from EFL and ESL classroom, Johnson (1995) concludes that the appropriateness of tightly controlled patterns of communication and greater variability in the patterns of communication depends on the pedagogical purpose of the lesson.

Based on the above arguments, the first point I want to make is we can’t compare the degree of communicativeness of lessons in different contexts with different pedagogical focus. That is to say, we can’t say Lesson 2 is more communicative than Lesson 1 just because turn-taking organization in Lesson 2 is less rigid, less allocated and less controlled by the teacher. For example, when the sub-pedagogical focus of the first episode of Lesson 1 is on the propositional content of the students’ answers and how well they relate propositionally to the listening comprehension questions, the question-and-answer adjacency pair and IRE/F cycle of speech system is more or less appropriate to this focus and seems a most economical way of doing so (Seedhouse, 1996).

The second point is that L2 classroom is a dynamic, complex, fluid and variable interactional environment, context can shift with great rapidity and fluidity during an L2 lesson (Seedhouse, 2004). For example, in the second episode of Lesson 1 (see Extract 1), teacher’s

sub-pedagogical focus in task-as-workplan is to let students do oral practice by doing a presentation. Obviously, according to teacher's task-as-work plan, context here will be changed into meaning-and-fluency context and with sub-pedagogical focus shifting into a new one, turn-taking and sequence organization is supposed to be changed accordingly in order to be compatible with the new sub-pedagogical focus. However, unchanged turn-taking organization and sequence organization in the form of the question-and-adjacency pair impede the opportunity for students to develop language fluency and make teacher's intended pedagogical focus unachievable in task-in-process (what actually happens in the classroom). In this sense, the degree of communicativeness of teacher-student interaction is diminished due to teacher's inappropriate in situ turn-taking strategy.

The third point is that just as Seedhouse (1996) point out, homogeneity and heterogeneity can both be displayed in instances of classroom interaction. While it is clear that there exist varieties of L2 classroom interaction which are different in terms of pedagogical focus and different interactional organization, all instances are similar in that they are recognizable as L2 classroom institutional interaction. As far as my data concerned, the heterogeneity here refers to the fact that the 3 lessons are taught by 3 different teachers and they are of different pedagogical focus and thus, in different contexts and accordingly of different interactional organization. The homogeneity is certainly in the fact that the 3 classes are all in Chinese EFL context and more specifically, they are in EFL context of a certain University in Southwest China and among them, Lesson 1 and lesson 3 are in the same context of teaching English to English majors. This means, although it's unreasonable and impractical to compare their communicativeness with one another and draw a conclusion to demonstrate which one is most communicative and which one is least communicative, we still can find similar characteristics in organization of teacher-student interaction as a whole and some practical implications for English teachers' talk-in-interaction practice can also be made based on these common features. These common features are as follows:

1. Turn is less initiated by students and more initiated by teachers. The responsibility for managing turn-taking usually lies with the teacher.
2. Question-and-answer adjacency pair sequence organization prevails the 3 lessons. The IRE/F sequence frequently occurs.
3. Topic management and development is mainly within teacher's domain.
4. Grammatical mistakes are always noticeable and repairable.
5. No cases of negotiation of meaning between students in all 3 lessons are found during teacher-student classroom interaction. That is to say, Students' utterances in teacher-student interaction still address only the teacher rather than their classmates. The teacher is still a central figure who is controlling the interaction and keeps the interaction going.

To sum up, what is clear from the analysis of transcription of 3 lessons is that students do quite a bit of speaking in all 3 lessons mainly in the form of a response to cues provided by teacher; no interaction occurring between students presumably shows that at least in students' view, the teacher is still accepted to be the central figure in the language classroom who they should address and who should respond to them and is responsible to direct the interaction. The argument emerging from this analysis is that in the evolution of language teaching, we find that practice doesn't always keep up theory: instructors might have wanted to take on new roles, but the reality of classroom shows that teachers still assume too much

responsibility in language classroom and students often assume too little. In a word, if CLT is to work, the pattern of interaction needs to be changed (Lee & Vanpatten, 2003). However, what should be born in mind is that the ways in which teachers organize the classroom interaction often depend on the pedagogical purpose of that lesson. And the organization of classroom interaction often has a reflexive relationship with pedagogical goals of that lesson (Seedhouse, 2004). Consequently, how communicative a lesson can be is still closely related to pedagogical goals and considering what to and how to improve teacher's practice in organizing classroom interaction and make class become more communicative should be within this frame.

5.2 Practical implications for teaching

5.2.1 Providing opportunities for students to initiate and take control of turn-taking

Student-centeredness is a key feature of CLT. Providing opportunities and encouraging students to initiate and take control of turn-taking is important to create student-oriented rather than teacher-oriented or directed classroom interaction. In a traditional classroom, teacher always initiates and students always respond, and then teacher automatically selects herself or himself to be the next speaker. In order to avoid this pattern, Kramsch's (1987) suggestions are very useful to help teachers have less control of turn-taking organization:

- Tolerate silence; refrain from filling the gaps between turns. This will put pressure on students to initiate turns.
- Direct your gaze to any potential addressees of a student's utterance; do not assume that you are the next speaker and the student's exclusive addressee.
- Teach the students floor-taking gambits; do not grant the floor.
- Encourage students to sustain their speech beyond one or two sentences and to take longer turns; do not use a student's short utterance as a springboard for your own lengthy turn.
- Extend your exchange with individual students to include clarification of the speaker's intention and your understanding of them; do not cut off an exchange too soon to pass to another student.

5.2.2 Allowing variability in the sequence organization in teacher-student classroom interaction

According to Swain (1985), adjacency pairs used for checking, repetition and clarification, etc. provide learners with negative evidence about their own output, and push them to modify it to make it more comprehensible and more target-like. So, teacher's seeking clarification, requesting confirmation, and getting students to reiterate their contributions can help students to express themselves more fully and more clearly (Walsh, 2006). Therefore, in teacher-student classroom interaction, question-and-answer adjacency pair shouldn't be the only form of sequence organization. Variable sequence organization should be created and co-existed with question-and-answer adjacency pairs, such as request-granting/refusal adjacency pairs, offer-acceptance/refusal adjacency pairs, etc.

5.2.3 Letting the interaction develop within the topic frames selected by students

When teacher is in control of the turn-taking organization of interaction, consequently the control of topic is within teacher's domain. If students are to take an active role in interaction, they should be given more right to develop topic. In the meantime, they must be shown how

to control the way topics are established, built and sustained. Also, Teachers shouldn't arbitrarily cut off a student's utterance as students may perceive their contribution very much relevant to the topic although it might be not in teacher's eyes. Just as Ellis argues "whatever is topicalised by the learners rather than the teacher has a better chance of being claimed to have been learnt (1998, p. 159). So, when we need students to be more proactive and less reactive (Van Lier, 1988, p. 279), we should let more interaction develop within the topic frames selected by themselves (Walsh, 2006).

5.2.4 Performing as 'co-communicator' rather than 'director'

With the advent of CLT, the teacher's role should change (Lee & Vanpatten, 2003). However, when teacher may have wanted to take on new roles, what we find in talk-in-interaction in those 3 lessons is that it is still mainly teachers who always direct the interaction and take responsibility of leading the interaction. Besides, the analyses of extracts display that teachers are always regarded as students' should-be addressee. When discussion is at work, the pattern is always in the form of one student talking to the teacher, or several students speaking at the same time to the teacher. The argument here is teachers should resist the constant temptation to display their knowledge of the language they teach, instead, they need to maximize learner's contributions and allow more students to state opinions and let them not just have opinions stated to merely teachers but to the whole of class (Lee & Vanpatten, 2003). Besides, students must be given opportunities to construct interactions as they would outside the classroom – to interpret, express and negotiate meaning (ibid). In general, during the teacher-student interaction, the roles teachers should assume are more those of resource person, architect (ibid) and co-communicator (Littlewood, 1981) rather than language authority, director and students' should-be addressee. Only when teachers have a clear understanding about their new roles in CLT, can they really consciously move away from teacher-fronted interaction to teacher-assisted interaction (Lee & Vanpatten, 2003) and accordingly offer more chances to students and create a better environment to foster students' communicative competence. In a word, when teacher really shift their roles, so will their students.

In summary, what actually happens in classroom interaction will ultimately determine how communicative the lesson is. EFL teachers obviously have great influence upon "communicativeness" due to their special status in the classroom. Thus, bearing in mind the fact that organization of interaction have a reflexive relationship with teaching pedagogical purpose, teachers should try to work out the suitable organization of interaction which is compatible with the pedagogical focus. At the same time, we know classroom context is never a static entity but changeable with teacher's sub-pedagogical goals. That is to say, organization of classroom interaction is also a very dynamical one and should be adjusted to sub-pedagogical goals. In order to create a more communicative teaching and learning environment to foster students' communicative focus, during the classroom interaction, teachers should resist roles of being a central figure of the classroom and try to be co-communicator with students. Providing opportunities for students to initiate and take control of turn-taking, allowing variability in the sequence organization in teacher-student classroom interaction, and letting the interaction develop within the topic frames selected by students are my suggestions for teaching practice as a result of careful analyses of my data – 3 English lessons in a EFL context of a university in China.

5.3 Theoretical implications for further research

Through this study, 2 implications concerning theoretical perspective are presented in the following space aiming at raising awareness of researchers when they intend to study communicativeness of EFL language classrooms.

5.3.1 Considering context issue when probing into communicativeness of EFL Classroom

Based on the analyses of teacher-student interaction of these 3 lessons, it can be argued that “in order to assess the degree of communicativeness of the FL classroom, then, it is fundamental to understand what is or is not communicative in the context of the classroom itself” (Gil, 2002, p. 275), “as the main objective of classroom discourse is to teach/learn, thus, it is essentially a teaching/learning discourse, which allows the mingling of pedagogic and natural modes of discourse” (Stern, 1983; Kramash, 1985; Gil, 1999, as cited in Gil, 2002, p. 275). This is evidenced in my data and it is shown that it is completely unreasonable to compare communicativeness of 2 lessons in different classroom contexts with different pedagogical focus.

5.3.2 Communicative ‘essence’ reside in ‘talk-in-interaction’ rather than ‘task-as-work plan’ activity

From this study, it’s proved that communicativeness of a lesson can’t be decided by just how much talking students do and whether the teacher uses authentic materials or not etc. Communicative ‘essence’ resides in talk-in-interaction from which we can find out the quality of interaction. Put it differently, we can find if it is students who initiate turns, develop topics and whether they express and personalize meaning, negotiate meaning. In a word, it’s not enough to just relate classroom activity to CLT theory to decide whether it is communicative or not. It’s essential to analyze interaction produced by the activity (Seedhouse, 1992) from an emic-perspective (from a participant perspective).

6 Conclusion

As Savignon (2007) writes, “The essence of CLT is the engagement of learners in communication in order to allow them to develop their communicative competence”. When students in China remain deficient in their ability to actually use the language after several years of formal English learning, CLT gains more and more importance in the Chinese EFL context and many English teachers are trying to catch up with the trend and commit themselves to developing students’ communicative competence through classroom communication.

However, it is “how” that often escapes teachers. As argued by Rivers (1968) “what actually happens in lessons ultimately determines how communicative and how successful the teaching is”. Therefore an understanding of the dynamic of classroom discourse is essential for teachers to establish and maintain good communicative practice (Johnson, 1995). Gaining an understanding comes after careful analysis of classroom talk-in-interaction. This has prompted my research to find out about communicativeness of classroom teacher-student interactions after CLT has been widely promoted and adopted in China for more than 30 years. The main aim of the study was to, by means of a conversation analysis methodology, describe

the organization of classroom teacher-student interactions in terms of turn-taking, sequence, repair and topic management, and then to relate classroom reality to CLT theory for the purpose of discussing the communicativeness of these lessons.

The research aims have been fully fulfilled through a process of careful analysis of transcription from video –recordings of 3 lessons. The findings with regards to the research questions are: 1) In general, there is a reflexive relationship between organization of interaction and pedagogical focus, and this can explain why, in the meaning-and-fluency-based lesson, organization of interaction seems less rigid and more interactional space is provided for students than in the text-based lesson. 2) Although differences exist in the organization of interaction in 3 lessons, it has been found that, in all 3 lessons, turns are mainly initiated by teachers, IRE/F sequence organization is still the most prominent speech exchange system and teachers are mainly in control of the topic management and development. Negotiation of meaning has not been found between students and teachers seem to be the students' only addressee most of the time in classroom interactions. When relating classroom reality to CLT theory, it has been demonstrated that 1) the interactions between students and teacher are more likely the early form of CLT when most part of these interactions are in the form of question-and-answer “conversation”; 2) using authentic material in class doesn't necessarily guarantee the high degree of communicativeness of interaction; 3) although teachers might have wanted to take on new roles in classroom interaction, what is reflected from talk-in-interaction is that teachers are still the central figures who initiate, respond and direct the interaction.

Based on findings of the study, we suggest that in order to establish a better environment for students to develop their communicative competence, the distance between teachers and students should be reduced. Secondly, it's better for teachers to perform as “co-communicator” rather than “director” in classroom interaction by not only providing opportunities for students but engaging more students to be in more control of turn-taking, sequence organization and topic development. In the meantime, negotiation of meaning between students needs to be encouraged. Finally, we argue that considering the examination of communicativeness of classroom interaction should take classroom context issue into account and communicativeness of a lesson resides in talk-in-interaction rather than the activity that produces it.

Acknowledgment

This research (Project No. CQDXWL-2013-054) was supported by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities at Chongqing University.

References

- Adamson, B., & Xia, B. (2011). A case study of the College English Test and ethnic minority university students in China: negotiating the final hurdle. *Multilingual Education*. Retrieved from: <http://www.multilingual-education.com/content/pdf/2191-5059-1-1.pdf>

- Allright, R. (1979). Language learning through communication practice. In C.J. Brumfit & K. Johnson (Eds.), *The communicative approach to language teaching* (pp. 167-182). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Allright, R. (1984). The importance of interaction in classroom Language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 5(2), 156-71
- Andrews, S. (1983). Communicative language teaching - some implications for teacher education. In K. Johnson & D. Porter (Eds.), *Perspectives in communication language teaching* (pp. 128-138). London: Academic Press.
- Ansarey, D. (2012). *Communicative language teaching in EFL Contexts: Teachers attitude and perception in Bangladesh*. Retrieved from: <http://www.asaub.edu.bd/data/asaubreview/v6n1sl6.pdf>
- Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy*. White Plains: Longman.
- Cullen, R. (1998). Teacher talk and the classroom context. *ELT Journal* 52(3), 179-87.
- Ellis, R. (2000). Task-based research and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*, 49, 193-220.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brumfit, C. (1979). 'Communicative' language teaching: An educational perspective. In C.J. Brumfit & K. Johnson (Eds.), *The communicative approach to language teaching* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fang, F. (2010). A discussion on developing students' communicative competence in college English teaching in China. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1, 111-116.
- Gil, G. (2002). Two complementary modes of foreign language classroom interaction. *ELT Journal*, 56(3), 273-279.
- Hu, G.W. (2002). Potential cultural resistance to pedagogical imports: The case of CLT in China. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 15(2), 93-105.
- Hu, G.W. (2005). 'CLT is best for China – an untenable absolutist claim. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 65-68.
- Johnson, K. (1979). Communicative approaches and communicative processes. In C.J. Brumfit & K. Johnson (Eds.), *The communicative approach to language teaching* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Johnson, K.E. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Kramersch, C. (1987). Classroom interaction and discourse options. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7, 169-83.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, J.F., & Vanpatten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen* (2nd ed.). New York: William R. Glass.
- Lee, Y. (2006). Towards respecification of communicative competence: Condition of L2 instruction or its objective? *Applied Linguistics*, 27, 349-376.
- Li, X.J. (1984). In defense of the communicative approach. *ELT Journal*, 38, 2-13.
- Liao, X.Q. (2000). *Communicative language teaching innovation in China: Difficulties and solutions*. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED443294.pdf>
- Liao, X.Q. (2004). The need for communicative language teaching in China. *ELT Journal*, 58, 270-273.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Markee, N. (1997). *Managing curricular innovation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McGroarty, M. (1984). Some meanings of communicative competence for second language students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18, 257-272.
- Memari, M. (2013). *How appropriate is communicative language teaching (CLT) in EFL Context (an Iranian Case Study)* Retrieved from [http://jlsb.science-line.com/attachments/article/26/J.%20Life%20Sci.%20Biomed.%2003\(6\)%20432-438,%202013.pdf](http://jlsb.science-line.com/attachments/article/26/J.%20Life%20Sci.%20Biomed.%2003(6)%20432-438,%202013.pdf)
- Morrow, K. (1979). Communicative language testing: revolution or evolution? In C.J. Brumfit & K. Johnson (Eds.), *The communicative approach to language teaching* (pp. 143-159). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rao, Z.H. (2000). Chinese students' perception of communicative or non-communicative activities in EFL Classroom. *System*, 30, 85-105.
- Richards, J.C., & Rodgers, T.S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C., & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Savignon, S.J. (2007). Beyond communicative language teaching: What's ahead? *Journal of Pragmatics* 39, 207–220.
- Seedhouse, P. (1992). Communicative call: A contradiction terms. *Journal of the CTI Centre for Modern Languages University of Hull* 7, 9-13.
- Seedhouse, P. (1996). *Learning talk: A study of the interactional organization of the L2 classroom from a CA institutional discourse perspective*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of York, York, England.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal* 59(4), 339-41.
- Slimani, A. (1989). The role of topicalization in classroom language learning. *System*, 17, 223-234.
- Slimani, A. (1992). Evaluation of classroom interaction. In J.C. Alderson & A. Beretta (Eds.), *Evaluating second language education* (pp. 179-221). Cambridge: CUP.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-252). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- TESOL White Paper (2012). *A principle-based approach for English language teaching: Policies and practices*. Retrieved from <http://www.tesol.org/docs/pdf/a-principles-based-approach-for-english-language-teaching-policies-and-practices-.pdf?sfvrsn=0>
- Tsui, A.B.M. (2001). *Classroom interaction*. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. London: Longman.
- Van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. New York: Longman.
- Van Lier, L. (2000). From input to affordance: Social-interactive learning from an ecological perspective. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning: Recent advances* (pp. 245-259). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 6, 3-23.
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. London: Routledge.

- Walsh, S. & Li, L. (2013). Conversations as space for learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 23(2), 247-266.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1979). The teaching of English as communication. In C.J. Brumfit & K. Johnson (Eds.), *The communicative approach to language teaching* (pp. 117-121). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Xiao, L.X. (2011). Communicative language teaching in Chinese university context: Beliefs and practice. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 34(2), 44-61.
- Xu, F., & Warschauer, M. (2004). Technology and curriculum reform in China: A case study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(2), 301-323.
- Yu, L.M. (2001). Communicative language teaching in China: Progress and resistance. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 194-8.

APPENDIX: Transcription Conventions

[Point of overlap onset
]	Point of overlap termination
=	a) Turn continues below, at the next identical symbol b) If inserted at the end of one speaker's turn and at the beginning of the next speaker's adjacent turn, indicates that there is no gap at all between the two turns c) Indicates that there is no interval between adjacent utterances
(3.2)	Interval between utterances (in seconds)
(.)	Very short untimed pause
<u>Word</u>	Speaker emphasis
e:r the:::	Lengthening of the preceding sound
—	Abrupt cutoff
?	Rising intonation, not necessarily a question
!	Animated or emphatic one
,	Low-rising intonation, suggesting continuation
.	Falling (final) intonation
CAPITALS	Especially loud sounds relative to surrounding talk
↑↓	Marked shifts into higher or lower pitch in the utterance following the arrow
< >	Talk surrounded by angle brackets is produced slowly and deliberately (typical of teachers modeling forms)
> <	Talk surrounded by reversed angle brackets is produced more quickly than neighbouring talk
()	A stretch of unclear or unintelligible speech
(guess)	Indicates the transcriber's doubt about a word
.hh	Speaker in breath
hh	Speaker out-breath
((T shows picture))	Nonverbal actions or editor's comments
ja ((tr.: yes))	Non-English words are italicized and are followed by an English translation in double parentheses
[gibee]	in the case of inaccurate pronunciation of an English word, an approximation of the sound is given in square brackets
T:	Teacher
L:	Unidentified learner
L1	Identified learner
LL:	Several or all learners simultaneously

(Seedhouse, 2004, p. 267)