ESCOLA DE HUMANIDADES
PROGRAMA DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM LETRAS
MESTRADO EM LETRAS

RAFAEL PADILHA FERREIRA

CLASSROOM DISCOURSE AND INTERACTION IN PORTUGUESE AS ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE: SEEKING CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE REFLECTIVE PRACTICE

Porto Alegre

2019

PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO - *STRICTO SENSU*

Pontifícia Universidade Católica
do Rio Grande do Sul

PONTIFICAL CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF RIO GRANDE DO SUL
SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES
GRADUATE PROGRAM IN LETTERS
MASTER'S DEGREE IN LINGUISTICS

RAFAEL PADILHA FERREIRA

**CLASSROOM DISCOURSE AND INTERACTION IN
PORTUGUESE AS ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE:**
SEEKING CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE REFLECTIVE PRACTICE

Porto Alegre
2019

RAFAEL PADILHA FERREIRA

**CLASSROOM DISCOURSE AND INTERACTION IN
PORTUGUESE AS ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE:**
SEEKING CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE REFLECTIVE PRACTICE

Master's Thesis presented as a partial requirement for obtaining a master's degree from the Graduate Program in Letters at the School of Humanities of the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul.

Adviser: Prof. Dr. Cristina Becker Lopes Perna

Porto Alegre
2019

Ficha Catalográfica

RAFAEL PADILHA FERREIRA

CLASSROOM DISCOURSE AND INTERACTION IN

PORTUGUESE AS ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE:

SEEKING CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE REFLECTIVE PRACTICE

> Master's Thesis presented as a partial requirement for obtaining a master's degree from the Graduate Program in Letters at the School of Humanities of the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul.

Approved in: _____.

BOARD OF EXAMINERS:

_____

Prof. Dra. Cristina Becker Lopes Perna – Adviser – PUCRS

_____

Prof. Dra. Gabriela da Silva Bulla – UFRGS

_____

Prof. Dr. Alexandre Anselmo Guilherme – PUCRS

Porto Alegre

2019

To all those who still believe in the power of education.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Não é no silêncio que os homens se fazem, mas na palavra, no trabalho, na ação-reflexão. (FREIRE, 2013)

ABSTRACT

The teaching of Portuguese as Additional Language (PAL) has been occupying more and more significant spaces within the studies of Applied Linguistics. In this context, this research looks for ways of investigating the characteristics of Classroom Discourse and Interaction (CDI) in a PLA class for graduate students of the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS). In order to increase the awareness of the professor about how the use of language interferes with the interactions that occur in the classroom, creating, or not, learning opportunities, one finds in the Reflective Practice (RP) framework, a Continuous Professional Development (CPD) tool for teachers, the basis for the promotion of collaborative reflection, which establishes a community of practice and promotes the use of real data from the classroom context of the professionals involved. This approach is combined with CDI studies, which commonly use Conversation Analysis concepts to collect, organize and present data. Therefore, in this research, classroom interactions were recorded, from which sections were used to illustrate discussions between the professor of the course and the researcher. These Discussion Meetings (DMs) were also recorded in audio and transcribed using the Computerized Language Analysis (CLAN) software, composing the research corpus. The analysis presented in this study seeks to show how the RP process contributes to the elucidation of issues related to CDI, thus increasing the awareness of professionals involved in the process about these concepts. The results observed from the data analysis demonstrate that RP has the potential to offer language professional the chance to observe phenomena occurring in their classroom from different perspectives, learning new concepts or reformulating their understandings about concepts already widely discussed in teacher education programs. It is believed that these results prove that the combination of RP with the theoretical contributions from the CDI studies, strongly based on the methodology offered by the Conversation Analysis applied to studies on Second Language Acquisition (CA-for-SLA), offers, at least in the context of this research, a solid opportunity for an ongoing, contextualized teacher education that promotes collaborative reflection among professionals with different experiences.

Key-words: languages teaching; Portuguese as additional language; reflective practice; classroom discourse and interaction.

RESUMO

O ensino de Português como Língua Adicional (PLA) vem ocupando espaços cada vez mais significativos dentro dos estudos de Linguística Aplicada. Nesse contexto, esta pesquisa busca formas de investigar as características do discurso e das interações em sala de aula em uma turma de PLA para alunos de cursos de pós-graduação da Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS). A fim de promover uma maior consciência do professor acerca de como o uso da língua interfere nas interações que ocorrem em sala de aula, criando ou não oportunidades de aprendizagem, encontra-se, na Prática Reflexiva (PR), uma ferramenta de formação continuada para professores, a base para a promoção de uma reflexão colaborativa, em que se estabelece uma comunidade de prática e se promove a utilização de dados reais do contexto de sala de aula dos profissionais envolvidos. Combinam-se a essa abordagem os estudos sobre discurso e interação em sala de aula, os quais se valem, comumente, de conceitos da Análise da Conversa para a coleta, a organização e a apresentação dos dados. Para tanto, nesta pesquisa, foram gravadas interações em sala de aula, das quais trechos foram usados para ilustrar discussões ocorridas entre a professora da disciplina e o pesquisador. Tais encontros de discussão foram também gravados em áudio e transcritos por meio do *software Computerized Language Analysis* (CLAN), compondo o corpus da pesquisa. A análise apresentada neste estudo busca evidenciar como o processo de PR contribui para a elucidação de questões referentes ao discurso e às interações em sala de aula, aumentando, assim, a consciência dos profissionais envolvidos no processo acerca desses conceitos. Os resultados observados a partir da análise dos dados demonstram que a PR tem o potencial de oferecer ao profissional de línguas a chance de observar fenômenos ocorridos em sua sala de aula a partir de diferentes perspectivas, aprendendo novos conceitos ou reformulando seus entendimentos acerca de conceitos já amplamente discutidos em programas de formação de professores. Crê-se que esses resultados comprovam que a combinação da PR com o aporte teórico dos estudos sobre discurso e interação em sala de aula, fortemente embasados na metodologia da Análise da Conversa aplicada aos estudos sobre Aquisição de Segunda Língua,

oferece, ao menos no contexto desta pesquisa, uma sólida oportunidade de formação docente continuada, contextualizada, que promove a reflexão colaborativa entre profissionais com diferentes experiências.

Palavras-chave: ensino de línguas; português como língua adicional; prática reflexiva; discurso e interação em sala de aula.

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CA – Conversation Analysis;

CA-for-SLA – Conversation Analysis for Second Language Acquisition;

CDI – Classroom Discourse and Interaction;

CLAN – Computerized Language Analysis;

CPD – Continuous Professional Development;

EFL – English as a Foreign Language;

ESL – English as a Second Language;

ESP – English for Specific Purposes;

LBT – Learning Behavior Tracking;

LOT – Learning Object Tracking;

LPT – Learning Process Tracking;

LSP – Language for Specific Purposes;

PAL – Portuguese as Additional Language;

PCN – Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais;

PML – Portuguese as Mother Language;

PUCRS – Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul;

RP – Reflective Practice;

SCT – Sociocultural Theory;

TTT – Teacher Talking Time;

UPLA – Uso e Processamento de Língua Adicional;

ZPD – Zone of Proximal Development.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

This research is inspired by the current context in which the teaching and learning of Portuguese as Additional Language (PAL) finds itself. Despite the political and economic situation of the country, Brazilian universities still receive a considerable number of international students every year. Beyond that, there are immigrants from several different countries arriving on a daily basis, also in need of learning Portuguese. These two reasons alone would be enough to justify the importance of even more investment and research in PAL. However, a third aspect has also contributed to the development of this study: the lack of specific and extensive teacher education for PAL professionals who work with graduate students. Considering this bigger picture, this research intends to zoom in on a more precise context: a Brazilian professor teaching PAL to a group of foreign graduate students at the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS).

The initial idea of this research was to suggest ways of increasing the quality and effectiveness of oral production activities in a course of PAL offered to foreign graduate students at PUCRS. The goal was to observe how these activities were presented by the professor and how students would respond to them, in an attempt to identify productive teaching practices and possible problems with room for improvement. However, throughout the semester in which the PAL classes where observed, and as we got in touch with the work of other researchers, we noticed that, in order to understand how oral language teaching occurs in our context, the logical first step would be to map the general functioning of interactions that take place in a language classroom like ours.

The Reflective Practice (RP) framework, presented by Mann and Walsh (2017) was the basis from which we started our study, because it promotes a dialogic, collaborative reflection process, in which language professionals are encouraged to create a community of practice to help each other. Mann and Walsh's study was chosen because it presents a comprehensive historical background of the RP framework, featuring studies from the first half of the 20th century to the most recent studies in this area. Their new model or RP attempts to resignify the way language professional understand it - usually as a set of forms to be filled in or as a

decontextualized tool for teacher's professional assessment - turning this reflective process into a Continuous Professional Development (CPD) tool for language teachers, in which they have the chance to collect and use their own data to improve their teaching practices. In order to understand how other researchers approach RP, other studies, like Pimenta and Ghedin (2012), Alarcão (2011), and McKay (2003) are also brought to the discussion.

The RP framework is a useful tool to help teachers collaboratively reflect about their professional practices, but it does not offer a solid theoretical basis on which one can find linguistic explanations of how language is used in the classroom and how interactions take place in that context. Therefore, to understand how teachers' use of language works and how interactions are build in the classroom, studies on Classroom Discourse and Interaction (CDI) were necessary. Most of these studies use principles from Conversation Analysis (CA) to collect, transcribe, and analyse classroom data, in a subarea of CA that is known as Conversation Analysis for Second Language Acquisition (CA-for-SLA, cf. MARKEE; KASPER, 2004). Studies on CDI were the basis to discuss concepts like learning opportunities (WALSH; LI, 2013; WALSH, 2006, 2002), teacher talking time (TTT) and interactional patterns (SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010; WALSH, 2002), classroom interactional competence (CIC, cf. SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010), scaffolding (SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010), among others, presented in more detail in Chapter 2. A few studies on CA-for-SLA are also presented in that Chapter, like Wong and Waring (2010), an introductory book for teachers interested in applying CA-for-SLA principles to their classrooms; Ten Have (2007), which presents a thorough introduction to the "classic" CA studies; and Markee (2008), Kasper (2006) and Seedhouse (2005, 2004), with works that demonstrate an application of CA-for-SLA to specific classroom contexts.

Using a combination of the RP, CDI, and CA-for-SLA, the focus of this research became an attempt to identify what aspects of CDI are discussed by two language professionals, a professor and a researcher, during a PAL course for graduate students at PUCRS. It was done through the analysis of classroom observation notes combined with the transcripts of excerpts of Discussion Meetings (DMs) recorded between the two professionals previously mentioned. In those meetings, professor and researcher used classroom notes and recordings of

classroom interaction (in a process called stimulated recall[1], cf. WALSH, 2006; LYLE, 2003) to discuss aspects related to CDI, in which the theoretical background mentioned above and their teaching experiences were taken into consideration, establishing a community of practice in accordance with Mann and Walsh's (2017) RP framework. Therefore, this study can be classified as a qualitative, exploratory, and descriptive research (LARSEN-FREEMAN; LONG, 1991). Besides that, it also presents what Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) call a "participant observer", in which the researcher is also part of the community being investigated. Chapter 3 (Methodology) presentes more details about the criteria behind the choice of the course to be used in this study, as well as some information about the group of students, the nature of the DMs between the professor and the researcher, and the details on why the Computerized Language Analysis (CLAN) software was used to transcribe the interactions used in this study.

Chapter 4 presents an analysis of the interactions transcribed from the DMs. Before showing the transcripts, a contextualization of the discussions is presented (Section 4.1), based on the researcher's field notes about the two first classes and the two first DMs, which were not recorded. Some of the topics that emerged in those conversations in the DMs were: the stages of a lesson and how appropriate planning is important; feedback strategies; students' needs analysis; guiding and assessing oral and written activities; the nature of the RP process and how it was developed in this research; classroom seating arrangements and how it affects interactions in the classroom; the pedagogic purpose of each lesson and its learning objectives; CDI features and how they affect student engagement; the role of the teacher as the interactional manager; and the challenges of scaffolding. It is important to remind the reader that the topics discussed here were relevant to the language professionals involved in this research, and that other teachers/researchers would probably focus on different aspects of CDI when developing a similar study. This research, therefore, shares the steps of one way of looking at classroom interactions from the RP framework, but we do not imply that this is the only right way to do so.

---

[1] Stimulated recall is the process of using audio or video recordings of classroom interactions as input for discussion in a community of practice (WALSH, 2006; LYLE, 2003). In this research, stimulated recall was used in the DMs to elicit and exemplify aspects of CDI under scrutiny.

The discussions presented here are the result of what we believe to be an ongoing process of understanding our own teaching practices in a more comprehensive way. As defended by Mann and Walsh (2017), we also see the professional development of teachers, in every level of education, as a lifelong process. Therefore, we found in the studies of CDI and CA-for-SLA an immense field of research that offers teachers more than enough input to apply and refine their RP attempts, turning it into an increasingly complex and productive process. We hope that our experience can be understood as an example of how important it is to encourage collaborative work among language professionals, because, after all, language teaching and learning is a social process. Also, we hope that this experience shows that an RP framework is not necessarily focused on finding problems in the teaching practices of languages professional, but that it is mostly focused on offering the professionals involved a chance to raise their level of awareness of what is going on in their classrooms.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

It is not easy to spot the specific moment in the history of mankind when the wish to understand the organization of oral language emerged. Maybe one could say that this preoccupation was already there during the Ancient Greeks development of rhetorical studies - in which mastering the spoken word was a decisive factor in achieving the persuasive skills needed for performing political and social roles (GIL, 2005; AMOSSY, 2005). Throughout the development of Linguistics studies, however, some important theoretical views showed a dichotomy in the literature that favored more the internal process of language than the study of its production.

For instance, in the *Course on General Linguistics* (1916/2006), a post-mortem compilation of his lectures, Ferdinand de Saussure introduces the distinction between *langue* and *parole*. The former is the object of study for the Science of Language, while the latter, *parole*, is outside the scope of Linguistics. In the 1960s, Noam Chomsky developed the Generative Approach, which while distancing itself in several aspects from the Saussurean Structuralism, similarly suggests the distinction between competence and performance, albeit from a different epistemological perspective. Competence is related to a supposedly natural ability to produce human language, innate to individuals that do not present intellectual impairment. The second, in turn, considers the use of such abilities in the production of language. In Chomsky's point of view, the focus of Linguistics studies is on the competence for mastering language, not on the performance. Both Saussure and Chomsky, although using different terminology and different theoretical perspectives, focus on the internal, the mental process of language.

This brief and incomplete retrospective of these two seminal studies on human language is an attempt to show a possible foundation for the current rift between how we behave linguistically when teaching a language to native and foreign students, as well as how we manage interactions in our classrooms. Despite research suggesting the importance of teaching and reflecting on oracy, there is a large focus on teaching written language while devaluing oral language production. Many linguists have been trying to establish the well-deserved place for oral language in the regular education system in Brazil. We can see this effort in the works of Bagno (2017, 2001), Neves

(2015), Ilari and Basso (2012), Antunes (2007), Perini (2004), Silva (2004), and Possenti (1996), just to mention a few examples. However, in some cases, not even Portuguese as Mother Language (PML) teachers recognize the variety and richness of the spoken language, and they end up promoting - unconsciously or not - linguistic prejudice and misconceptions of what is or is not "proper" Portuguese (BAGNO, 2013a, 2013b, 2010).

Considering that in Brazilian universities there are many undergraduate programs for those who want to teach PML and/or additional languages, it may seem irrelevant to talk about PML in a research focused on Portuguese as Additional Language (PAL). However, this is exactly the point we are trying to make. Diniz and Coelho (2017), Azevedo (2014), and Ferreira (2013) suggest that the number of PAL teachers that have gone through specific training to teach their mother tongue to foreigners is still very limited[2]. In most cases, these professionals have experience teaching PML or other additional languages (English, Spanish, French, German, etc.) and adapt their teaching methodology to PAL. This situation might make these PAL teachers feel as if they were in limbo, with no place to go to when in need of directly applicable theoretical and/or methodological support.

When recognizing that specific training/education for PAL teachers is still incipient, it is possible to suggest, even from our own experience, that these professionals face difficulties when trying to understand how classroom discourse and interaction works in PAL classes. As mentioned above, there are many studies in which the difference between how one speaks and writes in Brazilian Portuguese (BP) is discussed in depth. However, the teaching of Portuguese, especially in elementary and high schools, still suffers a strong influence of a prescriptive standpoint, focusing on teaching the written form of the language. Therefore, we believe that not knowing or, at least, not recognizing the importance of understanding how the building blocks of oral language work in PML might cause inexperienced PAL teachers to undervalue oral production in their classes.

---

[2] Rocha (no prelo) has collected data on universities that offer specific training/education for PAL teachers in Brazil. Her research found that only three universities (UnB, UFBA, and Unicamp) offer full undergraduate courses focused on the education of PAL teachers. However, it is important to mention that many other higher education institutions offer extra courses and research groups, both in undergraduate and graduate levels, where students can get in touch with what more experienced researchers in the area have been developing.

We find in Ferreira (2014) and in Schoffen (2012), for instance, examples on how to proceed when assessing oral production in PAL students, but studies on how classroom discourse[3] and interactions in PAL classrooms are organized and how they affect how we teach oral production are harder to find. Similarly, few studies on how to integrate oral language to the PML classrooms are available, and we can mention Crescitelli and Reis (2018) and Castilho (2006) as examples. Besides that, we must also consider the wash-back effect promoted by the implementation of the CELPE-Bras exam - the only proficiency exam of BP recognized by the government -, in the 1990s, which caused a whole new wave of studies in the area of PAL teaching[4].

In one of his articles, Marcuschi (1999, p. 114) analyzes the Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais (PCN)[5], in which he defends that for the "first time [...] an official document dedicates special attention to oral language in the teaching of mother tongue [...]"[6]. Further, he notes that another positive aspect of the document is that oral language "[...] is recognized as a common daily life activity and of relevance in the construction of social activities. The oral language/spoken language is seen as varied, historical and social" (p. 118-119)[7]. However, despite these positive aspects, the author also mentions that, in the PCNs, "[...] there is no clear definition of oral language nor adequate suggestion of its empirical treatment" (p. 114)[8].

---

[3] In this research, we use Tsui's (2008, p. 2) definition of classroom discourse, which says that the term "[...] refers to all forms of discourse that take place in the classroom. It encompasses the linguistic as well as the non-linguistic elements of discourse".

[4] The book organized by Dell'Isola (2014) is an example of this. Also, many papers focused on different aspects of the exam can be found in the Digital Repository of the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), available at: https://lume.ufrgs.br/.

[5] Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais (PCN) are a set of documents of reference for elementary and high school teaching in Brazil (BRASIL, 1998). It offers theoretical support for school practices. Its application is not mandatory and, therefore, it presupposes its adaptation to local contexts. A more recent document is the Base Nacional Comum Curricular (BNCC) (BRASIL, 2017a), which has a normative character. This document not only establishes a common curriculum that must be applied in the entire country, but also offers guidelines for teacher education, for the production of teaching materials, and for assessment (BRASIL, 2017b)

[6] In the original: "[...] primeira vez [...] um documento oficial dedica atenção especial à linguagem oral no ensino de língua materna [...]" (MARCUSCHI, 1999, p. 114).

[7] In the original: "[...] é reconhecida como uma atividade comum no dia-a-dia e de relevância na construção das atividades sociais (MARCUSCHI, 1999, p. 118).

[8] In the original: "[...] não há um definição clara da oralidade nem um sugestão adequada do seu tratamento empírico (MARCUSCHI, 1999, p. 114).

Given the lack of a clear definition and empirical treatment of oral language in the PCNs, highlighted by Marcuschi, one could claim that PAL teachers, like their PML counterparts, might also struggle to effectively integrate oracy into their teaching practice. It is important to understand that "writing is not [just] a graphic representation of speech" (MARCUSCHI, 1999, p. 120)[9]. Speech demands different linguistic behaviors determined by the genre. According to the PCNs, and based on Marcuschi's ideas (1999, p. 124), "[...] oral language [must have] a systematic place in school [or at any level of formal education]. It is not true that one only learns writing at school nor that speech is simply a matter of incidental daily life learning"[10]. Marcuschi (1999) also criticizes the fact that the PCNs convey the idea that oral texts are deeply planned, ignoring one of the most common characteristics of oral language, which is its spontaneity. He writes that "[...] it is unbelievable that, when working with oral language, it is necessary to use writing as a support. This does not happen on a daily basis" (p. 126).

This lack of orientation on how to deal with oral language is one of the common challenging aspects of the practice of PML teachers. When considering PAL teachers, it becomes even more complex; besides having to find the place of oral language in their classes, PAL teachers frequently must also deal with different levels of proficiency in Portuguese amongst students, and also with different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. It is exactly at this point that we believe that RP (MANN; WALSH, 2017), specifically applied to understanding CDI, can bring benefits; making the teacher more aware of the process and of what happens in the classroom might contribute to the development of activities that consider the students' needs and their levels of proficiency, thus promoting more meaningful learning opportunities.

Beyond recognizing the importance of reflecting on oral language within PAL teachers' education, this research also tries to develop further studies in the area of PAL teaching and learning. Such studies are an important step towards promoting the Portuguese language; this process has been taking place for a while, mostly in

---

[9] In the original: "*A escrita não é a representação gráfica da fala*" (MARCUSCHI, 1999, p. 114, italics in the original).

[10] In the original: "[...] a oralidade tem um lugar sistemático na escola. Não é verdade que a escrita só se aprende na escola nem que a fala é uma questão apenas de aprendizado espontâneo no dia-a-dia" (MARCUSCHI, 1999, p. 124).

Brazil and in Portugal, but we believe that there is still ground to be covered, especially when one compares the investment made by the Brazilian Government to the policies promoted by the Portuguese Government and other Portuguese institutions (MARTINS, 2016)[11]. Given this gap, we believe that any research effort concerning the education of PAL teachers is of utmost importance for the promotion of the Brazilian variation of the Portuguese language in the current global context.

Besides the linguistic and pedagogic aspects, we must also consider that the internationalization of Brazilian universities is closely tied to promoting the Portuguese language in a globalized world. In PUCRS' context, considerations related to PAL teaching and learning demonstrate the university's concerns about the comprehensive education of its international students, specifically the theoretical, professional, and social aspects of preparing students to be productive world citizens. These preoccupations show to the international students that the institution cares, among other things, about their Portuguese language acquisition process; this offers them additional research possibilities and chances to interact in a multicultural world. Beyond that, we believe that promoting access to high-quality PAL teaching is a way of offering domestic students relevant interactions with international ones - especially considering PUCRS' students who will not have the chance to go abroad while working on their undergraduate or graduate degrees.

International students who come to PUCRS for academic exchange have specific needs related to learning and using the Portuguese language, both in academic and non-academic settings. These situations have been a challenge for PUCRS' PAL teachers because these students must be able to actively participate in the academic community in a small amount of time. We believe that through a deeper understanding of CDI features and of how to promote oral production activities more acutely focused on the students' needs, we could help them adapt and integrate more naturally to their new reality. By learning Portuguese, students would be less dependent on a lingua franca, like English, to perform their roles in academic and

---

[11] One example of actions that have been taken in Portugal is the recent launch of the *Referencial Camões PLE: Português Língua Estrangeira*, organized by Direção de Serviços de Língua e Cultura, in an edition promoted by Instituto Camões and the Council of Europe. The document offers guidelines on teaching, learning, assessment, and production of teaching materials, to increase its quality and align the teaching of Portuguese as Foreign Language to the Common European Framework standards.

social situations in Brazil. Thus, we see the process of learning and teaching Portuguese, broadly, and of understanding CDI features, specifically, as ways of helping students and teachers achieve their goals.

The remainder of this chapter is dedicated to discussing the foundations of Reflective Practice (MANN; WALSH, 2017), in Section 2.1; some features of Classroom Discourse and Interaction (WALSH, 2011; SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010), in Section 2.2; and the use of Conversation Analysis to research classroom interaction in a SLA context (WONG; WAKING, 2010; MARKEE, 2008; KASPER, 2006; SEEDHOUSE, 2005; TEN HAVE, 2007), in Section 2.3. We believe that these areas can be a perfect fit to support our reflections on how to understand the mechanisms of CDI and how to apply this knowledge to teach oral production in the teaching-learning context we are inserted in. This combination of RP, CDI, and CA-for-SLA is the ground for the data analysis we present in Chapter 4 (Discussion Meetings Data Analysis).

2.1 ON REFLECTIVE PRACTICE (RP)

In this research, we attempt to apply the perspective of RP presented by Mann and Walsh (2017), in their book *Reflective Practice in English Language Teaching: research-based principles and practices*, to PAL teaching. Using a book related to English Language Teaching (ELT) is not seen as a problem here because, as far as we understand, RP concerns teacher education and not specific languages or academic disciplines. A few other authors will also be mentioned to show different perspectives and contexts, but the backbone of our discussion rests pretty much on the works of Mann and Walsh (2017, 2013).

When it comes to the importance of RP in the field of teacher education, Mann and Walsh (2017), mostly based on the works of Dewey (1933), Shön (1983), and Farrell (2004), defend that "[r]eflection and reflective practice continue to have a central position in professional education [...]", and that "[t]he importance of reflective practice has been established; it is widespread and a ubiquitous part of the teacher education landscape" (MANN; WALSH, 2017, p. 4). Furthermore, in their critical review, Mann and Walsh (2017) present a comprehensive list of studies that "[...]

have resulted in a range of models, practices and tools for implementing reflective practice, frameworks [...], levels [...], typologies [...] and phases [...]" (p. 45). Given all these tools, RP offers a myriad of opportunities for teacher development. However, the authors view the shortage in the usage of real classroom data and misconceptions about the purpose of RP as reasons why its practices have not been as successful as they could be. They propose "[...] a more evidence-based and data-led approach" as a way of making the whole process less "[...] elusive, general and vague" (p. 5). This would offer teachers a chance to make RP a more meaningful, collaborative and dialogic process.

Building on their previous study, published in 2013, Mann and Walsh clarify how important it is to reassess the way we currently understand RP. In that study, the authors mention that, despite all the research about RP, little has been done to teach professionals how to apply it. Also, RP is still understood as an individual process, mostly focused on written forms, and insufficiently based on real data. On top of that, it is also frequently used as an assessment, rather than as a continuous professional development (CPD) tool; some professionals even advocate against it due to this usage[12]. Mann and Walsh (2013) contend that RP should be reassessed and viewed as a data-led, collaborative process, with scaffolded spoken reflection in a community of practice. This use of various reflective tools engenders the perfect RP environment for teachers' professional development.

Looking back at the history of what could be seen as the beginning of RP, Mann and Walsh present the studies of Dewey (1933), who is, according to the authors, one of the most influential theorists in the development of the foundation of the contemporary literature of teachers' CPD. Mann and Walsh explain that Dewey's work was focused "[...] on the relationship between experience, interaction and reflection" (2017, p. 6). Dewey was one of the first researchers to reflect on the importance of experiential learning and to "[...] argue that teachers should not be passive recipients of knowledge but should play an active role in materials design

---

[12] Mann and Walsh (2017, p. 15) quote Boud and Walker (1998, 191) to exemplify authors who believe that "many examples of poor educational practices [were] implemented under the guise and rhetoric of reflection"; Bradbury and colleagues (2010, p. 55 apud MANN, WALSH, 2017, p. 15) show that some researchers affirm that "[...] RP has run its course and there is a need to move 'beyond reflective practice' [...] and consider new approaches to CPD".

and curriculum reform and innovation" (DEWEY, 1933 apud MANN, WALSH, 2017, p. 6). Dewey's influential studies can be identified, for example, in other works on RP, like McKay (2003) and Alarcão (2011).

Decades earlier, Dewey recognized that this process of reassessing one's own perspectives on teaching could be difficult, since "[i]t can involve reconsidering beliefs and practices and [...] [the] willingness to 'endure a condition of mental unrest and disturbance'" (DEWEY, 1933, p. 13 apud MANN; WALSH, 2017, p. 6). Mann and Walsh also call our attention to what Dewey considers "particular values" of the reflective practitioner, which are open-mindedness, responsibility, and wholeheartedness. These values are confirmed as still important in Farrell's work on RP, published in 2008, and in other more recent studies. McKay (2003, p. 2), for instance, says that reflective teachers "[...] consider the reasons why they make their decisions." Moreover, they try to solve classroom problems, they are conscious about how their values influence their teaching, they are able to read their institutional and cultural contexts, they take part in the curriculum development and get involved when changes happen in their institutions, and, last but not least, they "take responsibility for their own professional development" (McKAY, 2003, p. 6-7). All these characteristics can be easily linked to the work of teachers in any area, including to the context of PAL teachers who work with multicultural groups of students, where different opinions, beliefs, sociocultural backgrounds, etc., are all represented in the same classroom.

Mann and Walsh (2017) and McKay (2003) explain the importance of the differentiation made by Shön (1983) between the terms "reflection-in-action" and "reflection-on-action". The first "[...] is synchronous with the professional act (thinking on your feet) and [the second] is asynchronous (a reflection after the professional action or incident)" (MANN; WALSH, 2017, p. 8). On the same topic, Mann and Walsh (2017) go further than McKay (2003) and introduce the concept elaborated by Killion and Todnem (1991 apud MANN; WALSH, 2017, p. 8), of "reflection-for-action", "[...] which is prospective and identifies steps or guidelines to follow to succeed in a given task in the future". These three ideas represent a broader view of how reflecting on what and how we teach should be a constant discussion topic for language educators.

To demonstrate how important the balance between theoretical and practical aspects in the process of teacher education is, Mann and Walsh (2017) bring the concepts of received knowledge and experiential knowledge, developed by Wallace (1991), to their discussion. According to Wallace, knowledge related to a specific area of study is understood as received knowledge, while experiential knowledge of that area can only be acquired from experiencing and reflecting about that experience (WALLACE, 1991 apud MANN; WALSH, 2017). McKay (2003) also defends that the teacher's classroom experiences, combined with their general knowledge and personal values, are important elements of any RP experience. We believe that it is possible to understand that both received and experiential knowledge should be equally valued and responsibly dealt with in teacher education programs.

After presenting the value of a comprehensive process of teacher education composed by both received and experiential knowledge, Mann and Walsh (2017) complement this idea by justifying why RP is such a central aspect of teacher education. They introduce "[a] great deal of teacher education literature [that] foregrounded reflection as an important aspect of professional practice" (p. 8) and place their work under the definition of reflection elaborated by Boud and collaborators: "[reflection is] a generic term for those intellectual and affective activities in which individuals engage to explore their experiences in order to lead to new understandings and appreciation" (1985, p. 3 apud MANN; WALSH, 2017, p. 9).

As examples, the authors mention Zeichner and Liston's (1996) and Stanley's (1998) models of reflection, both composed of five steps (rapid reaction, repair, review, research, and retheorize and reformulate) (ZEICHNER; LISTON, 1996; STANLEY, 1998 apud MANN; WALSH, 2017). To show other possibilities, Mann and Walsh bring a series of other works in which this process is reduced to three steps, usually ranging from a more descriptive level, in the beginning, followed by a period of assessment of those descriptions, and culminating in "[...] the moral, social and political level [...] often characterized as 'critical'" (2017, p. 9). McKay (2003) brings a three-step reflection process, consisting of: 1) identifying a problem and its possible causes; 2) collecting and analysing data; 3) using this information to promote change. Both Mann and Walsh (2017) and McKay (2003) provide their readers with a

significant body of literature related to the process of RP, and both agree that, no matter what approach one chooses, those steps should be understood as inter-related, and not linear structures.

At this point, it makes sense to mention how much of a central role Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory (SCT) plays in the studies of RP. Mann and Walsh (2017), for example, affirm that "[they] believe that sociocultural theory has much to offer in terms of advancing our understanding of the theoretical underpinnings of RP" (p. 10). The authors even call our attention to the fact that "[a]lthough it is certainly true that Vygotskian perspectives have been most influential in considering children's learning, this is beginning to change, and Lantolf and Poehner (2008, p. 2 apud SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010) see it as unfortunate that Vygotskian educational thinking has been 'virtually ignored in adult educational settings'" (2017, p. 10)[13]. We believe that Mann and Walsh mention it to clarify that "[...] one of the aims of [their] book is to consider a Vygotskian perspective to RP" (idem).

In order to show the relevance of the SCT to their RP framework, Mann and Walsh (2017) explain the three principles of the Vygotskian theory from an RP perspective: "(1) Professional development is fundamentally a social process; (2) Teachers need to appropriate new understandings (make them their own); (3) Development may be assisted by scaffolding" (p. 11). To illustrate this application, the authors invite us to think about a conversation among teachers in which an issue related to teaching is being discussed. It might lead to reflection, eliciting further discussions that might cause changes in the participants' practice, promoting more discussion, more reflection, and so on. The knowledge and the new perceptions that emerge from this process are only possible, according to Mann and Walsh (2017), because of the dialogue and reflection on issues that the teachers have experienced in their private context and that were socialized in their conversation. Basically, it exemplifies the collaborative nature of this new, more dialogic, trend of RP.

---

[13] Paiva (2014) explains that Vygotsky's studies were not related to SLA and that he has never used the term "sociocultural", but, still, his thoughts on human development have influenced future studies on language acquisition. According to Lantolf and Becker (2009 apud PAIVA, 2014), Vygotsky used the terms "cultural psychology" or "cultural-historical psychology" to talk about his studies, and the term "socio-cultural" was coined by Wertsch, in 1985. In the remainder of her chapter, Paiva mentions a series of studies that contributed to the transition of the Vygotskian ideas from the area of developmental psychology to the studies of second language acquisition.

In her work on the education of reflective teachers in Brazil, Alarcão (2011), while presenting a historical perspective of the concept of RP in the country, also brings to the discussion the need for a more contextualized and collaborative RP. She presents the argument that institutions, in all levels of education, are also responsible for creating individual and collaborative opportunities for reflection and should not simply expect it from teachers. Following this idea of an experience-based educational context, Alarcão (2011), inspired by Schön's studies, mentions a three-folded dialog: the teacher with herself, the teacher with those who came before her and built her referential knowledge, and the teacher with other participants of the situation under scrutiny.

Going back to Mann and Walsh (2017), the authors present a detailed overview of SCT[14], including the reviews of other authors to make their case. Since the idea of their new trend of RP is to make it a more spoken and less written process of reflection, they emphasize, based on Vygotsky's perspective, "[...] the importance of social interaction to an individual's development" (p. 11). To support this point of view, they mention that, similarly to other authors, like Lantolf (2005) and Lantolf and Thorne (2006), "[...] [they also] see learning as essentially social and cultural in nature, and not an individual and solitary phenomenon (MANN; WALSH, 2017, p. 11). Applying this to teacher development, Mann and Walsh (2017) affirm that by "[d]rawing on SCT, we can say that, for professional development to occur, three elements are usually involved: a focus, dialogue with another professional, and reflection" (idem, p. 12).

Alongside this process of identifying an issue, reflecting about it, discussing it with a colleague, and promoting new practices - also presented by McKay (2003) and Alarcão (2011) - from Mann and Walsh's (2017) perspective, one could understand that there will be no results if teachers do not have a sense of appropriation and ownership regarding that new knowledge. According to them, "[o]wnership is a key aspect of any learning or development process since we all learn in different ways and the actual understandings we achieve will vary from one individual to another" (p. 12). The authors even call our attention to the importance of this idea of appropriation

---

[14] Mann and Walsh (2017) do not presuppose that readers are familiar with Vygotskian theory, but we must mention here that the introductory but comprehensive work of Rego (2012) was important to give us an embracing contextualization of Vygotskian studies.

to the professional development of teachers, because "[...] we are applying what we have learnt or understood and using that new knowledge to benefit our learners" (idem). On this perspective, professional talk assumes a greater importance, in which it is understood as "[...] a co-constructed series of encounters in which interlocutors may offer support and guidance through scaffolding [...]" (MANN; WALSH, 2017, p. 13).

The idea of scaffolding takes us to one of the last topics mentioned by Mann and Walsh in their review of SCT. Using Bruner (1990 apud MANN; WALSH, 2017 p. 13), the authors explain that the term "[...] was originally used to refer to the linguistic support given by a more experienced [speaker] [...] to a less experienced [one]". Transferring this concept to teacher professional development, Mann and Walsh defend that scaffolding takes place in the dialogic reflection on teaching issues promoted by RP. In their words, "[...] sociocultural theory has much to offer to understandings not only of RP but also of teaching and learning more generally [...]" (MANN; WALSH, 2017, p. 14).

After presenting a broad historical analysis of RP, Mann and Walsh (2017) introduce the readers to several authors that identify a series of problems related to what we can understand as an "old-style" RP. Basically, the central problem, identified not only by Mann and Walsh (2017), but also by Pimenta (2012)[15], is that teachers are often presented to different RP models, but are rarely given the chance to experience them. It goes without saying that the theoretical background is extremely important, but there must be an easily identifiable pathway from a theoretical perspective to a moment of active experimentation of practices. It implies that one must be careful when applying models, since different interpretations can easily make them become too prescriptive, hindering the "reflective enterprise" (MANN; WALSH, 2017, p. 14).

Another problem mentioned by Mann and Walsh (2017) is related to the lack of real data when teachers try to apply an RP framework. There is a plethora of "[...] models, checklists or series of questions to be used as prompts [...]", and "[v]ery few

---

[15] Pimenta's work is one of the chapters of a book called *Professor Reflexivo no Brasil: gênese e crítica de um conceito*, organized by Pimenta and Ghedin (2012). The book compiles works of specialists in Education in Brazil and brings a full review of the history of the concept, including philosophical, pedagogical, and practical aspects of it.

[of them] have examples of reflection and where data is included it is usually self-reported or short extracts from reflective journals" (MANN; WALSH, 2017, p. 17). Therefore, the authors believe that scaffolding and mentoring, when it comes to teachers' professional development, might not be enough, and a more data-led approach would be more productive. According to Mann and Walsh (2017, p. 17), "[d]ata-led accounts [...] provide the kind of evidence which promotes understandings of reflection. [They] help us to acquire the close-up understandings of our professional practice and [...] help to establish the knowledge base on which RP rests".

As briefly mentioned before, Mann and Walsh (2017) also condemn the individualistic and almost exclusively written approach to RP. They emphasize the importance of participating in a community of practice when doing RP, otherwise it cannot be considered a "dialogic process". When it comes to the written forms, they explain that "[a] common problem with [them] is that the focus of attention becomes the actual writing itself, or rather the pro-forma, checklist or whatever is used as a stimulus to reflection" (2017, p. 18). This clarifies why the authors believe that a dialogic approach to RP is more fruitful. As an attempt to increase the value of the reflections, they affirm that, "[b]y using a variety of tasks, practitioners are encouraged to think deeply and there is scope for progression in the tasks themselves" (idem).

It is important to clarify, though, that writing itself is not the problem. The problem is to diminish the whole process to just filling in a report. According to Mann and Walsh (2017), "[...] we need to think more about the distinction between 'reflection through writing' and 'writing as a record of reflection'" (p. 19). From this perspective, it is possible to see writing as both a record of reflection and as reflection itself, since "[i]t distills, clarifies or even reframes an experience, situation or event and increases awareness" (p. 19). Writing should be seen, then, as a valuable activity that has potential to be a useful tool for organizing and applying RP tasks.

Two other issues mentioned by Mann and Walsh (2017) are the use of RP as a tool for teacher assessment and the lack of appropriate RP tools. When considering pre-service teacher training, "[b]y only focusing on assessed RP, there is a danger that it will not become embedded in a teacher's future professional practice"

(MANN; WALSH, 2017, p. 20). Besides that, experienced professionals who do not have the tradition of applying RP to their teaching might see this only as one more task to be done, and not as a real CPD opportunity. Mann and Walsh (2017, p. 20) believe that "[...] RP is not reducible to particular tools but that the systematic use of tools and triggers can help". Therefore, it is important to make RP an interesting and relevant process, with a systematic progression in the reflective tasks, so the practitioner has more chances to dig deeper in the analysis. The authors advocate, according to Allwright (2003 apud MANN; WALSH, 2017, p. 20), for a more encouraging perspective, in which "[...] puzzles or points of interest [...]" are the focus, and not only on the problems or mistakes made by the teacher. This movement brings RP closer to a CPD tool than to an assessment mechanism.

Mann and Walsh (2017) bring to light the problem of "not practicing what you preach". When practitioners reach this point, "[...] reflection becomes so much part of the landscape that [they] forget to ask questions about why [they] are promoting it" and, according to Bengtsson (2003, p. 295 apud MANN; WALSH, 2017, p. 21), "[...] reflection is 'used in an unreflective manner'". This causes a "[...] lack of congruence between stated beliefs and beliefs-in-action" (MANN; WALSH, 2017, p. 21). The authors assume the position that, "[...] in order to promote reflective practice, teacher educators, university tutors and lecturers, and those running pre- and in-service teacher education programmes [...] ought also to engage with reflective processes" (idem). Simply making RP a discussion point is, as the authors believe, "[...] one of the quickest ways of making it accessible to others and of [not only] creating a genuine community of practice, but also a community of reflective practitioners" (MANN; WALSH, 2017, p. 21).

We believe that discussions on RP are of utmost importance when thinking about teachers' CPD, since they can contribute a lot to the work of either novice or experienced language professionals. We recognize, though, that there is much more to be discussed and that what we present here is a very restricted selection of the literature that is - thankfully - available nowadays. However, we understand that, to the purposes of this research, the theoretical clipping presented here will suffice for the analysis we conduct in Chapter 4. This will be done in combination with what is presented in the next two sections of this chapter: Section 2.2, in which we present a

few considerations on classroom discourse and interaction, and Section 2.3, where we discuss the use of Conversation Analysis to Second Language Acquisition studies (CA-for-SLA, cf. MARKEE; KASPER, 2004).

2.2 ON CLASSROOM DISCOURSE AND INTERACTION (CDI)

This section presents an important part of the theoretical background that will support our Discussion Meetings Data Analysis section, presented in Chapter 4. Here we introduce a few studies, mostly conducted by Steve Walsh, alone or in collaboration with other scholars, like Paul Seedhouse. In these studies, published between 2002 and 2011, one can find a comprehensive analysis of CDI features, which are extensively discussed by the authors. We hope to be able to guide the reader through these discussions, always keeping in mind the main goal of this study, which is, again, to shed some light on CDI characteristics presented in a classroom of PAL for graduate students at PUCRS. As we have already mentioned, in relation to the studies on RP, the fact that most of the studies presented here focus on EFL/ESL teaching, we believe that a great amount of the phenomena discussed by the authors are related to the language classroom context and can be applied to the teaching of any language.

Walsh (2002, 2006) and Walsh and Li (2013) discuss aspects related to the promotion or the obstruction of learning opportunities[16] through an investigation of teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom context. By promoting reflections on the use teachers make of language, he offers a few concepts to help us understand how teachers can do harm while believing to help students, as when they "fill in the gaps" or "smooth over" students' contributions (WALSH, 2002, p. 3). When it comes to learner involvement, the author adopts "[...] the position that maximizing learner involvement is conducive to second language acquisition [...]",

---

[16] In Crabbe (2003, p. 17) we find that the term "learning opportunity" is "[...] commonly found in educational literature, typically without comment or explicit definition, although in some instances authors adopt it to represent a key concept". As the author says, a learning opportunity can be understood as "[...] any activity that is likely to lead to an increase in language knowledge or skill. It may be the opportunity to negotiate meaning in a discussion, to read and derive meaning from a printed text, to explore a pattern in language usage, or to get direct feedback on one's own use of language" (idem, p. 18).

and that, "[...] through their choice of language, [teachers may] construct or obstruct learner participation in face-to-face classroom communication" (idem). Walsh even mentions that "[...] teachers' ability to control their use of language is at least as important as their ability to select appropriate methodologies, [since it] has implications for both teacher education and classroom practice" (idem).

When discussing the recurrent concept of teacher talking time (TTT) in pre- and in in-service teacher education programs, Walsh states that "[...] the focus has been on the quantity rather than quality of teacher talk, a position which is both simplistic and unrealistic" (WALSH, 2002, p. 3). This assumption matches well with the motivation for this research: the realization that we are not conscious enough about the ways we use language in the classroom and that, to teach our students how to be successful speakers in their target language, we must have a deeper understanding of how classroom discourse and interactions are constituted. According to the author, "[...] understanding classroom communication, being able to 'shape' learner contributions and making strategic decisions in the moment-by-moment unfolding of a lesson are regarded as being crucial to developing SLA in the formal, L2 classroom context" (WALSH, 2006, p. 133). Besides that, when "[g]iven an appropriate framework and corresponding metalanguage, teachers are able to gain detailed insights into interactional processes at work in their classes" (idem, p. 136).

Some of these basic, but not always simple to notice and understand, features are mentioned by Walsh (2002): teachers usually control the topic of the discussion, how it should be discussed, and who may speak, when and for how long; students get their hints (to participate in the interaction) from the teacher, and the roles performed by students and teacher are unequal in terms of power, which can be observed from the fact that it is usually the teacher who manages the interactions and who speaks more; also, teachers tend to modify their talk to learners, but the opposite rarely happens; one last aspect presented by Walsh is that teachers, most of the time, "[...] ask questions [...] to which they know the answers [...]" (2002, p. 4; also mentioned by MARKEE, 2000), making classroom interaction less realistic.[17]

---

[17] Walsh (2006) calls "referential questions" those to which the teacher does not know the answer, while "display questions" are those to which the teacher knows the answer. Shamsipour and Allami

Considering the classroom as "[...] a social context in its own right, worthy of study and scrutiny, [Walsh believes that] any attempt to understand the nature of classroom discourse should [recognize] the important relationship between language use and pedagogic purpose" (2002, p. 4; also in WALSH, 2006). However, sometimes not even the teaching aim is clearly organized in our minds (or lesson plans), let alone the appropriate language use. Therefore, Walsh mentions that "[...] appropriate language use is more likely to occur when teachers are sufficiently aware of their goal at a given moment in a lesson to match their teaching aim [...] to their language use" (2002, p. 5), promoting more effective learning opportunities.

We believe it is relevant to mention here what concept of "awareness" we use, which is also from Walsh's studies, where he complements the idea mentioned in his 2002 article with a longer definition in another paper (WALSH, 2006, p. 135), as it says:

> By 'awareness' is meant a more conscious use of language; noticing the effects of interactional features on learning opportunity (WALSH, 2002); understanding that teachers and learners jointly create learning opportunities; a realization of the importance of using appropriate teacher talk, adjusted not only according to level but also to pedagogic goals.

Therefore, one can say that teachers demonstrate interactional awareness when they can use metalanguage, critically self-evaluate themselves, and make more conscious decisions according to their classroom interactional context (WALSH, 2006).

As already mentioned in the previous section, from the RP perspective presented in the work of Mann and Walsh (2017), it shows that Walsh is consistent in his opinion that there must be a balance between content knowledge and practical knowledge in teacher education, as we can see from his 2002 and 2006 works. This shows that one of the motivations for this research, which is to try to find the right equation between knowledge of the content area (in this case, language teaching and linguistics) and educational/pedagogic knowledge, is a common preoccupation in the area of teacher education. Being able to use appropriate metalanguage, then, "[...] is, arguably, an important indicator of interactional awareness since it allows

---

(2012) elaborated an article showing the effect of a more conscious use of display and referential questions in teacher talk and how it positively affects learner involvement in an EFL classroom in Iran.

interlocutors to verbalize their understanding of key concepts" (WALSH, 2006, p. 136), and can also, perhaps, demonstrate that the teacher masters not only the linguistic knowledge, but also concepts related to a broader idea of teaching, learning, and education. While using metalanguage is a way of showing that decisions are made with a higher level of awareness, "[a]bsence of metalanguage, on the other hand, not only makes awareness difficult to judge, it creates an impression of reduced consciousness, of impoverished decision-making" (WALSH, 2006, p. 137).

When teachers have a deeper understanding of CDI features, they become aware of how patterns of communication are constituted and how they "[...] can either constrain or facilitate students' opportunities to participate (and consequently to learn)" (WALSH, 2002, p. 5). One could say, then, that teachers need to be able to understand and promote classroom communication patterns that facilitate the students' language acquisition process. The problem is that there is a fine line between what one understands as scaffolding, for example, and something Walsh (2002) calls "filling in gaps", when teachers complete students' sentences to "[...] facilitate a coherent and flowing discourse, but [...] may be denying their learners opportunities to get to grips with the subject matter and to identify potential problems in understanding" (idem, p. 6).

Before moving on in the discussion, it is necessary to state the basis of learning that we use in this research. Among many possibilities of reference, we align our discussion with what Seedhouse and Walsh (2010) present in their chapter in a book called *Conceptualising 'Learning' in Applied Linguistics*, organized by Seedhouse, Walsh and Jenks (2010). The authors characterize learning as a process of "[...] socially-distributed cognition [that takes place] in L2 classroom interaction" (SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010, p. 127). From that perspective, "[...] any conceptualization of 'learning' in a classroom needs to consider the ways in which learning processes are embodied in classroom interaction" (idem). Therefore, the authors clarify that "[...] any attempt to study learning must [...] begin by studying classroom interaction", due to the "[...] interplay between language, interaction and learning" (idem). A micro-analytic approach, using Conversation Analysis (CA)

methodology, "[...] enables us to identify specific strategies used by teachers and learners to enhance learning" (idem, p. 128).[18]

To understand how teacher talk, or the way teachers use language in the classroom, can promote or hinder learning opportunities, several studies place Conversation Analysis (CA) as a powerful tool to help us look at classroom data (WALSH, 2012, 2006, 2002; SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010; WONG; WARING, 2010, just to mention a few). According to Walsh (2002), CA allows us to look at naturally occurring classroom interactions in fine-grained detail. Besides that, "[...] CA forces the researcher to focus on interaction patterns emerging from the data, rather than relying on any preconceived notions which language teachers may bring to [it]" (WALSH, 2002, p. 8). It offers us the chance to see how conversation is collaboratively built by the participants and how the interdependence of turns works.

From a CA perspective, classroom context should be understood as dynamic, meaning that it varies according to the stage of the lesson, and the same happens to the teacher's use of language. Walsh defends that "[...] [teacher's use of language] is the principal force in bringing about changes in [classroom] context. That is, language, as 'the vehicle and object of instruction' (LONG, 1983: 9), reflects and determines what context is in operation" (WALSH, 2002, p. 8). This makes us understand that maybe one of the most important reasons why CA is suitable for CDI studies is because it is a way to deal with institutional discourse, which is normally goal-oriented. Walsh (2002, p. 8) explains that

> [...] the behaviour and discourse of the participants are influenced by the goal (or more likely, goals) towards which they are striving. While the participants may have different objectives, and almost certainly different agendas, the discourse which is jointly constructed is dependent on the intended outcomes and related expectations of the participants.

Applying a CA methodology, then, allows investigators to use transcriptions of classroom interactions excerpts and identify examples where the teacher's controlled use of language, combined with the pedagogic goals, facilitates (or not) the creation of learning opportunities by, for example, promoting "[...] reformulation and

---

[18] Although Conversation Analysis (CA) is mentioned here, we decided to dedicate an entire section of this chapter (Section 2.3) to briefly explain how CA studies, originally from the area of Sociology, in the 1960s, were eventually applied to a variety of other areas, including the SLA studies.

clarification, leading to greater involvement and precision of language on the part of the learners" (WALSH, 2002, p. 9).

Since the idea of promoting learning opportunities seems to be too abstract, Walsh offers us a few examples of "[...] features of this teacher's language use which facilitate learner involvement and construct potential for learning [...] (WALSH, 2002, p. 10). A first idea mentioned is the direct error correction, which is, put simply, "[...] a very open and direct approach to error correction [...], [...] far less time-consuming and intrusive than the more 'sensitive' (and therefore time-consuming) routes preferred by many teachers [...]" (idem). The author is careful, though, when explaining that he does not suggest that "[...] all error correction should be direct and minimalist, [but that] there is a certain logic in keeping error correction to a minimum in oral fluency practice activities in order to reduce interruption and 'maintain the flow'" (WALSH, 2002, p. 11).

A second feature that promotes learning opportunities is the content feedback, or feedback on the message, and not on its linguistic structure, which is viewed as "[...] more conducive to genuine communication" (WALSH, 2002, p. 11) and, therefore, more prone to boost learner involvement. In combination with that, confirmation checks are also seen as beneficial, since "[...] teachers who constantly seek clarification, check for confirmation, and who do not always accept the first contribution a student offers are more likely to maximize learning potential than those who do not" (idem, p. 12). Mentioning Musumeci (1996 apud WALSH, 2002 p. 12), Walsh reminds us that "[...] confirmation checks and requests for clarification are to be encouraged not only from teacher to learners, but more importantly, from learners to teachers". It is not uncommon to find teachers who remember their training sessions, in which they were taught how to make sure students understand what they are supposed to do when performing a certain activity. However, how many of us remember being taught to teach our students how to check their own understanding of what they should do?

Direct error correction, content feedback, and confirmation checks are all strategies to help teachers promote learning opportunities and learner involvement, but they will not be as effective as they could if the teacher does not offer students enough time to react to that, or, what some researchers call "extended wait-time". It

allows learners to think about what they want to say or do, usually resulting in an increased occurrence of student participation and in better formulated and extended contributions (WALSH, 2002). Still according to Walsh, one of the possible reasons for this teacher behavior when it comes to moments of silence in the classroom is because "[s]ilence, to many teachers, may be threatening, a sign of weakness, perhaps, or an indication that they are simply 'not doing their job'" (idem, p. 12).

One last aspect mentioned by Walsh (2002) as a booster for meaningful interactions in the classroom is the frequently discussed idea of scaffolding. Despite being a common issue in teacher trainings both in pre- and in-service teacher education programs, we believe that this concept is sometimes not fully understood by language teachers, since there is a fine line dividing the ideas of direct error correction, feeding needed language to the student, ignoring mistakes when the focus is on fluency, completing student sentences without giving them the chance to try, etc. From our experience, it is easy to get caught in the moment and start "filling in" too much, preventing students from fully enjoying an opportunity to speak their minds and to use their own mistakes to learn.

One thing is clear: at least from our experience, it is not common to find teachers who are not able to identify communication breakdowns in their classrooms. We usually seem able to point out when students need help producing language. Therefore, we believe it is possible to make this process more conscious and help teachers become better "helpers" and use scaffolding strategies in a more conscious and effective way. Walsh reminds us that "[t]iming and sensitivity to learner needs are of utmost importance and many teachers intervene too often or too early" (2002, p. 13). More than simply offering error correction, successful scaffolding "[...] requires the ability to listen actively and make economical use of language" (idem).

What constitutes scaffolding and how it is done in a productive manner might be blurred ideas for some teachers, because of the fine line mentioned in the previous paragraph. To clarify that, Walsh mentions a few examples that may help. Latched modeling, for instance, is when "[...] the teacher quickly models the language needed at the end of a previous turn" (WALSH, 2002, p. 13); another way of helping students is by offering alternative phrasing, when the teacher presents an alternative way of saying something, like a paraphrase; a third way of doing so is by prompting,

which is basically giving students a model to follow. The prompting strategy, we believe, is usually performed by the teacher, especially if we consider language teaching materials that use drills, for example, but it is not uncommon to find examples of students reminding classmates of a certain structure or pieces of vocabulary that must be used during an activity. Latched modeling and alternative phrasing, however, might be more commonly found in the discourse of both teachers and learners, since it can be even used as a confirmation check device or as a sign that interlocutors are making an effort to understand each other.[19]

In their classroom interaction examples, Walsh (2002) and Walsh and Li (2013) show how we can collect evidence of teacher and learner engagement in building discourse together, which resembles a conversation in any other context. To exemplify student engagement, Walsh (2002) mentions that learners self-selecting, overlapping, and latching samples are "[...] all features which are common to naturally occurring conversation and add further weight to the coincidence of language use and pedagogic purpose" (p. 13-14). Considering other examples in Walsh (2002), a distracted reader might think that the teacher-talking time (TTT) is too high and that the teacher is not offering students enough interactional "space for learning" (WALSH; LI, 2013; SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010), but we must remember that

> [...] the context of the L2 classroom is a constantly shifting one, that teachers and learners jointly construct the discourse structure of any one context and that teachers need to be well in tune with their teaching purpose and use language accordingly. (WALSH, 2002, p. 14)

Therefore, the author clarifies that "[h]igh and low TTT are, to a large extent, redundant under this view of context. What is more important is the appropriacy of language used in relation to the 'context of the moment' and task in hand" (WALSH, 2002, p. 14).

After presenting features that promote learning opportunities in the classroom, Walsh (2002) also brings examples of teacher actions that might hinder learner

---

[19] Ohta (2001) discusses and explains how socially-distributed cognition works in language classrooms. The author shows that, even when students are not directly involved in a classroom interaction, they might use this input (from scaffolding moments) to learn, which becomes evident in the uptake demonstrated by these students in future interactions.

engagement and, consequently, jeopardize the learning process. The first one mentioned by the author is turn completion, in which

> [...] latching [...] indicates that [...] [the] teacher is filling in the gaps, smoothing over the discourse in an effort to advance the discussion. [...] [In this case, the teacher] may be doing the learner a disservice as there is no negotiation of meaning, no need for clarification, no confirmation checks. There is a sense of the learner being 'fed the lines' instead of being allowed time and space to formulate her responses. (WALSH, 2002, p. 16)

The ideal situation would be to promote "[...] more student-student negotiation of meaning, [with the teacher] acting as an intermediary with the main purpose of keeping the channels open [...]" (idem, 2002, p. 18).

Walsh's experience with teacher education helps him notice that some teachers use "scaffolding", which means offering linguistic support, as a synonym for "completing student turns". While finishing each other's sentences is a common characteristic of conversational contexts, it should be carefully used in classroom discourse, because "[...] it limits the frequency and quality of student contributions, and minimizes learning opportunities as learners are not put in a position in which they have to clarify and reformulate their contribution in order to make meaning clear" (WALSH, 2002, p. 18). Despite agreeing with the author, we also believe that, in some cases, it is a matter of teacher discretion. It might be better to help a student and "fill in his or her gaps" when we notice that he or she "aimed too high" when trying to use a new or even unknown language structure or vocabulary, than to risk making the learner feel too embarrassed or frustrated and end up being quiet for feeling insecure.

When it comes to teacher echo[20], which is another "[...] commonly found phenomenon in any classroom, we understand that "[...] [it] may be used for good reasons: [such as] to amplify a student's contributions so that other learners can hear, for example" (WALSH, 2002, p. 18-19). It is, however, one more aspect that can possibly diminish learner engagement. As explained by Walsh, it may disrupt or even obstruct the natural flow of discourse, making the author suggest that it is "[...]

---

[20] Teacher echo occurs when the teacher repeats his/her own utterances or the contributions of the learners without a clear purpose (WALSH, 2006).

important for the teacher to know when and why they use echo and use it sparingly as it can very quickly become a habit with very little real function" (idem). It is clear to notice that, in some cases, teacher echo happens because teachers feel uncomfortable with silent moments and want to fill every single moment of the class with noise.

At this point, it seems relevant to mention the three-part IRF turn-taking structure presented by Walsh (2012, 2011, 2006, 2002), in which the cycle of teacher Initiation, learner Response, and teacher Feedback (IRF) is understood - and empirically confirmed in his studies - as the most common pattern of interaction in language classrooms. By recognizing this common model of classroom interaction, Walsh postulates that while it is a useful and expected way of organizing CDI, the IRF should not be the predominant pattern in such contexts, because it does not always promote chances of learning opportunities nor student participation. Unfortunately, it is not uncommon to find examples of language classrooms in which interactions are limited to the IRF structures and students are not encouraged to assume a more central role.

Following the same reasoning, teacher interruptions are also mentioned as actions that "[...] usually result in breakdown and can cause the student to lose the thread of what he or she is saying" (WALSH, 2002, p. 19). This happens mostly when teachers are not conscious enough or when they even forget about the pedagogic goal of a specific moment in the class and how it should be in accordance with their use of language. Using excerpts of classroom interaction in which the teacher keeps interrupting the oral production of a student, Walsh (2002, p. 19) mentions that,

> [h]ad the teacher simply waited and allowed the learner to finish her turn, the learner would have had an opportunity to produce a greater quantity of (possibly) more complex language. The teacher, by delaying her question for a very short time, would have increased opportunities for interactional adjustments and maximized opportunities for learning.

The examples presented by the author clarify the importance of understanding how the stated aims of every part of a lesson should be carefully combined with the use of language and with the interactional strategies used by language teachers to "orchestrate" (as put by BREEN, 1999 apud WALSH, 2011, p. 5) classroom

interactions. In the data collected for this research, a few similar examples were found and will be discussed with more attention to our teaching context in the Discussion Meetings Data Analysis section (Chapter 4). The discussion presented by Walsh (2002) was used as the basis for our RP experience, since it helped us understand that, in this learning context, where teachers keep interrupting students, "[l]earning potential would have been increased by a more judicious use of silence, by reducing or limiting teacher echo and by resisting the temptation to interrupt, unless absolutely necessary" (WALSH, 2002, p. 19).

Perhaps most of the aspects and concepts mentioned so far in this section could be synthesized into a bigger, more comprehensive concept presented by Seedhouse and Walsh (2010), in a chapter previously quoted in this text. The idea of Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC) "[...] focuses on the online decisions made by teachers and learners, and considers the extent to which these actions enhance learning and learning opportunity" (SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010, p. 139). According to the authors, it is possible to identify in classroom interactions examples of CIC, from both teachers and learners, which promote a closer understanding of how interaction can lead to L2 learning" (idem). As suggested, an "[...] enhanced CIC results in more learning-oriented interactions" (idem).

Based on a study by Kramsch (1986 apud SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010), who coined the concept of interactional competence, Seedhouse and Walsh (2010) also bring to the discussion the studies of Markee, who elaborates on the idea that "[...] interactional competence in a second language involves learners "'co-construct[ing] with their interlocutors locally enacted, progressively more accurate, fluent, and complex interactional repertoires in the L2'" (MARKEE, 2008, p. 3 apud SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010, p. 140). Based on the English Profile (2009 apud SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010), the authors justify their research interest with the belief that interactional competence will become the "fifth skill", what makes relevant the attempt to identify CIC features and how they influence learning. The remainder of this section is dedicated to present a few of these characteristics.

The first and maybe most important feature is the concept of space for learning, defined as

> [...] the extent to which teachers and learners provide interactional space which is appropriate for the specific pedagogical goal of the moment, [...] [acknowledging] the need to adjust linguistic and interactional patterns to the particular goal of the moment". (SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010, p. 140)

However, in order to promote the creation of such space,

> [...] teachers and learners [...] need to acquire a fine-grained understanding of what constitutes classroom interactional competence and how it might be achieved, [...] [resulting] in more engaged and dynamic interactions in classrooms, [and] also [enhancing] learning. (idem, p. 141)

Space for learning is, therefore, seen as a tool used by teachers to help students become an active part of the interactions that take place in the classroom.

Theoretically, this concept seems to be straightforward and easy to understand, but studies (WALSH; LI, 2013; SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010, among others) show that many details are included in it, and some of the ones we have previously discussed in this section are reviewed by the authors, under this bigger "umbrella term". For example, planning time (or increased/extended wait-time, cf. MANN; WALSH, 2013; SHAMSIPOUR; ALLAMI, 2012) seems simple, but classroom data usually shows teachers asking questions and giving students almost no time at all to sink in the question, think about their contribution and deliver it. Besides, this CIC approach also gives a great importance to studies[21] that show how difficult it is for some teachers to deal with silence in the classroom, and that it might lead to unnecessary teacher echo or to a constant need to "fill in quiet moments". Seedhouse and Walsh (2010) remind us that not allowing students enough time to think makes it more difficult for most of them to come up with what the authors call "extended learner turns", which are, in the end of the day, what we want every student to be able to produce. It is only by offering students enough "processing" time that "[...] they [will be] better able to contribute to the process of co-constructing meanings – something which lies at the very heart of learning through interaction" (idem, p. 141).

---

[21] See, for example, the work of Wong and Waring (2010), in which the authors discuss how silence can be interpreted in different cultures and how teachers should be ready to deal with it in a multicultural classroom, since it is an important issue to understand turn-taking.

Another aspect of teacher's CIC is the ability to shape learner contribution (SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010). As they say, "[...] by scaffolding, paraphrasing[22], reiterating and so on [...], a teacher is helping learners to say what they mean by using the most appropriate language to do so" (idem, p. 141). For example, seeking clarification is a tool that teachers could use to make their students reflect about what they are saying in a way that is less focused on language structure and more focused on content. By showing interest in understanding what a student is trying to say, even when there are inadequacies in terms of language structure or vocabulary, learners are given the chance to reformulate their contributions and to find new ways of paraphrasing themselves. What is interesting is that there are different ways of doing this, and teachers seeking to increase their own and their students' CIC could reflect about shaping learner contribution and use a mix of modelling, scaffolding, repairing learner input, so on and so forth, depending on the proficiency level of the students and on the learning outcomes expected from each part of a lesson.

In their examples, Seedhouse and Walsh (2010) discuss excerpts of classes in which teachers promote and inhibit learning opportunities, demonstrating, therefore, their CIC or their lack of awareness of CIC features. One example of good practice is the absence of repair, even when students made mistakes in their contributions. This was only possible because the teacher always had her learning objective in mind: she wanted to elicit the students' ideas and experiences and, to achieve that, she chose to ignore minor mistakes because "[...] error correction is not conducive to allowing learners to have space to express themselves" (SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010, p. 143). It is clear, from the authors' analysis of the excerpt, that, should students have made mistakes that would compromise the understanding of what they were trying to communicate, the teacher would have been ready to offer some sort of instant feedback while keeping the natural flow of the conversation.

The authors justify their belief by mentioning the fact that students' contributions were often followed by an expansion question from the teacher (such as "Why?") or by one of the "[...] several attempts to 'open the space' and allow for wider participation of other learners" (SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010, p. 143), promoting

---

[22] Jarvis and Robinson (1997 apud SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010, p. 141) came up with the term "appropriation", as "[...] a kind of paraphrasing which serves the dual function of checking meaning and moving the discourse forward".

longer and somewhat more complex learner turns. This questioning strategy results in students producing longer turns, therefore creating space for learning and, consequently, providing evidence of CIC on the part of the teacher (idem).

While, from the teacher's perspective, Seedhouse and Walsh (2010) mention features like extended wait-time (allowing students more time to think before responding), clarification requests (where the teacher can provide feedback to the student, clarify a possible confusing contribution to the rest of the class, and include other students in the conversation), minimal response tokens (which show students that they have the teacher's attention without interrupting the flow of the interaction), and content feedback (as a way of balancing the so characteristic asymmetrical roles performed by teacher and students in language classroom), the authors exemplify, on the other hand, how students can demonstrate CIC.

As they explain, students show their CIC when they provide an "[...] appropriate reaction to a question" (SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010, p. 145). In their example, using an extract from a classroom interaction, Seedhouse and Walsh mention that "[n]ot only does [the student in case] answer[s] the questions posed by the teacher, but he is able to recognise the precise type and amount of response needed, ensuring that his contributions are both relevant and timely" (idem). That is, according to the authors, evidence that the learner could grasp the goal of the teacher's questions, which were to allow students to talk about their experiences. Once more, the authors mention the idea that, "[...] while [the student's] responses are adequate and appropriate, they are certainly [in that case] not accurate; yet this is of little or no concern given the pedagogic focus of the moment, [...] [in which] accuracy is less important than the provision of that information" (p. 145). It clarifies the previously stated belief that the use of language made by the teachers must be in accordance with the pedagogical goal of the moment of the class in which the interaction occurs.

Besides this first student CIC characteristic related to being able to identify and comply with the goal of a certain moment in the class, Seedhouse and Walsh (2010) also mention a few other CIC features that can be identified in the discourse of students. According to them, we can consider evidence of student CIC: "[...] [the] ability to manage turns, hold the floor, and hand over his turn at a particular point in

the interaction [...], [and the ability to recognize] key signals which mark a transition relevance place [...], [always] [...] in line with what is required by the teacher" (idem, p. 145). This way, the authors defend CIC as a central point of learning in formal contexts, where "[...] teachers and learners, by making appropriate interactional choices through their online decision-making, both facilitate the co-construction of meaning and also display to each other their understandings" (idem).

What Seedhouse and Walsh (2010) present brings together the ideas of learning through interaction and of using a CA-based methodology to make it explicit and analyzable. In this context, CA, "[...] which focuses mainly on turn design, sequential organisation and repair" (SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010, p. 145), helps us understand what is going on in a certain interaction. As the authors believe, "[...] the two perspectives on classroom interaction advocated here (socially-distributed cognition and classroom interactional competence) offer a comprehensive approach to understanding and assessing learning in a formal, class-based context" (idem). This brought the authors to the conclusion that the CA's "[...] holistic portrayal of learning processes through interaction rather than the acquisition of discrete linguistic items [...]" allowed them to focus on the process and to see learning as "socially-distributed cognition rather than [the development of] [...] individual cognitive states" (idem, p. 146).

After briefly looking at all these discussions, we can say that the conclusions brought by Seedhouse and Walsh (2010) and by Walsh (2006, 2002) are useful to the context of this research, since they explain that:

- Understanding the correlation between appropriate language use and teaching aim (or pedagogic purpose) for language learning is extremely important to create a successful classroom environment, in which teachers can promote learning opportunities and in which students understand how to use them in a prolific way.
- Interactional adjustments (or what Walsh also calls "'shaping' learner contributions" (2006)) are a very important part of language classrooms and can be used to promote learning opportunities and to increase students' learning potential.

- Learning how to collect our own data and how to analyze it to modify our own verbal behavior in the classroom is a skill that we should focus more in our continuous professional development, just as much as the teachers use of language in the classroom should be deeply discussed in teacher education programmes, starting from pre-service trainings.

- There is still room for improvement when it comes to helping teachers understand the relevance of matching teacher talk, interactional strategies, and pedagogic purpose, so we can increase the chances of offering more effective learning opportunities to our students.

The CDI aspects presented in this section are an attempt to offer our initial RP enterprise a linguistic backdrop against which our analysis can be developed. Our goal is, again, to combine the RP framework, presented by Mann and Walsh (2017), with the studies on CDI presented in this section, so we can have a broader understanding of how classroom interactions are organized. However, RP and CDI do not offer us a way of collecting, transcribing and analyzing these classroom interactions, and that is when CA becomes extremely relevant in our study. The next section of this chapter is devoted, then, to discuss a few studies on CA and, more specifically, the application of these studies to SLA research.

2.3 ON CONVERSATION ANALYSIS FOR SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION (CA-FOR-SLA)

This section presents a short review of some authors who have been using CA as a tool to study CDI in a variety of educational contexts. It covers a few studies developed by authors like Seedhouse (2005), Kasper (2006), Ten Have (2007), Markee (2008), and Wong and Waring (2010). These researchers were chosen to be part of this study because of their contribution to a deeper understanding of the classroom context through an examination of the type of interaction that usually takes place in language classrooms. Besides that, we believe that their works complement one another and offer the basis for what we present in the analysis and discussion

session of this thesis. The work of Seedhouse (2005) functions as the backbone of this section.

Starting from the definition of CA presented by these authors, one can identify that, in general, they are similar throughout their works. In Seedhouse (2005, p. 165), for instance, CA is defined as "[...] a methodology for the analysis of naturally-occurring spoken interaction. It is a multi-disciplinary methodology which is now applied in a very wide range of professional and academic areas". The author focuses on how CA, Applied Linguistics, and SLA are related, and on how CA can contribute to the investigation of how learning takes place. Seedhouse briefly mentions the origin of CA, referring to the work of the sociologists Schegloff and Sacks (1973), to clarify the difference between what he calls a "CA mentality" - from the standpoint of Sociology - versus a "linguistics mentality". He explains that "CA's primary interest is in the social act whereas a linguist's primary interest is normally in language" (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 165).

Seedhouse (2005) also explains the aims and principles of CA, mentioning some key ideas like talk-in-interaction, the object of CA research, which can only be understood from an emic perspective, that is, from the point of view of the participants. Later on, we are going to explain how this emic perspective, an inheritance from the traditional CA studies, can be complemented with contextual information, in order to provide a more complex picture of the classroom context under scrutiny. Still related to that, Seedhouse brings the words of Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998, p. 14 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 165) to explain that, from this emic perspective, "[...] CA practitioners aim 'to discover how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns-at-talk, with a central focus on how sequences of action are generated'".

Another CA principle is the notion that "[...] contributions to interactions are CONTEXT-SHAPED and CONTEXT-RENEWING" (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 166, capital letters in the original), leading to the idea that turns-at-talk form adjacency pairs[23] which are "[...] part of the sequential environment in which a next contribution will occur" (idem). In the words of Heritage, one can understand that "'[t]he context of

---

[23] The concept of adjacency pair, according to Seedhouse (2005), is presented below, where the idea of preference is also briefly discussed.

a next action is repeatedly renewed with every current action', and it is transformable at any moment" (HERITAGE,1984b, p. 242 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 166). It clarifies why transcribing interactions is so complex, because they must be analyzed in every single step (or turn-at-talk) of an interaction if the conversation analyst wants to get the most out of it.

This second CA principle leads us to the third one mentioned by Seedhouse, which is the idea that "[...] no order of detail can be dismissed, a priori, as disorderly, accidental or irrelevant (HERITAGE, 1984b, p. 241 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 166; also CARROLL, 2004 apud KASPER, 2006). In other words, every detail matters, since the "[...] CA practitioners regard the recordings of naturally occurring interactions as the primary data" (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 166). It is from these recordings that transcripts will be produced to allow "[...] intensive analytic considerations by the analyst and other readers" (idem). However, while transcripts are complex to make and should be as complete as possible, they also must be readable. When thinking about CA and language learning, we must consider that not all language teachers are familiar with CA studies, and we do not believe that every language professional must be "trained" to transcribe nor learn a whole list of transcription symbols to make use of CA-for-SLA[24]. Therefore, it might be a challenge to offer CA-for-SLA as a CPD tool while not making it become one more burden for teachers.

The fourth and last CA principle mentioned by Seedhouse (2005) is the idea that "[...] analysis is bottom-up and data driven; we should not approach the data with any prior theoretical assumptions or assume that any background or contextual detail are relevant" (p. 167). Aspects like power, gender, race, etc. are considered "[...] only if and when close analysis reveals participants' orientation to such details" (idem). We believe it will become evident in our analysis that contextual details are usually relevant to allow us to paint a more complex picture of our PAL classroom context[25],

---

[24] The term CA-for-SLA (Conversation Analysis for Second Language Acquisition) was coined by Markee and Kasper (2004).
[25] See Excerpts 8, 9, and 12 for examples in which we believe it made sense to complement an emic perspective, from a CA approach, with contextual information related to power relations between the professor and the researcher.

and, as our analysis will show, we tried to stick to the essential question of CA, which is "Why that, in that way, right now?" (idem).

Seedhouse moves on to talk about a few details related to CA features, like adjacency pairs (pairs of utterances in which the second one becomes conditionally relevant in relation to the first one), preference (related to the idea of affiliation/disaffiliation to a certain action, usually to avoid conflicts). A first part of an adjacency pair can be combined with a preferred action (like accepting an invitation - using the example provided by the author), or by a dispreferred action (declining an invitation, for instance), usually preceded by a hesitation or a discourse marker. Therefore, "[...] preferred responses to actions are AFFILIATIVE and conducive to social solidarity, whereas dispreferred responses are DISAFFILIATIVE" (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 167 - capital letters in the original).

Turn taking is also a major feature of study in CA, and to understand how it works, it is mandatory to understand how turn-constitutional units (TCUs) and transition relevant places (TRPs) work. According to Wong and Waring (2010, p. 16), a TCU is "[...] a word, a phrase, a clause, or a sentence that completes a communicative act" while a TRP is "[...] where actual turn transitions are most likely to occur" (idem, p. 19)[26]. Seedhouse explains that,

> [a]t a TRP, the norms governing transition of speakers come into play. Overlap occurs for a number of reasons and in a number of ways. The system of turn-taking is normative, so speakers may choose to perform specific social actions 'by reference to one-party-at-a-time, even though they are realized through designedly simultaneous talk' (Schegloff, 2000a, p. 48). Overlap, then, may be designedly used to intensify the affiliative of disaffiliative nature of particular social actions. In institutional settings, the organization of turn-taking is constrained and related to the institutional goal, and this is the case in language classroom interaction. (MARKEE, 2000; SEEDHOUSE, 2004 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 168)

The last feature of CA mentioned by the author is repair, "[...] which comes into play whenever there are problems in the accomplishment of talk and may be defined as the treatment of trouble occurring in interactive language use" (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 168). Wong and Waring (2010, p. 212), think of it as "repair practices", as the "[...] ways of addressing problems in speaking, hearing, or understanding of the

---

[26] See Wong and Warring (2010) for a full discussion on turn taking in classroom contexts.

talk". Bringing the discussion to the classroom context, and leaning on his 2004 study, Seedhouse reminds us that "[i]t is of particular importance for L2 learners and teachers to understand how breakdowns in communication and misunderstandings are repaired, as repair in the L2 classroom tends to carry a heavier load than in other settings" (SEEDHOUSE, 2004 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 168).[27]

After providing a short introduction of CA and its relationship with Applied Linguistics, Seedhouse (2005) presents some possibilities of "CA-informed research" (p. 168) in a few Applied Linguistics areas. From a range of options, we decided to focus more specifically on what the author has to say about language classroom interaction and about teaching languages for specific purposes. With our PAL context in mind, we can say that, despite the fact that "[t]here is currently growing interest within the field of Applied Linguistics in CA methodology", as stated by Seedhouse (2005, p. 168), there is still a relatively small number of published papers in the area of PAL in which researchers apply CA methodology to explore features of CDI. In an even more specific context, we also had difficulties in finding materials and research papers focused on teaching PAL for Academic Purposes.[28]

Even though Seedhouse (2005) does not mention teaching language for academic purposes, we believe that it is possible to use his considerations related to teaching language for specific purposes (LSP), since we understand that the goals of these two areas are, according to what he presents and to what we notice as relevant to our context, similar. LSP, then, "[...] can be informed by CA research on institutional or professional discourse" (p. 169). Using Jacoby's studies, Seedhouse explains that "[...] LSP teachers have to prepare students to carry out spoken professional communication in a second language" (JACOBY, 1998a, p. 1 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 169), which is also one of the goals mentioned in the

---

[27] The discussions on repair come from the seminal work of Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977); Silva, Andrade and Osterman (2009) offer an introduction to CA, in Portuguese, where these aspects are also discussed; Wong and Waring (2010) also offer a comprehensive discussion on repair in the language teaching context.

[28] Seedhouse mentions that studies of L2 classroom interactions are predominantly related to EFL/ESL teaching. The author presents a list of studies featuring other languages, but none of them is regarding Portuguese. However, as the author says, "[i]t is to be hoped that this trend will continue and that data from an increasing range of target languages will be published" (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 173).

syllabus of the course we analyze in this research. Jacoby, when suggesting how to apply CA in the classroom, mentions some

> [...] ways of exploiting discoursal data in the classroom:
> - Extract pedagogical content and criteria for communicative success from the data;
> - Bring in data samples to class for the students to observe, analyse and appreciate;
> - Compare commercial LSP teaching materials with the reality observable in the data;
> - Research findings may also feed into LSP curriculum, materials and assessment design.
>
> (JACOBY, 1998b, p. 9 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 169)

Jacoby's suggestions are interesting because they apply CA methodology to classroom activities, and not only to teacher education processes, and we believe it might be a fruitful way of raising students' awareness on how communication happens and how meanings are built in interaction.

When it comes to language classroom interaction, Seedhouse uses his own previous work, from 2004, to explain the organization of L2 classroom. Using data from different classrooms around the world, he defends that

> there is a reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction in the L2 classroom, and that this relationship is the foundation of its context-free architecture. This relationship means that, as the pedagogical focus varies, so the organization of the interaction varies. However, this also means that the L2 classroom has its own interactional organisation which transforms intended pedagogy into actual pedagogy". (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 172)

Like other researchers who also study the subject (WALSH, 2002 and 2006, for example), Seedhouse understands the classroom as "[...] a complex, fluid, dynamic and variable interactional environment and provides concrete examples of how CA methodology can be applied to an issue of interest to language teachers and applied linguists" (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 172).

Before categorizing the application of CA to second language teaching and research into three different approaches, Seedhouse goes back in time again and says that "[...] CA itself only emerged in the 1960s, had no connection with learning, and in its genesis dealt exclusively with monolingual English data" (idem, p. 174). According to him, it was only in the 2000s that studies linking CA to language

learning emerged, and more publications started to appear. Using Gass's words, Seedhouse explains that, despite presenting varied approaches, these emerging studies had the "[...] use of microanalysis of transcripts of classroom interaction" in common (GASS, 2004, p. 551 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 174).

Identifying three distinct approaches to the application of CA studies to the field of language teaching and learning, Seedhouse (2005) classifies them into three strands: Ethnomethodological CA Approach; Sociocultural Theory Approach to CA; and Linguistic CA Approach. The Ethnomethodological CA approach is the classic CA approach, focused on describing institutional practices and their adaptations for specific tasks. It is "[...] neutral and agnostic in relation to learning theories and teaching methods and reveals an emic perspective" (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 175).

The Linguistic CA Approach[29], on the other hand, focuses on

> [...] interactional organisations or constructs which have been revealed by CA analysis [and which] are treated as 'decontextualized coding categories' (Wagner, 1996, p. 231) and employed in linguistic or psycholinguistic SLA studies, typically within a quantitative paradigm. (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 175)

The Sociocultural Theory Approach to CA, however, is what we consider the most relevant to the context of this research, not only because of its characteristics, but also because it matches the basis of Reflective Practice presented by Mann and Walsh (2017). Besides that, it is also "[...] compatible with the sociocultural theory school of SLA [...] and is now becoming known as CA-for-SLA" (MARKEE, 2000 in SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 179). According to Seedhouse, this approach has been "[...] currently attracting a great deal of interest as it has the potential to offer a systematic approach of how to study the process of second language learning" (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 175). As stated, it uses "[...] CA techniques as methodological tools that are in the service of different sociocultural theories of learning" (MARKEE; KASPER, 2004, p. 495 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2004, p. 175). Mondada and Pekarek Doehler

---

[29] Seedhouse (2005) uses his previous work from 2004 to explain that Linguistic CA is currently quite different from Ethnomethodological CA. He criticizes the use of CA methodology without the proper use of "[...] ethnomethodological principles and the dimension of social action [...], turning it into a "[...] description of superficial linguistic features rather than an analysis of the social action which is accomplished by the deployment of linguistic resources" (2005, p. 176). He defends that Linguistic CA should be seen not as a completely different approach, but as an "[...] amalgamation of CA constructs and a linguistic mentality" (idem).

approximate the Sociocultural Theory Approach to CA and the Socio-Interactionist perspective, when saying that "[...] these frameworks converge in insisting on the central role of contextually embedded communicative processes in the accomplishment of human actions and identities as well as of social facts" (MONDADA; PEKAREK DOEHLER, 2004, p. 504 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2004, p. 175).

Still leaning on the work of Mondada and Pekarek Doehler, Seedhouse explains that "[t]hey apply to their data the notion of situated learning, 'according to which learning is rooted in the learner's participation in social practice and continuous adaptation to the unfolding circumstances and activities that constitute talk-in-interaction'" (MONDADA; PEKAREK DOEHLER, 2004, p. 501 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 175). On the same path, Brouwer and Wagner (2004 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 175) see learning as a social rather than an individual process. As Seedhouse understands, "[t]hey propose [...] to focus on the development of interactional skills and resources [...]", because 'learning is situated; learning is social; and knowledge is located in communities of practice" (BROWER; WAGNER, 2004, p. 33 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 175). Seedhouse helps us to understand, then, that "Sociocultural theory is a learning theory and CA is an empirical research methodology" (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 175).

Seedhouse's work is not only important because of its presentation of a historical perspective of CA studies and how they were applied to language teaching and learning research, but also because he presents a detailed example of a CA-based analysis of language learning processes[30]. The author divides his analysis into three stages, and in each of these stages the analyst must answer one question (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 177):

1. [W]hat can we say about the learner's actual developmental level or current ability in L2?
2. [W]hat can we say about the learning environment in terms of input to the language learning process and facilitation of upgrading as a result of the interaction?

---

[30] For space reasons, a more detailed discussion of Seedhouse's analysis will not be presented here. However, we strongly suggest those interested in his work to see the item 4.5 in his article (2005).

3. [H]ow does the process of instructed L2 learning progress?

When answering these three questions, we understand that the analyst must be able to assess the students' ability to co-construct meaning in the interaction with the teacher and with other learners (Question 1). Using Walsh's concept of CIC, the analyst must be able to identify evidence of CIC on the part of the students and use it in his or her analysis. Regarding Question 2, Seedhouse explains that the pedagogic goals of the lesson must be carefully considered and that the way the teacher promotes positive affect and motivation are of utmost importance. He justifies his position in relation to motivation by saying that, when a teacher shows interest in what students have to say, it is possible to negotiate meaning, include other learners in the interaction, and help them follow the topic of discussion.

Using Ohta's definition of Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which says that "'[f]or the L2 learner, the ZPD is the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by individual linguistic production, and the level of potential development as determined through language produced collaboratively with a teacher or peer'" (OHTA, 2001, p. 9 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 177), Seedhouse explains that, in Question 2, the analyst must be able to spot "[...] evidence [...] of learner noticing and uptake of the embedded correction/scaffolding/recast [...]" (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 177). One possible way of identifying such evidence is by using CA methodology, since its "[...] contribution is to show how learning is constructed by the use of interactional resources and to explicate the progress of their learning and their socially-distributed cognition or intersubjectivity [...]" (idem). According to his previous study, "[...] CA is able to explicate the reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction and hence how learning takes place through the interaction" (SEEDHOUSE, 2004 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 177).

When it comes to his Question 3, Seedhouse goes back again to his 2004 work to bring up his concept of a canonical L2 classroom structure (introduction of the pedagogical focus by the teacher, production of language forms and ways of interaction by the students followed by the evaluation of the learners' productions by the teacher…) (SEEDHOUSE, 2004 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005). As he explains, when analyzing classroom interactions, "[...] we have access to the same emic

perspective of the learning process in interaction to which the teacher has access. CA, then, gives access to socially-distributed language learning processes" (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 178). CA gives us only this possibility of observing evidence of learning that is available in the interactions, because, as Schegloff (1991 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 178) explains, "[...] CA does not claim to be able to establish the cognitive state of individuals in isolation. What it is able to portray and explicate, however, is the progress of intersubjectivity or socially-distributed cognition". Therefore, when applied to SLA, CA "[...] not only demonstrates WHAT understandings the interactants display to each other, but also HOW they do so by normative reference to the interactional organisations" (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 178), that is, it is an emic perspective because "[...] we gain access to their displays of understanding to each other in the same way that they gain this access, i.e. by reference to the interactional organisations" (idem).

The relevance of CA to language teaching and learning becomes even clearer when we consider that "[...] any utterance is a document on many levels" (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 178) and "[...] that L2 classroom interaction in particular operates on a number of levels simultaneously" (SEEDHOUSE, 2004 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 178). According to the author, an utterance in this context displays

> [...] the learner's analysis of the prior utterance [...]; it performs a social action in response and [...] positions the learner in a social system; [...] [i]t displays an understanding of the current context (sequential, social and L2 classroom context) and also renews it; It documents the learner's cognitive, emotional and attitudinal states; [...] In the specific case of the L2 classroom, the learner's utterance may in addition be delivered in the L2 and may thereby document his/her actual developmental level as well. (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 178)

We agree with Seedhouse when he defends that we must be careful and understand that, as mentioned above,

> [t]his is not to suggest that this provides anything like the whole picture, nor that the methods employed by SLA and psychology are not useful in portraying other aspects of the full picture in relation to cognition. The point to be made, however, is that CA is able to make a major contribution to the SLA project in terms of the portrayal of socially-distributed cognition. (MARKEE, 2000, p. 3 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 178).

One last aspect we would like to include in this section is Seedhouse's consideration regarding CA as a methodology for social sciences research. The author defends that, when considering CA's methods and concepts, one must understand how to explain its validity, reliability, generalizability, epistemology, and quantification. Because of its emic perspective, CA is forced to be "[...] radically different from research methodologies operating in an etic perspective" (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 180).

Using Peräkylä (1997) and ten Have (1999), Seedhouse explains that reliability is related to "[...] the selection of what is recorded, the technical quality of recordings and the adequacy of transcripts (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 179). Still related to that, Bryman (2001 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 179) puts repeatable or replicable as characteristics of a reliable CA study. These authors affirm that "[...] because CA studies [...] display their analyses, they make transparent the process of analysis for the reader. [Therefore, they] "[...] are rendered repeatable and replicable to the reader in so far as this is possible" (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 179).

In terms of validity, Bryman (2001 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 180) divides it into internal or external and ecological. Internal validity refers to how sound, integral and credible the findings are. In other words, the analyst must be able to show how his or her data proves what he or she is saying. However, from the emic perspective of CA, how do we know what is the participant's perspective? As mentioned before, "[...] any utterance is a document on many levels" (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 178) and

> [b]ecause the participants document their social actions to each other in the details of the interaction by normative reference to the interactional organizations [...], [w]e, as analysts, can access the emic perspective in the details of the interaction and by reference to those same organizations. Clearly, the details of the interaction themselves provide the only justification for claiming to be able to develop an emic perspective. Therefore, CA practitioners make no claims beyond what is demonstrated by the interactional detail without destroying the emic perspective and hence the whole internal validity of the enterprise. (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 180)

External validity, in its turn, is related to generalizability, which means that, in terms of CA studies applied to SLA, "[...] by analysing individual instances, the machinery which produces these individual instances is revealed" (idem). Using an

example from his previous work, Seedhouse (SEEDHOUSE, 2004 apud, 2005, p. 180)

> [...] suggests that reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction is a generalizable, indeed, universal feature of L2 classroom interaction because it relates directly to the institutional goal, which is always the same wherever L2 classroom interaction is taking place.

In terms of epistemology, ethnomethodology is the basis of CA (SEEDHOUSE 2004 apud SEEDHOUSE 2005). According to Bryman, (2001, p. 14 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 180), "'it is the job of the social scientist [in this case, the CA analyst] to gain access to people's 'common-sense thinking' and hence to interpret their actions and their social world from their point of view'". Regarding quantification, some authors understand that it is not seen as a central aspect in CA (SCHEGLOFF, 1993; SEEDHOUSE, 2005, for example), but, as mentioned by Heritage (1999, p. 70 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 180), there is the "[...] likelihood that CA will become more quantitative during the next period of its development and identifies [...] a number of possible uses for statistics in CA".

The studies developed by Seedhouse are extremely relevant to this research. To conclude this section, we would like to briefly mention a few other studies, both book-length and articles, from researchers who have been developing their studies in CA-for-SLA, in an attempt to humbly insert our study in a broader picture of other works that inspire our own. We learn from Seedhouse that "[...] it is a safe assumption [that CA studies] will examine a wider range of languages being learnt and taught in a wider range of teaching and learning contexts" (2005, p. 181). However, to the best of our knowledge, regarding PAL teacher education, we can still agree with Seedhouse when he mentions that "[...] the potential of CA has only recently started to be explored, particularly in relation to teacher training, LSP/ESP, materials design and code-switching" (idem). With a bigger contribution of CA to the SLA area of study, we believe that the concept of learning a second language will no longer be related to "'[...] the acquisition of formal elements'", but understood "'[...] in terms of increasing interactional complexity in language encounters'", so "'[...] we can explain [the learner's] progress in terms of interactional resources and how they are

employed in the interaction in collaboration with [his/her] conversation partner'" (BROUWER; WAGNER, 2004, p. 45 apud SEEDHOUSE, 2005, p. 181).

The first book-length work we would like to mention here is Paul ten Have's *Doing Conversation Analysis: a practical guide* (2007). In this book, the author presents a thorough review on the origins of the area, from the definition of its scope to the current trends of CA research in a variety of fields of study. The second part of his book is dedicated to all the steps involved in producing data, from the very first ones - like choosing a research design, deciding between audio or video recordings, getting consent from subjects, dealing with social and technical issues - to the ones related to preparing data for analysis - like transcribing talk-in-interaction, including basic elements of transcript files, using softwares to simplify the process, etc. The next part of the book deals with data analysis, in which ten Have shows us how to start the entire process, how to choose and deal with fragments of data, how to run collaborative data analysis sessions, and how to present this data after the analysis phase is over. In the fourth and last part of his book, the author brings to the discussion a few examples of what he calls "applied CA". He begins with the distinction between "pure" and "applied" CA, leading to a short discussion on the differences between ordinary conversations and institutional interactions. Even though he does not dedicate any specific sections to the discussion of CDI, his work is still extremely useful for this research because it presents the basics of CA in a clear, objective and didactic way.

A second book-length work we would like to briefly mention here is Wong and Waring's (2010) *Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy: A Guide for ESL/EFL Teachers*. We mention this book because we believe that teachers interested in using CA-for-SLA in their PAL careers would benefit from the authors' work in order to complement their initial studies on CA, either from ten Have's book or from any other introduction to CA. The way we see it, these two books can somehow complement each other, being the first one more focused on CA itself and the second one more focused on using CA to improve our understanding of CDI features.

Wong and Waring's work (2010) is focused on teaching oral production. Starting with a discussion about interactional practices and teaching conversation,

the authors explain how a deeper understanding of CA can help teachers promote better opportunities for learners to develop their interactional competence. Following, they discuss turn-taking practices and guide readers on a discussion that becomes gradually complex as they depart from the idea of basic sequencing practices to more elaborate structures of topic management and story-telling. Their next two chapters are dedicated to a recurrent topic in CA studies, which are conversation openings and closings, followed by another recurrent topic, which is repair. Wong and Waring close their book with a chapter dedicated to demonstrating how CA can contribute to a better and clearer organization of classroom instructions, since it offers teachers a closer look into their own use of language in the classroom. Their work is relevant for teachers who are starting their investigations in the area of CA-for-SLA because they include, in every single chapter, a session on how to teach the topic discussed in that chapter, bringing theory and practice together.

As examples of articles in which the authors show their actual application of CA methodology to language teaching and learning research, we would like to mention two studies: Kasper (2006) and Markee (2008). Gabriele Kasper's article *Conversation Analysis as an Approach to SLA* sees CA as a tool that allows teachers to understand how learning opportunities in L2 emerge in different interactional activities. Her point of view, using CA, puts L2 learning in a position of both object and process to be studied, leading to changes in how we understand concepts largely discussed in SLA studies, like fluency, feedback strategies and interaction patterns.

Just like Seedhouse (2005), Kasper (2006) also sees learning as a social practice that takes place in interaction with others. She also sees CA as a tool with very specific epistemology and methodology, which allows its practitioners to investigate social practices from a unique (emic) perspective. Kasper's point of view becomes clear when she uses Hutchby and Wooffitt's words and states that CA's goal is to explain "[...] how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns-at-talk, with a central focus on how sequences are generated" (HUTCHBY; WOOFFITT, 1998, p. 14 apud KASPER, 2006, p. 83). What is different in her work is that she starts the discussion by using Hutchby and Wooffitt's idea of revealing "[...] the tacit reasoning procedures and *sociolinguistic competencies* underlying the

production and interpretation of talk in organized sequences of interaction" (idem, emphasis added), while we could notice that other authors (like SEEDHOUSE, 2005; TEN HAVE, 2007; WONG; WARING, 2010, for example) usually call it *interactional competence*. Only later in her article she explains that "[i]n second language research, these [sociolinguistic] competencies are now standardly referred to as "interactional competence" [...]" (KASPER, 2006, p. 86).

Kasper (2006) used the works of He and Young (1998) and Young and Miller (2004) to list some of these L2 learners' interactional competencies, like the ability to

> [...] understand and produce social actions in their sequential contexts; to take turns-at-talk in an organized fashion; to format actions and turns, and construct epistemic and affective stance [...]; to repair problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding; to co-construct social and discursive identities through sequence organization, actions-in-interaction and semiotic resources [...]; to recognize and produce boundaries between activities, including transitions from states of contact to absence of contact (interactional openings [...] [and] closings [...], and transitions between activities during continued contact [...]". (KASPER, 2006, p. 86)

All these abilities are seen by the author as relevant to an L2 classroom context, and it is easy to establish similarities between these features and the ones mentioned in the concept of CIC, presented by Walsh (2012, 2011) and by Seedhouse and Walsh (2010).

Another relevant contribution of Kasper's work is the discussion on the concept of cognition used in CA. She affirms that, due to its ethnomethodological origins, in the studies of Garfinkel (1967) and Heritage (1984), for example, cognition is not seen as an internal process anymore, but as a socially-distributed process among the participants of a certain interaction. As Kasper explains, "[i]n the process of jointly constructing meaning in sequentially organized talk exchanges, participants make their understandings available to each other, and hence to the analyst" (2006, p. 84). This view has the potential to change the way we, as language teachers, conceptualize fluency, for instance.

On the emic perspective, Kasper mentions a previous work of hers with Numa Markee (MARKEE; KASPER, 2004) and also refers to ten Have's book (1999, a previous edition of TEN HAVE (2007), mentioned above in this chapter). She presents similar aspects to what Seedhouse (2005) explains on this matter, when

she says that "[...] the analyst must not ascribe to social actors cognitive and affective states and processes, including motivations, beliefs and intentions, unless the participants' interactional conduct warrants such inferences" (KASPER, 2006, p. 84). She mentions that "[...] intrapsychological states and processes fall outside of CA's analytical scope" (idem), which is also in line with what Seedhouse (2005) understands.

When talking about CA's history, the author uses Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) and ten Have (1999) as examples of books in which interested readers can find extensive introductions to the area. Kasper mentions that "[...] CA as an approach in second language research, and specifically to SLA, is of more recent origin" (2006, p. 85), dating from the 1990s, with important works published in the middle of the decade (MARKEE, 1994; WAGNER, 1996; FIRTH; WAGNER, 1997), and reaching more international attention after the 2000s (GARDNER; WAGNER, 2004; LAZARATON, 2002; MARKEE, 2000; RICHARDS; SEEDHOUSE, 2005; SEEDHOUSE, 2004). A relevant point made by Kasper (2006) is that, differently from the "classic" CA studies (cf. TEN HAVE, 1999), featuring native speakers interacting in their L1, "[m]uch of this literature [in "applied" CA] examines interactions involving nonnative speakers in such institutional settings as L2 classrooms [...] and language proficiency interviews [...]" (KASPER, 2006, p. 85).

As Wong and Warring (2010) also brought up, Kasper (2006) believes that this CA-based approach to study L2 CDI offers teachers the chance to reassess their understandings on broadly known and discussed interactional practices. As examples, Kasper takes from Koshik's studies (2002 apud KASPER, 2006, p. 86; also mentioned in MARKEE, 2008) the idea of "designedly incomplete utterances", a common characteristic of language teachers discourse used as a strategy of error correction, that most teachers use without even noticing, and the "zones of interactional transition" (MARKEE, 2004 apud KASPER, 2006, p. 86), which are the "[...] boundary talk between differently organized activities in language classrooms". As we can see, this does not mean that CA-for-SLA solves all the possible problems a teacher may face in his or her classroom, but it is a powerful tool in helping them achieve a deeper understanding of their own teaching actions.

Kasper also discusses Wong's works (2000, 2004), in which the author identifies that inter-turn gaps in interactions between L1 and L2 speakers "[...] did not seem to project a dispreferred action. Rather, delays prior to an L2 speaker's turn appeared to afford the speaker time to recycle the co-participant's preceding turn and reassess her understanding of that turn" (WONG, 2000 apud KASPER, 2006, p. 88). According to Wong, "[d]elays prior to an L1 speaker's turn appeared to be related to the linguistic format of the L2 speaker's preceding turn. Specifically, the use of less idiomatic constructions made it more difficult for the L1 recipient to project how the L2 speaker's turn in progress was going to be completed" (WONG, 2004 apud KASPER, 2008, p. 88). Also using the work of Gardner (2004) on this matter, Kasper explains that, in such interactions "[...] the co-participants' engaged various forms of delay as a resource that enabled them to achieve mutual understanding and affiliation at specific moments in their ongoing conversations" (GARDNER, 2004 apud KASPER, 2006, p. 88). Therefore, we can see that the author tries to call our attention to the fact that, while in interactions where the subjects share the same L1, delays usually indicate a problem in communication or a dispreferred act, in interactions where speakers do not share the same L1, that may not be the case, and the language teacher should be aware of it.

As we mentioned above, the idea of "fluency" from the perspective of CA is different from the one presented by studies in psycholinguistics, for example. As Kasper explains, "[f]rom a psycholinguistic perspective, pauses, perturbations, restarts and related temporal phenomena are seen as evidence of difficulties in speech production and have been theorized as such [...]", and the problem is that this view "[...] does not entertain the possibility that perturbations in speech may be interactionally occasioned and that dysfluencies may even accomplish critical interactional work" (KASPER, 2006, p. 88). In order to complement this idea, Kasper brings Carroll's (2004) example, in which the author shows that "[...] novice L2 speakers may be skillfully constructing participation frameworks through their seemingly dysfluent turns" (CARROLL, 2004 apud KASPER, 2006, p. 88-89).[31] Once

---

[31] Markee (2008) presents a similar explanation to Kasper's (2006) on how pauses can be interpreted in ordinary conversations and in classroom contexts. According to him, in ordinary conversations, "[w]henever next speakers make contributions to the unfolding talk, they typically do so without pauses, silences, or overlaps [...]. When such behaviors do occur [...], they often presage trouble that

more, these discussions may change the way teachers understand concepts that have long been discussed in their education and practice.

Kasper recognizes the important fact that CA allowed us to take a closer look at interaction form a different perspective, but she also points to a possible gap in it: "[...] it does not provide a theory of how interactional competence is acquired and how it develops over time" (2006, p. 91), as mentioned by many researchers who use CA (see KASPER, 2006, for a full list of authors who have discussed this matter). She concluded that, in general, authors facing this issue chose to either link "[...] CA with compatible learning theories, or [extend] the scope of CA itself from socially-distributed cognition to socially-distributed learning" (SEEDHOUSE, 2004 apud KASPER, 2006, p. 91). It allows us to conclude that CA, when applied to SLA studies, tends to be used more as a methodology that needs to be combined with another theoretical approach, in order to be able to explain the phenomena that emerge from the data, leading the researcher to come up with possible explanations on how the acquisition or development of interactional competence happens.

Still on that matter, Kasper (2006), just like other researchers we have already mentioned in this section, presents a link between the CA and the Vygotskian Sociocultural Theory. Besides that, she also uses the idea of "situated learning" (LAVE; WENGER, 1991 apud KASPER, 2006, p. 91). Using Mondada and Pekarek Doehler's study, she explains that a "SCT's epistemological focus on the development of mind brings a number of theoretical resources to complement CA's emphasis on the accomplishment of order in interaction" (MONDADA; PEKAREK DOEHLER, 2004 apud KASPER, 2006, p. 91). The SCT's components are "[...] the critical role of mediation through language and other tools in higher cognitive functioning, and a stance on cognition as situated in and developed through social interaction in cultural, institutional and historical contexts" (KASPER, 2006, p. 91).

From this combination of CA and SCT emerges a remodeled understanding of "learning a language", in which it

---

needs to be repaired" (MARKEE, 2008, p. 407). On the other hand, in classroom interactions, "[...] these perturbations also frequently occur in the environment of 'points of maximum grammatical control'" (SCHEGLOFF, 1996, p. 93 apud MARKEE, 2008, p. 407), and, therefore, signpost a different process, and must be interpreted from a different perspective.

(…) essentially means learning how to deal with contextualized, interactionally oriented discourse activities. (…) More specifically, language learning is rooted in learners' participation in organizing talk-in-interaction, structuring participation frameworks, configuring discourse tasks, interactionally defining identities, and becoming competent members of the community (or communities) in which they participate. (MONDADA; PEKAREK DOEHLER, 2004, p. 504 apud KASPER, 2006, p. 91)

Such idea of learning can be demonstrated, according to Seedhouse (2004, p. 242 apud KASPER, 2006, p. 92), because it is through CA that it is possible to show "[...] how teachers and students 'talk the ZPD into being' in the organization of interaction". All these discussions led Kasper to conclude that it is only "[...] by engaging CA and language socialization as complementary approaches [that] SLA researchers are afforded a powerful perspective on SLA as social practice" (KASPER, 2006, p. 92).

Another example of author who focuses on applying CA-for-SLA is Markee, in his 2008 article *Toward a Learning Behavior Tracking Methodology for CA-for-SLA*. He proposes a longitudinal study in which he exemplifies "[...] how a longitudinal learning behavior tracking (LBT) methodology for CA-for-SLA works" (p. 404). This LBT is subdivided into two other concepts: Learning Object Tracking (LOT) and Learning Process Tracking (LPT). As the author explains, the "LOT involves tracking when participants deploy potential learning objects within a single conversation and in subsequent speech events", therefore, it "[...] attempts to document when a learning object occurs during a particular time period" (MARKEE, 2008, p. 404). LPT, in its turn, "[...] involves carrying out conversation analyses of participants' emerging grammar to understand how they orient to learning objects as resources for doing language learning behaviors that occur both in the moment and over time", therefore, its focus is "[...] to demonstrate how participants engage in language learning behavior" (idem).

Markee brings examples of studies in which other authors showed change in students' language learning behavior over time, but he criticizes the fact that "[...] none of these papers analyzes how members orient to language behavior that has occurred days or even months earlier as a resource for learning during a subsequent speech event" (MARKEE, 2008, p. 409). His idea was, then, to use LBT to conduct a study that does this. As we will show in our analysis, our focus was never to

concentrate our efforts in one specific learning object[32], but discuss how conducting an RP experience can affect our understanding of CDI features and, therefore, improve our teaching practices with the group of PAL which was chosen for this study. Even though Markee's longitudinal study is not exactly what we attempt to do in this research, his reflections are still useful, as we hope to make clear in the next few paragraphs.

One of the most relevant contributions of his article is the view presented by Markee on the emic perspective of CA studies. He is on board with other authors when he says that the goal of CA-for-SLA is not to make generalizations, but to show "[...] how participants analyze each other's real time conversational practices to achieve particular social actions [...] that occur naturally during talk-in-interaction" (MARKEE, 2008, p. 405). However, Markee goes beyond that when he poses the question: "If CA does not permit us to invoke *a priori* etic SLA theories in our analyses, how can we say anything useful about SLA issues?" (idem). To solve that, he presents three possible solutions:

1. Based on Young and Miller (2004 apud MARKEE, 2008, p. 405), the first possible solution is to ignore the emic perspective and use an a priori theoretical framework, turning CA techniques into a methodology solely focused on analyzing turn taking - although ignoring repair. Despite its contribution, Markee sees it as "[...] incompatible with CA-for-SLA" (2008, p. 405), because while turn taking is essential to the construction of sequences in interaction, "[...] repair is omnipresent in all talk" (SCHEGLOFF et al. 1977 apud MARKEE, 2008, p. 405). Therefore, Markee understands that "[...] models of interactional competence that do not treat turn taking, repair, and sequence organization as integrated practices are flawed" (MARKEE, 2008, p. 405).

2. Based on Mondada and Pekarek Doehler (2004 apud MARKEE, 2008, p. 405), the second possibility considers turn taking, repair, and sequence organization as elements that cannot be analyzed separately. However, "[...] it also invokes an a *priori* sociocultural or language socialization theories to

---

[32] As far as we can understand, Markee's idea of learning object can refer to the teaching and learning process a specific grammar structure, a piece of vocabulary, a pronunciation issue, etc.

make up for CA's alleged inability to theorize learning (KASPER 2006 apud MARKEE, 2008, p. 405), just like the first one mentioned before.

3. The third solution presented by Markee is the one he decides to go with, because it is based on the unmotivated look preconized by classic CA studies and because it is based on Schegloff's work (1989) when it comes to "[...] how participants accomplish socially-distributed cognition as behavior" (MARKEE, 2008, p. 405).

From his choice, we can understand how Markee sees interactional competence. In his words,

> [d]eveloping interactional competence in a second language includes but goes beyond learning language as a formal system [...]. It involves learners orienting to different semiotic systems—the turn taking, repair, and sequence organizations that underlie all talk-in-interaction, combined with the co-occurrent organization of eye gaze and embodied actions—and deploying these intersubjective resources to co-construct with their interlocutors locally enacted, progressively more accurate, fluent, and complex interactional repertoires in the L2. (MARKEE, 2008, p. 406)

Therefore, as other studies in CA-for-SLA also do, learners are considered "[...] highly knowledgeable social actors/learners [...]", differently from the learner view from the "deficit model" of language learning (GARDNER; WAGNER, 2004 apud MARKEE, 2008, p. 406). It is this view that allows us, according to Markee, to look at mainstream issues in SLA from a different perspective, like "[...] whether, and if so how, participants use transfer from the L1 to the L2 as they deploy turn taking, repair and sequential practices; and [...] how interaction and repair work in SLA" (MARKEE, 2008, p. 406).

On repair, Markee (2008) puts it as an important aspect to be analyzed, mostly because he affirms that it is directly related to how speakers "shape" their grammar in interactions. Leaning on Schegloff's study (1979), Markee provides examples of how to deal with repair in the SLA classroom. For example, "[...] cut-offs are generally post-positioned with respect to a trouble source, while sound stretches, the vocalization 'uh' and pauses are commonly pre-positioned" (MARKEE, 2008, p. 407). Using Schegloff's assessment of this phenomenon, he explains that post-positioned cut-offs are "[...] generally disjunctive syntactically, interrupting what is syntactically

projected by the sentence-so-far" (SCHEGLOFF, 1979: 273 apud MARKEE, 2008, p. 408), while pre-positioned delay (like sound stretches, vocalizations, pauses) usually "[...] carries forward the syntactic projection of the sentence-so-far" (idem). Based on that, the author defends that it is possible to affirm that "[...] repair changes the larger grammatical shape of sentences" (MARKEE, 2008, p. 407-408). Consequently, we believe that by not knowing how repair practices can contribute to the construction of interaction, teachers are missing a chance to instruct their students about it.

Markee's work also presents Schegloff's idea of "grammar of interaction", which is understood as the grammar structures elaborated in every step of the interaction, through the consecutive production of "turns so far" (SCHEGLOFF, 1996 apud MARKEE, 2008, p. 408). This view of grammar is only possible because "[...] the natural habitat of grammar is as much the turn-at-talk as it is the mind/brain of individuals" (SCHEGLOFF, 1996 apud MARKEE, 2008, p. 408), allowing the consideration of aspects like "'[...] moment-to-moment recalibration, reorganization and recompletion, and [...] interactional co-construction'" (SCHEGLOFF, 1996, p. 55-56 apud MARKEE, 2008, p. 408). Markee focuses a lot on Schegloff's work because he sees it as extremely relevant to SLA. As he says:

> Theoretically, the fact that grammar is empirically respecified as co-constructed, emergent practices (HALL et al., 2006; HOPPER, 1998) that achieve particular interactional repertoires contrasts radically with prior psycholinguistically-oriented understandings of grammar as an innate, abstract representation of knowledge about language (GASS, 1998), and establishes talk-in-interaction as the key object of study for SLA. Methodologically, behaviors that mainstream SLA treats as mere 'noise' (see GASS, 2004)—cut-offs, sound stretches, the vocalization 'uh', pauses, etc.—are respecified as interactional resources that constantly reshape the emerging grammar of speech events. Their transcription and analysis (as foreseen by HATCH, 1978) are thus obligatory components of any analysis that claims to illuminate how repair and interaction function as catalysts for L2 learning. (MARKEE, 2008, p. 408)

But, how can we identify, analyze and showcase behaviors that promote language learning (or learning opportunities, cf. WALSH; LI (2013))? Markee (2008) believes that, as analysts, it is our responsibility to assess pragmatic sequences and how specific behaviors lead to language learning. According to him,

> [l]anguage learning behaviors are massively achieved as repair sequences that may contain initial statements of non-comprehension, and/or emphatic assertions of understanding (these verbal behaviors are often accompanied by smiling, clapping, and embodied actions such as thinking gestures and pointing to information in written texts); changes of epistemic state, including the use of tokens such as oh (HERITAGE, 1984); participants independently volunteering new information that connects the learning object to practices or knowledge that are already part of their interactional repertoires; and translation from one language to another. (MARKEE, 2008, p. 408-409)

These examples approximate theory to practice, and we believe that, the more teachers get in touch with this kind of analysis promoted by CA-for-SLA, the more they will become aware of what goes on, in terms of discourse and interaction, in their language classrooms.

As Markee and other researchers who study CA usually state, dealing with any interactional context is a very complex work. That is why, in the more restricted area of CA-for-SLA, the use of micro-analysis is usually the easiest way to make a case and show some of the insights researches come across in their studies. On that matter, Markee offers a discussion on the idea of "[...] micro-moments of socially-distributed cognition [...]" (2008, p. 409), where he explains that

> [a]nalyses of socially-distributed cognition and successful language learning behaviors are most compelling when participants deploy multiple examples of these behaviors. Often, however, only some of these behaviors may be observed in particular instances of talk-in-interaction. Even more frequently, it is impossible to demonstrate successful language learning behavior because there is no evidence of independent, productive use of a new learning object. Furthermore, a great deal of language learning is likely never even manifested as behavior (MARKEE, 2000). Thus, it may be that only a small proportion of SLA (broadly conceived) is directly observable in and through talk. Nonetheless, within these self-imposed limits, CA techniques are arguably the most powerful tools available to us for analyzing the role of the linguistic environment in SLA. (KASPER, 2004 apud MARKEE, 2008, p. 409)

Therefore, we agree with Mann and Walsh (2017) when they defend that it is important for language teachers to know how to deal with data produced by themselves, using their own teaching context, and considering their students' needs. That way, even when only a small number of examples is available, the analysis they can develop from them is (at least we hope so) relevant to their specific context and true to their reality. We are not saying, though, that using someone else's studies and reflections on CDI is not useful, but that conducting their own studies and "making it

their own" (cf. MANN; WALSH, 2017) might be more productive in terms of language educators CPD.

When assessing his own work, Markee recognizes that his Language Behavior Tracking methodology (LBT) "[...] can indeed track when and how participants observably orient to, and recycle, language learning behaviors that occur across speech events" (MARKEE, 2008, p. 420), but that, in terms of Language Process Tracking (LPT), video recordings would have been a better call, because the CA-for-SLA that he advocates for "[...] does not use secondary self- or third-party report data to supplement primary observational data" (idem, p. 421). Moreover, he claims that "[...] it is impossible to guarantee that this methodology can reliably capture all instances of a specific learning object during a particular time period" (idem). Anyway, we still believe that CA-for-SLA, when applied to a well-defined context, by a properly trained analyst (like the teacher or a group of teachers), with clear goals in mind, can be a valuable tool to a better understanding of CDI characteristics. In the case of Markee's LPT methodology, which is an application of CA-for-SLA, the author believes that such methodology "[...] would be capable of showing whether, when, and how this member-relevant change of learning focus was achieved, and by whom" (idem). We can use his study as an example to justify our belief that, as time goes by and teachers get more used to this kind of approach, a list of commonly problematic learning issues can be elaborated, helping teachers plan their lessons in a more confident way.

As we approach the end of this chapter, we recognize that many other studies on CA and, more specifically, on CA-for-SLA, are available and could have been mentioned here. However, we also understand that any research project has limitations and methodological and theoretical choices must be made. We believe that, as stated in the beginning of this chapter and at the end of sections 2.1 and 2.2, this combination of RP, CDI studies, and CA-for-SLA offers a reasonable approach to the analysis of the Discussion Meetings excerpts we present in our Discussion Meetings Data Analysis section (Chapter 4) after we walk the reader through the methodological steps taken in this study, in Chapter 3.

3 METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the methodological steps taken to develop this research. As mentioned before, our initial research problem was related to understanding and improving oral production teaching strategies in a group of PAL for graduate students at PUCRS. However, after we started class observations and audio recordings, we noticed that, to achieve our goal, we would have to, first, learn more about CDI features, otherwise we would not have the theoretical basis to advocate for any improvements in oral production teaching and learning. Therefore, we decided to change the focus of our study from oral production activities to the observation of CDI characteristics through a closer analysis of interaction between the researcher and the professor in the DMs.

The next step was to find the proper research methodology to pursue our objectives. We found in Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991, p. 52) the classification of a qualitative research as "[...] an ethnographic study in which the researchers do not set out to test hypotheses, but rather to observe what is present with their focus, and consequently the data, free to vary during the course of the observation". Complementing that, we found in Gil (2008) that a qualitative research focuses on understanding aspects related to a social group, without considering the numerical representation of these phenomena. This type of research can also be classified as exploratory, since its goal is to promote familiarity with the issues under scrutiny (either from literature review or from data analysis). Besides that, our research is also descriptive, since we used standard techniques of data collection from CA to describe - at least some of - the characteristics of CDI in the group that we have observed.

According to Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991), a longitudinal approach (or a case study) "[...] typically involves the development of linguistic performance, usually the spontaneous speech of one subject, when the speech data are collected at periodic intervals over a span of time" (idem, p. 53); a longitudinal approach presents at least three of the characteristics of the qualitative paradigm: it is naturalistic, process-oriented, and not generalizable (idem). Considering our research, we believe it is not completely true to the idea of a longitudinal study, since it does not focus on

one specific subject and does not look at one specific issue, but tries to elicit, from a myriad of possibilities, some features of CDI - as discussed in the previous chapter. Therefore, we can say that our enterprise is naturalistic (cf. the CA's emic perspective), process-oriented (we are interested in the process that can help us understand CDI), and not generalizable (even though CDI features are similar in classrooms around the world - cf. MANN; WALSH, 2017; MARKEE, 2015; WALSH, 2011; SEEDHOUSE, 2004 -, our findings will be restricted to our context, while the process to do so, on the other hand, can be applied to different teaching-learning contexts).

In Larsen-Freeman and Long we found another concept that is very relevant to our research context, which is the idea of "participant observation", in which

> [...] researchers take part in the activities they are studying. They do not approach the study with any specific hypotheses in mind; rather they take copious notes of whatever they observe and experience, [...] usually [...] immediately after the activities so as to allow the researcher's full participation in them. The period of observation is usually long and the number of subjects studied is small. (LARSEN-FREEMAN; LONG, 1991, p. 60)

We decided that participant observation would be more productive than non-participant observation because it promotes more chances of collaborative discussions and, consequently, more opportunities for dialogic RP, making it a valuable tool for teacher CPD (cf. MANN; WALSH, 2017). Larsen-Freeman and Long, however, present pros and cons of it. For instance, this combination of qualitative approach, longitudinal study (which is not our case, as mentioned above), and participant observation can provide detailed and comprehensive descriptions of the object of study, but the data might not be natural and generalizable, the researcher might not be able to focus his/her attention on important aspects, and the data-processing might be time-consuming (LARSEN-FREEMAN; LONG, 1991).

We believe that it has been possible to minimize at least some of these negative aspects of this combination of approaches by using only audio, and not video, recording, and by selecting the excerpts from the DMs to be transcribed. When it comes to the classroom recordings, they were only used for stimulated recall during the DMs, and there was no need to transcribe them for this purpose. Also, using only

audio recording in the classroom allowed us to collect data in a less intrusive way than placing a video camera in the room[33]. Besides that, classes were not prepared specifically to be recorded, which makes us see it as a reasonable example of naturally occurring interactions (cf. WONG; WARING, 2010)[34]. This choice was also made as an attempt to diminish the effects of the observer's paradox (cf. LABOV *et al.*, 1968 apud MARKEE, 2015), since we understood that making the researcher part of the context would make the entire process more natural. Therefore, we believe that the data gathered in this research was as natural as possible, given the context of the situations in which it was recorded.

After defining where our research stands, the next step was to select the theoretical foundations on which it is based. The new approach to Reflective Practice, presented by Mann and Walsh (2017; also, PIMENTA; GHEDIN, 2012; ALARCÃO, 2011; McKAY, 2003) was the starting point. However, as the authors themselves explain in their book, RP is focused on teacher CPD, and does not offer a solid background on Linguistics studies. Therefore, it was necessary to combine the discussions proposed by RP with linguistic-based theories, allowing us to look at our data from a more scientific standpoint. It was in the studies of CDI (WALSH; LI, 2013; WALSH, 2013, 2011, 2006, 2002; SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010) that we found the basis to understand the phenomena presented in our data, and, from that, we decided it was necessary - as most of the authors we consulted do - to use the methodology of CA to collect, transcribe, and analyze our data (WONG; WARING, 2010; MARKEE, 2008; TEN HAVE, 2007; KASPER, 2006; SEEDHOUSE, 2005). With those readings in mind, it was time to elaborate a few questions to guide our study, and they are presented in the next section.

3.1 LEADING QUESTIONS

In this research, we tried to answer the following leading questions:

---

[33] The drawback of this choice is that a multimodal analysis was not possible, and we had to rely on what the transcription could offer and on what was registered in the researcher's field notes.
[34] Wong and Waring (2010, p. 4) describe "naturally occurring data" as "[...] actual occurrences of talk not gathered from interviewing techniques, observational methods, native intuitions, or experimental methodologies".

1. What are the features of CDI that can be observed in the PAL classroom for graduate students at PUCRS?
2. How are these features discussed by the professor and the researcher, through the RP perspective, in the DM?
3. Is it reasonable to integrate RP, CDI studies, and CA-for-SLA to reach a deeper understanding of how learning takes place in the PAL classroom?

3.2 OBJECTIVES

We believe that the questions presented above can lead us to successfully achieve the general and specific objectives of this research, which are presented below.

3.2.1 General objective

The general objective of this research is to combine studies on RP, CDI, and CA-for-SLA to promote teachers' awareness of how these features can increase the creation of learning opportunities in PAL classrooms.

3.2.2 Specific objectives

- To understand the relationship between teacher's use of language, classroom interactions, and learning opportunities.
- To explore ways of collecting classroom data and finding evidence of CDI features.
- To promote a combination of RP, CDI, and CA-for-SLA as a CPD tool for PAL teachers.

3.3 DATA-GATHERING PROCESS AND ANALYSIS

Three elements were of utmost importance to the process of data collection in this research: (a) the PAL course that was chosen to be observed and the professor

responsible for the course; (b) the group of students and its specificity; and (c) the purpose of the DMs.

3.3.1 The course

The choice of the graduate course to be the group in which our study would be conducted was based on some criteria, which we explain below. There was the wish to investigate the teaching of PAL at PUCRS, but a narrower study object was necessary. Thus, we identified the existing gap related to the awareness of CDI features, both in PML and in PAL, as briefly mentioned before in the beginning of the literature review. With that in mind, we identified RP as an appropriate starting point to address the nature of such gap, complementing it with CDI studies and using the methodology from CA-for-SLA.

To justify our choice, we can say that, after analyzing the undergraduate and graduate courses offered at PUCRS, we decided to choose the graduate course of Portuguese for Foreigners (*Português para Estrangeiros*). The reasoning behind this choice is because, according to its syllabus, the content to be covered in this course is rather "open". According to the students' needs, the professor responsible for the course chooses, throughout the semester, what content/topics are relevant to the students. This is possible because learners are invited to build the syllabus with the professor at the beginning of the semester, and suggestions related to Portuguese for Academic Purposes are welcome. This would not be possible with the group of Portuguese for Foreigners for undergraduate students, because they have to follow a more restrict syllabus. Therefore, the PAL course for graduate students was the best fit for this study, given the specificities required by RP and our interest in observing aspects of CDI.

Another reason for choosing this course is related to the students' level of proficiency in the language. We understand that, in general, higher-proficiency students are more open to oral production activities and produce longer turns, with a more natural flow of conversation, and that would be the perfect scenario for this research. Moreover, the group of graduate students is usually smaller than the undergraduate ones; this allows the professor to give more individual attention to the

students' needs, on the one hand, and makes the observations and the use of stimulated recall more focused, on the other hand. Considering the transcription time as a factor was necessary, in order to make sure we would have enough time to transcribe and analyze the data from the DMs.

Perhaps the most decisive factor for choosing the graduate course was related to the proximity between the researcher and the professor being observed, who happens to be the adviser of this research. According to Mann and Walsh (2017), RP should be more focused on a dialogic perspective, in which professionals feel free to observe each other's classes and to discuss practices and issues that sometimes might be very sensitive to one of them. As the researcher, I feel that working with my adviser is an opportunity to share and discuss with a more experienced professional on a much deeper level. We believe that the entire process would not have been as effective as it was if I were observing a professor with whom I have no common work experience with. Similar interests in terms of PAL teaching and learning, a shared interest in learning more about CDI and oral production teaching and learning, and, most importantly, the trust on each other and the willingness to learn together are elements that make us believe that this was the best decision to make.

3.3.2 The group of students

The group was formed by four students. Their ages ranged from 26 to 40 years old. Two of them are from Mozambique and learned Portuguese in elementary school; each of them speaks a different native language (Chaubo and Shona); both are Ph.D. students, one from the Psychology Department and the other from the Philosophy Department. There is one student from the United States of America; he is a Fulbright English Teaching Assistant (ETA) who was spending the academic year in Brazil; his L1 is Spanish, and he learned English in elementary school. His academic background is in the area of Political Sciences and he has experience with education, as an elementary school teacher. The fourth learner is a Colombian graduate student taking his master's degree in the Philosophy Department; his L1 is Spanish. All students are members of courses from the School of Humanities at

PUCRS. All participants recorded in the classroom interactions signed a Written Informed Consent, as required by PUCRS' Research Ethics Committee.[35]

3.3.3 The Discussion Meetings (DMs)

The DMs were the moments in which the professor being observed and the researcher prepared the lesson plans, reflected on previous classes, and used their conclusions to elaborate a plan of action for future lessons. It can be related to the ideas of reflection-on-action, reflection-in-action, and reflection-for-action, mentioned by Mann and Walsh (2017) and McKay (2003). All activities and topics covered on the syllabus took into consideration the students' needs and the goal of the course, which is to offer learners opportunities to acquire the necessary language tools to fully participate in the academic life, both in written and in spoken language. In those meetings, the researcher and the professor used their classroom notes and excerpts from classroom interaction, through the use of stimulated recall (WALSH, 2006; LYLE, 2003), to apply the tools of RP, focusing on a dialogic reflection. The topics for discussion elaborated by the professor and the researcher are the following:

1. The pedagogic purpose and the learning outcomes of the class;
2. The relevance of pedagogic purpose/learning outcomes to the students' needs;
3. The procedures/tasks to pursue the pedagogic purpose/learning outcomes;
4. The timing of every stage of the class and the time students need to perform the tasks;
5. The way of effectively communicating with students in different stages of the class;
6. The assessment of pedagogic purpose/learning outcomes at the end of the class.

---

[35] An example of the Written Informed Consent form signed by the participants of this research is presented in Appendix I. These documents, duly signed by the participants and by those responsible for this study, are stored by the professor responsible for the research group, and available for assessment by the PUCRS' Research Ethics Committee at any time.

These topics are discussed with more attention in Chapter 4, and we believe it is worth mentioning here that not necessarily all of them were discussed in every single DM, since not all of them are directly represented in the excerpts we have selected to include in our analysis.

3.3.4 Data processing and the Computerized Language Analysis (CLAN)

DMs and classes were recorded in audio using the researcher's cell phone. The files were stored in their respective folders in the researcher's personal Google Drive account, in separate folders (Classes or Discussion Meetings) and named according to the day in which they were recorded.[36] Classes were usually split into two files, one for the first half of the class, before the break, and one for the second half; sometimes more than two files were necessary, because in some occasions, the cell phone stopped recording and the researcher had to start a new file. DMs were recorded in a single file. All recordings were made using the *.wav* file format, so it can be read by the Computerized Language Analysis (CLAN) software.

Text files with field notes related to every class and to every DM were also created and saved in their respective folders, using the date of the class as the file name. These notes are supposed to complement the subsequent transcriptions and to help the researcher and the professor elicit relevant aspects for discussion during the DMs. The materials used in class were also stored in different text or PDF files, in order to keep all the resources used in class in one single folder.

After an extensive discussion on which transcription convention to use in the papers elaborated by our research group, it was decided that the Computerized Language Analysis (CLAN) software is the best option we could find up to the date. The software presents a user-friendly layout that can be easily used by researchers that are new to the area of CA. Beyond that, the audio/video being transcribed can be opened in a window that is also controlled by CLAN commands, making the whole

---

[36] It is relevant to mention how these files were named and stored because, in our research group, different researchers had access to the files, so that it was possible to conduct collaborative sessions for transcription and data analysis. As suggested by professor Steve Walsh (oral communication during the Master's Thesis Qualifying Exam, held in June, 2018), these sessions were a way of avoiding biased interpretations of the data under discussion.

process simpler. Before learning about CLAN, we had been using a combination of Audacity (to open the audio file) and Microsoft Office Excel (for the transcription), which was time-consuming and less effective than using CLAN[37].

From the 13 classes recorded in audio, resulting in approximately 39 hours of audio files, we selected excerpts that were considered relevant to our analysis (the criteria was the presence of aspects that were somehow related to the CDI features mentioned in the Literature Review). The decision not to transcribe classroom interactions came from the RP framework, in which Mann and Walsh (2017) defend that using stimulated recall to promote collaborative analysis of audio or video excerpts is as effective as using transcripts to do so, but less time consuming for teachers. These classroom recordings were made between March 21st and June 13th, 2018, and we tried to include in our analysis examples of discussions related to issues that took place in the beginning, in the middle, and closer to the end of the semester.

The eight DMs between the professor and the researcher were recorded between March 27th and June 12th, 2018, and a selection of relevant sections of the audio recordings from those meetings was made by the investigator to be transcribed and analyzed (in this case, the criteria was related to the presence of interactions that could be classified as evidence of an RP process, cf. MANN; WALSH, 2017). This selection of relevant excerpts to be transcribed might make room for questioning and doubt on the reliability of the data. However, we justify this decision by stating that we believe this kind of selection is possible in this type of research and that our criterion to select the excerpts was based on the attempt to find examples of interaction between the professor and the researcher that show evidence of reflection on their own practice and on how the interaction in the classroom works. Most of what was omitted in this process was related to making copies, finding materials, or even when the meeting was interrupted by someone else who walked in the room. We recognize that probably many interesting aspects might have been lost in this process, and that

---

[37] For more details on the software and its functions, see Hazel and Mortensen (2015), available at: <https://www.academia.edu/7370185/Research_Methods_workshop_-_CLAN_transcription>.
MacWhinney (2018) also presents detailed instructions on how to use the software, while Quadros (no prelo) presents a step by step methodology, showing how to organize files properly, prepare transcriptions, and use some functions offered by CLAN in a research focused on the acquisition of discourse markers by PAL students.

we may have missed many opportunities for reflection and collaborative discussion, but we tried to focus on what was more explicitly related to our goals in this research. Anyway, we understand that applying RP is a complex process and that it would not be possible to cover, with quality and responsibility, every single aspect that could come up in this kind of meeting.

Regarding the excerpts selected for transcription, we base our decision on McKay, when she says that, "[o]ne way of using audio or video recordings is to transcribe only some parts of it. The most efficient strategy is to transcribe only the part of it that is relevant to the problem that one wants to examine" (2003, p. 27)[38]. On the same matter, Mann and Walsh (2017) explain that, when short recordings, teachers can "[...] replay it and make a note of the particular features of their talk [...]. It eliminates the need for wholesale transcription[39], focusing instead on specific features of talk, and allows the teacher to select which elements of their practice they would like to study" (idem, p. 114). This is what some authors call "stimulated recall" (cf. WALSH, 2006; LYLE, 2003), which works as an alternative to when wholesale transcriptions are not possible. However, in our case, we need to be able to show interactions that took place in our DMs (in which stimulated recall was used), and that is what justifies our methodological choice of transcribing only excerpts of those interactions.

When it comes to the presentation of the transcripts in our analysis, a few considerations must be made in order to guide the reader through the process of analysis we have applied. A brief contextualization of the interaction is presented first, which includes the topic of the interaction in the excerpt; depending on the excerpt, the researcher's notes for the DM being discussed might be included to help us contextualize the situation. The excerpt is presented, in the layout offered by the transcription software being used (CLAN), and it is followed by our analysis. Since CLAN allows us to insert some information about the subjects participating in the interaction and some other relevant data, we would like to conclude this chapter by

---

[38] In the original: "Uma maneira de utilizar registros em áudio ou vídeo é transcrever apenas a parte da fita que é relevante para o problema que você está examinando" (McKAY, 2003, p. 27).
[39] Mann and Walsh (2017) call "wholesale transcription" the complete transcription of a certain interaction, in contrast with the transcriptions of excerpts, used for what they call "microanalysis".

explaining how these transcripts are presented in our analysis. To do so, we use one image from the beginning of a DM transcript. As we can see in Figure 1 below:

- Line 1 indicates to the software that the transcription has started;
- Line 2 indicates in which language the transcription is being made ("por", for Portuguese, since CLAN only allows three letters to indicate the name of the language);
- Line 3 presents the participants (in this case, RAFA, the researcher, classified as "investigator" because that is the closest classification offered by the software, and CRIS, the professor, classified as "teacher" for the same reason mentioned before);
- Line 4 indicates to the software what option of transcription symbols is being used, which is CA, in this case);
- Lines 5 and 6 indicate information to identify the participants, like their language, the corpus to which this participant is associated with (Discussion Meeting), the name or code for the participant (RAFA or CRIS, in this case), the age of the participant (29 and 59 years old), gender (male or female), the role performed by the participants (investigator or teacher - these are closed categories that CLAN users cannot change), and level of education (GRAD_STD, meaning graduate student, for the researcher, and PROF, meaning professor);
- Line 7 presents the file name; in the example presented in Figure 1, "1" indicates the ordinal number of the DM recorded; it is followed by the date in which it was recorded (27th of March, 2018), and by an indication of what type of file is being transcribed (audio or video). CLAN does not accept spaces in file names of transcripts, that is why underline marks ("_") were used to separate the information presented in the titles.

Figure 1 - Initial lines for Discussion Meetings transcripts

```
1      @Begin
2      @Languages:     por
3      @Participants:  RAFA Investigator, CRIS Teacher
4      @Options:       CA
5      @ID:    por|Discussion Meetings|RAFA|29;|male|||Investigator|GRAD_STD||
6      @ID:    por|Discussion Meetings|CRIS|59;|female|||Teacher|PROF||
7      @Media: 1_27_03_2018, audio
```

Source: the author.

It is important to clarify that, in the analysis, these initial lines are only presented in the first excerpt of the file, and the subsequent excerpts, when belonging to the same file, present only the lines of the interaction being discussed. It indicates that excerpts presented without the initial lines belong to the same file as the previous excerpt.

The identity of the professor and the researcher were not anonymized in the transcription because, from the beginning, both professor and researcher agreed on using their own experience and on being identified in the transcripts. It would not make sense to anonymize professor and researcher in the transcripts while we present our justification as to why we decided to choose the PAL course used in this research. However, for ethical reasons, students were anonymized, when mentioned in the DMs interactions.

4 DISCUSSION MEETINGS DATA ANALYSIS

The analysis presented in this chapter is composed of two parts that complement each other. The first one is a contextualization of the PAL course and its students. It is based on the field notes from the DMs and the classroom observations elaborated by the researcher during the two first DMs and the two first classes, which were not recorded. The second part focuses on excerpts of interactions that occurred during the DMs, between the professor of the PAL graduate course chosen for this study and the researcher. The starting point are the transcripts of these interactions, which, in combination with the researcher's field notes, compose the data to be analyzed.

The theoretical support used for this part of the analysis is heavily based on the RP approach, understood here as a CPD tool for teachers (MANN; WALSH, 2017; ALARCÃO, 2011; McKAY, 2003); some elements from CA (WONG; WARING, 2010; TEN HAVE, 2007) are also mentioned. We[40] believe that looking closely at these DMs can help us shed some light on our initial experience with the RP process and explain how we believe that the application of an RP framework can lead us to a deeper understanding of CDI features. Therefore, we try to put RP as a key element for teacher education, either for novice or experienced professionals, because we believe it can be applied to different situations, according to the needs and interests of language professionals.

This section is also dedicated to discuss some aspects of the theoretical background that focuses on how teachers and students use language in the classroom and how interactions are collaboratively built in that context. To do so, we support our discussions on studies about CDI combined with a CA-for-SLA approach (WALSH; LI, 2013; SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010; WONG; WARING, 2010; MARKEE, 2008, 2000; KASPER, 2006; WALSH, 2006, 2002; SEEDHOUSE, 2005). We believe that this combination allows us to present a reasonable junction of

---

[40] "We" or "us", in this text, includes the professor observed (the supervisor of this research) and the researcher (the author of this text). In an attempt to distance ourselves from the data, sometimes I refer to me and my adviser as "the professor" and "the researcher". It would not be reasonable to refer to the professionals involved in this research using other pronouns, since we explained, from the beginning, that this research is based on our own experience.

pedagogical and linguistic aspects and demonstrate the importance of those areas for a solid teacher education process. It is relevant to mention here that not every single aspect for discussion is going to be mentioned in this analysis, for we recognize that the classroom is a complex environment and that an exhaustive study of it would demand a much longer, comprehensive, and thorough investigation. However, we hope our selection of excerpts is able to demonstrate our reflective process and our efforts to contribute to the discussions in this area.

4.1 CONTEXTUALIZATION

As explained above, this section focuses on the first two DMs and the two first PAL classes. From the researcher's field notes, elaborated during these meetings and classes, some first impressions were selected for discussion and a few observation goals were set. From the DMs, we have selected a few examples that, according to our analysis, can be understood as evidence of the ongoing RP experience that was taking place. Similarly, the two first classes observed also provided input for the remaining DMs, because, based on the field notes, we were able to select a few elements for discussion and predict aspects we would like to observe and analyse with more attention throughout the semester.

It is important to mention that this was the first time the professor (the supervisor of this research) and the researcher (the author of this text) were effectively applying an RP framework, at least formally, using their own data, in a collaborative process, on a (very small) community of practice that promoted scaffolded dialogic reflection (MANN; WALSH, 2017, 2013). Therefore, it was decided that a few topics for discussion were necessary to guide all the DMs and help the professionals limit the discussion to the most relevant issues. These topics were:

1. The pedagogic purpose and the learning outcomes of the class;
2. The relevance of pedagogic purpose/learning outcomes to the students' needs;
3. The procedures/tasks to pursue the pedagogic purpose/learning outcomes;

4. The timing of every stage of the class and the time students need to perform the tasks;

5. The way of effectively communicating with students in different stages of the class;

6. The assessment of pedagogic purpose/learning outcomes at the end of the class.

These topics for discussion were set with two objectives in mind: they offer a starting point for RP, allowing us to discuss a myriad of issues that might be of interest in different contexts, and they establish a connection with aspects related to CDI, elucidating the importance of tuning the teacher's use of language in the classroom with the desired learning outcome of every stage of the lesson (SHAMSIPOUR; ALLAMI, 2012; WALSH, 2006, 2002). It clarifies how learning opportunities are created - or not - depending on how interaction is built by the subjects in the classroom (WALSH; LI, 2013; WALSH, 2012, 2011). These six topics are discussed in more detail below.

Our first topic (1) presents a possible distinction between pedagogic purpose and learning outcomes. As we understand it, the pedagogic purpose is the comprehensive objective a teacher wants his or her students to achieve by the end of a class. For example, in the excerpts that we are going to present, the pedagogic purpose of the third class was to guide students through the process of understanding the structure of a research project, so that they would be able to not only read and understand the characteristics of this genre, but also to produce it adequately. Therefore, we understand that the pedagogic purpose goes beyond the subject knowledge (language knowledge), including also how students can use it to act in the world (in this case, to participate in the academic context in which they were included).

The learning outcomes, on the other hand, can be understood as the subdivisions of this bigger pedagogic purpose - for instance, to understand how a research project is structured, teacher and students should explore together the characteristics and functions of each part of a research project, like the proper sentence structures and vocabulary to be used in the introduction, how to elaborate a

justification, how to express the research goals, so on and so forth. As we see it, learning outcomes can be understood as the steps the teacher believes his or her students can take to reach the pedagogic purpose. Since we see the classroom as a complex context, we also understand that the pedagogic purpose might change throughout the lesson or may not even be fully achieved at the end of it, as the students' needs that emerge during the process can change the focus of the class. This distinction between the two terms, though, is not a widely agreed upon issue among different authors, as they use it in different ways. In our case, seeing the learning outcomes as the result of a learning process which, combined with others of these results, will lead students to successfully achieve a more complex pedagogic purpose, helps us break the learning process into steps that can be easily measured and assessed.

This discussion topic (1) is closely related to the next one (2), which concerns the students' needs. To make sure that the initial idea of building the syllabus with the students was actually put to practice throughout the entire semester, classes were prepared taking into consideration what both the professor and the students considered relevant, according to the general purpose of the course and to some of the individual needs and interests of the students. This way, we believe it helped us create a clear link between the professor's expectations for the course and the results of the preliminary students' needs analysis, informally conducted during the two first classes and throughout the semester.

The next topic for discussion (3) was focused on the procedures to achieve the pedagogic purpose and the learning outcomes previously established. This topic offered the professor and the researcher the opportunity to decide, according to their experiences and to the students' needs analysis, what types of activities were adequate to lead students to their learning outcomes in each part of the class. The issue of timing activities (4) is closely related to that. Timing was identified, since the beginning of the course, as a challenge to the professor. It was clear from these two classes, in which students were presenting their cities to the group, that learners were quite open to participate, ask questions and contribute to their classmate's presentations. It allowed us to survey students' needs in a more personalized way, identifying language issues (positive aspects and issues with room for improvement)

and having a more precise idea of the proficiency level of each student. This strategy, however, caused the setback of extending an activity planned to be over by the end of the second class to finish during the first half of the third class. As the semester went by, it was also noticed that some students needed much more time to do activities that were easily done by some other learners, and timing for different stages of the lesson had to also include the professor and the researcher's estimate of how long each student would take to finish a certain activity[41].

The next topic for discussion was related to establishing a clear and effective communication with students in different stages of the lesson (5). As we have already discussed, the classroom context is dynamic and changes according to the stage of the lesson (MANN; WALSH, 2017; MARKEE; KUNITZ, 2015; WALSH, 2011, 2006), and it is the teacher's responsibility to make sure that students understand what is expected from them in every one of these stages. One way to do so is by making a conscious use of language according to what the learning objective of the stage is, since such use of language is a powerful tool to signpost changes in the classroom context (cf. WALSH, 2002). This topic was considered relevant to discuss because, as stated by Walsh (2002), classroom discourse is goal oriented, which influences how participants behave in terms of language use. Understanding classroom interactions as a valuable moment for the occurence of socially-distributed language learning (cf. MARKEE, 2008; KASPER, 2006; SEEDHOUSE, 2005, 2004), it becomes evident that making sure all of those in the class are "on board" and focused on the same objective is a reasonable way to help students achieve the intended outcomes.

The last topic for discussion was related to whether the pedagogic purpose and learning outcomes were achieved or not (6). Assessment is a largely debated topic in the area of SLA, and it is not our purpose to present an extensive debate on different perspectives of assessment here. What is relevant to this research is to identify how assessment can be conducted so it allows the professor and the

---

[41] Since there were no prerequisites for graduate students to enroll in the course, levels of proficiency in different skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) were not necessarily similar among students. Speaking was generally not a problem, because we could observe that all of them were able to communicate - even if that meant leaning on their mother tongue sometimes. However, when it came to writing, the proficiency disparity among learners became evident, and it was a great challenge to the professor.

researcher to identify evidence of the learning process in the students' contributions in class. Related to that, the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), organized by the Council of Europe, was used as a parameter. We took the part of the grid dedicated to oral production assessment and merged its bands A1 and A2, B1 and B2, and C1 and C2 into three bands (A, B, and C), to simplify it for students and provide them with a tool to self-assess their oral language production. The goal of it was to offer learners some guidelines on how to become more independent and critical about their own language production, leading them to assume a more central position in their own learning process. Despite that, the pedagogic purpose and the learning outcomes of each class were assessed by the professor and the researcher to determine whether they were achieved or not, and, if not, what actions would have to be taken to make it happen.

The first class was observed on March 14th, 2018. Audio recordings only started from the third class on, because students were introduced to the research project and signed the Written Informed Consent form in the second class. These audio recordings were used for stimulated recall during the DMs, and were not transcribed. In this class, the professor explained the goal of the course, which was to improve the students' skills in comprehending and producing texts in Portuguese, both written and orally, in academic contexts. As the students already knew, it was mentioned again that there was no minimum proficiency level required to enroll in the course and it was offered only for graduate students from PUCRS. It was possible to identify, from the syllabus, that there was a strong emphasis on the production of oral language used in academic genres, such as research presentations, vivas, talks, debates, etc.

As stated by the professor, the pedagogic purpose of this first meeting with the new group of students was to create a friendly atmosphere in which they would feel comfortable enough to participate as much as possible. Thus, she decided to conduct an informal conversation to welcome the students. After a short presentation of the city of Porto Alegre, in which she brought a few ideas of activities to get to know the city, she demonstrated a genuine interest in what students had to say about their own cultures and hometowns. From the observer's point of view, it is fair to say that, for the most part of the lesson, students were focused on the topic that was being

discussed, and not on language structures, preciseness of vocabulary, or pronunciation details - the focus was on the discussion, not on language accuracy. It is a positive point that shows how the pedagogic purpose (eliciting contributions from the group of students) was in tune with the use of language made by the professor (WALSH, 2002), who offered a few examples of instant feedback (cf. SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010), focusing most of it on feedback on the message (for instance, offering extension questions to allow students to rephrase their sentences and extend the topic, or even to include other students in the conversation, cf. WALSH, 2002).[42] Moreover, the topic of discussion and the way the professor organized the interactions provided the right context for an extensive use of referential questions (WALSH, 2006). When it comes to the students' behavior, it was possible to observe that they were able to understand what was expected from them and how to take, maintain, and hand over their turns-at-talk, which can be understood as evidence of student Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC, cf. WALSH, 2012, 2011).

Even without audio recordings of the first two classes, it was possible to use the field notes to make a prospection of topics that would be potentially worth analyzing during the semester. For instance, another aspect that called the researcher's attention in the first class was related to teacher talking time (TTT). One could characterize it as higher than expected or desirable, but, as we see it, TTT was justifiable and did not compromise the quality of the interactions. The professor was introducing herself, presenting the syllabus, the university, the city, and it was done in a dialogic way. Students were constantly handed over the floor to talk about their experiences and impressions, their research projects, their home countries and cultures, etc. This made us believe that a qualitative rather than a quantitative approach to TTT is necessary, putting the creation and the maintenance of interactional opportunities in the spotlight, as defended by Walsh (2002) and exemplified by Seedhouse and Walsh (2010) and by Walsh and Li (2013).

---

[42] This first class was also the moment in which the professor and researcher realized that feedback strategies would deserve a special attention throughout the semester. For example, as time went by, it was possible to notice that, in different classes, or even in different stages of the same class, in which the professor seemed to forget the pedagogic purpose of the stage, feedback strategies were not applied properly. It became a constant topic for reflection in the DMs.

This initial conversation was also relevant because it allowed us to learn more about the students. We had the chance to investigate issues related to the learners' academic literacy in their home countries as well as their experience with academic genres. Methodological aspects related to the writing process used by the students and to what textual genres they were used to read and produce in their home universities were discussed. The professor talked to the students about the most common academic genres in Brazil and students mentioned that, for example, reading scientific articles was not a problem, but that they had not had extensive formal orientation on how to write articles.

In addition to these academic topics, aspects related to social and racial issues were identified in the discourse of some students, when inquired about their adaptation process to the new city and the new university. Mozambican students mentioned that they had never noticed any racial discrimination in their home country, and that, when it happens, it is more commonly related to social class than race. The American student brought a few examples of racial issues in the USA as well. The professor mentioned a text about the empowerment of black children in a public school in Porto Alegre[43] that could be a starting point to their discussions about academic writing, bringing together the structure of a research project and a theme that students were interested in. It was decided that, after the presentations about their hometowns, the group would use that text to carry out the activities for the semester.

Some impressions on the first class were later discussed by the professor and the researcher, and a few focus points were established. As mentioned before, feedback strategies were certainly a point of discussion; from the professor's experience, she realized that she has the tendency to interrupt students in moments focused on fluency, not on accuracy, to provide feedback on language structure, vocabulary, pronunciation, etc., and that it was an issue she would like to address through RP. Also, the language background of students was a point of concern; the professor mentioned that she was not sure about how to keep classes interesting and

---

[43] The text mentioned here was written by César Fraga, and is called Os cabelos alegres da Restinga. It was published in March, 2018, at the Jornal Extra Classe, a newspaper organized by SINPRO/RS, the teacher's union of the state of Rio Grande do Sul. The text is available at: https://www.extraclasse.org.br/edicoes/2018/03/os-cabelos-alegres-da-restinga/.

relevant for students with different language, cultural and academic backgrounds, who present different levels of proficiency in the target language as well. Some students mentioned that, in their home universities, they had had contact with written assignments involving the production of essays, literature reviews, and expanded abstracts, but that they were aware that different areas of study apply academic language with some peculiarities and that the structure and the way researchers position themselves in their texts might change according to the area of study they belong to[44]. Students demonstrated interest in learning how to do it in BP, using adequate academic language, according to the academic culture validated by their areas of study and their graduate programs and professors in Brazil.

Towards the end of the class, the professor guided students on what they were supposed to do for the next class: write a short text about their respective hometowns and prepare a presentation similar to the one she had used to walk them through some characteristics of Porto Alegre. After class, she explained to the researcher that her goal was to have a preliminary assessment of the students' proficiency in writing and their vocabulary extension, although it was never mentioned to the students. As an observer, I had the impression that learners had not understood what they were supposed to do, and the professor did not ask them whether they had understood her instructions or not.

A few minutes before the end of the class, she handed out a text with some information on the history of Porto Alegre. The text was filled with historical facts and presented some pieces of vocabulary that might not be so simple for students to understand. The two Mozambican students, as expected, seemed to be following the reading with no problems. The Colombian student asked a few vocabulary questions, but also seemed able to grasp the general idea of the text. In an after-class discussion, professor and researcher agreed that a pre-reading activity would have made the process more effective and less dependent on vocabulary explanations from the professor; however, students seemed interested in the activity. Learners did

---

[44] Ferreira and Rollsing (2018) approached issues on the teaching of discourse genres in PAL, in which they attempted to contribute to the discussions regarding academic literacy. The works of Swales (1990), Askehave and Swales (2001), Biber (2006), Marcuschi (2008), and Street (2010) are a few examples of studies that offered the theoretical background for that discussion.

not have enough time to finish reading the text because the class was over before it; it was evident for us that closer attention to timing issues would be necessary.

The second class occured on March, 21st, 2018. We decided not to audio record this second meeting because it would be one more stressful factor for students; we agreed that, on top of making a presentation about their cities, in a language that not all of them were highly proficient in, to a group of classmates and teachers they had just met, was not the best time to start recording students, and would just make them feel under pressure. We let students know that classroom interactions were not being recorded in that lesson. Again, it was possible to observe that the "tone" set on the previous class was kept, and students were actively participating in the discussions; the presentations were well planned and many cultural, linguistic, and historical issues were discussed.

The goal of this second class was to give students an opportunity to express themselves and to show to the group some aspects of their cultures. The professor and the researcher made notes on how students organized the information they wanted to present and how they used the Portuguese language to do so. Different presentation styles could be observed, with some considerable differences among students. For example, some of them preferred to use pictures and key-words, while others decided to include more text on the slides and read it; some of them demonstrated their familiarity with that kind of presentation, making eye-contact with the entire group, while others were mostly focused on the professor, as if she was the only one in the audience. Considering the oral presentation and the slides as two genres from the academic discourse sphere that complement each other (FERREIRA; ROLLSING, 2018), this experience offered us a first opportunity to discuss about academic oral presentations with the students.

It was also possible to see how the professor controlled classroom interactions through the use of feedback and turn management strategies (SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010). For instance, when it came to feedback, in general, most of it was related to pragmatic aspects and vocabulary (with the Mozambican students), or to pronunciation (with the Colombian and the American students). Delayed feedback (WALSH, 2002) was predominant when applied to issues related to the content of the message, while feedback on the spot (SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010) was more

common with aspects related to language accuracy. This works as an example of teacher CIC, as defended by Walsh (2012, 2011), since it demonstrated how the professor was pairing the learning objective of that stage of the lesson with her use of language. Students did not demonstrate any resistance to these feedback strategies; it was observed that none of them refrained from participating, even after being "corrected". Actually, the environment was friendly and most of them showed interest in listening to what the professor was saying; students constantly took notes and tried to immediately use what they had just learned. For example, the most common language issues that we could observe from the students' oral presentations were related to the use of verbs in the present continuous in BP (Mozambican students tended to use "Estou a chegar" instead of "Estou chegando", since the former is more commonly used in Mozambican Portuguese than the latter), and vocabulary adequacy issues (for example, "Lá no *fundo* [da minha apresentação], falo de praias", meaning "Lá no *fim* [da minha apresentação], falo de praias", or "Trajes que as mulheres africanas *agasalham*", and not "Trajes que as mulheres africanas *vestem/usam*", which may lead the unaware interlocutor to misunderstandings).

The Colombian student, on his turn, showed, for example, a few language issues related to the gender of nouns and adjectives in BP, a common issue for Spanish native speakers who learn PAL. Structures used to make superlatives were also misused ("Más grande" instead of "Maior" [bigger], for instance), and most words, or even entire sentences, were said in Spanish. Examples of a possible interlanguage[45] that was being built in the student's language repertoire was also evident (as in constructions like "*as persoas*" [people], in which one can identify a morphological influence of the word "*personas*", in Spanish, and the corresponding word "*pessoas*", in BP, or in "*fecha con*", meaning "*feita com*" [made/done with], in which one can identify that the learner makes an approximation between the phonological structure he already knows ("*fecha*", in Spanish) with the word he has already heard ("*feita*", in BP), and tries to use it adequately. Being sensitive to notice these subtle aspects in the language production of students from the first lesson is

---

[45] We understand interlanguage, in this research, as the language system created by learners that presents elements not only of their mother tongue and of the target language, but also elements that do not belong to either of them, as explained by Gass and Selinker (2008).

important to help the language professional plan accordingly, considering the students' needs.

When it comes to the professor's management of the interactions in the classroom, it was noted that, in a certain moment, one of the Mozambican students had a hard time trying to explain to the professor one of the concepts he had used in his presentation, and the negotiation of meaning was not as straightforward as in other occasions. As the observer, I noticed that it was a discussion that did not include the other learners and that lasted for about five minutes, making the other students in the class lose interest in the topic. It was one more example, in combination with some other ones from the first class, to reinforce our impressions that a more conscious reflection on feedback and collaborative construction of interactions was a highly relevant topic for the DM. It proved necessary to discover ways to include the whole class in the discussion when a breakdown in communication occurs, in order to take full advantage of these valuable learning opportunities that emerge from these situations.

Another aspect that called my attention as an observer was that, after one of the presentations, the professor inquired the other students about one piece of information mentioned by the student presenting his city and none of the students could answer it. I had already noticed that some of them were distracted, but I thought that maybe they were able to multitask, after all, they are adult students and should be able to understand when their attention is required or not. The use of a listening chart would have provided students with guidelines on what to pay close attention to; another option would include creating opportunities for students to report what they have heard in the presentations. Our goal was to make sure that they feel comfortable enough in the classroom to ask questions and participate more. But, how can we do that? How can we make students pay attention to their classmates' presentations, contribute to their classmates' works and learn from and with each other? After the second class, it became a topic for the DM and a possible solution was to give students tasks and present to them a clear purpose to pay attention and understand what their classmates were talking about. By doing that, we believed we would be offering them the opportunity to understand that being a good listener is

also part of being a good speaker, and that they would also have the chance to develop the habit of contributing more to their peers' works.

The second half of this class was dedicated to the study of the text mentioned in the first class. Racism was the topic raised by students and a few questions were prepared by the researcher and the professor to guide the initial discussion, as a pre-reading activity. Those questions were elaborated according to what students mentioned in the first class. Since historical aspects were mentioned, especially when discussing the reasons why Mozambique is a lusophone country, slavery was a topic briefly debated, and we wanted to know how much students knew about the Brazilian history. Trying to learn from our previous experience with the text about the history of Porto Alegre, we noticed that the pre-reading discussion gave learners the chance to discuss vocabulary items in pairs and learn from each other, instead of always asking the professor. It made the subsequent group discussion flow in a more natural way. In an attempt to approximate the topic to their reality and their history, one of the questions gave learners the chance to discuss among themselves and with the whole group, and we expected historical details to demand some sort of language refinements in terms of negotiation of meanings; we believed it would be a rich opportunity to learn language through the discussion of an interesting topic. Another question was based on the students' impressions, since they stated that, before coming to Brazil, they imagined they would see more black people in Porto Alegre, but that they did not. The last question was an attempt to bring the discussion to our times, making a link to the text students were about to read.

We believed that this approach promoted the creation of learning opportunities (WALSH; LI, 2013; WALSH, 2006, 2002) and allowed us to have a more precise idea of how students deal with written materials as well. Moreover, we believed that creating interactional space for students to contribute to the topic with their own experiences would motivate them to take an active part in this socially-distributed cognition experience (SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010), in which they would both teach about the history of their country and learn about their classmates' countries. It allowed professor and researcher to "step back" and let students guide the conversation and manage their turns-at-talk in the target language (WALSH, 2002). From the observer's point of view, I believe that making a topic suggested by

students the very first topic for discussion sent them a clear message about the active role they had in their own learning process in that course, and it might have been one of the factors that made them feel motivated. They were given the chance to showcase their knowledge and to reassess what they already knew about the Brazilian history. I also believe that the professor's questions were relevant to the creation of such atmosphere, because they were, again, mostly focused on content, not on accuracy, and provided students opportunities to produce longer turns. She constantly used minimal response tokens and clarification requests (SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010), besides making an extensive use of alternative phrasing (WALSH, 2002).

We believe it is possible to say that students were actively involved in the discussions because they used their classmate's contributions to connect issues being discussed to their research topics, establishing a link with studies in a variety of areas, like Philosophy, Sociology, History, and Psychology. This shows us that students felt confident and comfortable enough to challenge themselves and expand their discussions to topics that are not commonly discussed in the target language (BP, in this case), since most of them mentioned that, usually, their readings were in their mother tongue (Spanish or English, except for the two Mozambican students).

Despite the successful interactions observed in this second class, according to our judgement, the sitting arrangement of the room in which classes took place was not adequate, since students had computer screens preventing them from easily making eye contact with their classmates. Because moving the group to another room was not possible and having computers at hand would be important for future lessons, the professor and the researcher decided to ask students, from the third class on, to sit all on the same side of the room, allowing them, in the moments of group discussion or pair work, to see their classmates without any trouble.[46]

---

[46] As examples of studies that seek to understand the relation between the physical learning environment and the creation of learning opportunities, we can mention Talbert and Mor-Avi (2018), who demonstrate how the areas of Education and Architecture can work together to create what they call *Active Learning Classrooms*, which are "[...] learning spaces specially designed to optimize the practice of active learning and amplify its positive effects in learners from young children through university-level learners" (s.p.); Kumar and Bhatt (2015) discuss the idea of informal learning spaces in the context of an Indian University; Beckers, van der Voordt, and Dewulf (2016) focus their work on university students' preferences when it comes to learning spaces at a Dutch institution.

The rest of the class was dedicated to reading and discussing questions related to the text. The professor oriented the reading activity and handed out the questions to be discussed by the students in pairs. After 15 minutes dedicated for individual silent reading, students had 20 minutes to discuss the eight questions in pairs. After that, a group discussion was conducted by the professor, but this time with more guidance and more attention to the topic raised in each question. Students were oriented to keep their contributions to issues directly related to the text and the questions, in order to allow professor and researcher to observe how coherent learners could be when providing oral contributions in this kind of group discussion. Students asked a few vocabulary related questions that they could not solve by themselves, with their peers, or by looking it up in an online dictionary. The Colombian student was not participating as much as he did in the pre-reading activity, and it was not possible to identify whether it was because he did not understand the text or the questions or because he just did not want to participate. Almost at the end of the class, I asked him about racial issues in Colombia and he said that it was not a concern, as far as he understood, and maybe this is why he was not as vocal during that discussion activity. When asked by the professor to further explain his answer, he had some difficulties finding the vocabulary to express his ideas, and the professor demonstrated adequate scaffolding skills, by offering the necessary vocabulary without completing the student's sentences.

In the next section of this chapter, we present a few examples of excerpts of the DMs, based on the professor's and the researcher's field notes, also including the use of stimulated recall. We hope that these micro-analysis (as presented, for example, in MANN; WALSH, 2017 and in WALSH; LI, 2013) are clear enough to guide the reader through our reflective and analytical processes.

4.2 DISCUSSION MEETINGS: AN RP APPROACH TO UNDERSTANDING CDI

We now turn our attention to a few excerpts of transcripts from the DMs between the professor and the researcher. As previously mentioned, these DMs had the purpose of promoting a collaborative, dialogic reflection about some of the issues that took place during the previous class, and to offer researcher and professor the

chance to plan the next class, based on their conclusions of what the following steps should be. It takes into account the interactions that can be understood as evidence of the RP framework that is being applied, and, in accordance with the purpose of this research - promoting a deeper understanding of how CDI are organized in our PAL course -, tries to establish a connection between RP and the awareness raising process of the professor and the researcher to aspects of CDI that can be learned from it. What we present in this section, then, is based on the researcher's field notes, as a way of contextualizing the DMs in relation to when it happened and what the topic under scrutiny in that specific excerpt was. The topic to be analyzed in the excerpt is stated, the excerpt is presented, and a brief analysis is offered after that, leading to a possible explanation as to why we think that excerpt presented something worth discussing.

The excerpt we present below shows an interaction that took place in the first DM recorded (Excerpt 1 -1_27_3_2018). In this DM, professor and researcher were discussing about the lesson plan for the third class; the third class had the pedagogic purpose of guiding students through the elaboration of a research project, using examples of projects produced according to the ABNT[47] standards. As previously arranged between the professor and researcher, the topics of discussion (briefly mentioned in the Methodology and discussed in the Literature Review) for the DMs were covered, and the researcher inquired the professor about the steps to be taken in the next class, as we can see in Excerpt 1 below[48].

The question presented by the researcher (lines 8-9) does not receive a straightforward answer, and some aspects of the professor's turn-at-talk indicate that she is still elaborating her response (line 10, indicating the beginning of the turn-at-talk; lines 11 and 12, with an inhalation and a pause); it is followed by the beginning of an answer to the question (lines 13-14), which is abandoned and a new subject is initiated (from the steps of the lesson to the preoccupation on how to behave linguistically in the class - lines 14-16). This concern is complemented later by the professor (lines 18-20), and the researcher presents an opposite point of view (lines 21-22), reminding the professor about the goal of the observations and of the

---

[47] *Associação Brasileira de Normas Técnicas* (ABNT - Brazilian Association of Technical Standards) is a private non-profit entity that dictates the formatting norms of academic papers.
[48] For a complete list of the transcription conventions used in these transcripts, see Appendix II.

importance of trying to make the data as natural as possible. A third topic emerges from this interaction, which is related to feedback strategies (lines 25-29), where both participants agree on the relevance of offering instant feedback, when adequate, while students present their papers.

Figure 2 - Excerpt 1 - File 1_27_3_2018

```
1       @Begin
2       @Languages:     por
3       @Participants:  RAFA Investigator, CRIS Teacher
4       @Options:       CA
5       @ID:    por|Discussion Meetings|RAFA|29;|male|||Investigator|GRAD_STD||
6       @ID:    por|Discussion Meetings|CRIS|59;|female|||Teacher|PROF||
7       @Media: 1_27_03_2018, audio
8       *RAFA:  vamos ver o que que: (.) tu queria fazer com eles na aula que vem
9               então?
10      *CRIS:  tá.
11              .hh
12              (0.6)
13              eu pensei em fazer o seguinte. tá. ahm::: depois da: apresentação
14              do ↑((student's name)) né? >a pergunta será da-< isso aí tudo bem.
15              isso aí tu pode até ver é- eu não sei se isso aí vale pra ti: no-
16              vale pelas minhas interferên:cias né?=
17      *RAFA:  =uhum
18      *CRIS:  mas ãh::: bom. >de qualquer forma tu tá:< tu tá:: gravan:do
19              e:: e: depois vendo de que forma EU né?: (.) eu teria que me segurar
20              e não fazer os meus apartes durante a $apresen$tação$ né?=
21      *RAFA:  =tá mas eu acho que a ide:ia é que tu continue agindo como tu:: (0.3)
22              fari:a=
23      *CRIS:  =sim, sim, sim, ⌈sim-
24      *RAFA:                  ⌊e a gente vai começar dePOIS, juntos ⌈a-
25      *CRIS:                                                       ⌊até pra
26              não deixar dePOIS né? porque se não PASsa né?=
27      *RAFA:  =passa. é: dependendo do tipo de feedback, eu acho que deixar pra
28              depois é pior porque não- tu per⌈de toda a situação contextual.
29      *CRIS:                                  ⌊sim perdeu a- perd- exatamente.
```
Source: the author.

Our analysis of this first excerpt makes us notice that a lot can happen, in terms of interactions, when we zoom in and observe it with more attention. It also shows the complexity of our enterprise, due to the nature of the classroom environment. From the RP standpoint, it demonstrated how professor and researcher are still coming to terms on how to conduct the research (collecting their own data, making it a dialogic and collaborative reflective process, coming to their own conclusions, and using it to promote changes in their teaching practice). From the CA point of view, we believe that many other aspects could have been observed by a more experienced analyst, but we recognize that, if it was not for the step by step

analysis of turns-at-talk in interactions promoted by CA studies, we would not have been able to identify what happened in those 21 lines, and possibly we would not have noticed that, perhaps, the professors' concerns in that case were more related to being observed than to thinking about the stages of the lesson. It gives us grounds to believe that being recorded raised her level of awareness about her own use of language in the classroom and how her discourse interferes in the interactions with students, and that is exactly one of our goals with this combination of RP, CA-for-SLA, and CDI studies.

Turning their attention again to the stages of the lesson, professor and researcher started a discussion related to merging the topic of interest mentioned by the students in the two first classes (racial issues in Brazil and in their home countries) and the pedagogic purpose of the third class (introduce students to the structure of a research project). Professor and researcher prepared questions to guide the reading of the text and tried to find a reasonable link between the topic suggested by the students and the structure of a project, as we can see in Excerpt 2 below.

Figure 3 - Excerpt 2 - File 1_27_3_2018

```
31    *CRIS:   daí então: eu a:cho que o que a gente pode fazer: (.) é botar em
32             duplas, apresentar o formato de um projeto=
33    *RAFA:   =uhum (.)
34    *CRIS:   como é que se faz um projeto, >daí eu vou preparar esse aqui:< e aí
35             como é que eles fariam um proje:to (.) ahm:: semelhante (.) para
36             ahm::-
37    *RAFA:   -ou então como uma proposta de algo que possa ser inserido nesse
38             projeto?=
39    *CRIS:   =ISSO. BOA. é: uhm. (.) sugestão de- de um projeto que possa: ahm::
40             incrementar o projeto atual né?
41             (0.5)
42    *CRIS:   dentro- dentro da: ⌐>dentro da universidade< quem sabe? em vez de
43             levar pras escolas°=
44    *RAFA:   =⌐sim
45    *CRIS:    ⌐trazer pra universidade, né?
46    *RAFA:   aí já vai pra outro debate né? o fato de quantos negros tem no
47             $campus inteiro$ da PUC, essas coisas.=
48    *CRIS:   =sim.
```

Source: the author.

At the third class, the professor had already given students the chance to explicit how they believe a project should be organized (lesson 2), how some projects

were organized according to the ABNT guidelines (examples to be present during the class), and then, based on the experiences described in the text, students were supposed to elaborate a project, on the same topic, and include it in the context of the university. This way, professor and researcher believed that they were giving students a chance to use their topic of interest to apply the academic genre under study to a situation that is relevant to the learners.

When we look at how the interaction is constructed in Excerpt 2, we can notice that there are no digressions (as compared to Excerpt 1), and that the topic is brought to a conclusion. The sound stretches (represented by ":") in the professor's turns-at-talk (lines 31, 34, 35 and 36, for example), as well as the continuation of tone (represented by ","), indicating a listing intonation, in which she was putting herself in the shoes of the students and "taking the steps" of the lesson with them. At the same time, this use of language can be understood as an evidence of the collaborative planning process that is taking place with the researcher, since he offers a suggestion that is accepted by the professor and assessed as a productive activity to be proposed to the students (as we can see from lines 37-45).

We also believe it is possible to say that the balance, in terms of power relations, between professor and researcher is represented in the lower volume in the professor's utterance at lines 42-43 (indicated by "°"). This softer speech can be interpreted as an indirect way of asking the researcher's opinion on the suggestion presented (applying the project to the university's context, and not to a school context), because it is a complement to the previous idea presented by the researcher. It shows us that, from an RP perspective, both interlocutors see each other's opinions as valid, and that, at least at this point, both of them are contributing to the lesson planning process.

Moving on, it was decided that students would produce a first draft of their projects, in pairs, and then prepare a short presentation to share their ideas with the group. It was, then, necessary to guide the activities. Professor and researcher debated about the formal aspects that would be included in the orientation to the activity (students were supposed to select the adequate verbs, according to each section of their project, and should also make sure to include all the parts of a project - introduction, research questions, hypothesis, objectives, justification, literature

review, methodology, and resources). These aspects were previously discussed with students and some examples were to be presented in the third class; the idea was not to have students write the entire project, but to prepare a first draft to demonstrate how they would do it.

Linked to the topic of guiding the activity, it was also necessary to decide how to assess that activity and make students aware of what was expected from them, both in the written draft of the project and in their oral presentation. From the transcript presented in Excerpt 3, it was possible to notice, however, that professor and researcher were not on the same page when it came to the ideas of "guiding an activity" and "assessing an activity", as we can see below.

Figure 4 - Excerpt 3 - File 1_27_3_2018

```
105    *RAFA:   como que a gente vai guiar a apresentação oral?
106             (2.1)
107    *CRIS:   eles vão ter que segui o:: o: o::: o formato de um proje:to né?:: e
108             eles apresentam esse projeto como eles fariam numa banca. ahn: de
109             qualificação, por exemplo.
110    *RAFA:   ºtá.º
111    *CRIS:   né?
112    *RAFA:   tu acha que é importante eu fazer uma: (.) rubric pra expplicar o que
113             que a gente vai estar avaliando? adequação vocabular:, ahn: abordagem
114             do tema, criatividade, sei ⌈lá.
115    *CRIS:                               ⌊sim:, sim, sim. eu acho que sim. boa.
116             então, ahn::: vamos colocar ai: ahn:: adequação, porque >na verdade
117             não< é: correÇÃO né? adequação:: tá? o que é que nós vamos estar
118             medindo? ahn::: que que é originalidade né? ⌈na verdade, né?
119    *RAFA:                                             ⌊pois é.
120    %com:    ((discussion about what to include in the rubric))
121    *CRIS:   é porque ISSO AQUI é o que a gente quer né? que ele chegue lá::
122             no final, apresente, possa fazer toda essa exposição,
123             argumentan:do,=
124    *RAFA:   uhum=
125    *CRIS:   =no estilo apropriado. ahn: o que que é um estilo
126             apropriado? usando todos os marcadores de discurso corre:tos, né:?
```

Source: the author.

As we can see, the researcher inquires the professor (line 105) about the guidelines to be offered to the students on how to elaborate their oral presentation (based on the first draft of their projects). The professor offers answers, in a single sentence (lines 107-109), what can be understood as the assessment of the activity and the guidelines to perform it. One could understand it as evidence that, in some cases, teachers are not fully aware of how important it is to offer clear guidelines to

the students; in this case, we can identify that the professor is focused on the product, not on the process, and this mindset can influence how she makes use of language when orienting students on how to perform certain activities in the classroom. Despite his initial question not being fully answered, the researcher also apparently did not notice the difference between "guidance" and "assessment", since he simply moved on and asked the professor whether a rubric would be relevant or not in that case (lines 112-114).

Line 120, which indicates a discussion that was not transcribed here, refers to the elaboration of a rubric based on the Common European Framework; it proved to be a useful tool for students to self-assess their work. However, our conclusion about this topic is that guidance for activities, be they written or oral, must be carefully planned, especially when dealing with a group of students with different proficiency levels, because it will have an effect on how students perform the activity; when teachers do not make sure their students understand what is expected from them, it might lead learners to experience a feeling of inadequacy, which is not always their fault, but simply a result of their not understanding the purpose of the activity. Therefore, we believe that clear guidance combined with clear assessment criteria must be a constant topic for a reflective practitioner when planning a lesson.

Throughout the semester, some other examples of what can be seen as evidence of the RP process under development could be observed. Although this evidence usually emerged from seemingly ordinary conversations, we believe they are relevant because, with the use of a CA methodology, we can make them explicit and suitable for a more careful analysis. Excerpt 4, for instance, starts with the professor talking about how having an observer in the classroom can broaden the idea of what is going on in different stages of a lesson, because the teacher is usually focused on one element and misses the bigger picture of the classroom; this topic led the professor to a conclusion about how she feels when it comes to assessing students, as we can observe in Excerpt 4 below.

The professor's utterance (line 130-131) demonstrates her opinion about one of the aspects of the RP process, which is promoting collaborative work among teachers in the same community of practice, and one of the ways of doing so is by observing each other's classes. It is part of the classroom observation process to

look at the details that were not necessarily noticed by the teacher in charge of the group, in order to make these details a topic for discussion and, if that is the case, improvement. As we can see from lines 132-135, professor and researcher seem to agree on the topic, even interrupting their turns-at-talk to complete each other's sentences, which can be understood as a sign of the affiliative nature of the social action that is taking place (SEEDHOUSE, 2005, 2004; MARKEE, 2000).

Figure 5 - Excerpt 4 - File 1_27_3_2018

```
130    *CRIS:   como é bom: ter duas pessoas observan:do as coisas porque EU (.)
131             presto atenção só:: no que o: outro tá: falando.=
132    *RAFA:   =sim=
133    *CRIS:   =eu não tô fa- vendo o que que o:-
134    *RAFA:   -não tá vendo o que tá acontecendo ⌜né?
135    *CRIS:                                      ⌞é:
136             (0.8)
137    *CRIS:   essas coisas de avaliação é complicado, né Rafa?
138             (0.9)
139    *CRIS:   eu- eu me sinto tão inconfortável com isso.
140             (0.6)
141    *RAFA:   é. mas acho que também é um- é um: exercício que a gente tem que
142             praticar como professor porque-
143    *CRIS:   -SIM. ⌜TEM que avaliar
144    *RAFA:       ⌞porque a gente tem que mostrar pra eles o que que tá
145             acontecen:do né? como é que eles tão evoluindo ou não:
```
Source: the author.

In our study, as we explained before, the course and the professor selected were an important factor to make sure that we would be able to apply a first attempt of an RP framework in an environment in which the professionals involved would feel at ease to discuss topics that might be uncomfortable for them. As we can see, the topic of discussion is changed by the professor (line 137), where she demonstrates how she feels about the assessment process and, after the researcher's contributions (lines 141-142 and 144-145), both of them express a similar conclusion about the relevance of offering an accurate and responsible assessment for the students. This short interaction brings up a topic that might resonate with other teachers, and we believe that having the chance to discuss it with other practitioners can be an interesting way to make language professionals aware of their feelings and able to try to find a way to make it, at least, a less uncomfortable task.

One last aspect mentioned during the first DM was related to the seating arrangement of the computer lab in which the lessons would happen during the entire semester. As we can see in Excerpt 5, the researcher states his point of view and asks the professor's opinion on the issue. A recurrent strategy used by the researcher is present here; as we can see at lines 171-172, the topic is not immediately addressed, and other examples of this behavior are going to be presented in the next excerpts. We believe that this pattern of presenting an introduction of an issue to be discussed might be directly linked to the RP process, since it involves observing the teaching practices of a fellow teacher and, sometimes, having to question the reasoning behind a certain teaching action, which might not be as simple as it looks.

Figure 6 - Excerpt 5 - File 1_27_3_2018

```
171   *RAFA:   uma coisa também que eu anotei pra falar contigo era: o setting
172            daquela aula. é muito estranho os alunos não se enxergarem.
173            (0.5)
174   *CRIS:   é horrível ⌈mas-
175   *RAFA:            ⌊a gente não pode botar todos de um lado do::
176            (0.9)
177   *CRIS:   ↑po:de.=
178   *RAFA:   =porque eu acho que fica mais fácil né? dai quando tiver discutindo,
179            todo mundo ⌈vira.
180   *CRIS:           ⌊boh- pode. é bom porque dai: ahn:: tem menos gente né?
181            >dá pra botar todos no mesmo l⌈ado<
182   *RAFA:                              ⌊sim: porque a gente se ench- eles se
183            enchergam pelo menos ⌈né?
184   *CRIS:                      ⌊uhum, uhum.
185   *RAFA:   eu vi que algumas horas o ((student's name)) tava falando com os
186            outros e ⌈teve que ficar se $torcendo$.
187   *CRIS:          ⌊sim, sim. é horrível aquilo alí mas eu ainda acho melhor
188            do que os outros.
189   *RAFA:   sim os outros outros não ⌈tem o que fazer. é.
190   *CRIS:                          ⌊um- um atrás do outro, ali no B (.) e no
191            C:: ahn: é- é muito concorrido.
192   *RAFA:   é.
193   *CRIS:   no- no A, na verdade. é muito grande e muito concorrido. então eu não
194            gosto também.
195            (0.3)
196   *RAFA:   sim.
197   *CRIS:   então: realmente não é uma- um- uma sala de aula. por isso que nas
198            aulas de ((mentions another course)) eu boto em círculo.=
199   *RAFA:   =aham.
200            (0.6)
201   *CRIS:   eu botei em círculo.
202   *RAFA:   vamos tentar colocar eles todos de um la:do-
203   *CRIS:   -isso.=
204   *RAFA:   =pra ⌈gente ver se fica melhor.
205   *CRIS:      ⌊perfeito. uhum.
```

Source: the author.

Using his classroom observation notes, the researcher introduces the topic for discussion and states his opinion about the seating arrangement of the room (lines 171-172), which is followed by a pause (line 173) and by the professor's beginning of a justification (line 174), which is interrupted by the researcher, as observed from the overlap that occurs at lines 174 and 175; the researcher presents his suggestion that, despite being incomplete, was apparently understood by the professor, who takes almost a second to respond (line 176). This, according to CA studies (cf. SILVA; ANDRADE; OSTERMAN, 2009, for example), is a long pause between turns-at-talk of different speakers, and can be interpreted in different ways; in our analysis, we believe it makes sense to state that this pause can be related to the fact that the utterance previously stated by the researcher (line 175) was syntactically incomplete, and that it might have caused the professor to "finish the sentence" in her head, according to the shared context between the two speakers.

Interactionally, we believe this interpretation is plausible because the researcher feels the need to further explain his suggestion (lines 178-179), and the professor seems to be on board with the idea, as can be observed from her subsequent utterance (180-181). The researcher presents more reasons to justify his point of view (lines 185-186), and the professor uses a longer set of turns to explain her choice of room for the class (lines 187-205), where she uses her previous experience with another group of students, in the same room, to bring the topic to a conclusion, demonstrating that they both agree on trying to change the seating arrangement of the classroom.

What seems to be an irrelevant topic has a great impact on how interactions take place in a classroom environment. Even though interactional aspects were not explicitly mentioned in the discussion presented in Excerpt 5, there is a large body of research in the area of SLA studies that present a clear link between the organization of physical spaces where one wants to create interactional space for learning, either in formal classroom settings or in informal places designed for learners to study individually or in groups (cf. TALBERT; MOR-AVI, 2018; BECKERS; VAN DER VOORDT; DEWULF, 2016; and KUMAR; BHATT, 2015, for instance). Therefore, we believe it is reasonable to say that the organization of the classroom might prevent

students from interacting as much as possible with their peers and the teacher, hindering the creation of learning opportunities.

The second DM was focused on discussing the student's presentations in the previous class, and a few classroom management issues were discussed (the sequencing of lesson stages and time management, for example). By talking to the students in the second class, the professor learned that they take a considerably high number of course credits, and that they are having a hard time adapting to the workload from the other courses they are taking (this topic was raised in class because some students looked tired and the professor noticed that they were sleepy). Besides that, when discussing the previous class together, professor and researcher agreed that a few examples of well applied scaffolding moments were observed and that no communication breakdowns were identified.

Leaning on the professor's previous teaching experiences with other groups of students, the researcher asked her about note taking and study strategies; he suggested that learners could reflect more explicitly about how they take notes while watching their classmates' presentations, since it is one of the students' needs that was observed in previous classes.

Figure 7 - Excerpt 6 - File 2_03_04_2018

```
1       @Begin
2       @Languages:      por
3       @Participants:  CRIS Teacher, RAFA Investigator
4       @Options:         CA
5       @ID:    por|Discussion Meetings|CRIS|60;|male|||Teacher|PROF||
6       @ID:    por|Discussion Meetings|RAFA|29;|male|||Investigator|GRAD_STU||
7       @Media: 2_03_04_2018, audio
138    *RAFA:  uma coisa que tu: fazia com uma turma >que tu comentou com a gente
139            uma vez:< era: ahm:: ah: aquelas estratégias de note taking.=
140    *CRIS:  =uhum, >uhum<.
141    *RAFA:  eu acho que isso era uma coisa que tu podia mencionar já amanhã.
142    *CRIS:  eu trab- é: eu trabalhava com esse note taking nas disciplinas de
143            inglês o ano passado. tinha várias palestras da escola de humanidades
144            volta e meia tem. eu levo os alunos e aí eles têm que fazer note
145            taking das palestras apresentadas nas escolas. então eu acho que a
146            gente pode fazer um levantamen:to de palestras. geralmente tem na
147            página da PUC alguma coisa das huma:nas algum e- até por exemplo
148            esse do: dom:: ((continue))
```

Source: the author.

We believe the interaction presented in Excerpt 6 works as evidence of how the RP approach defended by Mann and Walsh (2017) works: it offers professionals with different amounts of teaching experience the opportunity to work and reflect together about teaching issues, joining forces to think of different ways to improve their teaching practices. It is not about reinventing the wheel, but about learning together, in a community of practice. In Excerpt 6, the researcher reminds the professor about something she had mentioned in a previous meeting (lines 138-139), and suggests (line 141) that a similar activity could be useful to the group of PAL students.

After a short discussion about where to find lectures that students could attend to apply this new note taking techniques (lines omitted), professor and researcher demonstrate one more time their concern about the link between the students' needs and the pedagogic purpose of the lesson (see Excerpt 7 below); students are not fully conscious about how they take notes and stated that, for some of them, doing it in Portuguese makes it even more difficult, while the researcher and the professor identified the need to offer learners a task to do while their classmates are presenting something, in order to create an atmosphere that includes all students in these presentation moments.

Figure 8 - Excerpt 7 - File 2_03_04_2018

```
151   *RAFA:   mas: o que eu acho que a gente podia fazer, pra amanhã, já que a
152            gente acha que vai dar tempo de eles fazerem as apresentações-
153   *CRIS:   -uhum=
154   *RAFA:   =é pedir pra eles re- ahm:- pensarem e nos explicarem co- qual que é
155            am:- a forma que eles seguem pra fazer note taking.
156   *CRIS:   uhum, uhum.
157   *RAFA:   porque eu acho que também pode ser diferença de: AH um acha que
158            precisa escrever, outro presta ⌈mais atenção em palavras-cha:ve,
159   *CRIS:                                  ⌊aham, aham. tá. boa. uhum.
160   *RAFA:   porque daí a gente- é um jeito de a gente fazer eles prestarem
161            atenção no que os outros vão estar falando.
162   *CRIS:   uhum .
163            (0.5)
164   *CRIS:   sim porque foi um dos teus comentários, que tinha uns que não estavam
165            prestando atenção, né?
```

Source: the author.

The idea presented in Excerpt 7 is not, in our point of view, about controlling students, but a deliberate attempt to make every stage of the lesson become a

valuable learning opportunity, always taking the pedagogic purpose and the learners' needs into account. The activity started with the professor asking the group of students about their strategies for note taking, when most of them stated that they had never thought about it. The discussion was conducted by the professor and students started to come up with ideas on how they take notes when attending a lecture, for example; the researcher presented a few ideas on how to do it and students chose the one they thought would be more effective, according to the way they usually organize their information in such situations. It was made clear from the discussion that there is no right or wrong when it comes to note taking, but that reflecting about it can only make it easier and more effective for the students.[49]

We noticed that students had a hard time understanding information from their classmates' presentations; no extended comments were made by them and they were usually unable to answer questions about specific information. We assumed that it would be a problem for them to understand their classes from other courses too, and that is why note taking strategies became relevant. Also, we believe that being able to understand someone else's presentations/lectures is also related to being able to organize this information in a way that will help the students to use it appropriately when producing their own texts. At that point of the semester, we had already noticed that learners were not careful when using ideas and concepts from different authors in their written productions and presentations, and we believed that providing them the change to make their note taking strategies a more conscious process would help them with that as well.

Changing the subject once more to talk more about the nature of RP, the next excerpt shows how delicate the relationship between professionals who work together on an RP experience can be. In our case, the professor agreed to open her classroom to the researcher and the relationship between them has always been friendly, but it is possible to identify, from the researcher's linguistic behavior, that he is "linguistically careful" when uttering a comment or a suggestion that might be interpreted by the professor as a piece of criticism to her teaching practices, as we can see in Excerpt 8 below.

---

[49] When looking for materials on note taking, we noticed that it was not easy to find references in Portuguese for that. We found some guidelines in English, translated and adapted them according to our students' needs.

Figure 9 - Excerpt 8 - File 3_10_04_2018

```
1      @Begin
2      @Languages:    por
3      @Participants: RAFA Investigator, CRIS Teacher
4      @Options:      CA
5      @ID:     por|Discussion Meetings|RAFA|29;|male|||Investigator|GRAD_STD||
6      @ID:     por|Discussion Meetings|CRIS|59;|female|||Teacher|PROF||
7      @Media: 3_10_04_2018, audio
128    *RAFA:  o que que tu achou daquelada tua apresentação dos verbos?
129            (1.9)
130    *CRIS:  pode ser- eu acho que eu só li: eles né? que:- que eu podia ter dado
131            exemplos, talvez.  (0.6)
132    *RAFA:  é. a minha- uma das- das ideias que eu tive, na hora, foi eles não
133            tavam prestando atenção.  (0.5)
134    *CRIS:  hm::. não é ideia, é observação.
135    *RAFA:  é. isso é uma observação.=
136    *CRIS:  =uhum.
137            (0.6)
138    *RAFA:  e a ideia foi como que a gente pode hm: fazer com que isso seja mais
139            interessante. talvez só entregar aquilo como material de consulta,
140    *CRIS:  uhum.
141    *RAFA:  se precisarem. e eu achei também que: ahm:: a classificação daqueles
142            verbos tá ⌈MUIto confusa.
143    *CRIS:         ⌊é estra:nha. muito. pois é, na hora que eu tava len:do
144            eu- eu vi. eu peguei aquilo du::m- pois é.
```

Source: the author.

As we can see at line 128, the researcher starts asking the professor's opinion on her way of presenting a list of commonly used verbs in academic BP on the previous class. It is possible to interpret that giving the professor a chance to talk first about one of the stages of the lesson can provide the researcher with an idea of how his own comments should be made, as one can see from the CA studies, in which we learn that the building blocks of conversation can determine what comes next (cf. SEEDHOUSE, 2005, for example, turns-at-talk are content-shaping and content-renewing). In this case, the professor presents, after a long pause (line 129), a criticism about her way of conducting the activity (lines 130-131), giving the researcher the chance to present his point of view (lines 132-133), which is then corrected by the professor (line 134) and confirmed by the researcher (line 135). If we compare this excerpt with the previous ones, we can see that inter-turn pauses are longer (lines 129, 131, 133, and 137), which can bring up different possible interpretations, but that are usually linked to the idea of a dispreferred action (KASPER, 2006; SEEDHOUSE, 2005) or related to more processing time needed (to

remember the topic, to look for an adequate word, to think about an explanation, to present an opinion without offending the interlocutor, etc.).

Another topic that emerged from this discussion was related to the teaching material chosen by the professor. As later mentioned in this interaction (not transcribed), she explains that she found that material on a website that gives tips for Brazilian students who need to write academic papers. At first, the classification of verbs made sense to her, but, while presenting it to the students, she realized that it was not the case for the entire list, and it became difficult to figure out how verbs were classified. Professor and researcher came to the conclusion that materials designed for native speakers of Portuguese are not always adequate to be used with PAL student, even when they present a high level of proficiency. The activity could have been much more productive if the professor and the researcher had reflected more about how to use that material. One possible solution was showing how to use language corpora of Portuguese, available online, to the students. It was done in the subsequent class, with more productive results.[50] Students were instructed to choose some verbs from the list (the ones they did not know how to use or were not sure about the meaning) and look them up in the online corpus, so that they could see real examples of how to use those verbs in different contexts.

Excerpt 9 presents an interesting discussion that evidences how the professor and the researcher are beginning to reflect about the effects of their language use on CDI. In this case, the topic of discussion is related to how the professor manages turns-at-talk in the classroom. We can notice, again, that the researcher uses the same strategy to present his point of view, which is to offer the professor the chance to state her opinion about the topic before the researcher presents his point of view (line 228). However, in this case, we can notice a difference in the interactional pattern; less overlaps occur and longer inter-turn pauses are observed (lines 229, 231, 233, 245, 252, and 255), while most of the previous excerpts presented a higher number of overlap occurrences, indicating a possible intensification of affiliative actions (SEEDHOUSE, 2005).

---

[50] We used the BYU corpus of Portuguese, created by professor Mark Davies (available at: https://www.corpusdoportugues.org/).

Figure 10 - Excerpt 9 - File 3_10_04_2018

```
228   *RAFA:  e o terceiro era em relação- tu já notou como tu: toma o turno?
229           (0.7)
230   *CRIS:  não.
231           (0.9)
232   *CRIS:  direto?
233           (0.6)
234   *RAFA:  direto e, assim, eu notei que EU também faço isso quando eu vou falar
235           alguma coisa em aula. (0.5) eu noto que eu me intrometo na tua
236           fala. (0.7) aí >se fosse uma interação entre nós dois< eu
237           não te pediria desculpa porque é assim que a gente conversa.
238           (0.5) mas como eu sei que eu to em sala de aula, eu- eu
239           sinto a necessidade de te pedir desculpa porque parece que tô sendo
240           mal educado=
241   *CRIS:  =tsé=
242   *RAFA:  =e eu não sei se isso não vai ser um choque de cultura pra eles
243           porque eu não sei como é que se dá: (0.6) essa relação
244           de troca de turno, principalmente entre professor e aluno.
245           (1.3)
246   *CRIS:  ⌈eu-
247   *RAFA:  ⌊eu- eu noto que eu me policio em aula. (0.7) pra- em
248           relação à maneira como eu vou (0.7) ahm: interagir com eles e
249           contigo.
250   *CRIS:  uhum.
251   *RAFA:  eu não sei se tu tem essa preocupação ou não.
252           (2.4)
253   *CRIS:  em relação a eles? como é que eu pego o turno deles?=
254   *RAFA:  =sim.
255           (0.5)
256   *CRIS:  eu acho que eu sou bem incisiva. eu ach-
257   *RAFA:  -eu já notei que tem vezes que tu nota que eles estão falando
258           demais e aí tu começa uhum, uhum, ok, uhum. (1.9) parece que é
259           pra- >eu não sei se é pra:< (0.5) eu notei que eles têm o turno
260           expandido demais. às vezes tu faz uma pergunta ou tu pergunta:-
261   *CRIS:  -uhum. e tem uns que ado:ram que-
262   *RAFA:  -e tem uns que vão, vão, vão,-
263   *CRIS:  -sim: principalmenete os moçambicanos.=
264   *RAFA:  =é.
```

Source: the author.

The pause after the researcher's question (line 229) might indicate that the professor either did not understand it or that she has not thought about that. Her negative answer, presented at line 230, makes us believe that the Transition Relevant Places (TRPs, cf. WONG; WARING, 2010) represented by the inter-turn pauses in the researcher's turns-at-talk (lines lines 235, 236, 238, 247, and 258), made the researcher understand that a further explanation was necessary. All these utterances are intercalated with pauses, in which the researcher was "testing" how much explaining was necessary to make the professor understand the purpose of his question and not take it as a dispreferred action.

We can understand that the agenda pursued by the researcher was related to how the professor interrupts students' turns in the classroom, but that he did not make it clear enough, leading to a very truncated interaction. One evidence for that is the move observed from line 234 on, in which he shifts the focus of attention from the professor to his own language behavior in the classroom environment, justifying his concern with a possible cultural shock for students. Line 251 presents another unclear, indirect question, and the professor, once more, needs to confirm her understanding. This leads us to conclude that, besides their effort to establish an honest and straightforward communication channel, professor and researcher still had some uncomfortable points of discussion, and similar situations probably occur with other professionals who open their classrooms and share their teaching practices with other colleagues. CA was extremely relevant in this awareness raising process, because, if it was not for the efforts put into transcribing these interactions, only relying on the audio recordings would not have provide us with this type of analysis.

Going back to the issue being discussed in Excerpt 9, it caused the professor and the researcher to take a closer look at how in-turn gaps are interpreted when occurring in interactions between speakers of the same L1. As Karper (2006) and Markee (2008) explain, when pauses occur in ordinary conversations between speakers of a shared L1 (as the one presented in Excerpt 9), it usually indicates that a problem in communication needs to be repaired or, even, that a dispreferred act took place. We believe this is a reasonable explanation to the in-turn pauses present in the researcher's turns, since the topic that he was bringing up to be discussed could be interpreted by the professor as a criticism to how she interacts with the students. Comparing Excerpt 9 with the previous excerpts discussed, we can see that the professor's reaction to the initial question presented by the researcher takes longer than usual to be delivered, and consists of a straightforward negative, followed by a question (line 232), unleashing a series of utterances in which the researcher clearly piles up explanations to get his point of view understood.

Closely related to the fact discussed in the previous excerpt is what we can observe in Excerpt 10. Following the discussion on the challenges of managing turns-at-talk in a classroom environment, professor and researcher used the example

of one specific student to talk about scaffolding strategies. In that case, the student constantly presented difficulties finding the words to state his opinions or questions in class, and the researcher observed that, in different moments, scaffolding was offered in a rather unreflected way by the professor.

Figure 11 - Excerpt 10 - File 3_10_04_2018

```
293   *CRIS:  e será que eu to scaffolding ou será que eu do DANdo a resposta
294           também?
295   *RAFA:  aí eu não sei. eu acho que são duas coisas que a gente pode
296           tentar começar a prestar mais atenção. se isso tá scaffolding, (.) se
297           isso tá cortando a produção linguística dele, (1.6) ou se isso tá só:
298           oferecendo uma resposta da maneira mais rápida.
299           (1.9)
300   *RAFA:  né?
```

Source: the author.

The professor's question (line 293) might be considered an evidence that she is not always aware of how she provides scaffolding during her interactions with students, or even that she was open to discuss about it in a collaborative way. However, we believe that bringing this subject to discussion, especially concerning a group of students that present different levels of proficiency, is a way of helping the professional realize how scaffolding strategies need to be adapted according to the needs of different students. This topic gave us the chance to discuss concepts like direct error correction, content feedback, confirmation checks, extended wait-time, latched modeling, alternative phrasing, prompting, etc. (all extensively explained in WALSH, 2002), using a few audio recordings from classroom interactions, in order to try to identify which of these feedback strategies were used, how effective they were, and how adequate it was according to the student with which it was used.

This conversation led professor and researcher to identify that a clear concept of scaffolding was necessary and that an action plan would have to be designed. As the researcher suggests (lines 295-298), a closer look at how scaffolding strategies are used by the professor in different stages of a lesson should be conducted. It would help them identify whether the professor's contributions interrupt and complete the student's turns or help the learner with the necessary language structure, vocabulary or pronunciation, for example, to complete his/her utterances. As we see

it, Kasper's (2006) approximation of the Sociocultural Theory to the critical role that the teacher plays as the mediator of classroom interactions is of utmost importance here, since we understand that cognition is developed in social interaction, and the teacher must be aware of how it works to guide students through the process. As Mann and Walsh (2017) defend, "talking the talk" is already a way of making language professionals more reflective about their teaching, and we could observe that in our experience.

Excerpt 11, from the fourth DM, also included a discussion about time management. We believe that the recurrence of this topic is relevant because it has a direct effect on how different classroom stages are assessed. As we see it, when an activity takes more or less time than expected, it might increase the teacher's anxiety about how to manage lesson stages, and it can also have an effect on how students perceive the class - for instance, it might give students the impression that the teacher did not plan the lesson appropriately, and that all his or her decisions are being made on the spot. As an attempt to solve the problem, professor and researcher decided that establishing a clear objective for every stage of the lesson, resulting in the bigger teaching purpose of the class would be an adequate action plan. Therefore, it was necessary to share these goals with the students and make sure that they would also feel responsible for the progress of the lesson stages.

After closing the discussion about classroom management, professor and researcher started thinking about the best way to present theoretical material concerning the elaboration of books or articles reviews (resenhas), since they noticed that the strategies they had been using were becoming less interesting for the students, as we can see in Excerpt 11 below.

Besides offering students a different way of interacting with the study materials, this would also work as a chance to let learners deal with metalanguage about academic writing. We had already noticed that some of them have their beliefs about how they should or should not include their own theoretical positioning, or their own voices, in their texts, while also presenting some difficulties in differentiating the voice of different authors in their texts. In some situations, we could even notice some resistance to the professor's guidelines and suggestions about how to "voice" their points of view in their texts and presentations, and we decided that we should

tackle that by presenting them how authors, who work and research about academic writing, discuss the topic. At this point, we had already presented and analysed different academic genres and talked about how different areas of study present their idiosyncrasies, when we gave students the opportunity to bring texts from their areas and present them for a group discussion. However, we identified that more discussion about these aspects was necessary, because the next step was to show students different examples of book/article reviews and, after that, guide them through the process of elaborating their own article reviews. Therefore, they would have to be able to clearly identify the ideas of different authors and their own ideas in a written or oral text.

Figure 12 - Excerpt 11 - File 4_08_05_2018

```
1       @Begin
2       @Languages:     por
3       @Participants:  RAFA Investigator, CRIS Teacher
4       @Options:       CA
5       @ID:    por|Discussion Meetings|RAFA|29;|male|||Investigator|GRAD_STD||
6       @ID:    por|Discussion Meetings|CRIS|59;|female|||Teacher|PROF||
7       @Media: 4_08_05_2018, audio
120     *RAFA:  eu acho que eles tão meio cansados já >de ficar em apresentação
121             de powerpoint< e a gente também.
122     *CRIS:  ⌈sim
123     *RAFA:  ∟a gente podia trabalhar um pouco com texto mes:mo, fazer cópia
124             direta disso, ∟a gente seleciona os trecho que são relevantes e eles podem ter
125             material de consulta
126     *CRIS:                  ⌈sim, (0.8) sim, sim. com certeza.
```

Source: the author.

Roughly in the middle of the semester, the fourth DM (Excerpt 12) also presented some evidence that professor and researcher are recalculating the goals of their RP experiment, what aspects of CDI they are observing, and what is the role of the researcher in this process. Once more, we can see that, from an interactional point of view, it is possible to observe that the same interactional pattern is used, and the researcher takes responsibility for the lack of objectiveness of his observations, and a power/professional authority issue is present.

Our analysis of Excerpt 12 makes us believe that what the researcher stated at lines 141 and 142 might be a common feeling for professionals who are new to using the RP framework. Since our goal was to identify and discuss aspects of CDI in the PAL course at PUCRS, which is, itself, a very large study object, we recognize

that our research project was not well-defined, and it caused this sense of disorientation. Had we established specific phenomena we would like to look at, the entire process would have been easier. Dealing with our own classroom data from the RP perspective was more complex than expected, and the observation process was not a matter of simply checking boxes in a form; we had to find a way of establishing a dialogic collaboration and value our professional experience to turn this project into a CPD tool, bringing together received and experiential knowledge (MANN; WALSH, 2017; McKAY, 2003). Despite being a small scale study and far from being groundbreaking, we believe that this research is still a relevant case study to show some "dos and don'ts" for other language professionals interested in the topic.

Figure 13 - Excerpt 12 - File 4_08_05_2018

```
139    *RAFA:   isso é uma coisa que a gente precisa discutir um pouco.
140    *CRIS:   >uhum.<
141    *RAFA:   eu to me sentindo meio:- >culpa minha, não tua.< eu to me sentindo
142             perdido no que que eu to:: <olhan:do> na aula.
143             (.)
144    *CRIS:   ⌈>uhum.<
145    *RAFA:   ⌊eu acho que eu to participan:do demais e observan:do de menos.
146    *CRIS:   uhm:. sim. é culpa minha também porque eu te pedi pra ⌈tu fazeres
147    *RAFA:                                                        ⌊sim. mas⌋ é
148             culpa mi:nha também porque eu ah- a pesquisa é ⌈minha e eu que não me
149             toquei o que tava acontecendo. vamo fazer um mea $culpa compartilhado$
150    *CRIS:                                                  ⌊((laughs))tá.
151             ⌈então tá.
152    *RAFA:   ⌊mas, assim ahm: eu acho que n- na próxima aula, eu vou tentar ficar
153             mais quieto ⌈e observar-
154    *CRIS:               ⌊tá.
155    *RAFA:   ⌈-porque primeiro eles vão tá trabalhando
156    *CRIS:   ⌊tá⌋
157    *RAFA:   soz⌈inhos e depois eu quero ver ahm: como que a gente vai
158             pensar nessa orientação pra produção oral que vai ser a apresentação
159             dos trabalhos.
160    *CRIS:     ⌊óbvio. uhum:.
```

Source: the author.

The next aspect we would like to discuss is related to how professor and researcher reflected about the feedback process for written activities. After choosing two articles from their area of study, learners were asked to write one article review for each, in which they were supposed to present the authors' points of view and the strengths and weaknesses of each article. This activity was elaborated as an attempt

from the professor to help students improve their reading process, since we believed that this might have been the source of their problems when expressing different authors' ideas and differentiating those arguments from their own points of view.

Figure 14 - Excerpt 13 - File 5_15_05_2018

```
1     @Begin
2     @Languages:     por
3     @Participants:  RAFA Investigator, CRIS Teacher
4     @Options:       CA
5     @ID:    por|Discussion Meetings|RAFA|29;|male|||Investigator|GRAD_STD||
6     @ID:    por|Discussion Meetings|CRIS|59;|female|||Teacher|PROF||
7     @Media: 5_15_05_2018, audio
16    *RAFA:  como que tu pensou que vai ser a metodologia disso? a gente bota no
17            qua:dro os tre:chos-
18    *CRIS:  -é. eu já- nós já teríamos marcado em amare:lo >ou eu mando pra ti o
19            que que eu marquei=<
20    *RAFA:  =tá.
21    *CRIS:  e aí a gente ahm:: (.) procura  discutir o texto e ver que que acham
22            né? se tá bom:, se não tá bom:, como é que eles arrumariam.
23            (0.8)
24    *RAFA:  uma coisa que eu tenho notado nesse tipo de feedback de texto: (.)
25            escrito- >de produção escrita< é que: (0.8) a impressão que eu tenho
26            é que:: ÀS VEZES eles só seguem o que a gente tá dizendo (.) mas
27            eles não tão entendendo as observações que a gente tá fazendo. °tu
28            sente isso também?°
29    *CRIS:  eu acho que às vezes também é muito uma questão muito de esti:lo
30            também. que ahm::- porque QUEM na verdade tem que definir o que
31            quer são Eles que são os auto:res né:?
32    *RAFA:  sim. (1.4) mas eu noto que às vezes eles ahm: o alu- semana- semana
33            passada, por exemplo, quando o ((student's name)) tava mostrando o
34            resumo dele, ele tava prestando atenção no que a gente tava
35            discutindo, eu, tu, e a ((observer's name)) com ele, mas os outros
36            três tavam completamente dispersos, pensando em OUtra coisa. eu não
37            sei como que a gente pode mudar a dinâmica dessa atividade pra o
38            feedback fique mais interessante do que a gente só dizen⌈do-
39    *CRIS:                                                          ⌊é. é.
40            (3.5) ahm:: porque, na verdade, que que eles ahm: é:- ehm::- era re-
41            era o resumo do ((student's name)) e os outros dois tavam tentando
42            OUtra coisa porque eles tinham que apresentar. dessa vez eles não
43            TÊM o que apresentar.
44    *RAFA:  é:. então tem menos disper⌈são.
45    *CRIS:                             ⌊então tem os textos deles, (1.2) né? então
46            talvez os dois estão- a gente tá mostrando o texto deles. acho que
47            sim né? e o: também os outros também, acho eu, vamos ver, vamso
48            observar né? isso aí é uma boa observação, né?
49            (6.5)
50    *RAFA:  também se a gente pergunta pros outros como que eles alterari:am ou
51            se eles veem algum problema, talvez eles se sintam mais
52            participativos da atividade.
53    *CRIS:  exatamente.
54    *RAFA:  que eu acho que:- eu não sei se talvez inconscientemen:te eles pensem
55            que AH, NÃO É MEU TEXTO. EU NÃO TENHO QUE PRESTAR ATENÇÃO.
56    *CRIS:  exatamente. eu acho que é isso. pra mim me faz sentido. AH, NÃO VOU,
57            SABE? DAR PALPITE, até porque o:: ((continues))
```

Source: the author.

As we can see, the researcher is consistent in his strategy for discussion: as an introduction to the topic, he presents a question (lines 16 and 17) and listens to

the professor's opinion on the subject before sharing his observations with her. After the professor's response, he presents his impressions (lines 24-27), based on previous experiences of feedback provided for other writing activities (related to the projects organized by the students in the beginning of the semester), and, once more, asks the professor's opinion about it. In response to that, the professor brings up the idea that perhaps this is related to their individual writing styles (lines 29-31), causing the researcher to "redirect" his observation and clarify what he means by that (lines 32-37), explaining that his concern is related to how the other students are involved in the activity or not.

Two issues can be observed here: (1) we believe that students did not know what was expected from them while their classmates were presenting their texts to the group; perhaps because the professor did not remind them about it (and we say "remind" because similar activities had already been done in class, in which students understood that they were welcome to actively participate in the feedback process). Moreover, perhaps we can say that (2) the guidance for the activity was not clear enough to let students know that they were supposed to have their texts done before class, and not finish them in class, while their classmates were presenting their work (as mentioned at lines 40-43). Of course it is not fair to "blame" teachers for every time their students do not honour their classroom contract, but, at the same time, we believe that a clear and constant communication of the goals of a lesson is extremely important to make sure that everyone understands their roles and duties.

Another aspect addressed is related to changing the well-established state of mind that most of us have related to how we learn writing. By changing the way we offer feedback for students' written production, we believe to be moving away from an individualistic, deficit-based learning process, and approximating our teaching practice to a more collaborative one, according to the idea of socially-distributed cognition defended by authors like Seedhouse and Walsh (2010), Markee (2008), Seedhouse (2005, 2004), and Ohta (2001). We also believe that it resonates with the SCT-based idea of "talking the ZPD into being" (SEEDHOUSE, 2004, p. 242), in which teachers create learning opportunities that allow students to learn from their peers, and not only expect all the answers from the teacher.

As a conclusion for this discussion, we believe it is reasonable to say that it is important to make sure that students know, at all stages of a lesson, what they are doing, how they are supposed to do it, and for what reasons. It makes them feel responsible for their learning process and encourages them to actively participate in class. Besides that, when sharing the goals of the lesson with the students, the teacher has a chance to establish the mindset he or she wants his or her students to have when doing a certain activity. For example, in the case of students presenting their article reviews, the professor wanted the other students to take an active role, voicing their opinions and questions about their classmates' works. The outcome of it shows students that they can learn by helping their peers to improve their texts, and not only when the focus is on their own work.

Later, on the same DM, time management was mentioned one more time, when the researcher enquired the professor about how long the activities planned would take (related to the topic 4, presented in the contextualization). This time, however, a reassessment of this issue was raised by the researcher, as we can see in Excerpt 14 below.

Figure 15 - Excerpt 14 - File 5_15_05_2018

```
136   *CRIS:  eu DUVIDE-O-DÓ (.) que a gente consiga ir até o intervalo e
137           trabalhar da página oitenta e sete a noventa.  (1.4)
138   *RAFA:  TRINta e sete a noventa?
139   *CRIS:  oiTENta e sete a noventa.
140           (0.5)
141   *RAFA:  ah, se não der, também (.) não deu. mas: assim, (0.4) eu a:cho que:
142           >apesar da gente tá meio messy< (.) parece com as- os timing das-
143           das atividades, a gente tá fazendo tudo no tempo que eles precisam.
144           eu acho a gente não tem um conte- uma lis:ta de conteúdo-
145   *CRIS:  -nã:o. por- eu nunca tive. eu NUN:ca tive. teve épocas que eu
146           trabalhava mais TE:xto, leitura de TE:xto, entende? do que a própria
147           redação, porque eles precisavam. teve vezes que eu tive que pegar
148           tempos e modos verbais. eles não sabiam né?
```

Source: the author.

After being questioned about the order of the activities and how long each stage of the lesson would take, the professor demonstrates that she thinks it will take longer than they have planned to finish the study of a grammar point (lines 136-137) that seemed to be problematic for some students (active and passive voice structures). After a repair caused by the researcher not understanding the number of

the pages mentioned by the professor (lines 138-139), the researcher states his opinion about how the time management issue can be understood not as a problem, but as a result of the characteristics of the course and of the group of students (lines 141-144), which seems to be accepted by the professor, who confirms that the course does not have a specific list of contents to be covered (as we can see at line 145), followed by the explanation that previous groups of the same course had different language needs (lines 145-148). We believe that it can be understood as evidence of the flexibility of the course according to the students' needs, which affects directly how much time is dedicated to different topics throughout the semester. However, we now understand that the flexibility of the course content regarding the students' interests and needs is not an excuse for not being able to plan a lesson in which the teacher, besides teaching the content, also teaches learners about how to manage their time accordingly. Perhaps the biggest conclusion we can draw from this experience is that we were planning too many activities, due to being afraid of running out of "content to be taught" in a 3-hour class, and that we were not sharing our goal with the student to a point that we could count on them to "keep the pace" of the lesson.

Feedback was mentioned again in the sixth DM, when we had the chance to assess whether our previous discussion and our action plan had affected or not how learners participate in the process of feedback on written activities. It turns out that asking students to write their article reviews on a Google Docs file and share it with the entire group, including the professor and the researcher, made them participate more and pay more attention to each other's texts. From the classroom observation notes, it was possible to notice that, during the class, the professor mentioned that writing should be seen as a process, and that is why students were always given the chance to write a first draft, share it with a classmate, get it marked by the professor and then work on a final version to be assessed and graded. Students mentioned that, most of the times, they see a writing task as something they want to get done with as soon as possible, and they want to "get it right" from the first draft, because they know it is usually the only chance they have to get a good grade on the task. Linking these shared opinions about writing from the professor and the students with the issue of time management mentioned before, we believe it is possible to relate it

to the idea that maybe the professor and the researcher need to reassess their understandings of a lesson plan for a writing lesson, because, as we can see now, the entire writing process will, almost inevitably, take more than one class, and that is part of the process.

Figure 16 - Excerpt 15 - File 6_22_05_2018

```
1      @Begin
2      @Languages:      por
3      @Participants:   CRIS Teacher, RAFA Investigator
4      @Options:        CA
5      @ID:     por|Discussion Meetings|CRIS|59;|female|||Teacher|PROF||
6      @ID:     por|Discussion Meetings|RAFA|29;|male|||Investigator|GRAD_STD||
7      @Media: 6_22_05_2018, audio
8      *CRIS:   tu assinalou em amarelo né? eu vi (0.8) né? eles tão arrumando
9               $tudo, né$? com relação- e- e algumas dúvidas até eu vi que eles
10              tavam arrumando coisas que não era pra arrumar,=
11     *RAFA:   =sim.=
12     *CRIS:   =algumas coisas que eles identificaram como problema. mas: e:- que
13              não eram problema né?
14              (.)
15     *RAFA:   tá.
16              (0.6)
17     *CRIS:   tá, mas:: isso tudo é bom para pensar e pra refletir sobre o texto
18              deles né?
19     *RAFA:   uhum:
20     *CRIS:   e aí, conforme eles forem mudan:do, (0.4) a gente vai ver o processo
21              porque ele tá ali: (.) tá- tá o original, >o que tu assinalasse,< e
22              o que eles mexe:ram,
23     *RAFA:   uhum.
24     *CRIS:   né? então isso tu:do eu acho que é muito legal porque dá pra gente
25              ver todo o::-
26     *RAFA:   -todo o processo que eles tão fa⌜zendo.
27     *CRIS:                                    ⌞exatamente né? o raciocínio que vem
28              por trás.
```

Source: the author.

It was decided that the professor and the researcher would read the students' texts before the class and highlight issues related to grammar, vocabulary inadequacies, unclear sentences, etc., and the whole group would take a look at them together. As shown at lines 8 to 10, the professor noticed that this strategy made students pay attention not only to what was highlighted, but also to other aspects that they thought should be changed (lines 12 and 13), which she initially showed as a problem but, in the end, defended as a productive reflection process for the students (lines 17-18). As the researcher had explained, different versions of the same file can be viewed on Google Drive, and the owner of the file can even see who

has edited it and what changes were made, allowing us to take a look at the students'
written productions from the first draft to the final version, as mentioned by the
professor at lines 20-22. Both professor and researcher agreed that it is a great tool
for teaching writing, because it allows teachers to have a closer look at the process
students are going through (lines 23-28). It also gives us the chance to show to the
students how much they have improved, motivating them to keep up the hard work.

Another discussion topic that emerged from the field notes related to the
previous class was about how students use some of the writing tools available. From
their article reviews, it was possible to identify that none of them had used, for
instance, spell checkers nor online dictionaries, since their texts were handed in with
many simple mistakes that any word processor, like Microsoft Word or Google Docs,
would have been able to identify and indicate a correct alternative. While we
understand that students are not *tabula rasa*, we also need to be sensible enough not
to expect every student to be familiar with writing tools, and that is why we discussed
it in one of the DMs, as presented in Excerpt 16 below:

Figure 17 - Excerpt 16 - File 6_22_05_2018

```
63    *RAFA:   eu posso mostrar pra eles como usar o:: corretor do word.
64    *CRIS:   tá mas: (0.6) será que eles não sabem?
65    *RAFA:   °aparentemente não (.) porque eles mandaram textos com erros que
66             qualquer co⌈rretor encontraria.°
67    *CRIS:              ⌊AH:: NÃO, então isso aí é MUIto importante. MUIto
68             importante. mas ↑que EStra::nho:.
69    *RAFA:   imagino que eles saibam, mas:, assim, veio MUIto erro no texto.
70    *CRIS:   tá bom.
71    *RAFA:   não sei se tu chegou a olhar.
72    *CRIS:   e- eu- eu vi que tu assinalasse umas coisas óbvias ali que:, na
73             verdade, ao invés de se- eles arrumarem acentuaçã:o eles já ta- já
74             queriam arru- já ter arrumado outra coisa mas-
75    *RAFA:   uhum:, >uhum<.
76             (.)
77    *CRIS:   °por favor né?° o:- o:- o word ali:- o corretor: eu:- eu:- eu-
78             (0.5)
79    *RAFA:   é muito básico isso pra nível de pós-graduação. eu ⌈não sei
80    *CRIS:                                                      ⌊é MUIto básico.
81             (.)
82    *RAFA:   né?
83    *CRIS:   é. mas enfim. não custa tentar né?
84    *RAFA:   sim.
85             (1.0)
```

Source: the author.

As we can see from the interaction presented in Excerpt 16, the professor believes students already know how to use simple proofreading tools (line 64), but agrees with the researcher (lines 67-68 and 70) after he explains why he thinks so (lines 65-66 and 69). The rest of the interaction shows that they agree on the idea that it might be worth showing a few of these tools to make sure students know how to proofread their texts before handing them in, not only for the PAL course, but also for when they have to write papers for the other courses they take as well. It made us realize that including instructions on how to use writing tools is an important step in this course and should not be taken for granted, especially because we know how writing is valued in academic life.

The last DM we are going to present here (Excerpt 17) focused on procedures for the presentation of grammar content and the correction of exercises related to that. As observed in the previous classes, learners had been showing some problems understanding the construction, the functions, and the adequate use of the passive voice in BP; while reading and understanding these structures was generally not a problem, producing them was sometimes a challenge, and we decided to tackle it. However, the procedures to check the exercises was questioned by the researcher, as we can see in Excerpt 17 below.

We can see that, following the same interaction pattern of almost all the other excerpts, the researcher presents an introduction to the topic (lines 44-50), where he uses his own experience as an English teacher to compare it with how he does it when teaching Portuguese, complementing his utterance with what can be understood as a criticism of how the professor conducted the correction of the exercises in the previous class (line 52-53). This interpretation of an indirect criticism is supported by the question asked by the professor at line 54, followed by a pause (line 55), as a reprocessing of the criticism at line 56-57, where the researcher includes himself in the "wrongdoing", tries to justify the way the exercise was guided, and explains his opinion (lines 60-62). This is followed by the teacher asking to see and example of how she did it (stimulated recall was used and they heard an excerpt of the recordings later in the DM).

Figure 18 - Excerpt 17 - File 7_22_05_2018

```
1       @Begin
2       @Languages:      por
3       @Participants:  CRIS Teacher, RAFA Investigator
4       @Options:        CA
5       @ID:     por|Discussion Meetings|CRIS|59;|female|||Teacher|PROF||
6       @ID:     por|Discussion Meetings|RAFA|29;|male|||Investigator|GRAD_STD||
7       @Media: 7_22_05_2018, audio
44      *RAFA:   uma coisa que (.) eu queria comentar conti:go, pra ver o que que tu
45               consultou, o que que tu a:cha, e se tu concorda ou não. na correção
46               dos exercícios, >pelo menos em inglês<, em português eu nunca tinha
47               notado se eu faço isso ou não. (0.6) ahm:: eu sempre tento ler a
48               oração, a f- a frase inTEIra porque:: se a gente vai até só o ponto
49               gramatical, eu acho que dá a impressão pro aluno de que: o::
50               conteúdo não é intere- não interessa, mas só at⌈é a resposta correta.
51      *CRIS:                                                   ⌊entendi. entendi.
52      *RAFA:   isso é uma coisa que eu sempre tento evitar quanto eu tô::
53               corrigindo-
54      *CRIS:   -e eu FIZ isso?
55               (1.2)
56      *RAFA:   a gente foi até:: o ponto, até nem- eu enten::do porque a gente tá
57               (0.6) tentando focar no que é o objetivo do exer⌈cício.
58      *CRIS:                                                   ⌊é me::smo?
59               (.)
60      *RAFA:   eu acho que os alunos talvez não notem necessariamente isso, (07)
61               mas eu acho que fica uma mensagem implícita de que o que interessa
62               aqui não é o conteúdo, mas só a forma.
63      *CRIS:   ce- é. certamente. é. exatamente. (1.4) bá, deixa eu ver um exemplo
64               aqui:. como é que eu- como é que eu fiz?
65      *RAFA:   ÓBvio que tem uma questão do foco do ponto gramatical que é
66               problemático-
67      *CRIS:   -tudo bem. é. tá.
68      *RAFA:   mas, assim ó, eu que acho que têm- têm momentos que EU acho que isso
69               vale a pena.
70      *CRIS:   tem certe- é. tem razão. aham. (1.6) ah, e outra né? era
71               eu que tava dando as respostas ou eram eles?
72               (0.9)
73      *RAFA:   não. acho que eram eles. daí tu tava só: (0.4) outra coisa talvez
74               te- eu tenha que olhar de novo a gravação pra ver se não ficou
75               echoing. (1.2) eu a:cho que não. eu não anotei isso na hora. eu
76               anotei só a questão de não fazer a leitura completa das frases.=
77      *CRIS:   =uhum. uhum. provavelmente teve echoing.
78      *RAFA:   talvez sim, mas eu acho que não chegou a ser problemático. pelo
79               menos na hora da observação eu não notei.
80      *CRIS:   é?
81               (0.7)
82      *RAFA:   e nem na verdade a questão de ir só até o:: a resposta. eu acho que
83               não foi problemático. é só uma questão pra, assim, (0.4) em exercícios
84               futuros, em que o ponto gramatical TÁ sendo discuti:do com mais
85               atenção, talvez é sempre interessante linkar o ponto gramatical com
86               a informação que ele::-
87               (1.0)
88      *CRIS:   claro. uhum.
89      *RAFA:   -que ele agrega né?
```

Source: the author.

Another topic is brought up by the professor (lines 70-71), which is also related to how she conducted the correction of the exercises, but it was not noticed by the

researcher and, later, after listening to the classroom recordings again, we could notice that she was not handing over the answers and echoing was not taking place. The topic of focusing the correction on the grammar structure and ignoring the meaning it conveys was briefly discussed again and both agreed that it is important to always keep the meaning, use, and form of grammar aspects under discussion closely related, so we can increase the chances that students will have a broader view of it, and not only memorize its form. Asking students to check their answers and discuss with a classmate before group correction would have given them the chance to learn from their peers and feel more confident to share their answers and their reasoning when checking with the whole group.

The issues discussed in this section are evidence of the RP process that had been developed, and we believe that they present a sort of continuity of the discussions carried out throughout the semester. However, we recognize that many other aspects could have been discussed if the same data was analysed by different researchers, since RP applications tend to be a very personalized process. What we have selected to be discussed here is the result of what the researcher and the professor were able to identify as relevant topics according to their experiences and to their CPD needs, and probably would not be the same if this research was conducted using another course or another group of students. Therefore, it is reasonable to state that, directly or indirectly, the aspects presented above are closely related to how CDI is understood by the language professionals involved in this research.

As examples of other aspects discussed in the DM that were not presented here, we can mention the need to be careful when making comparisons between our variety of Portuguese (BP) and the one spoken by students from other Lusophone countries. For instance, when referring to the Mozambican students, the professor, in some occasions, called their variety "European Portuguese", which is not accurate. After being questioned about it by the researcher, she realized how rude it may have sounded, especially because the research topic of one of these students was the identity of Mozambican people after the independence from Portugal. The students did not mention anything in class, but, as language professionals, we know how

sensitive people can be when it comes to their cultures and identities and, undeniably, language is a very important part of somebody's identity.

Still related to the Mozambican students, in the first DM, the professor was curious about why native speakers of Portuguese were interested in taking a PAL course. Their reasons for taking the course were explained in the first class, when learners said that they were not confident when writing academic papers in BP and that, in fact, they learned Portuguese only after starting school, and only spoke their native languages at home[51]. Besides that, they mentioned that their advisers believed taking the PAL course would make them have a better understanding of their writing processes, which would be useful for their academic life in general.

Trying to figure out why time management was such a hard issue to deal with during the semester, we came to the conclusion that a more complete students' needs analysis would have helped us predict challenging points for the learners, and we would have been able to better plan the time for different activities accordingly. On the other hand, we finished the semester with the feeling that students were able to take the most out of the course. Despite our constant need to rearrange the activities and move some of them from one class to the next, we had enough time to discuss the academic genres we identified as most relevant for the learners (research projects, scientific abstracts, articles, and book/article reviews), and, most importantly, we believe we did it respecting the time students needed to adequately process and reflect about what they were learning and about what they already knew.

To conclude, this RP experience, with the support of CDI studies and the CA-for-SLA methodology, gave us the chance to take a closer look at how we had been planning our PAL classes, how we had been offering feedback to our students and how the RP framework can contribute to improve our teaching actions related to those aspects. Besides that, we could notice that students' needs were not as well assessed as we imagined, from the first classes, and that we had to reassess it throughout the semester. Moreover, having the chance to discuss with another

---

[51] This realization about how little we knew about other Lusophone countries gave us the opportunity to get in touch with professionals from other areas who study the topic, and, the initial idea of inviting a few people for a talk became a two-day event (*I Encontro Internacional de Lusofonia: história, língua e cultura em foco*), that took place in november 2018, at PUCRS, organized by professors Cristina Becker Lopes Perna and Marçal de Menezes Paredes, with the assistance of Aline Jéssica Antunes and Rafael Padilha Ferreira, students from the Master's Programs in Linguistics at PUCRS.

professional, from the same community of practice, gave us the chance to rethink some concepts related to teaching and learning (like feedback, guiding and assessing activities, pedagogic purposes, scaffolding, etc.). This experience also gave us the opportunity to learn about the RP framework together, and, most importantly, to value our experience and our practice, and trust that, even when we make mistakes, we are always trying to do the best we can. For example, topics seemingly irrelevant, like seating arrangements in the classroom, time management, and the use of basic writing tools, were entirely resignified, and we could see how closely related to CDI they were, at least in our context.

5 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

This research, inspired by the need for more studies focused on explaining the CDI features of PAL classes for graduate international students in Brazilian universities, used an RP-based experience of two language professionals to present a possibility of looking at classroom interactions in a more contextualized way. Using a PAL course for foreign graduate students at PUCRS as the backdrop, this study presented how RP, which is an evidence-based, data-led approach, encourages collaborative, dialogic discussions and the use of data that is collected, transcribed, and analyzed by the teachers themselves, making the process less vague, elusive and general (cf. MANN; WALSH, 2017). We tried to exemplify how CDI studies, mostly based on a CA-for-SLA methodology, can elucidate not only the way teachers use language in the classroom, but also how they understand classroom interactions and promote learning opportunities.

As it became clear during the first stages of this research project, the first step to have a better understanding of CDI characteristics would be to map the general functioning of interactions that take place in a language classroom like ours. The RP framework presented in Mann and Walsh (2017) was the starting point for the setting of what we called our community of practice. This framework promotes a way of looking at RP that turns it into a CPD tool for language teachers, offering them the chance to collect and use their own data and improve their teaching practices in a collaborative, personalized, meaningful, and contextualized manner. This RP framework was combined with CDI studies (WALSH; LI, 2013; SEEDHOUSE; WALSH, 2010; WALSH, 2006, 2002) and CA-for-SLA studies (WONG; WARING, 2010; MARKEE, 2008; TEN HAVE, 2007; KASPER, 2006; SEEDHOUSE, 2005, 2004), in order to provide a more Linguistics-base background. This body of research was used in the analysis presented in Chapter 4, and we believe that all the excerpts discussed here are, in a way or another, directly related to how the professor made use of language in the classroom or to how interactions were collaboratively built in the DMs.

This combination of RP, CDI, and CA-for-SLA gave us the chance to identify what aspects of classroom interactions were discussed by the two language

professionals involved in this study. Through the analysis of the classroom observation notes and the use of stimulated recall, professor and researcher discussed aspects related to the PAL course. These DMs were recorded and excerpts of it were selected for transcription, and from the analysis of these transcripts it was possible to observe how the RP process was taking place. Those meetings were focused on discussing aspects related to CDI, in which the theoretical background and the language professional's teaching experiences were used to collaboratively reach their conclusions, in an attempt to follow Mann and Walshe's guidelines of combining experience, interaction and reflection (MANN; WALSH, 2017). While the outcomes of this experience are hard to quantify, we are certain that this first application of an RP framework, based on the CDI and CA-for-SLA studies used in this project, offered us a chance to look at our own teaching practices and help each other in a dialogic awareness raising process of CPD. Moreover, it gave us the chance to learn new concepts and review aspects commonly discussed, but not always deeply understood in teacher training programs, complementing our previous received knowledge and expanding our experiential knowledge (WALLACE, 1991 apud MANN; WALSH, 2017).

The discussions presented above are, therefore, the outcome of an ongoing CPD process, since we believe that a broader understanding of our own teaching practices could not be achieved in a single application of an RP framework. We do believe, though, that the combination here presented (RP, CDI, and CA-for-SLA) has the potential to help language professionals develop a more conscious set of teaching practices that would help them improve their teaching skills, further increasing the impact they may have on the learning process of their students. The corpus of classroom interactions that we collected for this research is going to be a fruitful source of our own classroom data to be used in future studies. Likewise, the corpus compiled from the DMs, not fully presented in this research, is also a valuable source of interactions between language professionals that still offers opportunities for a great amount of collaborative and dialogic discussions.

After presenting our first attempt of applying an RP framework to our PAL context, we feel as if we had only "scratched the surface" of a much bigger and more complex field of study inside Applied Linguistics, which are the CDI and the

CA-for-SLA studies, and what is left is the certainty that we still have a lot to learn. Since our goal was to observe the professor's use of language and how the classroom interactions were taking place in our course of PAL for graduate students at PUCRS, we believe that the points of discussion that emerged in the analysis were relevant to the professionals involved in the research, and that they promoted the reconsideration of some beliefs and practices (cf. MANN; WALSH, 2017). However, we also recognize that other important aspects of CDI may have been forgotten during the process, but that future application of the same RP framework might expand the scope of discussion and include more relevant aspects, according to the goals of the professionals involved and the students' needs and interests. Similarly, while we recognize the limitations of this study, we also believe that it presents an alternative of CPD for language professionals who are interested in a more collaborative, dialogic, and highly contextualized study of their own working context.

In order to conclude this research, a few challenging points faced by the researcher should be mentioned. For example, we believe that RP frameworks (either from the perspective of the authors used here or from other researchers) should have more space in pre- and in-service teacher education programs, and the same also applies to CDI and CA-for-SLA studies. Saying that does not mean that we criticize what teacher education programs offer, nor that we ignore the amazing work that most of them do, but simply that we, and other language professionals from our community of practice, believe that these areas have the potential to contribute a lot with the professional qualification of language teachers. A widespread use of an RP framework, for example, would encourage language professionals to value their own context and produce their own data, which, at least in our case, proved to have a stronger impact on how we change our classroom practices.

While we believe that the results of this research are hard to quantify, as mentioned above, we believe that this experience has significantly affected the way we see classroom interactions and how attentive to smaller or apparently insignificant details we are now. Being aware of how we interact with different students, who present different needs and interests, is one of the results we could see emerging from our discussions. Besides that, understanding timing as an issue that must be carefully planned and flexible, instead of taking it as a failure when lesson stages go

off track, is a matter that most teachers have to be reminded of from time to time. Also, for example, being able to distinguish when we are offering scaffolding and when we are interrupting students' language production might be a fine line for some of us, and having a fellow teacher observing our class and challenging us to look at things from a different perspective is another productive outcome we could get from this research.

Despite the fact that most of the outcomes of this experience were positive, a few details in the methodology make us believe that the entire process could have been more effective or even easier for the researcher. For instance, focusing on CDI features from a PAL course seemed to be a reasonable objective at the beginning, but proved itself to be a very broad goal. We are aware that many aspects that came up in our DMs were not discussed with the depth we would have liked to, and that many other aspects were not even addressed, due to the complexity of discussions they would demand. No wonder it was hard to keep focused, because there was just so much going on in every single excerpt of DM. For future research, then, we would focus on a specific feature of CDI, like an aspect of the teacher's use of language, feedback strategies, learner-learner interactions, etc. so that we can conduct an even smaller-scale study, but with a much more thorough analysis process.

Another aspect that was a concern from the beginning was the fact that we were both producing the data (the subjects) and analyzing it (the researcher). Despite being part of the RP framework, which has, as one of its goals, the idea of making teachers able to collect, compile, and analyze their own data, we were concerned about how reliable our conclusions would be, and how much of it we would be able to observe, since we were part of the context that was under scrutiny. Now, at the end of our enterprise, we are able to say that, in some moments, our proximity to the data made the analysis process more difficult, because it was a matter of having to be straightforward and scientific, while trying to be understanding and not judgmental at the same time. The biggest lesson from this experience is that, by using a CA-for-SLA methodology, it was possible to identify interactional patterns in the conversations between the professor and the researcher that we were not able to observe by only listening to the recordings over and over again. It is important to mention, as well, that when writing about this experience, it was difficult to report it in

an impersonal way, because almost everything was related to my own experiences (of course, shared with my adviser, the subject of my study), and that was a challenge too.

REFERENCES

ALARCÃO, I. **Professores reflexivos em uma escola reflexiva**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2011.

AMOSSY, R. (Org.). **Imagens de si no discurso**: a construção do ethos. São Paulo: Contexto, 2005.

ANTUNES, I. **Muito além da gramática**: por um ensino de línguas sem pedras no caminho. São Paulo: Parábola, 2007.

ASKEHAVE, I; SWALES, J. M. Genre Identification and Communicative Purpose: a Problem and a Possible Solution. **Applied Linguistics**, v. 22, n. 2, p. 195-212, 2001. Available at: DOI https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/22.2.195. Access on: 20 May. 2018.

AZEVEDO, I. C. M. DE. Alternativas para a Formação do Professor de Português para Falantes de Outras Línguas (PFOL). **Anais do SIELP**, v. 3, n. 1. Uberlândia: EDUFU, 2014. Available at: http://www.ileel.ufu.br/anaisdosielp/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/2563.pdf. Access on: 07 dez. 2017.

BAGNO, M. **Português ou brasileiro?**: um convite à pesquisa. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2001.

BAGNO, M. **A língua de Eulália**: novela sociolingüística. 16. ed. São Paulo: Contexto, 2010.

BAGNO, M. **Gramática de bolso do Português brasileiro**. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2013a.

BAGNO, M. **Preconceito lingüístico**: o que é, como se faz. 55. ed. São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 2013b.

BAGNO, M. Por que estudar uma gramática brasileira? In: CASSEB-GALVÃO, V.; NEVES, M. H. M. (Org.). **O todo da língua**: teoria e prática do ensino de português. 1. ed. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2017, v. 1, p. 97-121.

BRASIL. Base Nacional Comum Curricular (BNCC). **Educação é a Base**. Brasília, MEC/CONSED/UNDIME, 2017a. Available at: http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br/images/BNCC_publicacao.pdf. Access on: 02 jun. 2017.

BRASIL. Base Nacional Comum Curricular. **O que é a Base Nacional Comum Curricular?**. 2017b. (3m31s). Disponível em: http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br/. Acesso em: 02 jun. 2017.

BRASIL. **Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais** - Terceiro e Quarto Ciclos Do Ensino Fundamental - Língua Portuguesa. 1. ed. Brasília: MEC/SEF, 1998.

BECKERS, R.; VAN DER VOORDT, T.; DEWULF, G. Learning space preferences of higher education students. **Building and Environment,** 2016. Available at: DOI 10.1016/j.buildenv.2016.05.013. Access on: 02 dez. 2017.

BIBER, D. **University Language**: a corpus-based study of spoken and written registers. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2006.

CRABBE, D. The Quality of Language Learning Opportunities. **TESOL Quarterly**, v. 37, n. 1, Spring 2003. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/3588464. Access on: 05 Jun. 2018.

CRESCITELLI, M. C.; REIS, A. S. O ingresso do texto oral na sala de aula. In: ELIAS, V. M. (Org.). **Ensino de Língua Portuguesa**: oralidade, escrita, leitura. São Paulo: Contexto, 2018.

CASTILHO, A. T. DE. **A língua falada no ensino de português**. São Paulo: Editora Contexto, 2006.

DELL'ISOLA, R. L. P. (Org.) **Exame de Proficiência Celpe-Bras em Foco**. Campinas: Pontes Editores, 2014.

DINIZ, M. B. N. P.; COELHO, R. P. Abordagem acional em curso de capacitação de professores de PLA: O ensino baseado em tarefas. De volta ao futuro da língua portuguesa. **Atas do V SIMELP - Simpósio Mundial de Estudos de Língua Portuguesa**. Lecce: Università del Salento, 2017. Available at: http://siba-ese.unisalento.it/index.php/dvaf/article/view/18104/15445. Access on: 7 Dec. 2017.

FARRELL, T.S.C. **Novice language teachers**: insights and perspectives for the first year. London: Equinox Publishing, 2008.

FERREIRA, R. P. A Formação do Professor de Português como Língua Adicional. **Revista da Graduação**: Porto Alegre: EdiPUCRS, 2013. Available at: http://revistaseletronicas.pucrs.br/ojs/index.php/graduacao/article/view/15512/10177. Access on: 07 Dec. 2017.

FERREIRA, L. M. L. Avaliação da proficiência oral: atividades de pós-leitura de listas e gráficos no exame Celpe-Bras. In: DELL'ISOLA, R. L. P. (Org.) **Exame de Proficiência Celpe-Bras em Foco**. Campinas: Pontes Editores, 2014.

FERREIRA, R. P.; ROLLSING, L. Z. Gêneros do Discurso no Ensino de Português como Língua Adicional: reflexões sobre a esfera discursiva acadêmica. **Domínios de Lingu@gem**, v. 12, p. 839-856, 2018. Available at: http://www.seer.ufu.br/index.php/dominiosdelinguagem/article/download/39953/22368. Access on: 15 Aug. 2018.

FIRTH, A.; WAGNER, J. On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. **Modern Language Journal**, v. 81, p. 285–300, 1997. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4626130. Access on: 15 Dec. 2017.

FREIRE, P. **Pedagogia do Oprimido**. [recurso eletrônico, s.p.]. 1. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 2013.

GARDNER, R.; WAGNER, J. (Orgs). **Second Language Conversations**. London: Continuum, 2004.

GASS, S. M.; SELINKER, L. **Second language acquisition**: an introductory course. 3. ed. New York, Routledge, 2008.

GIL, A. C. **Como elaborar projetos de pesquisa**. 4. ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 2008.

GIL, I. T. M. Retórica a argumentação: continuidade e rupturas. **Revista Máthesis**, v. 14, p. 69–79, 2005. Available at: http://repositorio.ucp.pt/bitstream/10400.14/9036/1/mathesis14_69.pdf. Access on: 7 dez. 2017.

ILARI, R.; BASSO, R. **O português da gente**: a língua que estudamos, a língua que falamos. [s.l.] São Paulo: Editora Contexto, 2012.

KASPER, G. Beyond repair: conversation analysis as an Approach to SLA. **AILA Review**, v. 19, p. 83–99. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2006.

KUMAR, A.; BHATT, R. K. A Study of Using Informal Learning Spaces at Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi. **Library Philosophy and Practice** [e-journal]. August 2015. Available at: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1239. Access: 02 Dec. 2017.

LARSEN-FREEMAN, D.; LONG, M. H. **An introduction to second language acquisition research**. New York: Routledge, 1991.

LAZARATON, A. **A Qualitative Approach to the Validation of Oral Language Tests**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

LYLE, J. Stimulated Recall: a report on its use in naturalistic research. **British Educational Research Journal**, v. 29, n. 6, 2003. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/0141192032000137349. Access on: 20 Jan. 2018.

MANN, S.; WALSH, S. RP or "RIP": a critical perspective on reflective practice. **Applied Linguistics Review**, v. 4, p. 291–315, 2013. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2013-0013. Access on: 20 Nov. 2017.

MacWHINNEY, B. **The CHILDES Project**: Tools for Analyzing Talk. 3. ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2018.

MANN, S; WALSH, S. **Reflective Practice in English Language Teaching**: research-based principles and practice. New York: Routledge, 2017.

MARCUSCHI, L. A. O Tratamento Da Oralidade nos PCN De Língua Portuguesa De 5ª A 8ª Séries. **Scripta**, v. 2, n. 4, p. 114–129, 1999. Available at: http://periodicos.pucminas.br/index.php/scripta/article/view/10280/pdf. Access on: 07 Dec. 2017.

MARCUSCHI, L. A. **Produção textual, análise de gêneros e compreensão**. Parábola Editorial, São Paulo, 2008.

MARKEE, N. Toward an ethnomethodological respecification of second language acquisition studies. In: TARONE, E.; GASS, S. M.; COHEN, A. (eds.). **Research Methodology in Second Language Acquisition**, p. 89–116. Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1994.

MARKEE, N. **Conversation Analysis**. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000.

MARKEE, N. Toward a Learning Behavior Tracking Methodology for CA-for-SLA. **Applied Linguistics**, v. 29, n. 3, p. 404–427, 2008. Available at: DOI https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm052. Access on: 26 Sep. 2017.

MARKEE, N. (Org.). **The Handbook of Classroom Discourse and Interaction**. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2015.

MARKEE, N.; KASPER, G. Classroom talks: An introduction. **The Modern Language Journal**, n. 88, p. 491–500, 2004. Available at: http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.458.7240&rep=rep1&type=pdf. Access on: 07 jun. 2017.

MARKEE, N.; KUNITZ, S. CA-for-SLA Studies of Classroom Interaction: Quo Vadis? In: MARKEE, N. (Org.). **The Handbook of Classroom Discourse and Interaction**. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2015.

MARTINS, A. F. **Direcionamentos para o ensino de Português como Língua Adicional em Portugal e no Brasil**: análise de propostas e reflexão para a definição de uma política linguística brasileira. 2016. 83 p. Trabalho de Conclusão - Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Instituto de Letras. Porto Alegre: UFRGS, 2016.

McKAY, S. L. **O professor reflexivo**: guia para investigação do comportamento em sala de aula. Tradução de Renata Oliveira. São Paulo: Special Book Services Livraria, 2003.

NEVES, M. H. DE M. **Que gramática estudar na escola?**: norma e uso na língua portuguesa. [s.l.] Editora Contexto, 2015.

OHTA, A. S. **Second Language Acquisition Processes in the Classroom**: Learning Japanese. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2001.

PAIVA, V. L. M. O. **Aquisição de segunda língua**. 1. ed. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2014.

PERINI, M. A. **A língua do Brasil amanhã e outros mistérios**. São Paulo: Parábola, 2004.

PIMENTA, S. G.; GHEDIN, E. (Orgs.). **Professor reflexivo no Brasil**: gênese e crítica de um conceito. São Paulo: Cortez, 2012.

PIMENTA, S. G. Professor reflexivo: construindo uma crítica. In: PIMENTA, S. G.; GHEDIN, E. (Orgs.). **Professor reflexivo no Brasil**: gênese e crítica de um conceito. São Paulo: Cortez, 2012.

POSSENTI, S. **Por que (não) ensinar gramática na escola**. [s.l.] Mercado de Letras, 1996.

QUADROS, T. D. (no prelo). **Marcadores discursivos na aquisição do português como língua adicional**: uma aplicação da análise da conversa em amostras do Brasil e da Inglaterra. 2019. 255 p. Dissertação - Programa de Pós-graduação em Letras. Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do SUl (PUCRS), Escola de Humanidades. Porto Alegre, 2019.

REGO, T. C. **Vygotsky**: uma perspectiva histórico-cultural da educação. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2012.

RICHARDS, K.; SEEDHOUSE, P. (Orgs.). **Applying Conversation Analysis**. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

ROCHA, H. C. **The curriculum of Portuguese as an additional language in Brazilian universities**. 2018. 112p. Trabalho de Conclusão - Curso de Letras. Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS), Escola de Humanidades. Porto Alegre, 2018.

SCHEGLOFF, E. A.; JEFFERSON, G.; SACKS, H. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. **Language**, v. 53, 1977. Available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/413107?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents. Access on: 17 jun. 2017.

SCHOFFEN, J. et al. **Português Como Língua Adicional**: reflexões para a prática docente. Porto Alegre: Bem Brasil, 2012.

SEEDHOUSE, P. **The interactional architecture of the second language classroom**: a conversational analysis perspective.Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.

SEEDHOUSE, P. Conversation analysis and language learning. **Language Teaching**, v. 38, n. 4, p. 165–87, 2005. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444805003010. Access on: 07 Jan. 2018.

SEEDHOUSE, P.; WALSH, S. Learning a Second Language through Classroom Interaction. In: SEEDHOUSE, P.; WALSH, S.; JENKS, C. **Conceptualising 'Learning' in Applied Linguistics**. Palgrave Macmillan: London, 2010.

SEEDHOUSE, P.; WALSH, S.; JENKS, C. **Conceptualising 'Learning' in Applied Linguistics**. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

SHAMSIPOUR, A; ALLAMI, H. Teacher talk and learner involvement in EFL classroom: the case of iranian setting. **Theory and Practice in Language Studies**, v. 2, n. 11, p. 2262-2268, 2012. doi:10.4304/tpls.2.11.2262-2268. ISSN 1799-2591. Available at: https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/9449/9c02ab003979e80c29cd40e9c3be29fb38e7.pdf. Access on: 22 sep. 2017.

SILVA, R. V. M. E. **O português são dois**: novas fronteiras, velhos problemas. [s.l.] São Paulo: Parábola, 2004.

SILVA, C. R.; ANDRADE, D. N. P.; OSTERMANN, A. C. Análise da Conversa: uma breve introdução. **ReVEL**, vol. 7, n. 13, 2009. Available at: www.revel.inf.br. Access on: 25 Jul. 2018.

STREET, Brian. Academic Literacies approaches to Genre? **Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada**, Belo Horizonte, v. 10, n. 2, p. 347-361, 2010. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1984-63982010000200004. Access on: 15 May 2018.

SWALES, J. M. **Genre Analysis**: English in academic and research settings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.1990.

TALBERT, R.; MOR-AVI, A. A Space for Learning: a review of research on active learning spaces. **SocArXiv**. 2018. Available at: osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/vg2mx. Access on: 28 dec. 2018.

TEN HAVE, P. **Doing Conversation Analysis**. 2. ed. London: SAGE Publications, 2007.

TSUI, A. Classroom Discourse: Approaches and Perspectives. In: CENOZ, J.; HOMBERGER, N.H. (Orgs.). **The Encyclopaedia of Language and Education**. v. 6: Knowledge About Language. New York: Springer, 2008. p 261-272.

WAGNER, J. Language acquisition through foreign language interaction: a critical review of studies in second language acquisition. **Journal of Pragmatics**, v. 26, p. 215–35, 1996. Available at: https://kundoc.com/queue/pdf-foreign-language-acquisition-through-interaction-a-critical-review-of-research-o.html. Access on: 29 dec. 2018.

WALSH, S. Construction of obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. **Language Teaching Research**, v. 6, n. 3, 2002. Available at: DOI 10.1191/1362168802lr095oa. Access on: 10 Feb. 2018.

WALSH, S. Talking the talk of the TESOL classroom. **ELT Journal**, v. 60, n. 2, April 2006. Available at: https://academic.oup.com/eltj/article-abstract/60/2/133/400304. Access on: 10 jun. 2017.

WALSH, S. **Exploring Classroom Discourse**: Language in Action. New York: Routledge, 2011.

WALSH, S. Conceptualising classroom interactional competence. **Novitas-ROYAL** (Research on Youth and Language), v. 6, n. 1, p. 1-14., 2012. Available at: http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol_6_1/Walsh.pdf. Access on: 10 jun. 2017.

WALSH, S.; LI, L.Conversations as space for learning. **International Journal of Applied Linguistics**, v. 23, n.. 2, 2013. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12005. Access on: 18 Oct. 2017.

WONG, J.; WARING, H. Z. **Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy**: A Guide for ESL/EFL Teachers. New York: Routledge, 2010.

APPENDIX I

ANEXO VI

PONTIFÍCIA UNIVERSIDADE CATÓLICA DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL

PRÓ-REITORIA DE PESQUISA E PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO

COMITÊ DE ÉTICA EM PESQUISA – CEP-PUCRS

TERMO DE CONSENTIMENTO LIVRE E ESCLARECIDO

Prezado(a) participante:

Como aluno(a) que frequenta disciplinas na Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul, você está sendo convidado(a) a participar da pesquisa "Uso e Processamento de Língua Adicional". O objetivo deste estudo é investigar o ensino de Português como Língua Adicional (PLA) por meio da observação das aulas e pela análise das interações professor-aluno. No presente recorte do estudo, objetiva-se verificar a atuação docente frente às necessidades linguísticas do aluno em ambientes acadêmicos para fins de desenvolver e aprimorar o processo de ensino de produção oral e de desenvolvimento de materiais de avaliação de proficiência de português como língua acadêmica adicional.

Para este estudo, adotaremos os seguintes procedimentos: (i) gravação de produções orais em áudio e vídeo no contexto da sala de aula; (ii) edição das gravações para submissão às metodologias de análise contempladas; (iii) submissão dos trechos de áudio e vídeo às metodologias de análise; (iv) discussão técnica acerca da pertinência das metodologias empregadas a partir dos resultados obtidos.

Para participar deste estudo, você não terá nenhum custo, nem receberá qualquer vantagem financeira. Levando em consideração que em todas as pesquisas que envolvem seres humanos existem riscos, neste caso, os riscos possíveis são de ordem psicológica, como, por exemplo, um possível incômodo ou cansaço sentido pelo participante em realizar os testes. Contudo, todas as providências serão tomadas para que qualquer tipo de desconforto seja evitado.

Você será esclarecido(a) sobre o estudo em qualquer aspecto que desejar e estará livre para participar ou recusar-se a participar. Poderá retirar seu

consentimento ou interromper a participação a qualquer momento. A sua participação é voluntária e a recusa em participar não acarretará qualquer penalidade ou modificação na forma em que é atendido pelo pesquisador.

Esta pesquisa tem como professora responsável a Dra. Cristina Becker Lopes Perna, professora titular da Escola de Humanidades da Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul – PUCRS, local onde se dará a coleta de dados. Seu endereço é Avenida Ipiranga, 6681, telefone: (51) 3320 3676 (ramal 8287).

O pesquisador irá tratar a sua identidade com padrões profissionais de sigilo. Os resultados da pesquisa estarão à sua disposição quando finalizados. Seu nome ou o material que indique sua participação não será liberado sem a sua permissão. Você não será identificado em nenhuma publicação que possa resultar deste estudo. O participante assinará este termo de consentimento em duas vias, sendo que uma cópia fica com o mesmo e outra será arquivada pelo pesquisador responsável.

Rubrica: _____

Eu, _____, portador do documento de identidade _____, fui informado(a) dos objetivos do estudo "Uso e Processamento de Língua Adicional", de maneira clara e detalhada e esclareci minhas dúvidas. Sei que a qualquer momento poderei solicitar novas informações e modificar minha decisão de participar se assim o desejar.

Declaro que concordo em participar deste estudo. Recebi minha cópia de Consentimento Livre e Esclarecido e me foi dada a oportunidade de ler e esclarecer as minhas dúvidas.

Porto Alegre, _____ de _____ de 2018.

Nome / Assinatura do Participante:

_____
Data: ____/____/ _____

Nome / Assinatura do Pesquisador Responsável:

_____

Data: _____/_____/ _____

Nome / Assinatura do Pesquisador Responsável:

_____

Data: _____/_____/ _____

Em caso de dúvidas com respeito aos aspectos éticos deste estudo, você poderá consultar:

Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa

Av. Ipiranga, 6681 – Prédio 50 – Sala 703

CEP: 90610-900 - Porto Alegre – RS

Fone: 55 51 3320.3345

Horário de Funcionamento: das 8h às 12h e das 13h30min às 17h

Site: www.pucrs.br/propesq

Email: cep@pucrs.br

APPENDIX II

GRUPO DE PESQUISA: USO E PROCESSAMENTO DE LÍNGUAS ADICIONAIS

COMPUTERIZED LANGUAGE ANALYSIS - CLAN
TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

Symbol	Meaning
(1.8)	Pause between speakers or inside a speaker's turn. Numbers represent the number of seconds of duration of the pause, to one decimal place. A pause of less than 0.3 seconds is marked by (.) and is considered a micropause.
⌈ ⌉ ⌊ ⌋	Indicates portions of an utterance that overlap with a portion of another speaker's utterance.
=	Indicates that there is no time lapse between the portions connected by the equal sign. The second speaker begins their utterance just at the moment when the first speaker finishes.
:	Indicates that the sound is extended. The number of colons shows the length of the extension.
(hm, hh)	Representations of the audible exhalation of air.
.hh	Indicates an audible inhalation of air (gasp). The more h's, the longer the in-breath.
?	Indicates that there is a slightly rising intonation.
.	Indicates that there is a slightly falling intonation.
,	Indicates a continuation of tone.
> <, < >	Indicate that the talk they surround was noticeably faster, or slower than the surrounding talk.
-	Indicates an abrupt cut off.
CAPS	Indicate that the speaker spoke the capitalised portion at a higher volume than the speaker's normal volume.
° °	Indicates an utterance that is much softer than the normal speech of the speaker.
Under	Indicate emphasis on the underlined portion of the word.

↑ ↓	Indicate that there is a rising or falling intonation.
$	Smiley or jokey voice.
((comment))	Indicates that the transcriber has guessed what was said, because it was indecipherable on the recording. If the transcriber was unable to guess as to what was said, nothing appears within the parentheses. It can also be used to omit names or confidential information.

SOURCES:
1. List of Special Characters from CLAN;
2. WALSH, Steve; LI, Li. Conversations as space for learning. **International Journal of Applied Linguistics**. 23 (2), 247-266, 2013.