Investigating the textbook in situated practices: what goes on in literacy events mediated by the EFL textbook?

Denise Santos
University of Reading, UK

Five decades ago, Cronbach (1955, p. 3) argued that "only the teacher – and perhaps a blackboard and writing materials – are found as universally as the textbook in our classrooms". Despite tremendous changes in technologies in the past fifty years, classrooms around the world remain relatively unchanged, and textbooks still occupy a central place in contemporary education across the disciplines in general (Baker and Freebody, 1989, p. 263; Venezky, 1992, p. 436; Woodward, 1994, p. 6368) and in language teaching in particular (Harmer, 1991, p. 256; Hutchinson and Torres, 1994, p. 315; Littlejohn, 1998, p. 190; Richards, 1993, p. 1; Sercu, 2000, p. 626).

In spite of its pervasiveness, the textbook is considerably understudied as compared to other aspects of the teaching-learning process (Apple and Christian-Smith, 1991, p. 1; Kramsch, 1988, p. 63; Woodward, 1993, p. viii). In particular, much is yet to be explored in relation to the role and meanings of the textbook in classroom interaction. In this chapter I intend to add to this exploration by looking at meaning-making processes jointly constructed by a group of teachers and students during lessons involving their EFL textbooks. Specifically, I will examine how these individuals describe and define the literacy events in which the textbook plays a central role.

In order to develop my argument I will organise this chapter as follows. First, I will provide a brief outline of how textbooks have tended to be researched in ELT in order to argue that, although we know a lot about the textbook as text and as a material object, we do not know much about the ways people engage in interaction with and through their textbooks; nor do we know much about the meanings these individuals co-construct about the textbook during these interactions. I will then explain how I will frame my analysis on theoretical grounds. After that I then move on to the empirical work, first describing the context of my investigation and then developing the analysis proper. I conclude this article by discussing the epistemological implications of my approach and by offering a few more practical, pedagogical applications arising from my claims.

Research into textbooks in ELT

In ELT, the debate surrounding the textbook dates back at least thirty years and one popular strand of this discussion has revolved about the "pros" and "cons" of textbooks (Allwright, 1981; O'Neill, 1982; Richards, 1993; 2001, p. 254-256). Although illuminating in the sense of bringing important issues to the surface, this discussion is not very helpful in terms of enhancing our understanding of what the textbook actually means to teachers and learners engaged in educational practices.

A different and perhaps mainstream approach to investigations into the textbook involves content analyses of linguistic and/or ideological elements present in the text (e.g., Holmes 1988 on the presentation of doubt and certainty; Williams 1988 on the language in business English textbooks; Wong 2002 on the openings of telephone conversations in ESL textbooks). Guiding these investigations is the notion that the language presented in textbooks should mirror "real-life" language and this assumption, in turn, is related to an important debate involving the definition and the role both of "authenticity" and of what is

the "native speaker" of English (issues which I will not develop here for space constraints).

Presentation and representation of language in ELT textbooks have also been looked at in a number of studies through the use of checklists (e.g. Ewer and Boys, 1981; Hamp-Lyons and Heasley, 1984; Hyland, 1994) and this method has also been employed in investigations into pedagogical practices present in ELT materials (e.g., Jacobs and Ball, 1996; Tomlinson, 1999).

Although these studies (and many similar ones carried out in different disciplines) have uncovered important issues regarding the presentation (and representation) of knowledge and learning, this not the stance adopted in this study. Elsewhere (Santos, 2002, p. 37) I have argued that content analyses of textbooks can reveal important assumptions these materials make about the world, about the discipline and about teaching-and-learning, but that it is impossible to predict, from these analyses only, how teachers and students will make sense of these messages.

Investigations of textbooks in the classroom have been advocated by some (e.g., Gilbert, 1989, p. 70; Hutchinson and Torres, 1994, p. 326; Nunan, 1991, p. 211; Tomlinson, 1998, p. 261; van Dijk, 1981, p. 16; Venezky, 1992, p. 436) but they are rarely put into practice. Motivations for this type of approach vary in the literature on textbooks across different disciplines. The mainstream goal is to assess how much time of classroom interaction is dedicated to the textbooks (see Johnsen 1993, p. 162-183 for a review). Others (e.g. Alverman and Commeyras, 1994; Gaskins *et al.*, 1994) have looked at textbooks in the classroom in an attempt to offer frameworks as to how teachers and/or students should orient their talk about textbooks. Particular relevant to this study is Maybin and Moss's (1993, p. 140) approach towards literacy events as social acts of engagement with text during which individuals jointly construct their understandings *vis-à-vis* not only the text proper but also "the text's legitimate audience and the speakers' place within it" (*ibid.*, p. 146).

In sum, mainstream research on the textbook is predicated on a view of the textbook as "text", according to which meanings are inherent in the text. This view neglects (or at best minimises) the role played by "people" and their "talk-in-interaction" in the construction of these meanings. In the next section I will explain how I intend to follow this latter perspective in this work.

An alternative approach to textbook research

This work is framed by three assumptions. The first one, as discussed in the previous section, is that textbooks play a central role in teaching-and-learning, yet mainstream debates about them have provided us with a limited understanding of this role. Therefore, in order to understand textbooks more thoroughly we should also examine them as discourse in literacy events in which they occur – and this is my second assumption. Finally, the meanings of a textbook can only be grasped from the emergent interplay between text-and-people in interaction, an idea which is well captured by Maybin's (1994, p. 135) claim that classroom activities are not merely "accompanied by talk"; rather, they are "defined and accomplished through talk".

These ideas challenge the so-called transmission model of communication (Reddy, 1979) as well as notions of textual determinism, according to which "texts are invariably read much as was intended by their makers, leaving little scope either for contradictions within and between texts or for variations amongst their interpreters" (Chandler, 1994). Teachers and students, I shall argue, do not necessarily make sense of their textbooks in similar ways (for further details see Santos, 2006); likewise it is unlikely that the meanings they construct will mirror what was intended by the textbook production team (which incidentally includes multiple authors, with possible multiple intentions – from authors themselves to designers, reviewers, referees, editors, just to name a few).

In other words, the meanings of a textbook are always in flux and constantly negotiated, rejected, confirmed, shaped, legitimised, reinforced – in sum, re-constructed by individuals (typically, teachers and students) in interaction.

Given all these issues, two questions are raised at this point: if the meanings of a textbook are so fluid and complex, how do teachers and students interact with and through textbooks so smoothly? Second, how can researchers capture the complexity and dynamism of these meaning-making processes? I will consider each of these questions in turn.

When people engage in interaction they do not invent new definitions for each situation they encounter. What they do instead is to resort to culturally-developed ways of making sense of recurrent events, i.e., to socially-endorsed ways of interacting with each other. As Goffman ([1974]1986) explains, in the attempt to provide a "definition of a situation" (*ibid.*, p. 1), interactants "do not *create* this definition" (*ibid.*, emphasis in the original); what "they do is to assess correctly what the situation ought to be for them and then act accordingly" (*ibid.*, p. 1-2).

Another way of putting this is that individuals *frame* events in particular ways. In this work I will be looking at how a group of teachers and students describe, through talk, *what goes on* when they engage in interaction with and through their EFL textbooks. A key issue here is that, in these conversations about and around literacy events involving textbooks, these individuals are not simply reporting neutral and pre-defined facts; rather, they are engaging in meaning-making processes about the these events in general and the role of these textbooks in particular. Further theoretical clarifications will be outlined later when appropriate.

The context of the investigation

This investigation was carried out in a language school in a large city in Brazil and the data were collected for the purposes of a larger-scale study investigating broader literacy practices surrounding the EFL textbook in that particular educational community (Santos, 2004). About thirty-two hours of classroom interaction were recorded and the literacy events involving the textbook were transcribed and analysed. A total of seven elementary groups, four different textbooks, six teachers and fifty-seven students participated in the study.

It is important to clarify that, at the time of the data collection, this school had recently undergone an innovation programme aiming at teachers' and students' redefinition of key issues including: (1) these individuals' roles in their teaching-and-learning process; (2) the very process of teaching-and-learning; (3) language; and (4) knowledge. Moving away from a more conservative interpretation of the so-called "communicative approach", the members of this school were trying to approach L2 development in general, and TEFL in particular, following a more complex and dynamic view of language and learning. Interactional sociolinguistics informed the former area and sociocultural theory provided the basis for the latter.

According to this new approach, classes were supposed to become learning events in which students engaged in constant collaboration and teachers provided assistance in a Vygotskian sense. Connections between the content learnt and the learning process were one important priority, and individuals were expected to engage in genuine interaction (and to reflect on their interaction) at all times.

In spite of all the emphasis on reflection (through metalanguage) about discursive practices in general and learning experiences in particular, and given that the textbook played an important role in these events, it was surprising to find out, during the piloting phase of my research, that the textbook was not a focus of inquiry for these individuals. That was the motivation I found to choose this school as the context for my investigation: spe-

cifically, I wanted to know what happened in literacy events involving the textbook in a community of teachers and learners committed to engaging in relevant educational experiences. In what follows I explore how teachers and students in this educational community described "what went on" during the literacy events involving the textbook.

How participants framed the literacy event involving the textbook

As Gumperz (1999, p. 455) reminds us, "more often than not participants' definition of what the relevant event is and what it means in an encounter emerges in and through the performance itself." The discussion to follow is based on this premise, and it also applies Goffman's ([1974] 1986) theory of frame to explore people's sense of "what goes on" during their interactions in which the textbook plays a central role. In more specific terms, my analysis has as its starting point teachers' and students' ways of *replaying* literacy events mediated by the textbook.

According to Goffman (*ibid.*, p. 506) a replaying involves "the reporting of an event – past, current, conditional or future" through which interactants can re-experience the event in focus. By definition, then, replayings involve transformed activity through the "use of replicative records of events" (*ibid.*, p. 68) (in this case, through spoken discourse).

The analysis of replayings of literacy events as a means of identifying and discussing frames is illuminating in at least two respects: firstly, because replayings of literacy events are an important source of interactants' ways of appropriating (Leont'ev 1981, as cited by Newman *et al.*, 1989) their understandings about these events – after all, when interactants engage in a replaying of a literacy event they necessarily emphasise what they understand as the predominant features of these events; and secondly, because there is a reversibility factor associated with these acts. As Goffman ([1974]1986, p. 79) explains, "The reporting of an event and

its documentation are not only seen as reductions of or abstractions from the original, but are also understood to possibly influence later occurrences of the real thing".

Foreseeing the literacy event

In this section I will examine specific instances in which teachers and students in the data explicitly discuss their expectations not around "what is going on" but around "what is about to be going on". In order to do so I will examine the occasions during which interactants engage in explicit talk about the literacy event about to start: what they expect to happen, how they believe they should behave during the event, what reasons and outcomes the event should have, and so on. The principles guiding the current methodology of school (as discussed earlier) were likely to trigger frequent uses of this type of metacommunication in any classroom event; nevertheless, these occasions are rarely found in the data.

Typically, when teachers and students talk about future literacy events involving the textbook, they tend to construct a *following a requirement* frame, which is characterised by a concern with "having to" follow a particular course of action. This type of replaying is illustrated in Excerpt 1, which revolves around a grammar activity entitled "Looking at language" (Bowler and Parminter, 1999, p. 7). According to the text, the Present Continuous should be explored in four stages: first, students should look at a few examples containing the tense; second, they should complete the rule regarding the formation of the tense (i.e., how the auxiliary verb is used, how the main verb is used); third, they should answer a multiple choice question about "when" the tense should be used; finally, they should translate a couple of sentences containing the tense into L1. Links with further references in the textbook (providing additional information about the tense) were also displayed in the text. Below is how the interaction between

students-teacher-textbook unfolded. Appendix 1 contains the transcription conventions.

Excerpt 1:

```
1    T:      okay guys let's take a look at looking at language page seven
2    ((students are talking at the same time))
3    T:      what do you think you have to do there?
4    S:      (?)
5    T:      what do you think you have to do there?
6    S:      in what part? aquí? [here?]
7    T:      ((reading the heading of the section)) looking at language
8    S:      ((reading the rubric of the activity)) complete the the the
9    ((students laugh and make a lot of noise))
10   T:      all rightie . what do you think you have to do?
11   S:      we have to complete the blanks
12   T:      complete the blanks? we are at page seven looking at
13           language
14   S:      so ((reading)) we form the present continuous with the auxiliary
15           verb complete the blanks
16   T:      complete the blanks . only?
17   S:      no . but it's not a sentence . it's an "enun-enunciate" . we have
18           to complete the "enunciate"
19   S       / we form the present continuous
20   T:      / do you agree with Rosa . group?
21   S:      ô [hey] group . group group group
22   S:      what?
23   S:      do you agree with me?
24   S:      yes
25   S:      what's agree? concorda? [agree?]
26   S:      no . okay fala [say] no but
27   ((incomprehensible simultaneous talk))
28   S:      complete the blanks in the enunciado [rubric]. put . complete
29           the blanks in the  "enunciado"
30   S:      yes (?) it is true
```

In spite of minor mismatches among interactants, it is clear that the *following a requirement* frame is foregrounded in this literacy event. This frame is signalled by the teacher right after the opening of the event, in line 3, and reinforced through the echoing of "have to" both by the teacher (in lines 5 and 10) and

by the students (explicitly in lines 11 and 17-18 and implicitly in line 8). Echoes are a type of repetition and they therefore provide good evidence of expectations in relation to a particular event (Tannen [1979]1993). In other words, the requirement of their engagement in doing something is not put to question (i.e., the *following a requirement* frame is tacitly, and unproblematically, agreed by interactants). Occasional misunderstandings, and subsequent negotiations, occur instead at a more practical level of *what* it is that they have to do (i.e., at what I describe as a *getting-things-done* framing of the event). It is important to emphasise that these mismatches trigger the need for clarification of "where" and "what" this *doing* involves: whereas the former is promptly clarified by the teacher (line 7), the latter generates a longer interaction on which the teacher clearly attempts not to impose excessive control (lines 8-30).

This example brings to the surface two additional aspects which reveal interactants' shared assumptions about the literacy event in general and the textbook in particular: firstly, the indexicality expressed by the teacher's use of "there" (lines 3 and 5) and by the student's use of "*aqui*/here" (line 6) suggest that literacy events around the textbook occur in a different interactional site away from the classroom proper. Secondly, the acknowledgement that this interactional site is marked by fragmentation and is divided into reified sections. In this particular example, the action of "looking at language" (line 7) is characterised as a "part" (line 6), a perception already anticipated by the teacher in the opening sequence of the literacy event (line 1).

In striking contrast to the straightforwardness of the clarification of the destination in focus (but note that this discussion is already embedded in the tacit agreement that this movement is to be done because "they have to do something there") lies the evident attempt from the teacher to encourage the students' articulation of *what* it is that they have to do. And in addition to this focus on the "what" (and not on the "why", or on the "what for") of the doing, what is really insightful in this interaction is the

acknowledgement, by most participants, of the recognition of "completing" as the main, and also perhaps the only, task to be done (lines 8, 11, 14-15, 17-18, 28-29). A number of alternative replies to the question "what do you think you have to do there" (lines 3 and 5) might be conceived of, for example: (1) a discussion around the heading of the activity, namely "Looking at language / Present Continuous"); (2) the reading of (and maybe reflection about) the examples; (3) the choice of the suggested rules; (4) the translation of the two final sentences; (5) the verification of the intratextual references containing further grammatical information. But none of these possibilities (or others) comes to life; instead everybody apparently equates the "complete the rule" task with "what they are supposed to do". This attitude therefore invokes three frames simultaneously: *following a requirement*, *getting-things-done* and *writing*. In fact, these frames (signalled linguistically by the repeated use of "have to", "do" and "complete the rule", respectively) represent a predominant orientation that teachers and students adopt in relation to the goals of the literacy event around the textbook: this tendency reinforces the commonly held belief in the power of writing (a myth, according to Olson, 1994), and it reveals a view of literacy as the bureaucratic accomplishment of products through the use of script.

Describing the literacy event

In this section I will analyse what leads interactants to the verbalisation of explicit descriptions of "what is going on". In addition, I will examine the reactions these descriptions trigger in interaction, and how these interpretive processes "relate to what is literally said" (Gumperz, 2001, p. 223).

According to the data, students and teachers do not engage in reportings of ongoing literacy events frequently, but when they do, it is often the teacher who articulates these descriptions. Excerpt 2 is typical in this respect:

Excerpt 2: The class is skimming through the book (Littlejohn and Hicks, 1996) to raise expectations about the course which is just starting.

1	T:	just go through it and see what we are going to . study . this
2		semester =
3	S:	= about poems from earth and space . ((laughs)) about the
4		lives by sea
5	S:	about the weather
6	S:	about the countries
7	S:	er . about the =
8	S:	= about the
9	S:	about the animals
10	S:	about the . weather of the world
11	S:	about nature . . about the cave people
12	S:	what? it's very dangerous
13	S:	about the . day at school
14	S:	I don't understand
15	T:	we are talking about the book to see what you are going to
16		learn. about this semester . what we are going to talk about
17		this semester

A description of the situation (lines 15-16) is triggered by a student's expression of "not understanding" (line 14). Although "what" is not being understood by this student is never articulated, the teacher infers that what is meant is "I don't understand what we are doing", and she constructs her reply (lines 15-16) based on this assumption, which incidentally invokes the *getting-things-done* frame. By linking the speaker's experience of the event to her world knowledge, inferences provide evidence of expectations (Tannen [1979]1993). Interestingly, the interpretive process triggered by this inference made by the teacher (and probably by the student in focus as well as by the other students through their tacit acceptance of the teacher's interpretation) resumes the directions found in lines 1-2 and not utterances produced later in the interaction: after all, the student (line 14) might be expressing a lack of understanding of any of the topics mentioned by his peers (lines 3-13) or he might be even asking somebody to repeat what the previous speaker had just said.

According to the data, other explicit replayings of ongoing literacy events are triggered by explicit questions asked by students (as in the example above) or, more commonly, by the teacher's perception, or assumption, that a student or a group of students might not have grasped exactly what they should do. Excerpt 3 illustrates this latter case: the teacher here tries to clarify a task in which students are asked to search for metatextual information in one book and to write down their conclusions in the other one:

Excerpt 3

```
1   T:  […] . exercise three . aí tem que . ó [there you have to . look].
2       skim through the book . unit two . . vai lá [go there] gente
3       [everybody] . vamos procurar [let's search] . unit two =
4   S:  = que página? [what page?]
5   S:  é [it's]
6   S:  o quê? [what?]
7   S:  yes
8   T:  a gente tá trabalhando com os dois livros agora . a gente tá
9       vendo o [we are working with the two books now. we are seeing
10      the] workbook  e a gente vai ver se / determinadas atividades do
11      [and we are going to see if certain activities from the] workbook a
12      gente pode usar . a gente pode / fazer ouvindo a fita [we can
13      use . we can do by listening to the tape] =
14  S:                                      / what page?
15  S:                                      / ah [oh] no . no
16  S:  = no
```

This interaction is also built upon a *getting-things-done* frame, as evidenced by the use of verbs of action in interactants' descriptions of the literacy event (*trabalhando* [working] and *vendo* [seeing] in lines 8 and 9). It is worth noting that the use of the verb "work" in the description of the literacy events is a very popular choice across the data: interactants see themselves as "working" (1) with the book as a whole (as seen here); and (2) topics from the book (e.g. *a gente tá trabalhando* [we are work-

ing] my name is, now countries" as said by one of the teachers on another occasion).

Another issue brought to the surface in this interaction is the fact that, in her attempt to clarify the "doing" that the literacy event involves, the teacher suggests that present (*a gente tá vendo* [we're seeing], lines 8-9) and future (*a gente vai ver* [we're going to see], lines 10-11) are not distinguished in their experience of the literacy event.

How people conceptualise time has strong connections with notions of power, values, and norms in social life in general (Adam, 1990) and with literacy practices in particular (Jones, 2000; Tusting, 2000). This discussion clearly resumes Giddens's (1990, p. 16-17) claim that "the dynamism of modernity derives from the *separation of time and space* and their recombination in forms which permit the precise time-space "zoning" of social life". As illustrated in Excerpt 1, in literacy events involving their textbook teachers and students in the data leave the physical properties of the classrooms and enter a disembedded space in which these events are expected to occur. Similarly, Excerpt 3 suggests how the perception of time can abandon the positivistic, rigid, linear and irreversible conception of time (segmented into distinct stages built around the notions of past, present and future) and acquire a more interpretive view "in which time is experienced as lived reality rather than as abstract measure" (Tusting, 2000, p. 36). The interaction below is even more emphatic in the support of this argument:

Excerpt 4

1	T:	well . let's correct now . we are correcting it now . so let's
2		check . letter a . unit two exercise three . so I have to pick this
3		book here . unit two
4	S:	*eu olhei nesse* [I looked at this one] ((shows her student's book
5		to the class))
6	T:	no . we have to use the workbook . look at the title Regina .
7		Regina . the workbook
8	S:	*eu nem li (isso)* [I haven't even read (this)]

9	T:	*pois é* [well]. we have to read everything . *né*? [isn't it?] okay .
10		so . unit two
11	S:	*ah eu fiz só no outro (?)* [oh I've done it in the other one only]
12	T:	unit two **exercise**
13	S:	three
14	T:	three . so let me see if if I can use . the cassette . with exercise
15		. three . this is exercise three ((turns her book to the class))
16		/ . do I need to listen to the tape to do this exercise? . yes or
17		no?
18	S:	/ no
19	S:	no
20	S:	*eu acertei do mesmo jeito (?)* [I got it right the same way]

This excerpt suggests that interactants experience the time of the literacy event alternating between what we traditionally define as either past (e.g. lines 4, 8, 11), or present (e.g. "we are correcting it now", line 1), or future ("let's correct", line 1). In other words, teacher and students unproblematically experience the time of the literacy event not only through the "here and now" usually associated with the present, but also (and most importantly), through a reconstruction of the past and an anticipation of the future. It could well be argued that the nature of this particular event creates the conditions for this multi-temporal experience: after all, homework correction involves, by definition, actions carried out at at least two levels (past and present). However, I believe there is more to be said about teachers' and students' perception of time in literacy events involving the textbook if we refocus our attention to the ways interactants discursively frame these events as occasions in which they *feel obliged to* carry out some sort of action. In this excerpt, the teacher develops a discourse which is very illuminating in this respect: Through the words "let's correct now" (line 1), she guides participants' immediate action by blending present and future time in her articulation of what Kramsch (1988) has described as the master's voice, i.e., the voice responsible for the management of the lesson. But future becomes present with no gap, and this correspondence is reinforced through the replay

("we are correcting it now") attached to a reformulation ("let's check"). Also, her repeated use of "we" organises their experience following a participation framework in which the teacher, and the students (but not the text), are to be seen as equal participants in interaction. So far, there is nothing extraordinarily surprising in the development of the replaying.

What is really interesting is that it is only after the establishment of this timeless dimension that the literacy event is "officially" opened (as suggested by the vocalisations of the destinations in lines 2-3). Furthermore, it is right after this opening that the teacher takes on an unclear voice (see "I" in "I have to pick this book here", line 2) and announces that there is a requirement to be followed. By doing so, she reframes the event not from the perspective of the "correcting"/"checking" (i.e., evoking a *getting-things-done* frame) in the here and now, but from the perspective of "having to carry out a task suggested in the text" (i.e., evoking a *following a requirement* frame) in some indefinite, perhaps transcendent, time. In this sense, a co-existence of presence and absence in connection with this timeless dimension also includes the *people* involved with the task – both at the level of its "imposition" and at the level of its "execution".

A closer examination of Excerpt 4 reinforces the argument that it is the "general" experience of the literacy event involving the textbook (framed at the level of "following a requirement") that is associated with this timeless dimension. More immediate tasks, framed at the level of "doing", tend to be discursively constructed around an also more immediate time defined in terms of chronologically conventionalised notions of present, past and future. Table 1 illustrates this point:

Excerpt 4, lines:		frame foregrounded	implicit time
6	T: no . we have to use the workbook .	following a requirement	absent

6-7	look at the title Regina . Regina . the workbook	getting-things-done (correcting)	present-future
8	S: *eu nem li (isso)* [I haven't even read (this)]	getting-things-done (doing the homework)	past
9-10	T: *pois é* [well]. we have to read everything . *né*? [isn't it?] okay . so . unit two	following a requirement	absent
11	S:*ah eu fiz só no outro (?)* [oh I've done it in the other one only]	getting-things-done (doing the homework)	past

Table 1: Making connections between frames and time, an example

The three examples discussed in this section illustrate the fact that, across the data, replayings of ongoing literacy events are articulated by the teacher through the use of action verbs framed at the *getting-things-done* level of their experience. In addition to *talking*, *working*/*seeing* and *correcting* (as seen in Excerpts 2, 3 and 4, respectively) other actions are described in other replays (such as *looking*, *repeating*, and *writing*). At a superficial level, the functions of these acts might be identified as clarifications of the task and/or rectifications of inadequate behaviour. However, my view is that these replayings serve other functions in addition to the mere attempt to adjust procedures: to me, what seems to be really interesting about these reportings of ongoing events, more than the mere descriptions of the "actions" that are "going on", is their usual juxtaposition with overt verbalisations highlighting the requirement of such actions. The latter, which can be seen as gentle reminders of these demands, also tend to be articulated by the teachers, and not to be challenged by students.

I now turn to the examination of the third and last form of replaying the literacy events involving the textbook, namely

teachers' and students' ways of reporting and/or assessing *past* literacy events.

Reporting the literacy event

A reporting of a past classroom event serves more than one function: it can be seen as a recap (Mercer, 2001), a teaching technique "emphasising the points or events they [teachers] consider of most educational significance" (*ibid.*, p. 248). Additionally, it can be described as a reconceptualization (Cazden, 1988), a strategy aiming "to induct the learner into a new way of thinking about, categorizing, reconceptualizing, even recontextualizating (sic) whatever phenomena (referents) are under discussion" (*ibid.*, p. 111).

So, if from a linguistic perspective my analysis of the replays of past literacy events involving the textbook will aim at the identification of frames within which participants re-experience the literacy events, it is important to keep in mind that, from a pedagogical perspective, it is imperative to discuss these frames within the broader views (of language, of learning, of literacy, of the textbook) they evoke. Arguably, both functions reveal teachers' and students' ways of appropriating (tacit or not) educational goals – not only at a referential, factual, level associated with the "content" of the discipline; but also, and perhaps more importantly, at a metatextual level emphasising sanctioned semiotic resources and preferred interpersonal relationships associated with the teaching and learning of the discipline. In the case of a literacy event involving teachers, students, and textbooks, these reportings thus reveal important aspects of the means and goals of the interaction with and through the textbook, as well as the values and norms embedded in such literacy practices. This is the topic of this section.

According to the data, teachers and students rarely report past literacy events involving the textbook – and when they do it, they reveal, through their discourses, a tacit agreement of

frames similar to the ones previously introduced. When reporting past events, *getting-things-done* is by far the most recurrent frame invoked by teachers and students, followed by an *exploration* frame (characterised by a search for something, and whose success tends to be described in terms of the quantity of items "found"). Excerpts 5 and 6 illustrate the former (while also pointing to shared assumptions interactants hold towards the textbook, namely the fragmentation and reification of the text); Excerpt 7, which involves a conversation following an activity in which students are asked to identify the musical instruments played in a recording, illustrates the latter:

Excerpt 5

1	T:	[…] can I erase it?
2	S:	yes
3	T:	so page nine . . the talking about you we did last class . so
4		listening and pronunciation . so ((reading)) listen and tick the
5		sentence you hear . *tá*? [okay?]

Excerpt 6

1	T:	page six . remember we did this part here? ((turns book to the
2		class, her finger moves over the part already "done")) =
3	S:	= *ah* [oh]
4	T:	yes . it's the other book sorry . we did this part

Excerpt 7

1	S:	*eu peguei duas só* [I got two only]
2	S:	*eu peguei uma* [I got one] =
3	S:	= *nenhuma* [none]
4	S:	*eu peguei* [Igot] trumpet *e* [and] double bass
5	S:	double bass?
6	S:	*é* [yes] =
7	S:	= I put piano *e* [and] flute
8	S:	*piano e quê?*[piano and what?]
9	S:	flute . flute
10	((students talk simultaneously and do not come to a conclusion; their	
11	interaction sounds more like a guessing game))	

```
[…]
19  S:      é violino(?) [is it violin?]
20  S:      eu consegui três [I've managed to get three]
21  S:      eu consegui quatro [I've managed to get four]. violin trumpet
22          cymbals clarinet
```

The examples above also highlight the product-oriented view interactants associate with both frames: in other words, "doing" is always overtly associated with the outcome of this doing, mainly through the use of the verbs "*pegar* [get]", "*conseguir* [manage to]" and "put" plus their complements. In addition to the action verbs listed here, others chosen by participants across the data include, for example, *escrever* [write] and *terminar* [finish]. "Do" (and its equivalent "fazer", in Portuguese) is by far the most recurrent choice, either with expected complements (e.g., "exercise", "number eight") or displaying very unusual collocations (e.g., "*já fiz todas as respostas* [I've done all the answers]").

This perception of "doing as product" (at the expense of "doing as process") becomes evident in another reporting of a literacy events, following the teacher's invitation to re-experience what they had just done (through the question "Could you repeat what you did?", see Excerpt 8 below, line 1): as the excerpt shows, instead of engaging in a description of their recent steps, interactants simply "list" the outcomes of the past event.

Excerpt 8:

```
1  T:   just a sec- no . not now . could you repeat what you did?
2  ((some students complain, no one takes the floor))
3  T:   number one . . ((reading)) sleep with English ((end of reading))
4       . yes or no?
5  Ss:  no
6  S:   no
7  T:   number two . ((reading)) listen to English
8  Ss:  yes
```

I will now discuss the only occasion in the data in which two students co-construct the replaying of a past literacy event with an emphasis on *how* they have "got things done" – and not on *what* they have accomplished, as seen in the other examples in this section. Interestingly, the means of approaching the literacy event (as reported by the students in lines 6 to 8 below) only serves to reinforce the fact that their ultimate goal is to "do" something (often through writing), and to display this outcome as evidence of his achievement.

Excerpt 9

1	S	*é só pra escrever isso daqui assim*? [do we have only to write
2		this like this?] (?)
3	T:	you can write more
4	S:	*pronto . já escrevi . não dá mais espaço* [done . I've written .
5		there's no more room]
6	S:	*graças a Deus eu fui pulando linha* [thank God I kept skipping
7		lines]
8	S:	*eu também* [me too]

The frames invoked by teachers and students in their replay-ings of past literacy events are also, yet implicitly, built around the *following a requirement* frame. In this sense, I interpret statements such as "I put this", "I found that", "I managed to get this" or even the pervasive "I have finished" (uttered on many occasions across the data), as direct answers to the overarching (and equally pervasive) question "*o que que é pra fazer?* [what is it that we have to do?]", the prototypical representation of the *following a requirement* frame. It is worth noting that, in these answers, students reveal that they see themselves as agents of the "do" present in the question, but still keep the source of author-ity unidentified – reinforcing a tendency common to all the re-plays examined here. And because the text proper is often re-framed by teachers and students, it is impossible to claim that this authority comes from the text per se.

Concluding remarks

In this chapter I have suggested that, according to my data, although teachers and students display a dynamic operation of multiple frames in their interactions with and through their textbooks, these individuals tend to overtly define these events following a *getting-things-done frame*. The dominance of this frame in their interactions, together with the lack of significant mismatches of expectations among interactants when operating in this overarching frame, support the claim that teachers and students do reveal a shared assumption regarding their conceptual engagement with the literacy events as "action" (and not as "being", nor as "cognition", nor as anything else). This tacit agreement is also marked by a general concern, by teachers and students, "with displaying to each other that they were 'getting the lesson done'" (Bloome, 1994, p. 106) through the use of written language. I have also argued that the ways interactants foresee, describe, and report the literacy events involving the textbook suggest that there is a pervasive (but often non-acknowledged) frame characterising these events – namely, a *following a requirement frame*.

Because these observations seem to contradict the school's beliefs and goals, and to differ from classroom practices in the same school which do not involve the textbook, it is very reasonable to keep on approaching these literacy events as occasions which take place in a different space "penetrated by and shaped in terms of social influences" (Giddens, 1990, p. 19) not associated with the "here and now" of the classroom. In this new space, teachers and students seem to ignore the most basic principles which orient their practices in other classroom events; in this new space, past, present and future blend in a timeless dimension characterised by the compulsion to act, to "do something" with or in the textbook. All these points are succinctly summarized by a student's utterance at the end of one literacy event involving the textbook, in which he says, "*pronto . já ter-*

minei. aonde é que vou? o que que eu faço? [okay . I've finished . where do I go? what do I do?]".

The points raised in this chapter challenge mainstream assumptions that the meanings of a textbook are encoded in the text and that these meanings can therefore be fully explored through content analysis and/or evaluations through checklists. I have shown that these meanings are jointly and continually reshaped by participants in interaction. According to the data, these interpretations are predominantly shaped not by the text proper, but by people's ways of making sense of the text. These points in turn call for more systematic research into the textbook through the examination of literacy events in which textbooks play a central role. In addition, these findings raise important issues regarding the analysis of textbooks in teacher education programmes. Here, situated studies of textbooks might gain visibility in addition to the usual emphasis on the development and/or application of pre-defined checklists. In the classroom, teachers and students might engage systematically in self- and peer- evaluation of interactional practices during literacy events involving the textbook.

I believe that this perspective I am suggesting involves an important epistemological shift in the examination of textbooks, moving away from the dominant tradition of focusing on purely textual characteristics, and enabling us to develop knowledge not only about textbooks in general but also about people's construction of knowledge. Also, and most fundamentally, about teaching and learning how to teach and learn.

References

Adam, B. (1990). *Time and social theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Allwright, R.L. (1981). What do we want teaching materials for? *ELT Journal 36 (1)*, 5-18.

Alvermann, D. and Commeyras, M. (1994). Inviting multiple perspectives: Creating opportunities for student talk about gender inequalities in texts. *Journal of Reading, 37 (7)*, 566-571.

Apple, M. W. and Christian-Smith, L. K. (1991). The politics of the textbook. In M. W. Apple, and L. K. Christian-Smith (eds.), *The politics of the textbook* (pp. 1-21). New York: Routledge.

Baker, C. and Freebody, P. (1989). Talk around text: Constructions of textual and teacher authority in classroom discourse. In S. de Castell *et al.* (eds.), *Language, authority and criticism: Readings on the school textbook* (pp. 263-183). Lewes: The Falmer Press.

Bloome, D. (1994). Reading as a social process in a middle school classroom. In D. Graddol *et al*. (eds.), *Researching language and literacy in social context* (pp. 100-130). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bowler, B. and Parminter, S. (1999). *Network: Student's Book 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinenmann.

Chandler, D. (1994). Semiotics for beginners [WWW document] URL http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/Documents/S4B/ [19 February 2006].

Cronbach, L. (ed.). (1955). *Text materials in modern education*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Ewer, J. R. and Boys, O. (1981). The EST textbook situation: An enquiry. *The ESP Journal, 1 (2)*, 87-105.

Gaskins, I. *et al.* (1994). Classroom talk about text: learning in science class. *Journal of Reading, 37 (7)*, 558-565.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gilbert, R. (1989). Text analysis and ideology critique of curricular content. In S. de Castell *et al*. (eds.)*, Language, authority and criticism: readings on the school textbook* (pp. 61-73). Lewes: The Falmer Press

Goffman, E. ([1974]1986). *Frame analysis: an essay on the organization of experience*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Gumperz, J. J. (1999). On interactional linguistic method. In S. Sarangi and C. Roberts (eds.), *Talk, work and institutional order: Discourse in medical, mediation and management settings* (pp. 453-471). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gumperz, J. J.(2001). Interactional sociolinguistics: A personal perspective. In D. Schiffrin *et al*. (eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (215-228). Oxford: Blackwell.

Hamp-Lyons, L. and Heasley, B. (1984). Textbooks for teaching writing at the upper levels, survey review. *ELT Journal, 38 (3)*, 209-216.

Harmer, J. (1991). *The practice of English language teaching*. New edition. London: Longman.

Holmes, J. (1988). Doubt and certainty in ESL textbooks. *Applied Linguistics, 9 (1),* 21-44.

Hutchinson, T. and Torres, E. (1994). The textbook as agent of change. *ELT Journal 48 (4)*, 315-328.

Hyland, K. (1994). Hedging in academic writing and EAP textbooks. *English for Specific Purposes, 13 (3)*, 239-256.

Jacobs, G. and Ball, J. (1996). An investigation of the structure of group activities in ELT coursebooks. *ELT Journal, 50 (2),* 99-107.

Johnsen, E. B. (1993). *Textbooks in the kaleidoscope: A critical survey of literature and research on educational texts*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.

Jones, K. (2000). Becoming just another alphanumeric code: farmers' encounters with the literacy and discourse practices of agricultural bureaucracy at the livestock auction. In D. Barton *et al.* (eds.), *Situated literacies: reading and writing in context* (pp. 70-90). London: Routledge.

Kramsch, C. (1988). The cultural discourse of foreign language textbooks. In A. Singerman (ed.), *Toward a new integration of language and culture. Northeast Conference Reports 1988* (pp. 63-88). Middlebury: Northeast Conference.

Littlejohn, A. (1998). The analysis of language teaching materials: inside the Trojan Horse. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 190-216). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Littlejohn, A. and Hicks, D. (1996). *Cambridge English for the world: Student's Book One*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maybin, J. (1994). Children's voices: Talk, knowledge and identity. In D. Graddol *et al.* (eds), *Researching language and literacy in social context* (pp. 131-150). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Maybin, J. and Moss, G. (1993). Talk about texts: Reading as a social event. *Journal of Research in Reading 16 (2)*, 138-147

Mercer, N. (2001). Language for teaching a language. In C. Candlin and N. Mercer (eds.), *English language teaching in its social context: A reader* (pp. 243-257). London: Routledge.

Newman, D. *et al*. (1989). *The construction zone: Working for cognitive change in school*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: a textbook for teachers*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.

Olson, D. (1994). *The world on paper: The conceptual and cognitive implications of writing and reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Neill, R. (1982). Why use textbooks? *ELT Journal 36 (2)*, 104-111.

Reddy, M. (1979). The conduit metaphor. In A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. (1993). Beyond the textbook: The role of commercial materials in language teaching. *RELC Journal, 24 (1)*, 1-14.

Richards, J. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Santos, D. (2002). Learning English as a foreign language in Brazilian elementary schools: Textbooks and their lessons about the world and about learning. *Paradigm, 2 (5)*, 25-38.

Santos, D. (2004). *A study of the textbook in literacy events: discourse, literacies and EFL in an educational community*. Unpublished PhD thesis. The University of Reading.

Santos, D. (2006). Framing the textbook in classroom events. *Folio* 11/1: 14-19.

Sercu, L. (2000). Textbooks. In M. Byram (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of language teaching and learning* (pp. 626-628). London: Routledge.

Tannen, D. ([1979]1993). What's in a frame? Surface evidence for underlying expectations. In D. Tannen (ed.), *Framing in discourse* (pp. 14-56). New York: Oxford University Press.

Tomlinson, B. (ed.). (1998). *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomlinson, B. (1999). Developing criteria for evaluating L2 materials. *IATEFL Issues, February-March, issue number 147*, 10-13.

Tusting, K. (2000). The new literacy studies and time: an exploration. In D. Barton *et al.* (eds.), *Situated literacies: reading and writing in context* (pp. 35-53). London: Routledge.

van Dijk, T. (1981). Discourse studies and education. In *Applied Linguistics, 2 (1)*, 1-26.

Venezky, R. (1992). Textbooks in schools and society. In P. Jackson (ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum: A project of the American Educational Research Association* (pp. 436-461). New York: Macmillan.

Williams, M. (1988). Language taught for meetings and language used in meetings: Is there anything in common? *Applied Linguistics, 9 (1),* 45-55.

Wong, J. (2002). "Applying" conversation analysis in applied linguistics: Evaluating dialogue in English as a second language textbooks. *International Review of Applied Linguistics (IRAL), 40 (1)*, 37-60.

Woodward, A. (1993). Introduction: Learning from textbooks. In B. Britton *et al.* (eds.), *Learning from textbooks: Theory and practice* (pp. vii-x). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Woodward, A. (1994). Textbooks. In T. Hus'en and N. Postlethwaite (eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Education, Volume 11* (pp. 6366-6371). Oxford: Pergamon.

Appendix 1
Transcription conventions followed in this study

(?)	Unintelligible speech
/	Onset of overlap
=	No pause between turns
(( ))	Comments or description of non-verbal behaviour
[…]	Omission
.	Pause of 5 seconds or less
. .	Pause of more than 5 seconds
Italics	Original utterance produced in Portuguese
[ ]	Translation of utterance produced in Portuguese
<u>Underlined</u>	Emphasis
Bold	Rising intonation, as if requiring a complement to the utterance
"words in inverted commas"	Portuguese words produced following English phonology, or English words produced following Brazilian Portuguese phonology