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A. Theoretical frame

- **Toulmin et al (1984):** contingency, historical & cultural context, practical & analytical reasoning, relevance & strength of data
- **Barnes & Todd (1995):** interpretative observation, discursive moves, metacognition, competition & conflict, support & collaboration
- **Bee (2000):** exploratory talk, frame, interaction, functional perspective, additive & reactive moves, new & old ideas connection
- **Kumpulainen & Wray (2002):** exploratory talk, social & linguistic & cognitive, classroom interaction mapping
- **Schwartz et al (2009):** knowledge transformation in classroom interaction, abstraction in context
[1] How can we elaborate an analysis model for exploring the transformation of grammar knowledge through small group interaction?
C. Objectives

- To design a model for analyzing the transformation of grammar knowledge through small group interaction.

- To establish macro-micro connections between a model of grammar instruction (GSD, Camps, 2012) and students’ reasoning processes.
D. Methodology

- Data, selection, material and sample
- Two perspectives upon data
- Unit analysis
- Analysis
- Results
D. Methodology

Experiencing a GDS at Secondary School: “The verb and the sentence”

a. It adopts a lexical perspective: the verb as a sentence heart Tesnière, 1959; Lorente, 1996

b. Semantics and pragmatics act as the entrance to the formal complexity of grammar Brucart, 2000; Larsen-Freeman, 2003
D. Methodology

This proposal is specified in the GDS model (Grammar Didactic Sequence) Camps & al., 2005; Camps & Zayas, 2006

a. It integrates grammar dimensions of P-S-F

b. It seeks creating a rich setting for intervention and participation

c. It enhances a broad way of dealing with grammar phenomena
## D. Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. P-S for F</td>
<td>4. Research: the use of pronouns.</td>
<td>5. Written inform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Consulting material elaboration</td>
<td>II. Speakers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III. Text books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV. Student’s own written compositions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student’s diary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Methodology

- Metalinguistic content units:
  (1) Dialogue
  (2) Discursive sequence
  (3) Metalinguistic sequence
  (4) Metalinguistic subsequence
  (5) Metalinguistic statement
D. Methodology

- Argumentative discourse units:
  6) Argumentative episode
  7) Argumentative sequence
### D. Methodology

#### Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS</th>
<th>Argumentative Episodes</th>
<th>Metalinguistic statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>- Reactive Diverge -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Additive Expand - X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Additive Add - X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>- Contradict - X -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>- Challenge - X -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Expand - X -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Methodology

- Analysis

1.1 Sònia: a vera | u = dificultat:

1.2 Joana: = (ac) pero ponlo así! =

1.3 Sònia: dificultat baixa | el Dalí va pintar de jove
aquell retrat del Lincoln | llavors

1.4 Joana: = = del Lincoln es ce i \ || = és ce i \ =

1.5 Sònìa: = del ce de \ =

1.6 Joana: és ce i! | de qui! \ <4>

1.7 Sònia: és ce de!

1.8 Jordi: és ce de / Joana \

1.9 Joana: (p) ah vale \
D. Methodology

Analysis

1.1 Sònia: let’s see | u = difficulty:: =
1.2 Joana: = (ac) but write it like that! =
1.3 Sònia: low difficulty | Dalí painted as a young man that portrait of Lincoln | then
1.4 Joana: = = of Lincoln is dative \ || = it’s dative \ =
1.5 Sònia: = of accusative \ =
1.6 Joana: it’s dative! | whose! \ <4>
1.7 Sònia: it’s accusative!
1.8 Jordi: it’s accusative / Joana \
1.9 Joana: (p) right OK \
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Argumentative Episodes</th>
<th>Metalinguistic statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Additive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Diverge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Contradict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Contradict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Contradict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Results

(1) About this dialogue

- it has a low exploratory profile
- metalinguistic content appears to be rigid
- “of Lincoln” is neither accusative nor dative
- “portray” is an event noun (Martí, 2002)
(1) About this dialogue

- The structure with a light verb “make” may explain the importance of the event noun (Herrero, 2003; Butt, 2003)
- Pupils could be overlapping four sentences:
  
  (a) Dalí painted that portrayal of Lincoln “Dalí va pintar aquell retrat de Lincoln”
  
  (b) Dalí made that portrayal of Lincoln “Dalí va fer aquell retrat de L.”
  
  (c) Dalí made a portrayal to Lincoln “Dalí va fer un retrat a Lincoln”
  
  (d) Dalí portrayed Lincoln “Dalí va retratar Lincoln”
E. Results

(1) About this dialogue

- pupils show a lack of metalinguistic repertoire…
- … but they are sensitive to P and S
- P and S are a content of the GDS where the dialogue takes place
- thus the mistake can be understood as only partial
E. Results

(2) About the sample group (see Hand out)

- in a second dialogue the group explores in a more integrated manner P-S-F notions:
  - co reference, null subject, complementary distribution, function, meaning
- although again they do not reach the solution…
- … interaction appears to be more exploratory and rich
F. Final considerations

- Our analysis model suggests...

- The importance of integrating **argumentative** and **metalinguistic** perspectives when exploring how metalinguistic content is transformed through argumentative interaction.
F. Final considerations

- Our analysis model suggests...
  - The fact that within the GDS grammar is built
    - in a dialogic manner
    - in a frame of potentially rich and collaborative processes
    - through interaction as a necessary but not a sufficient condition for learning
F. Final considerations

- Our analysis model suggests...
  - That the model of GDS should lead us explore new ways of teaching and learning grammar
F. Final considerations

- Our analysis model suggests...
  - The importance of integrating argumentative and metalinguistic perspectives when exploring how metalinguistic content is transformed through argumentative interaction.
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