Language diversity and classroom dialogue: Negotiation of meaning by students in an internationalised postgraduate classroom

Anthony William Walker
B.A., Grad. Dip. Teach., M.A. Applied Linguistics (Hons)

School of Education and Professional Studies (Brisbane, Logan)
Faculty of Education
Griffith University

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

December 2009
Abstract

One aspect of internationalisation of Australian higher education that has been problematic is the experiences of non-English speaking background (NESB) international students as participants in English-language medium classroom interactions. This study investigated ways nine NESB and nine English speaking background (ESB) postgraduate coursework students negotiated meanings in a tutorial-style classroom over one semester through collection and analysis of classroom data. Working within sociocultural conceptions of discourse, discursive practices, and learning as dialogic (Bakhtin, 1986; Linell, 1998), the initial analysis was conducted at clause level using the Systemic Functional Grammar (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004; Martin, 1992) model. More specifically, the analysis focussed on the social function of language, negotiation of exchanges of meanings in and through dialogue realised in the semantics, lexicogrammar, and phonology of the system of interpersonal meaning.

The semantic system of SPEECH FUNCTION was used to produce four data subsets based on discursive relationships in which students participated in exchanges of information and goods/services through (i) adoption of the speech roles of giving or demanding, or (ii) accepted the speech roles of receiving or giving on demand. Each data subset was then subjected to a more delicate analysis of students’ language choices at the clause level within the systems of interpersonal meanings. The data subsets were analysed also to identify primary/secondary knowers/actors in interactions (Martin, 1992) and the roles of participants as speakers and addressees in the co-construction and negotiation of the discursive text (Linell, 1998).

Analysis revealed significant findings of variation in participation in classroom interaction in the context of diversity in language background. In the four discursive relationships, analysis at clause and text levels found significant variation in participation of students of NESB and ESB in construction of the discursive text in both quanta of participation as speakers and addressees and in the language choices of their contributions. Despite evidence of individual difference, it was concluded that what emerged from incongruence between the discursive resources and repertoires of NESB and ESB students was constitution of a discursive space for student participation, and the engendering of students’ identities, occupied primarily by the practices of ESB students. Although NESB students were successful in taking up offers of discursive space as direct addressees, student participation in negotiation of the co-construction of the discursive text was undertaken increasingly by students who independently adopted roles to establish
discursively active identities in the emergent discourse community. Participation by NESB students was additionally constrained by language choices that relied heavily on polarity and made little use of the resources of modality to position speakers and their audience in relation to propositions under negotiation. In addition, discursive positioning by students as primary knowers, realised in adoption of the role of giving information more frequently than that of demanding, was an insight into the discursive relationships that operate in postgraduate classrooms and the nature of learning in and through negotiation of authoritative dialogical discourse.

From a dialogic sociocultural perspective, the quantitatively and qualitatively distinct discursive contributions and experiences of students in the class have implications for opportunities for classroom learning at both the individual and class level. Findings are used to argue that silence is a legitimate discursive role in polyadic classroom dialogue and that the privileging of talk in learning that has ensued from constructivist theory ignores the complexities of the dialogic relations of listeners with the spoken word. It is suggested that the emergence of a dialogical authoritative discourse in and through negotiation of discursive texts in classrooms offers new ways of meaning to all participants, not only those who are discursively active in negotiation. These conclusions offer some insights for teachers working in internationalised classrooms, and classrooms in general.

The findings underline also the value to approaches to learning of language for academic purposes and testing of language for university entry of conceptions of language as repertoires of discursive practices. A number of issues related to the study of spoken interaction in internationalised university classroom and to the discursive practices of NESB international students studying in Australian university classrooms are identified as worthy of further investigation.
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CHAPTER 1

1 SPOKEN INTERACTION IN THE INTERNATIONALISED CLASSROOM

This thesis reports my study of the participation of students in and through spoken interaction in an internationalised Australian university classroom from a linguistic perspective. More specifically, I investigated the negotiation of meanings (Martin, 1992) in a classroom of postgraduate students completing a course that was part of a Master’s by coursework programme in an Education Faculty. In Australian universities, international students are concentrated in Master’s by coursework classrooms. In 2006, the year of data collection for this study, 31.5% of international students were completing Master’s by coursework programmes, but these students constituted 50% of total student numbers in these programmes (Department of Education Science and Training, 2007). By comparison, 20% of students in Bachelor level programmes were international students (Department of Education Science and Training, 2007). The percentage of international students in higher education completing Master’s by coursework programmes continues to grow, having increased to 35% in 2008 (Australian Education International, 2009). The selected classroom was thus an appropriate site for the collection of data to enable investigation of a case study of student participation in spoken interaction in an internationalised classroom from a linguistic perspective.

1.1 Background to the problem

Classrooms in Australian universities continue to be increasingly characterised by a diversity of language backgrounds among students (Australian Education International, 2005, 2009; Marriot, Moore, & Spence-Brown, 2007). This is largely a reflection of the phenomenon of educational services as an export to international students. To a lesser extent, it reflects changes in the profile of domestic students (Asmar, 2005; Chanock & Cargill, 2003). The term, ‘internationalisation’, is used here to describe this growth in diversity of different language backgrounds of students in Australian universities, irrespective of whether enrolment status is that of domestic or international student. The term, ‘internationalised classroom’, is used to describe the sites in which this diversity prevails.

Over the several decades of internationalisation experienced in Australian universities, spoken interaction in classrooms has been an area of concern for both students and academic teaching staff (e.g., Ballard, 1987; R. B. Burns, 1991; Chanock & Cargill, 2003; Choi, 1997; Hellstén &
Prescott, 2004; Hodgkin, 1978; Mullins, Quintrell, & Hancock, 1995; Nakane, 2006; Neumann, 1985). The attention directed to spoken interaction stems from a number of sources.

First, sociocultural approaches to teaching and learning that emphasise the importance of language as a mediatative tool in learning (e.g., Bruner, 1986; Deborah Hicks, 1996; Lantolf, 2000; Vygotsky, 1986; James V Wertsch, 1984; James V Wertsch & Toma, 1995) have positioned spoken interaction as a privileged and desirable form of participation in Australian university classrooms (Ellwood & Nakane, 2009; Remedios, Clarke, & Hawthorne, 2008). Talk is strongly associated with learning and knowing in classrooms at all levels of education (D. Cameron, 2000; A. D. Edwards & Westgate, 1994).

Second, capacity to use spoken language is itself regarded as a key educational skill objective (D. Cameron, 2000; Moore & Hough, 2007), sometimes explicitly rewarded where a component for ‘participation’ is included in students’ grades for a course (Jones, 1999). One of the five ‘graduate attributes’ specified by the university in which this particular study was conducted focuses on communication skills. Specifically, the University states that it

… aims to prepare its graduates to be leaders in their fields by being … effective communicators and team members … (including the) … capacity to communicate effectively with others orally … (and the) … capacity to interact and collaborate with others effectively, including in teams, in the workplace, and in culturally and linguistically diverse situations. (Griffith Institute for Higher Education, 2009).

Last, values and beliefs are realised in social practices that involve talking and meanings that are expressed through ways of interacting vary across sociocultural settings (Feghali, 1997; Kim & Markus, 2002). In broad terms, openness, self-expression and assertiveness in talk are viewed positively in Western settings, such as Australian university classrooms. However, in other settings silence is valued and speakers are indirect and inferential (Smith & Bond, 1999). Experience or perception of differences in social practices is a defining feature of intercultural encounters (Hinchcliff-Pelia & Greer, 2004).

For students and academic teaching staff in internationalised classrooms, encountering such differences can prompt “cognitive irritation, emotional imbalance, and a disruption of one’s own cultural worldview” (Otten, 2003, p. 15) and can awaken an individual’s reflective awareness of their own culture (Agar, 1994).

Confluence of factors such as these that privilege spoken discourse frames the attention devoted to spoken interaction in internationalised classrooms in Australian universities. Non-English-
speaking background (NESB) and English-speaking background (ESB) students alike are observed, and observe themselves, through the lens of their discursive practices. Such practices include the ways students are involved in the negotiation of meanings that constitute the unfolding discursive text of the classroom – whether they ask or answer questions, contribute to the discourse, respond to information given by a teacher, and engage in interaction with other class members.

While there is much literature reporting the concerns of academic teaching staff and students about spoken interaction in internationalised university classrooms in Australia, the review in Chapter 2 shows there are fewer studies of spoken interaction that analyse internationalised classroom talk. Studies, both in Australia and overseas (e.g., Chanock & Cargill, 2003; Nakane, 2003; Tapper, 1996; Woodward-Kron & Remedios, 2007; Wright & Lander, 2003), identify spoken interaction in linguistically-diverse university classrooms as a neglected research area, particularly in the context of the emphasis placed on spoken interaction in learning processes in contemporary classrooms.

There continue to be calls for research into the relationship between negotiation of meaning and learning in all types of classrooms (e.g., Dysthe, 1999; Hicks, 1995/1996; Säljö, 2004; Van Boxtel, 2004; West & Pearson, 1994). In comparison with those carried out in primary and secondary school classrooms, studies of interaction in the natural setting of university classrooms of any type are few (Benwell & Stokoe, 2002; Kuech, 2004); studies of internationalised classrooms that have involved a delicate analysis of the linguistic choices of participants are even fewer. Wake (2006), in introducing her study, claims that

(a)lthough much has been written about the participation of second language international students in Australian university education in relation to their academic writing and from inter-cultural perspectives, there have been no in-depth examinations of actual learning experiences from a linguistic perspective. (pp. 2-3)

1.1 The theoretical perspective

social reality of the internationalised classroom is understood to be constituted in and through spoken interaction.

Participation in spoken interaction as both speaker and listener is contextualised by the immediate co-textual and concrete aspects of a situation in dynamic relation with the resources brought to the situation by students. The latter includes the resources of the English language available to students as well as more abstract contextual resources, such as prior and current understanding of the situation, and individual sociocultural histories that encompass what students “have become acquainted with as a result of their acculturation within a linguistic and interpretive community” (Linell, 1998, p. 130). In this context, spoken interactions is made up of utterances addressed to others, “taking into account possible responsive reactions” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 94).

This dialogic conception permitted description and discussion of spoken interaction in terms of diverse contextual resources brought to the classroom by the various participants, and in terms of congruence at the level of context of culture. It made it possible to understand the ways individual students used language to make meanings were mutually constitutive of both the context and the discourse that unfolded in it that context. Spoken interaction realizes meanings that reside in the social processes that language performs in the constitution of contexts. Simultaneously, and reflexively, language functions at the semantic level within the social situation constituted in and through its use.

The SFL conception of the interpersonal metafunction of language was key to the interrogation of the data. Halliday (1978) referred to this as “the participatory function of language, language as doing something” (p. 112). The semantic system of SPEECH FUNCTION provided analytical and descriptive tools to account for spoken interaction in the situational context of the classroom. Specifically, the second-order social roles (Halliday, 1978) in which students participated in negotiation of the exchange of information and goods/services provided the foundation for describing four classroom discursive relationships involving students and teacher that framed the analysis of the interaction.

This perspective on the spoken interaction allowed a clear focus on the ways individuals in a classroom exerted agency in co-construction of the unfolding discursive text, and on the ways they related discursively to other participants. Elaboration of the interpersonal metafunction as a component of the semantic system extends to more nuanced negotiation that can be accomplished in lexicogrammatical realization and phonological expression of meanings through choices in the systems of MOOD, POLARITY, MODALITY, COMMENT and KEY.
The delicacy of analysis at this stratum meant that it was possible to make distinctions in how participants positioned themselves in relation to the propositions they uttered and their addressee/s in the various speech roles. This enabled participation in negotiation of meanings to be visible in a way that reflects the complexities of classroom discourse and discursive relationships.

Dialogic conceptions of the nature of discourse complemented and enriched the Hallidayan notions of exchange. These concepts emphasise the importance in the analysis of the role of addressee/s in the language choices of speakers, and position addressees as active and influential participants rather than passive recipients. The term, interpersonal, captures the conception of a dialogic semantic space that resides irreducibly in the ‘between’. This reflects the notion that, by definition, “an utterance has both an author and addressee … addressivity, the quality of turning to someone, is a constitutive feature of the utterance; without it the utterance does not and cannot exist” (Bakhtin, 1986, pp. 95 & 99). Not only that, but “the choice of all language means is made by the speaker under varying degrees of influence from the addressee and his anticipated response” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 99, emphasis in the original). This conception embraces both speaker and addressee as active and irreducible elements of the relation of spoken interaction. Thus, both roles represent ways of involvement in the negotiation of meaning. This type of approach to participation offers a way of encompassing a discursive role, that of the addressee, that frequently has been ignored or misunderstood in classrooms, and in the analysis of classroom data and the interpretation of findings.

1.2 The research question

The objective of the study is to better understand the participation of students in spoken interaction in an internationalised postgraduate coursework classroom. More specifically, the focus was on the interpersonal meanings of spoken interaction and the ways students were involved in negotiation of meaning. While this inevitably includes, and is influenced by, the participation of the teacher, the focus of my interest was on the student participants. The first aim was description of roles that individual students played in the interactive negotiation of meaning and of the language choices they made in lexicogrammatical realizations of those roles and in positioning themselves as knowers and actors in the discursive relationships. The study was guided by one central question:

What ways do students negotiate meanings in an internationalised postgraduate coursework classroom?
Elements within the central question that guided the selection of a data source, collection and analysis of data, and interpretation of findings were:

- who participated and who did not?
- what speech roles were played by students who participated?
- how did students realise speech functions grammatically in utterances?
- who were addressee/s of student utterances and who were not?
- what were the discursive contexts of participation of students?
- how did students position themselves subjectively and objectively through modality?
- what did this positioning mean for the students roles as knowers?
- what did all of the above mean for opportunities for learning through negotiation of a persuasive authoritative discourse,? Who participated in these opportunities, and how?
- what comparisons can be made between individuals and between the NESB and ESB groups of students in all of the above?

1.3 Significance of the study

1.3.1 Theoretical significance

The contribution to theorisation based on this study has a number of dimensions. First, in attempts to theorise about the nature and implications of spoken interaction in the internationalised classroom in terms of language backgrounds, the particularity of the analytic framework offers capacity for fine-grained descriptions of ways that individual students of diverse sociocultural histories participate in negotiation of the exchange of meanings. In this theoretical context, following and interpreting the historical participation of individuals contributes to the perspective of difference within diversity in a field where much of the theorisation relies on the categorization of student identities as NESB and ESB.

In addition, the application of the SFL framework of negotiation of knowing and acting allows a conceptualisation of participation in spoken interaction in terms of the speech roles of students. The more delicate analysis of the positioning of students as knowers opens the way for theorisation about distinctions, between both individuals and the NESB and ESB student groups, as to how their participation contributed to the unfolding of the discourse. This theorisation extends to how linguistic choices reflected the internal dialogues of the participants and their relationship with the negotiation of an authoritative dialogical discourse of the classroom. From this point, it is possible to speculate about the significance of negotiation of
such a discourse and the opportunities for learning, in dialogical terms, for the individuals directly involved, and for those who participated peripherally.

In another sense, the study has potential to contribute to theorisation about discursive relationships that are negotiated in classrooms at the postgraduate level in general, not only in internationalised postgraduate classrooms. Understanding classroom relationships in terms of students’ positioning of themselves as either primary or secondary knowers, both as initiators of interactions and as respondents in them, and through their more delicate choices of language, is an important aspect of conceptualising classroom contexts as sites of learning and the conditions that favour it.

The dialogical perspective on spoken classroom interaction taken in this study explicitly recognises the role of addressee as a way of participation in the negotiation of meaning. This foregrounds not just the concept of addressivity of utterances, but also the role of silence of participants in polyadic classroom interaction and thus in theoretical understandings of the social mediation of learning through language. This study reinforces the need to better understand the relationship between talking and learning from a dialogical perspective that encompasses intrapersonal dialogue; the role of addressees as actively responsive needs to be reconceptualized to include the potential of internally-persuasive dialogues in silent, responsive understanding as interactive learning experiences.

Finally, the attention of the study to the naturally-occurring interaction between students in the classroom can add to the available knowledge about intercultural interaction in higher education settings as a dialogic phenomenon of third culture building that is based on acceptance of communication as “an on-going negotiation of meaning” (Casmir, 1999, p. 98, emphasis in the original).

1.3.2 Methodological significance

The study aims to contribute to the body of work demonstrating the value of SFL for analysis of classroom data. In particular, the intention is to demonstrate how the system of interpersonal meaning for analysis of dialogue can reveal the dynamics of classroom interaction, the negotiation of meaning, and the potential of particular dialogic features for learning. The framework of discursive relationships applied to the social situation of the classroom using the first-order social roles of student and teacher laid over the second-order social roles of speech roles offers a framework for probing the dynamics of dialogic exchange in formal teaching-learning contexts.
1.3.3 Significance for teachers working in internationalised classrooms

The study of authentic naturally-occurring classroom talk undertaken in this study offers teachers insight into the constitution by participants of contexts for classroom discourse and the roles of individual students in doing this. This includes the importance of the role of teachers in internationalised classrooms in constitution of the discursive context. In this sense, the findings contribute evidence for the debate over whether access to participation in internationalised classroom discourse needs to be explicitly structured by teachers as a response to a diversity of discursive resources and practices.

The study directs attention to the perspective of classroom interaction as negotiation and offers teachers a framework for understanding the significance of student participation as negotiation in discursive relationships from the perspectives of primary and secondary knowers, and the delicate choices of language that realize negotiation of meaning. The analytical framework of the study offers a theoretically sound way for teachers to consider the practices they encounter or observe in interaction with their students. An understanding of the implications of particular language choices, both for the ways these position students in relation to the unfolding discourse and the ways student interact with meanings under negotiation, generates insights into classroom learning as a dialogic discursive event.

The study will add also to knowledge at the disposal of teachers who wish to address issues with spoken interaction that can arise in internationalised classrooms marked by diversity in language backgrounds. Some recent studies of the participation of students in internationalised classrooms (Kettle, 2005a, 2007; Koehne, 2004, 2005) have been framed by concerns about the discursive construction of student identities based on language or cultural background that lead to teacher preconceptions and responses to these constructed identities rather than to their active and informed conceptions of individual diversity among students. Hopefully, studies such as this that aim to position diversity within difference will alert teachers to the inappropriateness of generalising a relationship between the types of broad cultural groups found in internationalised classrooms in Australian universities and particular discursive practices. Finally, there may be evidence that prompts reassessment by teachers in internationalised classroom of discursive practices that do not conform to those historically privileged in Australian university classrooms.
1.3.4 Significance for institutions

While the institutional context of internationalisation of postgraduate classrooms is outside the field of this study, and debates situated in this context are not considered in the literature review in Chapter 2, the findings may be of interest to those working in this area. In particular, it is possible the English-language requirements of universities as reflected in the testing and qualifications that are accepted could be informed by the outcomes of the study. Similarly, there is no focus in the thesis on EAP preparation courses and the concept of academic language proficiency (Cummins, 1979), but what is revealed by examining the participation of NESB students in the selected classroom could be of interest in the development of curricula for English for Academic Purposes programmes.

1.4 Thesis overview

The theoretical framework introduced in this introductory chapter is fleshed out in the first part of Chapter 2. The conception of language as dialogic is expounded and discussed in terms of the implications for spoken interaction in the internationalised classroom. The second part of the Chapter discusses the problematisation of spoken discourse in internationalised university classrooms, primarily in Australia but also in other parts of the world as well, as reflected in the academic literature and the approaches adopted by studies of the problem. Those that adopted a linguistically-oriented dialogic and/or SFL approach to describing, analysing and interpreting spoken interaction in internationalised classrooms are given particular attention.

The methods and procedures involved in conducting the investigation reported in this thesis are discussed in Chapter 3. The foundation of the research strategy in a dialogically grounded ontological and epistemological framework precedes description and discussion of the methods and procedures involved in data collection. This includes the data source and its selection, collection and transcription of the classroom data, and issues of validity and limitations. The remainder of Chapter 3 introduces the method of data analysis, in particular SFL, and describes in detail its application to the transcribed data. The four classroom discursive relationships based on the system of SPEECH FUNCTION are specified and the lexicogrammatical realizations of these relationships are detailed. The interpretations of language choices in the systems of MOOD, POLARITY, MODALITY, COMMENT and KEY as realizations of participant positions as knowers in the negotiation of meaning are specified. The analysis and significance of the larger discursive contexts of the participation of students in the speech roles typical of the four discursive relationships, and who was addressed in these roles, are also explained.
Findings of analysis of the transcribed data presented in Chapters 4-7 are organised around the four discursive relationships. Participation is described and discussed in terms of individuals and the NESB and ESB student groups and ways they are involved in the negotiation of meanings are compared. The following elements within the central research question were addressed:

- Who participated and who did not?
- What speech roles were played by students who participated?
- How did students realise speech functions grammatically in utterances?
- Who were addressee/s of student utterances and who were not?
- What were the discursive contexts of participation of students?
- How did students position themselves subjectively and objectively through modality?
- What did this positioning mean for the students roles as knowers?
- What comparisons can be made between individuals and between the NESB and ESB groups of students in all of the above?

Excerpts from the transcribed data are included to illustrate language selections of students and the significance of these for their positions in the unfolding negotiations.

In Chapter 8 the thesis is concluded with discussion and interpretation of findings presented in Chapters 4-7. The strengths and limitations of findings as representative of dialogue in the selected classroom are reviewed to substantiate generalisations about the classroom on the basis of data generated through recording and transcription of spoken interaction in the selected classes. The interpretation involves theorisation about the nature and implications of spoken interaction in internationalised postgraduate coursework classrooms, and in doing so addresses also the remaining element that emerged from the research question:

- What did the findings mean for opportunities for learning in and through negotiation of a authoritative dialogical discourse? Who participated in these opportunities, and how?

The discussion includes implications for teaching and learning in internationalised classrooms of inferential generalisations or extrapolations on the basis of the findings, and considerations for institutional policies and programmes. The methodological approach is appraised, and finally, it is argued questions raised by the study’s findings direct attention to the need for continued investigation of dialogue in internationalised classrooms.
CHAPTER 2

2 DIALOGUE AND THE INTERNATIONALISED CLASSROOM

Conceptualisation of spoken interaction in the internationalised classroom as dialogue, or dialogic, offers more than a useful model of speech communication as a process of negotiation of meaning:

… concepts like ‘dialogue’ and ‘dialogical’ … should not just be understood in the usual way as denoting direct face-to-face oral communication between two or more persons. They are also used in a much broader way to refer to conceptualizations of language and mind as truly social, cultural and historical phenomena … of the world as multidimensional and always only partially understood, and Man as a social being in search of meaning with the individual minds embedded in cultural collectivity. Linguistic meaning is conceived as open and dynamic, and constituted in the dialogic process of communication. (Heen Wold, 1992b, p. 1).

In this view, dialogue is a process of social semiosis. Meanings made through language reside in relationships, in what Stewart (1978) identifies as the ‘between’. Language is the means by which people interact, a means of entering into dialogic relationships and a product of them (Halliday, 1978). In this sense language is primarily a “medium of social action” (D. Edwards, 1997, p. 84) used to act in and on the world (Poynton, 2000) and action is achieved through exchange of meanings negotiated through dialogue (Halliday, 1984; Martin, 1992). Halliday, and others, have represented “the elementary relations of dialogue in a hierarchy of three networks, (a) social-contextual, (b) semantic, and (c) grammatical” (Halliday, 1984, p. 10). These systems are the analytic tools applied to classroom data in this investigation, and are discussed in detail in Chapter 3.

In the first part of this chapter, dialogue is discussed in terms of a model for spoken interaction that is relational and constitutive of social and cultural contexts. Dialogue is argued also to offer an ontological and epistemological foundation for knowing and getting to know social realities. This foundation is then extended to relationship between dialogue and the potential for learning in and through spoken interaction in classrooms. The second part of the chapter contextualizes this investigation through a review of studies of spoken interaction in internationalised university classrooms, predominantly those conducted in Australian
universities, with special attention to those that adopted a dialogic and/or SFL approach to analysis of classroom data.

### 2.1 Conceptualising dialogue

In the context of contemporary research across the human and social sciences, dialogue is possibly an ambiguous or confusing term (Josephs, 2003; Koczanowicz, 2000). Stewart and Zedicker (2000) assert that:

> the term ‘dialogue’ has become in the last decade a favourite of educational reformers, composition scholars, organisational theorists, psychotherapists, political theorists and activists, journalists, feminists, philosophers and communication teachers and scholars interested in promoting sometimes fundamental changes in practice, teaching and research. (p. 224).

A prescriptive view (Stewart & Zediker, 2000) associates dialogue with particular forms or ways of speech communication, such as formal argument, or with particular outcomes. Prescriptive dialogue includes various kinds of dialectical and rhetorical formats, in the form of arguments to be used in specific situations, such as described by Aristotle (Walton, 2000). The Socratic notion of dialogue as contributing to the general ‘good’, i.e., as moral or ethical action (Turlington, 1969), is most evident today in the prescriptive approaches to dialogue such as those of Buber (1970) and Bohm (Bohm, 1996, 2002). These prescriptive approaches are clearly too restrictive to account for all spoken discourse as dialogue.

Josephs (2003) asks whether “dialogue (is) everywhere … whether self-talk and talk with ‘imagined others’ … one’s interaction with material/symbolic aspects of culture (e.g., texts, art) are productively captured by the concept” (p. viii). This descriptive approach (Stewart & Zediker, 2000) uses “the term ‘dialogue’ to label … a pervasive, defining feature of humanity … the irreducibly social, relational, or interactional character of all human meaning-making … the inherently ‘dialogic’ character of all human life” (Stewart & Zediker, 2000, p. 225). Dialogue in this sense captures the “triple face” (Josephs, 2003) of dialogue as interpersonal and intrapersonal conversation, as a model for capturing the dialogical nature of psychological and social phenomena, and as metaphor.

Writing from a social psychology perspective, Josephs (2003), suggests three broad conceptualisations – “the triple face” (p. vii) - of dialogue while warning each is arguably inconsistent and open to interpretation. Dialogue can be understood firstly as “concrete phenomena” (p. vii), instanced by Josephs as interpersonal and intrapersonal conversations.
The focus of this investigation on spoken discourse – spoken interaction – might suggest intrapersonal dialogue is of no interest. However, the relational nature of dialogue and the idea of listening as actively responsive that is embedded in the Bakhtinian model of dialogue to be outlined challenges – or, at the very least, blurs - perceived boundaries of the inter- and intrapersonal. Josephs’ (2003) second conceptualisation of dialogue as “formal models of mapping … phenomena (known as dialogicality or dialogism)” (p. vii) is clearly the ground on which a dialogic model of spoken discourse can be drawn. The relational nature of ‘self’ in a dialogic understanding of human experience suggests the “psychological and non-psychological phenomena” (p. vii) to which Josephs refers may be more productively considered in terms of models of social phenomena, such as language use. It is in this sense that dialogue will be used in conceptualising the phenomena of discourse, culture, and learning. Josephs’ third ‘face’ of dialogue is that of “metaphorical analogy” (p. vii), although she notes ‘model’ and ‘metaphor’ tend to intermingle. This is the nature of the principle of dialogue. It is a relational rather than an absolutist principle. For instance, as Markova (1990) notes, dialogue can certainly be considered in what she calls a ‘narrow’ sense, that of face-to-face communication:

The special characteristics of dialogue in this narrower sense are a result of interaction, in temporal and spatial immediacy, between two or more participants who face each other and who are intentionally conscious of, and orientated towards, each other in an act of communication. (Markova, 1990, p. 6, emphasis in the original)

While Markova goes on to emphasise the fundamental importance of dialogue in this narrow sense to both language and the broader human experience, she first remarks that the immediacy of the face-to-face dialogue is only possible within a historical sociocultural setting. That is, face-to-face dialogue is shaped and made meaningful through the dialogical relations that permeate the immediate. Dialogue is a concrete phenomenon and a formal model and a metaphorical analogy.

In the sections that follow, a conceptual model of dialogue is outlined to support the investigation, discussion, and interpretation of negotiation of meaning in and through the concrete phenomenon of classroom dialogue. This includes a discussion of dialogue as a metaphor in the ontological realm that offers an understanding of human existence or being.

## 2.1.1 A dialogic model of spoken interaction

### 2.1.1.1 Dialogue and language

A model of dialogue begins with conceptions of language itself and the prescriptive/descriptive opposition that fuelled debate in linguistics during the twentieth century. This debate, captured
in the thinking of Saussure (1966), revolved around what was seen as the “inner duality” (Holquist, 2002, p. 45) of language as a rule-governed system of conventions common to all speakers of a particular language (langue) on one hand, and as it occurs in an individual’s speech (parole) on the other. In introducing his model of dialogue, Halliday (1984) discusses this as an opposition between code and behaviour. Attempts to understand language as a code or system of conventions have focused on “searching for fixed components of meaning, literal or propositional meaning, all presupposing some kind of conceptual realities” (Heen Wold, 1992b, p. 2). In this view it is not just language that is considered as an objective absolute that is external to human minds; language is seen to signify an absolute and independent external reality.

In this understanding the use of language in discourse involves individuals composing or “combining sentences together to express thoughts and ideas” (Fromkin, Blair, & Collins, 1996, p. 183) in the form of messages that are ‘transmitted’ via a channel of communication – speaking, writing – for interpretation. In this ‘transmission’ model, meanings are objective representations that can be passed between individuals and retain this objective representation (Edwards, 1997), and in principle exist in vacuo outside actual social situations. This implies a model of individual cognition and psychology that views the individual “as an essentially asocial, but highly complex information-processing device” (Rommetveit, 1992, p. 19).

This transmission model of communication follows from a view of language as an objective and external absolute. Although set in a social situation, it represents the antithesis of conceptions of discourse as a dialogic social activity. However, a model of individual language use in isolation from conventions shared by a community of language users is not an alternative. As Bakhtin (1986, p. 78) notes, “speech communication would be almost impossible” if individual speakers were not able to make use of collectively shared conventions. A dichotomous langue/parole model cannot adequately conceptualize language as a meaning-making social activity. In that model the social is found only in the shared “ready-made, normative and static systems of signs” (Markova, 1990, p. 5) that is langue. Parole is the realm of the individual:

…regarded from the speaker’s standpoint as if there were only one speaker who does not have any necessary relation to other participants in speech communication …(and where) if the role of the other is taken into account at all, it is the role of a listener, who understands the speaker only passively. (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 67)

A dialogue model of discourse abandons the conceptions of language-in-use - *parole* - as idiosyncratic, and of language-as-objective-system - *langue* - as meaningful. It does this by relocating the site of text production from the individual to the social in a model of “open unity”
(Bakhtin, 1986, p. 6) residing in the transformative relationship “between the relatively static and dynamic aspects of language” (Markova, 1990, p. 6). Similarly, Halliday (1984) characterises a systemic description of language as an “interpenetration of code and behaviour … an attempt to interpret simultaneously both what language ‘is’ and what language ‘does’ (or, more realistically, what people do with it)” (pp. 7 & 6). Larsen-Freeman (1997), although not using the term dialogic, suggests that the result of this transformative relationship is that language changes every time it is used, and that “rather than using rules to shape discourse, the rules themselves are shaped by the discourse” (p. 148). The corollary of this shift is that meaning can be regarded, by virtue of the social production of texts, as intersubjective, negotiated between the interactants.

This relationship, and the relational nature of dialogue, is central to a model of language as a dialogic phenomenon. In the SFL conception of the reality enacted in social relations as interpersonal meaning (Christie & Unsworth, 2000), the notion of the meaning-making relations between individuals is captured in the prefix ‘inter’. Meaning does not reside in individual minds. Meaning is made in relation with some ‘other’, in and through dialogue, and dialogue subsumes individual identities which are, in this conception, constructed dialogically in social relations through language (Farr, 1990; Koczanowicz, 2000; Markova, 2003a; Mead, 1934; Taylor, 1991; James V Wertsch, 1990). This is not to suggest contexts and meanings that are negotiated are identical, or necessarily even similar, for the participants. While it can be thought of as a shared experience, a shared making of meanings, negotiation of a temporarily shared reality is better considered as a goal of dialogue situated in active ongoing negotiation rather than achievement of some form of stasis.

This is why it is more appropriate to think of dialogue as a process of negotiating meanings and not one of negotiation of products. ‘Negotiation’ perhaps implies an activity that can be successfully completed, one in which a common or shared understanding, or unity, is achieved. It is more helpful to think of negotiation as a process of managing tension rather than one of resolution or some form of dialectical synthesis. The dialogic conception resists idealised models that suggest “dialogue is characterized by inclusion and a reciprocal sharing, such that the individuals become one in and with each other” (Jenlink & Banathy, 2005, p. 5). A dialogic model of interaction is one of plurality in which efforts to reduce voices to unified finality always exist in dynamic relational ratios with new voices and fresh interpretations; it is one which “defies a finalised completeness of separate worlds of individuals, groups or forms” (Gurevitch, 2000, p. 244). Although the dialogic relation is irreducible, the impossibility of unity or oneness is an inescapable characteristic of a world understood as dialogic, based as it is on the presence of at least two participants in any relation.
2.1.1.2 Dialogue as relation

The foundation of conceptual understanding of language based on the ‘dialogue principle’ is the social situation of language use. A dialogic model of language and spoken interaction proposes the meanings made in and through the use of language reside in relationships. It is meaning that distinguishes language from what are the physiological processes of mere sound production and reception (Todorov, 1984), and meaning “exceed(s) the boundaries of the isolated physiological organisms” (Vološinov, 1976, p. 31). Stewart (1978) identifies this social relation as the ‘between’, the irreducible phenomenon of the dialogic constitution of not just meanings, but the self, psychological processes, social activities, and culture.

Bakhtin (1979, 1981, 1984, 1986), who some believe (Holquist, 2002; Kent, 1991; Todorov, 1984) was also the author of works published under the name Vološinov (1973, 1976), conceived of language-in-use as utterances, socially, culturally and historically situated, which actively and responsively involve both speaker and addressee. In this model, “all verbal communication, all verbal interaction takes place in the form of an exchange of utterances, that is in the form of a dialogue” (Vološinov, cited in Todorov, 1984, p. 44). This mirrors Halliday’s (1978) conception of the impossibility of language functioning outside a social situation. Bakhtin (1986) argued that not only is “the real unit of speech communication … always cast in the form of an utterance belonging to a particular speaking subject, and outside this form it cannot exist” (p. 71, emphasis in the original), but it is also “constructed between two (sic) socially organised persons, and should there not be present an actual interlocutor, one is presupposed … discourse is oriented toward the person addressed, oriented toward what that person is” (Vološinov, 1973, p. 101, emphasis in the original). Utterances emerge in the relation between these ‘particular’ interactants and thus can be regarded as unique and irreproducible. This conception of spoken interaction has some important ramifications for the research question of this investigation. It is not only speakers who play an agentive role in the generation of utterances that constitute the classroom data collected for analysis. In posing the question, what ways do students negotiate meanings, the role of addressee must be acknowledged as a way of being involved in dialogic processes. In effect, this widens the scope of the analysis of spoken interaction in the classroom from speakers to include consideration of participants who are not speaking.

2.1.1.2.1 The speaker in the dialogic relation of spoken interaction

Utterances have what Linell (1998) calls “double-sideness … (a) ‘response–initiative’ structure, the movement from what is given in prior context to something new” (p. 81, emphasis in the original). Wertsch (1990) explains this necessity to look beyond the linguistic aspect of an
utterance for meaning thus: “spoken and written utterances can be adequately interpreted only if their interrelationships with other utterances are taken into consideration” (p. 63). This is not to say new ‘unrelated’ topics cannot be introduced, although this often involves some (re)contextualisation. However, although an utterance may be ‘independent’ in principle of preceding co-text, its relation to other contextual resources means that semantically it is anchored in and dependent on the social situation of interaction (Linell, 1998, p. 100). To generalise, in the dialogue of the classroom students become speakers in response to the preceding co-text for which they were direct, or indirect, addressees and “use their utterances to demonstrate, or document, to each other how they interpret what is going on” (Linell, 1998, p. 79). In doing this, utterances are constructed in anticipation that a response from an addressee will follow and ‘from the very beginning … constructed while taking into account possible responsive reactions, for whose sake, in essence, it is actually created” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 94).

This view of utterances as links in an unfolding “chain of speech communication” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 94) does not suggest the speaker begins within a predetermined linguistic structure that exists in its entirety before it is verbalised. Utterances, at least those that are impromptu, represent active cognition. Speakers are also “recipients of their own utterances” (Linell, 1998, p. 94), interpreting what they say as they verbalise. In this sense it is possible to see some aspects of the negotiation of meaning, for example, language choices which realize a speaker’s certainty of a proposition, as active responsive listening of the speaker to the utterance as it is produced.

From a speaker’s position a key feature of utterances is addressivity, the “quality of being addressed to someone” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 95). This refers to the influence of the speaker’s anticipation of the possible responsive understanding of the listener and the expectation of such a response at some time in the future:

… from the very beginning, the utterance is constructed while taking into account possible responsive actions, for whose sake, in essence, it is constructed. … the speaker expects a response from (the listener), an active responsive understanding. The entire utterance is constructed, as it were, in anticipation of encountering this response. … Both the composition and style of the utterance depend on those to whom the utterance is addressed … (Bakhtin, 1986, pp. 94-95)

Addressivity encapsulates the dialogical nature of human communication in identifying the active relationship between speaker and listener. The co-construction of dialogue, and negotiation of meaning, resides in this “dynamic, complex, context-dependent communicative ‘transaction’, ‘reciprocal bond’, ‘between’, or ‘relationship’” (Stewart, 1978, p. 184). In
Chapter 3, the four discursive relationships that frame the analysis of the classroom data are predicated on this notion of addressivity and the expectation of a response. In explaining the negotiatory nature of dialogue in terms of the speech roles of giving and demanding, Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) note the “complex notions” (p. 107) involved:

Giving means ‘inviting to receive’, and demanding means ‘inviting to give’. The speaker is not only doing something himself; he is also requiring something of the listener. Typically, therefore, an ‘act’ of speaking is something that might more appropriately be called an interact: it is an exchange, in which giving implies receiving and demanding implies giving in response. (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 107, emphasis in the original)

2.1.1.2.2 The addressee in the dialogic relation of spoken interaction

In a dialogic model of language use, the role of the ‘other’, the listener or addressee, is crucial in several ways in the meaning-making relation. The role of addressee is additionally complex in polyadic spoken interactions, such as a university classroom.

In principle, speakers can address utterances directly to all classroom participants. In practice in such instances, the speaker’s orientation to the addressees often moves, if only visually, between individual participants to encompass all, or at least most, listeners. However, in multi-party interaction the relation of utterances as sequential in a chain of communication means that an individual, often the previous speaker, is the direct addressee (Goffman, 1981; Linell, 1998). As noted above, this is the participant who has actively played a part in constitution of the co-textual context influencing the utterance of the current speaker. The utterance is likely to be, at least in part, a response negotiating the addressee’s utterance. In a classroom, the reciprocity of dialogue, the tendency to address an utterance to the previous speaker and their obligation to then respond, can lead to stretches of dyadic interaction between student and teacher or student and student in which other participants are indirect addressees. More specifically, it is arguable that in the classroom in this study the diverse contextual resources of student participants include perceived obligations embedded in the social roles of classroom interaction that influence the propensity of individual participants who are indirect addressees to respond to utterances addressed to others. If so, the role of addressee in these instances would not include the possibility of being the next speaker. These perceptions arguably extend to appropriateness of address of utterances to a teacher or other students. Complexities such as these are explored in the analysis of the classroom data in this study.
Multi-party interaction has another implication for addressees. As Goffman (1981) points out, listening, “the process of auditing what a speaker says and following the gist of his remarks … is from the start to be distinguished from the social slot in which this activity occurs, namely, official status as a ratified participant in the encounter” (p. 131). In the multi-party circumstances of classroom interaction the obligation for individuals to actively and responsively listen, either overtly to provide back-channelling or in order to be prepared to respond as the next speaker, is effectively diminished. While acknowledging this, the investigation adopted an in-principle approach, assuming addressees were active and responsive listeners in anticipation of the possibility of adoption of the role of next speaker.

Within the acknowledged constraints of multi-party interaction as outlined, in a dialogic model of language use the listener or addressee is essential in the meaning-making relation. Addressees have been and will be speakers and participate in the mutual co-constitution of context and text from which a speaker’s utterance emerges. The role of addressee in constituting context and specifically contributing the preceding co-textual context has been noted in the section on the role of the speaker and in this section, above. Also noted in the section on the role of speaker was another dialogic aspect of the relation between speaker and addressee, addressivity, the influence of a speaker’s perceptions of an addressee’s perspective and anticipated response. Addressivity is complicated in a classroom where a speaker may directly address an utterance to a specific participant but at the same time take into account indirect addressees, the other participants, as well.

Addressees are active and responsive listeners. Linell (1998) details three aspects of listening. First, during the process of verbalisation addressees provide feedback in various forms, both verbal and non-verbal, that is central to the addressivity of utterances, allowing speakers to make on-going assessments of their perception of addressees’ perspectives and possible responses. This is a form of negotiation that a speaker can in turn respond to during the process of production of an utterance. In some instances, this type of active listening extends to encompass addressees contributing to utterances, providing missing words, completing utterances in an explicit form of joint or co-construction (Linell, 1998).

Second, in a dialogic conception of spoken interaction addressees’ understandings of utterances are active. The listener is not regarded as a passive recipient of meaning, as in a transmission model. Understanding is itself a matrix of dialogic relations that emerge from immediate concrete and co-textual contexts in interaction with the more abstract contextual resources that embody the background knowledge and socio-cultural history of addressees (Linell, 1998).
Third, as a participant in speech communication an addressee will at some future point in time become a speaker. Just as a speaker addresses an utterance to a listener in expectation of a response, an addressee can expect to become a speaker; active listening is also actively responsive in the sense that it is preparation for response:

Any understanding of live speech, a live utterance, is inherently responsive, although the degree of this activity varies enormously. Any understanding is imbued with response and necessarily elicits it in one form or the other: the listener becomes the speaker. … an utterance is not always followed immediately by an articulated response … (it) can be realized in action … or it can remain, for the time being, a silent responsive understanding … sooner or later what is heard and actively understood will find its response in the subsequent speech or behaviour of the listener. … Thus all real and integral understanding is actively responsive, and constitutes nothing other than the initial preparatory stage of a response. (Bakhtin, 1986, pp. 68-69)

Again, the multi-party nature of classroom interaction can moderate the obligation of addressees as active listeners unless they are addressed directly as individuals. In addition, as noted earlier, more abstract contextual resources can influence perceptions of participants of social roles and obligations in settings for language use such as a university classroom.

The reciprocity of dialogue reflects these mutual expectations of speaker and addressee, captured in the SFL model of dialogue in which the four speech functions of offer, command, statement and question are paired with expected/discretionary responses (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). An active responsive understanding of an utterance encompasses the speech function performed and the responses expected by the speaker and which the addressee experiences an obligation to provide.

2.1.1.3 Dialogue, contexts, and diversity

Language is meaningful in social situations not only because of dialogic relations between and within a chain of utterances in a concrete situation, but also due to broader dialogic relations with sociocultural histories of participants. Bakhtin (1979) distinguishes clearly between the aspect of utterances that is reproducible, the language, and the social aspect, which “represents something individual, unique, nonreiterative, and therein lies all its meaning” (p. 284, cited in Todorov, 1984, p. 50). The social aspect of language use is context, “constituted by what people are doing and where and when they are doing it. … contexts consist of mutually shared and ratified definitions of situation and in the social actions persons take on the basis of these definitions” (Erickson & Schultz, 1981, p. 148). In these terms, meanings are realized in and through the reflexive relationship embodied in mutual constitution of dialogue and context achieved by language use. Halliday (1984) stresses the emergent qualities of dialogues and
contexts as participants respond to and assess the immediate situation in relation to the more abstract resources they bring to the interaction:

The social context of any conversation is continuously being created and modified, by the course of the conversation itself as well as by other processes that may be taking place; and those involved unconsciously assess its ongoing semiotic potential, using this information not only to interpret the meanings of others but also to project the likely scope and interpretation of their own subsequent acts of meaning. (Halliday, 1984, p. 8)

The nature of this process has considerable implications for dialogues in internationalised classrooms.

It is safe to assume the objectives of participants in spoken interaction in internationalised classrooms mirror those of verbal interactants in general, to be understood and to understand (Foppa, 1995; Graumann, 1995; Linell, 1995). However, as Linell (1998) points out, in participating in the processes described by Halliday (1984, above), “contextual resources are seldom completely shared by actors in a given situation” (Linell, 1998, p. 132). Although meaning making is successful remarkably often (Halliday, 1984), “mutual understanding, although widely believed to be a necessary prerequisite of dialogues, need not be vary far-reaching. … Understanding is not a matter of ‘all-or-nothing’ but … is always bound to be partial” (Foppa, 1995, p. 151). Exchanges of meanings do not constitute a context, or some kind of fixed frame for continued unfolding of dialogue. What is constituted, by virtue of dialogic relations between unique sociocultural histories of participants and interpretations of unfolding co-texts, are contexts that are also in dynamic and emergent relations with unfolding discourse.

The question of interest for dialogue in internationalised classrooms is the extent to which contextual resources are shared by participants of diverse backgrounds. When language is held to be instrumental in constitution of the social context of its use, the implications of divergence or incongruence of contextual resources of participants are significant. Specifically in relation to this study, there may be implications for the ways students are involved in the negotiation of meaning.

Contextual resources, as described by Linell (1998, pp. 128-131), are both immediate and abstract in nature, and this distinction is critical in terms of the extent to which participants share resources. It is essential to remember that contextual resources are brought to bear on dialogue as it unfolds, and thus are in an ongoing dynamic relation with dialogue. The co-text, utterances that constitute the interaction up to and including the current point of its unfolding,
and indexically relevant concrete aspects of the physical setting in time and space are immediate contextual resources available to all participants. Interpretations of immediate resources are mediated by progressively more abstract contextual resources embedded in the broader individual sociocultural histories of participants.

These more abstract resources include prior knowledge or beliefs about the propositional content of the co-text and the responsive understandings of participants of the content, as well as intimacy of knowledge of the other interactants and the type of interaction or activity under negotiation. These in turn are embedded in individual models of broader organisational and institutional frameworks as contexts for interaction and related “knowledge of language, communicative routines and action types (i.e., what actors have become acquainted with as a result of their acculturation within a linguistic and interpretive community) … (encompassed by) culture-specific general assumptions about the world” (Linell, 1998, pp. 130-131).

In these terms, the more abstract contextual resources of participants in internationalised classrooms are “linguistic and cultural-historical repertoires” (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003, p. 22) that are shared to the extent that linguistic and cultural histories are shared. Embeddedness of abstract contextual resources in efforts to understand and be understood means that participation in spoken interaction is a “deeply historicised act of communication mediated by pre-given conditions of expression, semiotic conventions, and other ideological and material conventions” (Sandywell, 1998, p. 200).

It is important to emphasize that the cultural regularities described as contextual resources and repertoires of practices are not located in individuals; cultures are constituted and experienced by what people do in day-to-day interactions (Cole & Engeström, 1993). Cultural regularities are dialogically constituted and renewed in practice itself:

There are regularities in the ways cultural groups participate in the everyday practices of their respective communities. However, the relatively stable characteristics of those environments are in constant tension with the emergent goals and practices participants construct, which stretch and change over time and with other constraints. This conflict and tension contribute to the variation and ongoing change in an individual’s and a community’s practices. (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003, p. 21)

Participants in social activities assess, update, and modify their models of contextual resources, including language, on an ongoing basis, as actively brought to bear in and through their efforts to understand and be understood in unfolding of discursive events. However, some resources, the more immediate, are more amenable to updating in the moment as the discourse unfolds,
and in fact participation demands that this be so. The more abstract the contextual resource, the more deeply embedded in practice it becomes and arguably less open to updating. Participation in social activity is more likely to activate renewal in and through practice of more abstract contextual resources that construct the meanings of the specific social situation.

When language is used to act in situations (like a classroom) interactants activate the necessary resources to constitute contexts for dialogue - the social situation and its meanings - in and through the language choices they make. This view of social situations as realized by language is the foundation of the functional relationship between language and social structure articulated by Halliday (1978) which assumes that:

the social system (or the ‘culture’) can be represented as a construction of meanings – as a semiotic system. The meanings that constitute the social system are exchanged through a variety of modes or channels, of which language is one; … given this social-semiotic perspective, a social context (or situation, in the terms of situation theory) is a temporary construct or instantiation of meanings from the social system. (Halliday, 1978, p. 189, emphasis in the original)

What does this conceptual framework mean in terms of the research question? “Since reality is a social construct, it can be constructed only through an exchange of meanings” (Halliday, 1978, p. 191), and thus the meanings negotiated by students in internationalised classrooms in order to understand and be understood constitute the social situation(s) of ‘internationalised postgraduate classroom’. ‘Exchange of meanings’ is negotiated through dialogue (Halliday, 1984; Martin, 1992), that is, in and through social relationships of participants as they use language to act in and on the world. This social function of language is realized in the semantics, lexicogrammar, and phonology of the system of the functional-semantic component of interpersonal meaning (Halliday, 1984).

In Chapter 3, the application of the system of interpersonal meaning to the classroom data is explained in detail. In the next sections of this Chapter, the constitution through the exchange of meanings of social situations such as classrooms is discussed in some additional detail, and the significance of meanings of talk itself in realization of social situations such as internationalised classrooms is considered.

2.1.1.4 Dialogue and classrooms

As Halliday (1978) points out, in a social-semiotic perspective the acquisition of language and the ‘acquisition’ of a social system are one and the same. Learning to use language to act in and on the world can be viewed as acquiring the set of discursive practices (Young, 2008) required
to participate in the social processes that comprise social systems. Classrooms are instances of social processes in which language plays a central part. The relationship between language and specific social activities or processes, is evident in “register … configurations of meanings that are typically exchanged … under given conditions of use” (Halliday, 1978, p. 185).

Register is an integral aspect of the ability to use language in social situations (Canale & Swain, 1980; Hymes, 1971), and variations in register are integral to a reflexive relationship between language acquisition and knowledge of social systems and processes. It is not uncommon for speakers to experience difficulties participating in discourses in their first language that are outside their experiences (Bakhtin, 1986):

> We know our native language … from concrete utterances that we hear and that we ourselves reproduce in live speech communication with people around us. We assimilate forms of language only in forms of utterances and in conjunction with these forms. (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 78)

Thus, while knowledge of register in a speaker’s first language is generally unsuspectingly acquired and utilised, it is integral to the constitution of social settings in and through exchanges of meaning.

Register captures variations in language in response to differences in types of situation. Classrooms are a type of situation, and postgraduate classrooms are a more specific type. Three situational factors or components of the social context influence language use, specifically, the field, tenor, and mode of the discourse (Halliday, 1978, p. 33). Analysis of the negotiation of meanings focuses on tenor of discourse, the social relationships in and through which meanings are exchanged, that is, dialogue. In a social-semiotic perspective, as an aspect of social context the meanings that constitute tenor of discourse are “realized through selections in the meaning potential of language” (Halliday, 1978, p. 189).

The question to be explored in internationalised classrooms is one of social semiosis in conditions of diversity. Abstract contextual resources of students who participate in classrooms using a second or additional language include cultural models grounded historically in other linguistic and sociocultural environments. Particular cultural communities are typified by repertoires of practices common to participants (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003), by regularities in what people do. By definition, different cultures have different ways of doing things, including classroom or educational discourse (Ellis, 1995; Hirst & Renshaw, 2004; Hofstede, 1986; Spizzica, 1996). By extension, such differences include the tenor of classroom discourse, that is, dialogic social relations in and through which meanings are exchanged and negotiated.
Cultural regularities are not fixed; they emerge and are renewed dialogically and in dialogue because although:

(d)ialogue contributions are produced in their local contexts … this does not tell the whole truth. The products of “small” local actions add up to discourse and texts, which also exhibit global regularities. At the same time, local productions take place in the contexts of socio-cultural traditions, within a “continuity of practices” that extends far beyond single situations. Meanings are of course not constantly created ab novo; rather, meaning potentials are part of actors’ knowledge of language and are used in the negotiation of situated interpretations. (Linell, 1998, pp. 81-82)

Discursive practices that both constitute social situations as classrooms and enable participation in them are rooted in historically unique sociocultural experiences of students. The implicit knowing of register - how to participate in classroom discourse, the ways of talking and the meaning of talk in classrooms - is embedded in social processes within particular social systems. These social domains make up day-to-day lived experiences, but common examples such as the courtroom or the meeting emphasise what is usually the more subtle role of control of discourse register in membership of or participation in the numerous discourse communities, or communities of practice, that social activity involves (Drew & Heritage, 1992).

Culturally-specific discursive practices are often as important for participation in formal classroom settings as content knowledge (D. Edwards, 1993). Knowing how to ‘be a student’ is no different from the need to know how to ‘be’ in any discourse community or community of practice. A classroom, like “each sphere in which language is used, develops its own relatively stable types of …speech genres” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 60). Classroom discourse was recognized also by Bakhtin (1981) as what he termed ‘social languages’, “discourse(s) peculiar to a specific stratum of society (professional, age group, etc) within a given social system at a given time” (p. 430). Hicks (1995/1996) describes several types of classroom discourse genres, and Christie (e.g., 1991a; 1991b, 1995, 1997, 1999) similarly elaborates curriculum genres of pedagogic discourse. Bakhtin stresses the operation of speech genres in every aspect of speech communication, from the “short rejoinders of daily dialogue” (1986, p. 60) to the most complex spoken and written interactions.

Although genre is often understood as a reductive, synchronic codification of texts with an emphasis on rules of production and consequent interpretation (Burkitt, 1998), a dialogic conception of genre shifts the emphasis to the relation between production and interpretation in actual speech communication. A dialogic understanding of discourse views all utterances – and all utterances take form as speech genres (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 80) - as responsive. The speech
genres of classroom interactions are typified then, not as specific codifiable ‘types’ of classroom talk, but as “response(s) to something within a specific social situation. …a genre corresponds to a hermeneutic strategy – a guessing game – that we employ in order to communicate. …a genre – as the determinate form of the utterance – represents a response to an utterance, and as response, the genre is the form that interpretation takes” (Kent, 1991, p. 299).

Speech or discourse genres that permit participation in classroom activities are cultural models that have their origin in the earliest learning experiences of children whose discursive activities are developed and nurtured through scaffolding by more knowing caretakers (James V Wertsch, 1984). Hicks (1995/1996) emphasises this idea that community-based discourse practices are “a primary conduit through which children structure their school experiences. If these experiences are consonant with those found in formal classroom settings, children typically learn academic discourse with ease” (p. 62).

Much research has focussed on the importance for future learning of the consonance to which Hicks (1995/1996) refers (e.g., Heath, 1982, 1983). In internationalised classrooms, students have been enculturated into classroom discourse communities or communities of practices in their cultural communities of origin. Contextual resources activated in the effort to understand and be understood ultimately reflect “the language practices, values, and ways of acting and believing characteristic of their communities” (Hicks, 1995/1996, p. 64).

This conception of discursive constitution of social situations and processes suggests the possibility of tensions in the negotiation of internationalised classroom contexts. As participants of diverse language backgrounds exchange meanings in their efforts to construct a context that has “a certain potential in terms of which their own acts of meaning will be interpreted and valued” (Halliday, 1984, p. 8), they may experience some dissonance that leads to reflection on cultural models of the tenor of classroom discourse. Cultural models reside in practice (Latané, 1996; Lau, Chiu, & Lee, 2001) in the dialogic tension of “open unity” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 6); “our unified perceptions of the world remains always open to new signifying relations. … (communicative interaction) animates culture and gives it life” (Kent, 1991, pp. 284-285). Gee and Green (1998), echoing the ‘open unity’ that characterises dialogic tensions, emphasise that practices that realise cultural models “are not fixed but are open to modification, expansion, and revision by members as they interact across time and events” (Gee & Green, 1998, p. 124).

Conceptually, in internationalised classrooms, the idea of contextual resources, including cultural models that reside in practice, needs to be considered from an inter-cultural perspective.
In intra-cultural dialogues it is unlikely culturally similar interactants, with broadly shared histories of participation in communities of practice, will completely share contextual resources; “the same activity can be framed or perspectivised differently by different actors” (Linell, 1998, p. 132). When dialogue is inter-cultural, interactants who do not share histories of participation, who differ culturally, exchange meanings in and through a network of contexts and contextual resources that may be in some instances incongruent.

There are suggestions that intercultural communication or interaction in social situations, such as classrooms, fosters the genesis of inter-culturally constituted social systems, or ‘cultures’. These are conceptualised in a variety of ways, for example, homogenised cultures or hybrid cultures (Gee, 1999; Knight, 2004). When students of diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and their teachers, come together the resultant learning discourse is inescapably inter- or between the cultures in this sense, perhaps to the extent of building an emergent ‘third culture’ (Casmir, 1992, 1999) through “the construction of a mutually beneficial interactive environment in which individuals from two different cultures can function in a way beneficial to all involved” (p. 92). The idea of third culture-building is based on acceptance of communication as:

an on-going negotiation of meaning … necessary to deal effectively with chaotic systems and environments. That is the case because dialogue and negotiation deal with the study of things we do together to make sense of any given setting. (Casmir, 1999, p. 98, emphasis in the original)

This places the communication process at the centre of a dialogic “communication-centred paradigm” (Casmir, 1999, p. 92) of cultures mutually constituted in and through the meaning-making of communicating and relating (Latané, 1996; Lau, et al., 2001). All culture-building models need to be considered in terms of individual practices embedded in multiple, and perhaps competing, contexts and contextual resources, rather than a single unified shared reality. This is the conception of dialogue in internationalised classrooms that frames this study.
2.1.1.5 Dialogue and the meaning of talk

Selections of language in the system of interpersonal meanings realises tenor of discourse, but the very act of talking, or not talking, also has meaning. Implicit beliefs and values attached to talk are tied up in social practices that involve talking and that are embedded in dialogically constituted social systems. As Fitzgerald (2003) notes:

all communication is potentially problematic, but where there are differences in cultural background, the difficulties can be greater … (because of) … beliefs, values and patterns of communicative behaviour learned through growing up, living and working in a particular culture and society (pp. 9-10).

A sociocultural understanding of language acquisition sees it as “a process whereby psychological processes are formed” (James V Wertsch, 1991, p. 98, emphasis in the original). Concepts of the self and relations with others vary across cultural communities (Gao, 1998a; Kim & Markus, 2002) and as these are inextricably embedded in social interaction (Lyra & Souza, 2003; Markova, 2003a; Mead, 1934; Richardson, Rogers, & McCarroll, 1998; Taylor, 1991; J. V. Wertsch, 1980; James V Wertsch, 1990), meanings of talk itself varies. Although “people’s varied participation in the practices of dynamic cultural communities can be distinguished from membership in ethnic groups” (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003, p. 21, emphasis in the original), a general comparison of Western and Eastern practices and ideas serves to illustrate differences in the meaning of talk in different communities of practice. There is evidence also of variation of the meaning of talk in the broad contexts of Middle Eastern and African practices as well (Feghali, 1997; Smith & Bond, 1999).

It is argued that talk in Western cultural communities reflects an independent mode of being, and is enshrined as a right and seen as a way of defining the self through expression of thoughts and feelings. In Eastern cultural communities the self is defined more by relations with others, and talking is more generally viewed in terms of how it facilitates or confirms these relationships. Kim and Markus (2002) report their study of Korean and American speakers in which Koreans placed significantly more emphasis on the ‘other’ when asked why the ability to speak is important. While openness, self-expression, and assertiveness in talk are generally viewed positively in Western communities, in some social systems more emphasis is placed on the listener’s role in constructing meanings (Smith & Bond, 1999). Speakers are indirect and inferential (Gao, 1998a, 1998b), because maintaining face for the listener is an important function of speaking:
What appears as passivity … carries with it in many eastern contexts a whole palette of highly positive associations, including intelligence, flexibility, managing face, cooperativeness, caring, and maturity. (Kim & Markus, 2002, p. 440)

Beliefs and values to do with meanings of talk relate directly to privileging of talk in Australian classrooms, at all levels of education, to the extent that in university classrooms “expectation for speech is clearly a norm of academic culture” (Ellwood & Nakane, 2009, p. 205). The elevation of the capacity to use spoken language to a key educational skill objective and inclusion of assessment of participation in students’ grades for a course (Jones, 1999) was noted in Chapter 1 as factor in the attention directed to spoken interaction in internationalised classrooms.

Contemporary understandings of learning based on constructivist views of interaction – or contestation - of existing and new knowledge, and/or sociocultural views that see learning as situated in socially, culturally and historically contextualised interaction, suggest that in classrooms “talk is central … being the primary medium of interaction, and because it helps learners to make explicit to themselves and others what they know, understand and can do” (A. D. Edwards & Westgate, 1994, p. 6). Spoken interaction, at least that which is sanctioned, is encouraged and valued. It is understood to provide students with opportunities to develop academic skills of critical thinking, problem solving, and evaluation through questioning, presenting and defending positions, learning from errors, and processing course materials. These are processes that, in constructivist models, are believed to engender cognitive growth through the restructuring of existing knowledge and connecting new knowledge with that already known (Biggs, 1999; Coats, Leach, Lentell, Phillips, & Scott, 1992; Lublin, 1987). Biggs (1999) focuses attention on the centrality of spoken interaction and describes ‘good’ tutorials as:

those that promote active learning, where tutors are able to set up a (supportive) atmosphere, to facilitate good debate, to open out the quieter students, to quieten the already too open and to provide a focus for discussion and interaction that requires students to prepare in advance. (p. 85)

While this offers a somewhat idealised model of classroom interaction, and one that perhaps fails to account for the expectations and attitudes of students (e.g., see Ashwin, 2005; Benwell & Stokoe, 2002, 2005), the perceived association between interaction and learning and the institutional expectation that students will participate are clear. The meaning of classroom talk is evident in concerns about students who don’t participate in talk as expected and who are
“often seen as problematic, commonly viewed as passive learners or as failing to learn altogether” (Remedios, et al., 2008, p. 201).

The values and meanings that privilege talk in classrooms in Australia and other English-speaking nations, and that underlie constitution of cultural models of practice, are not universally shared (Jones, 1999; Kim & Markus, 2002). For example, Jones (1999) describes Cambodian classrooms where student talk is not encouraged because a transmission model of communication and learning means there is “nothing to discuss” (p. 247). Ellwood and Nakane (2009) although contesting claims that in Japan silence is valued more than in Western countries, accept evidence of a “culture of silence” among students in Japanese classrooms. Likewise, Zhou, Knoke and Sakamoto (2005), and Wong (2004) in arguing that participation of students from China in internationalised classrooms is not predetermined or reified by membership of a cultural group per se, point to historical participation in classrooms where “merely accepting and absorbing everything the teacher said” (Wong, 2004, p. 154), was valued. This argument is consonant with dialogic conceptions of culture as residing in practice, as outlined earlier in this chapter.

To summarise at this point, dialogue offers a conceptual foundation for studying and understanding the ways exchanges of meanings are negotiated in spoken interaction in internationalised classrooms. It provides a means of elaborating how language constitutes dynamic social systems and processes in classrooms through the inter-relations of immediate and abstract contextual resources activated by participation in unfolding discourse. Further, dialogue as a principle can account for variations between particular social or cultural communities in the repertoires of practices and the meanings of practices that are realized and renewed in interaction. In the next sections, the focus moves to consideration of being and knowing as residing in discursive and dialogic relations.

2.1.2 Dialogue and the ontological and epistemological foundation of the research

The intention in this section is to place the research question in the context of a framework that supports the study of language as a way of coming to know the particular aspect of social reality identified for investigation. The most productive path here is to establish a focus on language that can be followed through into methods used in the study, following Seale’s (1999) advice to use “philosophical positions … as resources for thinking, rather than taken as problems to be solved before research can proceed” (p. 25). The research question, with an emphasis on negotiation of meaning, foregrounds the social constructionist view in which:
Social reality is regarded as the product of processes by which social actors together negotiate the meanings for actions and situations; it is a complex of socially constructed mutual knowledge – meanings, cultural symbols and social institutions. These meanings and interpretations both facilitate and structure social relationships. Social reality is the symbolic world of meanings and interpretations. (Blaikie, 2000, pp. 115-116).

Language is the most significant symbolic tool in the constructed world of meanings and interpretations (Halliday, 1978; P. Jarvis, 2006; Lantolf, 2000; Shotter, 1995). A social constructionist understanding distinguishes between what Stewart (1978), in discussing phenomenology, refers to as the ‘facticity’ of an external world, that is, “between being – that a thing is – and meaning, or what Husserl called essence – what a thing is” (Stewart, 1978, p. 188). In one sense language operates to allow recognition of this facticity in the realm of objective reality (P. Jarvis, 2006), which can best be thought of as exemplified in a dictionary (Bakhtin, 1986; Hicks, 1995/1996).

However, in language use we experience a subjective reality of meanings because language in use is marked by choices more akin to the thesaurus model than the dictionary (Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999). The choices, or meanings, open to users are, on the one hand, constrained by the shared cultural models (Gee, 1999) of the sociocultural context of the participants (Christie & Unsworth, 2000), but on the other, simultaneously open to “individuality and creativity” (Bakhtin, 1986), in situated meaning (Gee, 1994). Significantly, while language choices reflect these aspects of context, the same choices simultaneously serve to establish context (Gee, 1999; Martin, 1997; Schleppegrell, 2001). Language as a system of meaning choices plays a central role both in creating, shaping, and sustaining the social relationships and institutions necessary for social activity and in the realisation of the goals of this social activity.

In the SFL perspective, the simultaneous functions of language construe aspects of reality (Christie & Unsworth, 2000) through ideational, interpersonal, and textual meanings (Halliday, 1994). The ideational construes or represents experience of reality, the interpersonal the reality enacted in social relations, and the textual the semiotic reality of texts in context (Christie & Unsworth, 2000, p. 6). There is an irreducible bond between social reality and language because:

(1) language arises in the life of an individual through an exchange of meanings with significant others … his (sic) meaning group. … building up a picture of the reality that is around him and inside him. In this process, which is also a social process, the construal of reality is inseparable from the construal of the semantic system in which the reality is encoded. (Halliday, 1978, p. 1).
Language, then, is fundamental in negotiation of social reality. Without language, “we would find it almost impossible to give meaning to phenomena in our life-world” (P. Jarvis, 2006, p. 58). As Gee (1999) asserts, a deep understanding of the nature of social reality requires a deep understanding of language-in-use, that is, of discourse. Discourse is conceptualised in this study as the exchange and negotiation of meanings through dialogue. In the specific terms of the research question, a deep understanding of language-in-use offers a framework for investigating how the social reality of the internationalised classroom is negotiated by participants through the social activity of dialogue. This deep understanding of language in use centres on the centrality of language as a symbolic tool in a conception of the human experience of social reality as meanings negotiated in dialogic relations and what follows attempts to explain this place of language.

2.1.2.1 Dialogue, dialogism, and the experience of knowing

The term ‘dialogism’ has been coined to describe application of the principle of dialogue to various aspects of the human experience, although “dialogism is unthinkable outside its relation to language” (Holquist, 2002p. 40). While Koczanowicz (2000) asserts that “the philosophy of dialogue is regarded as one of the most important contributions of the twentieth century to the philosophical heritage of mankind”, Holquist (2002) is at pains to stress that dialogism is “not a systematic philosophy” (p. 16), that in fact it entails a refusal to be systematic. As an attempt to conceive of a state of “no ultimate endings, no elegant end states of balance” (Mifsud & Johnson, 2000, p. 94), dialogism is an understandably elusive principle. Locating dialogism within epistemic and ontologic dialogues is perhaps the best approach to revealing how it relates to this investigation. Markova (1990) offers a succinct introduction to the epistemic background:

Throughout the history of the natural sciences there have been persistent difficulties with the conceptual and methodological analysis of inherently dynamic phenomena. The reason for this is that, from its very beginnings, the fundamental preconception of Western science has been that the truth is uncovered by searching for the underlying, invariant, characteristics and laws of both natural and social phenomena. From Plato to Descartes and beyond it has been generally assumed that although such phenomena change in the course of time, their ‘essences’, whatever that term may mean, must surely be immutable and timeless. …The search for invariants seems to be ubiquitous in human thought. (Markova, 1990p. 11, emphasis in the original)

Although some of the ancients, e.g., Heraclitus (Mifsud & Johnson, 2000), centred their thinking on phenomena as dynamic and changing, thinking about the supposed invariant
characteristics of the world, or reality, and how it is or can be known by the human mind, has been dominated by dualism.

Dualism assumes that although world and mind can act upon each other, the existence of both is independent of each other (Farr, 1990; Rommetveit, 1992). Within these broad assumptions, some – realists – believe that knowledge resides purely in objects in the external world as absolutes to be experienced or discovered by conscious minds; others – idealists – understand knowledge to reside in the human mind as universal truths independent of the external world (Stewart, 1978). This separation of mind and world, usually conceived of as ‘inner’ and ‘outer’ worlds, Markova (1990) calls “Platonic-Cartesian monologism” (p. 11).

The use of the term ‘monologism’ is not a contradiction of the notion of dualism. Rather it serves to describe the unitary epistemic source of knowing that dualism implies, and the knowing of this external invariant world as the province of individual minds. It is an asocial paradigm (O'Connell & Kowal, 2003), and the paradigm of the langue/parole (de Saussure, 1974) dichotomy; langue is the static and objective meaning located in the external, and parole the irreconcilably idiosyncratic meanings of individual minds. It seems the first precludes the possibility of language making new meanings, while the other “offers no basis for human communication and … no grounds on which to construct a common language for scientific statements” (Seale, 1999, p. 24). The knowing of dualism is the knowing of a single voice – a monologic knowing. Although “wondering about such intricate issues is indeed a recurrent trade in philosophical and scientific enquiries into the human condition” (Rommetveit, 1990, p. 84), it was developments in the natural, physical, and mathematical sciences that demanded a reassessment of monologic ways of knowing.

Holquist (2002) locates dialogism as “part of a major tendency in European thought to reconceptualise epistemology the better to accord with the new versions of mind and the revolutionary models of the world that began to emerge in the natural sciences in the nineteenth century” (p. 17). The crucial shift in these new versions was from an absolutist, invariant understanding of the world and of ways of knowing it to a relational understanding. The philosophical grounding of a relational paradigm - “the metaphysical and epistemological primacy of relationship” (Stewart, p. 186, emphasis in the original) - can be located in phenomenology (Dop, 2000; Stewart, 1978).

Phenomenology locates knowledge neither in the conscious mind nor in the external world, but in the relationship between the two. Based on the premise that “all consciousness is
consciousness-of-something” (Kockelmans, 1967, cited in Stewart, 1978, p. 187), the nature of the conscious mind can be seen as exclusively and entirely relational. Stewart (1978) stresses that it is important to note that while these relations that constitute consciousness are between, for want of better terms, subject and object, the object in relation with the conscious mind must be regarded not as the object itself. Rather, it is a perception of the object. It is impossible for a subject to ‘know’ an object, that is, what it is to be an object, be it another person, a living creature, or some inanimate thing. Knowing resides neither in the mind of the subject, nor in the object, but in the event of consciousness-of the object.

This is the province of meaning introduced earlier, that is, what a thing is, rather than that it is. The epistemic question is not the existence or not of an external world, but the knowing of this world. In this conception, ‘inner’ and ‘outer’ worlds merge in the relationship that is knowing. Holquist (2002) identifies “the non-identity of mind and world as the conceptual rock on which dialogism is founded. …in dialogism consciousness is otherness. More accurately, it is the differential relation between a centre and all that is not centre” (p. 18). In the metaphorical sense, existence is dialogue, and thus is always shared, a state of “co-being” (Holquist, 2002, p. 25). This relation is summed up by Stewart (1978) as follows:

…the primary datum of reality is an irreducible, active relationship between subject and object. …reality is fundamentally a dialogue between perceiver and perceived. To remove one of the partners means to remove the whole dialogue. Neither of the participants can be considered in isolation. …’The dialogue cannot be reduced to simpler elements. The reductive step that tries to go beyond dialogue (relationship, encounter) leads to nothing’ (Luijpen, 1966, p. 88). (Stewart, 1978, pp. 187-188, emphasis in the original).

The “active relationship” (Stewart, 1978, above) of dialogue is based, in Holquist’s (2002) estimation, on the same principles as Einstein’s theory of relativity, and in fact is argued to be an epistemic mode that concurs with the changes in scientific thinking referred to earlier. In a nutshell, relativity expresses the necessity of objects moving in relation to one another if motion is to be observable. Motion only has meaning in the relations between two objects. Motion cannot be meaningfully observed in one object alone; it requires a field or ground to which it can be related, but is only meaningful as the relationship between what is the same and different about the time and space occupied by the two objects changes simultaneously. Dialogism applies this simultaneity of changing relations between sameness and difference in time and space to understanding human consciousness, the self, language – the entire human meaning-making experience.
However, while the scientist studying motion is portrayed as an observer, a perceiver of an external, independent relational event in the physical world, the dialogic view of human experience places the participants – and that word is significant - in the event of perception or meaning. Meaning is the relation, ongoing in time and space, of human consciousness, the mind, with all that is not-the-mind. As the primary symbolic tool mediating meaning, language operates actively in this relational field, serving to negotiate meanings, what we know of the world, in and through dialogue.

Language negotiates meanings that in the broadest sense co-constitute the social relations between participants, the discursive context, and the discourse that unfolds in that context (Linell, 1998). Further, it is helpful to think of negotiation of meanings as a complex interaction of the processes of re-constitution, renewal, and transformation. Dialogue as an active relational process is more one of ‘becoming’ than ‘being’ (Baxter & Montgomery, 1996, p. 47), “a constant, ceaseless creation and exchange of meaning” (Holquist, 2002, p. 41) Use of the term ‘negotiation of meaning’ is not intended to suggest a finalised meaning or the possibility of one, but an unfinalisable process of negotiating. This active principle captures the nature of everyday spoken discourse which:

defines its universe primarily as a process, encoding it not as a structure but as constructing – or demolishing. In the spoken language phenomena do not exist, they happen. They are seen as coming into being, changing, moving in and out of focus, and as interacting in a continuous flow. (Halliday, 1985b, p. 97, emphasis in the original).

From the epistemological perspective, the negotiation of the meanings that constitute the social reality of the internationalised classroom is captured in the discursive texts that are produced. Texts are how we can come to know what we seek to know about human experience, because texts are the artefacts of a relational social reality mediated by language. The dialogue principle allows the researcher of discourse to view the world as a text (Seale, 1999), to see texts as the necessary and defining mark of the human sciences, because what we can know of humans is in the texts they make:

Where there is no text, there is neither object of inquiry nor thought. … The human sciences are the sciences of man in his specificity, and not the sciences of a voiceless thing and a natural phenomenon. … Where human being is studied outside of the text and independently of it, we are no longer dealing with the human sciences (but with human anatomy, or physiology, etc …(Bakhtin, in Todorov, 1984, p. 17)

There are implications for this thesis of the conceptual framework of the principle of dialogue as outlined. First, the text itself and the analysis of it are not finalised meanings about the social
reality of the internationalised classroom, but only “temporarily fixed images of a dynamic phenomenon” (Markova, 1990). Second, the researcher brings to the dialogue with the discursive text assumptions about social reality grounded in his sociocultural history, and this Chapter and the Chapter that follows serve to acknowledge these. The data is itself made meaningful in a dialogic relation in which the researcher is an active participant. The research method outlined in Chapter 3 makes known as fully as possible the specific nature of this relation.

To summarise, the dialogue principle, or dialogism, allows for an account of both the nature of being, or rather of becoming, and of knowing the world through the mediation of language as a symbolic tool. The relationship between language and social reality binds the participants’ spoken interaction and their knowing of a social reality. As a means of coming to know the world, language as dialogue offers a foundation for understanding learning, and this is explored in the section that follows.

2.1.3 Dialogue and learning

An association between dialogue and learning stretches back to the Socratic dialogues of classical Athens (Turlington, 1969). What this association captures is constructivist and sociocultural conceptions of learning as socially mediated in and through language, conceptions that continue to be the subject of intense interest in educational thought and research since the last decades of the last century (e.g., Bruner, 1986; Dysthe, 1999; Kumpulainen & Wray, 2002; Lantolf, 2006; Mercer, 1995, 2000; Mercer, Wegerif, & Dawes, 1999; Renshaw, 1998; van der Linden & Renshaw, 2004; Wells, 1994; Wells, 1999; J V Wertsch, 1991). Equally, the dynamics of the relationship of the individual and social interaction in learning has generated debate over the relative virtues of the perspectives of sociocognitivist and sociocultural theory (e.g., Cole & Wertsch, 1997; Kumpulainen & Wray, 2002; Palincsar, 1998) and the conceptual compatibility of theories such as social constructionism, radical constructivism, social constructivism and sociocultural approaches (e.g., Confrey, 1995; Palincsar, 1998; Shotter, 1995).

In this context, this Chapter has articulated a social constructionist understanding of social reality and knowing of it as embedded in dialogic relations, or mutual constitution of discourses and contexts in exchanges of meanings. From the perspective of learning, this locates knowledge, not in the individual, but in the social, mediated by cultural tools, primarily language. A social constructionist view of knowledge and learning is distinct from various versions of a constructivist perspective (Palincsar, 1998; Vygotsky, 1978, 1986) which also

- mental functioning is understandable only in terms of its origins and dynamic transformative processes of ongoing change over time in sociocultural histories;
- mental functioning originates in social processes and intramental functions, or inner speech, retain and reflect those social processes;
- mental functioning is mediated by tools and signs in an irreducible relationship of “individual(s)-operating-with-mediational-means” (James V Wertsch & Toma, 1995, p. 163).

Constructivist theory has turned on the internalisation of social interaction, with a great deal of attention to mediation of learning in and through relationships with wiser or more capable teachers or peers (Vygotsky, 1978). In dialogic terms, it is more productive to consider how dialogic principles complement and extend (Clerehan, 1996; D Hicks, 1996; Wake, 2006; J V Wertsch, 1991) constructivist ideas of the social nature of thinking and learning. Wertsch and Toma (1995) argue that Vygotsky:

… tended to equate social with intermental functioning. … Instead of recognising that intermental functioning is always situated with regard to cultural, historical, and institutional settings, Vygotsky often treated it as if it always occurs in essentially the same form. (James V Wertsch & Toma, 1995, p. 164)

Dialogism conceives of language as embedded in relations of extralinguistic historical and sociocultural resources that participants rarely share in any complete sense. Social interaction mediated by language involves a relation between the immediate unfolding discourse and the more abstract contextual resources activated by participants in their negotiation of meanings. In dialogic terms, contextual resources, that is, sociocultural histories of speakers and listeners, are in “a series of complex interrelationships with the spoken word” (Clerehan, 1996, p. 70) in that understanding involves negotiating congruent and/or contradictory interpretations. There is not one single ‘dialogue’ in a spoken interaction. There is the utterance-by-utterance unfolding of a discursive text, and in concert with that are the active responses to the utterances of both listener and speaker (noted earlier), dialogues with the ‘voices’ or echoes of earlier dialogues and meanings. This is the essence of the Bakhtinian notion of multivoicedness: the word outside the social situation belongs “to nobody” but in an utterance is “filled with echoes of the other’s
utterance” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 88). What occurs is an inter-penetration of cognition and social interaction (Linell, 1998). In dialogic conceptions, this relation is the site of potential learning.

Application of dialogic principles to learning as a dialogic process is illuminated by the distinction made by Bakhtin (1981, 1986) between two types of discourses – authoritative discourse and internally persuasive discourse. The essence of the distinction lies in the dialogic relations of participants with the two types of discursive texts involved. Authoritative discourse is effectively not negotiable by other voices, reflected perhaps most accurately in transmission models of communication in which meanings are fixed and not open to interpretation.

Internally persuasive discourse is open to other voices and new meanings emerge as text is animated in dialogue. Lotman (1988, cited in Wertsch & Toma, 1995, p. 165) conceives of these two discourse as “functional dualism”, a dynamic relational tension found in all texts; a “univocal function focuses on how it is possible ‘to convey meanings adequately’ (p. 34), and the dialogic function is concerned with how it is possible ‘to generate new meanings’ (p.34)” (James V Wertsch & Toma, 1995, p. 165). In this,

Lotman goes beyond Bakhtin by viewing virtually every text as potentially involving both univocal and dialogic functions. … Lotman expands on the concept of “the text as a meaning-generating mechanism”:

So the picture we have before us is that of organic interaction, of a dialogue, in the course of which each of the participants transforms the other and are themselves transformed under the action of the other; the picture is not one of passive transmission, but of the lively generation of new messages (p.71).
(Dysthe, 1996, p. 392, including citation of Lotman, 1988)

Lotman’s dialogic conception of a mutually transformative process of generation of new messages is central to the model of classroom learning proposed here and to the analysis of classroom spoken interaction.

Dialogic conceptions of learning are captured in the idea of ideological becoming (Medvedev, 1978, attributed to M. M. Bakhtin), the development in individuals of ideas and views of the world. ‘Ideological’ is not used in the commonly accepted political sense, but to indicate a socially determined system of meaning (Freedman & Ball, 2004). There are parallels with Halliday’s (1993) theorising that learning is “a semiotic process: learning is learning to mean, and to expand one’s meaning potential” (p. 113, emphasis in the original), and with Halliday’s “conviction that all language, all sign systems are ideological, that is, they mean” (Clerehan, 1996, p. 70, emphasis in the original):
‘knowledge’ and ‘meaning’ are not two distinct phenomena; they are different metaphors for the same phenomena … All knowledge is constituted in semiotic systems, with language as the most central; and all such representations are constructed from language in the first place. (Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999, pp. 1 & 3)

The emergence and continuing transformation of the ideological self is a social phenomenon. It is characterised by exposure to and interaction with other discourses, with the voices of ‘others’, and emerges as internally persuasive discourse, “what each person thinks for him- or herself, what ultimately is persuasive to the individual” (Freedman & Ball, 2004, p. 8). Wertsch (1991) characterises learning as the appropriation of the voices. Other voices may be authoritative discourses, words “already acknowledged in the past” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 342, emphasis in the original):

In each epoch, in each social circle, in each small world of family, friends, acquaintances, and comrades in which a human being grows and lives, there are always authoritative utterances that set the tone … There are always some verbally expressed leading ideas … (Bakhtin, 1986, pp. 88-89)

On the other hand, the voices include the internally persuasive discourse of other individuals. Although these discourses do not hold ‘acknowledged’ authority, and are subject to ongoing change and transformation, they constitute an equally important element of the discursive environment in which ideological becoming transforms individuals. This complex interaction of discourse shapes “the unique speech experience of each individual … shaped and developed in continuous and constant interaction with others’ individual utterances” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 89). At the core of interactions is tension, and:

(acc)ording to Bakhtin, the social interactions that are most effective in promoting learning are those filled with tension and conflict. Individuals struggle with these tensions as they develop their own ideologies. … the struggles are needed for people to come to new understandings. … The role of the other is critical to our development; in essence, the more choice we have of words to assimilate, the more opportunity we have to learn. In a Bakhtinian sense, with whom, in what ways, and in what contexts we interact will determine what we stand to learn. (Freedman & Ball, 2004, p. 6)

The distinction between authoritative and internally persuasive texts has been re-interpreted by Morson (2004) in a way particularly applicable to classrooms (Matusov, 2007). Morson (2004) argues that some form of authoritative discourse is intrinsic to the operation of a classroom and especially so if internally persuasive discourses are to emerge. Essentially, he argues the two are dialogically related. Morson proceeds to propose that if and when authoritative discourse responds to challenge or questions, it enters into dialogue and is no longer “fully authoritative” (p. 319), but arguably no less authoritative because it has submitted to questioning. The
discourse that emerges from this kind of interrogation, Morson suggests, is authoritative dialogical discourse. Bakhtin’s authoritative discourse he refers to as authoritarian discourse, words that refuse to enter into dialogue, and thus representative of a monologic or transmission model, as in Lotman’s (1988) univocal text. In terms of learning, when utterances are treated monologically they are used for the “accurate transmission of information, but when they are treated dialogically they are used as ‘thinking devices’” (Westgate & Hughes, 1997).

For Morson, non-authoritarian authoritative words invite dialogue, and in dialogue rest their authority:

an authoritarian word of this non-authoritarian kind functions not as a voice speaking Truth, but as a voice speaking the one point of view that must be attended to. It may be contested, rejected, or modified … but it cannot be ignored. (Morson, 2004, p. 320)

The idea of dialogic learning has found expression primarily in the concept of dialogic teaching, and Morson (2004) develops his discussion in this direction. Teaching practitioners and researchers have attempted to establish classroom conditions based on authoritative dialogical discourse, the aim being to elicit dialogues of diverse internally persuasive discourses and thus rich environments for dialogic learning (e.g., Adler, Rougle, Kaiser, & Caughlan, 2003/2004; Clerehan, 1996; Daniel, et al., 2005; Daniel, et al., 2004; Dysthe, 1996; Elbers & de Haan, 2004; Hauser, 1992; Hirst & Brown, 2008; Laiken, 2002; Nystrand, Wu, Gamoran, Zeiser, & Long, 2001; Rodrigues, 1998; Skidmore, 2000; van der Linden & Renshaw, 2004; Wake, 2006; Wolfe, Tien, & Torres-Guzmán, 2009). The perspective adopted in this investigation of internationalised classrooms is not one that focuses on teaching practice, but on negotiation by students of the meanings exchanged in the classroom.

Through the lens of dialogic learning, what emerges in and through negotiation of meanings in internationalised postgraduate classrooms is an authoritative dialogical discursive text. In adopting and accepting the various speech roles students are making “attempts to expose and test their understandings” (Linell, 1998, p. 80, emphasis in the original), both dialogically testing the unfolding discourse and dialogically contributing on the basis of their own authority. Students do not only ask questions as they work to resolve dialogic tensions between their current internally persuasive dialogues and the authoritative text under negotiation in the classroom. From their positions as knowers, both primary and secondary, they have potential to contribute to the shape and direction of the unfolding discourse. This is potentially mutually transformative dialogue:
Bakhtin is concerned with more than individual growth because he places the individual firmly in a social context and shows that the individual influences the social world, just as the social world influences the individual. (Freedman & Ball, 2004, p. 5)

How do students influence the social world of classrooms? In the ‘monologic’ classroom, the teacher operates from a predetermined script. In authoritarian monologic discourse, as conceived by Morson (2004),

the relationship of teacher and student is restricted to that of evaluator and novice, organised for the transmission of information. This relationship forms the basis of a discourse environment in which students have little chance of becoming conversants of consequence, recognised as contributing, producing, or participating actively in the construction of knowledge. (Nystrand, et al., 2001, p. 4)

In the ‘dialogic’ classroom, participants negotiate the contributions of others to incorporate more than one ‘voice’ in the interaction. Students are regarded as potential sources of primary knowing. Nystrand et al. (2001) studied interaction in a variety of secondary school classrooms from a dialogic perspective, using event history rather than linguistic analysis. Although the research neglects the role of silent responsive understanding (Bakhtin, 1986) in dialogue and learning, they suggest that dialogically ‘active’ classroom interaction is characterised by cognitive engagement of student participants in spoken interaction, demonstrated by:

- participants’ display of interest and enthusiasm;
- discourse that builds upon earlier contributions of other participants;
- students asking questions;
- the teacher’s questions being answered without repeated ‘prodding’ or being assigned to specific learners.

While these features provide a useful starting point, they need to be extended. There are two dimensions to the influence of students in the social world as realized in the negotiation of an authoritative dialogical discursive text. First, students are addressees of utterances, with the implications for utterances of addressivity. Second, students are contributors of utterances to the dialogue. The significance of the two roles is qualitatively different for individuals and for all participants. Students who negotiate tensions between their own internally persuasive discourses and the unfolding authoritative discursive text through utterances contributed to classroom dialogue are arguably more influential. In this sense, students take on the role, ‘others,’ that Freedman and Ball (2004) identify as “critical” (p. 6) to ideological becoming, the development of idea systems, the expansion of meaning potential. This is the conception of
learning that is applied to findings, in Chapter 8, in a discussion of the significance of the ways students are involved in negotiation of meaning and potential learning for individuals and the class.

2.1.4 Dialogue in the internationalised university classroom

In the second part of this Chapter, attention is first devoted to locating spoken interactions in internationalised classrooms in broader phenomena of internationalisation of universities. Then literature is reviewed that reports on spoken interaction in internationalised classrooms.

2.1.5 Internationalisation and difference

Underlying the literature on internationalised classrooms there seems to be an implicit assumption that ‘native speakers’ of English are “somehow inherently superior in their knowledge of academic discourse and their ability to engage effectively in sophisticated language/literacy practices” (Duff, 2007, p. 01.6). Yet, as Fassinger (1995) points out, in most classes there are quiet or silent students who may complete a whole semester without participation in spoken interaction. The privileging of speech in classrooms, its investment with meanings about the capacities and performance of those who satisfy expectations of speaking, has arguably generated “an idealised version of the ‘Western student’” (Doherty & Singh, 2005, p. 53) that underpins problematisation of international students (Kubota, 2001). With few exceptions (e.g., Renshaw & Volet, 1995), the literature reporting internationalised classrooms fails to address this aspect of internationalised classroom interaction. Perhaps this is because, as noted in what follows, much of what is reported is not based on classroom data or observations. Thus, the attention in most of the literature discussed here falls only on international students.

In many cases, reports of participation of NESB international students in spoken interactions in classrooms have been embedded in broader studies or reviews of academic needs, expectations, and experiences of students and/or teachers at institutional level (e.g., Barker, Child, Gallois, Jones, & Callan, 1991; Batorowicz, 1999; R. B. Burns, 1991; Dawson & Conti-Bekkers, 2002; Harman, 2005; Hellsten, 2002). The dominant theme of this literature, as Kettle (2005a) notes, is difference, the source of the “dynamic undercurrent within the practices of teaching and learning” (Treviskes, Eisenchlas, & Liddicoat, 2003, p. 3) that has accompanied the changing faces of university classrooms in the era of internationalisation.

Experiences of teaching staff and international students as reported point to perceptions of both groups that the other group has differing understandings and expectations of what constitutes
teaching and learning (Hellstén & Prescott, 2004). From the perspective of this study, spoken interactions both mediate realizations of participants’ beliefs about teaching and learning in constitution of teaching and learning contexts, and are practices embedded in teaching and learning. Thus, it is not surprising that when internationalised classrooms are studied, classroom spoken interactions continue to be reported as among the practices that concern both students and their teachers. The review that follows looks at the nature of these concerns and identifies the types of responses to this issue as reported in studies.

2.1.6 NESB international students’ perceptions of participation in spoken interaction: An overview

Historically, in the Australian context, evaluations of the performance of many NESB international students in classroom situations involving spoken interaction (e.g., Bradley & Bradley, 1984; Samuelowicz, 1987) have tended to be expressed in terms of ‘deficit’ (Asmar, 2005). This assessment is one often made by the students themselves. Significant numbers of international NESB students continue to report experiencing a range of difficulties to do with spoken interaction in academic situations (e.g., Ballard, 1987; Barker, et al., 1991; Batorowicz, 1999; R. B. Burns, 1991; Choi, 1997; Dawson & Conti-Bekkers, 2002; Hellsten, 2002; Hellstén & Prescott, 2004; James & Devlin, 2001; Mills, 1997; Mulligan & Kirkpatrick, 2000; Mullins, et al., 1995; Neumann, 1985; Novera, 2004; Pantelides, 1999; Samuelowicz, 1987; Walker, 2004). Studies that report the perceptions of teachers (e.g., Samuelowicz, 1987) identify many of the same concerns, but NESB students’ perceptions of their language difficulties and needs don’t always match the perceptions of their teachers (Pantelides, 1999).

Students report difficulty giving oral reports, asking questions and participating in class discussions and seminars/tutorials (Barker, et al., 1991; Batorowicz, 1999; R. B. Burns, 1991; Choi, 1997; Mullins, et al., 1995; Nakane, 2002; Novera, 2004; Samuelowicz, 1987), and beliefs that accents make it impossible for native speakers to understand them (Choi, 1997). They report difficulty understanding Australian (ESB) students and teachers (Beasley & Watts, 2002; R. B. Burns, 1991; Choi, 1997; Mullins, et al., 1995). They consistently give lower ratings of their language abilities (Barker, et al., 1991; Novera, 2004), evaluate their English language speaking skills to be unsatisfactory (R. B. Burns, 1991; Choi, 1997; Novera, 2004), and consider themselves less likely than Australian (ESB) students to actively participate to express their own opinions (Barker, et al., 1991; Batorowicz, 1999; Novera, 2004). Similar reports, though with an emphasis more on written than spoken language, are given by students in studies of cultural diversity and NESB among domestic students (e.g., Asmar, 2005; Borland & Pearce, 2002; Chanock & Cargill, 2003; Neumann, 1985; Wilson, 2003). These findings are
mirrored in studies conducted in universities outside Australia, for example, New Zealand (Holmes, 2004, 2005; Kirkness & O'Rourke, 2005; Mills, 1997; Strauss, 2001) and Great Britain (Mills, 1997).

Explicit and implicit pressures to participate in interactive learning activities can exacerbate these difficulties (Jones, 1999; Kettle, 2005a; Wong, 2004). Oral assessment tasks, grades for participation, small group tasks and activities are all explicit demands for spoken participation that involve familiarity with complex sets of discursive practices. Students encounter difficulties when what constitutes appropriate participation is not made explicit (Duff, 2007; Ellwood & Nakane, 2009). For example, Conlan (1996) noted that some NESB students regarded attentive listening as demonstration of participation. At times, when expectations are explicit, they do not withstand scrutiny. As one NESB student noted, why ask questions if you already know the answers (Ellwood & Nakane, 2009). ESB students are not necessarily inherently better equipped to fulfil explicit expectations that they participate (Duff, 2007). At postgraduate level, implicit expectations that students will interact with teachers on more equal terms in negotiation of meanings (de Klerk, 1995) necessitates renegotiation of classroom social roles by both NESB and ESB students. Adoption by educators of constructivist approaches, evidenced in group work and collaborative tasks (e.g., see Hawthorne, Minas, & Singh, 2004; Imafuku, 2007; Woodward-Kron & Remedios, 2007; Wright & Lander, 2003), places discursive demands on postgraduate students that may differ from earlier classroom practices. Evidence of resistance to this type of participation has been observed among undergraduates in both Australia (Ryan & Ogilvie, 2005) and Britain (Benwell & Stokoe, 2005). Benwell and Stokoe (2005) interpreted their finding as a rejection of jointly produced learning and a preference for ‘transmission’.

The difficulties reported by NESB students may be a reflection of issues surrounding language proficiency. A study of English language entry requirements of 37 Australian universities (Coley, 1999) concluded “it was indeed possible for NESB students to be at an Australian university without being able to speak, write, read or understand English at the required level” (Coley, 1999, p. 15). Many international NESB students discover that despite meeting language requirements they struggle with the language demands of their studies and face failure as a result (Coley, 1999; Pantelides, 1999). There are complex aspects of this issue, but studies of English language proficiency scores or ratings of NESB students as a predictor of academic achievement (e.g., Loewen & Ellis, 2005; Wicks, 1996) have found proficiency to be a factor, and this is reported also in other studies (e.g., Hawthorne, et al., 2004). Although the nature of much assessment is writing-intensive, in the context of university entrance language requirements, many NESB international students feel they do not have levels of spoken
language proficiency to meet the demands of spoken assessment tasks (Novera, 2004; Pantelides, 1999).

In reporting difficulties, NESB students sometimes make explicit references to ESB students as ‘benchmarks’ of comparison (e.g., Beasley & Watts, 2002; Nakane, 2002), but, like their NESB colleagues, ESB students can experience difficulties in spoken participation. The demands of oral assessment tasks can be intimidating for ESB students, can involve new “discursive norms” (Duff, 2007, p. 01.7) in communities of practice not encountered previously. Silence of, or restricted participation by, ESB students has been reported both in Australia and elsewhere (Benwell & Stokoe, 2005; Fassinger, 1995; Remedios, et al., 2008; Renshaw & Volet, 1995; Walker, 2004). A complex set of factors at work extends beyond variations in language background, as outlined in the following section.

In longitudinal (e.g., Beasley & Watts, 2002; Kettle, 2005a) or comparative (e.g., Wong, 2004) studies, difficulties as reported in interview data were followed by more positive assessments of both speaking and listening, and this is supported by anecdotal observations (Ballard, 1987). Without observational or classroom data, qualitative and quantitative aspects of any changes can be judged only from the self-assessments of students. The scarcity of longitudinal studies supported by observation and classroom data in a field of study that draws on paradigms of adaptation and adjustment is surprising.

Responses, and research, have taken two predominant approaches. One effectively adopts a ‘deficit’ (Asmar, 2005; Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003) approach. It acknowledges the privileging of particular discourses of teaching and learning of the English-speaking academy in Australian institutions (Altbach, 2004; Koehne, 2004), and advocates remediation, adjustment, and adaptation on the part of NESB international students. There has been a focus on researching the teaching of academic skills (primarily academic writing) and the training and support of students to enable participation in activities they can expect to encounter in their classrooms (Beasley & Watts, 2002; Borland & Pearce, 2002; B. Cameron & Meade, 2002; Clerahan, 2004; Hawthorne, et al., 2004; Levy, Osborn, & Plunkett, 2003; Pantelides, 1999; Samuelowicz, 1987; Strauss, 2001). This is not an approach restricted to NESB students; Samuelowicz (1987) reports academic staff characterising the academic support needs of NESB and ESB students as similar, as academic support programs and projects attest (e.g., Cartwright, Ryan, Hacker, Powell, & Reidy, 2000).

The other predominant response to internationalisation of classrooms, a post-colonial (Dooley, 2001), or cross-cultural, approach, attributes difficulties experienced by NESB students to
differences in cultural practices, complicated by issues of language proficiency (Prescott & Hellstén, 2005). This response to difference recognises what are perceived as culturally-distinct practices and learning styles, and advocates concomitant adjustment by teaching staff to teach to difference and to support learners. Research has attempted to describe the characteristics and practices, and frequently argue the strengths, of learners based on national or regional groupings (e.g., Biggs, 1994; Chan, 1999; Choi, 1997; Ellis, 1995; Hofstede, 1986; Holmes, 2004, 2005; Kember & Gow, 1990, 1991; Novera, 2004; Ramburuth & McCormick, 2001; Spizzica, 1996; Tapper, 1996; Volet, 1999; Volet, Renshaw, & Tietzel, 1994; D. Watkins, 2000; D. A. Watkins & Biggs, 2001). At classroom and institutional levels, studies have aimed to identify or trial pedagogies that recognise and value (e.g., Anderson & Moore, 1998; Biggs & Watkins, 2001; Carr, 2003; Conlan, 1996; Crosling & Martin, 2005; Hawthorne, et al., 2004; Hudson & Morris, 2003; Jayathurai, 2004; Kirkness & O'Rourke, 2005; Prescott & Hellstén, 2005; Teekens, 2003).

From the ongoing focus on difference, and the discourse of ‘deficit’, a variety of ‘international student’ identities (see, e.g., Devos, 2003; Kettle, 2005a) have been constructed, often built from perceived cultural or national traits. Bound up in these reductive categorisations are preconceived expectations of the ways students participate in classroom interaction. The highly participative ‘ideal’ Australian student, constructed discursively by teachers and students in and through practices in the classroom, is posited to be imaginary (Doherty & Singh, 2005). The same can be said of the identity of ‘international student’, ‘Chinese’, ‘Japanese’ or ‘Middle Eastern’ student that can be realized in the classroom through discursive practices based on assumptions and stereotypical expectations. Although, as Hellstén and Precott (2004) point out, differences in classroom participation are generally attributed in the literature to linguistic and sociocultural backgrounds of students, classrooms and the roles of participants are jointly constituted contexts and the imposition of identities complicates participation of NESB students in spoken interaction.

Many of the studies based on self-reporting by NESB of their experiences in Australian classrooms also report that NESB students value interactive modes of classroom work (e.g., Remedios, et al., 2008; Wong, 2004), and wish to participate. Studies (e.g., Kettle, 2005a) document strategic processes of change in the discursive identities of students who begin to participate in new ways in classroom practices. Against this complex background, the focus in this investigation is on classroom dialogue as negotiated by participants, and what the ways students are involved can tell us about ESB and NESB students learning together in an internationalised classroom.
2.1.7 Silence in the university classroom

In the context of internationalisation, absence of talk – silence - is an issue that continues to recur and that is addressed in studies of international students and in classroom literature in general. Some of the studies referred to in this section were not conducted in Australian classrooms.

Silence is a complex phenomenon that bears close attention, and one that emerges frequently with regard to the participation of NESB students in spoken interaction. In general communicative situations silence is a communicative ‘linguistic’ resource for meaning-making and Cheung (1993, cited in Goldstein, 2004) identified a number of “modes or tonalities of silence” (Goldstein, 2004, p. 325). In multiparty interactions like classrooms, silence takes on additional dimensions in facilitation of learning and as a “strategic communicative resource … regulating the flow of communication” (Jaworski & Sachdev, 1998). The beliefs of teachers and students about the meaning of silence are not always congruent (Jaworski & Sachdev, 1998). Jaworski and Sachdev (1998) posit that while for teachers student talk is an unmarked behaviour and silence marked, the reverse is the case for students for whom “silence is the relatively unmarked, underlying linguistic form in the classroom” (p. 273).

There is a body of literature that associates practices of speaking, listening, and silence with particular broad cultural groups, for example, the work of Hofstede (1986, 2001) and Gao’s (1998a) description and explanation of Chinese speaking practices. Evidence for variations in classroom practices includes Nakane’s (2007, cited in Ellwood & Nakane, 2009) finding that Japanese secondary students rarely participated, any contributions to classroom discourse being limited to single ‘sentences’ or words. Cortazzi and Jin (2001) found Chinese students in multi-ethnic classrooms were reluctant to ask questions before they understood what the teacher wanted them to learn, and that they did so in order to preserve positive face for their teachers.

However, reductive identification of variations in discursive practices such as silence with membership of cultural, national, regional, or ethnic groups and with international students as a group is often ill-founded and obscures the complexities of the phenomenon (Asmar, 2005; Devos, 2003; Ellwood & Nakane, 2009; Zhou, et al., 2005). In fact, the nature and origin of variations in practices such as silence is a matter of contention (Zhou, et al., 2005). It has been suggested that in the classroom practices of silence are influenced by, among others, gender (Fassinger, 1995; Jones, 1999), power relationships (Jaworski & Sachdev, 1998; Jones, 1999), and politeness (Nakane, 2006), as well as cultural factors.
From a sociocultural perspective, it is accepted that there are variations in the regularities that constitute linguistic and cultural-historical repertoires of practices of particular cultural communities (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003). However, studies of silence in university classrooms suggest that personal and contextual factors as well as sociocultural background are influences in instances of silence in NESB students. Wong (2004) and Zhou, Knoke and Sakamoto (2005) argue that classroom practices such as silence are not linked to membership of national, regional, or ethnic groups per se, but to context. This is a position concurrent with the sociocultural view that variations in discursive practices are not situated in individuals, but are attributable to involvement in practices of particular communities (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003, p. 21) and thus open to renewal and transformation.

On the basis of data obtained through interview, Nakane (2002) suggests there is more to the silence of NESB Japanese international students than cultural background. She attributes silence of Japanese students to four contributing and inter-related factors. Linguistic silence stems from lack of English language proficiency in listening and speaking, while cognitive silence reflects the time students need to process utterances to permit responses. Fears and anxieties related to speaking in public and in an additional language lead to psychological silence, and the silences enacting contextual resources of norms of classroom communication are considered as sociocultural.

In Ellwood and Nakane’s (2009) study, Japanese students explained their silence by a preference for teacher nomination, problems with timing of turn-taking, the necessity to reflect before responding, a fear of making mistakes and a fear of drawing attention to themselves. The Japanese students’ problems with timing reflected their concerns with what Erikson (1996) termed ‘turn sharks’, that is, ESB students answered teachers’ questions more quickly, and even spoke over or interrupted the NESB students, behaviour identified in other studies (e.g., Choi, 1997; Novera, 2004). In a study of what they termed mono-ethnic and bi-ethnic small-group work in a university classroom, Wright and Lander (2003) found that ESB students ‘inhibited’ verbal participation of NESB South-east Asian students. The entirely observational nature of the data restricts comparisons, but suggests a similar ‘turn shark’ phenomenon in the context of the factors reported by Ellwood and Nakane (2009). Ellwood and Nakane (2009) identify this phenomenon as one that has “not yet been widely explored empirically” (p. 220) in relation to silence.

What is interesting also is the tension reported by Ellwood and Nakane (2009) between the Japanese students’ identification of their perceived shortcomings in participation and a
resistance to the practices of the ESB students to which they object on the grounds of their own cultural norms. These practices included those referred to above, related to timing, and other dispreferred behaviours such as perceptions of speaking overly frequently and sometimes without relevance, a point raised by students in other studies (Chalmers & Volet, 1997). This suggests a particular group of NESB students who are made ‘invisible’ in classroom discourse because of discursive practice incongruence. Their norms of practice are such that discursive contexts they attempt to constitute through practice are overwhelmed or taken over by oppositional practices of ESB students. This ‘complementarity’ of practices of speaking and silence that opens the way for domination of classrooms by those who value and privilege speaking is a perspective that will be returned to in the findings of this investigation.

A key aspect of silence that demands attention is the perceived association between speaking and learning which casts quieter or silent students as “problematic, commonly viewed as passive learners or as failing to learn altogether” (Remedios, et al., 2008, p. 201). The concern with silence in this respect for some researchers focuses on recognition of sociocultural and other factors but then moves to development of pedagogic strategies to assist students “realize their potential for active and equal participation” (Jones, 1999). Many NESB students express wishes to follow this path to active classroom interaction (Kettle, 2005a).

Alternatively, a body of research argues for recognition of different learning styles (Biggs, 1987, 1999; Chalmers & Volet, 1997; Kember & Gow, 1990, 1991; Purdie & Hattie, 1996; Volet, et al., 1994) and refutes the perception that quietness or silence among NESB students equates with passivity and a ‘surface’ approach to learning. For example, Chalmers and Volet (1997) found that, although sociocultural norms played a part in silence, these included students’ different conceptions of how to make best use of what they saw as valuable tutorial time. A study (Remedios, et al., 2008) of tutorials using problem-based learning, which mandates verbal participation, an “elaborate to learn” (p. 213) obligation, focussed on four students who spoke minimally, two of ESB and two of NESB. This study is valuable because it shifts the attention away from silence as the preserve of NESB students to the silent participant in general. Data generated through interviews and video-stimulated recall found a variety of factors constrained participation, but most important, concluded that “the insistence that verbal expression is seen as the only reflection of active engagement in learning is problematic” (Remedios, et al., 2008, p. 212).

The models of dialogue and dialogic learning introduced earlier in this chapter conceived of active listening in two modes, active responsive listening and delayed silent understanding. If classroom learning is assumed to emerge in the relation between internally persuasive
discourses and dialogical authoritative discourses negotiated through spoken interaction, then interactive verbal expression may have a part to play. But so too does the dialogue of silent understanding. Silence is perhaps considered problematic because in terms of managing classroom learning it is an impediment to the collaborative type of activity that Remedios, Clarke and Hawthorne (2008) suggest may prioritise the obligation to speak ahead of learning.

Researchers take the approach that silence in classrooms is a phenomenon in itself that demands attention. Nakane (2006) identifies silence as a key aspect of intercultural communication in need of study, and Ellwood and Nakane (2009) urge researchers to reflect on the roles of talk and silence in intercultural classrooms. In general terms that are relevant to the internationalised classroom, the privilege accorded talk in classrooms has produced calls for attention to be turned to students’ beliefs about the role of silence in learning (Jaworski & Sachdev, 1998). In the specific context of dialogic learning, Matsutov (2001) asserts that research on “the positive function of silence in educational discourse is definitely needed” (p. 225). This is supported by the call of Remedios, et al. (2008) for research on the role of talk and “less vocal modes of participation” (p. 213) in learning, and on the extent to which silence of classroom participants is, in fact, active listening to learn.

2.1.8 Studies of spoken interaction in internationalised classrooms

Despite what is a significant body of literature, studies that focus solely on spoken interaction in internationalised classrooms are the exception. Spoken interaction is often studied in a suite of academic or discourse skills, or as one aspect of interaction experienced by international NESB students in the broader social environment. It seems data rarely includes recorded spoken classroom discourse.

NESB students’ experiences of classroom interaction are investigated through data gathered in surveys and questionnaires (Barker, et al., 1991; Batorowicz, 1999; R. B. Burns, 1991; Choi, 1997; Mullins, et al., 1995; Novera, 2004; Samuelowicz, 1987), observations (Ellwood & Nakane, 2009; Hawthorne, et al., 2004; Wright & Lander, 2003), journals (Nemoto, 2007; Yoshimitsu, 2007), interviews (Beasley & Watts, 2002; Choi, 1997; Ellwood & Nakane, 2009; Nakane, 2002; Pantelides, 1999; Remedios, et al., 2008; Wong, 2004), interviews using video stimulated recall (Imafuku, 2007; Remedios, et al., 2008), or anecdotally (Ballard, 1987), rather than through analysis of actual classroom discourse itself. Some studies (e.g., Remedios, et al., 2008) employ combinations of data collection methods.
Studies that rely on data generated through self-reporting of participation in spoken interaction appear to continue to dominate the literature. For example, Yoshimitsu’s (2007) case study of one Japanese student’s academic participation relied on the participant’s reporting of her experiences in study journals and interviews. Nemoto (2007) relied on diaries, interviews and other written documents in his investigation of the experiences of two Japanese exchange students’ participation in academic contact situations. Self-reported difficulties need to be balanced against classroom studies that observed participation in internationalised classrooms (e.g., Renshaw & Volet, 1995; Wright & Lander, 2003) or analyse recorded classroom data (e.g., Hirst & Brown, 2008; Imafuku, 2007; Wake, 2006; Walker, 2004; Woodward-Kron & Remedios, 2007).

In a study of males only, collaborative group work in an undergraduate Engineering program, Wright and Lander (2003) observed the rates of participation in interaction of ESB Australian and NESB South-East Asian students. Students worked in groups of four – some all ESB students, some all NESB students, and some with two students of each language background. No attention was given to the length or complexity of utterances, only frequency. It was found that both ESB and NESB students produced more utterances in what Wright and Lander refer to as mono-ethnic groups, although the number of utterances of ESB students exceeded those of NESB students. In mixed groups, both ESB and NESB students produced fewer utterances, but the variation was significantly greater for NESB students. Wright and Lander focussed their conclusions on pedagogic implications and opportunities for unlocking potential benefits of inter-cultural learning that have been argued to underpin internationalisation of education as preparation for participation in a global workforce. This study offered insights that didn’t rely on self-reports of students into the dynamics of participation in groups of diverse language and cultural backgrounds. However, from the perspective of linguistic analysis of interaction and the ways students were involved in negotiation of meaning, the frequency of utterances only can tell us little.

In a study of dialogic learning in a postgraduate internationalised classroom, Hirst and Brown (2008) recorded spoken interaction during completion of a task over a ninety minute session. The analysis conducted was not linguistic, but drawn from the principles of a pedagogic approach, Collective Argumentation (Hirst & Brown, 2008, pp. 183-184), that was embedded in the task. The analysis focussed on the stances taken by students and the contestation of knowledge as dialogic interaction. The emphasis in the interpretation of findings was on, among other points related to learning, the success of the task in engagement of NESB students in interaction with their ESB peers.
In Renshaw and Volet’s (1995) widely-cited study of the participation of Australian and South-East Asian undergraduate students in first year undergraduate Economics tutorials, one set of data was collected through observation of the participation of students. The aim was to investigate approaches to study and modes of participation, and other data were generated using questionnaires, including self-reports of tutorial participation. The observation executed an analysis of classroom data that, in terms of Halliday’s functional approach as used in this study (see Chapter 3), analysed the speech roles of students but with a focus on student-teacher exchanges. Student statements or questions were classified by observers into three categories based on different levels of self- or other-regulation. Self-regulation referred to adoption of initiating roles of giving and demanding; other-regulation involved responding to the adoption of the roles of giving and demanding by the tutor, and whether the utterance was directly addressed to the responding student (tutor-regulated participation) or to the class as a whole (tutor-initiated participation). Although this framework has some important parallels with the analysis of spoken interaction in an internationalised classroom conducted in this investigation, there are some equally important differences. The analysis was conducted by observers who coded student utterances, and did not involve recording, transcription, and subsequent delicate analysis of classroom interaction. The study found no significant differences in the participation of the two groups, and focussed attention more on variations within groups, particularly the Australian group, who dominated the extremes of participation. This, it was argued, demanded a re-evaluation of the perception that it is international students who are quiet or non-participants. Renshaw and Volet (1995) noted also that their study was a ‘special case’ because almost all the international student participants were Singaporean, had been educated in English, and nominated English as their first language. This, they argued, supports rejection of broad categorisation of international students, for example, as ‘Asian’, ‘Middle Eastern’ (or for that matter, ‘Australian’), but arguably it highlights also the critical role of language background in participation.

Walker (2004) collected recorded classroom data in two internationalised classes in Education programmes, one undergraduate and one postgraduate, and focussed on students’ initiations of interaction - self-regulated and tutor-initiated participation in the terms of Renshaw and Volet’s (1995) study, above. He found that silence or very limited participation was characteristic of both ESB and NESB students. NESB and ESB groups were marked by variations in selections in the system of MOOD to realize the speech function of demanding, leading to the conclusion that NESB students tended to position themselves with greater certainty in relation to the validity of propositions than did ESB students. Unlike ESB students, NESB students made few demands for missing information. Walker (2004) suggested closer analysis of functions of
initiating utterances and of discursive contexts of initiations of interaction by ESB and NESB students was merited, rather than just a focus on rates of participation.

Participation of NESB students in group work has prompted a number of studies, perhaps because participation in these circumstances becomes an imperative if learning objectives are to be achieved by students. Three studies of problem-based learning (PBL) in health sciences courses focussed attention on participation in groups composed of NESB and ESB students. Findings of an observation-based study of participation of NESB students in PBL tutorials (Hawthorne, et al., 2004) agreed with those of Wright and Lander (2003); NESB students made significantly fewer contributions.

A case study of interaction in a first year Physiotherapy PBL tutorial (Woodward-Kron & Remedios, 2007) recorded and transcribed spoken interactions of nine students of diverse language backgrounds, some ESB and some NESB. It was found that the four overseas-born NESB students, although some had been in Australia for some time, contributed less than 10% of the total turns taken by students. Although it was not noted, considerable variation was evident in the participation rates of the ESB students as well. The linguistic analysis of student utterances applied some elements of systemic functional linguistics to the data, but did not include a focus on the selections of language of the NESB participants. Perhaps this was because of the disparity in participation, or because the primary focus was on the realization of the PBL generic features, and the regulation of the discourse by the tutor and students in management of the task. What was noted was the joint construction of propositions by ESB students, and modalization of propositions as a means of signalling openness to negotiation, or negotiation of co-text. Analytically, the study applied also speech functions of interactive discourse structure as modelled by Eggins and Slade (1997), as did the case study of PBL conducted by Imafuku (2007).

Imafuku’s (2007) study offers similar insights into participation of ESB and NESB students. The aim of the study was to investigate the enactment of the PBL as a learning experience, but it was clear from findings included that the participation of NESB students was far outstripped by that of ESB students. What was notable was the great variation between ESB students. One ESB student participated no more than the NESB students, yet the conclusion of the study drew attention to the NESB students as alone meriting further investigation. Yet the ESB student, and the variation in ESB student participation, were not remarked upon.

Systemic functional linguistics was one theoretical and analytical tool employed by Wake (2006) in her case study of dialogic learning in a tutorial group of five NESB students in one
tutorial session of an Economics class. The focus of the research was cognitive development as revealed in construals of experience and textual structure in discourse negotiating predictive reasoning and argumentation. Wake’s study differed significantly from this investigation of an internationalised classroom. It was, in a sense, an instance of action research, a study of the implementation of a pedagogic approach, and an enlightening study in terms of negotiation of a curriculum task by NESB students, with support and input from their tutor. However, it was not an attempt to capture the dynamics of spoken interaction between ESB and NESB students and their teacher in negotiation of meaning in an open classroom situation. Rather it was a homogeneous group interacting at intervals with their tutor. The attention devoted to interrogatives coincides to some extent with this investigation, and although it applies a more delicate system of analysis to interrogatives in some respects, Wake did not set out to undertake an exhaustive analysis of interpersonal meaning, and the interpretive framework applied to the analysis of interrogatives differs from that outlined in Chapter 3 of this thesis. Instead, Wake’s analysis focuses primarily on experiential and textual metafunctions in the conduct of a rhetorical unit analysis to determine how the tutor and students mediated learning through their interactions. Apart from its evaluation of the responses of NESB students to a pedagogic approach in the context of an undergraduate economics module, the contribution of Wake’s study lies also in its demonstration of the utility of SFL in exposing how spoken interaction negotiates learning opportunities in university classrooms. She identifies this aspect of her study as a field of inquiry that has thus far been neglected:

(a)though much has been written about the participation of second language international students in Australian university education in relation to their academic writing and from inter-cultural perspectives, there have been no in-depth examinations of actual learning experiences from a linguistic perspective. (Wake, 2006, pp. 2-3)

2.1.9 Investigation of spoken interaction in internationalised higher education classrooms

It is only recently, as Wake’s (2006) observation suggests, that researchers either in Australia or elsewhere have turned their attention to spoken interaction in tertiary classrooms (Csmay, 2005). In contrast, at primary and secondary levels of education constructivist approaches to learning and pedagogy produced over recent decades an explosion of research into the role of talk and social interaction in classrooms (e.g., Aulls, 1998; A. D. Edwards & Westgate, 1994; D. Edwards & Mercer, 1987; Hall, 1998; Heras, 1994; J. Jarvis & Robinson, 1997; Mercer, 1995; Mercer, et al., 1999; Wells, 1992, 1993, 1994; Westgate & Hughes, 1997). Research into the nature of classroom interaction that facilitates learning and development was described as
“an enduring research task” (Westgate & Hughes, 1997, p. 125). Yet, in the context of the emphasis placed on spoken interaction in learning processes in contemporary classrooms, interaction in culturally diverse classrooms where students bring together varied cultural resources - practices for learning – was identified relatively recently as a neglected research area (Elbers & de Haan, 2004).

In higher education the major focus has been on written academic discourse (Duff, 2007). Marriott (2004) observed that:

> there has been an overwhelming concentration of research on students’ writing, and not many studies have examined other academic situations … studies that examine non-writing activities, or investigate the full participation of students in their particular academic communities are to be encouraged, given that activities, other than writing, are also of basic importance. (Marriott, 2004, pp. 45-46)

Over a decade ago Fisher (1996) pointed out that “in higher education, in spite of the prevalence of seminar discussion for students and researchers, there has been little investigation of the discourse that occurs and whether it is used effectively for developing learning” (p. 237). Around the same time, but referring specifically to NESB students, Tapper (1996) concluded the need existed for descriptions of “how international students actually participate in academic oral interactions…(and)…whether there are differences in non-native speaker participation…whether they initiate exchanges, and if so, what types of exchange patterns are involved” (pp. 30-31). Yet, several years later, in a chapter of his edited volume on academic discourse, Flowerdew (2002) referred to the study of Furneaux et. al. (1991) of NESB students speaking in academic seminars as focussing on a skill “which has received little attention subsequently” (p. 239).

As noted in the previous section, Australian studies of internationalised university classrooms that are based on observation of classroom interaction or recorded classroom data are scarce. Those that do take this approach (e.g., Woodward-Kron & Remedios, 2007; Wright & Lander, 2003) urge that more attention be devoted to this type of investigation of the increasingly common phenomenon of students of diverse language backgrounds interacting in Australian university classrooms. While writing about group work in internationalised classrooms, Wright and Lander reinforce the point made in the previous section:

> Most of the group work studies … have been surveys or interviews of students’ subjective recollections of their experiences … their subjective impressions have not been evaluated against the actual behaviours they display … In fact, what students from
different ethnic backgrounds actually do in collaborative groups has not been described in any detail. (Wright & Lander, 2003, pp. 240-241)

That was one of the intentions of this investigation - the production of a detailed description of what ESB and NESB students actually do to negotiate meaning in and through spoken interaction. With a description based on the analysis of naturally occurring classroom dialogue, what students actually do in the classroom was then able to be interpreted in terms of opportunities for learning from a dialogic perspective.
CHAPTER 3

3 COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS OF CLASSROOM DATA

In this chapter the research strategy, methods of data collection and generation, and methods of data analysis used to address the research question are outlined. The research question is:

What ways do students negotiate meaning in an internationalised postgraduate coursework classroom?

3.1 Research Strategy

In Chapter 2, the metaphorical construct of dialogue as dialogicality or dialogism was proposed as an ontological and epistemological framework (Heen Wold, 1992b; Lyra & Souza, 2003; Markova, 2003b; Todorov, 1984) for understanding social realities constructed and reconstructed in and through participants’ social interactions. This is congruent with an interpretivist (Blaikie, 2000; Hiley, Bohman, & Schusterman, 1991) or hermeneutic (Baronov, 2004) paradigm. In this construct, realities constituted by particular cultural or Discourse groups (Gee, 1999) in the ongoing interactions in which they engage (Snape & Spencer, 2003) are based on “mutual knowledge - meanings, cultural symbols and social institutions … (that) … both facilitate and structure social relationships” (Blaikie, 2000, p. 116); “interpretivists are concerned with understanding the social world people have produced and which they reproduce through their continuing activities” (Blaikie, 2000, p. 115). Thus the dialogic conception of language-in-use as mediative of social reality and of what can be known about it is broadly consistent with a research strategy grounded in interpretivism.

The research strategy applied in the investigation was derived from the logic of abduction, predicated on there being no prior hypothesising, no advance theorising, and no presuppositions about the event being investigated (Levin-Rozalis, 2004). As explicated by Blaikie (2000), abduction has two stages:

- describing the everyday activities, and/or the language and meanings of social actors; and
- deriving categories and concepts that can form the basis of an understanding or an explanation of the problem at hand (Blaikie, 2000, p. 117).
While Blaikie (2000) focuses on the accounts that participants give of their actions, the intention here was to begin with the spoken discursive texts produced by participants in the ‘everyday activity’ of meaning-making in a postgraduate university classroom. What we can know of the social worlds people have produced, such as the internationalised university classroom, begins with the texts that these activities have produced (Bakhtin, in Todorov, 1984, p. 17). Abduction is characterised by Ezzy (2002) as “an important part of the cycle of theory building and data collection in grounded theory” (p. 15), where data is not collected to test a particular theory, but ensues from the identification of an important issue. Theories played a role in focussing the research and guiding data collection (Ezzy, 2002). While Denzin (1978) advocates abduction to “reconstruct the events (causes) that produced the event (consequence) in question” (p. 110), the intention here was to provide a description of the activities of participants and then to theorise about the explanation and impact of these activities (Blaikie, 2000).

Blaikie’s (1993, 2000) conception of abduction applies Schutz’s (1963) logic of moving from first degree constructs of reality created by individual social actors to second degree constructs of that reality by the researcher. Essentially the difference between the two levels of construct in this investigation is that the first was created by the participants with the purpose of participating in and understanding the internationalised postgraduate university classroom, while the second aimed to respond to the academic problem of adding to knowledge of negotiation of meaning, and the relationship of that to opportunities for learning in internationalised classrooms. In following this logic, this study examined the language of the participants to begin a process of constructing models of “social actors with typical motives and typical courses of action in typical situations” (Blaikie, 2000, p. 117). In this case, this was analysis of the roles of students involved in negotiation of meaning in verbal interaction in an internationalised postgraduate classroom.

Reliability of the initial analysis of data was subjected to an inter-coder reliability assessment (Silverman, 2000). Two coders worked independently using the audio-recording and working transcript of Class 5, session 1, to determine the reliability of the researcher’s representation of the classroom data and judgements made in relation to aspects of selection and analysis (see, p. 74). Following this assessment of the initial analysis of the classroom data, a more delicate analysis produced findings that described the roles and language choices of students in the negotiation of meaning. These findings were interpreted by the researcher in theorizing about the relationship between ways of negotiating meaning and individual and group learning in the context of the conceptual framework of the investigation, and in the specific classroom, rather
than generalising to other settings (Dey, 2004). However, as is discussed in a section that follows, methodical and comprehensive reporting of abductive research allows others to judge the value of generalising to other situations.

3.2 Methods of data collection/generation

Sources of data may be open to various data generation methods (Mason, 2002). Thus, the first task here is to focus on internationalised postgraduate classrooms as a data source, in this broad sense, and to argue for the construct validity (Mason, 2002; Seale, 1999; Yin, 2003) of spoken classroom discourse as a data source in terms of the research question and the conceptual framework of the study. The second task is discussion of selection of the specific data source used in this study, the issues this process involves in terms of research quality, and description of the selected sources. This is followed by the details of the method of data generation.

3.2.1 Data source: Spoken classroom discourse

Assumptions about spoken interaction as dialogic, socioculturally-grounded processes meant that decisions about where to look for data were “mediated by pre-existing ideas and values” (Seale, 1999, p. 26). These assumptions are foregrounded by a focus on negotiation of meaning (Martin, 1992), understood here as a dialogic process embedded in the “complete interconnectedness of the linguistic and the social” (Christie & Unsworth, 2000, p. 3). Classrooms are social situations largely constituted in and through the symbolic tool of language (Freedman & Ball, 2004; Lantolf, 2000; Morson, 2004; Vygotsky, 1986; James V Wertsch, 1991) and the spoken word in particular (Christie, 2002; Freebody, 2003). Sociocultural theory conceives of the cognitive work of thinking, learning, and knowing as located in the dialogic relations of social interactions or discourses and individual minds (D Hicks, 1996; James V Wertsch & Toma, 1995). Data providing access to the process of negotiation of meaning in relations between participants in a natural classroom setting was therefore judged to be the most desirable and illuminating source of primary data for answering the research question, and preferable to other forms of generated data that offered the researcher only a re-constructed account of ways of negotiation of meaning.

While the value of spoken classroom discourse as data in investigations of classroom learning is well-established in the research literature (Cazden, 1988; Christie, 2002; A. D. Edwards & Westgate, 1994; Gee & Green, 1998), dialogic understandings of the nature of language and discourse as articulated by Bakhtin (1986) point to limitations of this type of data in fully addressing the research question posed in this study.
3.2.1.1 Limitations of spoken classroom discourse as a data source

Utterances are delivered in expectation of a response (Bakhtin, 1986) and meaning resides in the dialogic relations of utterances/responses and of speakers and listeners. In the context of the multiple membership of a classroom discursive community only some responses to co-textual utterances are realised in ensuing utterances. This, as Bakhtin points out, is not necessarily unusual:

Any understanding of live speech, a live utterance, is inherently responsive, although the degree of this activity varies enormously. Any understanding is imbued with response and necessarily elicits it in one form or the other: the listener becomes the speaker. … an utterance is not always followed immediately by an articulated response … (it) can be realized in action … or it can remain, for the time being, a silent responsive understanding … (Bakhtin, 1986, pp. 68-69)

Arguably, one of the ways students are involved in negotiation of meaning in the classroom is in internal dialogues of silent responsive understanding. Silence as a discursive act (Jaworski & Sachdev, 1998) plays an important role in the institutionally and polyadically constrained construction of classroom texts (Saville-Troike, 1985). However, silence is easy to overlook when the analytic focus is on spoken data generated by participants who do respond to the discourse as speakers. While silences are in one sense observable, insofar as they represent silent responsive understanding as a way students negotiate meanings they are not open to analysis in the same way as active spoken responses that comprise the data used in this study.

3.2.2 Selection of data source

The selection of the data source involved:

- The selection of the classroom in which classroom data were to be collected; the term classroom as used here encompasses the course of study, the teacher delivering the course in the classroom and the students.
- The selection of the classes as the source of data for analysis and discussion; the term class is used here to refer to the weekly three-hour face-to-face institutionally mandated course delivery.

A single internationalised postgraduate university classroom over the duration of one semester was purposively selected as the data source for the study. It is not unusual to focus on a single case (Patton, 2002). This served to establish a context for effective analysis by imposing limits on the data (Silverman, 2000) that in turn allowed the in-depth analysis of the data required in any attempt to understand a case (Sturman, 1994). Classroom discourse analysts (e.g., Christie,
advocate the study of extended classroom interactions over time, and the complete and thorough analysis of all data. The selected class represented “particular features or characteristics which … (enabled) … detailed exploration and understanding of the central themes and puzzles” (Ritchie, Lewis, & Elam, 2003, p. 78) at the heart of the study.

The status of the findings of this study hinges to a significant degree on the decision to select a single classroom as the data source. Upon that selection depends the generalisability, both within and beyond the specific context of the data sources selected for study (Blaikie, 2000; Lewis & Ritchie, 2003; Patton, 2002; Silverman, 2000; Williams, 2002), or the “transferability” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 124), of findings to other contexts. The approach to selection of the data source taken here attempted to marry the more instrumental argument that “questions of generalisability are tied to those of sampling because the sample is the bearer of those characteristics that it is wished to infer to a wider population” (Williams, 2002, p. 132) with recognition of the implications of the ontological base of the study (Lewis & Ritchie, 2003; Mason, 2002) for generalisation from the data sources selected.

The ontological base of this study was grounded in the tension of the “open unity” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 6) found in discourse. This meant that on the one hand the data source selected was recognised as providing access to what were socially and historically unique meanings open to interpretations that cannot and did not represent a single or fixed reality (Blaikie, 2000). Yet it was simultaneously recognised that the meanings negotiated in relations between the participants represented realizations of “unified perception(s) of the world” (Kent, 1991), evolving cultural models (Gee & Green, 1998) suggestive of “cultural consistency” (Williams, 2002) or a “cultural community” (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003, p. 21). The discursive practices in and through which participants constituted the data source were “recognisable ways by which members (of cultures) can achieve their social purposes in the range of situations they typically experience” (Christie & Unsworth, 2000, p. 4). The researcher’s representation and interpretation was situated in this open unity of ongoing processes in which enactments of unique social events constituted in and through situated meanings simultaneously affirmed, renewed, modified, and restructured cultural models that made this possible. Speculation on the nature of cultural consistency must arguably begin with experiences and interpretations of specific, socio-historically unique instances of social activity within the relevant broader cultural context. From the ontological perspective of the study, questions of generalisation from the selected data source were thus tied up in reflexivity rather than “statements of causal relationships … which are context-free” (Lewis & Ritchie, 2003, pp. 266-267), and permit
prediction. It was more useful to consider generalisation itself in a variety of contexts as suggested by Lewis and Ritchie (2003, pp. 266-270).

The ontological base of the study suggested the selection of a single classroom as a data source would support theoretical generalisation (Mason, 2002). In this perspective, theory is not seen as “fixed and immutable …(but) better understood as a fluid collection of principles and hypotheses” (Lewis & Ritchie, 2003, p. 267). In this study, theoretical generalisation can take place in terms of the social processes and structures that framed the negotiation of meaning by participants in the selected internationalised postgraduate classroom. The conceptual framework and literature review directed the researcher to an existing or developing body of theory in the areas of internationalised classroom discourse and of learning as dialogic processes. These were the terms in which the findings of the study were discussed, not in deductive terms of theory testing, but with a view to suggesting possible developments or refinements. To develop the argument for theoretical generalisability from another direction the selected data source represented a case. In this sense, the possibility of theoretical generalisability of the study’s findings conformed to Eckstein’s (1975) views of the use of the case in theory building. In Eckstein’s classification of the uses of studies of cases, this study was heuristic, allowing the researcher “to arrive at a preliminary theoretical construct …(that), … being based on a single case, is unlikely to constitute more than a clue to a valid general model” (Eckstein, 1975, p. 104). In terms of the broader phenomenon of internationalised classrooms as found elsewhere in the university, and elsewhere in Australian and international contexts, the study produced a “temporarily fixed image of a dynamic phenomenon (that) serves only a heuristic purpose and (which) must on no account be mistaken for the concept that properly represents the dynamic nature of the phenomenon itself” (Markova, 1990, p. 13). Selection of the data source was thus undertaken not with the intention of generalisation to permit prediction, but so description and interpretive explanation could facilitate development of what Lewis and Ritchie (2003) prefer to call “principles and hypotheses” (p. 267) to guide the framing of relevant questions (Mason, 2002) about the same structures and processes in other similar classrooms.

From another perspective, it was important selection of a single classroom as a source of data had potential to permit inferential generalisation (Lewis & Ritchie, 2003) which involves transfer of findings to other settings or contexts outside the original context, in other words, external validity (Lewis & Ritchie, 2003; Seale, 1999) of the study. Despite the unique nature of the data source selected for study, the possibility of inferential generalisation depended on the “fittingness … (or) … degree of congruence” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 124) between the context of the original data source and other internationalised postgraduate university
classrooms. At a broader level, the possibility of inferential generalisation centred on fittingness between internationalised university classrooms in general, and perhaps even more generally any university classrooms or classrooms at other levels of education. The researcher’s responsibility in terms of inferential generalisation was not necessarily to make such generalisations, but to provide ‘thick descriptions’ (Geertz, 1973), that is, “sufficient information about the context in which an inquiry is carried out so that anyone else interested in transferability has a base of information appropriate to the judgement” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, pp. 124-125). This was consistent with the grounded approach of the abductive research strategy, in which transfer of findings is seen in practical terms of others deciding the value of findings within particular settings in which they interested (Dey, 2004). Patton’s (2002) suggestion of extrapolations was also helpful in guiding the conditions under which inferential generalisations from a single classroom might be possible:

Unlike the usual meaning of the term generalisation, an extrapolation clearly connotes that one has gone beyond the narrow confines of the data to think about other applications of the findings. Extrapolations are modest speculations on the likely applicability of findings to other situations under similar, but not identical, conditions. Extrapolations are logical, thoughtful, case derived, and problem oriented rather than statistical and probabilistic. Extrapolations can be particularly useful when based on information rich samples and designs. (Patton, 2002, p. 584, emphasis in the original)

The conditions for inferential generalisation or extrapolation thus guided selection of a classroom in which it was demonstrable that it was an example of a problem that exists in similar, but not necessarily identical, classrooms, and that, in combination with the selected methods of data collection/generation, it was a rich source of data.

It was a fundamental objective of the research that, following selection of a classroom, the classes selected as data sources provided a foundation for representational generalisations (Lewis & Ritchie, 2003) about negotiation of meaning and individual and group learning within that classroom. The phenomenon investigated consisted of, in its entirety, all the classes conducted over the semester in this particular classroom. Data was collected in selected classes, five in total, and representational generalisation (Lewis & Ritchie, 2003) was thus concerned with questions of transferring of findings from the selected classes to all the classes that were conducted in the selected classroom. Guidance in producing and evaluating generalisations of this type is offered by Hammersley (1992) who suggests the validity of an accurate representation of “those features of the phenomenon that it is intended to describe, explain or theorise … (rests on) the adequacy of the evidence offered in support” (p. 69). Ultimately, the adequacy of evidence must be considered in terms of plausibility and credibility, the centrality of the claim to the argument, and in relation to the nature of the claims made by the researcher.
In all cases, this adequacy will rely in the first instance on the data sources selected for the study. Attention in this study, then, fell especially on the need to demonstrate that the classroom data selected for analysis is itself comprehensive in its coverage of the phenomenon. Transparency in selection of data sources based upon logical principles that are clearly described and explained is the methodical strength upon which internal validity of the study rests. Establishing this credibility was essential to generalisation of the findings as representative of the complete phenomenon of the negotiation of meaning in the classroom discourse and the related opportunities for learning of individuals and groups over the entire semester.

The responsibility of the researcher in this study was seen, then, as ensuring that selection of the data source, and the data produced as a consequence, provided a foundation for the types of generalisations or the transferability or extrapolations such as described by Lewis and Ritchie (2003), Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Patton (2002). In the next section a full and detailed description of the careful and purposeful selection of the classroom and classes as defined is provided.

3.2.2.1 Selection of the classroom

The classroom selected was considered to represent a case. The study of a case does not involve a methodology but “a choice of what is to be studied” (Stake, 2000, p. 435). The choice of the case in this instance was made with an instrumental (Stake, 2000) intention, that of producing insights into the discourse, and its relationship with learning, of the internationalised classroom. Selection of the case was criterion-based and purposive (Ritchie, et al., 2003; Silverman, 2000) or judgemental (Blaikie, 2000; Burgess, 1984), with the goal of identifying a case that would be an “information-rich” (Patton, 2002, p. 230) data source.

The broad criterion of “usefulness” (Patton, 2002, p. 229) provided initial guidance in the selection of the classroom to be used for detailed analysis and discussion:

> The trick is to keep coming back to the criteria of usefulness. What data collected during what time period describing what activities will most likely illuminate the inquiry. … The key issue in selecting and making decisions about the appropriate unit of analysis is to decide what it is you want to be able to say something about at the end of the study. (Patton, 2002, p. 229)

Building on this explanation of usefulness, and keeping in mind the key elements of the research focus - the internationalised classroom as a site for the meeting of cultural
practices/regularities and spoken discourse - the following criteria were considered salient in the classroom selected:

- An appropriate diversity of student cultural and linguistic backgrounds, including educational experiences in the culture of origin of the discursive practices of higher education classrooms.
- A classroom teaching and learning environment which involved opportunities for and was receptive of student participation in the classroom discourse.

In relation to the first criterion, while the regularities of classroom discursive practices at all levels of education reflect the diverse sociocultural circumstances which give rise to and sustain them, there are identifiable differences in the practices found in universities and the preceding tier of secondary education. This is supported by the literature on Australian students’ experiences of secondary-to-tertiary education transition and adjustment (e.g., Krause, Hartley, James, & McInnes, 2005; McInnes & James, 1995; Nulty & Meyers, 2003; Pitkelthy & Prosser, 2001). The interest in this study was not classrooms in which social practices and discursive regularities emerge as students commence their participation in learning in university classrooms. The interest was in classrooms in which a diversity of these practices and regularities meet. Thus for the purposes of this study it was deemed appropriate to select as a data source a postgraduate coursework classroom in which the prior experience of university classrooms of participating students had been situated in their country of origin.

An appropriate diversity of student cultural and linguistic backgrounds was essential if inferential generalisations were to be considered on the basis of a single classroom as the source of data. While by broad definition an internationalised classroom includes both ‘domestic’ students with a history of higher education in Australia and international students, or at least domestic students who now reside in Australia following an education elsewhere, the question remained one of how to judge what composition of students, linguistically and culturally, represented a suitable classroom case.

At the time of selection of the classroom in 2006, the most recent available data on international students in Australian higher education was for the year 2005. The data presented here is for the year 2006, the year in which the data were collected, but variation between the two years was not significant. As shown in Figure 3.1, below, in the year 2006 international students represented a significant proportion of total equivalent full-time student load (EFTSL) in Australian universities, including at the site of the study, Griffith University (Department of
Education Science and Training, 2007). Closer examination of the figures released by the Department of Education Science and Training (DEST) (2007) revealed that international students were concentrated in courses in the postgraduate sector rather than in undergraduate classrooms, and at Griffith University this concentration in postgraduate study was significantly higher. Within the postgraduate sector Australia-wide, four out of every five international postgraduate students were enrolled in coursework masters programmes, making up 61.5% of total EFTSL in such programmes in Australian universities. The corresponding figures at Griffith University were again somewhat higher, with 90% of international students in postgraduate programmes enrolled in masters by coursework degrees, 67.5% of the total EFTSL in these programmes at the university. These figures must be balanced by the fact that in 2006 27% of overseas students were studying offshore, although the figure for Griffith University was much lower at 6% (Department of Education Science and Training, 2007). Data on onshore/offshore status and level of study was not available from DEST.

Figure 3-1: International students in Australian universities as a percentage of total equivalent full-time student load, 2006 (Department of Education Science and Training, 2007).

On the basis of data presented in Figure 3.1, postgraduate classrooms, especially coursework Master’s classrooms, in Australian universities were experiencing the greatest degree of
internationalisation. Six out of ten students in Master’s coursework classrooms were international students, and at Griffith University this figure was a little higher, at two out of every three students. It must be acknowledged that these figures vary greatly across disciplines, with narrow discipline groups of Information Technology (51%) and Management and Commerce (46.5%) attracting the highest percentages of non-domestic students (Department of Education Science and Training, 2007). Education, the broad discipline of the classroom selected for study, attracted amongst the lowest percentages of international students (3.5%) in 2006, but 48% of those international Education students were enrolled at the level of coursework Master’s programme, and constituted 31% of total enrolments in Education coursework Master’s programmes (Department of Education Science and Training, 2007).

The possibilities for inferential generalisation or transferability of the findings of the investigation to other internationalised classrooms rested additionally on details of the cultural and linguistic diversity of the international student cohort in the selected classroom. The extent to which this might be possible rested on whether the selected classroom was in any way typical of the presence of international students in postgraduate classrooms. The region of permanent home residence of all overseas students in 2006 (Department of Education Science and Training, 2007) and those of the overseas students in the selected classroom is displayed in Figure 3.2:

![Figure 3.2: Overseas students by region of origin (percentage of total overseas students).](image)

(Department of Education Science and Training, 2007)
The data presented in Figure 3.1 and Figure 3.2 supported the purposive selection of the postgraduate coursework classroom used in the study on two grounds. First, that it is in a postgraduate coursework classroom, as opposed to an undergraduate classroom, where the phenomenon of interest is manifested in a rich but not extreme or unusual form, that is, on the grounds of intensity (Patton, 2002). Second, that the demographic features of the class are such that it can be considered a typical case (Patton, 2002), one in which the composition of the students illustrates the diversity of students both in terms of the origins of international students and in terms of the balance of domestic and international students. In seeking diversity the intention was not to reductively equate the regional origin, nationality, first language, or ethnicity of students in the selected class with particular ways of participation in classroom practices. However, “these categories have long-standing influences on the cultural practices in which people have the opportunity to participate, often yielding shared circumstances, practices and beliefs” (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003, p. 21, emphasis added). The region of permanent home address thus gave an indication of the diversity of these sorts of historical opportunities for participation in cultural communities among overseas students in Australian universities and in the selected classroom.

The second criterion applied to selection of the classroom - a classroom teaching and learning environment which involved opportunities for and was receptive of student participation in the classroom discourse - recognised that a variety of teaching contexts, and teaching methods and styles are found in university classrooms in Australia. To reiterate arguments introduced in relation to the unobservable aspects of classroom dialogue, even a lecture entirely in the form of a monologue is dialogic in that the addressees are (in theory) engaged in silent responsive understanding. However in the context of purposeful selection of a source of classroom data that could be potentially rich in offering insights into the ways meaning is negotiated in internationalised classrooms, the ideal classroom was an overtly ‘dialogic’ classroom (Nystrand, et al., 2001), as discussed in Chapter 2, in which learning was premised on a “dynamic transformation of understandings through interaction” (Nystrand, et al., 2001, p. 4), one in which the internally persuasive discourses of individual students were exposed to a diversity of voices in the negotiation of an authoritative dialogic classroom discourse (Matusov, 2007; Morson, 2004). From another perspective, what was sought was a classroom that reflected the university’s stated “commitment to excellence in student-centred education. … At its core is the concept of engagement. … The most valuable educational experiences have interactivity and engagement at their core” (Dewar, 2005, pp. 4 & 5). Considering that the research question was framed around spoken discourse in the context of diversity in the internationalised classroom, purposive selection of an interactive classroom can be justified as follows: firstly, on the grounds of intensity as an “excellent or rich example of the phenomenon
of interest” (Patton, 2002, p. 234), and secondly on the grounds that it is intended to represent a typical case (Patton, 2002) of the approach to classroom teaching and learning in the context of the institutional setting.

Finally, from an ethical perspective, selection of the classroom was dependent on obtaining the informed consent of the teacher and students involved, following procedures detailed in the ethical protocol for the study approved by the university Office for Research (Griffith University Office for Research, 2003). This process is described in more detail in the following sections.

3.2.2.2 Selection of the classes

Selection of classes for data collection was constrained in the first instance by requirements of the ethical clearance granted by the university (Appendix 1). Access to the class was negotiated with the teacher on the basis that the researcher would visit the class to request informed consent for participation of the students in Week Two of the thirteen week semester. The approved protocols required that participating students be allowed one week in which to read the information statement and to consider whether they would provide the necessary informed consent in writing. In the event that consent was forthcoming, participants were informed that data collection would commence in Week Four of the semester, at which time the classroom as a discourse community had a history of approximately nine hours, and continue at fortnightly intervals, a total of five three-hour lessons. As it transpired, because one scheduled class fell on a public holiday, data was collected in Weeks Four, Six, Nine, Ten, and Twelve.

Collection over time provided information-rich sources of data on the discursive practices that simultaneously constituted the discursive context and text of the classroom in a sequence of situations that can be portrayed as representing an evolving discourse community. The classroom selected was like all classrooms in that it had a fixed term of existence; it was constituted by the participants and evolved over time through their ongoing participation. Each class in this sense was not only different but unique. To use an image cited earlier in this section, each was a ‘temporarily fixed image’ (Markova, 1990, p. 13) of a dynamic phenomenon permitting analysis of the “choices of words and actions that members of a group use to engage with each other within and across time, actions, and activity” (Gee & Green, 1998, p. 127). A comprehensive analysis of the entire corpus of data accounting for all the spoken interaction had the potential to allow representational generalisation as well provide a
provisional analytic scheme (Mehan, 1979) suitable for application to other bodies of classroom data.

### 3.2.3 Description of data sources/participants

#### 3.2.3.1 The classroom:

The term classroom was used to encompass the course of study, the teacher delivering the course in the classroom, the student participants, and the physical space in which classes took place.

##### 3.2.3.1.1 The course of study

Introduction to Language Teaching was a one semester, thirteen-week course in a Master of Arts (Applied Linguistics)/Graduate Certificate in Applied Linguistics programme offered at Griffith University in Queensland, Australia. The course was described (Griffith University, 2006a) as aiming to introduce the student to the practice of second language teaching and to the process of classroom based research. Two modes of course delivery were offered, face-to-face and web-based, both supported in print in the form of lecture notes/study guide, a book of readings, and text-books, but it was the weekly, three-hour on-campus face-to-face classes that were the site of data collection. An additional and compulsory component of the course was a twenty-hour practicum requiring teaching of ten two-hour second/foreign language classes, commencing in the fourth week of the semester. Students were required to reflect on practicum experiences and one of the modes in which on-campus students fulfilled this requirement was through participation in structured reporting and discussion in the subsequent class.

While in the respects outlined earlier, selection of the classroom was purposive and instrumental, the actual selection of an Education postgraduate class was undeniably pragmatic. More particularly, as part of their course of study these students were immersed in theoretical foundations of language teaching that foreground the role of interactive dialogic processes in learning. In these circumstances, identification of the patterns of participation of both ESB and NESB students presented opportunities to consider congruence between these understandings of learning processes and students’ own modes of participation in learning, and the implications of findings.

##### 3.2.3.1.2 The teacher

The teacher participant was of English-speaking background, born and educated in Australia apart from a Master’s degree undertaken in the UK. He was the designer of the course of study
and had in excess of thirty years of tertiary teaching experience and ten years experience in the delivery of the course of study.

3.2.3.1.3 The students

The 18 students in the classroom were nine students of English speaking background (ESB) (seven female and two male) and nine of non-English speaking background (NESB) (eight female and two male). The NESB students’ countries of origin were People’s Republic of China (3), Japan (1), Taiwan (1), Burma (1), Oman (1), Slovakia (1) and Chile (1). One of the ESB students was born in a non-English speaking country but migrated at an early age and completed her entire education in English in Australia. The NESB student from Slovakia was a domestic student, that is, an Australian non-English-speaking background, or ANESB, student (Chanock & Cargill, 2003), a migrant participating in her first experience of English language medium classrooms. However, use of the term NESB included this student.

Enrolment in the programme of which the course was a mandatory component was restricted to applicants who were qualified teachers with a three year Bachelor’s degree, or equivalent, and a minimum of one year of full-time teaching experience. Any applicant whose previous study was undertaken in a language other than English was required to meet the University’s standard postgraduate English language requirement for entry to coursework postgraduate programs. This requirement was a test result no more than two years old that met one of the following standards (Griffith University, 2006b):

- A minimum score of 570 on the Test of English as Foreign Language (TOEFL)
- A computerised TOEFL score of 237
- An Internet Based (IBT) TOEFL score of 88 (no score less than 21)
- A minimum overall band score of 6.5 on the International English Language Testing System with no sub-score of less than 6.0
- No score less than 3+ in each skill of the International Second Language Proficiency Rating

In the classes selected for data collection, student attendance varied between 13 and 18 (see, Figure 3.3, below).
Figure 3-3: Numbers of students attending classes selected for data collection by language background

The findings in Chapters 4-7 conflate the discursive activities of the individuals that constituted the NESB and ESB groups to reduce the data for the purposes of comparison on the basis of English-speaking background. This is not intended to obscure or reduce individual differences of a diverse group of students, a tendency identified in the literature (e.g., see Kettle, 2007; Koehne, 2005) as a weakness of studies of international students. It was possible to consider the students as two groups on the basis of their English-speaking background, but the groups were not considered to be homogeneous in any other respects. Data for individuals is presented and discussed in Chapters 4-7, in some instances providing the basis for conclusions about the significance of discursive practices of individual students. In the case of the ESB students, the defining characteristic of English-speaking background was a crucial element of shared cultural models (Gee & Green, 1998) and contextual resources (Linell, 1998), although in other respects they brought varied backgrounds and experiences to the classroom. The NESB students were a diverse group of nationalities with varied language and cultural backgrounds, although some individuals within the group shared, to some extent, cultural and contextual resources.

3.2.3.1.4 Physical configuration of the classroom

Although the impact of this variable is unknown, it must be acknowledged the teaching space, configured as a traditional lecture theatre with raked seating and a capacity of approximately one hundred, may have been a factor in ways the discourse unfolded. It needs to be noted that cultural assumptions that students, and perhaps in particular NESB students, brought to such a formal teaching space may have been a critical factor in the ways that participants interacted to
negotiate meanings. It perhaps positioned the teacher to play a more pivotal role in discourse than might have eventuated in other circumstances. It directed student focus to the teacher at the front of the room, and did not facilitate and possibly discouraged student-student interaction. In a more practical sense, it made it difficult, and perhaps physically uncomfortable, for students to direct attention to or address utterances to students sitting behind them, especially directly behind. The limitations of these constraints on the findings produced by the study must be acknowledged.

3.2.4 Data collection/generation procedures

The classroom data collection was in fact a process of data generation (Mason, 2002); the discourse was a naturally occurring social activity, but the presence of the researcher, even as a non-participant, and the decisions made in selecting particular aspects of the data and means of recording the data generated for analysis a particular ‘slice’ of the naturally occurring discourse of the classroom. The aim was to collect a record of the naturally-occurring spoken interaction in the classroom in order to investigate the ways spoken discourse is used in negotiating meaning. The data were recorded using Olympic DS-2200 digital voice recorders and transcribed using the accompanying software. Two voice recorders, one at the front and one at the rear of the classroom, were used for the predominant lesson organisation involving whole-group or teacher-fronted interaction. When the lesson organisation involved small-group work, additional recorders were used, one with each group. To assist in identification of speakers when transcribing the recordings, the classes were also videorecorded using one camera located in a corner at the front of the classroom. The researcher was present during the recording and sat behind the student participants and noted participating students to assist in transcription. The aim throughout was the collection of naturally occurring classroom data with minimum intrusion, whilst making best use of the equipment available.

3.2.4.1 Limitations of classroom data collection/generation methods

Shortcomings of the data collection/generation methods in the capture of complex classroom interaction constrained the data available for transcription and analysis. These constraints impacted on a number of aspects of the discursive activity in the classroom. First, the initial intention to include data generated from recording classroom group work (Weeks 2, 3, and 5 of the data collection) had to be reconsidered. Digital sound recorders, with noise reduction features in the accompanying software, were used. However, it became apparent following the first recording in Week Two that the outcome of several groups working in a single space was recordings of a quality that made meaningful transcription impossible. Without access to alternative recording equipment, for example, individual wireless lapel microphones for each
participant in each group, the option of asking groups to move to separate rooms was rejected on the grounds that such action would have been an intervention in the normal operation of the classroom and teacher-student interaction in the group-work situation, would have drawn additional attention to the data collection procedure, and would have intruded unacceptably into the learning environment. The potential distortions in the data collected under these circumstances conflicted with the intention of the investigation to collect naturally-occurring classroom data. Although attempts to collect data in group-work situations continued, so little proved to be transcribable that the thirty-three minutes of group-work over the five lessons was excluded from the analysis. This proved to be a serious limitation of the data and hence the findings; if this data had been available, it may have revealed more about the ways students in the two groups negotiated meaning, and in particular allowed a comparison of the language choices made in small group student-student interaction and those made in the context of whole-class interaction which are reported in the findings.

The shortcomings of the selected data collection method in conjunction with the complexity of the discourse in the classroom also constrained the quality of data recordings of whole-class interaction. The data generated included instances of indecipherable utterances, some as a consequence of overlapping and/or simultaneous utterances, and conceivably excluded inaudible utterances of which the researcher was unaware. The transcribed representation of the data reflected these aspects of generation. Alternative methods of data recording may have alleviated this limitation and analysis of the consequent transcribed representations may have produced findings and conclusions that differed in some ways from those presented in Chapters 4-8. These issues and others are taken up in the description and discussion of the transcription of the data generated by the selected data collection methods.

3.2.5 Transcription of the classroom data

Classroom data collection generated recordings of the spoken interaction that took place in the classroom during a total of twelve hours and fifty minutes. The thirty-three minutes devoted to small group work was excluded from the data for transcription on the grounds already outlined. In addition, there was only intermittent verbal interaction during the viewing of videotapes of second language classrooms during Classes One, Three, Four, and Five. Table 3.1, below, shows the duration of the recorded data transcribed for each class and the total, approximately ten hours and twenty minutes of classroom interaction. Classes were scheduled for a block of three hours duration each week, but in practice, because a short break was taken during the class each week; the data were transcribed as first and second ‘sessions’ of each class (see Attachment 1) and referred to in this way in transcript extracts.
The transcription of the raw data as undertaken by the researcher was “theoretical, selective, interpretive, and representational … the result of a series of choices in need of explication” (Davidson, 2009, pp. 36 & 37). To apply Schütz’s (1963) conception, the transcripts were second order constructs, the researcher’s re-presentation of an event, not the event itself (J. Green, Franquiz, & Dixon, 1997). The researcher selected the activities that were deemed relevant to answering a question about the social activity under investigation, so that the transcripts re-presented the participants’ activities as interpreted by the researcher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>2.06.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>2.01.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>1.57.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>2.01.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>2.14.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10.21.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-1: Length in Hours.Minutes.Seconds of the transcribed data

Freebody (2003), while stressing the value of recordings of classroom interaction, emphasises that

there can be no perfect record or transcript of any event, … (the) apparently straightforward steps of moving from the event to a tape of the event, and subsequently to a written transcript of the talk from the tape, involve a number of critical decisions that will influence the kind of analytic work that can be done and the kind of conclusions that are thereby made available. … Tapes leave certain things out and give primacy to other features of the event. Similarly, the production of a written transcript involves representing what is heard of the audiotape itself, thereby, again, giving certain features salience and rendering others either unavailable or less important. (p. 92)

The mechanical process of transcription involved continued re-examination of the data (Silverman, 2000) beginning with what could be heard on the audiotape (Freebody, 2003) and progressively refining the transcript to select the data that reflected the goal of the research and to include elements of intonation that realized speech functions. In response to the issues surrounding of representation spoken interaction in written transcripts (Bucholtz, 2000), the transcribed utterances were not literacized (Bucholtz, 2000, p. 1461) by the use of the conventions of written language such as punctuation, apart from apostrophes to identify contractions. However, in keeping with the analytical objectives of the research (Oliver, Serovich, & Mason, 2005) the working transcripts were not naturalised (Oliver, et al., 2005) by
the inclusion of as much detail as was possible of all the idiosyncratic features of spoken language such as pauses, but did include intonation where analytically pertinent as outlined in what follows.

The inclusion of some of the features of spoken language made the transcripts “less transparent” (Bucholtz, 2000, p. 1461) for the reader. The editing of illustrative extracts of the transcripts selected for inclusion in the text of this and following chapters was supported by the distinction made by Mondada (2007) between working transcripts and those edited for publication. Hesitations, transcribed as ‘ahm’ or ‘ah’, for example, in the working transcript used for the analysis have been removed. Forward slashes have been added to indicate breaks or pauses in utterances; the intention was not to mark clauses but to assist the reader, particularly in longer extracts involving clause complexes and/or ellipsed clauses, clause fragments, and ‘false starts’ that occurred frequently in the interaction, for example:

T: you should be/ you should be prepared to be interviewing at least four people each/ maybe even more/ there have been years where/ where you’ve/ we’ve had people having to go off to different/ different rooms around the place and there’ve been queues waiting outside waiting to get in to be interviewed and sometimes people have had to/ had to interview about ten people but/ we’ll/ by the end of tonight hopefully you’ll/ you’ll know what it is the/ you/ you should actually be interviewing them about and how you’re going to extract the information from them/ alright (2) (1.1:lines 84-91)

Participants were coded (see Appendix 2) to satisfy ethical requirements, and the transcription system was adapted from Silverman (2001) to reflect the specific needs of the study. A linear format was used and instances of simultaneous and overlapping speech were indicated as follows. Overlapping utterances, where the second utterance began before first utterance concluded, or utterances were simultaneous, were indicated by brackets as in the examples below:

T: …so we get a/ we get those interesting things like six and sux/ that/ that type of thing [happening

E: [but in a way then are we not saying that like we’re saying that the pronunciation of different ahm people with different languages

R: [mmm
I: [yeah
Instances of brief utterances during the utterance of another speaker who continued without interruption and after the second speaker concluded were indicated by insertion in the transcript between equal signs, as below:

T: one’s long/ so/ long/ but what happens to a vowel when it gets longer and longer/ it becomes no longer=
F: it changes
T: =a vowel but a/ what do you call it when you get an elongated vowel

Instances of indecipherability were indicated by double parentheses, as in ((inaudible)), while single parentheses were used to enclose items in instances of any uncertainty about what was heard on the tape, for example:

T: …wasn’t spoken/ mhm/ (wasn’t) a conversation …

The noting of intonation patterns that were central to identification of speech functions using the system of KEY (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) was an element of the recursive process of transcription that was explicitly analytical. As Halliday and Matthiessen (2004, pp. 141-142) point out, the relationship between tone and mood is a grammatical system that includes both unmarked typical patterns as well as marked realizations of mood through tone. Instances in which tone was critical to analysis of speech function were indicated by underlining of the tonically prominent element of utterances followed by a tone number, shown in Table 3.2, below, in double parentheses to denote the contour of pitch movement (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 141):

Instances of this notation in the transcript included clauses marked by tonic contours that indicated the speech function was incongruent with mood realised by the grammar of the clause, distinction between the use of units such okay and right textually as continuatives or interpersonally as elliptical demands or offers, or the use of a tonic pattern in a mood tag that marked it as functioning incongruently to demand rather than give, for example:

I: so we need to prepare a lesson for next Saturday ((2))

J: it was Krashen who said that wasn’t it ((2))
Table 3-2: Tone numbers to identify contours of pitch movement (From Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 141).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone</th>
<th>Symbol/contour</th>
<th>Pitch movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone 1</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>Falling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone 2</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Rising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone 3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Level (actually showing a rise in pitch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone 4</td>
<td>\V</td>
<td>Falling-rising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Tone 5 | \
| Compound |                |                                    |
| Tone 13 | \             | Falling + level                    |
| Tone 53 | \V            | Rising-falling + level             |

In clauses with the mood block ellipsed, the functions of question and statement were realised through tonic contour; in the transcript, questions were identified, as below:

R: body language ((2))

Intonation was also helpful in distinguishing continuatives, such as alright, right, and okay, that functioned textually from use of the same items in elliptical clauses functioning interpersonally to give or demand, such as in the hypothetical examples, (that is) alright, (are you), alright (with that), and (is that) alright. The tonic patterns of continuatives were not identified in the transcribed data.

The initial challenge of transcription of polyadic classroom interaction (Davidson, 2009; Freebody, 2003; Mehan, 1985), given the limitations of the data recoding methods, was a representation of what could be heard of the interaction. In this sense, the transcript was in some
respects incomplete. The researcher made judgements that determined both the representation of individuals in the discourse and the data available for analysis. For example, in many of the frequent instances of speakers overlapping or speaking simultaneously it was not possible to identify the individual speakers using the audio-recordings in conjunction with the video recorded data; the video-recorded data were much more valuable when identifying speakers in more ‘linear’ or dyadic dialogue than in cases of simultaneous utterances. It was also not always possible to identify the precise language used by individuals, or who was responsible for the various utterances that it was possible to transcribe. This resulted in the individual participation of some students, and the exact utterances involved, being excluded from a full analysis, although the occurrence of the utterances and their indecipherability was noted. This at least permitted a degree of analysis of the place of such utterances in the unfolding discourse, but unfortunately not of the participation of students individually or as members of one of the two groups. Examples of these cases of simultaneous utterances are evident in the following:

T: … if you’re having difficulty with English/ if you’re a student here the sort of English likely that you’ll be wanting to have help with is English to do with the stuff you’re studying=  
SS: mmm right yes  
T: =so that leads to a whole/ one whole classification of/ of field of discourse/ English for academic purposes/ okay … (1.1:193-200)

T: … so that’s/ that’s one area/ what a/ is it just vocabulary  
J: [no/ it’s the grammar as well  
SS: [(inaudible))  
T: yeah/ that’s right … (1.1: 1065-1072)

In numerous instances overlapping parts of utterances were indecipherable. Factors such as proximity to the recorder, vocal volume, and vocal frequency often determined which speaker was audible and which was not. Thus the transcribed data included incomplete utterances, for example:

L: Greg/ is the age range/ is the age range with those doing English quite diverse too/ or do we tend/ or do you tend to get a/ a narrow [(inaudible))  
T: [it’s really narrow/ it’s/ it’s a university/ they’re adults … (1.1:488-492)

The transcription involved interpretive decisions about what constituted meaningful aspects of particular interactive or discursive events (J. Green, et al., 1997). Selection of what to transcribe was guided by the goal of the research (Davidson, 2009) to investigate the ways
students were involved in negotiation of the unfolding classroom discursive text. This was defined as utterances of students and the teacher that were judged to be addressed directly and/or indirectly to all classroom participants. Some of the recorded data was judged to fall outside this definition. This was particularly the case for utterances of individual students seated closest to the audio-recorders who on occasions produced ‘self-talk’ and/or participated in ‘peripheral dialogues’.

‘Self-talk’ generally refers to either inner speech or egocentric speech (Karpov & Haywood, 1998), sometimes referred to as private speech (Frawley & Lantolf, 1985) or private dialogue (J. V. Wertsch, 1980), but here refers to instances of egocentric or private speech uttered without expectation of a response, that is, talking to oneself. The production of utterances as self-talk by these individuals prompted the conclusion that it was likely that others in the class also produced similar utterances that the data recordings did not capture. Despite the potential significance of self-talk, not only were these utterances not addressed to another participant, but the fragmentary and incomplete nature of the self-talk data collected led the researcher to exclude what was judged to be self-talk from the final transcripts for analysis.

‘Peripheral’ dialogues were exchanges between two or more participants in which the utterances produced were intended to elicit responses (not necessarily verbal) only from that/those participant/s directly addressed, and not from any other member of the whole class. However, as with the self-talk, only the confidential dialogue of students in close proximity to the recorders was available for transcription, if decipherable. The researcher observed confidential dialogue among students not sitting near the recorders and thus the data collected constituted an incomplete record of this aspect of the classroom discourse. Under these circumstances, data collected that was judged to be confidential dialogues was not included in the final transcripts for analysis.

This “classroom noise” (Nunan, 1996, p.41) was not discounted as an element of the discourse of learning because “what happens in the margins of instructional conversations feeds into the discourse and affects what is taught and what is learnt” (Bannink & van Dam, 2006, p.284). However, not only were these utterances outside the discursive text available to all participants, it was beyond the capacity of the collection methods used for the research to fully capture all such instances from all participants. In these circumstances the researcher was confronted with a partial record of what was arguably an important aspect of the discourse, but was not in a position to begin to understand fully the role marginal or peripheral discourse played in the unfolding negotiation of meaning in the classroom under investigation. Although the utterances involved were transcribed, when decipherable, in the initial transcription, during the repeated
examinations of the recordings instances of self-talk and peripheral dialogue were removed from the working transcript.

Exclusion of these aspects of the discourse, as well as the instances of small-group interaction as noted earlier, could be seen as imposing a significant qualification on the conclusions drawn from the working transcripts. However, it must be reiterated that the focus of the investigation was those utterances for which all participants were either direct or indirect addressees. These constituted the collectively negotiated discursive classroom text to which all participants had the opportunity to respond and negotiate as it unfolded. The challenge of effective collection of data that would permit the analysis of the full complexities of classroom discourse was beyond the resources of the study. Ideally, it would have been carried out with resources that enabled it to “break free from … reliance on linear dyadic models of communication and learning in which one verbal utterance at a time bounces back and forth between a speaker and a targeted addressee” (Bannink & van Dam, 2006, p. 284) that the final transcript to some extent resembled. On the other hand, if that had been the case, the implications of any necessary additional intrusion into naturally occurring discourse would have required consideration. Nonetheless, exclusion of ‘self-talk’ and ‘peripheral dialogues’ from the data used in the analysis, as well as the approximately thirty minutes of small group work, means the conclusions that can be drawn about the participation of both ESB and NESB students are, in this respect, severely limited.

The reliability of the representation of what was heard and of the analysis and selection as outlined was subjected to a form of inter-coder reliability assessment (Silverman, 2000) of a sample of the data. Two other ‘coders’ with academic qualifications and experience worked independently with the initial transcribed representations of what was heard of Class Five, session 1, and the corresponding audio-recording of the 55 minutes of classroom data. This was approximately nine percent of the total data in terms of time. Using guidelines provided by the researcher with regard to tone, self-talk and peripheral dialogue, the independent ‘coders’ made judgements about the accuracy of the representation, of instances requiring the use of notation for tone, and of instances of self-talk and peripheral dialogue. The few instances where one or the other was uncertain of correspondence between the recorded and transcribed data were resolved by discussion between them. The independent ‘coders’ and the researcher agreed that the judgements of the researcher as represented in the transcript were accurate with regard to tone, self-talk and peripheral dialogue and agreed that the transcribed data represented accurately utterances of participants that were judged to be addressed directly and/or indirectly to all classroom participants.
3.2.5.1 Transcription limitations from a dialogic perspective

In a dialogic perspective, it is vital to recognise that the original texts were a co-construction of the participants to negotiate meaning in the given context, which did not include the researcher. Although the researcher entered into a dialogical relationship with the text (Todorov, 1984), the original text was not addressed to the researcher, that is, the researcher was not an ‘other’ participating in the process. Transcribed spoken texts cannot capture what Bakhtin calls the expressive aspect, that which brings to life the semantic aspect, and which is both a responsive interaction with other utterances, not necessarily within the direct referential context, and with the “varying degrees of influence from the addressee and his anticipated response” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 99). This is the lived reality of language-in-use that is a “nonreiterative whole, historically unique and individual … whole utterances are non-reproducible (although they can be quoted) and are bound among themselves by dialogic relations” (Bakhtin, 1972, in Todorov, 1984, p. 26). This non-reproducibility means it is impossible for analysis of a transcript to penetrate the unique addressivity of an utterance. Instead the researcher must accept that what is produced is “thoughts upon thoughts, experiences of experiences, discourse upon discourses, texts bearing upon texts” (Bakhtin, 1972, in Todorov, 1984, p. 22).

The original spoken text was, in general terms, a first order construction of reality (Schutz, 1963). In dialogic terms, it is useful to keep in mind the social reality of classrooms at postgraduate level is to some extent situated in spoken dialogic reconstructions, perhaps the ventriloquation (Bakhtin, 1986) of the voices of written texts, which in turn are embedded in dialogic conversations of disciplinary fields. The interaction of the researcher with the recorded data in the process of representation must be recognised as a second order construction, once removed from the actual interaction and based upon only a partial understanding of the unique dialogic context. The transcript resembles a butterfly pinned flat in a display case that provides no idea of how it appears in flight;

... it must be understood a temporarily fixed image of a dynamic phenomenon serves only a heuristic purpose and must on no account be mistaken for the concept that properly represents the dynamic nature of the phenomenon itself. (Markova, 1990, p. 13)

3.3 Data analysis

Most of this section of the Chapter is devoted to introduction to systemic functional grammar (SFL) as a method of analysis of spoken classroom data and explication of the systems of interpersonal meanings applied to the transcripts. The section is concluded with a brief outline
of the approach to identification of learning opportunities on the basis of findings of the analysis.

3.3.1 Introduction to data analysis method

Over the last sixty years the study of classroom discourse in the English-speaking world has rapidly expanded to become a major area of research, and has utilized a variety of analytic approaches from disciplines including linguistics, ethnography, ethnomethodology, and psychology (Christie, 2002; Christie & Unsworth, 2000). Much of the earlier work (e.g., Barnes, Britton, & Rosen, 1971; Barnes & Todd, 1977; Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975) is well known and influential, as is later work such as that of Cazden (1988), Lemke (1985, 1990), Green (1981; 1988), Christie (1995, 1997, 2002), and Wells (1994, 1999; 2000). The analytic approach adopted in this study of internationalised postgraduate university classroom discourse is based in systemic functional linguistics (SFL), as expounded by Halliday (1976, 1978, 1984, 1985a, 1985b, 1994; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) and Martin (1992), and in dialogical perspectives on interaction laid out by Linell (1998). Linell notes that SFL shares “fundamental principles” (1998, p. 49) with a dialogic approach to the study of discourse in spoken interaction and contexts; this is particularly the case for the interpersonal metafunction of language as a means of enacting personal and social relationships (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) and of negotiation of meaning (Martin, 1992).

SFL developed (e.g., Halliday, 1976, 1978, 1984, 1985a; Halliday & Hasan, 1985; Martin, 1985a), and continues to develop (e.g., Christie & Martin, 1997; Halliday, 1994; Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004; Martin, 1992), in both theory and practice concurrently with the growth of interest in classroom discourse. The early work of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) drew inspiration from Halliday’s earlier work (Christie, 2002), and as Unsworth’s (2000) collection of studies demonstrates, SFL is the analytic tool of choice for some researchers investigating classroom discourse. However, its use is still far from widespread. Rogers (2004), introducing a collection of work on critical discourse analysis (CDA) in education describes SFL as the “linguistic backbone” (p. 8) of CDA, yet also notes that “despite the centrality of SFL in discourse studies in general and CDA in particular, educational researchers in the American context have been reluctant to take up the work of SFL” (p. 9). A review of CDA studies in the field of education published in journals between the years 1980-2003 (Rogers, Malancharuvil-Berkes, Mosley, Hui, & Joseph, 2005) found only 46 examples, of which only a handful analysed texts of classroom interaction.
SFL is certainly constructively applied to teaching work in classrooms in terms of approaches to first, second, and foreign language teaching and literacy (e.g., A. Burns & Coffin, 2001; Coffin, 2003; Dare, et al., 1998; Halliday, 1977, 1982, 1991; Huang & Morgan, 2003; Macken-Horarak, 2005; Marshall, 2000; McArthur, 1997; Russo, 2002; Stuart-Smith, 2003). The most intensive analysis of spoken classroom interaction using SFL, and the most widely cited, seems to be that of Christie (e.g., 1991a; 1991b, 1995, 1997, 2002). Christie analyses texts from both primary and secondary classrooms, and secondary (Hoon, 2004; Love, 2000; Wallace & Ellerton, 2004; Young & Nguyen, 2002) and primary classrooms (Gardner, 2006; Jacobs & Ward, 2000) are the sources of most other published work. Studies of classroom discourse in the tertiary or adult education sectors that have applied SFL as an analytic tool focus largely on language-learning classrooms (Gibbons, 1998, 2003, 2006; Haneda, 2004; Love & Suherdi, 1996; Mohan & Beckett, 2003). Even in this field of inquiry, SFL “remains severely underutilized by SLA researchers” (Ortega, 2008, p. viii) as a useful tool.

The comment of Wake (2006, pp. 2-3) that there have been no linguistic analyses of the classroom learning experiences of international students was noted earlier. Wake (2006) used SFL to analyse the discourse of five second language international students in her study of dialogic learning in small group interaction in an Australian university economics tutorial. In another Australian study, Woodward-Kron and Remedios (2007) used SFL to analyse interaction of a group of first-year undergraduate students of both ESB and NESB backgrounds in one problem-based learning Physiotherapy tutorial.

On a more cautionary note, contexts involving the interaction of second language learners and native speakers, which include the classroom under investigation in this study, are the sites of construction of what Kettle (2005b) calls hybrid texts. Kettle, working in a CDA context, questions the analysis of these texts using standard linguistic models and suggests that “analysis is made more effective by drawing on principles from second language acquisition (SLA), in particular communication strategies” (p. 87). The analytical focus on negotiation of meaning in the study reported here arguably aligns it to some extent with linguistically realized features of communication strategies. Textual hybridity is not restricted to university classrooms, and - while acknowledging that meaning-making through intercultural communication has been going on for thousands of years – the contemporary world is increasingly one where cultures, ethnic groups, or speech communities are interacting and mingling, and diversity is the rule rather than the exception. As Poynton (2000) observes, “this is the contemporary scene within which the texts and meanings that speakers/listeners and readers/writers need to negotiate are increasingly produced and contested” (p. 22). The interest in researching ‘inter-discourse’ communication,
as realized in ‘hybrid’ texts, stems directly from this characteristic, and is what prompted this study.

Christie (2002) advocates the use of SFL as a tool for discourse analysis that is “delicate … (and) allows a very fine interpretation of the meanings made and the nature of the relationships of participants in the discourse” (p. 24), and she is not alone. Lemke (2006), for example, describes SFL as “probably the most fully elaborated and useful system for discourse analysis” (p. 1). Unsworth (2000) argues the value of SFL in investigation of language use, including the language of classroom interaction and learning, on the grounds it is “particularly suited to applied language research because it is premised on the complete interconnectedness of the linguistic and the social” (p. vii).

In the study reported here the focus was on the interactive aspect of language use, on the social roles played by NESB and ESB students as they the negotiated exchanges of meanings that constituted the discursive text of the classroom. In SFL, this is the interpersonal metafunction of language, the meanings made by “language in action” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 30), propositions or proposals “whereby we inform or question, give an order or make an offer, and express our appraisal of and attitude towards whoever we are addressing and what we are talking about” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 29). Language constructs the interactive relationships “that pertain to the immediate dialogic situation” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999, p. 511) in which “the speaker is not only doing something, he is also requiring something of the listener” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 107). In this, the interpersonal metafunction reflects the fundamental dialogic conception that language is “always addressed to somebody” (Linell, 1998, p. 102) and is thus characterised by addressivity (Bakhtin, 1986).

Given that SFL offers a window into how the meanings of language in action negotiates social roles and realizes attitudes and relationships, the analysis also promises insights into how differences in sociocultural histories of participants are manifested in meanings they make through the social roles they construct and the attitudes and relationships that are realized through language choices. Ways language is used in action are realizations of sociocultural contexts:

… grammar has to interface with what goes on outside language; … with the social processes we engage in. But at the same time it has to organise … the enactment of social processes, so that they can be transformed into wording. In step one, the interfacing part, experience and interpersonal relationships are transformed into meaning; this is the stratum of semantics. In step two, the meaning is further transformed in to wording; this is the stratum of lexicogrammar. (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, pp. 24-25)
Language in action realizes social processes, and lexicogrammatical choices of interactants make visible variations in how social processes are enacted in the practices of cultural communities (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003).

Thus, systems that represent the resources for making interpersonal meanings provide an analytical instrument for “interpreting dialogue … (and) … the relation between general grammatical classes and the role they play in structuring a conversation” (Martin, 1992, p. 33). Accounts of these interpersonal meanings systems in Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), Martin (1992), and Berry (1981a, 1981b) were the basis of the method of analysis. How these systems were applied to analysis of the data is outlined in the section that follows.

3.3.2 Application of data analysis method

The ways students were involved in negotiation of meaning in the classroom was approached in terms of the discursive roles and relationships of the participants. Classroom participants were related firstly by their first order social roles (Halliday, 1978) as students and teacher, roles “defined without reference to language” (p. 144). The dialogic interactions of participants in these first order roles realized discursive, or second order social roles (Halliday, 1978), which “come into being only in and through language” (p. 144). As mapped out in the semantic system of SPEECH FUNCTION (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 108), these discursive roles involved the adoption by the participant students and teacher of the initiating speech roles of giving and demanding to negotiate the exchange of the commodities of goods/services or information. These first and second order social roles were used to define four types of classroom discursive relationships that provided the overarching analytic framework:

- Discursive Relationship 1 (DR1) was characterised by the adoption of the speech role of giving by the teacher, casting the direct and/or indirect addressees - the student participants in the interaction - in the role of receiving. The adoption of the role of giving was initiated by the teacher and not in response to a demand from a student participant;
- Discursive Relationship 2 (DR2) was characterised by the adoption of the speech role of demanding by the teacher, casting the addressees - the student participants in the interaction - in the role of giving on demand;
- Discursive Relationship 3 (DR3) was characterised by the adoption by a student of the speech role of demanding, casting the direct and/or indirect addressee/s – the teacher and/or student participants in the interaction - in the role of giving on demand; and
Discursive Relationship 4 (DR4) was characterised by unsolicited adoption of the speech role of giving by a student, casting the direct and/or indirect addressee/s - the teacher and/or student participant/s in the interaction - in the role of receiving.

The ways students were involved in each of these four discursive relationships was the focus of the analysis that ensued.

3.3.2.1 Identification of the discursive relationships

The language used by participants in the adoption of speech roles to exchange commodities performed speech functions, as shown in Table 3.3, below, with the potential to elicit from addressees a response, or responses, that performed corresponding functions, also shown in Table 3.3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech role</th>
<th>Commodity exchanged</th>
<th>Speech function</th>
<th>Speech function of response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>give</td>
<td>goods/services</td>
<td>offer</td>
<td>acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demand</td>
<td></td>
<td>command</td>
<td>undertaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give</td>
<td>information</td>
<td>statement</td>
<td>acknowledgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demand</td>
<td></td>
<td>question</td>
<td>answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-3: Functions of initiating and responding utterances (From Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 108)

Although dialogue, including the data in this study, is generally more complex, these related sets of speech functions, often referred to as “adjacency pairs” (Martin, 1992), provided a framework for unfolding dialogue “in which giving implies receiving and demanding implies giving in response” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 107). The four speech functions in the initiating role and the corresponding speech functions of expected/discretionary response present, in simple terms, the nature of the negotiations that can unfold in each discursive relationship.

The interactions shown in Table 3.3 are a “more or less standard and predictable” (Love & Suherdi, 1996, p. 243) system of synoptic moves (Martin, 1985b). For realization of any of the
four discursive relationships, only the initiating move was essential; the various responses were optional, but if present, the focus in this analysis progressed to if and how the participant who established the discursive relationship continued or concluded the interaction. The delicacy of the analysis did not extend to identification of dynamic moves (Martin, 1985b) in more complex interactions. The analytical focus remained on the discursive relationships that prevailed, the speech functions of utterances and language choices of the student participants in particular with the aim of comparing and contrasting the ways NESB and ESB students were involved. While the prevailing focus in much of the research literature for description of sequences of synoptic moves and any dynamic moves in the functional analyses of interaction is the exchange (e.g., Berry, 1981a; Love & Suherdi, 1996; Martin, 1985b, 1992), the approach taken here was to attempt to understand utterances and their constituent clauses dialogically in terms of “response-initiative structure” (Linell, 1998, p. 165, emphasis in the original). The aim was to move the focus to the utterances as “both a response to the other and an initiative projecting a possible continuation by the other” (Linell, 1998, p. 165). Thus the analysis was conducted at the level of the speech roles of participants, and of the speech functions of initiating moves and (any) responses as negotiation of the unfolding discourse. It included also identification of addressee/s of utterances as an important aspect of the ways students were involved.

Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) go on to distinguish between the negotiations involved in the exchange of information and of goods/services:

When language is used to exchange information, the clause takes the form of a proposition. It becomes something that can be argued about – something that can be affirmed or denied, and also doubted, contradicted, insisted on, accepted without reservation, qualified, tempered, regretted and so on. But we cannot use the term ‘proposition’ to refer to the exchange of goods-&-services …; they cannot be affirmed or denied. ... we will refer to them by the related term proposal. (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, pp. 110-111, emphasis in the original)

Although proposals are ‘negotiated’, the meanings are not. Negotiations of the meanings of proposals can only be conducted through propositions. This essential distinction focuses the analysis on how students were involved in negotiation of the exchange of information.

Linguistic units that realized meanings as a proposition were negotiable by the addressee/s in terms of their assessments of the validity of the propositions. The nature of these negotiations of validity of meanings encompassed the propositions and questions themselves, and, at the most fundamental level, acknowledgement or contradiction of statements, and answering or disclaiming of questions. At a more delicate level of analysis, choices in the system of MODALITY enabled participants to negotiate by positioning themselves in relation to
propositions in terms of certainty and usuality; in instances of the modalization of proposals that
moved clauses into the indicative mood, this positioning expressed obligation and inclination.

Discourse roles determine participants’ selection of options in the system network of SPEECH
FUNCTION, and this was the initial analytical lens applied to the transcribed data. The options
for the realization of major clauses that were applied to the data included the systems of MOOD
TYPE, POLARITY, MODALITY, COMMENT, as well as the related system of KEY. These
options are expanded in what follows. Minor (or moodless) clauses, while fulfilling important
functions in the unfolding of the dialogue were not open to the same degree of analysis.

3.3.2.1.1 Analysis of shifts in discursive role within utterances

The corpus of data was analysed to identify the discursive relationships underlying the
transcribed interactions of speaker and addressee/s. The data consisted of the transcribed
utterances of participants, which, in line with Bakhtin (1986), were viewed as turns at
contributing to the dialogue (Linell, 1998) “regardless of length and structure, whether outside
of turns (as listener support items … ), or only part of a turn or in itself constituting a whole
turn” (Linell, 1998, p. 160). The analytical problem that ensued was the adoption by a speaker
of the roles of giving and demanding within the one utterance, that is, a shifting of discursive
relationships. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004, p. 108) construct the system of SPEECH
FUNCTION around the idea of a move in an exchange and the analysis of speech function relies
on the correspondence of this to a linguistic unit. The transcribed data included many
utterances constituted of two or more linguistic units, that is, combinations of major and/or
minor clauses and/or clause complexes. Martin (1992) argues a move be defined as “a
discourse unit whose unmarked realization is as a clause selecting independently for mood” (p.
59, emphasis in the original). On the basis of the systems of TAXIS and LOGICO-SEMANTIC
RELATION (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, pp. 373-383), this view includes hypotactically
dependent expansions in clause complexes in the move, and thus analysed as the same speech
function of the dominant clause, an approach adopted in this analysis. Martin goes on to
suggest additional independent clauses in an utterance, even if they can be analysed as
performing a different function, be included in the move as dependent on the initial function,
unless the proposition realized therein is negotiated by the addressee. In other words, analysis
needs to be conducted on the basis of the co-text of instances. This analysis adopted a different
approach to shifts in speech function within an utterance that drew on Berry’s (1981a)
interpretation of the exchange of goods/services and information.

Berry (1981a, 1981b) describes the exchange of commodities as negotiations involving primary
and secondary knowers/actors. In the exchange of information, the primary knower is the
interactant who already knows the information given/demanded, while the primary actor carries out the action demanded/offered. This distinction was important in the analysis of negotiation in the classroom for a number of reasons that are discussed further later in this section. To understand the ways students were involved in the negotiation of meaning, it was judged to be important to capture students’ adoptions of the roles of giving and demanding that, using Martin’s approach, may have been ignored. In the first example that follows, ESB Student L addressed the teacher, and initially adopted the role of demanding as secondary knower, but then shifted to the role of giving as a primary knower. In the second instance, ESB Student K did the opposite, beginning in the role of giving as primary knower and concluding with a shift to secondary knower with her demand to the teacher:

L: what if some of these students on this side don’t understand a lot of this vocab that’s being/ she’s not checking at any stage that/ I mean/ it seems to me a lot of/ there are a few people giving a lot of the answers/=  
R: mmm [yeah/ not everyone’s (inaudible)  
T: [yeah  
L: =a lot of the passive people on this side might not understand any of that vocab  
T: might/ they may not/ that’s right/ yeah (4.2:1406-1418)

K: yes/ we had an excellent example of that in last Saturday’s lesson/ we’ve got those Sudanese ladies and we were talking about going to the emergency department at the hospital and stitches/ there’s just no way these ladies could say stitches/ just recasting/ repeating the word/ is that what you mean  
T: yes (4.1:302-305)

On the basis of the co-text of the teacher’s response alone, both these student utterances would be included in the findings as the adoption of one role only. These were instances of the adoption of the speech roles of giving and demanding without elicitation of a response, but, in fundamental terms, it was the adoption of the speech role that was considered to invoke the discursive relations between speaker and addressee/s. In the polyadic context of a classroom, elicitation of a response is not mandatory for a participant to be involved in the discursive relationships initiated by others, particularly when the teacher addresses the whole class. Thus, to exclude instances of the adoption of a speech role on the grounds that there was no response would, it is argued, not provide a complete picture of the ways students were involved. Consequently, the initial analysis of the data identified discursive relations not on the basis of whole utterances performing a single function but dynamically on the basis of moves and shifts within utterances as well. As Linell (1998) notes, speakers do not deliver entirely pre-planned utterances, and they respond to their own utterances during production. It is worth noting that
shifts in speech role did not necessarily signal a change in a speaker’s role as knower; the findings presented in Chapters 4 and 5 show the teacher often shifted between the roles of giving and demanding while remaining in the role of primary knower. The key point here is that the discursive relations operating in more complex extended utterances were analysed as unfolding dynamically with the potential for shifts in these relations.

3.3.2.1.2 Moving from SPEECH FUNCTION to MOOD

The discursive relationships described at the semantic level of speech function were identified through analysis of the data at the grammatical level on a clause by clause basis, primarily using the system of MOOD, the “resource for negotiating meaning in dialogue” (Martin, 1992, p. 32). As detailed in the discussion of transcription, this analysis of the transcribed data was conducted in conjunction with listening to the recordings in order to enable analysis of KEY. However, while there were numerous instances of participants’ congruent expression of the semantic categories of command, statement and question in characteristic corresponding grammatical realizations (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, pp. 114-115), Table 3.4, below, “there is no simple relation between general grammatical classes and the role they play in structuring conversation” (Martin, 1992, p. 34).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech function</th>
<th>Mood by which typically encoded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>offer</td>
<td>Various; no congruent form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statement</td>
<td>declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>command</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>question</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-4: Lexicogrammatical realization of semantic categories (congruent pattern) (From Halliday, 1984, p. 15).

Thus there were also many instances of incongruence that required a more delicate analysis of MOOD drawing on the system of MODALITY, or analysis in conjunction with the system of KEY. Where possible and appropriate, the function of the co-text was used to confirm the analysis of speech function, although in some cases the co-text, adjacent (preceeding and/or following) and/or within moves (Martin, 1992), was instrumental in analysing the function of a linguistic unit. Finally, the classroom context was sometimes the final determinant of the function played by the linguistic unit, particularly in instances of ambiguity that ensued when modulated offers and commands shifted into the indicative mood (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, pp. 147-148).
The analytical framework of discursive relationships emphasises the situatedness of utterances in sequences of verbal interaction and is thus consistent with dialogic understandings of discourse and associated methodological implications:

Dialogism is more a matter of ‘theory’ (a theoretical framework, a general epistemology) than a set of specific empirical methods. When it comes to method, many dialogists would undoubtedly argue that the nature of dialogue necessitates qualitative methods that attempt to account for the multifaceted, dynamic and reflexive properties of specific discourse and their contexts. A cornerstone in the methodological arsenal is sequential analysis, which amounts to saying that no utterance should be analyzed in isolation from the contexts and the sequence in which it is positioned. (Linell, 1998, p. 265)

The identification of the speech roles of participants and the speech functions of their utterances accommodates this orientation towards the reflexive and sequential unfolding nature of the classroom discourse. At the same time, this analysis constitutes “coding practices (that) always involve decontextualizing and abstracting from, and hence disregarding, many properties of the dynamic flow of interaction. It is therefore a conceptually tricky business to code and ‘count’ units in discourse and interaction” (Linell, 1998, p. 265). Nonetheless,

(quantification … is highly desirable too, especially if comparative studies across individuals, groups and situations are to be performed. … it is possible, within certain limits, to conceive of empirical methods of coding and quantification which are derived from, or at least consonant with, a dialogistic theory. … if one still opts for methods that identify and code units, these units should capture aspects of actor’s interactions in their joint discourse, rather than individuals’ acts considered as autonomous entities. The analysts second order constructs should reflect the interlocutors’ first-order constructs as they emerge with the unfolding discourse. (Linell, 1998, pp. 265-266)

This analysis proceeded with knowledge of the conceptual constraints of such a methodological approach pointed out and qualified by Linell, supported by Linell’s (1998) acknowledgement of Halliday’s work as one of the research traditions exploring authentic discourse through which “modern dialogism has received its main impetus” (p. 50).

Quantification was based initially on the instances identified as adoption of the roles of giving and demanding by individual participants. These were recorded to produce tables showing the frequency of instances of each of the four discursive relationships in each class and in total. Also recorded was the frequency of adoption of the roles by individual participants and this data was conflated to produce findings for the NESB and ESB groups of students to permit comparison. The more delicate analysis of each speech function, described below, such as congruent and incongruent realizations of speech functions, and realizations of questions as
WH- or polar interogatives, were also recorded in terms of frequency of instances for individuals and as group frequencies. Responses to the adoptions of the roles of giving and demanding, and any continuations/conclusions of interactions by the initiating participants were similarly identified and quantified. This approach was ultimately extended to quantification of the final level of delicacy of the analysis involving the systems of MODALITY, POLARITY, and COMMENT.

An associated and important aspect of the analysis of the roles and relationships of participants in negotiation of the exchange of information and goods/services involved Berry’s (1981a, 1981b) distinction between primary and secondary knowers/actors in the discourse. In particular, the analysis determined whether the participants involved adopted the roles of giving and demanding as primary or secondary knowers/actors. This proved to be a significant point of distinction in the comparison of the NESB and ESB student participants. How this analysis was additionally sensitised in relation to grammatical realizations of speech functions is clarified later in this section.

3.3.2.1.3 Adoption of the role of giving: Statements and offers

When participants adopted the role of giving, the linguistic unit/s involved functioned either as statements, for the giving of information, or offers, for the giving of goods/services.

3.3.2.1.3.1 Giving information: Statements

Statements were identified firstly by their congruent realization evident in mood element structure characteristic of declarative mood and the tonic pattern associated with unmarked statements (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, pp. 141-142), for example (Note: only tones that marked incongruence were notated in transcription):

L: maybe he’s confident ((1)) and she wants a confident person to go first ((1))
(3.2:2351)

The analysis also noted statements with mood tags, which “serves to signal explicitly that a response is required, and what kind of response it is expected to be” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 109). This was regarded as a significant way in which the validity of propositions was negotiated. Adopting the role of giving to negotiate the exchange of information is congruent with the role of primary knower, and both students and teacher assumed this role in clauses realized as statements giving information. The use of the mood tag is generally regarded as an explicit expression of the certainty of the knower of the validity of the proposition involved.
Not all statements were realized using a grammatically congruent mood element structure. The function of clauses with interrogative mood element structure had to be confirmed by consideration of the type of response the speaker intended to elicit, if any. For example, interrogative clauses were projected in recounts of interaction in the classroom and when referring to questions encountered in the students’ readings. On the basis of the co-textual evidence these and similar instances were not intended to elicit answers but to give information, and thus functioned as statements.

The data contained many instances of ambiguity around the issue of clauses with modulated finites that could be analysed as proposals expressing obligation or inclination, particularly as the teacher offers a great deal of advice and suggestions about future teaching practice in the language classroom, and student expressed their obligations for action in the future. Modalization moves imperative clauses into the INDICATIVE TYPE and thus allows a discretionary response (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 148) as in the instance below:

T: … you should actually study that full/ full thing before/ before Saturday … (1.2: 767-768)

This and similar instances were analysed as statements of information. They could have been analysed as asking for or offering a delayed action (Martin, 1992) but the clause above can be argued with a mood tag, should we?, and was judged to be a proposition rather than a proposal. In addition, there were no instances in the data of undertakings/refusals or acceptances/rejections, so it is argued these functioned as exchanges of information, not services.

3.3.2.1.3.2 Responses to statements

In the polyadic context of classroom interaction, responses to statements were optional and were not regarded as necessary for analysis of a clause as a statement. On the other hand, this was a discursive context in which a statement had the potential to elicit more than one response, as the findings demonstrate. The expected and discretionary responses of acknowledgement and contradiction encompass realizations from the positive polarity of confirmation or agreement on the validity of a proposition, across the options offered by the system of MODALITY to express probability and usuality, to the negative polarity of rejection of the validity of a proposition. The polar mood adjuncts yes and no are identified by Halliday and Matthiessen (2004, p. 144) as functioning as acknowledgements to statements, but they also assert that in performing this function these adjuncts can be analysed as statements giving information. This raised the question of the discursive role of the speaker in responding to a
statement. The apparent conflict is resolved by analysis of responses in the context of dialogue that is unfolding. In this study the information given by responses to statement is interpreted as giving confirmation/disconfirmation of propositions. Thus, they were not analysed as marking any shift in the discursive relationship.

This study is at variance with the position that the statements of participants in the role of primary knower initiate non-negotiated exchanges (Berry, 1981a), an approach predicated on a view that information (meaning?) is transmitted rather than dialogically co-constructed. In the analytical approach of this study, the nature of the proposition as arguable (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) is taken to include the option of the addressee to negotiate with the speaker a mutual or shared understanding through confirmation. In simple terms, this type of negotiation involved establishing agreement or shared understanding between the interactants. In that sense, the acknowledgement is a key discursive element indicative of the active co-construction of meaning in the classroom, of active responsive listening, and the belief on the part of the addressee/s of some shared understanding.

In the context of these considerations, utterances of the addressee/s of statements that did not involve the adoption of the role of giving or demanding, and thus a shift in the discursive relationship, were analysed as responses to statements. A variety of realizations of responses were possible, as illustrated in the instances below:

M: whereas that’s more of a recast [isn’t it
R: [that’s right/ yeah (5.2:1394-1396)

M: if it was explicit you’d be putting up the phonetics on the board=
T: exactly
M: =and saying do you understand the difference between this and this=
R: [yeah/ yeah/ no yeah
T: [yeah
M: =and repeat this after me (5.2:1378-1386)

As noted earlier, this study did not take the analysis to a level of delicacy to attempt to distinguish between the response acknowledgment and the back-channel, “which is used to monitor dialogue, reassuring interlocutors that negotiation is proceeding smoothly” (Martin, 1992, p. 67). In this analysis, the acknowledgement subsumed the back-channel, on the grounds that the back-channel effectively serves a very similar purpose and because similar realizations
as polar adjuncts and paralinguistic items like *mmm*, such as that below, mean distinctions between the two are difficult (Martin, 1992):

\[ T: \ldots \text{what we were talking about was something that could only go on on a one to one basis=} \]

\[ \text{SS: mmm} \]

\[ T: =\text{it's not the sort of thing you can do with a whole class … (5.2:1243-1248)} \]

Responses such as polar mood adjuncts that occurred as part of complex utterances in which the co-text, the other clause/s in the utterance, functioned to give or demand, such as the instance of ESB Student R, below, are examples of shifts in discursive relationships during an utterance:

\[ G: \text{like I think you'd have to be careful with [something like that} \]

\[ R: \text{[like/ yeah/ it’s the way you do it} \]

\[ (5.2:1548-1550) \]

Instances of the shifts in discursive relationship illustrated above can involve the acknowledgement that is then qualified through the use of modal adjuncts or through paratactic adversative or conditional relationships, as in the instance of the relation realized in the adversative adjunct, *but*, below:

\[ T: \ldots \text{you try/ don’t you/ to get them using it outside the (classroom)} \]

\[ O: \text{yeah/ but it depends on the personality of the learners … (2.2:1232-1234)} \]

The analysis of the utterance/s following a statement was not restricted to the identification of expected/discretionary responses and the recording of these in terms of frequency and the participants involved. The options of addressee/s following statements and offers also included the adoption of the roles of giving or demanding. The analysis identified the instances of all options open to the addressee/s as ways students were involved in negotiation as the discourse unfolded.

### 3.3.2.1.3.3 Giving goods/services: Offers

There is no characteristic grammatical expression of the offer of goods/services (Halliday, 1984). Rather, instances are realized in clauses of mood types that function uncharacteristically, i.e., incongruently. Thus analysis of instances of the adoption of the role of giving goods/services realized through clauses with declarative or interrogative mood element structure relied on the identification of the commodity involved and the whether the exchange
involved knowing or acting (Berry, 1981a, 1981b) as well the functions of the surrounding co-
text. Modulation of offers and commands can create ambiguity, such as in the instance below:

T: … you can have one of these each/ take one and pass the others on … (1.2:9)

In the declarative clause, you can have one of these each, the teacher arguably negotiated his
offer to students of the good of a teaching material as primary actor while he carried out the act
of distribution. In this analysis, the expected response would have functioned as an acceptance,
bu
no responses were captured in the recorded data. In an alternative analysis, the clause was
arguably a command demanding students adopt the roles of primary actors, that is, carry out the
action negotiated by taking a copy of the materials, perhaps accompanied by the expected
verbal response, an indication of compliance. This was in fact the function of the second
clause, take one, an imperative. The first clause above was analysed as an offer in this context,
but the difficulties of analysis without the accompanying co-text of verbal responses is clear
from this instance.

In the context of the classroom the concept of offer of a linguistic service (Martin, 1992), that
is, an offer to give information, is especially relevant. This can be realized in clauses with
declarative mood elements, as in the instance of ESB Student L who responded to a demand for
a linguistic service addressed to the teacher, below, and clauses with interrogative mood
elements, such as the teacher’s offer, below, in which the finite, do, was ellipsed:

K: … now/ if you can give me an example/ I can [(read) ((inaudible))]
L: [I’ll give you an example (4.2:1870-
1873)

T: okay/ you want to hear why it’s an easy task ((2))/ for a start
I: yeah
T: yeah/ let/ let’s do that for a start … (1.2:224-228)

Martin’s (1992) concept of offers of linguistic services was expanded to include offers to
receive information. Students sometimes responded to the teacher’s comprehension or
‘satisfaction’ checks, for example, okay ((2)), by adoption of the role of giving, placing the
teacher in the role of receiving information. The status of these utterances as offers was
determined by the responses of student addressees; in some instances students adopted the role
of demanding, placing the teacher in the role of giving on demand. Thus, some of the offers
made by the teacher can also be described as *offers of discursive opportunities* for the adoption by students of the speech roles of demanding and/or giving.

The second utterance of the teacher in the second data extract, above, illustrates another type of offer that functions ambiguously. The use of *let’s*, which can be analysed as “a wayward form of the subject ‘you and I’ … (that) … realizes a suggestion, something that is at the same time both command and offer” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 139), that is, clauses such as this made an offer to the students as well as commanding them to accept it. Co-textual responses functioning to express acceptance or undertaking were vital aspects of the analysis in these cases.

Problematic in the analysis were elliptical clauses that appeared to be teacher demands that checked student comprehension or ‘satisfaction’, for example, *right, alright, okay*, used during and to conclude utterances of the teacher in the role of giving. These typically carried the unmarked intonation pattern of the unmarked *yes/no* interrogative (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, pp. 140-142), used by the teacher to elicit confirmation, for example:

T: … I think probably most of the time you’ll be doing this sort of data gathering which comes from observation/okay ((2)) (2.2:260-261)

Analysis of the co-text revealed that responses included adoption by the addressee/s of the role of giving or demanding, suggesting that these elliptical clauses sometimes functioned in the discourse to offer the addressee/s discursive opportunities to take linguistic action, questioning or stating, as a primary or secondary knower.

### 3.3.2.1.3.4 Responses to offers

Analysis of negotiation of offers, particularly offers made by the teacher, focussed firstly on whether or not the expected/discretionary responses of acceptance/rejection were elicited in the classroom context, where teacher utterances are frequently addressed to the whole class. In instances of responses, it was the participant/s involved and the nature of the negotiation that contributed to the findings. While it was anticipated the negotiation of offers would be, strictly speaking, achieved through expected/ discretionary responses, the analysis was also concerned with instances of shifts in discursive relationships that followed two types of offers identified above, offers of linguistic services and offers of opportunities to take linguistic action. For example, in the instance below, NESB Student B first accepted the offer realized in the
teacher’s ellipsed polar interrogative and then adopted the role of demanding information, demanding missing information in a WH-interrogative embedded in a declarative clause:

T: … anything else that you want to know about the/ what’s happening on Saturday
B: yeah/ I think that I’d like to know what the classrooms/ what equipments will be available in the classroom (1.2:864-867)

The analysis identified instances of this type of response, the participant/s involved, and the function/s of the responses.

3.3.2.1.3.5 Continuation of interaction following adoption of the role of giving
Adoption of the speech role of giving in the classroom was the pre-condition for Discursive Relationships 1 and 4, but the ways students were involved in these differed. In DR1, while it was essential to identify the instances of the teacher’s adoption of the role and the roles of participants as addressees, the responses of students in the role of receiving as the direct/indirect addressee/s was the key focus of the analysis that is presented in the findings in Chapter 4. In DR4 students were involved by definition in the adoption of the role, but also in the role of receiving as direct/indirect addressees, and potentially as respondents. In addition, students who adopted the role of giving and whose statements/offers elicited some utterance/s in response, be it acknowledgement/contradiction, acceptance/rejection, statement, question, offer or command, had options for continuation of their participation in the dialogue. These options were to either conclude their active participation with some sort of acknowledgement of the response or to continue it by resuming the role of giving, adopting the role of demanding, giving on demand, or acknowledging/contradicting. The speech functions of instances of this were in turn analysed and the recorded in terms of functions and individuals involved to contribute to an understanding of ways of involvement in the unfolding discourse by students who adopted the role of giving. The findings presented in Chapter 7 cover all these facets of the ways students were involved in DR4.

3.3.2.1.4 Adoption of the role of demanding: Questions and commands
When participants adopted the role of demanding, the linguistic unit/s involved functioned either as questions, demands for information, or commands, demands for goods/services.

3.3.2.1.4.1 Demanding information: Questions
Participants had several grammatical options for the realization of demands for information, each positioning them in the role of knower in a different way, and each expressing the negotiability of the proposition realized. The analysis began with the Mood types characteristic
of demands for information, WH- and polar interrogatives that functioned as questions. The analysis also identified demands for information expressed in clauses with uncharacteristic declarative and imperative mood structures that functioned incongruently as questions.

The adoption of the role of demanding, as Berry (1981a) notes, does not always enrol the addressee/s as the primary knower/s in the interaction. A characteristic feature of classroom discourse is the pedagogic practice of teachers making demands for information they already have. In doing so they fill the role of delayed primary knower (Berry, 1981a), that is, their knowing is delayed to the utterance following a student response, frequently referred to in the literature on classroom discourse as the feedback or evaluation move of triadic dialogue (Lemke, 1985, 1990; Mehan, 1985). The teacher’s demands for information in particular were analysed to identify the instances when he was in the role of delayed primary knower and when in the role of secondary knower; this preceded the analysis of student responses to determine if the language choices of students were influenced by the knower role they assumed in responding to teacher demands for information. Although there were many instances in the data of adoption by the teacher of the role of delayed primary knower, in this study the analysis and subsequent interpretation of the findings took a more nuanced approach to the positioning of student participants as knowers. This approach is explained at the end of this section on demands for information.

3.3.2.1.4.2 WH-interrogatives

WH-interrogatives were realized as propositions in which missing information was represented by a WH-element, that is, the propositions were essentially incomplete. WH-elements have the potential to function in clauses as Subject, Complement, Adjunct, or to be related to the process (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004), and negotiated an explicit co-construction or co-authoring of propositions with the addressee/s. Instances of the teacher in the role of delayed knower aside, in principle the adoption of the role of demanding in this way signalled an ‘incomplete’ knowing, meaning-making on the part of the participant that required further negotiation of exchange of information. For example, ESB Student J’s demand, below, negotiated the co-construction of a proposition, with the teacher giving the information represented by the WH-element functioning as the complement:

J: what’s the purpose of the time column
T: the time is so that you know roughly what you can/ can line up and/ and you’ll also get some sort of idea of frequency of errors … (5.2:1670-1673)
3.3.2.1.4.3 Polar interrogatives

Polar interrogatives aimed to elicit confirmation of the polarity of propositions from the addressee/s. Unlike WH- interrogatives, these were complete propositions “that can be argued about” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 110). In polar interrogative clauses, the finite element in theme position, for example, in the utterance of ESB Student E, below, foregrounded the arguability of the validity of the propositions:

T: … there’s a sound difference/ but it’s not a/ it’s not a phonemic difference
E: is that similar to certain countries don’t/ oh I don’t know whether they just/ don’t have the sound/ like /vi/ /vi/ and double /yu/
T: yeah/ yeah/ see in/ in French … (4.1:376-382)

In realising propositions as polar interrogatives, speakers signalled their reservations about the validity of propositions and invited addressees to participate in the types of interactive discursive negotiation of meaning Halliday and Matthiessen describe, above. However, while the WH- interrogative is explicitly premised on what the speaker does not know, the polar interrogative positions the speaker as a potential knower testing their knowing or meaning-making; if the validity of the proposition is confirmed, this likewise confirms the position of the participant as a knower.

The analysis also identified polar interrogatives in paratactically related clauses presented as alternatives. These demanded the addressee/s select the valid proposition rather than confirming, or not, the validity of a single proposition, as illustrated in the instance of ESB Student F, below:

F: so is it used just in Australia/ or is it used in other countries as well (1.2:25)

This realization of questions suggested participants were certain of the validity of one of the two propositions, and thus positioned as knowers in a way that was different to the demand for confirmation of a single proposition. Although the speaker still relied on the addressee/s as primary knower/s to identify the valid proposition of the two, in principle this type of question, assuming one of the alternatives is valid, elicited a response that confirmed the participant as a knower. With the single clause positive polar interrogative, on the other hand, the speaker risked rejection of the validity of the proposition, and of their knowing.

Selection of polarity was significant in polar interrogatives. While “the positive contains no suggestion regarding the likely answer, the negative is … a question expecting the answer
‘yes’” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 144) This expectation of confirmation of the validity of the proposition, a significant difference in the certainty of the speaker, suggests positioning of participants as knowers in the interactive relationship that is qualitatively different to that for positive polar interrogatives. For example, in the instance of ESB Student K, below, the negative polarity combines with the falling pitch contour on that, approach, and assignment to realize a high degree of certainty of the validity of the propositions:

K: … don’t you base your case study on that ((1)) =  
T: yep  
K: =in terms of that ((1))/ like reflecting on our development as a second language teacher/ like/ isn’t that a case study approach ((1))/ the second assignment ((1)) (2.2:465-470)

The analysis was also cognizant of what was, in one sense, incongruent functioning of polar interrogatives that nonetheless functioned to demand information. Modulated demands for linguistic services, such as illustrated by the utterance of ESB Student R, below, did not aim to elicit confirmation of polarity but the linguistic service of giving information, confirmed by the addressee/s acceptance of the role of primary knower and giving information on demand:

R: can you give an example of a multiple error  
T: yeah/ multiple error is one where you’ve got/ where you might have a … (5.2:1679-1682)

3.3.2.1.4.4 Declarative clauses functioning as questions

Declarative clauses functioned incongruently as questions when marked by distinctive tonic patterns selected from the system of KEY. Uncertainty about the validity of the proposition introduced in the declarative clause was expressed by tonically prominent pitch movements consistent with either the tentative statement, the reserved statement, or the polar interrogative (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 142). Lime polar interrogatives, these clauses functioned as demands for confirmation of the polarity, that is, of the validity of the clause concerned. The responses that followed confirmed that these clauses functioned as demands, for example, the instance of NESB Student O and the teacher’s response, below:

O: so we can also teach them the grammar ((3))  
T: oh yeah you certainly can … (4.2:1973-1975)
Although this type of incongruent realization of questions negotiated confirmation of validity, the selection the declarative mood was interpreted as an expression of certainty that differed from the positions established in positive and negative polar interrogatives. The selection of the declarative mood suggested the speaker was more committed to the certainty of the validity of the proposition than in the case of positive polar interrogatives, but not as strongly as expressed in the negative polar interrogative (Basturkmen, 1999). This option in the possible realizations of questions thus offered participants another positioning in the discursive relationship as negotiators of meaning and as knowers. However, this was not the full extent of the options open to participants through the incongruent functioning of declarative clauses.

Declarative clauses also functioned as questions demanding confirmation of validity when the pitch movement of a tonically prominent mood tag reversing the polarity of the clause was consistent with one of the three distinctive tones listed above. For example, in the utterance below, ESB Student L made two demands for confirmation of validity realized in declarative clauses; in the second it is the mood tag with rising pitch characteristic of the polar interrogative that signals the function of the clause as a question:

L: and we/ the students here would not be new arrivals through ((3))/ they’d probably be more likely to have been here a little while/ wouldn’t they, ((2)) (1.1:1462-1463)

The certainty attached by speakers to propositions in questions realized in this way was stronger than in untagged incongruent declaratives, but not as strong as that signalled by negative polar interrogatives.

3.3.2.1.4.5 Imperative clauses functioning as questions: demands for linguistic services

The analysis identified demands for information realized grammatically as imperatives. These functioned not as commands to addressee/s to adopt the role of actors to provide goods/services, but incongruently as questions, as demands for the linguistic service (Martin, 1992) of giving information, as illustrated in the instance below:

T: … give me an example of a metalinguistic clue (5.2:1455-1456)

The responses of addressee/s were analysed to confirm this function, evident in the adoption by addressee/s of the role of giving information on demand as knowers, rather than the role actors.
3.3.2.1.4.6 Responses to questions

The varied nature of realizations of demands for information meant the analysis of responses to questions had to address the responses in terms of the type of response demanded. In keeping with the research question, the responses of students to demands from the teacher and other students were the focus of the analysis of this aspect of the negotiation of the exchange of information.

Student responses were analysed in terms of whether they complemented the type of question being answered. In broad terms this meant the provision of missing information or the confirmation of polarity/validity as appropriate. This aspect of the ways students were involved in negotiation included the complexity of responses. Each instance was identified as one of the following: elliptical, a complete clause, a clause complex, or multiple clauses/clause complexes. This allowed identification of instances of, for example, responses that confirmed polarity/validity only in response to a polar interrogative, those that justified, supported or otherwise expanded the clause confirming polarity, and those that did not explicitly confirm (or deny) validity. This analysis provided valuable data for comparison of the ways NESB and ESB students were involved in this type of discursive relationship.

Responses were analysed for selection of mood. Giving information on demand is characteristically realized grammatically using declarative mood. Identification of variations involving uncharacteristic incongruently functioning selections of mood or tonic patterns allowed analysis of students’ certainty of the validity of their answers.

3.3.2.1.4.7 Interpretation of the analysis of exchanges of information

The analysis of speech roles and speech functions and their grammatical realizations permitted some preliminary interpretation of the ways the linguistic choices of students positioned them in the negotiation of the contributions they made to the discourse in the exchange of information. The interpretation does not include giving and demanding information by the teacher as primary knower in which he often delayed his knowing for pedagogic purposes; students did not adopt this role of delayed primary knower. The relationship between mood selection in grammatical realization of speech functions and the commitment of students to propositions, their certainty of validity, as suggested by Basturkmen (1999), and their positions as primary/secondary knowers is shown in Table 3.5. This sensitised the strict analysis of the roles of students conceptualized as primary or secondary knowers when giving or demanding information.

While realization of demands for information as WH-interrogatives were incomplete propositions that demanded addressees participate in co-construction, the various realizations of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech function</th>
<th>Realization</th>
<th>Certainty or commitment</th>
<th>Role as knower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question:</td>
<td>Wh- interrogatives</td>
<td>Certain of polarity</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicits of information</td>
<td>Incongruent imperatives (demands for linguistic services)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question:</td>
<td>Positive polarity polar interrogative</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicits of confirmation</td>
<td>Polar interrogative/incongruent declarative alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incongruent declarative (functioning as question)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tagged incongruent declarative (functioning as question)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative polarity polar interrogative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement:</td>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicits of acknowledgement/ contradiction</td>
<td>Unmarked mood tag statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-5: Commitment or certainty expressed by grammatical realizations of adoption of the speech roles of giving and demanding of information (Developed from Basturkmen, 1999, p. 67).

demands for confirmation were complete propositions, the validity of which the demand functioned to negotiate. The strength of commitment, or degree of certainty of speakers as grammatically realized provided a means of interpreting this aspect of the discursive relationship between knowers. Realizations that expressed stronger certainty were interpreted
as positioning students more strongly as knowers who were seeking confirmation of their knowing as authoritative; these propositions were interpreted as being less open to negotiation.

Realizations that expressed weaker certainty or commitment were interpreted as positioning addressees more explicitly as knowers with the authority to negotiate propositions. Adoption of the role of giving information was consonant with the role of primary knower, and, at the level of choice of mood, signalled speakers were certain of the validity of propositions. More delicate analysis of choices in the systems of MODALITY and COMMENT further sensitised the analysis of participants’ positioning as knowers, but these initial distinctions through selection of mood allowed valuable comparisons to be made between NESB and ESB students.

3.3.2.1.4.8 Demanding goods/services: Commands

In the context of postgraduate classrooms commands served to organise and manage learning, but did not extend to regularization and routinization (Iedema, 1996) of student behaviour as in primary and secondary school classrooms (e.g., Christie, 1991a; Christie, 1991b, 1995; Iedema, 1996). The characteristic grammatical realization of commands is the imperative mood. Some reference has already been made to modulated imperatives that were open to analysis as statements giving information rather functioning as commands, and to analysis of imperative clauses demanding linguistic services that functioned as questions demanding information.

In characteristic imperative clauses the mood element is ellipsed, as illustrated in the instance below:

T: … have a look at the way it’s set out on the second page … (1.2:18)

Imperatives such as this functioned as commands as addressee/s were required to carry out actions in response, and no exchange of information was involved. Commands were also realized incongruently in clauses with declarative mood element structure and in which commands were modulated to express obligations of addressee/s to carry out actions in response. In the instance below, for example, obligation was expressed subjectively in the finite of a projecting clause, want, and the subject was the teacher, I, not the addressees, the primary actors who were to carry out the action.

T: … what I want you to do is to spend a little bit of time now perhaps just preparing a/ a lesson/ just jot it down … (2.2:1567-1569)
Analysis of commands included instances of the use of let’s, referred to in analysis of offers. As noted, let’s “realizes a suggestion, something that is at the same time both command and offer” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 139). That is, clauses such as that below made an offer to the students as well as commanding them to accept it:

T: … let’s say it’s a/ it’s an error which has been caused by/ by a habit which has come across from the/ from the first language … (5.1:328-329)

As noted in analysis of offers, any co-textual responses functioning to express undertakings, suggesting the function of command, or acceptances, suggesting an offer, were vital aspects of the analysis in such cases.

3.3.2.1.4.9 Responses to commands

As demands for action rather than information, responses to commands were not necessarily realized verbally. The distinction between negotiation of action achieved by commands and negotiation of meaning suggests responses to commands had limited relevance in answering the research question. In the context of classrooms, where teacher commands are largely addressed to the whole class, individual students were perhaps less likely to make expected verbal responses of undertaking, instead simply acting as appropriate. The discretionary response of refusal would attract some analytical attention if negotiated verbally, as would responses that involved adoption by addressees of the roles of giving or demanding to negotiate meanings of the commands or actions to be taken. Thus, analysis of responses to commands focussed first on whether addressees responded verbally at all, and second on whether responses were expected, discretionary, or involved a shift in discursive relationships.

3.3.2.1.4.10 Continuation of interaction following adoption of the role of demanding

Adoption of the speech role of demanding in the classroom was the pre-condition for Discursive Relationships 2 and 3, but the ways students were involved in these differed. In DR2, while it was essential to identify instances of the teacher’s adoption of the role and the roles of participants as addressees, responses of students in the role of giving on demand as the direct/indirect addressee/s were the key focus of analysis presented as findings in Chapter 5. In DR3 students were involved by definition in adoption of the role of demanding, but also in the role of giving on demand as direct/indirect addressees, and potentially as respondents. In addition, students who adopted the role of demanding and whose questions/commands elicited utterance/s in response, be it answer/disclaimer, undertaking/refusal, statement, question, offer or command, had options for continuation of their participation in the dialogue. These options were to either conclude active participation with some sort of acknowledgement of the response
or to continue by resuming the role of demanding, adopting the role of giving, or giving on demand. The speech functions of instances of this were in turn analysed and recorded in terms of functions and individuals involved to contribute to an understanding of ways of involvement in the unfolding discourse by students who adopted the role of demanding. Findings presented in Chapter 6 cover these facets of ways students were involved in DR3.

3.3.2.1.4.11 Recording the findings of the analysis of adoption of the roles of giving and demanding

Instances identified as adoption of the roles of giving and demanding by individual participants were recorded to produce tables showing frequencies of instances of each of the four discursive relationships in each class and in total. Also recorded was frequency of adoption of the roles by individual participants and these data were conflated to produce findings for the NESB and ESB groups of students to permit comparison. More delicate analyses of each speech function as described above, aspects such as congruent and incongruent realizations of speech functions, and realizations of questions as WH- or polar interrogatives, were also recorded in terms of frequencies of instances for individuals and then as group frequencies.

3.3.2.1.5 MODALITY, mood Adjuncts, and comment Adjuncts

3.3.2.1.5.1 MODALITY

In propositions that relied on the resources of POLARITY, students were able to express positions in relation to propositions in terms of, to put it simply, *is* or *isn’t*. However, when students chose to draw on resources of MODALITY they were able to express a range of intermediate positions between positive and negative poles (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) on validity of propositions or modulated proposals they contributed to the dialogue. This was the case both in adoption of the roles of giving and demanding, and in responses to propositions of other participants. “Modality is an expression of the speaker’s opinion” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 147), and this in itself signalled negotiability of propositions. However selections made within the system enable, in addition, expression of degrees of probability or certainty that speakers attach to propositions and hence their levels of commitment to them. This in turn signalled negotiability of meanings. Modulation of proposals shifts mood selection into the indicative and allows all clauses involved to be considered in terms of propositional validity.

3.3.2.1.5.2 Finite modal operators

Analysis focussed first on use by students of finite modal operators (Table 3.6, below) to express probability/usuality in propositions and obligation/inclination in proposals.
Finite modal operators were analysed as implicit introduction of speakers’ “own judgement on the validity of the proposition” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) and thus a subjective, rather than objective, expression of meaning. The degree of attachment of speakers to the subjectivity was analysed more delicately in terms of the value of finite modal operators selected, with low value suggesting the greatest willingness to negotiate validity.

### 3.3.2.1.5.3 Mood Adjuncts

Analysis also looked at another option open to speakers, the system of mood Adjuncts, in particular mood Adjuncts of modality and intensity and comment Adjuncts. Mood Adjuncts of modality (Table 3.7, below) offered additional resources for expression of probability and usuality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Outer: high</th>
<th>Outer: low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>probably</td>
<td>certainly, definitely; no way (no how)</td>
<td>possibly, perhaps, maybe; hardly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usuality</th>
<th>usually</th>
<th>always, never</th>
<th>sometimes, occasionally, seldom, rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 3-7: Adverbs serving as mood Adjuncts of modality (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 128)

Again, expression of probability or usuality signalled speakers accepted propositions were open to negotiation, to degrees expressed by the selection from median or outer options, illustrated in the instance of ESB Student L, below:
L: over eight weeks that’s probably where’d they be happier (1.1:1001)

By moving modality out of the finite and the mood element, which is the arguable element of propositions and on which validity rests, speakers who selected this option to express their opinion implicitly objectified their evaluation (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, pp. 149-150) and so distanced themselves from any negotiation of validity argued by the mood element.

Mood Adjuncts of intensity (Table 3.8, below) functioned similarly, allowing speakers to express a range of judgements on propositions while positioning themselves more objectively in relation to the validity of propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>totally, utterly, entirely, completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>quite, almost, nearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>low</td>
<td>scarcely, hardly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-expectancy</td>
<td>exceeding</td>
<td>even, actually, really, in fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>limiting</td>
<td>just, simply, merely, only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-8: Adverbs serving as mood Adjuncts of intensity (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 129)

3.3.2.1.5.4 Interpersonal metaphor

Interpersonal metaphor was another aspect of modality that allowed participants to express evaluations of validity of propositions, both their own propositions and in responses to those of other participants. In this language choice projecting mental clauses served as modal adjuncts to modalize propositions and allow speakers to express propositions as subjective rather than objective, as in the example of ESB Student E, below:

E: I think/ anyway/ for Australian society/ no-one pronounces everything the same anyway/ like (1.1:1277-1278)

Analysis of this language choice provided insight into ways students used the system of modality to express certainty of and commitment to propositions, and ways this realized negotiation of validity of propositions in the roles of giving and demanding and as respondents.
3.3.2.1.5.5 Orientation

The resources of modality allow speakers to position themselves and addressees in relation to propositions either subjectively or objectively, essentially, whether the speaker is the source of the opinion or not. These two options can be stated explicitly or implicitly. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) illustrate this principle of orientation of the speaker with the examples in Table 3.9, below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>subjective</th>
<th>objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>implicit</td>
<td>that must be true</td>
<td>that’s certainly true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explicit</td>
<td>I’m certain that is true</td>
<td>it is certain that is true</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-9: Examples of orientation (based on Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, pp. 149-150)

3.3.2.1.5.6 Comment Adjuncts

Comment Adjuncts (see Table 3.10, below) offered speakers options to comment on propositions, as in the example of ESB Student E, below, on the subjects of clauses, or to express the perspectives of speaker or seek that of addressees:

E: apparently that’s an Australian thing though (3.2:1696)

These Adjuncts positioned speakers across a spectrum of commitment in relation to the propositions they contributed, moderating the association of speakers with validity of propositions by drawing attention to their own attitudes toward propositions, or demanding information about attitudes of addressees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type</th>
<th>on whole</th>
<th>asseverative</th>
<th>examples of adverbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>propositional</td>
<td>on whole</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>naturally, inevitably, of course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>obvious</td>
<td>obviously, clearly, plainly, of course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sure</td>
<td>doubtless, indubitably, no doubt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualitative</td>
<td>prediction</td>
<td>predictable</td>
<td>unsurprisingly, predictably, to no one’s surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>surprising</td>
<td>surprisingly, unexpectedly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presumption</td>
<td>hearsay</td>
<td>evidently</td>
<td>evidently, allegedly, supposedly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>argument</td>
<td>arguably</td>
<td>arguably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>guess</td>
<td>presumably</td>
<td>presumably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desirability</td>
<td>desirable</td>
<td>luckily</td>
<td>luckily, fortunately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hope</td>
<td>hopefully</td>
<td>hopefully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>undesirable</td>
<td>sadly</td>
<td>sadly, unfortunately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on Subject</td>
<td>wisdom</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>wisely, cleverly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>foolishly, stupidly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morality</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>rightly</td>
<td>rightly, correctly, justifiably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>wrongly</td>
<td>wrongly, unjustifiably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speech-functional</td>
<td>unqualified</td>
<td>persuasive</td>
<td>assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assurenace</td>
<td>truly, honestly, seriously (+ tone 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>concession</td>
<td>admittedly, certainly, to be sure (+tone 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>factual</td>
<td>actually, really, in fact, as a matter of fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualified</td>
<td>validity</td>
<td>generally</td>
<td>generally, broadly, roughly, ordinarily, by and large, on the whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal engagement</td>
<td>honesty</td>
<td>frankly</td>
<td>frankly, candidly, honestly, to be honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secrecy</td>
<td>confidentially</td>
<td>confidentially, between you and me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>individuality</td>
<td>personally</td>
<td>personally, for my part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accuracy</td>
<td>truly</td>
<td>truly, strictly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hesitancy</td>
<td>tentatively</td>
<td>tentatively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-10: Examples of adverbs serving as comment Adjunct (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 130).
3.3.2.2 The contexts of giving and demanding and addressee/s

Two important aspects of analysis of ways students were involved in negotiation remain to be elucidated: discursive contexts of adoptions of the roles of giving and demanding and of responding to other participants; and addressees of student utterances, as well as the situations in which students responded to utterances of others, whether as direct or indirect addressees or through self-selection.

Discursive contexts of the adoption of discursive roles were the discursive relationships of interactants in the co-text immediately preceding the initiating utterance. This allowed identification of any regularities in the discursive circumstances of adoption of speech roles by individuals or groups.

Analysis included identification of addressees of utterances of the teacher and students. This permitted findings to be generated on interactions between the teacher and the whole class, the teacher and individual students, and between students. The last was of particular interest in terms of interaction between NESB and ESB students. In some instances, identification of addressees was possible in the subject/s of clauses or because of the use of vocatives. In some instances co-texts were used, in particular previous speakers (Linell, 1998), to provide some analytical direction in terms of addressees. Co-texts, that is, respondent/s to utterances, were also used to confirm analysis of addressee/s. Analysis of addressee of student utterances was relatively straightforward. Teacher utterances were more problematic.

Responses of individual students were analysed in terms of their status as addressees. As noted earlier in this section, when the teacher or another student adopted the roles of giving and demanding, initiating utterances were directly addressed to individuals or to the whole class. When individuals, for example, the teacher or a student, were direct addressees, the remaining participants were considered to be indirect addressees (Linell, 1998). Responses were analysed as one of the following: responding as direct addressee; responding as indirect addressee, that is, another individual, the teacher or a student was analysed as the direct addressee; and instances of self-selection when the class was directly addressed as whole.
3.4 Opportunities for learning

Chapter 2 included a discussion of the concept of dialogic learning and in this section discursive indicators of opportunities for dialogic learning are identified.

The intention to identify opportunities for learning stemmed, first, from recognition of the difficulties inherent in attempting to produce measures of learning that can be directly and validly linked to classroom interactions. Dysthe (1999), working from a dialogic conception of teaching and learning, developed the concept of learning ‘potential’ because

(m)easuring the growth in understanding and conceptual changes in individual students as a result of interaction is very complex at best and most likely impossible. Besides, each participant in an interaction will have a different learning experience. (Dysthe, 1999, p. 50)

Second, the intention stemmed from the interpersonal analysis that was undertaken to produce findings presented in Chapters 4-7. Analysis of spoken classroom data brings to light dialogic processes that are involved in the types of learning that were outlined in Chapter 2. Learning was associated with tensions between voices articulating discourses, and that was postulated to operate in classroom interactions of participants with unfolding classroom dialogue at two levels – in dialogue with evolving internally persuasive discourses and in negotiation of authoritative dialogical discourse. Dysthe (1999) suggests that is “possible to analyse both the interactional patterns and the development of the content, and on the basis of this to make assertions about the learning potential in the particular activity” (p. 50).

Analysis conducted in the current study did not include ideational and textual analysis of the data. The content and organisation of discursive text would reveal much about the development of ideas, but the focus of this study was the interpersonal to enable description and interpretation of the ways students were involved in negotiation of meaning. However, interactional patterns can be interpreted in terms that identify discursive practices that can be associated with opportunities for learning potential. In other words, interpretation of findings will consider the practices of students that could open the way, contingent upon the content of utterances, for what is considered dialogic learning. To this end, the question of opportunities for learning was approached through theorisation on the basis of findings rather than analysis of the transcripts and particular instances of negotiation.
Two key questions that capture the dialogic relation of voices in negotiation of unfolding discursive text guided theorisation about opportunities for dialogic learning in the selected classroom. How did the social world of the classroom influence students? How did students influence the social world of the classroom? Learning, in dialogic conceptions, rests in social interactions that negotiate tensions that emerge in and through diversity of voices (Freedman & Ball, 2004) and that have the potential to be mutually transformative. The framework of discursive relationships that directed analysis produced descriptions of classroom social interactions and the ways tensions were negotiated. Regularities were identifiable both in the ways interactions unfolded and in the ways individuals and groups participated, and it was to these regularities attention was directed. Participation of students falls into two broad classes that reflect the two questions above. Students spoke and students listened. The significance for opportunities for learning was in the ways students were involved in these two types of participation.

When students spoke they acknowledged, gave information on demand, demanded information, and gave information. These ways of participation need to be interpreted in terms of:

- The opportunities they offered for the voices of participants to be appropriated in the unfolding of an authoritative dialogical discourse. This hinged on the roles played by students as knowers when they contributed.
- The participants involved and who they responded to or addressed.
- The ways participants negotiated meanings emergent in the co-text of the interaction.
- The language selections of participants in positioning themselves as knowers or voices of authority.
- The patterns of participation in negotiation, for example, participation in sequences of interaction, frequency of participation, and regularity of participation.

When students listened they received information, and this way of participation needs to be interpreted in terms of:

- The voices that were heard, the diversity of those voices, and the roles those voices played as knowers.
- The nature of the discursive text that unfolded in the classroom, that is, was the discursive text authoritarian monologic discourse or a negotiated authoritative dialogical discourse. Other participants who demanded or gave potentially generated tensions that
listeners experienced in relations between their internal discourse and the unfolding classroom discourse.

- The evidence that listening was actively responsive, demonstrated by participation as a speaker; in this study this evidence relies on findings that had some limitations that might be significant for this point, for example. Self talk and peripheral dialogues.
- The evidence that listening was silent responsive understanding, demonstrated by delayed spoken responses.

Theorisation on the basis of findings will encompass the significance of the above for the role played by individuals in potential opportunities for their own learning and the dialogic relations of this with opportunities for other classroom participants.

In summary, in this Chapter a complete and detailed description of the methods of data source selection, collection, and analysis has been presented. The analysis as outlined will allow all the elements of the research question as identified in Chapter 1 to be addressed. In the four Chapters that follow, findings of analysis of data that were collected, analysed, and interpreted as outlined in this chapter are presented for each of the four Discursive Relationships in turn.
CHAPTER 4

4 DISCURSIVE RELATIONSHIP 1 - STUDENTS IN THE ROLE OF RECEIVING

In this Chapter, findings are presented of ways students in the selected internationalised classroom are involved in negotiation of meanings when in the speech role of receiving.

Discursive Relationship 1 (DR1) is characterised by adoption of the speech role of giving by the teacher, casting direct and/or indirect addressees - student participants in the interaction - in the speech role of receiving. Adoption of the speech role of giving is initiated by the teacher and not in response to a demand from student participants. Analysis of the transcribed data found NESB and ESB student groups, and individuals within the two groups, differed in ways and the extent they responded in the speech role of receiving, specifically:

- acknowledging/contradicting utterances directly or indirectly addressed to them by the teacher in the role of giving; and
- responding in ways that shifted the discourse to other discursive relationships.

4.1 Students in the role of receiving

Ways students were involved in receiving were shaped by statements and offers of the teacher, commodities involved, by address of the statements and offers to the class or to individual students, and by the teacher-student relationship in which the teacher, as expert, negotiated meaning in this discursive relationship from the position of primary knower.

4.1.1 The teacher gives: teacher statements and offers

Student contributions in this discursive relationship were contingent upon the teacher’s adoption of the role of giving, but findings of instances of the teacher adopting the role (Figure 4.1) convey neither the variation in complexity and duration of utterances of the teacher, nor the frequency of student responses.
Although there were well over 500 instances analysed as adoption of the role of giving by the teacher, the number of expected/discretionary responses of students numbered far fewer. To some extent, this may reflect the limitations of the verbal data and their collection; there was potential for students’ acknowledgement of teacher utterances to be non-verbal, and much of the verbal data that were analysed consisted of overlapping or simultaneous student utterances that precluded identification of individuals. Analysis of the data to identify the teacher’s adoption of the role of giving was at times problematic as well. In particular, some intra-utterance shifts by the teacher between the role of giving to students on demand, that is, answers to students’ questions, and the role of giving in DR1 generated analytical uncertainties. Also, the teacher’s adoption of the role of demanding, seemingly for pedagogic purposes, without necessarily intending to elicit a student response and proceeding to give the information himself, complicated the analysis and perhaps distorted the numbers of instances given in Figure 4.1. Thus, findings of the analysis of ways students were involved in negotiations of meanings in DR1 that follow are necessarily constrained by limitations of the data and analytical judgements made by the researcher.

### 4.1.1.1 Mood selection and commodities exchanged

When the teacher adopted the role of giving he contributed utterances to the discourse that varied in complexity and selection of individual clause Mood structure. Unlike the teacher’s demands which were generally realized in single clauses, or in a limited number of instances in two or three clauses, the teacher’s utterances in DR1 varied from single clauses to lengthy and
complex utterances, some of several minutes duration. Selections for Mood functioned congruently, in most cases, to either offer goods/services or to give information.

4.1.1.1 Giving information

Clauses in teacher utterances in DR1 were typically propositions functioning as statements giving information in the role of primary knower and realized congruently as clauses with declarative mood structure. Thus student utterances of major interest are expected responses of acknowledgement or discretionary response of contradiction, as in the following instance of acknowledgement:

T: … if you can arrange to/ to have a colleague who can sometimes come into your classroom/ just to give you feedback/ it does a couple of things which are really important/ it improves collegiality
SS: yeah (2.2:890-894)

When he was giving information the teacher regularly added mood tags in which the sequence and polarity of clause mood elements were reversed, an explicit elicitation of acknowledgement (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 109) from students, for example:

T: … it’s basically kind of throwing you in the deep end/ isn’t it/ in many instances
K: yes
T: yes/ but you’re all teachers so … (2.2:22-27)

Exceptions to this function of mood tags involved rising pitch typical of unmarked yes/no interrogatives or non-reversal of polarity. These were analysed as instances of teacher demands and are discussed in Chapter 5.

There were not infrequent marked departures from use of declarative mood structure in some clauses that functioned as statements. Clauses with polar and WH- interrogative structures functioned incongruently to give information in projected clauses and as clause expansions. Instances involved elaboration of content or assessment matters, or suggested questions students could themselves pose to themselves or in their interactions with language learners. For example, in the instances below, the responses expected by the teacher were acknowledgements, not missing information or confirmation:

T: … that’s the two types of needs that we’re going to be looking at/ that’s the objective needs/ what language/ how do we specify the language that we’re going to
teach/ and subjective needs/ ah/ how do we decide how we’re going to teach it/ that/ that language … (1.1:65-68)

T: yeah/ you’re absolutely right Erica/ that’s/ that’s the/ that’s exactly the problem that we’ve got/ that’s actually transcribing the difference/ how do you transcribe the difference … (5.1:143-145)

T: … you just talk to them about/ about their reading habits/ do you read [the newspaper/ do you= R: [a newspaper T: =yeah/ do/ you know/ do you read books/ what sort of books do you read in English/ would you like to/ what/ what would you like to be able to read as a result of this course/ and so on (1.2:329-336)

Other language choices of the teacher positioned students in relation to propositions. Choice of either polarity was not important in itself except in instances of contradiction, but expressed certainty and the teacher’s role as primary knower. The teacher also used resources of modality, including interpersonal metaphor, to negotiate his role as primary knower. For instance, in the utterance below, the teacher’s role as knower was negotiated by the use of interpersonal metaphor, I thought and I think, and ESB Student R contradicted, then positioned herself in the same way:

T: no/ it’s not a phonological repair/ is it/ it’s a/ it’s a/ it’s a syntactic repair/ it’s likely/ not/ now I have to say I agree with Lyster there because it passed me by/ I thought that it was not so much a focus on the/ on a grammatical issue/ but I think she was/ I thought she was just getting her making sure she heard it correctly
R: no/ I didn’t/ I thought she was pronunc… (5.2:2041-2046)

The data also contained many instances of the teacher’s projection of propositions through verbal and mental processes. This allowed attribution of propositions to participants (the teacher and/or the students) as well as to outsiders, which in this classroom included authorities in the field and texts prescribed for reading, among others. This permitted the teacher to position himself subjectively or objectively in relation to propositions.

Projection and modality allowed the teacher to align himself subjectively with an idea, or to distance himself as objective, and to indicate certainty of or commitment to validity of propositions. This served equally to position students and to complexify discursive relationships between teacher and students as knowers and negotiators of meaning.
4.1.1.1.2 Offers of goods/services

4.1.1.1.3 Offers of services

The teacher offered students *linguistic services*, defined by Martin (1992) as commands or offers to exchange the commodity of information. This concept is expanded here to refer to offers to *give information on demand* and to *receive information*. The instances included in this section show that there were several distinct realizations of teacher offers of this kind and that the status of utterances as offers was sometimes determined by the responses of student addressee/s. In some instances that did function as offers, the speech role/s of the teacher in the subsequent interaction of giving on demand, or receiving, or both, was determined by student responses to the offer. Thus, some of the offers made by the teacher can also be described as *offers of discursive opportunities* for the adoption by students of the speech roles of demanding and/or giving. When students accepted offers of this kind, the discursive roles of the participants were no longer those of DR1.

These offers were realised in three distinct ways. First, in some instances the teacher made explicit offers to give information on demand. For example, in the instance below, NESB Student B first accepted the offer of a discursive opportunity realized in the teacher’s elliptical polar interrogative and then realized a demand for missing information in a WH- interrogative embedded in a projected declarative clause:

T: … anything else that you want to know about the/ what’s happening on Saturday  
B: yeah/ I think that I’d like to know what the classrooms/ what equipments will be available in the classroom  
T: ah/ now that varies/ as you know/ now standard equipment is … (1.2:864-869)

Student B’s demand for information meant the teacher’s response involved giving the missing information on demand, typical of the discourse roles of Discursive Relationship 3 (DR3). These were offers of a linguistic service, to give information on demand.

A second type of offer involved elliptical clauses, problematic in the analysis because they also had potential to function as teacher demands that checked student comprehension or ‘satisfaction’, for example, right, alright, okay. These were used during and to conclude utterances of the teacher in the role of giving and typically carried the unmarked intonation pattern of unmarked *yes/no* interrogatives (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, pp. 140-142) that function to elicit confirmation, for example:
T: … I think probably most of the time you’ll be doing this sort of data gathering which comes from observation/ okay (2)) (2.2:260-261)

T: … because we’ve taught them the language to talk about the language/ alright (2)) (4.1:1021-1022)

The majority of these elliptical clauses associated with DR1 (over 150 throughout the data) elicited no recorded verbal response, although the teacher may have been aware of responses not captured or of non-verbal responses. These instances were analysed as demands and instances of shifts to Discursive Relationship 2 (DR2). Of interest are the more than 40 instances where the co-text that followed (that is, the student responses) suggest the clauses functioned as offers to students of discursive opportunities to adopt the roles of giving or demanding. For example, in the instance below, NESB Student O accepted the discursive opportunity and adopted the role of demanding, initiating a shift to DR2; the teacher adopted the role of giving on demand and confirmed Student O’s proposition:

T: that’s the problem/ that’s the problem/ you’ve got to remember this/ okay (2))
O: do we have to do/ with the Chinese learners/ do this
T: broadly/ broadly/ I think it’d be a good exercise for you to do it/ yeah/ yeah (1.2:184-189)

Chapters 6 and 7 include the finding that acceptance by NESB students of these offers of linguistic services, or opportunities to adopt the roles of demanding/giving, was one of the discursive practices that distinguished the two groups of students.

A third type of offer to students of linguistic services, giving information, did not offer discursive opportunities or involve a shift in discursive relationships, merely acceptance of the offer. In the sequence, below, the first teacher utterance is an instance of an offer of linguistic services, but the second teacher utterance illustrates a type of analytically ambiguous offer found in the data. It is characterised by the use of let’s, which can be analysed as “a wayward form of the subject ‘you and I’ … (that) … realizes a suggestion, something that is at the same time both command and offer” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 139):

T: okay / you want to hear why it’s an easy task / for a start
I: yeah
T: yeah/ let/ let’s do that for a start … (1.2:224-228)
Instances such as the above, and the additional two included below, involved students in DR1 in a distinctly different way, making an offer to the students as well as commanding them to accept it.

C: so we have to deal with cohesion and coherence
T: you will/ but let’s/ let’s not race into that just yet/ let’s/ let’s keep on pursuing this one (1.1:1844-1846)

T: … let’s say it’s a/ it’s an error which has been caused by/ by a habit which has come across from the/ from the first language … (5.1:328-329)

‘Suggestions’ such as these, managing and regulating the interaction, were offered regularly throughout the data and have been included in Chapter 5 findings as demands. Perhaps more significantly, there were no instances of verbal realization of acceptances, and no refusals. Thus as ways of verbal negotiation by students these ‘offers’ were not open to an analysis of student involvement.

4.1.1.4 Offers of goods

In this classroom, there were isolated instances, two in total, of the teacher offering students goods. The distribution of teaching/learning materials was accomplished linguistically with a combination of offers and commands, as in the following, where a clause with declarative Mood structure functioned as an offer:

T: … ASLPR stood for the Australian second language proficiency rating scale but basically it’s the same scale and/ you can have one of these each/ take one and pass the others on/ now that one/ you’ll notice that … (1.2:7-10)

No student responses were captured by the data collection. This and the limited number of offers of this type meant that what is sometimes an important aspect of regulative discourse in classrooms in schools (Christie, 1995) was not regarded as a significant aspect of negotiation of meaning in the postgraduate classroom.

In summary, when the teacher adopted the speech role of giving, propositions were realized in clauses that functioned, with limited exceptions, as statements. The exceptions were offers, primarily of linguistic services, some of which entailed a shift by respondents from DR1. Thus, the commodity exchanged was almost exclusively information. This positioned the teacher as primary knower, although selections in the systems of POLARITY and MODALITY, and use of projection and interpersonal metaphor, negotiated validity of propositions. This nuanced
students’ relationships with the teacher as knowers, and the positions offered them as respondents.

4.1.1.2 Discursive contexts of students receiving

In the unfolding of classroom interaction, the discursive context of DR1 and the addressees of teacher utterances shaped the student contributions. The expected/discretionary student responses that were elicited by teacher utterances in DR1, acknowledgement/contradiction of statements and acceptance/rejection of offers, were realized in brief and highly elliptical utterances. Consequently, the data analysed as constituting the verbal interaction of DR1 is primarily teacher utterances.

At its most fundamental, interaction in DR1 consisted of a single clause teacher and no student response. In the example below, J was concluding a response to a teacher demand, which the teacher acknowledged, *okay*, and then adopted the role of giving, *we’re getting in to a bit more complexity here*, before resuming the role of demanding in the two polar interrogatives that follow. There was no discursive opening for any student acknowledgement/contradiction of the proposition and no use of a tag by the teacher to elicit one:

J: … or you can discuss it or you can negotiate it
T: okay/ now/ now/ we’re getting into a bit more complexity here/ now/ is it justified/ is it justified with plurals/ is the plural system that complex
R: it’s not that complex but … (5.2: 2251-2257)

Moves by the teacher from the role of giving to the role of demanding occurred frequently in teacher utterances of all durations, not just the briefest as above. In one instance (2.2:972-1059), a teacher utterance of over four minutes duration, although punctuated by two or three acknowledgements, concluded with the teacher’s adoption of the role of demanding. In many instances, students responded while the teacher was speaking; acknowledgements overlapped or were simultaneous with the utterance of the teacher. In other instances, such as that below, where there was a discursive opening for acknowledgement, the teacher sustained the speech role of giving and continued with what was arguably an expansion of the complex utterance preceding the student response:

T: … you need the opportunity to turn that input into comprehensible input because often the input isn’t comprehensible so
SS: mmmm/that’s true/yeah
T: yeah/ yeah/ and in/ and in fact … (3.1:192-198)
Expected responses were more likely to occur during a teacher utterance than at the end because the teacher managed the interaction, moving into the role of demanding to elicit student utterances. Discretionary responses during an utterance would more than likely have been acknowledged by the teacher and addressed, whereas expected responses permitted him to continue uninterrupted. However, there were very few discretionary responses that directly contradicted the propositional content of teacher utterances.

Thus, while there were few instances in DR2 of teacher demands addressed to the whole class which did not elicit a student response, student responses in DR1 were not explicitly elicited and therefore unpredictable. While the discourse could not satisfactorily proceed without some resolution if a teacher demand went unanswered or ignored by all the participants, the same was not true of teacher utterances in DR1. The findings in this respect are again constrained by the reliance on verbal data; the propensity for verbal back-channelling varied between students, arguably because some relied more on non-verbal signals. Thus, the address of a teacher utterance in DR1 to the whole class or to an individual student, as well as the use of mood tags, undoubtedly directly influenced the involvement of students but the limitations of verbal data constrain the findings about how the two groups of students or individuals negotiated the meanings proposed by the teacher.

4.1.1.3 Addressees

Addressees of the teacher in the role of giving reflected the primary social roles of teacher and students in whole-of-class interaction. In this situation, teachers probably aim to direct their other-orientation from student to student in turn. However, Linell (1998) suggests there is a tendency in multi-party interactions for speakers to select or ‘target’ one individual as addressee, probably the previous speaker. However, even if this is the case, all participants are addressees, be it direct or indirect, in classroom interactions. These complexities are not the focus in this section. Utterances that were explicitly directly addressed to individual students or groups within the class are of interest. Student responses to the teacher’s utterances in these instances shed light on the circumstances of student involvement in negotiation. Utterances were addressed to students in the context of whole-of-class interaction and during student’s reporting of their teaching practicum.

In total, the teacher explicitly addressed eight utterances to NESB students and three to ESB students when those students were not the previous speakers. All other instances of the teacher in the role of giving directly addressing individual students were initiated by students in the role
of giving. That is, the student as previous speaker addressed the teacher and the teacher replied in the role of giving. Thus the teacher in the role of giving created very few opportunities for individual students to adopt a speech role and participate in the interaction. What he did do was give students opportunities to resume the role of giving to continue their participation. Findings presented in Chapter 7 discuss these sequences of interaction. Offers by the teacher of discursive opportunities in the role of giving were discussed earlier in this Chapter, but they were not addressed to individuals.

The teacher used vocatives to directly address students in all but one instance. Discursive opportunities such as this were not so important for the participation of the ESB students involved; Students J and L were active participants without assistance from the teacher. The same was not true for the NESB students. However, those addressed happen to be the three students in their second semester of study, Students O, B, and C. This fact is behind the attention of the teacher who refers to their experiences in his statements. For example:

T: … what we ought to be doing is all the time trying to work out how it can apply to those/ to people/ people who are teaching (that)/ now I know Olivia did a/ you you/ you try/ don’t you/ to get them using it outside the
O: yeah/ but it depends on the personality of the learners/ if they are very outgoing they will use the language outside the classroom= (2.2:1230-1235)

These three students were found to be among the most active NESB participants and their semester of experience and instances of teacher address such as above arguably contributed to this.

Five additional opportunities were directed to some or all of the NESB students as a group. Two were taken up by, one by NESB Student Y, who adopted the role of demanding, and the other by NESB Student I, who adopted the role of giving. You guys, referred to three students teaching Mandarin in the teaching practicum. :

T: …don’t worry/ the first lesson isn’t a big problem for you guys because you do/ you do have something to give them
I: because I haven’t taught Chinese before
T: you haven’t what have you taught
I: I teach/ I teach English in my country (1.2:712-719)

The practicum reporting context, analyzed in detail in Chapter 5, involved students giving on demand. However it was the context for sequences of dyadic interaction between the teacher
and individual students in which the teacher often shifted between the roles of demanding and giving as he responded to the students’ reports. These were instances of the teacher directly addressing individual students in the role of giving. In all instances the student addressed was the previous speaker.

Although the interaction proceeded with few student acknowledgements or instances of back-channelling when the teacher addressed the whole class, this contrasted with the practice of some students who were direct addressees of a teacher statement during practicum reporting. In these circumstances, there were instances of numerous acknowledgements during a single teacher utterance as the student addressee acknowledged through back-channelling to indicate their active listening and meaning-making, such as in the instance below in which the teacher directly addressed NESB Student B:

T: see I/ I/ I kind of agree with you/ I/ I think that if/ if they’re doing it there’s no need to ask them what they learned=

B: yeah

T: =you know/ you can work that out/ you can work that out and if they can’t do/ it
doesn’t matter if they say/ oh/ we/ today we learned to make a shopping list=

B: mhmm

T: =if they can’t do a shopping list=

B: yeah

T: =it’s/ it’s/ there’s no point in that/ you /you as a teacher would be/ would be much more interested in having a look at their shopping list=

B: yeah

T: =to see if they can do a shopping list

B: exactly/ yeah/ I mean the last phase where … (4.2:485-506)

Findings in Chapter 5 provide more details of the practicum reporting. It was difficult to compare the interaction of the two groups of students as not all students reported in the lessons in which data were collected, and more ESB students reported, some twice, than was the case for NESB students. Nonetheless, the teacher in the role of giving addressed statements to students during their reporting, but as part of dyadic sequences in which the student was the previous addressee.

4.1.1.4 Relationships as knowers

Findings in this and subsequent Chapters show negotiations in the selected classroom revolved around exchange of the commodity of information. In a postgraduate coursework classroom,
this orientation is understandable. Although findings in this Chapter and Chapter 5 include ways the teacher used language to negotiate actions in management of classroom learning, the interest for this study is the interaction of participants as knowers negotiating exchanges of information.

The adoption of the role of giving positioned the teacher as primary knower in his discursive relationships with the students, although this was nuanced through language resources of polarity and modality and through interpersonal metaphor and projection. Students were secondary knowers, and as direct/indirect addressee/s were, in principle, engaged in silent responsive understanding (Bakhtin, 1986). Acknowledgements of the teacher’s propositions by students confirmed that relationship. However, discretionary contradictions challenged it and, unless a student demand for information ensued, indicated an attempt to assume or at least share the primary knower role. Instances of students adopting the role of primary knower signalled a shift in the discursive relationships away from DR1.

4.1.2 Students in the role of receiving

The analysis of the mood element structure of clauses initiating exchanges in DR1 in which the teacher adopts the role of giving (above) found these clauses to function as statements giving information or as offers to give information. Statements are propositions which can be affirmed or denied or qualified or argued about by respondents (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 110). In DR1, the analysis looked for the expected or discretionary responses, i.e., acknowledgements or contradictions, but noted also other responses involving students’ adoption of the roles of demanding and giving. A feature of the teacher utterances in DR1 is that many were extended and uninterrupted. In the classroom context, where teacher statements and offers were typically addressed to the group as a whole, individual participants were under a much reduced obligation to respond, and verbal student responses to teacher statements were arguably the exception, rather than the rule. While a teacher offer necessitated a response of acceptance or rejection, or negotiation by the teacher, for the interaction to continue to unfold, the same was not true when the teacher gave information.

4.1.2.1 Expected responses

Students’ acknowledgements/acceptances in response to utterances of the teacher in the role of giving were considered as two classes. First, responses to utterances addressed to the whole class or to another student, and, second, responses to utterances addressed to students individually.
4.1.2.1.1 Expected responses when not addressed individually

There were 240 recorded instances of verbal acknowledgements/acceptances by students of utterances addressed to the whole class or another student (see Figure 4.2). This included responses to offers of linguistic services and statements of information.

![Bar chart showing instances of NESB, ESB, and unidentifiable students' responses to teacher utterances.]

Figure 4-2: Instances of NESB, ESB and unidentifiable students’ responses to teacher utterances addressed to the whole class

The findings presented in Figure 4.2 reflect one of the shortcomings of the data collection methods. The acknowledgements that are recorded in the transcribed data frequently involve more than one student; when one responds with an acknowledgement, others often join in. When this occurs, the individuals involved are often not identifiable, as in the instance below, illustrative of acknowledgements that occurred during teacher utterances:

T: … if you’re going to be able to speak the language/ use the language/ then you’re going to need the opportunity to practise it=

SS: mmm/yeah

T: =and you’re going to have to use it … (4.1: 414-420)

It cannot be asserted with any certainty, on the basis of the audio-recordings, whether NESB students were or were not among those responding in the situations illustrated in the instance above. What can be asserted with confidence is that in instances where speakers acknowledging the teacher’s utterances were identifiable, ESB students predominated (see
Given the number of non-ascribable simultaneous responses, variation within the ESB group may not truly reflect participation patterns of this group. What can be noted from the identifiable NESB students is that these are the students most active in other speech roles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESB students</th>
<th>Number of acknowledgements</th>
<th>NESB students</th>
<th>Number of acknowledgements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-1: Instances of identifiable NESB and ESB students’ acknowledgement of teacher utterances addressed to the whole class

As the sequence below illustrates, elicitation of student acknowledgements was unpredictable, and in many cases it was not possible to identify speakers. ESB Student J acknowledged the validity of the teacher’s proposition during production, but arguably it was the tag, *isn’t it*, that elicited acknowledgement from ESB Student M, who was identifiable, and the unidentifiable individual students who responded simultaneously following Student M. The frequency of simultaneous acknowledgements severely limits the findings presented in Table 4.1

T: Yeah/ yeah/ but there must come a time though/ mustn’t there/ where/ where some of those people at least are going to wish they could eliminate that

J: mmm

T: =from their language because it is stigmatising isn’t it

M: yeah

SS: mmm/ yes/ mmmm (5.2:2234-2231)
Expected responses as individual addressees

The number of acknowledgements of students as individual addressees shown in Table 4.2 needs strict qualification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESB students</th>
<th>Number of acknowledgements</th>
<th>NESB students</th>
<th>Number of acknowledgements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-2: Instances of NESB and ESB students’ acknowledgement of teacher utterances directly addressed to individuals

It records acknowledgements of students during the practicum reporting, but not all students reported on the practicum, and some ESB students did so twice. It includes acknowledgements following explicit address of students by name. It includes student acknowledgements of and during teacher utterances when the student was the previous speaker. However, ESB students were previous speakers more frequently, largely because they adopted the role of giving more frequently and addressed the teacher. This was also the case for NESB Student B who, as findings presented in Chapters that follow will demonstrate, was marked by his active discursive participation in sequences of interaction and by direct address of him by the teacher. However it was observed, if acknowledgements are any indication, that students in this position assumed the role of addressee and responded. Within these constraints, additional variables cannot be discounted. For example, ESB Student J was marked by his propensity for frequent back-channelling. However, students who were directly and individually addressed responded through back-channelling and explicit verbal acknowledgements

In the isolated instances where teacher utterances were addressed to, or referred to, individual participants, the requirement to respond was considerably more compelling. A sequence between the teacher and NESB Student B in which Student B responded freely and often as
direct addressee during his practicum report was included earlier. The teacher’s use of vocatives, while outside the mood element, served in some instances to elicit a verbal acknowledgment from students concerned. In the case of NESB Student H, below, the student adopted the role of giving to give information:

T: … and I think it’s well worth you trying it/ especially in your case Carl/ for example/ with your/ with your EAP/ and Roslyn and Hannah in you/ in your case with the higher level ((inaudible)) general English group it would be/ you know/ be interesting for them and I think they’d/ they’d rather enjoy at that level the discussion of the/ of the language itself [that it would/ that it’ll lead to

H: [yes/ that is what we did

T: you did/ mhmm/ okay (4.2:1818-1826)

The key finding is marked variations in the ways students in the two groups participated in the role of receiving information from the teacher. Whereas the expected response of acknowledgement when the teacher addressed the whole class was unpredictable and largely the practice of ESB students, both ESB and NESB students responded with acknowledgements with more regularity when directly and individually addressed.

4.1.2.1.3 Responses to tagged declaratives

There were about 250 instances of the teacher’s use of mood tags distributed throughout the DR1 data from the five lessons. The tag was an explicit signal that the teacher expected a response from the listener confirming the polarity of the mood element in the clause, that is, agreement. This may account for more 40% of the student acknowledgements of teacher statements following tagged statements. Still, less than 60% of the tagged clauses elicited verbal responses from students that were captured in the recordings, although non-verbal responses may well have been clear to the teacher in some, or all, instances.

On many occasions, there was no evidence, such as a pause, to suggest the teacher expected a verbal response to tagged statements addressed to the class. In the first instance below, two tagged statements elicit no verbal responses, while in the second instance, like many of the responses to untagged statements, the student responses overlapped or were simultaneous with the teacher utterance:

T: … I saw the dog/ now there is a/ that’s a basic pattern/ isn’t it/ I saw the dog/ it’s the same pattern as I saw the cat/ I saw the budgie/ I ate the budgie/ I ate the/ the cookie/ I/ they’re/ they’re the same pattern/ aren’t they/ really we’re just/ we’re just slotting in … (4.1:565-568)
T: … it’s an attitude too/ a lot/ a lot of teachers eventually get tired/ don’t they=
SS: mmm
T: =and / and they’ve/ they’ve got to survive and … (2.2:792-797)

Nonetheless, the elicitation of a response from one or more students was much more predictable than for untagged statements, and included some of the 14 responses to utterances addressed to the whole class that were ascribable to NESB students. However, because of problems already noted around the analysis of this set of data, there was no conclusive evidence of variation between the two groups of students in responses to tagged statements in ways that differed from responses to untagged statements.

The analysis did find that students from both groups responded to tagged statements directly addressed to them individually. In the first instance, below, the falling pitch on the tagged statement addressed to NESB Student D confirmed the clause as declarative:

T: … I bet next week they’ll come/ you’re going to take to them a restaurant/ aren’t you/ next week
D: yeah (4.2:1084-1087)

The directly addressed tagged statement in the following example, confirmed as unmarked by the falling pitch on the tag, as well as the projecting clause, I know, elicited an expected response, yeah, but was followed by NESB Student O’s adoption of the role of giving and thus a shift to Discursive Relationship 4 (DR4); the adversative conjunctive adjunct but signalled Student O’s intention to negotiate the teacher’s proposition:

T: … now I know Olivia/ did a/ you/ you/ you try/ don’t you/ to get them using it outside the (classroom)
O: yeah/ but it depends on the personality of the learners … (2.2:1231-1234)

Within the limitations of the data as noted, the key difference identified between the two groups in responding to the teacher’s utterances in DR1 was the acknowledgement by some ESB students of utterances addressed to the whole class, while there was limited evidence that some NESB students participated in this way. Tagged statements addressed to the whole class played a role in eliciting verbal participation of students in the negotiation of confirmation of meaning within the confines of this discursive relationship. However, students in both groups responded with acknowledgements when they were the direct addressees of teacher utterances.
4.1.2.2 Discretionary responses

Analysis of discretionary responses of students to teacher utterances giving information found the two groups of students differed as they did in the case of acknowledgements. Instances of students from both groups choosing to contradict the teacher are tied to the roles of the participants as knowers in the discursive relationships. The one instance of an NESB student using polarity to contradict the teacher is part of a discussion of case studies some students are completing for the teacher in a different course. NESB Student B contradicts the teacher’s proposition, *no (this isn’t not sounding promising)*, and, assuming the role of primary knower, adopts the role of giving to elaborate his response:

T: … this doesn’t/ isn’t sounding promising for/ for the/ for the sociolinguistics subject  
B: no/ it is the second assessment/ so we are worried about the/ the first one first  

(2.2:404-407)

Although the frequency of discretionary responses differs, this instance of NESB Student B and those involving ESB students were similar in that student contradiction of a proposition of the teacher without then adopting the role of giving to elaborate were rare. In the instance below, in a discussion of the Danish language, ESB Student J, a speaker of Danish, is firmly in the position of primary knower and thus in a position to contradict the teacher’s proposition, *ah/ no*, and then confirm the validity of the teacher’s demand that follows:

J: … there’s not a way to do it unless you say ((Danish phrase))/ that’s possible=  
T: yeah/ well/ that’s right/ that’s the other one  
J: =but without please  
T: mmhmm/ yeah/ [or would you mind  
L: [some  
J: ah/ no  
T: no ((2))/ that doesn’t happen in Danish ((2))  
J: no/ no/ ((inaudible)) (1.1:1584-1599)

Generally, outright contradiction using polarity by ESB students is followed by adoption of the role of giving to elaborate, as the in instances of ESB Students R and M, below. Here the teacher’s position as primary knower is negotiated through the use of projection as interpersonal metaphor, *I thought*, and the use of the mood adjunct, *just*, and both students position themselves as knowers in relation to their proposition in a similar way:
T: no/ it’s not a phonological repair/ is it/ it’s a/ it’s a/ it’s a syntactic repair/ it’s likely
not/ now I have to say I agree with Lyster there because it passed me by/ I
thought that it was not so much a focus on the/ on a grammatical issue/ but I
think she was/ I thought she was just getting her/ making sure she heard it
correctly
R: no/ I didn’t/ [I thought she was pronounc
M: [yeah/ no/ I thought it was a little bit pronunciation as well because the
way the lady said snore/ it was a bit it was like she didn’t understand her/ yeah
(5.2:2041-2049)

All told, in the DR1 data there were less than ten discretionary responses by ESB students that
realized contradiction of the teacher through polarity.

Students in the ESB group were more likely to realize a response other than an affirmative
acknowledgement and to signal negotiation of a teacher proposition in DR1 through selection of
the adversative conjunctive adjunct, but, or the conditional conjunctive adjunct, though. This
was another point of difference between the two groups; there were around 30 instances of this
type of response to a teacher proposition by an ESB student, and four instances of the use of but
by NESB students. For example, NESB student B used the adversative but to signal his
reluctance to validate the proposition of the previous speaker before attempting to negotiate:

T: … it might kind of be helpful sometimes if they could/ if you had an opportunity to
discuss it with the other two/ other two lecturers/ but I don’t know whether you
B: but/ we/ we usually have (post/ post)/ discussion after a lesson observation
T: yeah/ I know/ but it doesn’t/ sometimes it’s/ it’s rushed/ isn’t it (4.2:297-303)

ESB students used these conjunctive adjuncts preceding the adoption of both the roles of giving
and of demanding, as in the instances of ESB Students M and E, below:

T: … there will be people who are learning English as a second language who will be
reluctant to get out and practise it in the way that we’re wanting them to do as
well
M: but/ I think for a foreign language it’s more difficult because people expect that you
will speak English/ whereas … (2.2:1256-1261)

T: … and so we get a/ we get those interesting things like six and sux/ that/ that type of
thing happening
E: but in a way/ then/ are we not saying that/ like we’re saying that the pronunciation of
different people with different languages=
T: mmm
E: =is incorrect/ then aren’t we saying that New Zealand and Australian accents are incorrect (5.1:221-227)

A polar adjunct was occasionally used to acknowledge the teacher’s proposition before the conjunctive adjunct signalled the adversarial position about to adopted by the student, as in the instance of ESB Student J, below:

T: no no/ we tend to see them as being impolite
J: yeah/ but I mean the/ the Danes would see us as=
R: unnecessarily verbose
J: =sort of being a bit sort of verbose ((inaudible)) (1.1:1639-1645)

The incidence of contradiction of the teacher by students in DR1 was limited, probably because the teacher’s social role as much as his speech role as primary knower (even when he negotiated his orientation to the validity of propositions through modality) mitigated the likelihood of outright contradiction. However, there were instances of students’ adoption of the role of giving to at least share the role of primary knower as discursive adversaries of the teacher, and some isolated instances of the teacher being cast in the role of secondary knower. There were also instances of students’ selecting language to position themselves as discursive adversaries but in the context of adoption of the role of demanding, thus sanctioning the continuation of the teacher in the role of primary knower. With few exceptions all these instances involved ESB students. The outcome of all of these types of discretionary responses was to effectively shift the discursive relationship following the polar or conjunctive adjunct in the student utterance, from DR1 to DR3 or DR4. Details of the findings to do with these utterances are included in the findings in Chapters 6 and 7. Strictly speaking, student responses to the teacher in DR1 were limited to the expected/discretionary alternatives; what happened in practice in the classroom was that there were many instances of students’ responsive adoption of the discursive roles of demanding or giving effecting a shift in the discursive relationship.
4.1.3 Students’ adoption of the roles of demanding and giving

As they indicate a shift to other discursive relationships, these instances will be dealt with briefly; Chapters 6 and 7 present findings for the ways students were involved in the roles of demanding and giving.

The instances of students’ adoption of the roles of giving and demanding as responses to the propositions contributed to the discursive text by the teacher in the role of giving are shown in Figure 4.3:

![Bar chart showing instances of NESB and ESB students' adoption of the roles of giving and demanding following the teacher in the role of giving (DR1)](chart.png)

**Figure 4-3: Instances of NESB and ESB students’ adoption of the roles of giving and demanding following the teacher in the role of giving (DR1)**

Figure 4.3 indicates both groups of students adopted the role of demanding following a teacher utterance in the role of giving, arguably as active responsive listeners negotiating meanings. Not all these demands were prefaced by polar adjuncts to express acknowledgement/contradiction or by conjunctive adjuncts as noted in the previous section, but they point to the teacher continuing in the role of primary knower in the co-construction of the discursive text. What stands out in Figure 4.3, however, is the number of instances students adopted the role of giving after the teacher gave information. In other words the students in both groups were more likely to adopt the role of giving and arguably that of primary knower to participate in negotiation of the discursive text as interactive equals than they were to adopt the role of
secondary knower with a demand for information. The significance of these findings is explored further in the relevant chapters that follow.

While Figure 4.3 draws attention to a similarity between the two groups, despite a marked variance in quanta, presentation of this data as percentages of the total instances of the adoption of the roles of giving and demanding (Figure 4.4) reveals some nuances of the findings and an important difference.
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**Figure 4-4: Adoption of the roles of demanding and giving by NESB and ESB students following the teacher in the role of giving (DR1) as percentages of total adoptions of the roles**

Twice the proportion of ESB student demands followed an utterance of the teacher in the role of giving, suggesting these students negotiated new meanings proposed by the teacher *more regularly*. The findings in Chapter 6 support this, with evidence that some NESB students asked sequences of questions to negotiate a single point or matter whereas ESB students tended to respond to more of the teacher’s utterances but asked one or two questions. Figure 4.4 also reinforces the finding that the students responded as active responsive listeners to the teacher’s adoption of the role of giving by in turn adopting the role of giving to participate in dialogue with the teacher as discursive equals. Although there is a large disparity in the number of actual instances, a greater proportion of the instances of NESB students’ adoption of the role of giving followed the teacher giving information than is the case for ESB students, suggesting they interacted with the teacher in this role, relatively less frequently with other students.
4.2 Summation

The teacher’s adoption of the role of giving reflected his status as the primary knower (Berry, 1981a) in the classroom and also reflected his role of manager or facilitator of classroom interaction (Nassaji & Wells, 2000). It broadly represented a conventional conception of classroom relationships with the teacher as primary knower in the role of giving information, and students as secondary knowers in the role of receivers. When the teacher addressed utterances to the whole class the ways the two groups of students were involved differed. ESB students participated much more actively, but any negotiations of meaning within the discursive relationship were limited for both groups to spontaneous or teacher-elicited affirmative acknowledgement of these teacher utterances.

There are some questions over the status of students’ responses, and thus of these findings. First, the nature of affirmation meant acknowledgements could be made non-verbally; how this factor played out in the participation of the two groups of students is unknown. Second, some students responded with acknowledgements very regularly, particularly when the direct addressee; the question is whether these utterances indicated negotiation of the confirmation of teacher propositions and so of active responsive listening, or functioned more as formulaic back-channelling, at least in some instances. Whatever the case, the distinction between the practices of individuals and of the two groups suggests a variety of ways of participating in this type of discursive relationship in the context of the polyadic classroom; while some may be expressions of individual identity, more broadly they could be realisations of practice models embedded in sociocultural histories of participants. Although the teacher actively created discursive opportunities for students to negotiate at least the confirmation of meaning within the roles of DR1, there was evidence that very often he neither expected verbal responses nor relied upon them for the continued unfolding of the discourse. Thus, it would seem appropriate to suggest that expected student responses were perhaps most important as a means for students to suggest that they actively listened rather than as signals for the teacher of negotiated exchange of meanings.

Arguably, student responses to the teacher’s utterances that involved students adoption of the roles of giving or demanding reveal more about the ways students were involved in negotiation of the discursive text; this was discourse outside DR1 but was negotiation of the meanings proposed by the teacher in giving information and providing linguistic services. Discretionary responses necessitated a shift by students to a discursive relationship in which they adopted one of the roles of giving or demanding, but adoption of these roles did not necessitate contradiction of the teacher. It was found that the pre-texts of the majority of the adoptions of the role of
giving by students in both groups were utterances of the teacher in the role of giving; DR1 was associated with dialogue between teacher and student as discursive equals. The relationship between DR1 and students’ adoption of the role of demanding was more complicated; a teacher utterance in DR1 was twice as likely to be the pre-text of the demand for information of an ESB student as it was for the demand of an NESB student. Nonetheless, a considerable proportion of student demands were negotiations of meaning as secondary knowers in response to teacher utterances giving information. Thus, although DR1 was dominated by the utterances of the teacher, clear evidence of active and responsive listening of students was found in the relationship with the unsolicited adoption by students of the roles of giving and demanding, roles in which they played significant and proactive parts in the negotiation of the discursive text. These unsolicited adoptions of speech roles foreshadow findings presented in Chapter 5, which follows, that self-selection by students to give on demand is a significant feature of ways students are involved in negotiation of meanings in Discursive Relationship 2.
CHAPTER 5

5 DISCURSIVE RELATIONSHIP 2 - STUDENTS IN THE ROLE OF GIVING ON DEMAND

In this Chapter, findings are presented of ways students in the selected internationalised classroom are involved in negotiation of meanings when in the speech role of giving on demand. Discursive Relationship 2 (DR2) was characterised by adoption of the speech role of demanding by the teacher, casting direct and/or indirect addressees - student participants in the interaction - in the speech role of giving on demand. Analysis of the transcribed data revealed that NESB and ESB student groups, and individuals within the two groups, differed in the ways and extent to which they were involved in:

- giving on demand in response to utterances directly or indirectly addressed to them by the teacher;
- giving on demand in response to utterances addressed to other students; and
- participation in the discourse following the adoption of the role of giving on demand.

5.1 Students giving on demand

Ways students were involved in giving on demand were shaped initially by demands of the teacher, by mood selections of his demands and commodities demanded, by address of demands to the class or to individual students, and by assumption or designation by the teacher of the role of primary knower/actor.
5.1.1 The teacher demands: Teacher questions and commands

Frequency of adoption of the role of demanding by the teacher ranged from 69 instances in Class 2 to 115 instances in Class 5 with a total of 463 instances identified in the transcribed data (Figure 5.1).
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**Figure 5-1: Instances of adoption of the role of demanding by the teacher in all classes and in total**

5.1.1.1 Mood selection and commodities exchanged

When the teacher adopted the speech role of demanding he realized demands in clauses with polar interrogative, WH-interrogative, declarative, and imperative mood element structures. On 83 occasions the teacher used two or more of these clauses in a single utterance, sometimes clauses of the same mood type, but often of different mood types demanding distinctly different responses. Hence, the total number of clauses that realized demands (Figure 5.2, below) exceeded the number of instances of adoption of the role of demanding shown in Figure 5.1.
Many of the clauses included in Figure 5.1 functioned incongruently. For example, most of the declarative clauses, on the basis of intonation patterns and the co-text, functioned as questions and not statements; many imperative clauses functioned as demands for linguistic services, that is, exchange of information as a service (Martin, 1992, pp. 50-51).

5.1.1.1 Demands for goods/services

Less than 15% of demands made by the teacher were satisfied by actions rather than language. Two or three demands for exchange of goods during distribution of materials were so isolated as to be insignificant. There were around 90 instances of commands realised in imperative mood to manage classroom learning, the use of teaching/learning materials in the classroom, for example:

T: … have a look at the way it’s set out on the second page … (1.2:18)

Around forty instances of commands served to manage the spoken interaction, sometimes in conjunction with other demands:
T: okay/ right/ go back then to what we talked about before/ what/ what are some of the causes of/ of/ of error (5.2:2131-2132)

Isolated declarative clauses functioned incongruently as grammatical metaphors of modulation of the sort that aren’t unusual in school classrooms (Christie, 2002; Iedema, 1996) to manage learning, for example:

T: … what I want you to do is to spend a little bit of time now perhaps just preparing a/ a lesson/ just jot it down for/ for Saturday/ but doing it in terms of reflective practice method (2.2:1567-1569)

Modulation moved imperative clauses into the indicative mood (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 148), and any proposal was thus negotiable. For example, the clause, below, realised of a demand for postponed action (Martin, 1992):

T: … you should actually study that full/ full thing before/ before Saturday … (1.2:791-792)

This clause could have elicited an undertaking, or, on the other hand, been negotiated with a mood tag, should we. Other instances of the teacher offering advice and suggestions about future teaching practice in the language classroom or in the teaching practicum were realised similarly. In the event, there was no verbal response. The absence of verbally realized undertakings from students was the key point about the ways students were involved in the teacher’s demands for services, whether managing the classroom or demanding postponed actions. As noted in Chapter 3, instances such as this were analyzed as giving information. Consequently, analysis of the ways students were involved in the role of giving on demand focussed entirely on demands for information that elicited verbal responses captured in the data.

5.1.1.1.2 Demands for information

When considered on a clause by clause basis, the teacher demanded information most frequently using WH- interrogatives that asked students to give missing information. In 90% of instances the teacher provided the element on which propositions rested, the Subject, and students co-authored propositions by supplying complements or adjuncts in clauses, for example:

T: … what’s a clarification check (3.2:1432)
The teacher demands realized as polar interrogative clauses demanded that students confirm or contradict polarity of propositions predicated by the teacher, that is, in principle the demands were elicitations of confirmation rather than of missing information, as was the case with WH-interrogatives. WH-interrogatives enlisted the student participants in active joint construction of propositions, whereas in polar interrogatives the teacher was responsible for propositions, for example:

T: … are there aspects of um of telephone communication which makes it different=
J: [yeah sure
F: [oh yeah
T: =I mean make it more demanding (1.1:1778-1785)

There were fewer instances of the teacher’s incongruent use of clauses with declarative mood element structure to make demands. These also functioned to elicit confirmation of validity of propositions, rather than missing information, but carried an expectation of confirmation (Basturkmen, 1999). Not all these were marked by a tonic pattern that included rising pitch on the final syllables; some were marked by falling pitch on the closing syllable/s, such as in the instance involving NESB Student I, below, suggesting an even stronger certainty of confirmation of the proposition:

I: my/ cause my reading’s best/ I have passed the IELTS exam/ my reading is 8.5
Y: 8.5
I: yeah/ that’s pretty good
T: yeah/ that’s very good/ yeah
I: mmm
T: that’s on IELTS ((1))
I: yes (1.2:75-87)

Even fewer declarative clauses used by the teacher to make demands were tagged clauses marked by tonic patterns that demanded confirmation of polarity, arguably the strongest signal of certainty addressees would confirm the proposition.

There were almost 30 instances of teacher demands realized as imperatives commanding students provide linguistic services by giving information (Martin, 1992), sometimes with missing information represented by embedded WH-elements, for example:
T: … give me an example of a metalinguistic clue (5.2:1465-1466)

T: … tell me where you’re coming from/ tell me why you don’t think it’s/ it’s necessary and sufficient (3.1:48-49)

Demands for the service of giving information were also realized in a few instances as modulated polar interrogatives, for example:

T: yeah/ could you elaborate on that (5.2:2151)

T: … can you give us an example of a confirmation check (3.2:1380)

Although realised as interrogatives demanding confirmation of polarity, these and the imperative demands for linguistic services demanded information rather than confirmation, and thus have more in common with WH- interrogatives in terms of how they involve students in negotiation.

Problematic in the analysis were highly ellipsed clauses with no selection for mood, teacher demands that checked student comprehension or ‘satisfaction’, for example, right, alright, okay. These typically carried the unmarked intonation pattern of the unmarked yes/no interrogative (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, pp. 140-142), used by the teacher to elicit confirmation of the validity of a proposition. The teacher used about 150 of these ‘checks’, seemingly deliberately, especially during extended utterances giving information, such as in the example shown here, part of a longer utterance. It included three uses of okay and one of alright as elliptical interrogatives:

T: … if you’re making an error in a/ in another language let’s pick on the Chinese again/ let’s say it’s the /ruh/ luh/ distinction/ okay((2))/ you got to know what’s behind it/ you got to know that/ that the/ that it’s a phonemic distinction here in English which doesn’t exist/ phonemes exist the/ the/ the sounds exist in Chinese/ the sounds exist in Thai/ the sounds exist in Japanese/ but they’re not phonemically distinct/ okay((2))/ so therefore a speaker of Japanese speaker of Chinese speaker of Thai may not always hear the difference/ okay((2))/ because it’s not a significant difference/ so that if you want to get them pronouncing it correctly/ firstly you got to make sure they’re hearing it/ hearing the difference/ alright((2))/ so/ you can see what’s happening here/ we’ve … (5.1: 474-483)

When addressed to the whole class, students responded, verbally at least, to less than 10% of the checks; the great majority elicited no recorded response, although the teacher may have been aware of responses not captured or of non-verbal responses. When directly addressed to
individuals, verbal responses were more frequent but, again, in many instances no response was recorded. In the instance addressed to ESB Student J, below, Student J’s response is arguably an acknowledgement the initial proposition is valid, rather than providing polarity in response tot the demand, okay(2):

T: … what Anderson says is that/ is that acquisition is simply learning with a whole lot of practice going on/ okay(2)
J: yep/ exactly (2.2:1486-1489)

In general, the teacher was content to proceed without verbal student responses. When analysis focussed on instances that elicited responses other than positive polar responses, it was found respondents adopted of the role of giving or, as in the example below, the role of demanding:

T: that’s the problem/ that’s the problem/ you’ve got to remember this/ okay(2)
O: do we have to do/ with the Chinese learners/ do this (1.2:184-187)

Respondents in such cases did not give in response to a teacher demand, but shifted the discursive relationship by adoption of the roles of giving or demanding. This suggests these elliptical clauses had three possible functions; as demands for confirmation, as offers to addressees of discursive opportunities for adoption of the role of speaker in the interaction, or as elicitations of acknowledgements. As a way of involving students in negotiation of meaning, this teacher practice had a role to play in this classroom that was perhaps not fully evident in the data that were collected, and probably not open to an analysis using verbal data only. Comprehension/satisfaction checks, far fewer in number, occurred also in Discursive Relationship 3 at the conclusion of some teacher utterances in the role of giving on demand in response to student demands. These were directed to individuals and elicited a polar response, another demand, or a statement, and are discussed in Chapter. However, this serves to reinforce the functional ambiguity involved, only resolved by the co-text. There is no argument that these elliptical utterances exhibited the tonic characteristics of a demand. However, most responses shifted the interaction to another discursive relationship and are discussed in Chapters 6 or 7. With ambiguity surrounding their functions, and an extremely limited number of verbal polar responses, comprehension/satisfaction checks as ways the teacher involved students in negotiation of meanings are discussed in other chapters in terms of students’ acceptance of discursive opportunities. They were not included as polar interrogatives in the analysis of teacher demands (Figure 5.2).
Because many of the teacher’s demands to students for information involved more than one clause and often of different mood types, as the examples below illustrate, it is difficult to consider the different mood types discretely in terms of the responses elicited by what were single utterances:

T: … tell me about how/ how we’re going to get to that/ what sorts of questions might you ask (1.1:179-180)

T: … yeah/ what about that pronunciation one/ what are we going to do there/ could you imagine it leading to pronunciation lessons (1.1:1102-1103)

This practice of the teacher oriented participants’ to more specific propositional contexts. For example, in the second instance above, the first WH- interrogative directed students to the broad field of the proposition that was the goal of the teacher; the second proposed that there was missing information about the action to be taken in relation to this field; and the third demanded students confirm the validity of a specific proposition about the nature of an action that was possible.

To facilitate analysis of ways students were involved in giving on demand, demands made by the teacher were analysed a second time. First, in instances of the teacher realizing demands in two or more clauses in a single utterance, such as the examples included above, student responses were analysed to enable classification of the teacher’s adoption of the role of demanding as functioning as one of the demand types on the basis of the response/s elicited. Second, demands of the teacher, such as that instanced in the WH- interrogative, first below, and the polar interrogative second below, arguably made without expectation of eliciting answers, were excluded from the demands for information:

T: … here you are Saturday/ two hours/ you teach something/ don’t do anything else till next Saturday/ another two hours/ how much is going to be learnt from that/ the answer to that is it’ll vary … (2.2:1065-1068)

T: … Alwright’s book looks at the comparison between naturalistic settings or/ he/ he talks about how/ how interaction occurs in naturalistic settings/ are we clear about what he means by naturalistic settings/ that’s non-classroom settings … (3.2:1322-1325)

Instances such as the above occurred with some regularity in utterances of the teacher in the role of giving. While active responsive listeners may have proposed answers no discursive
space was offered; the contention is that these instances had pedagogic aims that did not include elicitation of answers.

The outcome of this secondary analysis is shown in Figure 5.3 as the numbers of the types of demands for information made by the teacher.
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**Figure 5-3: Numbers of types of demands for information**

These teacher demands for information, with few exceptions, elicited verbal responses from one or more student participants and these responses form the basis of the findings presented in this chapter.

### 5.1.1.2 Discursive contexts of students giving on demand: Addressees of teacher demands

Sixty-one percent of the teacher’s demands for information (Figure 5.4, below) were addressed to the class, and it was in the taking up of these opportunities to give on demand that the ways the two groups of students were involved was found to differ. There was not a great difference in the opportunities to give on demand offered directly to the two groups of students; 21% of the teacher’s demands were directly addressed to individual ESB students and 18% to individuals in the NESB group. There were some small differences in the opportunities for contribution to the discourse offered by the questions directed to the class and to individuals. When clauses demanding confirmation of polarity are conflated, and likewise for WH-interrogatives and demands for linguistic services as demands for missing or additional
information, the teacher’s demands addressed to the whole class favoured demands for missing information (55%) over confirmation of polarity (45%), but the opposite was the case when demands were addressed directly to individuals, who were more likely to be asked for confirmation of propositions (52%) than missing information (47%).
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Although the number and types of demands directly addressed by the teacher to individuals in the two groups of students were similar, there were distinctions between the two groups in the discursive circumstances of the teacher addressing questions to individuals. Seventy percent of demands addressed to individual NESB students were in the context of reporting the practicum experience (see Student reporting, page 159), which means that, apart from the initial demands to report, the student was the previous speaker and the teacher was eliciting additional information or negotiating meanings of co-textual utterances of students. Thirty-five percent of teacher demands to ESB students were in this context, the implication being that not only did the teacher interact and negotiate meanings with NESB students to a greater extent in these circumstances, but in the unfolding discourse of whole class interaction most of the teacher demands directly addressed to students were directed to ESB students. A more delicate analysis
of the types of demands directed to the students reporting the practicum, Figure 5.5, below, revealed yet another distinction between the groups.

Figure 5-5: Types of teacher demands for information addressed to individual NESB and ESB students during reporting of the practicum

Collation of demands in terms of missing information and confirmation emphasises the distinctions between the two groups of students (Figure 5-6, below) and shows that the function of a clear majority of the teacher’s demands to ESB students when they were reporting their practicum experience was to request additional or missing information from the students (65%) rather than confirm the validity of meanings the teacher was making (35%). The opposite was the case for ESB students, though not so emphatically, more demands being made for confirmation of polarity (54%) than for missing information (46%). These variations reveal how the teacher shaped the ways students in the two groups were involved in negotiation of meaning in the role of giving on demand through the context and nature of his demands.
Figure 5-6: Teacher demands for missing information and confirmation of polarity, and comparison of initial and follow-up demands addressed to individual NESB and ESB students during reporting of the practicum as percentages

Outside the practicum reporting context, although there were many instances of the teacher making sequences of demands addressed to the class (e.g., Class 4, session 1 is almost entirely conducted in DR2), only a small number were dyadic sequences in which an individual student who answered a question was judged to be the direct addressee of a question that followed. Outside practicum reporting, student addressees were previous speakers in about 40 of the 60 instances of direct address of demands to individuals by the teacher. In over 30 of these utterances, that is, in half the demands directly addressed to students outside practicum reporting, student addressees had adopted the role of giving in the preceding utterance, that is, they were not answering a teacher question. ESB students were the addressees in 75% of teacher demands directly addressed to a student who was the previous speaker, reflecting the findings, presented in the chapters that follow, of more active adoption of the role of giving by these students. Thus, in these instances of teacher demands, the direct address of students is an outcome of both their own discursive activity and of the teacher’s responses to this. Analysis of the types of questions (Figure 5.7, below) reveals more about the discursive roles offered to individual students by the teacher’s demands:
One finding of interest shown in Figure 5.7 is that, unlike demands addressed to the whole class, the majority of which demanded missing information (55%), the majority of questions directly addressed to individuals in both groups of students were asking for confirmation of validity of propositions (60%). It seems the teacher made different types of demands when addressing individual students than when directing questions to the class as a whole, perhaps because in the majority of instances, he was responding (in Linell’s, 1998, conception of the response-initiative structure of utterances) to an utterance of the student he was addressing. The types of demand addressed to both groups of students were similar, offering similar opportunities for participation in and contribution to the discourse; the distinction between the two groups in the numbers of demands directly addressed to individuals in the groups reflects to a large extent their discursive activity, rather than the teacher choosing to address more demands to the ESB students. This is a theme that recurs in the findings of the chapters that follow; a contribution to the discourse is often followed by additional opportunities to participate, further sharpening disparities between individuals.

In summary, individual students were direct addressees of 40% of the teachers’ questions. Although there was little difference in the numbers of questions addressed to the two groups, the teacher was more likely to address questions directly to individual ESB students in the
context of whole-of-class interaction than to NESB students. This was largely because ESB students were more discursively active and the teacher’s questions often followed utterances by the student addressed. This context may explain why a majority of demands addressed to individuals outside the practicum reporting context asked for confirmation of validity, in contrast to the predominance of WH-interrogatives in the role of primary knower when addressing the whole class. Teacher demands in this context were arguably negotiations of meanings proposed in the co-textual utterances of students.

Most of the questions addressed to individual NESB students were in the context of structured interaction, during practicum reporting, in which dyadic student-teacher interaction seemed to be the norm. During practicum reporting most teacher questions to ESB students demanded additional information, whereas questions to NESB students favoured confirmation of polarity. Thus ESB students were involved in more joint construction of propositions, and as the following section suggests, in the role of primary knower. This contrasts starkly with WH-interrogatives addressed to the whole class, and suggests in this situation ESB student were adding distinctly personal voices to the discursive text.

5.1.1.3 Relationships as knowers

In this discursive relationship roles of primary and secondary knower are at the most complex (see Table 5-1, below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demands and addressees of demands</th>
<th>Teacher as primary knower (%)</th>
<th>Teacher as secondary knower (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All demands</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All demands addressed to whole class</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands for missing information addressed to whole class</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands for confirmation of polarity addressed to whole class</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All demands addressed to individual students</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All demands addressed to ESB students</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All demands addressed to individual NESB students</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands addressed to individual students reporting on practicum experience</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-1: Teacher’s role as primary or secondary knower by addressees or demand type as percentages
As shown in Table 5-1, in 61.5% of the instances of the teacher’s adoption of the role of demanding information it was judged he negotiated meaning as the primary knower (Berry, 1981a; Martin, 1992), that is, the teacher already knew the information or at least had a desired or expected response. In the instances where the demand was addressed to the class as a whole, the teacher was judged to be the primary knower in 88% of instances. To take this analysis to a more delicate level, in 96% of instance of demands for information addressed to the whole class and realized grammatically as WH- interrogatives or imperatives, the teacher was judged to be the primary knower in the interaction; for those realized as polar interrogatives or declaratives, the teacher was primary knower in 76% of instances. For example, in the instance below, it is clear from the teacher’s utterances during and following ESB Student K’s answer, *that’s right/ exactly/ yeah/*, as well as from the tag on Student K’s response eliciting confirmation of the validity of her answer, that the teacher was not relying on Student K to provide the missing information in the WH- interrogative:

T: … okay/ that/ that’s field of discourse/ now/ what about tenor of discourse
K: well/ it’s basically/ you know/ how we were talking before about rank and status and gender and=  
T: that’s right  
K: =sex/ that sort of thing/ that’s going to come in under tenor at this point/ isn’t it ((2))  
T: that’s right/ exactly/ yeah/ exactly … (1.1:1365-1375)

In instances such as the above, where the teacher was identified as primary knower in the negotiation, the teacher’s adoption of the role of demanding in fact functioned to negotiate giving of information (Love & Suherdi, 1996) by the teacher, or to delay the teacher’s giving of it (Berry, 1981a). That the teacher was negotiating giving of information when demanding information in the role of primary knower is emphasised in instances of student answers not providing the information the teacher in fact wished to give to the class, such as in the instance below in which the teacher contradicts the answer of NESB Student B:

T: … we’re talking about here down to the level of microskills/ what is it that we/ that we have to do in order if we’re going to be said to be learning a language/ what’s one of the skills  
B: reading  
T: no/ no/ that’s a macroskill isn’t it/ reading writing listening speaking/ macroskills/ but they’re made up of some micro/ lots of different microskills (4.1:106-114)
In other instances, the teacher acknowledged that answers had some validity before making it clear that they was not the desired responses, such as in the instance of the answers given by several students, below:

T: … the student presents/ and what are they doing when they’re presenting
SS: speaking
K: and reading
T: they’re speaking/ but what have they done prior to that (1.1:1889-1885)

Validity of the response produced by several students, speaking, is acknowledged by the teacher’s repetition, although the response of ESB Student K is not acknowledged. The acknowledgement is followed by the adversative, but, which does not carry the outright contradiction of negative polarity, and in this case another wh-interrogative that reiterates the question in a form that excludes the students’ responses.

The teacher’s negotiation of giving of information was not always so straightforward in realization. In a significant proportion of instances of teacher demands, the teacher’s language choices arguably realized more complex relationships between participants as knowers. For instance, although the teacher was primary knower, with few exceptions, polarity of teacher demands realized as polar interrogatives was positive, the form that “contains no suggestion regarding the likely answer” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 144). The significance for students can be gauged by considering the following clause, and keeping in mind that clauses marked for the negative are also marked by falling pitch associated with statements:

T: isn’t that interesting (3.2:2322)

Arguably, a version of this clause with positive polarity, is that interesting, is more open to either confirmation or contradiction than the negative, “in the traditional formulation, a question expecting the answer “yes”” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 144). Thus the exceptional instances of polar interrogatives marked by negative polarity, such as the two below, positioned students as secondary knowers more restrictively than those that were not marked in this way:

T: but isn’t that what Krashen says (3.1:65)

T: … I think it’s a good idea for us to/ to/ to see that as being one of the important criteria/ don’t you / that proficiency (1.1:985-986)
The Subject of clauses realizing teacher demands also served, in a variety of ways, to position students as knowers, at times arguably blurring distinctions between primary and secondary knowers. For instance, although the teacher remained primary knower in principle, the use of *we* as Subject positioned the teacher and students as knowers of equal status, for example:

T: yeah/ what do we call them/ those auxiliary
SS: modals/(inaudible) (1.1:1418-1420)

T: … how do we do this/ how do you decide how to remediate an error (5.1:321-322)

The Subject most frequently used by the teacher in demands, *you*, endowed students with responsibility for validation of propositions and embeds their understanding, knowledge, preferences, or experiences in meanings under negotiation. In demand realizations such as the following, even though it was judged the teacher already had the information, the projection of the missing information positions the students as subjective knowers, and any responses as negotiable but of some validity. ESB Student K’s response, realised as a request for confirmation, is validated by the teacher to suggest that, despite the positioning of students as knowers, he retains the role of primary knower:

T: … what would you say there/ what/ what do you think it is/ why are these people making this error
K: is it overgeneralisation/ do you think
T: yeah … (5.2:2146-2151)

This contrasts with the objectivity of answers to demands realized with non-participant or existential subjects. These questions are much more closed, not only as polar questions as in the instances below, but in the sense that, although the teacher is seeking confirmation, there is not the same latitude in validity of answers:

T: … are there aspects of um of telephone communication which makes it different/ I mean make it more demanding (1.1:1778-1779)

T: now/ is it likely to be/ according to Lyster’s research/ is it likely to be effective (5.2:2034)

Modalization of interrogatives by the teacher permitted responses from students that expressed uncertainty, for example, in the instance below, projection modalizes an already modalized
Thus it is argued that in the role of demanding information as primary knower the teacher’s language choices blurred the distinctions between primary and secondary knowers and established the status of responses of student addressees as secondary knowers as potentially more or less negotiable.

Finally, the teacher addressed 12% of demands to the whole class in the role of secondary knower (see Table 5-1), relying on students to confirm the validity of propositions or to provide missing information, for instance:

T: … when you did your work for Ian for the error analysis/ did you go on to phonology
SS: no/ no (5.1:115-118)

In the second example, below, the projecting clause, *I suppose*, explicitly referred to the certainty of the teacher’s knowledge, and the non-reversal of polarity in the tag, marked by the rising pitch on the final syllables, elicited confirmation without which the teacher himself remained uncertain of the validity of the proposition:

T: I suppose most of you/ sometime or other/ have done that/ have you ((2))
SS: mmm/ yeah (4.1:577-579)

The addressee of teacher demands was an important variable in the discursive relationship in terms of primary and secondary knowers (see Table 5-1). While the teacher was judged to be primary knower in 88% of demands addressed to the class as a whole, he was primary knower in 17.5% of all demands directly addressed to individual students. This reversal in the relationship was even more pronounced in instances of demands directed to individual students reporting on the practicum experience, where the teacher was judged primary knower in 7% of instances. The greater number of demands directly addressed to students in the NESB group during the reporting (noted above, p. 149) is reflected in the greater proportion of demands directly addressed to NESB students which endows them as primary knowers, 87%, compared to 79% of teacher demands directly addressed to ESB students as primary knowers. The key finding here, however, is the relationship between the addressee/s of teacher demands and the roles of the participants as knowers in the negotiations instigated by the teacher’s adoption of
the role of demanding. The involvement of the two groups in giving on demand in these varied
discursive circumstances is where significant variation between the two groups was found.

5.1.1.4 Student reporting

In Classes 3 to 5 there was a distinctive variation of DR2, the practice of the teacher demanding
that students report reflections on the student practicum experience. It was found the ways
students in the two groups were involved by the teacher’s demands during this reporting
differed.

For a ten week period during the semester students taught a second/foreign language class for
two hours every Saturday. In the recorded/transcribed data, Class 1 was largely devoted to the
preparation of students to undertake interviewing and proficiency rating of prospective language
learners prior to organisation of classes and commencement of teaching the following week.
Data collected in the next four classes included periods of time allocated for selected students to
report and reflect on their experiences. These exchanges are initiated by the teacher with either
a demand for information or a demand for linguistic service addressed to individual students,
casting those students in the role of giving on demand. In Class 2, the first time students
participate in this activity, the teacher calls for volunteers to report, time devoted to it is limited
by comparison with later classes, and exchanges are managed more closely by the teacher as he
elicits responses using polar and wh-interrogatives:

T: … has anybody got any/any comments to make about/about any of their classes
they’ve had that they’d like share with us/some of the/any of the experiences
that you had on the weekend/on Saturday (2.1:69-72)

T: … what are you going to make of that/what sort of thing would you like/would you
like to make of that/ of that little observation/ I mean can you analyse it and
G: like you need to be on your toes if you know your learners are eager to learn …
(2.1:130-134)

In the classes that follow, when students are familiar with what the teacher expects, students
report if they have been observed teaching and provided with feedback by one of the staff who
lecture in the programme. The demands are briefer and now include imperatives, some
incongruent declaratives, even just vocatives alone, and combinations of these:

T: … well look/ we’re getting a bit behind here/ let’s get on to going through the stuff
from the weekend/(and who did I see)/ I saw Natalie first up

N: yes/ I’m teaching advanced learner/learners and there are two Australian girls in my
class … (5.2:521-522)
T: …I then went to see Erica and/ Erica and Gail/ so come on/ tell us what you/ tell everyone else what you did (5.2:575-576)

T: … okay/ now/ Jack/ what you/ what did you and Allan do (5.2:787)

T: let’s move on/ and/ Kate and Leanne
K: our lesson on Saturday was part two of a two part lesson task based lesson on
(5.2:924-926)

The differing ways the teacher involved the two groups of students in this reporting were included in the section on addressees of teacher demands (p. 149). With few exceptions, it was in the role of secondary knower that the teacher addressed additional demands to reporting students; the responsibility of students for the validity of the propositions or the missing information was reinforced by the teacher’s frequent use of the subject you:

T: … what did you do as an out of class task/ are you addressing that issue at all
(4.2:537-538)

T: … what did you think of that as feedback (4.2:455)

These additional questions in the reporting context, that is, not including the initial demands to give, elicited 33% of the instances of NESB students’ utterances in DR2, whereas for the students in the ESB group they elicited less than 5% (see Figure 5.6); clearly, although in principle the reporting student addressed the class, the dyadic interaction between the student and the teacher in these circumstances was an important way NESB students gave on demand to contribute to the discursive text. Furthermore, the teacher concluded the reporting with offers of discursive opportunities for other students to adopt the roles of giving or demanding to comment or ask questions of students who reported. This led to some interaction in other discursive relationships, particularly for NESB Student B, included in the findings in Chapters 6 and 7.

In summary, in DR2 the teacher adopted positions in which he demanded not only information, but, through his language choices, that students be involved in the negotiation of meanings in particular ways. The extent to which students were restricted to these ways is included in the findings that follow. Address of teacher demands to the whole class or to individuals was closely related to the roles as primary or secondary knowers in which the participants negotiated meaning, with the teacher effectively using most demands addressed to the whole class to give
information. As findings in the next part of this Chapter show, as a result of the practice of addressing demands to the whole class the two groups of students participated in very different ways.

5.1.2 Students giving on demand

Students in the two groups were involved in giving on demand in DR2 in very different ways - in the discursive circumstances of involvement, in the quanta of contributions, in types of demands they answered, and how they answered. Students participated in two circumstances that are reported separately: self selection (de Klerk, 1995), when demands were addressed to the whole class; and teacher selection, when demands were addressed directly to individual students. The NESB group of students gave on demand more frequently when selected by the teacher, whereas in almost 80% of instances of ESB students’ responses, students self-selected to give on demand (see Figure 5.7).

![Figure 5-8: Instances of NESB and ESB students giving on demand; self-selection and teacher selection as percentages of total utterances for each group](image-url)
5.1.2.1 Student self-selection to give on demand

Findings presented in this section are subject to some limitations. Demands addressed to the class often elicited two or more student utterances and thus there is no direct correspondence between numbers of instances of the teacher’s adoption of the role of demanding and instances of students giving in response. There were frequent instances of two or more students responding simultaneously. A limitation of the findings that follow, due to limitations of the data collection methods (see Chap. 3), is that in more than 60 instances, including both demands for information and for confirmation of validity, it was not possible to ascribe the utterances involved to individual students of either group, as in the examples below:

T: … are those terms familiar
SS: yes/ mmm
T: yeah/ those are/ these are terms that you’ve/ you’ve struck before in other in other places ((2)) (1.1:152-156)

T: … the most complete and satisfying explanation of/ of how syntax is acquired is/ is it a/ what is it/ behaviourist/ cognitivist/ what is it/ the most satisfying that seems to meet the/ seems to meet the/ the requirements of/ of rationality/ what/ what type of process is it
SS: cognitive
T: cognitive/ yes … (4.1:455-461)

Although individuals who self-selected and were identifiable were preponderantly ESB students, it is speculative to suggest that ESB students constituted the majority of speakers when identification was not possible.

Demands for confirmation addressed to the class were also problematic analytically because in addition to verbal responses they invited non-verbal responses that were not captured in the data recordings but which permitted the interaction to proceed. While there were few instances of demands such as these addressed directly to individuals that did not elicit verbal responses, over 30 instances addressed to the whole class elicited no verbal responses in the recorded data. Yet in instances such as the following, without some form of confirmation from at least one student in response to the demand, remember how we had a language acquisition device/ we had the/ that concept/ language acquisition device, it is unlikely the teacher could have proceeded as he did:
T: …whether you’re a teacher a language teacher or not/ there’s pretty good evidence/
remember how we had a language acquisition device/ we had the/ that concept/
language acquisition device/ there’s almost evidence to suggest that every
human being might be walking around with a language teaching device where/
where/ you watch mothers for example when … (4.1:756-760)

This has implications for findings focussed on the ways students in the NESB and ESB groups
were involved in negotiation of meanings, similar to those noted in relation to the difficulties of
identifying individuals when students simultaneously responded to demands for confirmation.
When there was no recorded response, such as in the instance above, it was not possible to
identify students that negotiated confirmation of the teacher’s demand; in instances of students’
verbal negotiation of demands for confirmation, it was not possible to determine whether
additional students were involved non-verbally, or whether they were NESB or ESB students.
Thus it is acknowledged that what follows presents findings limited to verbal negotiation
captured in the data recordings. It was found that when the teacher addressed demands for
information to the class, students in the ESB group self-selected to give on demand more
frequently than students in the NESB group. Student self-selections to give on demand for each
the four demand types are presented in Figure 5.8:

Figure 5-9: Numbers of instances of NESB and ESB students’ self-selection to give on demand for
each type of teacher demand
Over time, while there appears to be no significant trend in the number of instances of self-selection by students in the NESB group Figure 5.9, below), instances of self-selection by students in the ESB group become more frequent.

![Figure 5-10: Number of NESB and ESB student self-selections in response to teacher demands for information by class](image)

Analysis of qualitative aspects of student utterances is presented below, but on the basis of quanta alone, self-selection to give on demand is a way ESB students are much more involved in the construction and negotiation of meaning in this classroom. If the data is further reduced to two classes of demands, those intended to elicit missing information (WH- interrogatives and imperatives) and those intended, in principle, to elicit confirmation of the validity of a proposition (polar interrogatives and incongruent declaratives) the contrast between the contributions of the two groups in the role of giving of demand takes on an additional dimension. This is shown in Figure 5.10, below, which shows the numbers of instances of self-selection by students in the two groups as percentages of the total responses to the two classes of demand:
Although ESB students made the majority of self-selected contributions to the discourse to give both missing information and confirmation, the two groups of students differed in the types of demands to which they responded (see Figure 5.10). NESB students appeared more prepared to self-select to give missing information as opposed to confirming validity. This is further confirmed by comparing the types of questions asked by the teacher with the types of questions students from the two groups self-selected to answer, shown in as percentages of the total (see Figure 5.11):
Figure 5-12: Types of teacher demands and instances of student self-selection to give on demand as percentages of total

ESB students’ self-selection to give on demand matched the types of demands the teacher made more closely than did the self-selection of the NESB students, who, although they volunteered answers for far fewer teacher questions than the other group, clearly contributed in response to demands for missing information much more than they did to demands for confirmation of validity. As noted earlier, the teacher addressed demands for information realized as WH-interrogatives to the whole class almost exclusively in the role of primary knower, so it seems NESB students were more prepared to self-select in the role of secondary knower in instances which were arguably displays of knowledge, as the instances below illustrate. Both involved NESB Student I, the NESB student who self-selected most frequently to give on demand:

T: … okay/ so mode of discourse/ here we are/ what do we include under this/ what sorts of things are we going to include under mode
I: mode is the role language plays
T: that’s right
I: whether it’s written word or spoken form
T: okay/ alright (1.1:1719-1729)
T: yeah/ and how does that get realised within English/ degrees of formality and ((inaudible))
J: [register
R: [social ((inaudible))
SS: [(inaudible))
I: auxiliary ((inaudible))
T: yeah/ what do we call them/ those auxiliary (1.1:1407-1418)

Not all the teacher’s WH- interrogatives demanded displays of knowledge that were as objective as these two examples. For instance, in the demand below, modality of dependent clauses and uses of the subject you in the clauses realized the demand much more subjectively, although the teacher was judged to be primary knower on the basis of his evaluative responses to ESB Student K:

T: … why/ then/ do you do it/ why/ what are some of the reasons you may have=
R: to give positive
T: =for giving positive feedback when you ought to be giving/ when/ when perhaps you could be giving/ it needs negative feedback
R: [because negative
K: [sometimes though/ you’re trying to reward the process of attempting rather than the product as correct=
T: yep/ mhmm
K: =and you don’t want to dissuade [somebody from doing that
T: [that’s/ that’s part of it/ yeah … (4.1:704-720)

Demands for displays of knowledge didn’t always elicit utterances that expressed certainty or commitment to the propositions such as NESB Student I and ESB Student K realized through mood selection and/or polarity and/or intonation in the instances above. The tonic pattern of the responses of ESB Student J and NESB Student I in the instance below, typical of the polar interrogative, indicated uncertainty about the proposition:

T: yep/ all of the aspects of=
F: grammar
T: = syntax and/ yep/ what else
J: functionality of language maybe ((2))
T: pronunciation
SS: mmm/ yeah/ pronunciation
I: culture ((2))
These responses were more conjectural, more risk-taking, than the earlier examples, and suggest a lower level of commitment to the proposition than the certainty Student I demonstrated in the earlier responses; this feature of student utterances when self-selecting to give on demand in the role of secondary knower is discussed in more detail later.

With few exceptions it was ESB students who self-selected to answer demands addressed to the whole class eliciting confirmation of validity. The instance below illustrates the contrast between many instances of this type of question and demands for missing information. Here the teacher is asking students to make a choice between alternatives that revolve around validity of meanings that were emerging in interaction rather than knowledge students brought to the classroom from prior learning or preparatory reading of course materials. ESB Student K was not prepared to risk making a clear choice and the possibility of being judged ‘incorrect’ by the teacher, but the teacher’s modalized response suggests, objectively, that there was a preferred response:

T: … was that data more valuable or less valuable or/ than/ than the stuff you would have got if you’d given them a subjective test
K: as valuable
T: just as valuable/ yeah/ some people would say it might have even been more valuable … (2.2:213-219)

NESB students, it seems, were prepared to self-select when what was demanded was arguably prior knowledge, but markedly less so when they were asked to commit to a proposition that emerged in unfolding discourse. Isolated examples of NESB students self-selecting in response to demands for confirmation were instances that involved little risk for students. For example, the instance below, in which the polar interrogative is used to project an embedded WH-element, is essentially a display question, and NESB Student C’s highly elliptical answer provides the missing information without any polar adjunct to confirm the teacher’s proposition:

T: … you just couldn’t sustain an argument that says it’s just complete mimicry/ there had to be something else/ do you remember what it was/ what the
C: structuralism
T: structuralism/ that’s right yeah/ structuralism/ which said … (4.1:553-559)
In other instances, such as the example below, the teacher addressed the question about the first language of speakers of English as a second language to the whole class, but in the role of secondary knower; as the primary knower in the negotiation of the proposition, any risk NESB Student I was exposed to arguably excluded the provision of an ‘incorrect’ answer:

T: … I can tell the difference between a Vietnamese speaker and a Chinese speaker/ can you
I: yeah
T: most people can/ yeah … (5.1:104-19)

The ways students in the two groups were involved in negotiation of meaning in the role of giving on demand extended beyond the types of demands to which they self-selected to respond; the groups differed as well in the realisations of responses in terms of complexity and language choices.

5.1.2.1.1 Responses to demands for missing information

Many utterances of students from both groups when self-selecting to answer demands for missing information addressed to the whole class were, typically (Martin, 1992), elliptical clauses providing the information represented by the WH- element, for example, all three ESB students responses to the teacher interrogative below:

T: … why do you make notes
K: to record
R: to record
L: so it lasts (1.1:1824-1830)

In these circumstances the involvement of the students of both groups in the construction of the discursive text is strongly directed by the teacher as primary knower. It was instances of ESB students contributing more complex utterances that set the two groups apart in the realization of responses to WH- interrogatives addressed to the whole class. For example, in the instances below of demands in which WH- elements functioned as Adjunct, ESB Students G and M ellipsed all but the dependent clauses expanding the original proposition. As the answers of ESB Student R and NESB Student W in the first instance illustrate, highly ellipsed clauses were alternatives to the more complex response of Student G:

T: … I guess if you’re teaching English you’re probably giving a lot of positive feedback which/ which may be deceptive/ why/ why do we that/ why
R: [praise]
W: [encourage them]
SS: [(inaudible)]
G: because you want them to feel that they’re achieving ((inaudible)) (to make them confident) they’re doing well (4.1:686-695)

T: … why would syntax/ the other stuff too will also/ probably be assisted by practice
M: because you can’t learn every possible sentence=
T: that’s right yeah
M: =construction so if you’re/ if you’re using the language you’re learning more than you could possibly learn in the classroom just saying here’s one structure/ here’s one structure (4.1:423-432)

Although what was the WH- element most frequently used by the teacher, there is no evidence that the WH- element itself influenced complexity of student responses, or that students from either group selected to answer any particular type of WH- element interrogative more than any other. The instances above, for instance, demonstrate that why elicited both highly elliptical and more complex responses. Although what elicited displays of knowledge often limited to single words or phrases, the response of student J, below, demonstrates that what interrogatives also elicited more extended complex utterances from students. In this instance, as the peremptory tone of the teacher’s utterance that follows suggests, Student J’s attempt to supply missing information was not what the teacher, as primary knower, desired:

T: … what can be learned from case studies
J: well/ you have to take a/ either you take a theory and you/ and you sort of trial it/ the different aspects of the theory where you test it/ the different aspects of the theory/ against something tangible/ some tangible situation or (inaudible) situation/ or you go the other way round and you have it a bit more open-ended/ you/ and you/ but you/ you’ve always got to have a/ an hypothesis/ I mean you’ve got to have something that you’re [trying to
T: [for a case study (1)]

(2.1:422-431)

Instances of a student in the NESB group contributing a more complex utterance in these circumstances were exceptional; in the instance of NESB Student O, below, she is encouraged by the teacher with an imperative, a command to provide a linguistic service, addressed directly to her, although arguably, Student O intended to continue:
T: … how do we get around all of this in our explanation of/ of how in fact we/ we actually do something which looks like genuine language learning and language use/ how did the behaviourists do it/ they had to/ they came in with/ with a/ a

O: standard/ standard patterns/ [(inaudible)) patterns

T: [standard patterns/ that’s right/ yeah

O: ah/ the output was just (an added/(inaudible)) [in the

T: [yeah/ go on Olivia/ keep going

O: in the real situation we usually generate language in a/ in the way we have never heard it before so we usually use the creative ways/ so that’s different/ so it’s a cognitive process instead of the behaviourist

T: instead of behaviourist/ that’s right/ yeah … (4.1:532-549)

Similarly, NESB Student C contributed a lengthy utterance in response to a WH- interrogative addressed to the whole class, but the majority of it, not included here, follows a second demand, a sequence of WH- interrogatives, addressed directly to Student C asking him to expand his proposition:

T: … what are some of the problems with participant observation in terms of a data gathering technique

C: you may lose control of the classroom when you are involved in observation of the classroom

T: you may/ yeah/ what are you thinking of Carl/ with what kind of/ what kind of observation/ how do/ how would/ how are you imagining that observation will take place

C: oh/ it could be actually … (2.2:276-287)

What also set the two groups apart in realization of their responses to demands for missing information addressed to the whole class were grammatical choices within the systems of MOOD, POLARITY, MODALITY, COMMENT, and KEY to express certainty. Language choices of NESB students suggest self-selection was limited largely to instances in which students were certain of the validity of answers to the teacher’s questions; those of students in the ESB group, on the other hand, indicated commitment to validity of answers across a much broader range of certainty. Self-selection by ESB students to contribute propositions about which they are uncertain reveals a fundamental point of difference in the discursive contributions of the two groups.

Students in both groups realized certainty when answering teacher demands through congruently functioning declarative clauses in which positive or negative polarity positioned speakers as committed to the validity of answers. For example, the explicitly objective
language choices of NESB Student I, in the instance below, already included earlier, suggest she was certain of the validity of the answer she gave:

T: … okay/ so mode of discourse/ here we are/ what do we include under this/ what sorts of things are we going to include under mode
I: mode is the role language plays
T: that's right
I: whether it’s written word or spoken form
T: okay/ alright (1.1:1719-1729)

While ESB Student J’s answer in the instance below is similarly explicitly objective, such utterances were not necessarily typical of the students in the ESB group:

T: … what do you see as being a typical sort of activity that goes on in a seminar
J: it’s a student presentation (1.1:1877-1880)

ESB Student K, for example, realizes even stronger certainty in the response in the following through the mood tag that signals her expectation that her answer will be validated by the addressee the teacher:

T: … okay/ that’s field of discourse/ now/ what about tenor of discourse
K: well it’s basically you know how we were talking before about rank and status and gender and=
T: that’s right
K: =sex that sort of thing/ that’s going to come in under tenor at this point/ isn’t it
T: that’s right/ exactly/ yeah/ exactly … (1.1:1365-1375)

The strong, assertive commitment realised through the use of negatively tagged declaratives is the exception rather than the rule. The expression of uncertainty in student responses through selection of the interrogative or the incongruently interrogative declarative occurs far more frequently in the ESB group of students.

Ellipsis of mood elements shifted attention from polarity to tone as the indicator of commitment to propositions. In the instances in the sequence below, it is tone, that of the unmarked statement, of many of the responses of both NESB and ESB students to the teacher’s demands for missing information, what’s one of the skills, what else, and what else is there, that permits analysis as expressions of certainty of validity. The response from NESB Student B is evidence
that certainty did not always translate to validity of the answer. The utterances of ESB students K and R that followed the teacher’s contradiction of Student B both functioned, through choices of mood or tone, as interrogatives, realizing uncertainty of the validity of the propositions they are contributing. These were followed by the second response of ESB Student K, and then those of NESB Students W, O, I, and H, all expressing certainty through the tone characteristic of the unmarked statement.

T: … what really we’re talking about here is down to the level of microskills/ what is it that we/ that we have to do in order/ if we’re going to be said to be learning a language/ what’s one of the skills

B: reading
T: no/ no/ that’s a macroskill isn’t it/ reading/ writing/ listening/ speaking/ macroskills/ but they’re made up of some micro/ lots of different microskills

K: do you think things like meaning
T: [yeah/ like
R: [comprehension ((2))
SS: [(inaudible)
T: like vocabulary
SS: [((inaudible))
K: and grammatical patterns
T: and grammatical patterns/ and what else
W: syntactics
T: syntactics/ that’s your/ that’s her grammatical patterns
I: semantics
O: semantics
T: semantics/ that’s her/ that’s my vocabulary
SS: mmm
T: what else is there
H: discourse
I: phonology
T: discourse/ yeah/ discourse/ phonology/ all of those sorts of things/ okay/ now …

(4.1:106-150)

The utterances of NESB students in this sequence, above, are typical of the certainty realized in language choices of NESB students’ answers more generally, and the same can be said of the variation of those of ESB students. Intonation patterns in the instances of elliptical NESB student responses are consistent, in the main, with unmarked statements; one exception, an elliptical response of NESB Student I (1.1:1121), was included earlier. ESB students, on the
other hand, quite frequently realized uncertainty in ellipsed utterances thorough tone. For instance, in the following, intonation indicated the elliptical responses of ESB Students R and L functioned as either polar interrogatives or tentative statements. Ordinarily, the utterances that follow would be helpful in the analysis of mood selection, but when the teacher is negotiating, as he is here, in the role of primary knower the function of the confirmation is ambiguous:

T: …what are likely to be these issues that/ that Kate’s just mentioned/ status
R: gender ((2))
T: yeah/ gender/ that’s another=
R: age ((2))
T: =one /age yeah
L: religion ((2))
T: all of these are important aren’t they … (1.1:1381-1394)

Although these utterances are analysed as giving on demand, not unsolicited adoption of the role of demanding, responses such as these do serve two the functions of response-initiation in the negotiation of meaning; they give information in response to the teacher’s demand, but at the same time are functioning to demand information from the teacher in the form of confirmation of the propositions involved.

In some instances, ESB students’ uncertainties of validity of missing information they provided was realized more explicitly by selection of interrogative mood, as in the two instances involving ESB Student K, below:

T: … who says it is/ I don’t mean in this class because/ but/ I mean there are pretty influential people
K: is it the behaviourists (3.1:25-29)

T: … how would you go about getting quantitative data in your Saturday morning class
K: would you like/ conduct tests and get test scores (2.2:106-109)

The teacher demands missing information with imperatives on only a few occasions, but in the instance below, ESB Student F responds with a polar interrogative, in this case the uncertainty realized by the demand for confirmation of her answer moderated by selection of negative polarity:
T: … metalinguistic clues/ what goes on with a meta/ give me an example of a metalinguistic clue

F: isn’t it like saying remember that the adjective goes before the noun and [try it again

T: [that’s right/

yeah/ or just using the term adjective (5.2:1465-1471)

Few NESB students expressed uncertainties about their answers using resources of modality. In the case of finite modal operators this was perhaps because of ellipsis of mood elements in many utterances. In relative terms, ESB students modalized utterances more frequently. For example, the teacher demand, below, elicited three modalized responses from ESB students, the first two, using the low value modal finite could, expressing a greater degree of uncertainty than the second, using the median value would:

T: … how do you try to make observations a little bit more or/ a little bit less subjective
J: you could correlate them if you got two people in the class and ((lines 496-500))
G: you could look at what you observed and from/ consider the different/ a different viewpoint from the first one/ you come and consider the flip side of it and look at it from different angles ((lines506-510))
E: also you would observe about tying your own emotions and thoughts to it (2.2:489-513)

While there were fewer instances of the use by ESB students of modal adjuncts or interpersonal metaphor to express uncertainty about responses, such as in the instances of ESB Students J and M, below, there were no instances of NESB students doing so:

T: … what else
J: functionality of language maybe (1.1:1092-1094)

T: … how do you decide how to remediate an error
M: I think it depends on the error (5.1:321-324)

In summary, although students in the NESB group self-selected to answer demands addressed to the whole class that sought to elicit missing information significantly more regularly than demands that elicited confirmation of validity, they still did so much less frequently than students in the ESB group. In addition, although the answers of both groups included many realized elliptically, relatively fewer instances of the utterances NESB students contributed are similar to some of the more complex and extended contributions of ESB students. Unlike the NESB students, the language choices of ESB students suggest they were prepared to self-select
to answer the teacher’s questions when they were uncertain of validity of answers but without committing themselves too strongly to the proposition. Whether this suggests that the students in the NESB group avoided volunteering answers to questions unless they felt certain of the answer or that they simply lacked the command of the linguistic resources of modality to express uncertainty is a question that emerges from the findings across the discursive relationships.

5.1.2.1.2 Responses to demands for confirmation of validity

Disparity between the two groups in self-selection to give on demand is more pronounced in the case of demands for confirmation of validity than was the case for demands for missing information, although the limitations of the data acknowledged earlier are especially pertinent to findings in relation to demands for confirmation. In excess of 90% of self-selected student responses to demands from the teacher for confirmation of validity were contributed by ESB students (see Figure 5-10). The utterances of individual NESB students in this discursive circumstance number nine over the five classes. As the instance of NESB Student C, below, and others included later in this section illustrate, NESB students self-selected to give on demand in response to demands for confirmation when they were the primary knower or the response involved a display of prior knowledge:

T: he’s not a/ he’s not a teacher/ is he/ he’s not
M: [no
C:  [no/ he’s (inaudible)
T: huh
C: he’s in a master of environmental studies (2.1:272-281)

ESB students, on the other hand, while they self-selected in these circumstances as well, also contributed answers about which they themselves were doubtful, as evidenced by the selection of interrogative mood or of tonic patterns consistent with the interrogative to demand confirmation of the validity of their answer.

To generalise, because there was such limited participation by NESB students, the key finding here is that this was a way ESB students were involved in co-construction of the discursive text that, with limited exceptions, NESB students were not. Thus, interest rests not so much in any similarities or variations in the ways the two groups of students negotiated meanings, but more specifically in the ways ESB students realised their responses to the teacher’s demands for confirmation of validity that, in general, illustrate ways NESB students were not involved in interaction.
5.1.2.1.3 Responses to polar interrogatives

Students who self-selected to respond to demands from the teacher for confirmation of validity realized responses in varied ways and, despite the very limited instances of NESB students self-selecting to respond, this was the case for both groups of students.

More than half the responses of students who self-selected to answer polar interrogatives functioned to confirm or contradict the teacher’s propositions. Although many of these were realized as one of the polar adjuncts, yes and/or no, there were variations in the expression of confirmation/contradiction, as the instances below illustrate. NESB Student I, in the first example, used the informal, yeah, to confirm the teacher’s proposition. The second illustrates the frequent use of mhmm to express positive polarity. In the third, both respondents used the informal, yeah, but ESB student J included a second mood adjunct of intensity expressing degree, sure, while the tonic pattern of ESB student F’s oh yeah was that of the insistent statement. In the last, an atypical example, ESB student L used interpersonal metaphor to modulate her expression of negative polarity in a complete clause, placing the tonic prominence on think, essentially, probably not:

T: … I can tell the difference between a Vietnamese speaker and a Chinese speaker/ can you
I: yeah
T: most people can/ yeah … (5.1:10-109)

T: are you familiar with that group/ are you
J: mhmm
T: doctors without borders/ medicine sans frontiere
SS: mmm/ yeah(4.1:1351-1342)

T: … are there aspects of/ of telephone communication which makes it different/= J: [yeah/sure
F: [oh yeah
T: =I mean/ make it more demanding (1.1:1778-1785)

T: … in your mind/ is there good evidence to suggest that/ that hearing lots of language necessarily correlates with improved pronunciation
L: I don’t think so (4.2:44-48)
Contributions of students to the discursive text in instances such as the above are little more than the expediting of the unfolding discourse within the constraints of the teacher proposition. In the first two, the teacher was the secondary knower, as he was in 20% of polar interrogatives addressed to the whole class. Yet the student responses contributed no additional propositional content to the classroom discursive text. In the third the teacher was the primary knower in the sense that confirmation was the preferred answer. This was also the case in the fourth instance, even though he referred to *in your mind*; the discourse that followed made it clear that contradiction of the proposition was in this instance the preferred answer. In 80% of polar interrogatives addressed to the whole class the teacher was the primary knower, and the teacher question called on students to confirm or deny a proposition for which, despite sometimes being realised as an elicitation of the personal experience of students in the classroom, there was an expected or ‘correct’ response. In the instance below, the utterance of the teacher following the modalized response of ESB student R, *absolutely not*, confirmed the contradiction of the proposition as the ‘correct’ answer:

\[
\text{T: yep/ yes that’s a/ that’s a clear example of getting quantitative data/ anything wrong with that} \\
\text{R: no/ not really} \\
\text{T: absolutely not/ in fact for many of you … (2.2:113-118)}
\]

Consider the difference a positive student response in the exchange above would have made to the direction of the discourse. The extract below illustrates how the teacher managed a response that, while it was not polar, suggesting both *yes and no*, was not the one he expected. He proceeded to provide the negative polarity he had hoped to elicit with the question, and elicited acknowledgement validity from ESB Student M:

\[
\text{T: … does it happen with your first language} \\
\text{M: sometimes} \\
\text{T: ohh/ not very often does it/ you don’t have to do that/ it’s/ it’s/ you’re very /you’re very good at that first language} \\
\text{M: yeah (4.1:822-830)}
\]

Polar interrogatives nominally function as questions, utterances produced in the role of demanding information, but, as a way of negotiating meaning, when the teacher retained his role as primary knower, these were instances of negotiating giving of information (Love & Suherdi, 1996). Confirmatory, or at least ‘correct’, polar responses to such polar interrogatives served largely to smooth the giving of information by the teacher. In these circumstances,
although ESB students played a much more significant role in the interaction, it was somewhat perfunctory rather than a substantive negotiation of meaning. Unless many students were responding non-verbally to polar interrogatives, the verbal responses of a minority of student participants, sometimes a single student, and almost always ESB students, was sufficient for the teacher to proceed on the basis propositions had been validated. In terms of negotiation of authoritative dialogical discourse, the teacher’s questions are not generating the participation of additional voices in the dialogue. It was the teacher’s voice that was confirmed. The implications of student silence for individual meaning-making in these situations are matters for speculation, and are taken up in Chapter 8.

Almost half the instances of student self-selections to answer polar interrogatives addressed to the whole class included propositions in addition to or in place of confirmation/contradiction. In the instance below, ESB student J’s response contradicts the polarity of the teacher’s proposition; arguably, the proposition that makes up the remainder of the utterance pre-empts a predictable teacher demand that would follow the contradiction:

T: … is it just vocabulary
J: no/ it’s the grammar as well
T: yeah/ that’s right (1.1:1078-1084)

Although the student response contradicted the polarity of the question, the limiting counterexpectancy of the mood Adjunct just suggested the teacher aimed to elicit a negative response, that is, J’s response was ‘correct’. The teacher’s evaluation of Student J’s response, that’s right, confirmed his role as primary knower. However, in adding a proposition to his polar response, J assumed at least a ‘share’ of the role of primary knower. This was because the teacher’s demand was an instance of an implicit demand for information. Arguably, the teacher’s intention was to elicit more than a polar response, and Student J understood this. In responses to polar interrogatives that implicitly demanded not only confirmation but also information, an explicit confirmation of polarity was not necessarily included. In the following examples, ESB Students J and R ellipse any polar adjunct or clause confirming polarity and the mood block of the clauses, uttering only elaborations:

T: … can you think of any time when you actually put pen to paper
J: oh/ when you’re taking notes/ taking notes
R: taking a message ((2))
T: that’s right/ take a message (1.1:1744-1749)
In addition, the intonation pattern of the response of ESB Student R, above, illustrates the uncertainty realized in some of the elaborated responses of ESB students, a feature absent from the limited instances of self-selection in these circumstances by NESB students. These utterances functioned in the unfolding of the discourse to both give information and to demand confirmation from the teacher. The answer of ESB Student K, below, realized as a polar interrogative, was an explicit demand for confirmation from the teacher of the validity of her response. The other answers from ESB Students J, F, and R illustrate how a single teacher demand often elicited two or more responses that differed in realization and discursive function:

T: … those of you who’ve operated in a second language/ are there aspects of telephone communication which make it different/=  
J: [yeah/ sure  
F: [oh yeah  
T: =I mean/ make it more demanding  
R: it’s [more difficult  
K: [oh/ because it’s not face to face/ [do you mean/ without seeing  
T: [that/ that’s right/ that’s right/ yeah/ exactly/ yeah (1.1:1754-1865)

What is additionally interesting about ESB Student K’s response to the question, above, is the explicit suggestion, do you mean, that the teacher aimed to elicit a specific answer. The teacher is certainly in the role of demanding, but Student K is well aware the response being elicited is not information the teacher does not already possess. There may be a pedagogic purpose to this type of question, but the interactive relationship is that typical of classrooms; the teacher does not cede the role of primary knower and, as long as the ‘correct’ response is supplied, while important to allow the discourse to continue, the participation of students exerted little influence on the direction it takes.

On the other hand, a final instance of self-selected student responses to polar interrogatives illustrates the potential significance of more elaborated responses for appropriation of additional voices in classroom dialogue. There are several instances of the adoption by students of the role of primary knower evident in these instances that demonstrate the potential discursive influence of giving on demand in the classroom even when the teacher aims to retain the role of primary knower. The beginning of this sequence of utterances was included earlier as evidence the teacher asked polar questions in order to elicit a specific response and to illustrate the use of modal adjuncts. What the complete exchange shows is ESB student F also responded to the question after the teacher evaluated M’s response. Then M, despite her positive acceptance of
the teacher’s utterance, elaborated on her initial response *sometimes* with the end result being that the teacher accepted and evaluated the responses positively:

T: … it’s the rehearsal/ so in preparation for the/ the actual production/ in preparation for the output/ okay/ it tends to happen/ does it happen with your first language

M: sometimes

T: ohh/ not very often does it/ you don’t have to do that/ it’s/ it’s/ you’re very/ you’re very good at that first language

M: yeah

F: if you’re making a phone call you might have to prepare what you’re going to say before you [(inaudible)

M: 

T: yeah

M: =(inaudible) about the language (4.1:821-845)

Both Students M and F were giving information on demand as elaborations of responses to the teacher’s demand, and in doing so challenged the teacher’s status as primary knower, demonstrating the capacity of some ESB students to shape the discourse as they responded to teacher questions that in principle required only polar responses for the discourse to proceed.

5.1.2.1.4 Responses to incongruent declaratives

This was a minor way students were involved by the teacher in negotiation of meaning. Of 108 instances of students self-selecting to confirm validity, 16 were responses to teacher demands realized as declarative clauses functioning as demands. The involvement of NESB students was limited, more so than for self-selecting to answer polar interrogatives, but consistent with other self-selections by NESB students; in the two instances students were in the role of primary knower and certain of validity of their answers. This reflects what is interesting about ways both groups of students were involved in negotiation of meanings in self-selecting to answer this type of teacher demand.

There were relatively fewer instances of the teacher making demands as primary knower. In the instance below, the teacher as secondary knower, dependent on the student responses for confirmation of the propositions, realised two demands as declarative clauses following an initial polar interrogative:
T: … you should be concerned with the field of discourse that you’ll be teaching/ you should be also interested in/ in issues to do with tenor of discourse/ and you should also be interested in mode of discourse/ are those terms familiar

SS: yes mmm

T: yeah/ those are/ these are terms that you’ve/ you’ve struck before in other/ in other places ((2))

SS: yes/yeah

T: okay/ Ian’s been talking about it ((2))

SS: mmm/ yeah

T: okay

I: we just learn it

T: just learn it

I: yes (1.1:149-171)

This is not to say there were no instances of students responding as secondary knowers, for example in the instance below, as evidenced by the teacher utterance, yeah/ that’s right, that follows the response of ESB Student K.

T: there’s one interesting confirmation check that’s going on all the time=

R: mmm

T: =when she talks ((1))

K: the upper inflection in [the voice ((2))

T: [yeah/ that’s right/ yeah … (3.2:1685-1693)

However, authentic exchanges of information, as opposed to the pedagogic type above, were generally achieved when students responded to this type of demand. In the instance below, the rising tone on the mood tag made it clear the teacher needed a student to self-select to confirm/contradict his proposition. NESB Student C’s contradiction effectively pre-empted a teacher demand that would predictably follow the contradiction:

T: he’s not a/ he’s not a teacher/ is he ((2))/ he’s not

M: ]no

C: [no/ he’s (inaudible)

T: huh

C: he’s in a master of environmental studies (2.1:272-281)

Reliance of the teacher on responses for confirmation imparted an intrinsically different quality to interactive relationships. In the following, part of a discussion of the language learning
activity, dictagloss, the clause students responded to is *what they want is ‘created by’/ isn’t it* ((2)). ESB Student A responded positively while the unidentified respondents and ESB Student R contradicted the teacher who accepted the alternative proposed:

T: … but really what they want is *consistent/ okay/ or got/ no/ created by* I think *isn’t it* ((2))
A: yeah
R: she’s saying consists/= SS: consists of
R: [=she’s saying consisted of/ consisted of
T: [no/ consists of/ consists of/ yeah/ mmm/ and he thinks they’re saying consistent (1.1:1701-1712)

To return to the broader field of teacher demands for confirmation in general, involvement by the students in the NESB group in self-selecting to negotiate such teacher demands was limited both in comparison to the involvement of ESB students and in comparison to their self-selection to negotiate demands for missing information realised as WH- interrogatives. Within the constraints of this limited involvement, there were qualitative differences between the ways the two groups of students’ participated. NESB students self-selected when the teacher was in the role of secondary knower, and when, although the teacher retained the role of primary knower, demands elicited displays of prior knowledge. In these circumstances they were certain of the validity of answers.

ESB students self-selected in these circumstances as well, but also when they were less certain of the validity of answers. This was not only evident in realizations of answers as demands for confirmation, as already noted, but in language selections drawing on the resources of MODALITY and COMMENT, resources from which NESB students made no selections in responding to demands for confirmation. The instances below illustrate how uncertainty was realized by ESB students in both highly elliptical responses using modal Adjuncts, as in the response of ESB Student J, and in instances such as that of ESB Student L, in which the high value modal finite operator, *has (got) to*, as well as the asseverative comment Adjunct, *obviously*, expressed certainty:

T: … do extroverts make better language learners
J: probably (3.2:1949-1951)

T: … could you imagine it leading to pronunciation lessons
To conclude this section, analysis of verbal responses of students to demands for confirmation found that ways students responded to polar interrogatives fell into two broad groups: those that provided only the polarity demanded by this type of interrogative, and; those that included additional propositional content. The students that self-selected to respond to polar interrogatives in both these categories were, predominantly, students in the ESB group. With few exceptions, the student responses in the former category matched the expectations of the teacher and, as a way of negotiating meaning, contributed little that was substantive to shaping or unfolding of the discourse, effectively leaving the teacher in control of the information that was exchanged. Student responses in the latter category had the potential to play a more substantial role in negotiating meanings and incorporating students’ voices in the discursive text, and ESB students drew on choices in the systems of MODALITY and COMMENT in negotiations. The significance of this demands consideration, but suffice to note here that that this means negotiations of meanings when this category of demand was realized by the teacher in DR2 were largely in the hands of the teacher and some of the ESB students in the class.

5.1.2.1.5 Joint construction of responses when giving on demand

A further distinction between the two groups of students when responding to demands addressed to the whole class was the practice of some ESB students of joint construction of answers to the teacher’s questions. For example, ESB Student R, below, contributed her own completion of ESB Student J’s proposition in answer to the teacher’s question:

T: … how would you handle that
((lines 562-572))
J: put all the high ranking officers [in one group
R:  [together/ yeah
T: yeah and … (1.1:560-578)

There was a fine line analytically between joint construction and confirmation of the validity of the answer given by the other students (see p. 197). For instance, ESB Student F’s interjection, below, completed the clause being uttered by ESB Student K, but could also be regarded as a confirmation or even a repetition of the earlier clause in Student K’s utterance:
T: how’s your/ how’s our remediation going to go with this
F: [ohhh/ lots of repetition
SS: [([inaudible)])
K: I would suggest she’s/ you know/ one of the factors influencing her production and her errors is motivation/ she’s simply not=
F: not motivated
K: = motivated to move beyond the plateau level that she’s at
SS: mmm/ yeah
T: absolutely/ yeah/ yeah/ she’s doing fine where she is and what she’s doing (5.2:446-461)

Whatever the analysis of instances such as this, both instances above are illustrative of discursive practices limited to some of the ESB students in the class that, while not pervasive, occurred regularly and are interpreted as observable evidence of participation in the co-authoring of the discursive text by students as active responsive listeners. This interpretation is extended to posit that the students involved verbalised their responses on some occasions and not others, that is, joint construction is arguably evidence of the practice of active responsive listening that is, for the most part, unobservable. The question that arises in light of finding that it was ESB students only who provided the evidence for this suggestion is the status of NESB students in this regard. Did NESB students, like some ESB students, choose not to participate in and through this practice, that is, to practice silence, or were they too engaged in the work of listening, as suggested in the research of Nakane (2002), to be actively responsive in this way?

5.1.2.2 Students giving on demand as direct addressees

Students were involved in giving in response to teacher demands directed to them as individuals in two distinct classroom situations, the unfolding of whole class interaction, and the reporting of teaching practicum experiences of classroom group work. While language choices of students in these circumstances are of interest, there are constraints on comparisons between the students in the two groups.

5.1.2.2.1 Responses as direct addressees: Whole class interaction

As noted in the findings (above, p. 149) on the discursive context of students giving on demand, in unfolding classroom discourse, demands were more likely to be directly addressed to students who were previous speakers, because they either adopted the role of giving or they self-selected to give on demand. In the latter case, there were instances of this leading to more than one directly addressed demand. The outcome, given the disparity between the two groups in self-selection (outlined above) and in adoption of the role of giving (see Chapter 7), was
significantly more questions directly addressed to individual students in the ESB group than to students in the NESB group. Thus many instances of responses to demands directly addressed to students were continuations of interactions rather than instances of teacher-initiated selection of individuals.

Within these constraints, the ways students were involved differs initially from self-selection in that the direct address means any propensity of students in the two groups to respond more readily to demands either for confirmation of validity or for missing information is no longer relevant. The key differences between the two groups are again to do with language selections in systems of interpersonal meanings and the roles of the students as primary or secondary knowers.

In the sequence below, ESB Student M self-selected to answer the teacher’s WH- interrogative, and she was then involved in a sequence in which the teacher addressed a further nine demands to her, the first three of which are included here, a demand for a linguistic service, a WH-interrogative, and an incongruently functioning declarative:

T: … why are these people making this error
M: is it overgeneralisation do you think
T: yeah/ could you elaborate on that
M: because it doesn’t exist in their own language/ the distinction between/ you know it doesn’t exist in their own language maybe ((2))
T: what doesn’t
M: the/ the
F: the ((inaudible)) and the verb
M: yeah/ so that there’s no need for it to be plural=
T: ((inaudible))
M: =in Italian or/ or whatever that you
F: Japanese is the same
M: yeah/ Japanese is the same
F: you don’t change it for he she or I or it
T: now/ this is plural you’re talking about ((3))
L: so in three dog you don’t need the s because you have the number
J: [simplification
M: [yeah/ there is no plural really/ well/ you just don’t need it for that (5.2:2145-21279)
ESB Student F self-selected to answer the teacher’s second WH-interrogative, *what doesn’t*, and ESB Students L and J adopted the role of giving to contribute, but the interest lies in Student M’s language selections. She moved from the choice of interrogative mood in her initial answer, to selecting the mood Adjunct, *maybe*, to seek confirmation of validity of her answer to the demand for linguistic information in the first teacher demand directly addressed to her. Finally, she expressed her growth in certainty from the selection of a low value modal Adjunct, *maybe*, through to the stronger commitment of a factual comment Adjunct, *really*, in the last utterance in the sequence. This progression mirrored the shift of the role of primary knower from the teacher in the first demand, an analysis supported by the mood choice of Student M’s answer and the teacher’s confirmation, to Student M in the teacher’s final demand, where he relied on Student M to provide the confirmation.

Students M’s selection of the low value modal Adjunct when the teacher was the primary knower contrasts with the commitment to propositional validity realized in the polarity of the response of NESB Student O, below. Here, the teacher followed Student O’s initial self-selection to answer his demand for linguistic information with a demand for a confirmation of her proposition which he, asserting his role as primary knower, then contradicts:

T: … tell me why you don’t think it’s/ it’s necessary and sufficient
O: it’s not challenging enough
T: it’s not [challenging
O: [not challenging enough/ yeah
T: so challenging/=
O: yeah
T: =something has to be challenging as well ((3))
O: a little more difficult than other experiences/ yeah
T: but isn’t that what Krashen says
O: yeah (3.1:48-67)

Modalization is not entirely absent from the responses of NESB students when directly addressed. In one of the few instances, NESB Student C, below, in response to a demand directly addressed to him following self-selection, negotiated missing information using a low value finite modal in a statement, although in conjunction with a factual comment Adjunct, even though the teacher was analysed here to be the secondary knower:

T: … how are you imagining that observation will take place
C: oh/ it could be/ actually/ it could be field notes/ … (2.2: 284-287)
Negotiation through modality by NESB students was, however, the exception, regardless of who was in the role of primary knower, whereas the utterances of ESB students in response to demands directed to them by the teacher as primary knower, used modality, mood Adjuncts and tone to negotiate the validity of their responses. For example, ESB Student A, below, after the certainty of his response to the teacher’s initial demand, realized his response to the subsequent demand addressed directly to him to express his uncertainty of the validity. The modal Finite and the modal Adjunct in conjunction with the tonic pattern of the clause meant it functioned semantically as a demand for confirmation.

T: … or is it proficiency which causes the person to be a high input generator/ is it
A: with Igor/ he went up into a/ a higher level class=
T: okay
A: =and then he stopped [(talking)
T: [and then he stopped/ yeah/ so what would you infer from that
A: it could be related to proficiency perhaps (2))
T: well/ it could very well be that/ that the fact that Igor was pro/ was proficient that …
(3.2:1998-2011)

In summary, in instances of demands addressed directly to students, ESB students drew on the resources of the systems of interpersonal meaning to negotiate meanings from a position of some uncertainty when the teacher was in the role of primary knower, but when the teacher was in the role of secondary knower realized propositions with more certainty relying more on Mood and polarity for negotiation. NESB students, on the other hand, negotiated most responses from the position of the certainty carried by declarative Mood and Polarity regardless of who was the primary knower in the exchange of information.

5.1.2.2.2 Student responses to teacher demands directly addressed to another student

ESB students were involved in negotiation in DR2 in a way that NESB students were not. This was the practice of answering questions directly addressed to other students in the context of whole class interaction. The teacher’s demand in the sequence below was directly addressed to ESB student M, yet ESB Student F answered before Student M and ESB Student R also answered following the utterance of Student M:

M: yeah/ he wants to be in my class/ he’s Japanese and he wants to be in my class
T: well/ why wasn’t he in your class
F: she’s teaching Japanese
M: in intermediate Japanese ((2))
R: she’s teaching Japanese
M: yeah
T: ohhh/ I see … (2.1:238-240)

Analytically there were instances where it was difficult to judge if students who were not direct addressees responded to the teacher’s demand or to the answers of students directly addressed. In the instance below, the teacher’s demand was addressed to ESB Student L following her comment during a discussion of the effectiveness of a teacher recast of a student error in a video recording of a language class (it, in the teacher’s question refers to the recast). The utterance of ESB student M was analysed as an answer to the teacher’s question, but conceivably could have been regarded as either supporting or jointly constructing the answer of Student L. Likewise, the utterance of ESB Student R was potentially ambiguous. It was analysed as an answer to the teacher’s question on the basis of tone, but the use of the item (un)clear could have been analysed equally as a contradiction of Student L’s proposition had she stressed the prefix alone:

L: pronunciation-wise it was clearer the second time
T: so you think/ think it did have an effect ((2))
L: I think more pronunciation-wise [(inaudible)]
M: [yeah because she said it/=]
R: it was unclear
M: =she said it better the second time (5.2:2061-2070)

Despite the questions that surround overlapping sequences, these instances point to the responsive listening of indirect addressees during dyadic interactive sequences in the classroom. Although instances of this practice were not found frequently in the data, they suggest evidence of involvement in joint construction of meaning that is, apart from these instances, not observable or captured in the verbal data that were collected. Once again, this points to the weakness of reliance on verbal data alone to provide a comprehensive picture of how participants were involved in negotiating meanings in relation with the discursive text as it unfolded in interaction.
5.1.2.2.3 Responses as direct addressees: Reporting

The teacher demanded selected students give on demand to report the teaching practicum experience and classroom group work. The data for the latter was limited to one instance in Class 3 that elicited utterances from NESB Students H and O and ESB Students R, F, and K. The paucity of data and the limited involvement of students from both groups restricted the findings on how students were involved in negotiation of meaning in this particular discursive situation. What set it apart from the practicum reporting was the teacher’s position as primary knower, evident in his responses to the reports which included confirmations and contradictions of the validity of student propositions. However, the language choices of the students in the seven utterances concerned mirrored those made in the more extensive data generated by practicum reporting, so the two have been combined.

The teacher selected students in Classes 3, 4, and 5 to give on demand to report practicum experiences. Following initial demands selecting students, subsequent demands were directly addressed to reporting student as previous speakers. It was found the reporting mode had implications for roles as knowers in the discursive relationship and types of demands made to students. In these circumstances there are constraints on generalizing about the two groups and any comparisons of them; in the classes in which data were collected, NESB Students O, I, and Y, and ESB Students A, F, and M were not selected to report, while ESB Students E, J, and K, were selected twice. The outcome was six reports contributed by six NESB students and nine contributed by six ESB students. Despite the disparity in the number of reporting sequences, NESB students responded to nearly twice the number of teacher demands as did the ESB students. Ways the teacher demands involved students from the two groups who were selected differed as well; NESB students responded to more demands for confirmation, while ESB students responded to more demands for missing information (see Figure 5.12):
Students’ responses in these exchanges included the most extended and sustained student utterances found in the data. For example, in Class 5 ESB student K spoke for more than three minutes in a single utterance, although there were occasional acknowledgements from the teacher and other ESB students. There were a number of similar utterances from other students. NESB students N, C, D, W, and B all produce extended multi-clause utterances, lengthy compared with their utterances in other DR2 interactions. Thus, while these constitute 41% of the instances of utterances contributed to the discourse in DR2 by NESB students, a significant proportion compared with the 9% of the total instances for ESB students, the length of the utterances means this is the context across all the discursive relationships in which NESB students are most involved. It was the only recorded participation of NESB Student D, and NESB Student N contributed only three brief clauses elsewhere in the recorded data. However, the selective nature of the student contributions, from both groups, constrains any findings regarding the language choices in group terms.

Although what sets the practicum reporting apart from much of the interaction in DR2 is that the students in both groups were in the role of primary knower in the discursive relationship, one clear difference between the two groups was the extent of the negotiation between the reporting student and the teacher during the reporting, reflected in Figure 5.12, above. Compared to ESB students, NESB students who reported responded on average to three times the number of additional demands from the teacher; While no ESB student responded to more than five additional demands, NESB Student W responds to 11 and NESB Student B to 14.
additional demands from the teacher. The preponderance of responses of NESB students to
demands for confirmation, shown in Figure 5.12, came about as the students negotiated with the
teacher a shared understanding of the propositions that constituted their report. This appears to
stem from differing practices of the students in the two groups in responses to polar
interrogatives. Negotiation of validity of NESB students’ propositions elicited student
responses that did no more than confirm validity, and consisted of polar adjuncts or clauses
confirming/contradicting polarity. Some negotiations consisted of several demands and
responses. For example, in the sequence of utterances of the teacher and NESB Student B,
below, the teacher used two additional polar interrogatives and an incongruent declarative to
negotiate his original demand:

T: … did you have end up having them doing those things
B: no/ I didn’t
T: didn’t you
B: no
T: I mean the/ like/ did you have them role-playing
B: yeah (inaudible)
T: yeah/ so they were doing those things=
B: yeah
T: =that you were going to ask them about/ what you learnt
B: yeah
T: okay (4.2:459-479)

Similarly, during reporting of the practicum NESB student W, below, responded to a sequence
of demands from the teacher to confirm a shared understanding of her report:

T: so this was going to be over the phone
W: yes
T: ringing about=
W: yeah that’s right
T: =returning goods
W: yes
T: over the phone
W: that’s right (3.2: 345-359)

The practice of NESB students of providing confirmation of polar interrogatives, but no more,
contrasted with ESB students who characteristically provided additional information. In the
instance below, although the teacher appeared to make a second demand, it was because ESB Student R had responded with a polar adjunct during the teacher utterance; once his demand is complete, she did not include a polar adjunct but contradicted the polarity of the proposition in a clause complex giving additional information:

T: ...did they have a/ did you have a transcript with that=
R: yes
T: =I mean did/ did they have a transcript
R: they/ they weren’t looking at the transcript when we did the conversation and we specifically did that because last time they were looking at the transcript=
T: oh yeah
R: =and we thought/ and that’s when they said it was quite easy for them to/ to do
(4.2:64-76)

Similarly, ESB Student J, following his contradiction of the teacher’s questions about his lesson, continued to provide what his response has effectively identified as missing information, pre-empting the teacher demand that arguably would have ensued:

T: but you were asking them eventually/ weren’t you ((2)) / to do a critique of a film
((2))
J: no no no/ not to do a critique because the/ the/ the/ the aim was/ the target language was likes/ dislikes/ preferences/ and comparisons (3.2:704-707)

The status of primary knower, illustrated in the instances above, is reflected in the consistent choice of declarative mood by the two groups of students, unlike the instances of student self-selection when the teacher was the primary knower and responses of ESB sometimes functioned as interrogatives. ESB students are nonetheless set apart from the NESB students by their expression in some utterances of uncertainty through mood and comment Adjuncts and interpersonal metaphor, and more limited selection of finite modal operators. The instance of ESB Student E, below, for example, is an interesting illustration of how ESB students responded to the teacher’s negotiation of their reporting. The comment Adjunct, actually, and the median value finite modal operator, would, suggest Student E was more committed to the validity of her proposition than she was following the teacher’s arguably joking response, oh/ impossible. She continued using the low value mood Adjuncts, possibly and maybe, additionally modalized by the interpersonal projection of I think:

E: … and it actually seems like it would be a more workable=
T: mhmm
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E: =way to do it
T: oh/ impossible
E: yeah/ well=/
SS: [(inaudible)]
T: [no/ no/ fair enough/ yeah
E: = / I think with the lesson we were doing possibly/ maybe the lesson we were doing
didn’t lend to the way that you’ve structured it
T: yeah mm how what sort of structure
E: we’d done the …(3.2:179-198)

This sensitivity of language choice in the face of what functioned semantically as a
contradiction, even if jocular, contrasted with the way NESB Student W, for example, in the
continued unfolding of a sequence included above, responds to the tagged declarative clause
emphasising the teacher’s implicit suggestion the task set by Student W was too difficult for her
language learners.

T: over the phone
W: that’s right
T: oh/ okay/ you’re making it difficult/ aren’t you
W: yes/ and then I/ I said to them okay now I have a lot of these magazines … (3.2:357-
363)

Although it is entirely speculative to suggest, conceivably ESB students might have responded
differently, perhaps positioning themselves and the teacher in relation to the proposition through
Adjuncts or modal selections, rather than the uncompromising response of Student W, a polar
adjunct confirming the teacher’s proposition before she continued.

Although the teacher remained to a large extent the manager of the interaction, the selected
students from both groups played the role in the interactive relationship of primary knower,
performing the service demanded of them and contributing to the discursive text being
constructed in the class. In a seeming contradiction, the responses of the NESB students were
in fact negotiated more closely and intensively than those of the ESB students, yet the language
choices of the NESB students realized their responses with a certainty stronger than that found
in the responses of the ESB students who were allowed freer rein. Although there was
substantial negotiation with the teacher of the meanings contributed by the selected NESB
students, this was a particularly important way NESB students were actively involved in
authoring and negotiating the discursive text, a contrast to silent responsive understanding as a
way of meaning-making when interacting with a text constructed by ESB students and the teacher.

5.1.2.3 Individual students

Analysis of data below the distinction between the two groups of students, NESB and ESB, revealed variations in ways individuals in both groups were involved in self selecting to give on demand to negotiate meanings. The absences of some students (noted in Chapter 4) militate against direct comparisons in some cases. Variations in instances of self-selection to give on demand were evident among students in both groups (see Table 5.1) but the most active NESB students in this regard, Students I, O, C, and W gave on demand more frequently than only the least active ESB student, Student A.

Apart from the broader overall variation between the total instances of self-selection, a couple of points of interest are to be found in Table 5.1. Six of the nine instances of NESB students self-selection to confirm the polarity or validity of propositions involved Student I, accentuating further the apparent preference of the remaining students for self-selecting to give missing information. In this respect NESB Student I, who self-selected in equal measure for both the broad types of demand, was distinctive within the NESB group. Among the ESB students, while all reflected the group finding of more frequent self-selection to give missing information, proportions varied between 54% of instances for Student M and 72% of instances for Student J.
Variations in teacher selections of students are not regarded as being as significant as self-selection. As noted earlier, the analysis of addressees found that direct addressees of teacher demands were predominantly students who self-selected to give on demand or adopted the roles of giving or demanding. Thus differences between individuals in frequency of direct address by the teacher to some extent reflected and further accentuated differences in propensity to participate voluntarily in the interaction such as that shown in Table 5.1. However, as Table 5.2 shows, there were notable variations between the numbers and types of demands directly addressed to students who gave on demand outside the reporting context. Reference to Table 5.1, and the findings to be presented in Chapters that follow, confirms that these do not directly reflect the differing participation of the students in self-selection to give on demand or adoption of the roles of giving and demanding. While ESB Student J was very active in all three discursive relationships, ESB Student M was not one of the most active. ESB Students R and K, who ranked among the most active in all relationships, had few demands directly addressed to them. These findings suggest that the propositions contributed by ESB Students J and M, whether when self-selecting or when adopting other roles, were for some reason, negotiated by the teacher through demands for confirmation or for more information. The number of

![Table 5-2: Numbers of instances of self-selection by NESB and ESB students to give on demand in total and by types of teacher demand](image)

Variations in teacher selections of students are not regarded as being as significant as self-selection. As noted earlier, the analysis of addressees found that direct addressees of teacher demands were predominantly students who self-selected to give on demand or adopted the roles of giving or demanding. Thus differences between individuals in frequency of direct address by the teacher to some extent reflected and further accentuated differences in propensity to participate voluntarily in the interaction such as that shown in Table 5.1. However, as Table 5.2 shows, there were notable variations between the numbers and types of demands directly addressed to students who gave on demand outside the reporting context. Reference to Table 5.1, and the findings to be presented in Chapters that follow, confirms that these do not directly reflect the differing participation of the students in self-selection to give on demand or adoption of the roles of giving and demanding. While ESB Student J was very active in all three discursive relationships, ESB Student M was not one of the most active. ESB Students R and K, who ranked among the most active in all relationships, had few demands directly addressed to them. These findings suggest that the propositions contributed by ESB Students J and M, whether when self-selecting or when adopting other roles, were for some reason, negotiated by the teacher through demands for confirmation or for more information. The number of
instances of demands addressed directly to individuals in the NESB group generally reflects their discursive activity across the discursive relationships. Demands addressed to students in both groups outside the reporting context are perhaps more a reflection that these are student who participate in one or more of the discursive relationships, rather than directly reflecting the extent of participation.

While the positive relationship between individual participation and direct address holds true across all discursive relationships, self-selection to give on demand did not necessarily prompt the teacher to respond to the previous speaker with a subsequent demand. Perhaps this reflects how in most of the teacher’s demands outside the reporting context has was managing giving information as primary knower, and this constrained the need to negotiate meanings elicited in response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>WH- interrogatives</th>
<th>Polar</th>
<th>Incongruent declaratives</th>
<th>Imperatives</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>WH- interrogatives</th>
<th>Polar</th>
<th>Incongruent declaratives</th>
<th>Imperatives</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-3: Numbers of instances in whole class context of teacher selection of NESB and ESB students to give on demand in total and by types of teacher demand

5.1.3 Student responses to other student answers

Responding to answers of other students was a practice restricted to some of the ESB students. Although tone offered guidance in some instances, it proved difficult to distinguish definitively between utterances in which the student effectively adopted the role of primary knower to
confirm answers of student respondents, and utterances as secondary knowers to support other students’ answers. For example, in the instance below, ESB Student K validated the proposition of ESB Student L, although whether in a supportive role, suggesting that she too demanded validation of the proposition from the teacher, or in the role of knower validating the proposition itself, is difficult to judge:

T: … could you imagine it leading to pronunciation lessons
((lines 1105-1117))
L: when pronunciation is interfering with communication then obviously=
K: yeah
L: =it’s got to be addressed (1.1:1103-1123)

Similarly, in the instance below, whether ESB Student R was confirming the tentative proposition of ESB Student K, or adding her voice to Student K’s implicit demand for acknowledgement from the teacher is difficult to determine with certainty:

T: this is/ this is/ this is most un-Vietnamese like/ don’t you think
R: mm[m
J: [mmmm
K: I found it really surprising that if she thought it was not important that she’d say it was unimportant ((3))
R: [yeah
T: [yeah (3.2:1829-1840)

As was the case with other ways some of the ESB students were involved in negation of meaning and the accompanying construction of the discursive text, despite any analytic uncertainty, the practice is evidence of active responsive listening by these students in the role of indirect addressee in polyadic discourse.

5.2 Summation

In this discursive relationship, although there were a number of important differences between the students in the two groups, ways both NESB and ESB students were involved in negotiating meaning was determined in important ways by the teacher. By adoption of the role of demanding, the teacher defined the discursive relationship and shaped and managed the discourse by the types of demands he made, the address of the demands to either the whole group or individuals, and the retention or endowment of the role of primary knower.
What was different about the ways the two groups of students gave on demand were firstly the disparity in the extents to which they self-selected to give on demand and the language choices they made when they did so. The majority of the contributions of the students in the NESB group came when they were directly addressed, although the expression of meanings with little recourse to the language choices apart from those offered by MOOD and POLARITY contrasted with the ways ESB students, who more fully exploited the systems of interpersonal meanings to position themselves and their addressees in relation the propositions they contributed when giving on demand to the teacher. The reporting context provided the discursive space for the most significant contributions of NESB students to the discourse, at least in terms of quantum, but, although addressed at the very least indirectly to the whole class, the nature of DR2 meant that these contributions were very much dyadic interactions between student and teacher. As a group, the ESB students interacted more freely and extensively within the discursive opportunities offered by the teacher and in addition frequently contributed to the negotiation and construction of the discursive text when indirect addressees. These differences in the ways students were involved in the negotiation of meanings that constituted the discursive text meant the voices of ESB students played a more significant role, in conjunction with the teacher, in determining the meanings that constituted the discursive text and context(s) in and through which exchanges, primarily of information, took place when the teacher adopted the role of demanding.
CHAPTER 6

6 DISCURSIVE RELATIONSHIP 3 - STUDENTS IN THE ROLE OF DEMANDING

Discursive Relationship 3 (DR3) was characterised by adoption by students of the speech role of demanding, casting direct and/or indirect addressee/s – the teacher and/or student participants in interactions - in the speech role of giving on demand (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). NESB and ESB student groups, and individuals within the two groups, differed in the ways and extent to which they were involved in the speech role of demanding in:

- adoption of the role of demanding information or goods/services;
- responding to demands addressed to them directly or indirectly by another student who had adopted the role of demanding; and
- participation in discourse following adoption of the role of demanding.

6.1 Students’ adoption of the role of demanding

6.1.1 Adoption of the role of demanding by NESB and ESB students

The number of utterances in which students in the two groups adopted the role of demanding in each class, and in total, is shown in Figure 6.1:
NESB students adopted the role of demanding in 34 utterances and ESB students in 155 utterances. Although the numbers of demands made by both groups fluctuated from class to class, two points emerge from Figure 6.1. The ESB student group consistently adopted the role of demanding more frequently than the NESB student group, and instances of NESB students doing so declined markedly, from 17 in Class 1, to the point of insignificance, a single demand in Class 5 (absences need to be noted; see Table 6.2). Over time, NESB students made fewer demands in fewer utterances relative to the number made by ESB students, as Figure 6.2 illustrates:
Considered in terms of demands made by individual students within the groups (Table 6.1), the disparity takes on additional dimensions. It needs to be noted Student D was absent from two classes, Students A, G, O, Y, and B were absent from one class, Student J arrived late for four of the classes, and Student B for one. Notwithstanding, variation between individuals in both groups of students is clear. ESB Students J and K were responsible for nearly half of all utterances realizing demands made by ESB students. Six ESB students, Students J, K, L, E, R, and G made 75% of the total number of demands.
Table 6-1: Number of utterances in which NESB and ESB students adopt the role of demanding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESB Students (9)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>NESB students (9)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>155</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ESB Student A and NESB Students W and D did not adopt the role of demanding at any time during the five classes in the transcribed data. Student O accounted for over 50% of NESB student demands and Students O, Y, and B were the only students in the NESB group who adopted the role of demanding more than twice throughout all five classes.

Frequency of adoption of the role of demanding by individual students over the course of the five classes is also of interest (Table 6.2, below). Variations in participation of students between classes are striking. Only ESB Student J adopted the role of demanding more than once in all five classes. ESB Student L made 80% of her demands in Class 1. Six NESB students did not adopt the role of demanding in four, or more, of the classes in which data were collected. It is clear from Table 6.2 that NESB Student O made more demands than the rest of the NESB group of students combined. She is the only student from that group to ask at least one question in every class she attended. Student O was absent in Class 5 and thus her participation could not be tracked through all five classes.
Findings presented to this point provide an important element of the context of those presented in the remainder of this chapter. Any comparisons of the ways students in the two groups negotiated meaning in and through adoption of the role of demanding are constrained by the significant disparity in the number of instances.

### 6.1.2 Relationships as knowers

Adoption of the role of demanding by students was not for the purpose of negotiating giving information, as was the case with many of the demands made by the teacher. Students positioned themselves as secondary knowers who did not possess missing information or who were uncertain of the validity of propositions. In line with the approach adopted in this study, the role of knower is interpreted in terms that reflect realizations of certainty in and through selections in the systems of interpersonal meanings. Thus the findings in this Chapter refer to how participants positioned themselves as secondary knowers, based on the evidence of language choices that suggest relationships between participants as knowers in DR3 are complex and varied.

### 6.1.3 Discursive contexts of adoption of the role of demanding by NESB and ESB students

In DR1 and DR2, student utterances, by definition, were responses and followed those of the teacher. Exceptions were student joint constructions. In DR3, students initiated shifts in discursive relationships, and thus the discursive relationships that prevailed in the immediate
co-text are of interest in placing students’ participation in the unfolding of the discourse.
Within the limitations imposed by disparities in participation of the two groups of students, it was found that circumstances surrounding adoption of the role of demanding by students in the two groups were different in three respects of note; co-textual relationships with other participants and with the students’ own utterances, and whether students were addressees of co-text (see Table 6-3, below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context of adoption of the role of demanding by students (DR3)</th>
<th>Instances of NESB students adoption the role of demanding (%)</th>
<th>Instances of ESB students adoption the role of demanding (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Following teacher in DR1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following interaction in DR2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following interaction in DR3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resuming the role of demanding (DR3)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following interaction in DR4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student shifts from giving (DR4) to demanding (DR3)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student adopting the role of demanding was addressee of preceding utterance</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-3: Contexts of adoption of the role of demanding by NESB and ESB students as percentages

It was noted in Chapter 4 that students initiated shifts in discursive relations following teacher utterances in the role of giving in DR1. As shown in Table 6-3, above, forty percent of the demands of ESB students and 26% of those of NESB students followed the teacher in the role of giving. This included acceptance of discursive opportunities offered by teacher explicitly or through comprehension/satisfaction checks. This is significant for NESB students; most of the instances of adoption of the role of demanding by NESB students following DR1 involved acceptance of discursive opportunities, that is, the adoption of the role of demanding by these students was to some extent managed by the teacher. ESB students were not similarly constrained, and the great majority of their questions following the teacher in the role of giving were demonstrations of initiative to create discursive opportunities.
Although about 10% of the instances of ESB students’ adoption of the role of demanding followed interaction in DR2, these were the circumstances in which students in both groups were least likely to adopt the role of demanding. One NESB student asked a question at this point, and for both groups this may again have been because of the way the teacher managed the interaction following student responses to his demands. He either resumed the role of demanding, and asked another question, or shifted to the role of giving. The relatively few demands made by students in this context suggest that either the propositions negotiated in and through the teacher’s demands did not prompt additional negotiation from students, or any negotiation that did take pace followed the teacher’s resumption of the role of giving. The practice of the teacher to use demands to negotiate giving information, as noted in Chapter 5, prompts the observation that questions following DR1 and many following DR2 are all following the teacher in the role of ‘giving’.

Fifteen percent of ESB and 17% of NESB demands followed interaction in DR3 involving another student, suggesting perhaps students took advantage of the discursive relationship once it was established. Likely also is the possibility that students desired to negotiate further responses of the teacher to demands of other students; assuming demands of students reflected meanings emerging in the discourse, it is not unlikely students experienced, in dialogic terms, similar tensions.

The discursive context of DR3 also established the circumstances for students to resume the role of demanding following responses to demands. This is a necessary distinction within the adoption of both giving and demanding; in effect, a subset of adoption of role is resumption of role, one of the options of speakers following responses. This was a point of distinction between the NESB student group and the ESB group. Forty-four percent of the demands of NESB students involved resumption of the role of demanding and continuation of the discursive relationship. As addressees of the immediate co-text, students were potentially the next speaker; this point is developed further, below. ESB students resumed the role of demanding in about 13% of instances of adoption of the role.

However, there were only two instances (6%) of NESB students adopting the role of giving following another student giving information in Discursive Relationship 4 (DR4), but 15% of the adoptions of DR3 by ESB students were in these circumstances. This reflects the limited interaction between students in the classroom, but in the case of NESB students removes them almost entirely from that type of interaction. A further 7% of the demands made by ESB students followed interactions in which initiating students themselves were speakers in the role of giving, that is, they were addressees of the immediate co-text and shifted the discursive
relationship to DR3 when they continued the interaction. There was one instance of this pattern in the NESB group.

One significant point that emerges from the findings outlined above is the incidence of adoption of the role of demanding by students who were addresses of immediate co-text. There was pronounced contrast between the two groups of students. In 53% of instances of NESB students adopting the role of demanding, the student in question was the addressee of the preceding utterance. For students in the ESB group, this was the circumstance in about 20% of instances. This magnifies somewhat the disparity between the two groups in the adoption of the role of demanding. Since the addressee of an utterance is generally regarded as the likely next speaker (Linell, 1998), there is a qualitative difference in the circumstances of many of the adoptions of the role of demanding by NESB students. A variety of discursive relationships were involved in instances of ESB students being addressee of the pre-text, although about two thirds involved resumption of the role of demanding. In 83% of NESB student demands in these circumstances, the student in question was resuming the role of demanding. Furthermore, all 15 of these instances were in three sequences of student-teacher interaction (discussed further, below). The key point of this finding is that over 50% of demands made by NESB students were in the context of continuation of interaction as addressee. For ESB students, this was so for 20% of demands.

All demands of NESB students were realized in single clauses or clauses expanded with dependent clauses, in all cases constituting entire utterances. Like many of the demands of the teacher, some demands of ESB students were in utterances of two or more independent clauses or clause complexes in which speakers performed in both speech roles, giving and demanding. This was another feature of the discursive contexts of adoptions of the role of demanding that set the ESB students apart. There were 34 instances of ESB students shifting between DR3 and DR4 during an utterance. This practice served the purpose of justifying or contextualizing demands, and positioned students as primary knowers in the immediate context of the demand. In the example below, ESB Student K responded to the teacher’s utterance, realized as a command but analyzed in co-textual terms as a statement giving information as primary knower rather than eliciting postponed action. This analysis is supported by Student K’s response of acknowledgement, agreement with the teacher rather than undertaking, before adoption of the role of giving, and the role of primary knower, in the clauses that follow. In the final clause, she shifted to the role of demanding, repositioning herself as secondary knower to elicit confirmation of the validity of her knowing expressed in the propositions:
T: … children seem to be able to be great/ be great mimics/ but adults/ you try a bit of recasting with your/ with your adults on Saturday morning and/ and hear some of the feeble attempts there’ll be

K: yes/ we had an excellent example of that in last Saturday’s lesson/ we’ve got those Sudanese ladies and we were talking about going to the emergency department at the hospital and stitches/ there’s just no way these ladies could say stitches/ just recasting/ repeating the word/ is that what you mean

T: yes

K: just repeating the word stitches … (4.1:298-309)

It is clear the two groups of students adopted the role of demanding in circumstances that varied in some important ways. ESB students demonstrated a greater degree of agency in creating discursive opportunities to negotiate meanings. They engaged more freely in shifting the dynamics of co-textual discursive relationships, not only of other participants but themselves when they changed speech roles from giving to demanding in continuations of interaction, or within utterances. NESB students relied more, though not entirely, on the teacher’s offers of discursive opportunities and the reciprocity of discourse they enjoyed when addressees of an utterance. This meant they adopted the role of demanding in restricted co-textual contexts, and interacted more exclusively with the teacher and in responses to co-text contributed by the teacher. Within the constraints of the great disparity in frequency of participation in the role of demanding, these variations had implications for opportunities afforded students for negotiation of meaning, with whom they interacted, and how they positioned themselves in relation to other participants. The next section reports findings of analysis of language selections made by students when they adopted the role of demanding.

6.1.4 Language selections in systems of interpersonal meanings

Variations between the two groups of students in frequency of adoption of the role of demanding extended into findings of analysis of realizations of demands in the systems of MOOD TYPE, POLARITY, MODALITY, COMMENT, and KEY. Findings are organised around selections of Mood, and findings of language choices in other meaning systems are included in findings for each Mood type as appropriate.

Twenty-one utterances included two or more clauses expressing demands. In six instances clauses functioned to negotiate meanings in different ways. That is, one clause demanded information missing from a proposition and another clause demanded confirmation of validity of a proposition. The practice of making multiple demands, or strings of elicits (Basturkmen,
1999), in a single utterance is considered elsewhere (Multiple demands, p. 220), but the clauses are considered separately in the discussion of Mood, below.

In addition, as noted in the previous section, although most demands constituted entire utterances, there were instances of demands that constituted an element of an utterance, that is, the speaker shifted between the roles of demanding and giving, generally in order to justify or support the demand (Basturkmen, 1999). Only clause/s that realized demands in these utterances are included in findings presented in this chapter.

### 6.1.4.1 Mood selection and commodities exchanged

The Mood types of all clauses that functioned to express demands of students in the two groups are shown in Figure 6.3, below. Students demanded, with five exceptions, the commodity of information. However, speech functions of clauses were not always congruent Mood elements of clauses. In more than two thirds of the clauses that realized demands of ESB students, the Mood element was congruent, whereas for NESB students, Mood elements of one third of were congruent.
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**Figure 6-3: Number of clauses of each mood type used by NESB and ESB students**
6.1.4.1.1 Demands for information

Two hundred and eight clauses functioned as questions demanding the commodity of information. It is clear from Figure 6.3 that the two groups of students differed in realizations of questions either as the two interrogative subtypes, polar and WH- interrogatives, or as incongruently functioning declaratives. The significance of findings of selections of Mood type in negotiation of meanings is detailed in what follows.

6.1.4.1.2 Interrogative mood type

6.1.4.1.2.1 Polar interrogatives

One third of clauses that expressed demands for information by NESB students and one half of those of ESB students were questions realized as polar interrogatives. In these utterances, students negotiated the validity of meanings emergent in and through active responsive listening. In principle, the choice of positive polarity, the case in all instances but ten percent of those from ESB students, “contains no suggestion regarding the likely answer” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 144). ESB student E makes this clear in her negotiation of validity of her proposition, below:

T: … there’s a sound difference/ but it’s not a/ it’s not a phonemic difference
E: is that similar to certain countries don’t/ oh I don’t know whether they just/ don’t have the sound/ like /vi/ /vi/ and double /yu/
T: yeah/ yeah/ see in/ in French … (4.1:373-379)

Although positive polarity in students’ polar interrogative questions endowed addressees as primary knowers (Berry, 1981a), what was demanded, strictly speaking, was confirmation (Basturkmen, 1999) rather than information. In practice, however, addressees frequently gave more than minimal responses (Linell, 1998). Polar interrogatives in the sequence, below, involving NESB Student O and the teacher, illustrate how tentative meanings emerged for Student O as the discourse unfolded around the subject of language-learner silence. She negotiated the validity of these meanings as propositions in questions:

O: but if they keep silent for a long period or time/ for example for two years/ is that normal here
T: no no no=
L: no
T: =no/ that/ they/ not for two years/ that’s
O: yeah/ so do we have to encourage them to speak out
The teacher’s effectively minimal response to the first demand of Student O disconfirmed the validity of the proposition, although it’s arguable he was ready to negotiate the proposition further. However, disconfirmation was all Student O required to proceed with negotiation of another proposition. There were numerous instances of students’ explicit negotiation of validity of meanings as responses to contributions of other classroom participants, usually the teacher. For example, ESB Student J, below, seeks confirmation of his active understanding of meanings proposed by the teacher and embedded as a projected ventriloquation:

J: so/ so are you saying that/ that they’ve got to intellectually grasp the fact that there are different [sounds
T: [yes (5.2:2306-2309)

ESB students were set apart from the NESB group because of relatively more frequent selections made in the systems of POLARITY, MODALITY, and MOOD, as well as in the system of KEY, that expressed a wider range of positions on validity of propositions. This had ramifications for their positions as knowers in negotiation of propositions with addressees.

ESB students realised some demands as polar interrogatives marked by negative polarity. This suggested students expected confirmation of propositions, and positioned them more strongly as knowers in the interactive relationship than did positive polar interrogatives. This was especially so in the instance of ESB Student K, below, in which negative polarity combined tone, falling pitch contours characteristic of statements on that, approach, and assignment, to realize a high degree of certainty of the validity of the propositions:

K: … don’t you base your case study on that (1) =
T: yep
K: =in terms of that (1)/ like reflecting on our development as a second language teacher/ like/ isn’t that a case study approach (1)/ the second assignment (1)
T: that is/ absolutely that’s a case study approach … (2.2:465-472)

In a few instances, although without realizing the same certainty, ESB students marked positive polar interrogatives with tonic prominence in the same way. For example, following the teacher’s quite lengthy response to a question asked by ESB Student J, the polar interrogative in the instance, below, tested the validity of Student J’s understanding of the teacher’s response. The counter-expectancy of the mood Adjunct, just, provides Student J with the option of
limiting the claim to validity of his proposal, his understanding of what the teacher has said, as opposed to the absolute commitment of polarity alone. However the falling tone arguably suggests arguably he expects of confirmation:

   J: is it then just a case of being sensitive to the fact that those kind of people exist ((1))
   T: yeah exactly/ yeah exactly … (4.1:989-991)

Complexity of this kind positions ESB students in their negotiation of demands in nuanced ways that were not evident in the utterances of NESB students. ESB students drew also on the resources of modality in realisation of polar interrogative questions, expressing the likelihood of validity of their propositions, or of their obligation, or of obligation of others, to carry out an action. The example of ESB Student E, below, is also an instance of shift of role during an utterance. Student E was explicit in positioning herself as a knower, I know, and reiterating the certainty of her knowing in the mood tag, aren’t they, before shifting to the less certain position realized in the median value finite modal, would, in the interrogative:

   E: … I know lots of Islamic things are written in Arabic too/ aren’t they/
   B: [mom
   F: [yeah
   E: =so that would/ would that provide an authentic text (4.2:692-699)

With only 12 selections by NESB students of polar interrogative to demand confirmation, there is scant evidence that these students took up positions on propositions outside that expressed by positive polarity. However, the instance of modality in a polar question asked by NESB Student O, below, is interesting. She moved realization of her uncertainty of the proposition for which she sought validation into the projecting clause. This focussed the uncertainty on whether or not the teacher would validate the meaning she proposed, although she perhaps revealed her position by adding the polar adjunct, despite the interrogative tone:

   O: would you say it will become fossilized/ yes ((2)) (2.2:1163)

The outcome of students’ adoption of the role of demanding using polar interrogatives, such as all the instances cited above, is that the unfolding discourse rested on propositions that expressed active responsive listening of students as participants in classroom interaction. In 92 of the total of 104 instances (see Figure 6-3), these were meanings proposed for confirmation by ESB students. In principle, students who sought confirmation of the validity of a proposition assumed the role of secondary knower. However, through polarity, modality and tone, ESB
students were able to expressed certainty in some instances in more nuanced ways, thereby assuming other, more subtle positions as knowers in relation to propositions and to addressee/s.

6.1.4.1.2.2 WH-interrogatives

ESB students made 33 demands for missing information in WH-interrogative clauses. There was one instance of an NESB student realizing an interrogative with a WH-element in theme position. It was arguably a demand for confirmation of polarity rather than missing information. This was confirmed by the polar response and repetition of NESB Student O’s earlier proposition, rather than giving missing information, below:

O: so using the weak form they can also internalise structures ((2))
T: they can do it using the weak form or they use it during the strong form/ mmm
O: how about the weak form
T: yeah/ I just said they can use it/ they can internalise the stuff through the weak form … (4.2:1980-1986)

However, there were three instances in which NESB students realized demands for missing information in WH-elements embedded in declarative clauses. In the first example, below, NESB Student B accepts a discursive opportunity offered by the teacher and responds first to the polar interrogative, (is there) anything else you want to know, and then demands missing information in the characteristic realization of WH-interrogatives:

T: … so anything else that you want to know about the/ what’s happening on Saturday
B: yeah/ I think that I’d like/ what/ to know what the classrooms/ what equipments will be available in the classroom (1.2:863-867)

The other two instances were not realized with characteristic Finite-Subject order, but analysis of function as a demand for missing information is supported by the final rising tone, the supporting comments of ESB student R, and the teacher’s response. NESB Student Y’s utterance was the last of a sequence of demands for confirmation, all realized incongruently with mood element order Subject-Finite characteristic of declarative clauses:

Y: I’m just worried about what I should teach in the first [lesson ((3))
R: [she’s wants to know
what to prepare for=
T: yeah
R: =I think/ should she prepare for beginners or [(inaudible)
Y: [yeah/ some teaching materials
Apart from these few instances of students in the NESB group, WH-interrogatives were a selection restricted to students in the ESB group. However, if the single command to provide a linguistic service is overlooked, WH-interrogatives were the least selected option for demanding information among ESB students as well. WH-interrogatives comprised a similar proportion of total demands for both groups. Nonetheless, negotiation here was markedly different from that involved when polar interrogatives were used to demand confirmation and deserves attention. In simple terms, polar interrogatives were meanings that had already emerged in and through students’ active responses to co-text, and which they sought to validate. WH-interrogatives were still emergent, incomplete meanings that required the teacher or other students to participate as co-authors by supplying missing information represented by WH-elements and needed to complete propositions. For example, ESB Student J and the teacher, below:

J: what’s the purpose of the time column
T: the time is so that you know roughly what you can/ can line up and/ and you’ll also get some sort of idea of frequency of errors … (5.2:1670-1673)

Although realizations of demands as WH-interrogatives were largely restricted to ESB students, this reflected the overall disparity in participation in DR3. In addition, six instances of WH-interrogatives questions asked by ESB students’ were analytically ambiguous. They were ‘second order’ WH-interrogatives (Martin, 1992) requesting repetition, utterances that functioned to sustain the interaction (Love & Suherdi, 1996) rather than achieve actual negotiation. To apply Linell’s (1998) response-initiative conception, in one respect these utterances responded to the utterances of others, yet explicitly demanded responses. They indicated listening, but also incapacity to listen in an actively responsive way while information was missing. While not discounting these utterances as legitimate ways of involvement, it’s argued that these were demands for joint re-construction of propositions that did not reflect emergent meanings in the same ways as joint constructions. This adds a different perspective to the function of some of the demands of ESB students for missing information. Despite being the interrogative mood type that most explicitly demands exchanges of information, WH-interrogatives were found to be, by comparison, a minor way students were involved in the negotiation of meaning in this classroom.
6.1.4.1.2.3 Declarative mood type

Two thirds of the 35 demands made by NESB students were realized in clauses with declarative Mood elements that functioned incongruently as questions. Less than one third of the 178 demands made by ESB students were declarative clauses functioning as questions. In principle, these demands, like polar interrogatives, are more accurately described as eliciting confirmation of validity of propositions rather than information, as in the instance of the teacher’s confirmation of the proposition of NESB Student O, below:

O: so we can also teach them the grammar ((3))
T: oh yeah you certainly can … (4.2:1973-1975)

The incongruent use of declarative mood structure to elicit confirmation of propositions suggests that students were more certain of propositional validity of than when they chose to positive polar interrogatives to elicit confirmation (Basturkmen, 1999). Whereas the polar interrogative does not, in principle, suggest the likely answer, in these cases students arguably anticipated confirmation of validity rather than contradiction. Nevertheless, whatever certainty students attached to propositions, these exchanges were concerned with negotiation of meanings students had constructed and then realized as a demand for confirmation of meanings. Again, there were instances of explicit references to meaning-making, for example:

E: so then that means that if you’re working alongside someone their plan will be the same as you ((3)) (1.1:1708-1709)
J: so you/ you’re saying that we improvise on this ((3))/ we expand this ((3)) (1.2:338)

The causal conjunctive adjunct, so, although outside interpersonal analyzes, is widespread in theme position in these clauses as students from both groups introduced propositions seeking to confirm understandings or interpretations, for example, ESB Student J and NESB Student I, below:

J: so if the motivation is there=
T: yep
J: =then go a bit more into depth ((3))/ more into
T: exactly yeah mmm yeah … (5.2:2378-2384)

I: and so if you’re teaching Chinese or Japanese you should prepare for a teaching plan ((2))
Only ESB students used tagged declaratives, ten in all, to realize questions. All but one reversed the polarity, and the rising pitch on tags effectively reversed any certainty carried by polarity of clause mood elements, for example:

L: it’s nine teaching weeks/ isn’t it ((3))/ nine Saturdays ((3)) (1.1:217)

There were 52 instances of ESB students realizing demands for confirmation of polarity as incongruently functioning declaratives (see Figure 6-3). In 11 of these students modulaized propositions through selection of low and median value finite modal operators that realized uncertainty about validity of propositions. The low value modals in particular, positioned the teacher strongly as primary knower. For example, ESB Student K, below, in her demand to the teacher for confirmation of her analysis of a learner error, selects the low value might. That suggests she was uncertain of her proposition and, in addressing the utterance to the teacher, made the modal selection modal in recognition of the possibility of contradiction:

K: … and sometimes I think Ibrahim does it/ does he call it he
L: yeah
T: mhmm
K: yeah/ you might classify that as a gender error ((2))
T: yeah/ I’d call/ I’d call that gender error (5.2:1650-1659)

Median value modal operators were generally used by both ESB and NESB students to seek confirmations that revolved around obligations of the students themselves. These clauses were somewhat ambiguous, but in the instances below, through selection of the median value modal operator, should, the students were able to realize reasonable certainty of validity of the propositions for which they sought confirmation. Where they differed was in the selection of tone. ESB Student E’s use of the tone of tentative statement to elicit (dis)confirmation, resulted in a qualitatively different positioning of herself in relation to her proposition and the addressee, the teacher, than NESB Student I’s use of the tone associated with polar interrogative:

E: Greg/ our assignment’s/ sorry/ our assignment’s a ten week plan yet we’re only doing eight weeks/ so/ we should write a different plan ((3)) to/ ah
T: yeah/ I’m not too worried about that … (1.1:1677-1680)

I: and so if you’re teaching Chinese or Japanese you should prepare for a teaching plan ((2))
In general, negotiation of validity of propositions by NESB students through modality selection was entirely in this area of personal obligation. In one clear exception, below, NESB Student Y used both a low value modal adjunct, *maybe*, and a finite modal operator in clause further modalized metaphorically by the projecting clause, *I guess*. The focus of her uncertainty is entirely on the proposition:

Y: so ah/ that is/ we may/ I guess maybe also some of the learners/ some learners could have an advanced level of/ in Chinese ((2)) (1.2:634-635)

The instance below is an interesting illustration of the negotiation that ESB students engaged in and provides an instructive insight into the unfolding of meaning as Student L develops her propositions through a series of expressions of certainty, and then calls the whole proposition into question with the final interrogative tag. ESB student L’s demand is expressed in two clauses. The first a declarative clause with negative polarity and the pitch movement of a tentative statement, and then the second with positive polarity reversed in the tag. The interplay between the modal operator *would*, the Adjuncts *though*, and *probably*, as well as the probability expressed by *more likely*, in conjunction with the tonic patterns, suggest L was certain only about her uncertainty:

L: and we/ the students here would not be new arrivals though ((3))/ they’d probably be more likely to have been here a little while/ wouldn’t they ((2)) (1.1:1462-1463)

Clauses with declarative mood structure that functioned to demand information sought, in principle, to confirm or negotiate meanings constructed by students interacting with the classroom discourse as it unfolded utterance by utterance. The predominance of the use of declarative clauses by NESB students for this purpose suggests that when these students adopted the role of demanding they generally aimed to confirm propositions about which they had some degree of certainty of the validity, more so than was the case with the one third of demands that were realized as polar interrogatives. The ESB students were more likely in relative terms to realize demands for confirmation of the validity of meanings as polar interrogatives, but when they did realize questions as declarative clauses, they were more likely to draw on the linguistic resources of polarity and modality to negotiate the validity of propositions.

T: yeah/ you should … (1.1:94-96)
6.1.4.1.3 Demands for services

Five demands for services were made, all by ESB students. The one use of the imperative mood structure, ESB student J, below, imagine saying that to your boss, was addressed to the teacher and arguably the class as well. The tonic pattern was that of the unmarked imperative, so it is reasonable to argue the clause was not an elliptical polar interrogative. It was the sole unambiguous command to addressees, but demanded no concrete action of participants:

J: no/ no/ I really do speak Danish/ no/ the only thing/=  
T: please/ Jack  
J: =the only thing you can say is/ and it’s very rare for them to say that/ they can say (Danish phrase)) and that means/ will you be sweet and do that/ but imagine saying that to your boss/ or something like that … (1.1:1574-1580)

In contrast, the four other demands are “of an intermediate or complex kind” (Halliday, 1984, p. 11). Two modulated interrogatives functioned as commands demanding a service, essentially demands for a “linguistic service” (Martin, 1992, p. 50), below. The tonic pattern characteristic of the imperative and by the compliance of the addressees, the teacher and Student E respectively, in providing the service confirmed the function of these two clauses as commands:

R: can you give an example of a multiple error (5.2:1679)

G: … can you explain it because I still/ I still don’t kind of (5.2:632)

There were two instances of declarative clauses functioning to demand a service from the teacher; student K modulated her commands and realised them as conditional clause enhancements. Again, the service demanded was actually the provision of a commodity that could be “brought into being only through language” (Halliday, 1984, p. 11):

K: and I wondered/ if you could just talk us through a quick example of each of those it might clarify it (a bit) for me/ of a strong form and a weak form of communicative approach ((3))(4.2:1847-1849)

K: yep/ and the strong form goes from meaning to form/ now/ if you can give me an example/ I can read ((inaudible)) (4.2:1870-1871)

As the latter four instances demonstrate, when students adopted the role of demanding to demand a service, it was to negotiate the provision of the commodity of information by the
teacher or another student. Information is clearly the commodity negotiated by students who adopt the role of demanding in this classroom, regardless of English-speaking background.

### 6.1.5 Individual students

While it is convenient to consider features of the two broad groups, variations between the participation of individuals within NESB and ESB groups have been noted earlier. The number of each type of demand made by individual students (Table 6-4) reinforces the observation that individual students are not uniform in the ways they choose to realize construction and negotiation of propositions in adoption of the role of demanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESB students (9)</th>
<th>Clause mood type</th>
<th>NESB students (9)</th>
<th>Clause mood type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polar</td>
<td>Wh-</td>
<td>Declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-4: Individual student demands by clause mood type

Table 6-4 shows that there was variation between students in both groups in terms of the clause Mood types favoured by individuals when they adopted the role of demanding. Of the eight students in the ESB group who adopted the role of demanding, polar interrogatives were the clause type most frequently used to make demands by all but student R, who favoured the incongruent use of declarative clauses to make demands over both polar and WH-interrogatives. Students J and G used more WH-interrogatives than declaratives, but students E and F used no WH-interrogatives. These variations point to individual ways of participating in
negotiation, reflected most clearly in the differences between eliciting confirmation and missing information. They flow on into varied positioning by students as knowers and the influence of their voices in the text emerging in and through interaction.

Most of the seven NESB students who adopted the role of demanding made so few demands that it is probably misleading to suggest that one clause type was preferred over another by the group as a whole. NESB Student O was responsible for more than half the demands made by NESB students, and her participation was marked in other ways. She used ten polar interrogative and eight declarative clauses to make demands, contrary to preferences for declarative of the group as a whole. Whether this reflected individual characteristics of Student O, her Taiwanese educational background, or was related to her being in her second semester of study in the course, is a matter for speculation. NESB Students C and B, also in their second semester of Australian study, but both from different backgrounds, preferred declarative over interrogatives. As noted above, only Student O made a demand that used a WH-element in theme position although it arguably functioned to demand confirmation. Students I, C, Y, and N used declarative clauses only. Student H’s only demand was a polar interrogative and Student B used one polar interrogative and three declaratives. Although not evident in Table 6-4, three sequences account for more than half of all the demands made by students in the NESB group. Student Y made all six of her demands in one continuous sequence in the first class. Student O made fourteen of her nineteen demands in two sequences, one of six demands in Class 2 and one of seven in Class 4. This suggests that once NESB students found the opportunity to make an initial demand, they capitalized on the reciprocity of discourse to ask additional questions as addresses of the teacher until they were satisfied with the meanings negotiated.

6.1.6 Multiple demands

The twenty occasions on which students realized demands for information in a multiple demand, or strings of elicits (Basturkmen, 1999), are of interest. First, they offer additional insight into the ways meaning is negotiated when students adopt the role of demanding, and second, this was a discursive practice restricted almost entirely to the ESB students.

Forty-one of the 178 clauses used by ESB students to demand were parts of multiple demands: 32 polar interrogatives, six WH-interrogatives, and three declarative clauses. In addition, there were two occasions when an extension of a polar interrogative was signalled by the conjunctive adjunct or, but a second clause was not fully realized. One NESB student realized two polar interrogatives contiguously in the one utterance.
Propositions in the first two interrogatives, above, were almost identical both linguistically and semantically. The realisation differed in the subjects of the clauses. The first gave the student participants, we, responsibility for the validity, while the second based the validity on a reference to the preceding utterance, that. The third introduced a new proposition, the subject was now you, and the predicator, the process involved in the proposition, was now keep rather than generate, and the confirmation of a substantively different, potentially contradictory, proposition was being demanded. This and other instances of polar interrogatives used in conjunction suggest the students involved negotiated the information they were demanding during the utterance itself. Arguably, they adjusted or reformulated the demand as they responded to their own questions and their own predictions of the possible responses of the addressee (Linell, 1998).

Ongoing negotiation of meaning is illustrated also in ESB student K’s utterance, below, that followed the teacher’s statements about case studies. Student K first adopts the role of giving and then the role of demanding as she negotiates confirmation of meanings she proposed:

T: … your case could be the case that you’re studying or you could be the case that you’re studying
K: the first second assignment/ that’s what it is/ it’s/ you use the diary that we’re keeping continuously and/ don’t you base your case study on that ((2))=
T: yep
K: =in terms of that ((2))/ like/ reflecting on our development as a second language teacher/ like/ isn’t that a case study approach ((2))/ the second assignment ((2))
T: that is/ absolutely/ that’s a case study approach … (2.2:464-472)
Six instances where two polar interrogatives were used in conjunction were in the form of alternatives, as in the instances below, as well as one instance in conjunction with a wh-interrogative:

L: Greg/ is the age range with those doing English quite diverse too/ or do we tend/ or do you tend to get a narrow range (1.1:465-466)

F: so is it used just in Australia/ or is it used in other countries as well (1.2:25)

Although it may seem that students were asking the addressee to resolve uncertainty of meanings they constructed as active meaning-making listeners, in another view, perhaps in these and other instances of multiple demands already cited, this is evidence of students engaging in negotiation of meaning during an utterance, perhaps even assessing the likely response of their addressee and pre-empting this anticipated response (Linell, 1998). In the case of alternatives, students have proposed another meaning that often effectively contradicts their original proposition, but, arguably, students anticipate one of the propositions will be confirmed as valid. The single instance of an NESB student, Student O, using two polar interrogatives in one utterance was a case in which, logically, only one of the alternatives, and contradictory, propositions, could be valid. One of the interrogatives would suffice to elicit (dis)confirmation:

O: if they keep silent for a long time is it good or is it bad (2.2:1157)

In two instances extension of a polar interrogative was signalled by the use of the conjunctive adjunct or but an alternative proposition was not realised, for example:

L: if they use he she instead of it/ do they count that as a gender error or as a (5.2:1641)

This suggests an explicit recognition of the possibility of contradiction and a degree of uncertainty and readiness to negotiate perhaps greater than in polar interrogatives in general. If the response is contradictory, the incomplete second proposition invites the respondent to provide missing information to replace the residue of the first proposition, that is, to co-author a proposition with the student making the demand.

On six occasions ESB students ask questions with different clause Mood types; in five a WH-interrogative preceded a polar interrogative and in one a WH- interrogative followed a polar interrogative. The relationship between the demands in these instances varied. In two, missing
information was identified before proposing possible responses, below, in one instance as alternatives and in the other with an alternative signalled, but not realised:

L: Greg/ last time what was the breakdown roughly between beginners and the more proficient/ like/ was it one quarter/ three quarters/ or half and half (1.2:408-409)

G: so how old is he/ is he a young or (2.1:289)

In these instances students identified meanings for co-authoring, but proceeded to complete the proposition, for which they demanded confirmation. In another instance, below, ESB Student J followed a polar interrogative with a WH- interrogative, a re-negotiation of the information demanded:

J: another thing is/ do you have an observation schedule/ in other words/ who’s coming in when (2.2:1613-1614)

Engagement with the discursive text that was evident in the negotiation of meaning in single demands was made more transparent in instances of ESB students realizing two or more demands contiguously in one utterance; in effect, these instances provided a window into students’ engagement with their own utterances and their responses to the meanings they made in the act of uttering. These are examples of ESB students’ active cognition and of negotiation with addressees during utterance production and delivery, explicitly situated in the relation of dialogue. NESB students, interacting in a language that was not their first, provided no comparable examples.

6.1.7 Demand addressee

Analysis of language selections cannot ignore roles of addressees: “the listener is present in the speaker’s mind as he formulates his contributions to dialogue. … The other-orientation of the speaker’s utterance is of course part and parcel of its dialogicality” (Linell, 1998, pp. 103-104). The previous section included some preliminary observations on this aspect. Grammatical choices of students in demands addressing the teacher differed in some respects from selections they made when addressing demands to students, and thus the exact nature of co-authoring relationships differed as well.

Twenty-four student demands were addressed directly to other student participants and the remaining 188 were addressed to the teacher, although five were analyzed as directed to the classroom as a whole. The clause Mood types used by students are shown in Table 6-5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause mood type</th>
<th>Number addressed to students</th>
<th>Percentage of total demands to students</th>
<th>Number addressed to teacher</th>
<th>Percentage of total demands to teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polar interrogative</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH-interrogative</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total clauses</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-5: Clause mood types of demands addressed to teacher and students

Although the number of demands to other students was small, as Table 6-5 shows, the Mood type choices differed somewhat from choices in demands to the teacher. Polar interrogatives were used most frequently in demands to both other students (41.5%) and the teacher (50%). WH-interrogatives (37.5%) were more likely to be used than declaratives (21%) when a demand was made of another student. This was the reverse of the situation with the teacher (13.5% and 36.5% respectively). In other words, students who addressed demands to other students positioned addressees as knowers, and placed greater reliance on addressees for co-authorship of propositions.

This influence of students and teacher as addressees on ways students engaged in the negotiation of meaning played out in the context of NESB and ESB groups in two ways. First, 23 of the 24 demands addressed to students were made by ESB students, that is, the influence of students as addressees on the language choices of NESB students who adopted the role of demanding was negligible. The number and clause Mood types of demands to other students made by each student are shown in Table 6-6. NESB students adopted the role of demanding, in general, much less frequently than ESB students, but the difference was much more pronounced in the case of demands addressed to other students. Clearly ESB Student K asked questions of other students comparatively frequently, and was arguably an exceptional case in this instance. If Student K were to be removed from the data, the contrast between the two groups would not be so marked but the key point would remain that it was the ESB students who addressed demands to other students. The other side of this finding is that, while ESB students actively recognised other students as primary knowers, the (almost) exclusively student-teacher orientation of the adoption of the role of demanding by NESB students acknowledged the teacher alone as a primary knower capable of validation of the meanings they were constructing.
Table 6-6: Numbers of demands addressed to other students by individuals by clause mood type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESB students (9)</th>
<th>Clause mood type</th>
<th>NESB students (9)</th>
<th>Clause mood type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polar</td>
<td>Wh-</td>
<td>Declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other perspective on student addressees is provided by the finding that ESB students were the addressees of 21 of the 24 demands addressed to students. These are the only occasions other students endow NESB students as primary knowers. All in all, there was little interaction between students in DR3. But when compared to the ESB students, the involvement of NESB students as speakers or addressees in student–student interaction in DR3 is insignificant.

The common thread that links most instances of students addressing demands to other students is the practicum report. All three demands addressed to NESB students and 75% of those addressed to ESB students stem from this context. In the only instance of an NESB student addressing a demand to another student, Student I’s demand, an incongruently functioning declarative clause, below, addressed ESB Student G during G’s practicum report. Students I’s demand elicited no response, despite her repetition of it, perhaps because the question and her repetition of it was simultaneous with utterances of both student G and the teacher:

T: yeah/ next week’ll be good because they’re going to bring their own recipes aren’t they
G: mmm
T: and ahm
I: they all [(cooked) ((2))]
T: mmm [and
G: [plus/ discuss=
I: they all (cooked) ((2))
G: = what/ what [they will bring to the last week too
T: = yeah/ and while I while I remember/ about that last week too/
remember … (5.2:749-769)

The demands addressed to NESB students all elicited responses. ESB Student R addressed a question to her practicum teaching partner, NESB student H, during their reporting, and, after the teacher prompted comments or questions (anybody else from a foreign language or second language background want to contribute to Bruce’s thing 4.2:632-633), NESB Student B was asked questions, below, by students J and E. Both related to B’s report of his practicum class:

J: Bruce/ how many people in the class
B: mmm
J: how many people in the class
B: ah/ I think now/ seven out of fifteen
… (Lines 664-670) …
T: it’s interesting isn’t it/ how the Arabic class is the biggest class of all
E: could you use/ sorry/ could you use things like/ cause I know lots of Islamic things are written in Arabic too/ aren’t they/= B: [mmm
F: [yeah
E: =so that would/ would that provide an authentic text
B: yeah look=
F: (it’s available) too
B: =I think it’s difficult/ it’s more difficult than other authentic (inaudible) texts
T: it’s more difficult/ is it
B: yeah/ I think/ yeah (4.2:690-709)

It was concluded in Chapter 5 that the practicum reporting realized the context in which the students in the NESB group, endowed as primary knowers, were most active in participation in the discourse. Here, the practicum experience appears to have provided the context for utterances demanding information to be addressed to an NESB student as a primary knower, and the findings presented in Chapter 7 suggest the same holds for some instances of utterances giving information. The question of authentic Arabic texts surfaced again later in the same class, with somewhat different discursive outcomes (see p. 229).
Overall, instances of students addressing demands to other students were a relatively minor way students were involved in negotiating meanings, but an aspect in which the involvement of the two groups was in marked contrast.

In summary, the ways students from the two groups were involved in negotiation of meaning in DR3 varied. It was found that adoption of the role of demanding was a way of meaning-making largely the preserve of individual ESB students, and that this offered insight into the interaction of these students with the unfolding discursive text and the meanings they were co-authoring as listeners. These students generally negotiated confirmation of propositions expressed mainly as polar interrogative clauses and to a lesser extent as declarative clauses, realized in a significant number of instances in conjunction with the resources of polarity, modality, and tone to express varying degrees of uncertainty or commitment to the validity of propositions, and to position speakers and addressees in interactive relations as knowers. They made fewer demands for addressees to co-author propositions by giving missing information on demand. When NESB students adopted the role of demanding, they negotiated confirmation of propositions expressed mainly as declarative clauses, with fewer realised as polar interrogative clauses, and generally with more restricted use of the potential offered by polarity and modality to express their positions of certainty of the validity of propositions. While there was some interaction between ESB students in the roles of this discursive relationship, instances of interaction between students from the two groups was very limited by comparison.

6.2 Students giving on demand

Students were involved in negotiation of meaning in DR3 as respondents, cast in the role of giving on demand by another student’s adoption of the role of demanding. Analysis of students’ responses to demands made by students revealed points both of similarity and of difference between the ways the NESB and ESB groups of students were involved at this point in interactions. The responses fall into two broad categories on the basis of students’ addressee status.

Of the 213 clauses used by students adopting DR3, 24 were analyzed as directly addressed to individual students. For the remainder, directly addressed to the teacher apart from six analyzed as addressed to classroom participants in general, students were considered indirect addressees. Responses from students were not limited to demands directly addressed to students; some students responded as indirect addressees. Ten student demands did not elicit any verbal response captured in the recorded data (see p. 236). The numbers of instances of responses to the demands of another student by the students in the two groups are shown in Table 6-7:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discursive role</th>
<th>NESB student responses</th>
<th>ESB students responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct addressee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect addressee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-7: Student responses to demands of other students

6.2.1 Responses elicited from students as direct addressee

NESB Students H and B answered the three questions addressed to them, while 17 of the 21 questions addressed to ESB students elicited responses. All responses provided more than the missing information demanded. For example, ESB student G’s response to ESB Student K’s WH- interrogative during G’s reporting of her practicum experience gave more information than that represented by the WH- element in the demand, pancakes:

G: … the students had to describe out loud what I was doing at each step based on the language they’d already learnt or [already generated
K: [what did you make
G: hmmm
K: what did you make
G: pancakes/ yeah/ we just thought something simple/ you know/ and they had fun with it and they got involved and had a turn at cooking as well/ and then after … (5.2:599-610)

Without the co-text of the demand, Student G would not have contributed the additional propositions to the discourse before she resumed reporting, and then after…. The additional propositions were part of Student G’s response to the demand of Student K, rather than unsolicited adoption of the role of giving.

Similarly, only four of the 11 responses to polar interrogatives and declaratives functioning as demands, that is, demands for confirmation of propositions, elicited polar adjuncts only. In the response of NESB Student B, below, although he initially validated the proposition of ESB Student E, he continued, negotiating the validity of the proposition. Although in the role of primary knower, Student B positioned himself and his addressee in relation to the negotiated proposition through the interpersonal metaphor of I think:
E: could you use/ sorry/ could you use things like/ cause I know lots of Islamic things are written in Arabic too aren’t they/= 

B: [mmm 

F: [yeah 

E: =so that would/ would that provide an authentic text 

B: yeah/ look/= 

F: (it’s available) too 

B: =I think it’s difficult/ it’s more difficult than other authentic ((inaudible)) texts (4.2:692-705) 

There was one instance of a student, ESB Student G, demanding a service from another. Her demand to ESB Student E, *can you explain it* (5.2:632), during reporting of the practicum, was a demand for linguistic services. 

As the instances considered illustrate, although few questions were addressed to students by their peers, the opportunities to give on demand generated answers that expanded beyond minimal responses. Because most demands were addressed to ESB students, this type of interaction contributed to further magnification of disparity between the two groups of students. This is a pattern that continues to emerge in the findings. Discursive visibility took on a momentum that generated additional opportunities to participate in negotiations of one kind or another. 

### 6.2.2 Responses from students as indirect addressee

Members of the NESB student group produced fewer responses as direct addressees of demands of other students than did the ESB student group, but this disparity simply reflected the number of demands directly addressed to students in the two groups. This disparity was even greater in the case of the responses contributed by students as indirect addressees of student demands. In principle both groups were presented with similar opportunities to participate at this point in interaction, but there were 36 instances of ESB students doing so, and six of NESB students. NESB Student B contributed five of the six, four in a single sequence. 

Demands addressed directly to students endowed them as primary knowers. Propositions involved, for example, to do with practicum or personal experiences, generally meant only the student addressed could provide the information demanded; it was unlikely that other students had the capacity to respond. There was a single instance of a student responding to give information as indirect addressee of a demand in DR3 addressed to a student. ESB Student G’s
demand, below, was addressed to her teaching practicum partner, ESB Student E, but elicited an additional response from ESB Student K:

G: … the feed/ not negative feedback/ what would you call it the [constructive
E: [constructive
feedback
K: [constructive criticism (5.2:625-630)

In contrast, there were 19 occasions when students responded to demands addressed to the teacher by other students. In some cases, there was more than one response. Individual students made 21 responses and there were two instances of a number of simultaneous non-ascrivable student responses. Twelve demands ESB students responded to were polar interrogatives, six were declarative clauses functioning as demands, and one was a *wh* interrogative. This may broadly reflect the frequency of use of these demand types by students adopting the role of demanding, or suggest that students did not possess the information identified as missing in *wh*-interrogatives addressed to the teacher.

NESB Student W was the only member of the NESB group to participate in an exchange in these circumstances, responding to a demand to the teacher from NESB student O about the ‘silent period’ of some language learners:

O: does it last a long time/ go on for a long time
T: yeah/ oh it’s/ yeah/ as long as you can in fact/ you can sustain it/ yeah/ it’s fine
W: it’s a maximum of six weeks in primary school
T: yeah/ it’ll/ it’ll/ of course/ give or take/ yeah (2.2:1149-1155)

In some instances student responses preceded teacher responses, as in the first example below, while in others they followed teacher responses, as in the second example below. As these two instances of responses to declarative clauses functioning as demands illustrate, in many cases the propositions were effectively identical:

L: it’s nine teaching weeks/ isn’t it ((3)) [nine Saturdays
T: [nine/ yeah/ well/ nine weeks including
this Saturday
L: yeah so eight teaching weeks ((2))
B: [ooohhhh
R: [eight teaching [weeks for English/ yeah
G: but a repetition/ you’re just re/ you’re just saying it as they’ve just said it ((3))
T: yeah/ mhm/ so the repetition is a/= 
G: oh I see 
T: =you repeat what [they said
R: [repeat exactly what they’re saying (5.2:1502-1510)

The propositions realized in student responses were not always in agreement with the response of the teacher, for example:

K: is that what a task based method is= 
F: task 
K: =is that what 
F: no 
T: can be [it can be 
F: [oh (3.1:523-533)

Not all responses of students to other students’ questions validated propositions or provided missing information. There were 15 instances of individual ESB students’ utterances that were provisionally analyzed as instances of acknowledgement or adoption of the role of giving, but in fact supported or arguably even jointly constructed the demand of another student. In the instance included here, ESB Student M’s question referred to errors in a written text. ESB Students F and R used polar adjuncts not as a validation, not as primary knowers, but to signal that they made the same or a similar meaning for which they also sought confirmation:

M: maybe the article’s a ((3))/ rather than the ((3))
F: yeah 
M: I worked in a shop/ [we don’t know the shop ((3))
F: [the first time she’s mentioned it
R: yeah 
T: okay/ alright … (5.2:125-135)

These instances, such as the joint constructions by ESB Students F and R, below, all involving ESB students made transparent the active responsive listening of indirect addressees:
Finally, this active listening and meaning making by indirect student addressees was evident in instances of reformulation of other students’ demands, the most interesting being the two occasions on which ESB student R appeared to be concerned that the teacher understood demands of NESB students Y and N, for example:

Y: I’m just worried about what I should teach in the first [lesson ((3))
R: [she’s wants to know
what to prepare for=
T: [yeah
Y: [yeah some teaching materials ((2))
R: =I think/ should she prepare for beginners or ((inaudible)) (1.2:658-667)

Although instances of students participating in exchanges in this way were isolated, they provide an insight into the interactive relationship of other students with the discourse that unfolds when a student adopts the role of demanding. This type of involvement is a significant demonstration of ESB students taking the initiative to participate in negotiations of meanings and thus of the discursive text all participants interact with as meaning-makers. It reflected their perception of their role in the classroom discourse and of themselves as knowers, and was a point of contrast with students in the NESB group.

The discursive context that emerges when students perceive themselves as primary knowers and take the initiative to participate in the interaction as indirect addressees is exemplified in the sequence included below. This context takes on a sharper significance through the attempts of NESB Student B to contribute to the discourse as it unfolds. The sequence involves re-surfacing of the question of authentic Arabic language texts, some time after the sequence included in earlier. It followed the teacher’s reference to the availability of authentic Mandarin language materials in a particular Brisbane suburb:
T: … you’ll only have to go to Sunnybank and you’ll get stacks of authentic material that you can use for those purposes

E: is there not an area of mainly Arabic people in Brisbane

B: no

T: I don’t think so/ no

E: because there’s/ there’s quite a few in Sydney/ isn’t there

B: yeah I

F: on the Gold Coast/=

T: mmmm

F: = isn’t there an Islamic group on the Gold Coast

K: I don’t know if=

SS: ((inaudible))

K: =((inaudible)) Islamic community

B: [((inaudible)) community

E: [there might be around Mt Gravatt/ I know that Mt Gravatt primary have a lot of Arabic people in it

T: are there any though/ I think that what you’re leading to is if that’s the case then are there any businesses and so on which

R: cater

E: there would be around near the mosque at Kuraby and the school there though wouldn’t there ((2))/ that’s the/ somewhere in that area=

T: mmm/ yeah/ alright

E: = because there’s/ yeah/ I think there is actually because there’s the=

B: ((inaudible))

E: = Islamic school of Brisbane there and the mosque just up the road and there’s ((inaudible))

R: yeah/ that’s at Kuraby

T: there used to be actually quite close to here … (4.2:1107-1155)

NESB Student B, who was teaching Arabic, responded firstly to ESB Student E’s demand addressed to the teacher, and then to her statement that followed. However Student B’s contribution was cut short firstly by the response of ESB Student F, an indirect addressee who adopted the role of demanding. Whether she addressed her question to the teacher, ESB Student E, or the class in general was not clear. Student F’s question elicited a response from indirect addressee ESB Student K, and Student B’s next attempt to contribute was cut short by Student E’s adoption the role of giving. His final attempt to contribute was during a long utterance of Student E in which she shifts roles from demanding back to giving. ESB Student R validates Student E’s final proposition.
NESB Student B’s Middle Eastern background arguably endowed him to some degree as a primary knower in this instance. His participation as primary knower earlier in the class in the sequences following his practicum report probably reinforced this position and encouraged him to respond, as an indirect addressee, to the demands addressed to the teacher and other students. However, his attempts to participate in this sequence of interaction were overwhelmed by ESB students. Perhaps, because the propositions, both statements and questions, centred on local knowledge ESB students were also endowed as primary knowers. This was not the only instance of unacknowledged or unanswered contributions of NESB students, and some contributions of ESB students met a similar fate. These attempts of NESB Student B to participate are significant, however, in the context of the evident preference of students in the NESB group to interact with the teacher rather than other students.

In summary, the relative absence of participation of NESB students as respondents to demands made by students is explained partly by the limited number of questions directly addressed to students in the group. However, in contrast with the ESB students, NESB students responded in few instances as indirect addressees. In interactions between students in DR3, whether in the role of demanding or giving on demand to other students’ questions, the situation in this classroom was that even when NESB students raised their voices, they were not heard. The outcome is that in DR3, although the teacher predominated as addressee and respondent to students’ demands, and thus as co-author of the discursive text, this was also another way ESB students were involved in the negotiation of meanings that constituted the text and context of the classroom that NESB students were not.

6.3 Students’ continuation of interaction following adoption of the role of demanding

Students in the two groups, NESB and ESB, differed in some important respects in the ways they continued their participation in the interaction following adoption of the role of demanding. Again, a constraint on the involvement of students in the NESB group at this point in sequences, and thus on any comparison with the ESB students, is that students in that group initiated considerably fewer opportunities to conclude or continue an exchange. Students from the ESB group adopted the role of demanding on almost five times the number of occasions (as distinct from the number of clauses realizing demands) as did students from the NESB group. Even so, some features of the discourse that unfolded following instances involving NESB and ESB students merit attention.
When the addressee of a student demand gave on demand, the student who made the demand moved from the role of demanding into the role of receiving. As the previous speaker they were, in principle, the addressee of the response with several options open to them. When the student participated no further in construction of the discursive text following the response, or acknowledged the response to conclude the interaction, the continuation of the discourse relied upon either the teacher or another student participant to adopt one of the speech roles of giving or demanding. When the student opted to resume the speech role of demanding, a new demand for the purposes of the analysis, the interactive sequence continued. Alternatively, the student could adopt the speech role of giving, continuing the interactive sequence but in a different discursive relationship. Interaction did not always unfold so predictably. Addressees of student demands sometimes adopted another role and the discourse moved on. For example, the teacher responded to a number of demands of students by proceeding to adopt the role of demanding after a response, as in the instance involving ESB Student J, below:

J: but that must be similar then to a seeking clarification ((3))
R: clarification check
T: clar/ oh no/ no/ what’s a clarification check
L: when you’re confused (3.2:1428-1432)

On ten of the 188 occasions students adopted the role of demanding, no response was elicited. In some instances, responses may have been non-verbal or the student making the demand proceeded to provide the information. In other instances, addressees did not respond and no exchange took place. The only instance of repetition of a demand when a response was not elicited was that of NESB student I, and the repetition did not succeed in eliciting a response. This suggests that even when students signalled the wish to confirm or co-construct propositions by adopting the role of demanding, if their demand was not acknowledged with a response, they were not willing to persist to interrupt the interaction that had continued to unfold.

The functions of the utterances of students following responses to their demands are shown in Table 6-8:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech function of utterance</th>
<th>Number of instances</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NESB students</td>
<td>ESB students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No utterance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-8: Speech functions of NESB and ESB student utterances following responses

6.3.1 No student utterance following the response

There was no further participation in the interaction by NESB students in 33% of the occasions of adoption of the role of giving, and none by ESB students in 42% of the occasions. This finding is subject to some limitations.

First, when the teacher or a student responded to a demand to give information all other classroom participants were in the role of receivers as indirect addressees, as evidenced by the acknowledgements that were sometimes produced simultaneously, for example below, where ESB Student M might have acknowledged the teacher’s answer but could not be isolated in the recorded data among the simultaneous responses of a number of students:

M: how long do we spend with each student/ and then/ sort of/ do we say after that/ okay
T: the longer the better actually/ you know/ except that if you’ve got/ if we’ve got a really big number of people there then it becomes the shorter the better
SS: yeah/mmm/okay (1.2:513-518)

In other instances where there was no student utterance in the transcribed data, it is arguable that the student indicated satisfaction with the response to their demand non-verbally. For example, in the instance below, the teacher checked the satisfaction of ESB Students J and R, *okay* ((2)), twice, then signalled a shift in the discursive roles with the conjunctive adjunct, *now*, suggesting confirmation of satisfaction had been elicited, but not verbally:

J: that assumes that you’re going to get them to do some reading ((2))
T: no no [no
R: ]just by *talking* [to them] ((2))
T: [you’re not/ you’re going to/ you’re/ from what you/ from what they say about reading/ what they say they do and/ so you’re going to infer it/ their level/ *okay* ((2))/ now that’s/ that’s fine/ it’ll/ it’ll be/ it’ll be reasonably/
There were occasions on which another participant entered the discourse to acknowledge the response or to open a new discursive relationship. In the instance below, for example, the teacher offered ESB Student L the opportunity to conclude or continue, which may have elicited a non-verbal response, or, alternatively, ESB Student J adopted the role of giving and initiated a new exchange before Student L could acknowledge the response, or resume the role of demanding, or adopt the role of giving:

L: Greg/ last time/ what/ what was the breakdown roughly between beginners and the more proficient/ like/ was it one quarter three quarters/ or [half and half

T: [yeah/ there was a/ there was a very small beginners group … (lines 405-410) … that simply means that we might have more intermediates/ intermediate classes/ alright ((2))

J: I think there’s … (1.2:408-420)

These instances show the absence on some occasions in the transcribed data of a student utterance following a response could be attributed to the limitations of data collection and/or the various circumstances outlined. On the basis of the analysis as it stands, however, there was some difference between the two groups. There was no student utterance following the response to a demand in close to 40% of ESB student demands, while this was the case for 26% of NESB student demands. This was largely a reflection of the immediate context of a number of the adoptions of the role of demanding by ESB students, illustrated in the instance of ESB Student K, below, who interjected to demand information; the teacher responded but returned immediately to the speech role of giving and any acknowledgement by Student K was not captured in the recorded data:

T: what we used to do on a/ on a Saturday and we/ we discontinued it for obvious reasons was when/ after you/ after you had finished your teaching we’d all get back together for example in this room and/ and there’d be discussions about =

K: every Saturday ((2))

T: = what went on/ every Saturday/ which meant that … (4.2:287-293)

Despite limitations in the data, it is also clear in the findings as they stand that on a significant proportion of the occasions on which students in both groups made demands, the answer of the addressee concluded the interaction between the student who made the demand and the addressee. However, as the findings in the next section show, a significant proportion continued the interaction between the student and the addressee.
6.3.2 Student utterances following responses to demands

There were important differences in the ways students in the two groups continued interaction with addressees after adoption of the role of demanding. Table 6-9 shows functions of utterances students did contribute, as well as instances of no further participation, as percentages of the total for both groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student group</th>
<th>Function of utterances following response to a demand (% of total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concluding interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESB</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESB</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-9: Functions of utterances following responses to demands as percentage of total

Responses that were not followed by any utterance or that were acknowledged by the student making the demand have been combined on the ground that both effectively brought the role of students in the interaction to a conclusion. Questions and statements continued students’ participation in the interaction through realization of propositions with the potential to engage other participants in negotiation of meaning and with demonstrably different implications for how the discourse unfolded.

As Table 6-9 shows, although members of the NESB group of students made relatively fewer demands, they were significantly more disposed when they did adopt the role of giving to continue their involvement in the interaction rather than conclude the exchange with an acknowledgement or no utterance at all. The speech roles adopted by NESB students to continue their participation further underscores the difference between the two groups of students. In almost one of every two instances in which NESB students adopted the role of demanding, they resumed the role to ask another question following the response to their demand. In only one in ten instances did they adopt the role of giving. The three sequences of demands made by students NESB students O and Y have already been noted. These students adopted the role of demanding following the response to an earlier demand several times in succession.

ESB students, on the other hand, adopted both the roles of giving and demanding in equal measures following responses to demands. They were much less likely to ask follow-up questions, and twice as likely to adopt the role of giving, but did so in about one in five
instances for both. ESB students most involved were those identified as adopting the roles of demanding and giving most frequently. In a number of instances, students produced more than one utterance or an utterance served two functions. For example, in Class Four (4.1:957-987) student J acknowledged the teacher’s response, right, no/ that’s true, during the response and followed the response with another demand (4.1:989).

The practice of adopting the role of giving in these circumstances, that is, following responses, needs to be considered in conjunction with the practice of ESB students of also adopting, in about one in five instances, the role of giving to preface, contextualize, or otherwise support demands, as already noted in the section on discursive context of adoption of the role of demanding. This constituted a distinct variation between members of the two student groups in the way they are involved this type of exchange. There were instances, for example ESB Student K, below, of adoption of the role of giving in the utterance following a response from the teacher before shifting to the role of demanding:

K: so the weak form goes from form to meaning ((3))
L: mhmm
T: the weak form goes from form to meaning/ yep
K: yep/ and the strong form goes from meaning to form/ now/ if you can give me an example I can (read) ((inaudible)) (4.2:1864-1871)

6.3.2.1 Student acknowledgement of response to demand

Students in the two groups were similar in the extent and realization of this speech function. It was often the case that the teacher checked whether the student found the response satisfactory, for example:

R: sorry/ going back/ what was the OT/ I missed that one/ we had/ in the [one before
T: [off target
R: off target was it ((3))
T: yeah/ they got it all wrong/ okay ((2))
R: mhmmm (5.2:1760-1768)

It was neither unusual for the student initiating the exchange to acknowledge the response without any check from the respondent nor for an acknowledgement to be repeated during a more lengthy response. In the instance below, ESB Student F acknowledged the first teacher
utterance that confirms the second of the alternative propositions in her demand. As the
addressee of the teacher’s reply, she then continues to acknowledge each subsequent utterance
until the teacher checks her satisfaction, which was either non-verbal or not captured in the
data:

F: so is it used just in Australia or is it used in other countries as well
T: versions of/ well/ the ISLPR is used/ is used fairly widely throughout the world
F: okay
T: one that is used very normally/ commonly/ is the/ what’s called the IELTS
F: yeah/ I know that one/ yeah
T: yeah/ yeah/ we’re not going to use the IELTS because it’s too complicated for us to
use on a Saturday morning
F: oh/ okay
T: this one is/ this one’s nice and simple to use so this is what we’re using/ this will
serve our purpose/ we don’t want/ we don’t really need anything all that precise
for what we’re going to be doing=
F: okay
T: =on Saturday morning/ alright ((2))/ basically what it’s doing … (1.2:25-46)

On many occasions, particularly when responding to polar interrogatives, the teacher gave
additional information. The function of acknowledgements that followed were ambiguous in
terms of what was acknowledged. In the following instance, the teacher’s proposition
concludes with a tagged declarative and Student L acknowledges the additional proposition
rather than the confirmation of her own proposition. Nonetheless, the acknowledgement
concluded the exchange initiated by the student:

L: if they use he she instead of it/ do they count that as a gender error/ or as a
T: yeah/ that’s about the only time it would happen in English/ isn’t it
L: mmm (5.2:1641-1645)

As noted earlier, in classrooms responses to demands have the potential to cast all participants
in the role of receivers as indirect addressees, sometimes eliciting simultaneous
acknowledgements from two or more students. Some of these acknowledgements from students
other than the initiator of the exchange are attributable to individuals, such as in the instance
below in which students L and R, as well as student K, acknowledge the teacher’s response to
the demand of student K:

K: is it just you that wants that ten minutes or if it’s Ian doing our observation
Acknowledgements were of interest as a way of involvement in negotiation of meaning in DR3 because they suggested, on the surface at least, that the student who made the demand was satisfied with the response. In principle, uncertainties have been negotiated and emergent meanings confirmed or their co-authoring completed. In dialogic terms, acknowledgements represented active responses to the co-text and, in this discursive relationship defined by questions, the resolution of tensions between classroom discourse and participants’ evolving inner discourses.

6.3.2.2 Student resumption of the role of demanding following a response to a demand

Distinctions between the two groups were most pronounced in instances of resumption of the role of demanding following responses to demands. The three sequences of demands from NESB Students O (2.2:1145-1186; 4.2:1920-1991) and Y (1.2:595-700) that represented half the demands of students in the NESB group were the core of instances of NESB students resumption of the role of demanding. These sequences suggest that although NESB students adopted the role of demanding on relatively few occasions, in the cases of Students O and Y, at least, once the interactive relationship was established these individuals were prepared to continue negotiations to resolve uncertainties. ESB Students K (4.2:1829-1918) and E (1.2:1677-1715) also initiated sequences of negotiation involving six and four demands respectively. Apart from these extended sequences, follow-up demands involved two, and very occasionally three, demands in sequence.

Instances of resumption of the role of demanding were analyzed as demands and included in the findings earlier in this chapter. As a way students were involved in exchange in the classroom these follow-up questions merit a brief but broad overview. In some instances, in follow-up
demands students sought to elicit additional information to confirm or complete the proposition in the original demand, for example:

G: sorry/ sorry/ Greg/ the difference between a recast and a repetition is that/ would a repetition/ like
T: no/ a recast is when you recast in the correct form
G: but a repetition/ you’re just re/ you’re just saying it as they’ve just said it ((2))
T: yeah/ so the repetition is a/
G: oh I see
T: = you repeat what they said (5.2:1497-1508)

A number of student utterances following a teacher response to a question elicit confirmation of the proposition realized in the teacher response, for example:

R: sorry/ going back/ what was the OT/ I missed that one/ we had/ in the [one before
T: [off target
R: off target was it ((3)) (5.2:1760-1764)

In other follow-up demands elicit more than confirmation of proposition are realized in the response. For example, in the instance below, it is arguable ESB Student J’s second question realized meanings he had been making as he listened to the teacher’s response to his original question:

J: … I’m just querying/ you know/ like/ if you into/ if you jump/ if you jump too hard into the feedback stage/ right
T: mmm
J: is that going to be an issue ((inaudible)) people
T: yeah/ sure/ yeah it is … (lines 959-986) … they like a little bit of quiet while they process things but/ you know there’s/ yeah
J: is it then just a case of being sensitive to the fact that those kind of people exist ((1)) (4.1:952-989)

The notable instance of adoption of the role of demanding by an NESB student in this context was Student O, leading to one of the two sequences of demands that involved her. In the transcript extract, below, at the conclusion of a sequence of demands and giving on demand involving ESB Students K and L, ESB Student E also gave on demand, but as the indirect addressee of ESB Student K’s original question. It was then that NESB Student O adopted the role of demanding, addressing the teacher to demand more information about the strong form of
communicative language teaching, the beginning of a sequence of seven demands. Her
determination to confirm meanings that emerged during the interaction between ESB Students
L and K is evident in the propositions she addressed to the teacher, despite some
miscommunication at times:

K: so you start off with the story and derive the=
L: which is the meaning
K: =meaning from that ((2))/ whereas the weak form/ you start off with teaching the
form ((2))
L: yes/ start off with the form/ used to/ and the grammar [((inaudible))
K: [and then you illustrate it later
with the story and use it
L: yes
K: thank you
E: that’s similar to the way our course/ this subject is structured/ where we’re teaching
and we’re deriving our theory from the teaching [rather than
T: [mmm/ that’s
right
SS: ((inaudible))
T: yeah
E: so that’s the strong form
K: thank you
O: do we explain the structure of the language in the strong form
T: sorry
O: do we explain the structure of the language
T: in the strong form ((3))
O: yeah/ in the strong form
T: oh yeah/ ultimately/ yeah/ mmm/ yeah/ nothing wrong with that
O: but if you say we just engage in language use/ we don’t emphasise on the usage here/
so we don’t/ we don’t explain the structures=
R: you don’t explain ((inaudible))
O: =((inaudible)) just in the weak form we explain ((1))
T: yeah/ you start with your/ you start with your activities
O: yeah/ but we don’t use/ but then we don’t explain/ yeah/ we don’t explain it at all/
the structures ((inaudible))
T: you don’t express the structures at all
O: yeah/ we don’t explain/ yeah/ I just said ((inaudible))
SS: [explain the structures
Although 50% of the responses to the demands of NESB students were in sequences of ongoing negotiation through additional demands (see Figure 6-9), three individuals and a limited number of demand sequences were involved. It was NESB Students O and Y, as noted earlier, who were the participants in sequences that included six and seven demands, and NESB Student B asked two questions in sequence on one occasion.

While fewer than 20% of the demands of ESB students were followed by another demand (see Figure 6-9), continued negotiation through resumption of the role of demanding was more widespread in terms of the number and distribution of demand sequences and among the group. Seven ESB students asked two or more questions in sequences. Sequences of questions from students suggest active responsive listening and more vigorous negotiation of dialogic tensions that have emerged and the outcome is the appropriation of students’ voices in the discourse that
results. The influences of individual students in this respect were varied, but it is clear the voices of some were heard more frequently than others.

6.3.2.3 Student adoption of the role of giving following response to a demand

This discursive practice marked a distinct variation in the ways the two groups of students were involved in the negotiation of meaning. ESB students were more likely to adopt the role of giving to continue negotiations than they were to resume the role of demanding. NESB students were much less likely to do so (see Table 6-8 and Table 6-9). That is, these students were unlikely to assume the role of primary knower in exchanges they initiated as secondary knowers. In contrast, ESB students appear to move more freely between the roles of secondary and primary knowers. This was evident also in the practice, restricted to ESB students, of adopting the role of giving to support, contextualize, or justify a demand.

The findings show adoption of the role of giving to continue interaction following a demand was a practice, almost exclusively, of ESB students. Utterances contributed to achieve this shift in discursive relationships are included in the findings for DR4, Chapter 7, but some instances of the negotiation that takes place in these circumstances are included here. In the first, below, ESB Student K’s initial demand as secondary knower elicited a response as primary knower from indirect addressee, ESB Student F, although her answer was contradicted by the addressee, the teacher. Student K resumed the role of demanding to negotiate a second, consequent proposition. She then followed the teacher’s response with an utterance with an explicit response-initiative structure, firstly validating the teacher’s response but then adopting the role of giving. In one sense, Student K became the primary knower giving information, but in another remained the secondary knower, the information functioning as a clarification of the original proposition with the intention, not of eliciting validation of the proposition, but of eliciting information from the teacher:

T: … in the immersion program they’re on about content and ah and language the language focus is a secondary thing but the content is presented in such a way as to make it comprehensible

K: is that what a task based method is=  
F: task
K: =is that what
F: no
T: can be=
F: oh
T: =it can be
K: so can that become a content
T: yeah/ it can/ it can be/ there’s a range/ content/ content based classes can range a whole/ across a whole range of things/ at the very very strong content end of the continuum would be something like an immersion program
K: immersion classroom=
T: that
K: =where it’s a science class ((inaudible))/ but I’m sort of thinking about our language teaching [classes on Saturday
T: [yeah/ yeah/ yeah/ and I think you … (3.1:519-549)

ESB Student K gave information to clarify and negotiate the tension she experienced between the teacher’s response and the demand she made. The three instances of NESB students adopting the role of giving following responses to demands were in the sequences of demands of NESB Students Y and O, and all three were similar to the instance of ESB Student K, above. In the instance, below, of the adoption of the role of giving following a response to demand, NESB Student Y arguably was not satisfied with the teacher’s response to her original question, and pursued it in the role of knower:

Y: so/ that is/ we may/ I guess maybe also some of the learners/ some learners could have an advanced level of/ in Chinese ((2))
T: maybe/ it’s never happened before/ but maybe
Y: I met one/ I met a guy last week who went to China for/ to learn Chinese for about two/ over two years [I guess
T: [well he’s a rarity/ no/ he’ll be a rarity/ they’ll/ they’ll mainly be/ they’ll mainly be beginners … (1.2:634-642)

Adoption of the role of giving in the ways outlined adjusts the interactive relationship of the participants in an exchange. Arguably, there is a progressive assumption of the role of knower by the student as they justify or support a demand on the basis of prior knowledge or experience. This movement between the roles of giving and demanding exposes the learning interface between the extant discourses of participants and the negotiation of new meanings as students interact with the unfolding co-text.

6.4 Summation

While the findings revealed notable differences in ways members of the two groups of students were involved in interactions in DR3, there were some similarities. Students in the NESB group were involved infrequently in the role of demanding, less so in the role of giving on
demand, and interacted almost exclusively with the teacher. They favoured incongruent grammatical realizations of demands that elicited confirmation or validation, made only isolated demands that elicited missing information, and but made some use of the resources of modality in negotiation of these demands. Although there were isolated instances of a minority of students engaging in prolonged negotiation of meaning when they did adopt the role of demanding, unlike ESB students, they rarely adopted the role of giving as part of this extended negotiation. Students in the ESB group adopted the role of demanding much more frequently and favoured congruent realizations but, although they primarily made demands to elicit confirmation of propositions, they also made demands for missing information. Demands were primarily addressed to the teacher, but not exclusively. Addressees of demands addressed to students were, with few exceptions, ESB students. In realizing demands, ESB students drew upon a wider range of the resources of modality to position themselves, and addressees, more nuanced ways in relation to the propositions they wished to validate. When they resumed the role of demanding to continue negotiation after a response to a demand, the sequences of interaction were generally less extended, although they were much more likely than NESB students to participate in a sequence in which they then adopted the role of giving. This reflected a broader capacity of most of the ESB students to position themselves to varying degrees as knowers in the context of their demands for information.
CHAPTER 7

7 DISCURSIVE RELATIONSHIP 4 - STUDENTS IN THE ROLE OF GIVING

Discursive Relationship 4 (DR4) was characterised by unsolicited adoption of the *speech role of giving* by a student, casting direct and/or indirect addressee/s - the teacher and/or student participant/s in interaction - in the *speech role of receiving*. Unsolicited adoption of the role of giving includes responses to utterances addressed to the student by other participants in the role of giving, but excludes responses to demands addressed to the student by other participants. Adoption in this context that the speaker was not responding to a demand for information of goods/services. Analysis of the transcribed data revealed that NESB and ESB student groups, and individuals within the two groups, differed in the ways and extent to which they were involved in the *speech role of giving* in:

- *adoption of the role of giving* information or offering goods/services;
- *responding to utterances* directly or indirectly addressed to them by another student who had adopted the role of giving; and
- *participation* in discourse following the adoption of the role of giving.

7.1 Students’ adoption of the role of giving

To begin, there were differences in the propensity of students in the NESB and ESB groups to adopt the role of giving and in the discursive contexts of the instances of them doing so.

7.1.1 Adoption of the role of giving by NESB and ESB students

Consideration of ways the unsolicited role of giving was adopted by the two student groups was constrained, as it was in DR3, by differences in the quantum of data. Instances of adoption of this discursive role by students in the two groups shown in Figure 7.1:
Figure 7-1: Number of instances of NESB and ESB students adopting the role of giving by class and total

NESB students adopted the speech role of giving in 51 instances, 12% of the total, and ESB students did so in 388 instances. There were additional instances, not included in the above, of several students adopting the role of giving simultaneously, usually interjections, for example:

T: … it belongs in the camp which we call qualitative research as opposed to=
SS: quantitative/ quantitative research
T: =quantitative research/ quantitative research is … (2.2:97-102)

While these instances are evidence of student engagement in active listening and meaning-making, they weren’t attributable to individual students and weren’t included in a comparison of ways NESB and ESB groups of students were involved in DR4. Most similar instances involving identifiable individuals were attributable to students in the ESB group, suggesting it is reasonable to speculate that simultaneous, non-attributable interjections were also mostly utterances of students in this group.

Disparity between the two groups assumed greater significance when instances were considered in terms of complexity of utterances. In adoption of the role of demanding in DR3, students realized demands in single clauses or paratactically related clause complexes. However, because there are options in realizations of interrogatives, these functioned to negotiate meanings in two qualitatively different ways, that is, either demanding information missing from propositions or demanding confirmation of the validity of propositions. There were instances of two or more clauses functioning in these distinctly different ways used by students in single utterances. Consequently, the findings in relation to DR3 reported the analysis on the
basis of functions of individual clauses, of which there were more than the total number of occasions demands were made by students.

In Chapter 6, it was noted that there were 34 instances of utterances in which students shifted between the speech roles of giving and demanding. In these instances, the clauses that functioned to demand were included in the analysis of DR3, although the co-textual context of these demands was given attention as a notable variation in the ways students in the two groups adopted the role of demanding. Thus, although many demands constituted entire utterances, the analysis of DR3 necessarily included a focus on clauses to facilitate analysis of discursive relations.

The speech function of giving was frequently realized in move complexes (Love & Suherdi, 1996), utterances of more than one clause or clause complex. Instances of students adopting the role of giving ranged from single lexical items to extended utterances realized in diverse and often complex combinations of lexical and/or elliptical items, clauses, and/or clause complexes. Thus, although the initial analysis was conducted at the level of the clause, the 439 instances of students’ adoption of the role of giving represented the number of instances in the transcribed classroom data of adoption of the role of giving by student participants, not the number of clauses that realized these utterances. In discursive terms, analysis in both DR3 and DR4 focused on the adoption of the speech roles in the context of unfolding discourse and the assignment of discursive roles to other participants in the negotiation of meaning, and the language selections of students in these roles.

Complexity of utterances of students in the two groups varied significantly (see Table 7-1, below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of clauses in utterances giving information</th>
<th>NESB student utterances in DR4 (%)</th>
<th>ESB student utterances in DR4 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No more than single clause</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two clauses</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than two clauses</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-1: Number of clauses in utterances of NESB and ESB students in DR4 as percentages of total

Sixty percent of NESB students’ utterances were no more than a single clause. Twenty percent included more than two clauses, either as part of clause complexes, as individual clauses, or some combination of these. More utterances of ESB students were complex and extended. Forty-seven percent of ESB students’ utterances consisted of no more than one clause, and 34%
of more than two clauses. This magnified the disparity in participation of the two groups evident in the number of instances of adoption of the role of giving (Figure 7.1). Thus considerably more data was available for analysis of ways ESB students were involved in DR4 than for the NESB group of students.

Complex utterances of students in the ESB group included the 35 instances of students shifting between the roles of giving and demanding in utterances. For instance, ESB Student M, below, shifted to the role of demanding with the polar interrogative, *is that him*, and then back to the role of giving, without eliciting recorded verbal responses to her demand:

M: well/ that’s sort of what Lyster says in his error correction/ is that him/ he says that students are … (4.1:260-261)

The reverse was also the case in instances in which students adopted the role of demanding and shifted to the role of giving and back again. For example, Student L, below, adopted the role of giving, *sometimes they might think it’s going to some government (inaudible)*, between two polar interrogatives:

L: do we/ if they’re a bit nervous/ do we just/ we/ do we tell them what we do with this sheet after we’ve finished with it/ sometimes they might think it’s going to some government ((inaudible))/ if they do seem a bit nervous/ do we just say this is only for me for teaching and learning and then it’s destroyed (1.2:356-363)

The speech role of giving was adopted preceding and/or following demands as well as between demands, as Student L did. In almost all instances, respondents to these utterances assumed the role of giving on demand, that is, they answered the question/s rather than acknowledging statements. The role of giving was adopted primarily as a means of introducing, contextualizing, or supporting a demand, such as in Student L’s utterance above. Instances such as that of Student M, above, in which the primary goal of the utterance was arguably to give, were exceptions. In analytic terms, these utterances were considered to be single instances of initiation of DR4.

There was no identifiable sustained change over time in the complexity of utterances of students in either group or in the extent of participation of either group in relation to the other but there were variations in frequency of the adoption of the role of giving from class to class. Class 2 was the occasion of the greatest number of adoptions of the role of giving by NESB students, 15 in total including the longest utterances contributed by students in the group, but in Class 3
NESB students contributed five utterances - two single lexical items, a phrase and two clauses, or a total of fourteen words; clearly, the contribution of NESB students to the discursive text in the role of giving in Class 3 was insignificant. As Figure 7.2 shows, the relative participation of both groups fluctuated and there was not the same shift to relatively greater participation by the NESB group that was identified in DR3.

![Figure 7-2: Instances of adoption of the role of giving of NESB and ESB student groups as a percentage of the total for each class](image)

Although the relatively limited corpus of data from the NESB student group makes meaningful comparison of the interpersonal language choices and discursive practices of the two groups difficult, the findings that follow establish that, when students adopted the role of giving, there were variations between the two student groups.

### 7.1.2 Relationships as knowers

Adoption of the role of giving positioned students as primary knowers in the fundamental relationship underpinning DR4. However, as findings presented in this Chapter demonstrate, students who adopted the role of giving positioned themselves as knowers in nuanced ways through language selections that reflected certainty of validity of propositions and in turn discursive relationships of speakers and addressees as knowers in the classroom discourse community. This is the interactive domain that most readily offers opportunities for levelling of relationships in the classroom in dialogue between knowers. Addressees, their responses and
the unfolding of continued interaction are of especial interest in the ways students were involved in negotiation of meaning.

7.1.3 Discursive contexts of adoption of the role of giving by NESB and ESB students

Differences in discursive contexts of adoptations of the role of giving by students in the two groups were evident firstly in the discursive relationships that prevailed in preceding co-text. The teacher’s pivotal position in the classroom was reflected in over 80% of instances of adoption of the role of giving by NESB students following utterances by the teacher in the role of giving. For ESB students, 70% of instances occurred in this context. Comparisons with adoptations of the role of demanding reveal that, given the greater propensity of students in both groups to adopt the role of giving, this was clearly the interactive relationship most initiated by students in this classroom. In this relationship, students position themselves as primary knowers, within the constraints of other language choices. What this suggests is that in a postgraduate classroom students are considerably more likely to respond to information given by the teacher, not by asking questions, but by responding as primary knowers and givers of information in return.

Ten percent of instances of DR4 initiated by NESB students and nearly 20% initiated by ESB students followed interaction in which a student was in the role of giving. In some instances, this reflected students’ resumption of the role of giving, but in others, they followed contributions of other students. Interaction between students is given close attention in the findings later in this Chapter, but this finding suggests some reluctance on the part of NESB students to respond to the utterances of other students, and a preference for interaction with the teacher.

When ESB students adopted the role of giving following interaction in DR3, it generally involved students who adopted the role of giving following responses to demands they had made. The limited number of instances of NESB students’ adoption of the role of giving makes further analysis and findings questionable. Only four utterances of NESB students did not follow co-text in which the interactants were in DR1 or DR4. However, having noted the limitations of the data, there were some variations in this aspect of the discursive context of the adoption of the role of giving by students in the two groups that take on more significance in the findings that follow.
While all utterances analyzed as instances of DR4 were considered to be unsolicited, that is, not giving on demand, the reciprocity of dialogue does position direct addressees as the next speaker. Adoption of the role of giving was not the only option for addressees. Options included validation/contradiction of the proposition of the speaker, adoption of the role of demanding, or no response at all. Under these circumstances, adoption of the role of giving necessitated less agency on the part of students. Thus, there were two qualitatively different contexts of the adoption of the role of giving. In 33% of instances of adoption of the role of giving by NESB students, students were addressees of preceding utterances, while for ESB students this was the case in 25% of instances. These co-textual utterances were instances of either DR1 or DR4, that is, the teacher or another student in the role of giving.

The obligation to take on the role of speaker that is experienced by addressee varied as well. The instance of NESB student O, below, who was directly addressed by the teacher in the role of giving is illustrative:

T: … now I know Olivia did a/ you/ you/ you try/ don’t you/ to get them using it outside the

O: yeah/ but it depends on the personality of the learners/ if they are very outgoing they
will use the language outside the classroom … (2.2:1231-1235)

The mood tag made the expectation of some response from Student O more explicit. Whether Student O would have contributed to the discourse on the matter at hand if she was not addressed by the teacher is unknown, but it can be asserted that her participation in the discourse at this point stemmed from her being addressed by the teacher. Although Student O could have simply confirmed the validity of the teacher’s proposition with the polar adjunct alone, she adopted the role of giving and negotiated the meaning proposed by the teacher. This was an interesting instance in a number of ways. While the teacher explicitly positioned himself as knower, I know, and did not demand an action of Student O, apart from confirmation, his address of her arguably presents a discursive opportunity. Much of the participation of NESB students was in response to offers of discursive opportunities.

Finally, as noted earlier, a difference between the discursive contexts of the adoption of DR4 by the two groups was in the co-text of the students’ own utterances. There were 34 instances of ESB students shifting between the roles of giving and demanding in a single utterance, but none of an NESB student doing so. This occurred most often when the student involved supported or contextualized a demand. For example, ESB Student L, below, was prompted to enter the interaction because she wanted to demand some missing information, but shifted from the role
of demanding to the role of giving. In dialogic terms, in doing so she made visible the tension she was experiencing between meanings emerging in her relation with the unfolding discourse in the classroom. In this case, she challenged the authority of the teacher who had endorsed the value of the videotaped language teaching the class was observing. Arguably, this was a practice that perhaps challenged other students as well:

L: what if some of these students on this side don’t understand a lot of this vocab that’s being/ she’s not checking at any stage that/ I mean/ it seems to me a lot of/ there are a few people giving a lot of the answers /=

R: mmm [yeah/ not everyone’s (inaudible)

T: [yeah

L: =a lot of the passive people on this side might not understand any of that vocab

T: might/ they may not/ that’s right/ yeah (4.2:1406-1418)

This analysis of the discursive context of the adoption of the role of giving indicates that there were differences in the ways students in the two groups became involved in the negotiation of meaning as the discourse unfolded. The attention turns now to the language choices of students in the contributions they made to the discursive text when they adopted the role of giving

7.1.4 Language selections in systems of interpersonal meanings

7.1.4.1 Commodity and mood

With two exceptions, information was the commodity exchanged when students adopted the role of giving. One offer was made to the teacher and students of a teaching resource; the second offer was made by Student L, responding to a demand for a service made to the teacher by Student K:

K: … now/ if you can give me an example/ I can [(read) ((inaudible))

L: [I’ll give you an example

T: good/ good/ let/ let Leanne

L: I started talking about … (4.2:1870-1877)

Student L’s utterance, a clause with declarative mood element structure, functioned as an offer to provide the service K demanded of the teacher. Arguably, although L addressed K, you, the offer was also addressed to the teacher, who accepted the offer by addressing an imperative, a
command, to Student K and deferred to L to provide the example. The two exceptions aside, the commodity exchanged in DR4 by both the NESB and ESB groups was information. Students’ utterances were realized as clauses with declarative Mood element structure and functioned as statements. For example, ESB Students L and F adopted the role of giving to contribute propositions realized as declarative clauses. The sequence has a number of features addressed later in this section; the use of modal Adjuncts and modal finite operators, acknowledgement of validity from another ESB students, and joint construction of propositions by students and teacher:

T: … it could be that she’s/ that she is doing what lots of teachers do and call upon and encourage the males to have/ to have a greater degree of input
L: maybe he’s confident and [she wants a confident person to go first
T: [maybe
K: yeah
T: maybe he is /yeah
F: or it could be the fact that the women have spoken a lot before in the big group and now
T: she’s trying to even it up
F: yeah (3.2:2348-2366)

Exceptions to the use of the declarative mood were 36 interrogative clauses and four imperative clauses that functioned incongruently. These projected locutions or reports in which students spoke about how they would interact with language learners in classrooms, or reported questions encountered in a written text. Some recounted experiences outside the classroom, such as the instances of projected interrogatives and an imperative in the utterances below. ESB Student L was recounting a conversation in the language school where she worked, not reporting on her practicum experience:

L: I had one student who just flew in last week from Moscow to Sydney and I said/ how long was the flight/ and he said/ four hours/ and I said/ so did you stop somewhere/ no/ and then we … (3.2:1462-1465)

M: if it was explicit you’d be putting up the phonetics on the board=
T: exactly
M: =and saying do you understand the difference between this and this=
R: yeah yeah no yeah
M: =and repeat this=
T: yeah
Amongst the NESB students, Students H and W each contributed one utterance that included projected interrogatives. In NESB Student H’s recount of an encounter and conversation with a student from a practicum class, three of the projected locutions in her utterance, below, were projected interrogative clauses:

H: he’s the one we had the first time and I told him when I met him/ I said/ instead of like/ coming to our class/ I said/ there’s a new class for academic/ why don’t you go there/ and he said/ do you think I should go there/ why do you think that I should go there/ so I said/ you are (really bored) in our class// I think that it will be possible for you/ you will achieve something there after paying twenty dollars/ so he/ he (went there) (4.2:917-921)

While only Students W and H in the NESB group realized meanings in clauses that weren’t declarative in Mood structure, seven students in the ESB group included such clauses in utterances. This may reflect the propensity of ESB students to produce longer, more complex utterances in which they recounted personal experiences, described classroom scenarios, or course reading materials, the contexts of most of the uses of incongruent mood structure. The utterance of Student H, above, falls into this category but it was the lengthiest utterance of an NESB student in DR4.

7.1.4.2 Polarity

Positive polarity in statements is “just as substantive and meaningful as choosing negative” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 143). However, significance can be ascribed to polarity in realization of meanings in the sense that it signifies unqualified commitment to propositions as knower, in contrast to indeterminacy realized in instances of modalization or through Adjuncts. The commitment carried by a clause that is not modalized is exemplified by the positive polarity in the utterance of ESB Student R, in the first extract below, where the certainty realized in her use of is can be contrasted with the uncertainty realized in and through ESB Student L’s selection of the modal Adjunct, probably, in the second extract:

T: … and that gives you a/ a great perspective on what’s going on in the classroom/ okay ((2))/ so I’d suggest that
R: there’s a lot of benefit in that
T: oh/ a terrific amount of benefit/ in fact I would even suggest … (2.2:883-888)

T: … we’re going to put beginners with beginners/ advanced students with advanced students/ as much as we can
Thus, one way polarity took on significance in the ways the two groups of students were involved in the construction of meaning is in the context of the findings, presented later in this section, that ESB students made significantly greater use of the grammatical resources of modality, and of mood and comment Adjuncts. More than three quarters of the utterances of NESB students, propositions were realized in polar terms, without the resources of modality. This suggested to addressees that speakers were not only certain of their positions as knowers and that validity of propositions would be confirmed by addressee/s, but also that the speaker did not anticipate negotiation of meanings. For example, the utterance of NESB Student C, below, was characteristic of the single clauses (see Table 7.1) that comprised 60% of the initiations of the NESB group and that, with few exceptions, were not qualified in any way:

T: … we won’t worry about the ones at the/ on the top of that diagram/ experiments and quasi-experiments
C: they’re artificial
T: eh
C: they’re artificial
T: yeah/ they’re artificial … (2.2:858-867)

Even when contradicting the teacher, NESB Student I, below, realized her attempt to negotiate the teacher’s meaning without any recourse to the nuances available in modality or Adjuncts, relying entirely on the negative polarity to position herself in relation to the proposition and, likewise, positioning her addressee, the teacher, with the responsibility of validation of her absolute position or negotiation of the proposition:

T: … the tables idea is a very good example of the place for a rote type of learning/ and then if you want to expand into higher level mathematics after that/ in grade one/ then go ahead and do it/ but at least you/ at/ at least you can work out your change
R: mmm
I: it doesn’t matter now/ you have calculators
T: yeah but you can become … (5.1:444-453)

Whether NESB students felt themselves to be knowers of valid propositions or whether their language choices reflected their capacities to deploy linguistic resources is an important question. The evidence to be presented seems to point to either a restricted capacity or a disinclination to express the full range of positions in relation to validity of propositions. For
example, although unmodalized statements expressing certainty of the validity of propositions were prevalent in the utterances of NESB students, all but one of the 15 instances of mood tags, the strongest expression of the validity of a proposition through polarity, were in utterances of ESB students. For example, in the instance below, ESB Student E’s certainty of validity of her proposition in the first clause was realized initially in positive polarity. However, this was subsequently strengthened through addition of the tag that explicitly signalled that her certainty was such that she expected her proposition to be corroborated by the addressee/s. Student E’s certainty is sustained in the clause that follows and then she then expresses certainty of the obligation in the proposition with the high value modal have to:

E: that’s part of being a teacher/ isn’t it/ it doesn’t matter if you’re teaching an ESL class or a mainstream class or whatever/ you have to be flexible … (2.2:762-763)

When students adopted the role of giving, co-texts of utterances determined much of the significance of polarity of clauses in utterances. Both groups realized validation and shared understanding through polarity in mood elements, but contradiction of preceding propositions was rarely realized through polarity in the mood element of clauses only. In discourse that unfolded in sequences of participants’ adoption of the role of giving, important negotiation involving validation and contradiction was realized through polar mood Adjuncts.

7.1.4.2.1 Polar adjuncts

When adopting the role of giving, students in both the NESB and ESB groups used polarity to negotiate meaning not only in the finite element of clauses, but also in polar mood adjuncts that in these circumstances functioned, in principle, as statements giving information that validated/contradicted a preceding statement. More than fifty utterances of ESB students and seven of NESB students opened with polar adjuncts, and a smaller number, fewer than twenty, concluded with polar adjuncts. For instance, NESB Student B, as direct addressee, validated the proposition of ESB Student F with the positive polar adjuncts, yeah/yeah, contextualizing his own proposition negotiating some expansion of the meaning proposed by F:

F: … especially for Japanese=
T: excellent
F: =there’s plenty of basic websites that I/ that I personally use for myself as well
B: yeah/yeah/ there are some that is for teaching Arabic and learning Arabic for beginners … (4.2:640-647)
When students resumed the role of giving, polar adjuncts negotiated shared understandings of participants. For example, the polar adjunct in Student E’s second utterance, following the teacher’s corroboration of the proposition in her first, is her confirmation of shared understanding with the teacher that provides the context for the proposition to follow:

E: rote learning with tables is almost like pattern making anyway/ isn’t it  
T: I think so/ mmm  
E: yeah/ so then you’re not/ it/ that’s why it works so well because … (5.1:460-464)

Although polar adjuncts played an important part in the ways students in both groups used polarity to negotiate meanings proposed by others to achieve some shared understanding, where the two groups differ is in use of polar adjuncts to contextualize negotiation that contradicts co-text. The sequence of utterances of the teacher and ESB Students R and M, below, illustrates a disputed understanding signalled by utterances that open with polar modal adjuncts, and in the instance of Student M, closes with a polar adjunct as well:

T: …I thought she was just getting her/ making sure she heard it correctly  
R: no/ I didn’t/ I [thought she was pronunc  
M: [yeah/ no/ I thought it was a little bit pronunciation as well/ because the way the lady said snore/ it was a bit/ it was like she didn’t understand her/ yeah (5.2:2044-2050)

While ESB students made more use of polarity to contextualize validation and negotiation than they did to negotiate contradiction as in the instance above, there were instances of students from both groups using conjunctive Adjuncts to begin utterances as more implicit realizations of reluctance to validate propositions and to contextualize negotiation.

7.1.4.3 Modality

There was a marked contrast in use by the two groups of the resources of modality to realize uncertainty, with implications for the extent to which the students implicitly rest the validity of the proposition on their own judgement (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). This contrast extended beyond incidence of use of these resources to include differences in degrees of uncertainty expressed, and thus degrees of personal attachment. Although finite modal operators and modal Adjuncts were sometimes used in conjunction, the findings are presented in terms of these two means of expressing uncertainty.
7.1.4.3.1 Finite modal operators

There were frequent instances of utterances of ESB students in which modality was realized through finite modal operators to express the probability of the validity of propositions, and thus the certainty of the student. For example, ESB Student L, below, selected the low value modal operator, might, to implicitly position herself as unsure of the validity of her statement, and by extension, acknowledged her position as primary knower was negotiable:

T: … when he went into a class where he/ when he was just ordinary his number of instances of/ of generating input reduced
L: might be to do with nationality/ we’ve got a/ a class at the moment and the … (3.2:2013-2016)

Almost three quarters of the utterances of ESB students included one or more modalized or modulated clauses. In contrast, there were seven instances, in five utterances, in contributions of NESB students. More sensitive analysis of data from both groups found that students in the ESB group used low or median value modal operators almost to the exclusion of those of high value. The commitment of speakers to propositions, the strength of the opinion expressed, corresponds to the value. The choice of low value finite modals, for example, by ESB Student M, below, in may and could, suggested in the speaker a corresponding preparedness to negotiate the validity of the proposition; in this instance, responses of the teacher and students function to confirm the validity of M’s proposition:

M: … I was just going to say that it may not just be as simple as it being a nationality thing either/ it could be a personality thing …
SS: mm/ yes/ exactly
M: =you know/ you/= T: that’s a good point
M: =an Australian student could be sitting there going/ oooh/ I don’t want to do this/ ooh/ you know/ and=
SS: that’s right/ yes (2.1:531-543)

Student M’s uncertainty contrasts with the strength of ESB Student E’s commitment to the proposition, below, which is one of the isolated instances of use of a high value modal finite by an ESB Student. Arguably, Student E has chosen language, a mood tag as well as a high value modal, that suggests she is less prepared to negotiate her proposition than was Student M:

E: that’s part of being a teacher isn’t it it doesn’t matter if you’re teaching an ESL class or a mainstream class or whatever you have to be flexible … (2.2:762-763)
Although there were limited data on which to base a comparison, the seven modal finite operators used by students in the NESB group were concentrated in the middle of the value scale. The one high value modal operator used expressed certainty about obligations, in the utterance of NESB student H, below:

H: (inaudible) the meaning/ isn’t it/ so you have to know the meaning  
T: what’s that  
H: you have to know the meaning of the/ of the word as well (4.1:175-179)

The strength of Student H’s commitment to her proposition is greater than that of NESB student O, below, but it is useful to compare Student O’s use of the median level finite modal, will (and will not) to express usuality, with the utterance of ESB student M, above, who used low level modals to express her position in relation to the proposition; while Student M expressed uncertainty, Student O arguably expressed a certainty that committed her to the validity of the proposition:

T: … now I know/ Olivia/ did a/ you/ you try/ don’t you/ to get them using it outside the  
O: yeah/ but it depends on the personality of the learners/ if they are very outgoing they will use the language outside the classroom/=  
T: that’s right  
O: =but if they are very/ you know/ not so outgoing or if they are=  
T: introverted  
O: =a introvert yeah/ they will not do that because they are not comfortable with that (2.2:1231-1243)

The propensity of the two groups to modalize/modulate propositions and the choice of modal values exposed a variation in the way the students involved positioned themselves in relation to the validity of propositions, and in the way they are involved in negotiation of meaning. The use of mood Adjuncts provided an even greater contrast.

7.1.4.3.2 Mood Adjuncts

There were in excess of seventy instances of use by students in the ESB group of mood Adjuncts of modality and intensity. These students made no use of high value mood Adjuncts of modality during the five classes in which data was collected; the low and median value modals sometimes, maybe, and probably were the most frequently used. In the instances below, students adopted the role of giving but the mood adjuncts of probability, probably and maybe,
especially the low value carried by maybe, signalled a reservation about the validity of the proposition on the part of the speaker, that they were proposing a negotiable meaning to the addressee/s:

T: … we’re going to put beginners with beginners/ advanced students with advanced students/ as much as we can
L: over eight weeks that’s probably where’d they be happier (1.1:998-1001)

E: she was/ used was up further correctly/ second line down/ I sometimes I was standing there in the shop/ that’s correct=
T: yep
E: =so maybe she understands was/ or maybe that’s
L: or maybe [(inaudible)
T: [may/ maybe again what you’ve/ it could be also that you’ve got another one of these examples of English with its … (5.2:310-319)

The negotiation initiated by ESB Student E’s modalized proposition, above, is continued by both ESB Student L’s adoption of the role of giving to propose an alternative meaning and the teacher’s similarly modalized proposition. The sequence below, again interaction involving ESB Students L and E and the teacher, illustrates the sort of negotiation in which students in the ESB group were sometimes engaged when they adopted the role of giving. In this instance the mood adjuncts of usuality, sometimes and often, allowed the two students to negotiate a degree of congruence that would not have been possible if restricted to the resources of polarity:

L: you notice that/ that/ that/ that different attitude to what learning is with older students=
T: yeah
L: =and sometimes it’s a bit more of a/ a slower learning curve to get them into/ into/ into something that’s [(inaudible)]
T: [that’s right
E: [the thing is though they’re coming from different cultures where often they have a different approach to learning anyway
L: but older tends to be sometimes a double
E: ((inaudible)) (even more)
L: yeah=
T: yeah/ a double whammy there/ I think
L: =it’s sometimes harder to get them to change/ I think/ younger people sometimes are a little more flexible if/ to get/ if you’re trying to mould them to do something or become a bit interactive/ older students sometimes don’t handle that change all that well (1.1:487-513)
In contrast, there was one instance of the use of a mood adjunct by a student from the NESB group, NESB Student B, below. Here Student B signalled his wish to negotiate the proposition of the teacher in the conjunctive adjunct, *but*; he then additionally realized this wish by modalizing his proposition with the median value mood adjunct, *usually*, to propose an adverse but negotiable meaning:

T: … if you had an opportunity to discuss it with the other two/ other two lecturers/ but I don’t know whether you
B: but/ we/ we usually have (post/ post) discussion after a lesson observation
T: yeah/ I know/ but it doesn’t … (4.2:298-303)

Essentially, it was found the use of the linguistic resources of mood adjuncts as a way students positioned themselves in relation to meanings they constructed and a resource they deployed to negotiate the meanings proposed by other classroom participants was restricted to students in the ESB group. A similar situation prevailed in the use of comment Adjuncts.

### 7.1.4.4 Comment Adjuncts

There were in excess of thirty instances of the use by ESB students of comment Adjuncts that positioned speakers in relation to validity of propositions and one instance of the use by a member of the NESB group. These instances included several that commented on propositions, such as, *obviously*, and, *apparently*, in the utterances of Students M and E in the second sequence, below. Others qualified speakers’ positions, as with, *in my experience*, in Student M’s utterance, first instance below, or functioned as claims of truth, such as, *actually*, in the utterance of Student K, also in the second sequence below:

M: … whereas a Japanese learner in/ in my experience/ is more likely going to … (2.1:545)

T: … rising intonation pattern at the end of every sentence
E: apparently that’s an Australian thing though
T: it’s an Australian female thing particularly
M: she’s [obviously English
E: [ohh
T: [it’s it’s not
K: [but the thing is/ Greg/ and I think that this/ Leanne was making this point to our students on Saturday/=
T: mm
K: =and it is actually a useful thing to know because for instance when … (3.2:1693-1711)

The comment adjunct in the utterance of NESB Student H, below, was propositional rather than interpersonal, that is, it functioned to comment on the part she herself played in the proposition, rather than expressing her attitude or position in relation to the proposition itself:

H: unfortunately for me/ I went to Nathan and I met him in the/ in the campus bus (2.1:362)

A picture is emerging of a distinct difference in the capacities of the two groups of students to position themselves, and their addressee/s, in relation to the validity of their own propositions and those of others, and the resources at their disposal to negotiate meaning. With the exception of one student in the NESB group, this finding is further evidenced by students’ realization of modality through interpersonal metaphor.

7.1.4.5 Conjunctive adjuncts

Although they are, strictly speaking, outside an interpersonal analysis, ESB students used the adversative conjunctive adjunct, but, and to a lesser extent the conditional, though, to shape meaning and construct interpersonal context (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) with a frequency similar to the use of polar adjuncts. NESB students, on the other hand, used the adversative, but, on four occasions. In the instance below, both NESB student B and the teacher in turn used the adversative, but, to signal their reluctance to validate the proposition of the previous speaker before attempting to negotiate:

T: … it might kind of be helpful sometimes if they could/ if you had an opportunity to discuss it with the other two/ other two lecturers/ but I don’t know whether you
B: but/ we/ we usually have (post/ post)/ discussion after a lesson observation
T: yeah/ I know/ but it doesn’t/ sometimes it’s/ it’s rushed/ isn’t it (4.2:297-303)

The context of negotiation was sometimes shaped by the use of both polar and conjunctive adjuncts. The use of polar adjuncts by NESB Student B, below, was included earlier, but following his validation of ESB student F’s proposition (not included here), establishing a shared understanding, he continued, using the adjunct, but, to signal that there was also an aspect of her meaning he wished to re-negotiate:

B: yeah/ yeah/ there are some that is for teaching Arabic and learning Arabic for beginners/=
F: yeah
B: =but I think here is speaking about/ I mean/ just I mean
T: authentic stuff
B: authentic/ yeah (4.2:646-655)

Although the two instances above involved NESB Student B, ESB students were involved in all but four instances of negotiation of meaning using conjunctive adjuncts. The sequence of interaction between ESB Students L and E, below, included earlier, is included here again because it includes two instances, but, and, though, an excellent illustration of the use by students of conjunctive adjuncts to negotiate agreement of some degree of shared understanding, here in unison with the interpersonal resources of mood adjuncts:

L: you notice that/ that/ that/ that different attitude to what learning is with older students=
T: yeah
L: =and sometimes it’s a bit more of a/ a slower learning curve to get them into/ into/ into something that’s [((inaudible))]
T: [that’s right
E: [the thing is/ though/ they’re coming from different cultures where often they have a different approach to learning anyway
L: but older tends be/ sometimes/ a double
E: ((inaudible)) (even more)
L: yeah= (1.1:487-503)

The choices of students in the systems of polarity and modality and the harnessing of comment and conjunctive Adjuncts contrasts ways the two groups of students’ were involved in the construction and negotiation of meaning in DR4. The variations extend beyond any relative significance in the context of the disparity in utterances of the two groups. ESB students positioned themselves as uncertain of the validity of propositions not only more frequently but in ways that realized propositions as more open to negotiation. Arguably, this reflected the addressivity of utterances that were sensitive to the possible responses of addressees. This facilitated some interactions in which students negotiated the utterances of the teacher and of other students. It allowed disagreement without the positions of interlocutors as knowers being challenged in absolute terms, and allowed students themselves to participate in the unfolding of the discourse without risking their positions or status as knowers. NESB students, with the exception of Student B, attached themselves strongly to most of the propositions they contributed. The circumstances under which they contributed were often similar to the circumstances of giving on demand in DR2; these students responded when they were certain of
validity. This is one explanation of their language selections. If this is the case, then their participation is constrained in a context where other participants are prepared to risk contradiction and are prepared to negotiate. The marked exception of NESB Student B is taken up in the next section.

7.1.4.6 Interpersonal metaphor

In the utterances of students who adopted the role of giving there were in excess of 70 instances of projecting mental clauses functioning as mood adjuncts that subjectively and explicitly realized the speaker’s certainty of the validity of propositions metaphorically. On the surface, in relative terms, the two groups as a whole were similar in the extent of metaphorical realization of modality. However, six of the eight instances involving students in the NESB group were propositions of Student B. There were seven ESB students who realized modalization in this way, all in at least as many instances as Student B. The utterances of ESB Students E and J, below, illustrate how projecting clauses functioned to explicitly realize propositions as the opinions of speakers and hence signal some uncertainty about validity of propositions. Arguably, this indicated speakers’ assessments of the possible responses of addressee/s. Student J amplified his uncertainty with the mood adjunct probably in the projected clause:

E: I think/ anyway/ for Australian society/ no-one pronounces everything the same anyway/ like
T: not only in Australian society/ anywhere (1.1:1277-1280)

J: but/ but then I think that’s a very interesting question anyway/ phrasing objectives/ because I think that there are probably different perspectives on that/ you know (5.2:846-847)

NESB student B’s recount of his interaction with a student during the previous year, first instance below, was realized with the certainty of unmodalized polarity until the final clause. The projecting clause in final position realized it as his opinion and modalized the proposition, a recognition the validity was open to negotiation:

B: one of my last semester/ yeah/ students/ yeah/ she/ she is not Moslem but she tells me that she has read half the/ half of the Koran/ and she said it/ it is a holy book/ it is valuable reading/ I think (4.2:727-729)

ESB students often deployed the various resources of polarity and modality in conjunction to realize quite complex meanings in terms students’ positions with regard to validity of a
proposition and anticipated responses of addressee. For example, ESB Student G, below, whose utterance began with the median value finite modal operator, \((\text{would})\text{d have to}\), in conjunction with the mood adjunct of intensity, \(\text{kind of}\), signals her expectation her proposition will be corroborated by the teacher with the negative mood tag, \(\text{wouldn’t you}\). She adds the conditional conjunctive adjunct \(\text{though}\), but then, perhaps aware of the certainty she has expressed and of the possible responses of addressees, diminishes the certainty with the projecting clause, \(\text{I think}\), almost as an afterthought and perhaps in expectation of a response contradicting or negotiating the proposition:

\[
G: \text{you’d have to kind of be careful with that one/ wouldn’t you \text{though} ((2))}/ \text{I think} ((2)) (5.2:1527)
\]

In summary, students in the NESB group realized their certainty and negotiated the validity of propositions largely through the resources of polarity, with limited use of conjunctive adjuncts and the resources of modality. Although there was some modalization of meanings, there was none of the complexity that was realized in some ESB utterances in which students sometimes positioned themselves and their addressee/s in relation to their proposition by drawing upon a variety of grammatical resources.

The prevalence of polar statements in the utterances of students in the NESB group suggests that they were either reluctant to adopt the role of giving unless they were confident of validity of propositions, or that they experienced difficulties deploying the resources of modality. The choice of median or high probability modal finites in the few instances of NESB students using these resources supports the suggestion that the students in this group adopted the role of giving when they were reasonably confident of validity of propositions. By comparison, on the basis of findings in this section, choices of ESB students suggest either that they were prepared to adopt the role of giving when they were uncertain about validity of propositions or that they were reluctant to commit strongly to propositions, or both depending upon individuals and circumstances. When considered in conjunction with the findings on polarity in propositions, it seems more accurate to suggest that students in the ESB group used the full range of resources offered by the systems of polarity and modality to express commitment to propositions that ranged from the strongest to the weakest. This allowed them to fulfill obligations for talk that identified and positioned them as knowers in direct relation to the dynamics of their commitment to the validity of various propositions they contributed.
7.1.5 Joint construction

To this point, the focus has been on students in the role of giving and their active negotiations of meanings realized in constitution of the discursive text and context. Students who were not actively participating in negotiation were participating as addressees and, in principle, in active responsive listening or silent responsive understanding. Student utterances, including those in DR4, were observable evidence of active responsive meaning-making. Student utterances in the role of giving that achieved explicit joint construction of propositions, the completion or expansion of the utterance of another speaker are arguably utterances that provide the sharpest insight into largely unobservable active listening.

The bulk of joint constructions involved the teacher. Instances of joint construction involving students only were the exception. More than 70 utterances of students who adopted the role of giving were analyzed as joint constructions, seven of them utterances of NESB students. However, while eight of the nine ESB students participate in at least one instance of joint construction, and some in many instances, three NESB Students C, H and W are involved in interactions in this way. In addition, a closer analysis of the contexts found that ESB students jointly constructed propositions both in interjections and by taking advantage of discursive opportunities such as mood tags, pauses by other speakers, or intonation patterns signalling the end of a clause/utterance. NESB students, with a single exception, used discursive opportunities, that is, they avoided interrupting the speaker. The instances below of ESB Students J’s and K’s joint constructions of propositions with the teacher illustrate utterances that were interjections, essentially interruptions of, in both cases, the teacher:

T: … where Anderson says/ you’re quite right/ you know/ where it’s almost where practice makes perfect/ that’s basically/ that’s basically =

J: like audiolingual/ yeah

T: = what he’s saying isn’t it/ yeah/ he’s saying that that... (2.2:1479-1484)

T: … you’ll find out what still needs to be taught when you get to that=

K: to praxis stage

T: =role play/ praxis stage [at the end

K: [where they’re actually producing something (3.2:1213-1220)

Students in both groups who participated in the joint construction of meaning at points of discursive opportunity, generally completed or expanded a teacher proposition, for example, the
utterances of NESB Students H and C, below, which are typical of the utterances of the NESB students involved:

T: … but if you come from China and you come from Japan and you come from Korea/ you come from/ ah
H: Burma
T: Burma/ you don’t have a Socratic background … (2.1:429-434)

T: … the cognitive process is a/ a process of hypothesising/ isn’t it/ where=
C: testing
T: =you/ that’s right/ where you/ where you have a hypothesis about … (4.1:674-679)

Students who engaged in this type of practice, although they were engaged in a joint construction, positioned themselves in relation to the validity of the proposition they were contributing. Utterances of ESB Students K, L, and J, below, took up discursive opportunities with utterances marked for polarity in the instance of Student K, and by modality in the instance of Student J:

T: … all that we’ll be developing in the learner is their semantic capabilities
K: not their communicative capabilities
T: yeah/ and … (3.1:263-268)

T: personally/ I think they’d= F: yeah
T: =probably/ they/ they’ll tend to be at the higher/ [higher proficiency end
SS: [yeah/ yes/ mmm
L: or very confident
T: yeah/ or very confident/ [yeah/ yeah
J: [or just extroverted
T: they could be extroverted … (3.2:1925-1941)

Considered in terms of the practice and the groups as a whole, this was a way both groups were involved in negotiation of meaning. Even though limited numbers of NESB students were involved, and the contexts of the utterances differed, the insight into active responsive listening offered by instances of students adopting the role of giving to jointly construct propositions focuses attention on the dialogic relationships between speaker and addressee/s and between utterances of participants. The explicit partnership of meaning-making in joint construction of
propositions made visible the responsive role of addressee/s in negotiations of meanings and the role of co-text in utterances that continue the discourse. A more implicit facet of meaning-making partnerships was the influence of addressees on the language choices made by speakers. Thus, the final set of findings on the ways students were involved in the construction of meaning when students adopted the role of giving focuses on student addressees of utterances.

**7.1.6 Addressee/s of students who adopted the role of giving**

A final distinction between the two groups was addressees of utterances of students who adopted the role of giving and consequently the roles played by addressees in co-construction. The analysis of addressees of the utterances of the NESB and ESB groups of students are shown in Table 7-2. The addressees of ten percent of utterances were difficult to analyze with certainty. Co-textual features such as the previous speaker and the speaker who followed the utterance were insufficient to resolve the uncertainty. In 90% of instances, the analysis identified the direct addressee and these utterances were used in an analysis comparing the linguistic choices of speakers addressing the teacher and of speakers addressing students to enable an understanding of any influence the addressee had on the ways students constructed meaning when they adopted the role of giving.

Before proceeding to those findings, Table 7-2 reveals a disparity between the two groups of students not only in adoption of the role of giving but also in roles played by students in the two groups as addressees. Individual NESB students were direct addressees of six utterances, all utterances of ESB students; five of these were addressed to NESB Student B. Individual ESB students, on the other hand, were direct addressees of 82% of utterances addressed to students by students who adopted the role of giving, including two utterances directed to individual students by students in the NESB group. Apart from NESB Student B, opportunities for students in the NESB group to participate as direct addressees in discourse that unfolded following adoption of the role of giving by other students were effectively non-existent from the outset. Equally limited was the influence of students in the NESB group, apart from Student B, on the language choices of students who adopted the role of giving. Thus, as a way of being involved in negotiating meaning, any “active influence” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 95) by student direct addressees was largely limited to ESB students and NESB student B.
Diverse ways that students were involved in negotiating interpersonal meanings in utterances in DR4 largely reflected the extent to which the direct addressee was the teacher. In this context, the question of interest regarding the ten percent of utterances that were directly addressed to individual students is whether students make different language selections in these instances, or more specifically, if ESB students do so. There were fewer than twenty instances of use of the various resources of modality and Adjuncts in the utterances addressed to other students, suggesting prevalence of a greater certainty of validity of propositions. For example, the interaction of Students F and J, below, illustrates how students negotiated meaning using polar and conjunctive adjuncts without any uncertainty about the validity of the actual propositions realized through modalization:

F: … but if she changed the group so she’s not stuck with the same person/ she’s not benefiting/ benefiting from that
J: no/ no/ she/ she/ her [problem
F: [oh/ it was just pair/ it didn’t matter who she was with
J: yeah/ yeah/ yeah/ well/ her problem was with the concept of … (1.1:830-837)

Most of the instances of modal operators in student utterances, although they were not commands, primarily expressed obligation rather than probability or usuality. For example,
Student R, below, addressed her suggestion of a classroom activity to Student D, although it was the teacher who responded:

\[
\text{R: next time you could show them cards and see if they recognise/ you know/ see if they [recognise}
\]

\[
\text{T: [yeah/ that’d be good/ mmm}
\]

\[
\text{R: if you showed them meals and see if they could put a name to it ((inaudible))}
\]

There appeared to be a contrast between the uncertainty realized through various grammatical resources in student utterances proposing and negotiating meanings when the propositions centred upon the teacher’s field of expertise, and those they addressed to their student peers. Arguably then, direct addressees influenced ways students negotiated meaning. Addressees were co-authors of utterances addressed to them and were involved in constructing interpersonal meaning in utterances of students who adopted the role of giving. In addition, on some occasions students who were direct addressees of student utterances were also previous speakers, and instrumental in shaping the contexts and referents of utterances. Ways students were involved in negotiation of meanings when students adopted the role of giving were thus complex sets of interactions between speakers, previous student speakers, and addressee/s.

### 7.1.7 Individual students

Clear differences were found in the ways the two groups of students were involved in negotiating meaning in discursive relationships realized when students adopted the role of giving. These differences extended to individual members of the two groups, and many of these have been identified in findings already presented, especially with regard to the students in the NESB group. In this section, participation of individuals within the two groups is the focus. The numbers of utterances of individual students in the role of giving are shown in Table 7-3. As was the case with DR3, some individuals participated much more actively than others. Four students, ESB Students R, J, L, and K, contributed 62.5% of all student utterances in DR4, and each of these four students individually contributed more utterances than the NESB group of students as a whole. All ESB students, with the exception of Student A, contributed a greater number of utterances than any NESB student. In the NESB group, Students H and B contributed 45% of all utterances of NESB students, and Students N and D did not contribute at all in the five classes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESB Students</th>
<th>Number of utterances</th>
<th>NESB Students</th>
<th>Number of utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>387</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-3: Numbers of instances of adoption of the role of giving by individual students

Table 7-4 shows that the number of utterances of students in both groups varied enormously from class to class. Putting absences aside, only Student A in the ESB group did not contribute at least one utterance in every class, while no NESB student contributed in every class.

What neither Table 7-3 nor Table 7-4 does show is the diversity of utterances involved and of language choices made by individual students in those diverse utterances. However, some key points have already been noted. Complexity of utterances of students in the role of giving varied enormously. Utterances of both groups of students included single lexical items and those of two or three words, which often jointly constructed propositions in conjunction with the co-text of the preceding utterance, or explicitly constructed propositions jointly. The more complex and lengthy utterances however were primarily those of students in the ESB group. Students B, H, and O were the only students in the NESB group who contributed utterances, seven in all, of more than three clauses. All ESB students contributed utterances of more than three clauses, over ninety utterances in all, including Student A in one instance.
To conclude, when students are considered as two groups on the basis of language background, some clear variations are identifiable. The two groups were not homogeneous, however. The participation of individuals within the groups varies enormously in some cases. It has been made clear in previous chapters that this is a limitation of findings, and is not restricted to those for DR4. In the NESB group in particular, the limited number of utterances means one or two more active students can obscure just how limited is the participation by other students in the group. Despite these variations between individuals, it remains the case that the character of the discursive contexts realized through the utterances of the individual students who constitute the two groups based on language background differ in some significant respects. These are the matters that will be taken up in Chapter 8.

### 7.2 Students in the role of receiving

NESB and ESB student groups were involved in negotiation of meanings in DR4 as direct and indirect addressees of utterances of students who adopted the role of giving, and this involvement differs in a number of respects. Participation of NESB students at this point was constrained by the limited number of utterances directly addressed or co-addressed to them as individuals, 11 in all, while 56 were addressed to ESB students. In principle, individual students in both groups were presented with opportunities in equal measure to respond to any of
the 22 utterances analyzed as co-addressed to all students and the teacher, or to any utterance
directly addressed to the teacher or another student. In addition, two utterances were directly
addressed by ESB students to the NESB students as a group. While responses of students in the
two groups varied in the circumstances described, findings are based on ten utterances of NESB
students and 128 utterances of the ESB students. This disparity in participation constrains
meaningful comparison of functions of utterances of the two groups and thus of ways they were
involved in negotiation of meanings as respondents to utterances of students who adopted the
role of giving.

Responses were analyzed on the basis of speech roles of respondents and speech functions of
utterances. Responses of students in the role of receiving acknowledged/contradicted utterances
addressed to them but when respondents adopted the role of giving, and occasionally the role of
demanding, the utterance sometimes included an acknowledgement/contradiction as well,
frequently a polar adjunct, for example:

T: … you try a bit of recasting with your/ with your adults on Saturday morning and/
and hear some of the feeble attempts there’ll be
K: yes/ we had an excellent example of that in last Saturday’s lesson/ we’ve got those
Sudanese ladies and we were talking … (4.1:298-303)

In these instances utterances were included in findings as statements or questions; utterances
analyzed as acknowledgements in findings that follow consisted of acknowledgement/
contradiction only. Findings regarding student responses in instances in which they were the
direct or co-addressee and those in which they were the indirect addressee are presented
separately.

7.2.1 Responses of students as direct or co-addressee

The functions of the responses of NESB and ESB students as direct or co-addressees are shown
in Table 7-5. In the case of utterances addressed to the whole class, the 15 utterances in the ‘No
response’ column include those to which the teacher responded; two utterances were addressed
to a Student group, the NESB Student group, and no student in the group responded. In the 27
instances of students’ adoption of the roles of giving or of demanding, utterances functioned as
statements or questions. These utterances have been included in the findings reported earlier in
this Chapter and in Chapter 6, so while some linguistic features that pertain especially to the
unfolding negotiation of meaning are noted in the instances included in this section, these
features have already been considered in more detail earlier in this or the preceding Chapter.
Table 7-5: Functions of responses of NESB and ESB students as direct addressees and co-addressees of students in the role of giving

The limited number of utterances directly addressed or co-addressed to individual NESB students, 11 in all, makes it difficult to generalize about how they were involved in the construction and negotiation of meaning in the roles they were cast in or adopted. Further, the fact that NESB student B was addressee of nine of the utterances and the only NESB respondent makes any conclusions about NESB students as a group at this point questionable. The significance lies more in the absence of engagement of the NESB students in the discourse as addressees in DR4. While the teacher was the direct addressee of the bulk of all initiating utterances for both groups, the apparent reluctance of NESB students to address other students, and of ESB students to address students in the NESB group has already been remarked upon earlier in this chapter. Students in and within the two groups are arguably bringing into being, through discursive practices, distinctive classroom contexts that are, in this aspect at least, partly discrepant.

One similarity between the two groups suggested by the findings presented in Table 7-5 is that addressees did not respond verbally to a number of the utterances addressed or co-addressed to individual students. Four of six utterances directly addressed to an individual NESB student, that is, two thirds of instances, did not elicit verbal responses from the addressee captured in the
recorded data. In all four instances, the teacher and/or another student responded to the
utterance, for example, NESB Student D was denied the opportunity to even acknowledge ESB
Students R’s suggestion addressed to her, you, below, because the teacher’s response, which
overlapped Student R’s, took up the discursive space:

R: next time you could show them cards and see if they recognise/ you know/ see if
    they [recognise
T: [yeah/ that’d be good/ mmm
R: if you showed them meals and see if they could put a name to it [((inaudible))
T: [see/ what you could
do would be to take a … (4.2:107-1105)

In contrast, although ESB students responded to close to two thirds of utterances directly
addressed to them, utterances that didn’t elicit responses from addressees generally went
unacknowledged altogether. A significant proportion were instances of joint-construction of
propositions, essentially interjections that went unacknowledged by the student addressee. For
example, the joint constructions with the teacher of ESB Students R and F, below, elicited no
response from the addressee, ESB student J:

J: … have something that/ that you can really/ you know/ fall back on or have some/
    [have some/ some
T: [yeah/ but what/ normally you could/ couldn’t you/ you could/=  
R: adjust it
T: =your material should be okay/=  
J: [yeah
F: [you could modify it
T: =the way you actually negotiate it might … (3.2:921-935)

In the instances of no response to an utterance when the student was co-addressee with the
teacher, different circumstances prevailed. In many instances the teacher, as co-addressee,
assumed the role of respondent, or adopted the role of giving, while the student addressee did
not respond.

While there was insufficient data to justify any firm conclusion about differing ways the two
groups of students responded to utterances, the discursive practices of the ESB group of
students when they did respond to utterances directly or co-addressed to them were more
visible. Acknowledgements alone were the response in about one third of the instances, and
although they functioned to negotiate meaning in the sense of confirming the validity of a
proposition and of some shared understanding, often served to conclude an interaction rather than contribute to an unfolding sequence. But the most frequent response of ESB student addressees was to adopt the role of giving, continuing interaction between the students involved. For example, in the sequence of utterances between ESB students L and E included earlier, below, both students resume the role of giving to respond to an utterance addressed to them and continue the interaction:

L: you notice that/ that/ that/ that different attitude to what learning is with older students=
T: yeah
L: =and sometimes it’s a bit more of a/ a slower learning curve to get them into/ into/ into something that’s [((inaudible))]
T: [that’s right
E: [the thing is though they’re coming from different cultures where often they have a different approach to learning anyway
L: but older tends to be sometimes a double
E: ((inaudible)) (even more)
L: yeah=
T: [yeah/ a double whammy there/ I think
L: [=it’s sometimes harder/ harder to get them to change/ I think younger people sometimes are … (1.1:487-508)

Student L addressed her utterance to the teacher, realizing uncertainty through the modal adjunct sometimes, but indirect addressee Student E responded, addressing her utterance to Student L, and attempting to negotiate the meaning by expanding it with a conjunctive adjunct of concession, though. Student L signalled her intention to negotiate the validity of the expanded proposition with the adversative conjunctive adjunct, but, in theme position and resumed the role of giving, addressing Student E. Student E resumed the role of giving to respond, although whether she acknowledged Student L’s reply is unknown because of audibility problems. However, Student L acknowledged and confirmed the validity of the proposition in E’s second utterance with the positive polar adjunct, yeah, and resumed the role of giving.

ESB students were more frequently addressed, but then by frequently adopting the role of giving in reply, multiplied the opportunities for ESB students to participate in negotiation of meanings. On the other hand, students in the NESB group, apart from Student B, were effectively excluded from participation as respondents both on the basis of the limited utterances addressed to them and the competition for discursive space. The first constraint, at
least, did not operate when students of both groups were the indirect addressees of utterances, and the responses of students in this discursive context are reported in the next section.

**7.2.2 Responses as the indirect addressee**

In principle, indirect student addressees of students who adopted the role of giving included all students apart from speakers and, in the relevant instances, individual students who were the direct or co-addressees. In these circumstances, students in the NESB group were not restricted in their active participation as indirect addressees by the limited number of utterances addressed to them. However, there was an even greater disparity between the two groups in participation as respondents than that discussed in the preceding section on responses of direct and co-addressees. Four of the 79 instances of indirect student addressees responding to utterances addressed to other participants were utterances of NESB students. The speech functions of utterances of the two groups of students in the speech role of respondent as indirect addressee are shown in Table 7-6, below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addresser</th>
<th>Acknowledgement</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NESB</td>
<td>ESB</td>
<td>NESB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual student/individual student &amp; teacher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-6: Function of responses of NESB and ESB students as indirect addressees of students adopting the role of giving

Several points are clear from the findings presented in Table 7-6. First, the number of responses involved, 75 of students in the ESB and four of students in the NESB group, suggest the latter group played no significant role in this way of construction and negotiation of meanings. Three students in the NESB group were respondents while eight of the nine ESB
students participated in this way. The finding here is thus that this was a way ESB students were involved in the discourse that NESB students were not. Second, students in both groups were more likely to respond as indirect addressees to utterances addressed to the teacher than to those addressed to another student; the proportion of total utterances addressed to the teacher that indirect addressees respond to is twice that of those addressed to students. This suggests interaction between two students in the role of giving was played out dyadically, or possibly in interaction with the teacher, and only rarely with the interaction of any additional active student participants. When utterances were addressed to the teacher, however, students were much more prepared to be involved in negotiation of meanings. Perhaps indirect addressees perceived their role and discursive relationships with interactants in student-student discourse in a different way than when interactants are a student and the teacher, a discourse that perhaps was seen as less personal and more ‘public’ and ‘open’ to contributions.

Finally, utterances of students who responded functioned in equal measure to either acknowledge/validate utterances or as statements that were part of sequences of utterances functioning as statements. As was the case with responses of direct and co-addressees, the instances of students adopting the role of giving or of demanding have been included in the findings reported earlier in this Chapter and in Chapter Six. Rather than the general linguistic features of the utterances already considered in more detail earlier in this or the preceding chapter, the focus here is more on how these linguistic features constructed and negotiated meaning through both acknowledgements and statements at this point in exchanges/sequences.

Acknowledgement of an utterance by indirect addressees arguably provided an insight into the active and responsive making meaning of participants. What is evident from the data is that some of these individuals, through responses acknowledging the utterances of others, were bringing into being a discourse context in which responsive meaning-making was more transparent than in that of other participants. In earlier Chapters the propensity of students in the ESB group to acknowledge the utterances of the teacher when he adopted the role of giving in DR1 and the responses of the teacher and other students to demands in DR2 and DR3 has been noted as a way those students contributed to the interaction. The situation here was similar; ESB students were bringing into being a more interactive classroom in which meanings proposed by other students when they address the teacher or individual students were validated (or contradicted), not only by the teacher, but also by indirect student addressees as they verbalized the meanings they were making as active responsive listeners. In the instance below, ESB students M and F acknowledged the teacher’s utterance, and in so doing validated the proposition. Student F then validated the expanded proposition negotiated as a joint construction by Student M, as did the teacher followed by several unidentifiable students:
T: … and it’s incredible how far from the mark some learners will be
M: mmm/ yeah
F: oh yeah
M: in their attempt at mimicry
F: [yeah
T: [in their attempt at mimicry/ [mmm
SS:                                             [yeah/ mmm
T: yeah/ it really is … (4.1:284-298)

In acknowledging and validating utterances of others, ESB students sometimes explicitly positioned themselves in the discursive relationship as knowers. For example, Student R, below, firstly adopted the role of giving herself, then used polar adjuncts, a little confusingly perhaps, to validate the proposition addressed to the teacher by Student M. Her second acknowledgement positioned her alongside the teacher as a knower responding with evaluative feedback, realized by both R and the teacher as a clause with the explicit objectivity of unmodalized positive polarity, that’s right:

T: … there won’t be too much actual/ actual grammatical teaching about it as an error/ will there
R: no/ it’s just/ it’s just the=
T: mmm yeah
R: = pronunciation/ for understanding/ [for the meaning
M: if it was explicit you’d be putting up the phonetics on the board=
T: exactly
M: = and saying/ do you understand the difference between this and this=
R: [yeah/ yeah/ no/ yeah
M: = and repeat this
T: [yeah
M: = after me=
H: saying don’t do that
M: = whereas that’s more of a recast/ [isn’t it
R: [that’s right/ yeah
T: that’s right/ exactly … (5.2:1369-1398)
Validation of propositions through acknowledgements by indirect ESB student addressees realized a broadened base of shared understanding and implications for the two student groups and the ongoing construction of discursive text are considered in the chapter that follows.

When student indirect addressees adopted the role of giving to respond to utterance of other students in DR4, the discourse entered another dimension of potential for meaning making, but again effectively restricted to students in the ESB group. This is in no way surprising considering the unsolicited adoption of the role of giving is the precondition of DR4. While all utterances involved have already been included in the findings presented in the first section of this chapter, consideration of instances in this context focuses attention on student-student interaction.

The disparity between the two groups that was one of the primary findings of the analysis of initiation of DR4 is even more pronounced in these circumstances. This becomes even more so considering the three responses of NESB students that functioned to give elicited no responses from student addressees. The two students involved, NESB Students W and C proposed meanings but the addressees did not respond so there was no acknowledgement or confirmation of the validity of the propositions. The instance involving NESB Student C, for example, below, was the sole instance of an NESB student responding, as indirect addressee, to an utterance addressed to another student. The utterance of Student C was simultaneous with the teacher’s response and the student who initially adopted the role of giving, ESB Student K, does not acknowledge or respond to student C, and neither does the teacher or the addressee of Student K, NESB Student B:

T: … but one fellow for/ for Arabic/ he’s interested
K: one Bruce
T: oh no/ no/ no/ there’s more/ there’s more than that/ there’s more than that/ a number/= 
C: last semester it was the most popular
T: =a number of people have said that they want to/ they want to get involved in Arabic
K: you should’ve put your picture in the corner
T: yes/ okay/ so/ yes/ so what we’ve got to do is … (1.1:30-43)

While contributions to the discursive text of NESB students adopting the role of giving in this context were limited by the number of instances and the influence on the unfolding discourse, the same cannot be said of utterances of ESB students in this context. There was no response to one third of utterances of indirect addressees, but half the utterances elicited responses from the
student addressees and the remainder from the teacher. When the utterance elicited a response it enabled the proposition of the indirect addressee to be validated, or not, and perhaps negotiated further. The sequence below illustrates both acknowledgement and adoption of the role of giving by indirect student addressees. The respondents, ESB students F and R, respond to ESB student G’s proposition in different ways; Student F acknowledges and validates Student G’s proposition but Student R tries to negotiate the meaning:

G: but I mean/ using repetition/ if you were going to repeat something back that an adult had just said and use this rising tone at the end/ I think you could be seen as/ I don’t know/ like really putting them on the spot and embarrassing them in front of everyone

T: ahm
F: yeah
R: it depends how you do it/ mmm
G: like/ I think you’d have to be careful with [something like that
R: [like/ yeah/ it’s the way you do it
G: yeah/ yeah/ no/ I don’t think I’d ever use/ I don’t think I ever really use repetition with adults (5.2:1537-1552)

Student G, modalized her proposition addressed to the teacher from the outset, and proposed a negotiated meaning following R’s first response. Now the direct addressee, Student R responded to validate G’s negotiated meaning, but continued to seek a shared understanding in the terms of her original response. Although Student G was prepared to acknowledge that Student R’s proposition had some validity, the final understanding that is shared is one of disagreement. The teacher continued the negotiation of the proposition with Student G, but Student R took no further part in the interaction from this point. The dyadic sequence of exchanges between Students G and R demonstrates the negotiation that followed indirect addressees adopting the role of giving. The discourse in this type of exchange was sometimes more intricate in its unfolding, for example, following Student J addressing the teacher to give a recount of a language learner’s aversion to pair-work in the language-learning classroom, negotiation took place in the sequence of interaction between ESB Students J, F, and R, below:

F: also/ if she changed/ sorry/=  
J: no
F: =but if she changed the group so she’s not stuck with the same person/ she’s not benefiting/ benefiting from that
J: no/ no/ she/ she/ her [problem
F: [oh/ was just pair/ it didn’t matter who she was with
Student J was then prompted, by Student F’s response to the proposition he addressed to the teacher, to negotiate the meaning he had attempted to realize. As he did so, Student F engaged in a series of responses that renegotiated J’s meanings, the first of which J validated, and then the students both spoke simultaneously and established a shared understanding of J’s meaning. During this sequence Student F became the direct addressee, but at the same time, indirect addressee ESB student R responded to Student J’s utterance to propose some additional meanings, but which elicited no response from Student J.

The two sequences included, above, demonstrate the significance of ESB students’ adoption of the role of giving to respond as indirect addressees in the construction and negotiation of meaning. These and the instances of acknowledgements and adoptions of the role of giving as direct or co-addressees included earlier in this section exemplify discursive practices in which the NESB group of students play little or no part. Student B was the NESB student most actively involved in DR4, adopting the role of giving on ten of the 51 occasions students in the NESB group did so, being the addressee of nine of the eleven utterances directly addressed or co-addressed to students in the group, and contributing six of the ten utterances of this group of students as direct or indirect addressees. Thus apart from NESB student B, student contribution to the discourse as the direct or indirect addressee of a student who adopted the role of giving was a discursive practice effectively restricted to the ESB group of students. Any negotiation of meaning at this point in interactions was thus also effectively the province of the ESB group of students and the teacher.
7.3 Students’ continuation of interaction following adoption of the role of giving

Students in the two groups, NESB and ESB, differed in some important respects in the ways they continued their participation in the interaction following adoption of the role of giving. Again, a constraint on the involvement of students in the NESB group at this point in sequences, on the evidence already presented, is that students in that group initiated considerably fewer opportunities to conclude or continue an exchange. Even so, findings have shown the discourse that unfolded following instances of DR4 involving NESB and ESB students was identifiably different in some significant ways.

A second constraint on student participation at this point was the function of any reply of direct/indirect addressees, whether teacher and/or students. These functions played a key role in shaping the discourse that followed. To contextualize the findings presented in this section, the functions of all responses from teacher and students to utterances of students who adopted the role of giving are shown in Table 7-7.

The findings presented in Table 7-7 require some elucidation. First, the various co-textual circumstances surrounding the 48 utterances that elicited no response have been touched on in the previous section and these applied equally to those addressed to the teacher; the instances were unacknowledged joint constructions, or among simultaneous or multiples utterances directed to a single addressee, or simply interjections. The relatively larger number of instances of no response to the utterance of a student in the ESB group reflected the propensity of students in that group to contribute utterances in the role of giving in the circumstances described. The absence of a response effectively precluded the student from continuing their participation in the interaction with another utterance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function of responses to utterances of the two groups</th>
<th>Utterance of NESB student</th>
<th>Utterance of ESB student</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total initiations</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of utterances that elicited responses</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-7: Functions of responses to utterances of students who adopted the role of giving by NESB and ESB students and number of utterances that elicited responses

Second, while some utterances elicited no responses, in other instances two or more responses were forthcoming from direct and/or indirect addressees. Hence, as shown in Table 7-7, 391 utterances of students who adopted DR4 elicited a total of 456 utterances from direct and indirect addressees.

Last, the limited number of instances of students in the NESB group adopting the role of giving was a constraint on the number of responses to utterances of students in that group. The resultant disparity makes a meaningful comparison of the responses difficult. However, the analysis of student responses presented in the preceding section included the finding that ten were utterances of NESB students; thus, all but ten of the 456 responses included in Table 7-7 were utterances of ESB students or the teacher.

One finding evident in Table 7-7 is that similar proportions of the responses to utterances of students in the two groups served the three functions of acknowledgment, statement, and question. It is tempting to suggest that the teacher and students in the ESB group responded to NESB and ESB students similarly. What this did mean was that in those instances where a response was elicited, the NESB and ESB students who adopted the role of giving were, as a group, in comparable discursive circumstances following the responses as far as the speech function of the co-text was concerned.

Students who contributed an utterance in the role of giving were most likely addressees of any response and thus positioned to respond in turn, possibly as the next speaker. These students
continued the interaction with another utterance in 196 instances. Functions of the utterances are shown in Table 7-8. The large number of instances of students not continuing/concluding the interaction was one similarity between the two groups, as was acknowledgment or validation of a response. In both these circumstances participation of students in the interaction as speakers concluded. Participation of the two groups was also similar in instances where interaction continued because addressees, generally the teacher in these instances, adopted the role of demanding following some utterances of students in DR4. This invariably elicited a response from the student, but in these instances adoption of the role of giving was not unsolicited, and the utterance functions in this context as an answer, not an instance of a student in DR4, and was included in the analysis of DR2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech function</th>
<th>NESB</th>
<th>ESB</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer/disclaimer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total conclusions/continuations</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No conclusion/continuation</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-8: Functions of NESB and ESB students’ concluding/continuing utterances

The relatively few instances of the adoption of the role of demanding by students at this point in interaction, 11 of ESB students, and one of an NESB student, suggests this was not a significant way the discourse unfolded for students in either group.

What is of greatest interest is the contrast between the two groups evident in the number of instances in which the ESB student involved continued the exchange by resuming the role of giving, and the relatively few instances this was the case for an NESB student. This is sharp contrast with the sequences of demands of NESB Students O and Y in DR3. Utterances of students who resumed the role of giving were in sequences of (largely) dyadic interaction between teacher and student or student and student. To compound the contrast between the two groups, unlike several ESB students, NESB students were not involved in any sequence to which they contributed more than two utterances in the role of giving. In the sequence below, included earlier, NESB student O contributed two utterances in the role of giving, participating
in perhaps the most complex negotiation of meaning involving an NESB student in the role of giving:

T: … now I know/ Olivia/ did a/ you/ you try/ don’t you/ to get them using it outside the
O: yeah/ but it depends on the personality of the learners/ if they are very outgoing they will use the language outside the classroom/= 
T: that’s right
O: =but if they are very/ you know/ not so outgoing or if they are=
T: introverted
O: =an introvert yeah/ they will not do that because [they are not comfortable with that
T: [no no no no no/ I don’t agree
O: yeah
T: =they’re less likely to do it/ but that doesn’t mean to say they won’t do it
O: yeah/ they are afraid of embarrassing themselves if they speak in the wrong [way/
yeah
T: [mmm/
yeah/ that’s right/ yeah/ so … (2.2:1231-1255)

Apart from her resumption of the role of giving, Student O’s use of polar and conjunctive adjuncts and finite modal operators to negotiate first the validity of the teacher’s original proposition and then the teacher’s renegotiation is exceptional in the context of NESB student utterances in DR4. ESB students, on the other hand, participate in sequences of interaction with the teacher and other students, such as the sequence between ESB students J and F included in the previous section. In the example below, ESB student M followed the reply of the teacher with validatory acknowledgements during his utterances and two resumptions of the role of giving:

M: well/ that’s sort of what Lyster says in his error correction/ is that him/ he says that students are sort of /error correction as far as like pronunciation goes=
T: yep
M: =you can say something to the student and they can repeat it back to you and that seems to be the most effective for pronunciation/ but as far as grammar correction and those sort of things go/ it’s either a discussion of the grammar or having students try to recreate the grammar themselves/ so that’s how it works ((inaudible))
T: yeah/ it’s natural/ isn’t it/ for something like pronunciation=
M: yeah
T: =for you to give feedback in the sense of/ you might do a recast
M: yeah/ that’s what it’s called ((inaudible)) [it’s recast
T: [yeah/ a recast/ and then it/ it seems to be
   natural for a learner to try to mimic what the teacher has said in terms of a recast/ but see/ they’re engaging in output in doing that and/= M: yeah
T: =and it’s incredible how far from the mark some learners will [be M: [mmm yeah
F: oh yeah
M: in their attempt at mimicry
F: [yeah
T: [in their attempt at mimicry/ [mmm
SS: [yeah mmm
T: yeah/ it really is (4.1:260-296)

There are numerous instances of sequences of interaction involving both the teacher and individual ESB students in the role of giving, for example, the sequences involving ESB Student L (1.1:401-445), ESB Student J (1.1:1535-1629), ESB Student M (5.2:2397-2488), and ESB Student R (3.1:281-329) are just some of the instances of sequences in which students participate in sustained interaction with the teacher, contributing several utterances in the role of giving. Some instances, for example, that involving ESB Student G (5.2:1470-1529), follow interaction in the role of demanding and the student adopts the role of giving following, in the case of Student G, the teacher’s response.
7.4 Summation

Students adopted the speech role of giving much more readily than the speech role of demanding. Students’ contributions were unsolicited in the sense they were not responding to demands addressed to them by another participant, although in some instances co-text preceding adoption was addressed to them by another participant in the role of giving. In quantitative terms they contributed to the discursive text both more frequently and in longer, more complex utterances. These utterances represented active responses to the unfolding discourse that positioned students as knowers in negotiations. While demands of students in DR3 represented emergent meanings, the discursive relationship deferred to primary knowers, usually the teacher. Although student questions shifted the discourse towards the relations between classroom discourse and students’ inner discourses, the teacher retained the authority of primary knower. In DR4, student’s inner discourses became even more visible and their voices claimed some authority. Addressees responded to these claims of authority very often with their own claims. From this emerged sequences of interaction in which students who adopted the role of giving negotiated or defending the authority of their knowing. This focused attention on selections of language in systems of interpersonal meanings.

Variations in individual participation in negotiation were pronounced. ESB students exercised greater agency in adoption of the role of giving and continued interactions they had initiated much more frequently than NESB students. In this, there was significantly more evidence of active responsive listening on the part of ESB students, and this extended to features such as joint construction of propositions and responding to utterances as indirect addressees. On the other hand, there was explicit evidence ESB students, and the teacher, took up discursive opportunities offered to NESB students. ESB students responded to other students who adopted the role of giving and student-student interactions emerged almost exclusively between ESB students.

Three NESB students were responsible for the bulk of NESB student interaction in DR4, but even these students were overshadowed by all but one of the ESB participants. When compared as groups, the participation of NESB students in the discourse in the unsolicited role of giving was limited, even when the variation in individual contributions is acknowledged. Not only that, the NESB students had minimal involvement in negotiation that followed either their own initial utterances or those of the ESB students. Discursive practices of ESB students such as joint construction and responding as indirect addressees left little discursive space for students.
whose repertoires did not include these practices. With isolated exceptions, instances of student participation in sequences in the role of giving involved ESB students and the teacher.

In DR4, language selections in the systems of interpersonal meanings highlighted variations in how students in the two groups negotiated meanings, and differences between the two groups of students in how they positioned themselves and their addressees in relation to propositions. In realization of propositions ESB students drew frequently and widely on the linguistic resources available, while NESB students drew on a much more restricted range. The result was ESB students positioned themselves in the interaction in ways that reflected a much wider spectrum of commitment to the propositions they contributed and correspondingly moderated the authority they assumed in interactions. This positioned both speakers and addressees for negotiation as knowers. The active NESB students drew most heavily on the modalizing qualities of interpersonal metaphor to moderate the authority of polarity and to realize propositions as expressions of their own knowing. Apart from that, most language choices of NESB students, in the limited number of contributions they made, did not include implicit realizations of their judgement of validity of propositions, and positioned addressees correspondingly.

This was a discursive relationship that generated significant discursive activity and the negotiation of a significant component of the discursive text, yet this text was constructed with very little contribution of students in the NESB group. The implications of these broad conclusions are developed in the chapter that follows.
CHAPTER 8

8 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In this Chapter findings presented in Chapters 4-7 are discussed and interpreted. The strengths and limitations of findings as representative of dialogue in the selected classroom are reviewed to substantiate generalisations on the basis of data generated through recording and transcription of spoken interaction in the selected classes. The interpretation involves theorisation about the nature and implications of spoken interaction in internationalised postgraduate coursework classrooms, and in doing so addresses also the remaining element that emerged from the research question:

- What did the findings mean for opportunities for learning in and through negotiation of authoritative dialogical discourse? Who participated in these opportunities, and how?

The discussion includes implications for teaching and learning in internationalised classrooms of inferential generalisations or extrapolations on the basis of the findings, and considerations for institutional policies and programmes. The methodological approach is appraised, and finally, it is argued that questions raised by the study’s findings direct attention to the need for continued investigation of dialogue in internationalised classrooms.

8.1 Representativeness

Before proceeding to discuss and interpret the findings presented in Chapters 4-7 the status of findings as representative of the spoken interaction in the selected classroom needs to be clarified.

8.1.1 Limitations of findings

The status of the data as second-order constructs of the meanings negotiated in the selected classroom was acknowledged from the outset. In Chapter 3, limitations of data recording procedures were outlined in detail, and the exclusion from the transcribed data of group work, self talk and peripheral dialogues was noted and justified. The identities of speakers when utterances were simultaneous or overlapping were sometimes not determinable, and in these and other circumstances, utterances or parts of utterances were indecipherable or uncertain. It was
acknowledged that it was possible some utterances addressed to the class were not captured in
the recorded data. In the transcription process, the researcher made judgements, confirmed by
judgements of two independent ‘coders’, about the intentions of speakers, and about what to
include and exclude to achieve the purpose of the study. These constraints make it clear that the
transcribed data was a representation of spoken interaction that did not include all the utterances
of participants.

In relying on verbal data this investigation worked with only a partial picture of the
communicative practices of students. In this sense the research design was limited by its
dependence on verbal interaction as the cultural tool mediating negotiation of meaning. At the
explicitly observable level the data excluded non-verbal elements of interaction, for example,
nods of the head to acknowledge utterances. More broadly, assumptions about the universal
primacy of verbal language in mediation of human interactions ignore the practices of groups
who are less focussed on practices of speaking (Kim, 2002; Kim & Markus, 2002; J V Wertsch,
1991) as contextual resources deployed by individual students in their work to constitute the
discursive space of the classroom.

Five of the 13 classes conducted during the semester were selected for data collection. There
were student absences from the selected classes. It is under these additional constraints that the
data is a representation of spoken interaction in the selected classroom.

8.1.2 Strengths of findings

Findings presented in Chapters 4-7 were based on exhaustive analysis of all data as represented
in the completed transcripts of the selected classes. No data was excluded from any aspect of
analysis, and the findings present as complete a picture as the analysis would allow of the ways
students negotiated meanings in the selected classes.

The completed transcripts represented, within the constraints identified in the preceding section,
the discursive text negotiated in and through spoken utterances addressed, directly or indirectly,
to all participants in the class. Although they do not represent all the meanings exchanged in
the classroom, the transcripts do represent the discourse negotiated by the discursive community
as a whole, and thus the authoritative dialogical discourse that emerged in and through that
community.

The transcripts provided access to the discursive roles and practices through which participants
negotiated meanings and constituted the discursive contexts of their interactions. The five
selected lessons were located in time over the duration of the semester and the discursive history of the class. As the findings show, this provided adequate opportunities to collect data that reflected the ways individual students participated, and that showed variations in student participation from class to class. At the same time, it provided data that was able to reveal some consistencies in the ways students participated, and when participants were conflated into two groups on the basis of language backgrounds, regularities in practices that permit interpretation and theorisation about spoken interaction in internationalised classrooms.

Discussion of findings in the sections that follow is situated in the tension between these strengths and limitations. Interpretations and theorisations are made on the understanding that the findings can be generalised as representing the spoken interaction that unfolded in the selected class over the period of one semester.

### 8.2 The nature and implications of spoken interaction in an internationalised classroom

Chapters 4-7 presented findings of analysis of participation and language choices of 18 students as they negotiated meaning in four discursive roles in concert with the teacher and each other. Findings were presented for individuals, and also organised on the basis of English-speaking background to allow comparison between two groups of students.

While clear differences were evident in the ways individuals were involved, when conflated into two groups on the basis of English-speaking background identifiably distinct participation in interpersonal roles and interpersonal language selections by the two groups of students emerged. This was the case irrespective of variations in rate of participation. It was found that the ways the two groups of students were involved differed in two key respects:

- the extent of participation in the co-constitution of the discursive context(s) and the discursive text; and
- the types of negotiation and language selected in realization of this co-constitution

These frame discussion of implications of findings and of opportunities for student learning in the context of whole class spoken interaction.
8.2.1 Participation in co-constitution of discursive context(s) and discursive texts

In conceptions of learning as “the process of becoming an active participant in various communities of practice” (Kaartinen & Kumpulainen, 2004, p. 172), opportunities for classroom learning are situated in the dialogic relations of responsive individuals and the discourses of particular classroom communities. Thus, in the classroom studied in this investigation, successful learning at one level involved students in the process of becoming active participants in the language teaching community of practice. However, at another, more immediate level, learning was situated in the relation of students and the practices of participants in the classroom academic community of practice, Language Teaching in Practice. It is the practices of participation in a classroom community that are the focus of interest in this discussion. The academic community of practice of the classroom was realized in the mutual co-constitution of a discursive text and a context. The identities of participants as student members of the community were embedded in this discursive construct in and through the ways they practiced membership. Essentially, the practices of students mediated the constitution of their own discursive identities, identities of other participants, and the discursive context or community in which these identities interacted.

On the basis of findings reported in earlier Chapters, it is argued variations in practices of individual students, in conjunction with those of other participants, constituted what emerged as diverse or discrepant discourses of the postgraduate classroom as a learning community, and of the identities of participants as learners and knowers in it. The internationalised nature of the classroom meant constitution of discursive context(s) was an inter-discursive phenomenon (Linell, 1998) of the simultaneous enactment by participants of diverse cultural-historical repertoires of social practices (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003). These practices had value and meaning in cultural communities, including classroom communities, in which participants had observed and practised them. Disparities between the practices of individuals confirmed that, even for interactants with similar backgrounds, abstract contextual resources were unlikely to be identical (Linell, 1998). Variations, for instance, in participation of individuals in the ostensibly culturally concordant ESB group realized the distinctive contextual resources of each ESB student. In this internationalised classroom, contextual resources of students, realized in their ways of responding to the discourse as learners and knowers, arguably encompassed discrepant values and meanings surrounding talk and silence (Feghali, 1997; Gao, 1998a; Kim & Markus, 2002; Smith & Bond, 1999) that were, at least in some respects, also at odds. The end result, as evident in the findings, was a diverse group of students acting in diverse ways in re-constitution of diverse classroom discursive contexts. There were fundamental differences in the natures of
these contexts that meant as semiotic spaces they were, in effect, in competition. The outcome was not so much discourses in conflict, but, due to the nature of the differences, discursive spaces that were occupied by the practices of others.

An important determinant in the shaping of the discursive contexts that emerged from the discursive resources of the student participants was the agency of the teacher as the key interactant in the discourse. Arguably, the more abstract discursive resources of the teacher were more closely aligned with those of the ESB students than with those of the NESB students. The discursive practices of the teacher conceivably played a part in re-constituting a classroom context that was at variance or incongruent with the practices of some or all of the NESB students and thus made it difficult for these students to establish their identities as learners and/or knowers. The teacher played a pivotal role in the unfolding of the discourse in two key ways. First, as a speaker in the roles of giving and demanding, he addressed the bulk of his utterances to the class as a whole, placing the onus on students to accept the roles of receiving and giving on demand. Second, he was the addressee of the bulk of utterances of students who adopted the roles of demanding and giving, a practice of students that limited student-student interaction in these discursive relationships. The relatively few utterances directly addressed to individual students by both the teacher and/or other students was arguably a key determinant of the participation of individuals and of the discursive context constituted by the interaction, not to mention the emerging discursive identities of students as participants in the ensuing classroom discourse community.

From another perspective, verbal participation in constitution of the classroom as a discursive context was potentially constrained by the English-language background of students. The participation and relative silence of NESB students in higher education classrooms has been attributed to a variety of factors (Hellstén & Prescott, 2004; Jones, 1999; Nakane, 2002; Novera, 2004) such as success in following the English language interaction, nervousness, the “fear of face-threatening linguistic error, … cultural and educational background, … (or) competence in the rules and norms of English conversation” (Jones, 1999, p. 244). Such constraints may have distorted, restricted, or amplified the practices involved in reconstitution by NESB students of classrooms and their identities/roles in it. The outcome was a situational context framed, in terms of student contributions, largely by sociocultural resources of ESB students that extended from organisational aspects of relations between participants through to language and routines of the communicative genres (Linell, 1998) of the classroom. In these circumstances, arguably, it was difficult for NESB students to reconstitute discursive contexts and hence discursive identities that reflected accurately, in their view at least, their historical identities and their discursive (in)visibility constrained opportunities for learning.
Ways students participated in the discursive community of the postgraduate classroom in all four discursive roles were ways of responding to, and in some instances of co-authoring, the “continuous chain of speech performances” (Vološinov, 1973, p. 72) that constituted the unfolding discourse. Apart from those instances when students were the direct addressees of utterances, the institutional mediation of the semiotic space (Martin, 1992) dictated that active responses of all student participants were, for the most part, delayed (Bakhtin, 1986). Student responses to utterances as direct/indirect addressees and listeners fall into two classes; delayed “silent responsive understanding” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 69) and active responsive listening realized in an utterance. These responses represented different opportunities for learning. In turn, the types of responses co-constituted the discursive text and the discursive contexts, shaping the ongoing relations, and learning opportunities, of all participants.

8.2.2 Silent responsive understanding

The findings presented in preceding chapters have concentrated on spoken interaction and contributions of students to the interaction. At this point the focus shifts from the spoken to the unspoken, to student responses that were delayed and not realized as utterances that contributed to the discourse. One finding concerned a non-linguistic element of the discourse – the silence of students. In this, it aligns with some other studies of higher education classrooms, not only of internationalised classrooms (e.g., Ellwood & Nakane, 2009; Jones, 1999; Nakane, 2002) but of classrooms in general (e.g., Fassinger, 1995; Remedios, et al., 2008).

Another way of interpreting the findings is that the utterances of each student represented occasions on which they were not silent. Silence as a discursive practice in the classroom had a number of dimensions. First, it was not restricted to one of the two groups or to particular individuals within the groups. It was partly in and through the tacitly agreed practice of silence that the diverse contexts that participants each understood as a classroom emerged (Tsui, 2008). This was to some degree an observable convergence of the discursive resources of student participants. Taking a dialogic perspective, silence of participants, whether in the role of direct or indirect addressees, was not equated in the first instance with passivity but with active responsive listening (Bakhtin, 1986). The emergence of the polyadic discursive context of the classroom rested partly on contribution of very few of the responses of students to the contemporaneous discursive text of the classroom, and the delay (Bakhtin, 1986) of the great majority of responsive understandings of participants. Opportunities for learning here for students in both groups were situated in the practice of active listening, of interacting with or appropriating the meanings being constructed in the discursive text through “silent responsive
understanding” (Bakhtin, 1986). In this perspective on the findings, participants responded to the discourse predominantly in this realm of responsive dialogue - thinking - situated in the dialogic relation between each individual and the discourse.

The understandings of silent listeners were not realized in utterances that contributed to the discursive text and the attendant ongoing constitution of the discursive context, at least not as part of the immediate co-text. Rather, participation was a potential; “sooner or later what is heard and actively understood will find its response in the subsequent speech or behaviour of the listener” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 69). For these students, this means participation in the discourse community of language teaching, or the discourse community of the postgraduate classroom, or in some other discursive context. There were explicit and observable instances of this. It was evident in ESB Student L’s comment below, in which she referred to an utterance of the teacher in a previous class which she reconstituted here as part of the meaning she was negotiating:

T: … what we’re seeing here is one particular lesson too/ it may be that/ that the/ that the teacher adopts some other approach in other lessons
L: last week you said they might not be students that she’s familiar with and= 
T: I’m pretty sure she’s not/ yeah 
L: =if you’re with your own class they might get familiar with your/ when you ask that kind of question in the middle/ they may get used to then focussing on/ perhaps on/ (I don’t know/ some error on) … (5.2:1932-1942)

This is an excellent and explicit instance not only of delayed response, but also of active responsive listening and the dialogue that was unfolding for Student L in relations between the co-textual discourse and her own contextual resources. Her adoption of the role of giving to respond to the teacher ventriloquates an earlier utterance of the teacher from a prior class, and in this her proposition carries the teacher’s voice as well as her own. Her contribution demonstrates first her appropriation of the teacher’s voice in an evolving internally persuasive discourse of language teaching. Second, it illustrates the agency she exercised in going on to negotiate an emergent meaning, an instance of potential for individual learning. Just as significant are the implications for other student participants. Student L’s voice enters into potential negotiation of authoritative dialogical classroom discourse and thus potentially into relation with evolving internally persuasive discourses of other classroom participants

The demand made by NESB Student I, below, was delayed until the teacher offered the opportunity for students to adopt the role of giving or demanding. She was responding to the
statement, you can get down very quickly to the business of actually teaching, which the teacher uttered approximately one minute earlier:

T: … those of you who/ who are going to be teaching Chinese or Japanese or Arabic/ you’re not going to need to do the same type/ well/ you’ll be doing the same sort of interview but you can get down very/ very quickly to the business of actually teaching/ those of you teaching English/ you won’t be doing any teaching … (lines 81-89) … you’ll know what it is/ the you/ you should actually be interviewing them about and how you’re going to extract the information from them/ alright (2)

I: and so if you’re teaching Chinese or Japanese you should prepare for a teaching plan
T: yeah/ you should … (1.1:78-96)

From another perspective, NESB Student I’s utterance contrasts with the active responsiveness of ESB Student L’s utterance. Although Student I exercised some agency in making the demand, the instance prompts consideration of how she would have resolved the question of the validity of the meaning she had made in responding silently to the teacher’s earlier utterance if the teacher had not offered a discursive opportunity.

Instances of delayed responsive understandings were found in the utterances of students in both groups, but more so in the ESB group, arguably because they contributed more frequently than students in the NESB group. To return the focus to findings of the ways students were involved verbally in the interaction, while the practice of silence and silent responsive understanding by students in both groups was essential for the orderly unfolding of the discourse, there were important differences in the place of the practice in the overall discursive activities of individuals and the two groups. Some students did voice responses and this is where the ways of participation of the two groups of students diverge; some students were more silent than others.

The constraints of interacting in English arguably exerted some influence on participation of NESB students and their capacity to engage in familiar social practices reconstituting classrooms and discursive identities. However, the findings offer evidence of practices that suggests incongruence between the value and meanings of silence and talk (Kim & Markus, 2002). These values and meaning are embedded in participants’ discursive resources that reflect their experiences of broader cultural environments (Linell, 1998). For example, the almost complete silences, throughout the five classes, of NESB Students Y, D, and N were arguably practices in and through which they realized discursive contexts in which status and role relationships are characterized by students listening to the teacher as a recognition of
authority and expertise, and by students speaking only when directly recognised (Gao, 1998a; Nakane, 2002).

Findings identified the predominance of ESB students as respondents when the teacher addressed statements and questions to the whole class in DR1 and DR2. But what was also identified was the capacity of the NESB students to participate when addressed directly by the teacher. For instance, NESB Students D and N reported at length on their practicum experiences; as direct addressee NESB Students B, O, W, and C were involved in sequences of utterances; and as direct addressees NESB students fulfilled their roles as interlocutors with acknowledgements of the teacher’s utterances while he was speaking. Clearly, the immediate contexts of participation by NESB students are significant. There is more to the silence of these students than their status as NESB speakers of English. One interpretation of the findings is that limited discursive activity of NESB students is partly a case of differences in practices. In this interpretation, the practices of ESB students are equally significant. This point is developed more fully in what follows. However, in light of the capacities of NESB students to speak when directly addressed, silence at other times can be explained as attempts to reconstitute classroom contexts in which the values and meanings of silence and talk differ from those evident in the practices of ESB students who were educated in Australian classrooms.

It is pertinent to note again that the findings reported ‘whole-of-class’ verbal interaction. Limitations of the data collection methods entailed the exclusion of the 33 minutes of small-group work that took place over the five classes and of what was identified as peripheral dialogues and self talk simultaneous with the whole-of-class discourse. The focus in this investigation has been whole class interaction, and within that parameter, the absence of contributions to the text has been equated with silence and, arguably, active listening. Extant studies of small-group work in university classrooms have identified silence as a practice of both overseas- and Australian- educated students (e.g., Nakane, 2006; Remedios, et al., 2008). Had it been possible to include data from the small-group work, limited as it was, the additional perspective on the discursive activity of students in both groups would have provided a valuable element of a more complete picture of classroom interaction and the role of the practice of silence.

Limitations aside, the conclusion of Remedios, Clarke and Hawthorne (2008) that “in some cases the demand that students demonstrate their learning verbally may in fact interfere with learning itself” (p. 214) cautions against the application of Australian classroom norms and expectations of verbal interaction to findings of this study. Spoken interaction was the focus of attention at the proposal stage of this investigation, but as the research progressed it became
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clear that this privileged classroom talk as the expected and valued mode of participation. Rather, “‘activeness’ in listening” (Gao, 1998a, p. 174) is argued to be an important practice and learning opportunity not only for the silent NESB students, but as part of the repertoire of practices of all the classroom participants. In this perspective, practice of silent responsive understanding opened up learning opportunities for individual students. These opportunities reflected in turn the various discursive roles they may have adopted or been cast in, responding to the co-text as it unfolded. For instance, an utterance of the teacher addressed to the whole class and demanding missing information or confirmation of validity would have provoked silent responses that then in turn shaped a response to the answer/s elicited. Silent responsive understanding may have been punctuated by active responses in the form of utterances, but these were elements of an ongoing dialogic relation with the unfolding discourse in which each student participated.

Careful consideration of the findings supports suggestions in the literature (Ellwood & Nakane, 2009; Matusov, 2007) that “further research on the positive function of silence in educational discourses is definitely needed” (Matusov, 2007, p. 225). That said, the findings point to significant differences between individuals and the two groups of students of the place of the practice of silence in the repertoires of students. In the next section, the focus moves from the practice of silent responsive understanding to practices of actively responding to contribute the responses, and the implications of the practices of students in the two groups for opportunities for learning.

8.2.3 Active responsive listening and participation

Findings reported in Chapters 4-7 pointed to differences in the active responses of students in the two groups to the unfolding classroom discourse. These differences had implications for the types of opportunities for learning open to individuals and to the classroom learning community.

The predominance of ESB students as active respondents ensured that it was largely in and through their utterances, and those of the teacher, that the discursive context(s) of the classroom emerged. Likewise, negotiation of the discursive text was equally the work of the teacher and these same students. For the actively responsive ESB students, those practices were the resources of a discourse that privileges talking over silence. In re-constitution of this discursive context, the students involved constituted for themselves discursive identities of the type esteemed in classroom communities of their experience. In that sense, this emerged as more of an Australian classroom than an internationalised classroom. The discursive practices
of ESB students occupied the discursive space. They obscured the practices of students who perhaps were “generally quiet in class and taught not to question or challenge their teachers” (Wong, 2004, p. 155) and so not prepared or unwilling to ask or answer questions or contribute to the discourse unless directly addressed (Ellwood & Nakane, 2009; Prescott & Hellstén, 2005).

In comparison to utterances addressed to the class as a whole by the teacher, or addressed by students to the teacher, both the teacher and students themselves addressed a limited number of utterances directly to individual students. Under these circumstances, in terms of student participation, the continued unfolding of the discourse relied mainly on ESB students who adopted the roles of giving and demanding, or self-selected to give on demand. Students who did this were often the direct addressees of the co-text that followed. Electing to participate in the discourse produced a sort of multiplier effect; the more a student talked, the more likely it was that he/she was talked to, and vice versa. Thus, students who were not prepared to be actively responsive and to self-select or adopt roles without direct address were afforded little discursive space. Many of them were effectively restricted to contexts, such as the practicum reporting, where their participation was directly demanded by the teacher. As members of the classroom discursive community they were relatively ‘invisible’, with little opportunity to establish an identity as learners/knowers and limited opportunities to participate in negotiation of the discursive text or to actively participate in the academic community of practice.

8.2.3.1 Student identities as learners/knowers and learning opportunities

The outcome of their seizure of the discursive space by ESB students is perhaps most generously described as multiple and overlapping communities of practice. For participants, opportunities for “speaking and acting in the present” (Renshaw, 2004, p. 6) fluctuated within a matrix of sociocultural histories and circumstances, and the contexts that emerged in the collectively constituted discourse. The identities of students who became highly ‘visible’ in the classroom through their participation and contributions were embedded in the discursive text. Discursively ‘visible’ students’ voices constituted, in conjunction with the teacher’s, the text that emerged in the classroom. The degree to which students were ‘visible’ discursively, and correspondingly constructed as identities in the classroom, was critical not only in how they contributed to the text as speakers, but also as addressees. Even the most actively responsive students practised silent responsive understanding for much of the interaction. But when students did respond actively the learning opportunities situated in active participation in the
negotiation of meanings then constituted significant elements of the text which other students in turn engaged with through either active or delayed responses.

There were highly visible student participants such as ESB Students K, J, E, R, L, and M who were heavily involved in the shaping of the dialogic, mutual co-constitution of the discursive context and text. These students responded to and addressed the teacher and each other freely. The NESB students with the highest discursive ‘visibility’, Students B, O, H, W, and I all precipitated the constitution of their identities by self-selecting to give on demand or adopting the roles of giving and/or demanding. In turn, the teacher, in particular, then addressed these students, opening discursive spaces for their voices to be heard in the text and their identities to continue to emerge. NESB Student B was especially visible in the class because he was the addressee of the utterances of other students; his voice identifiably shaped meanings both as speaker and addressee at some points of the interaction.

In general, however, with the exception of ESB Student A, ESB students were more discursively active and constructed stronger identities than the most active in the NESB group. Apart from that involving NESB Student B, there was almost complete absence of direct interaction between the two groups of students. However, there was interaction within the ESB group, and this contrasted with the absence of interaction within the NESB group. It is difficult to see any other discursive manifestations of cultural “compromise and hybridity” (Lo Bianco, 2009) in the discursive relations of the domestic ESB students and the international NESB students. While the interactivity within the ESB group can be interpreted on one level as the construction of third cultures (Casmir, 1992, 1999) between individuals who might not share common meanings about people, their actions and objects (Rohner, 1984), the limited active interaction between the Australian-educated and overseas-educated students offered few opportunities for “the construction of a mutually beneficial interactive environment in which individuals can function in a way beneficial to all involved” (Casmir, 1999). Third cultures that emerged at this level over the period of data collection were, at best, nascent. The teacher may have addressed utterances to the whole class, but the active discursive community was composed primarily of ESB students and the teacher.

The reporting context opened discursive spaces for some otherwise marginalised students, and offered opportunities identity-building. However, among the NESB students only Student B shaped and participated in the ensuant discourse. While the extent varied across both groups, some participants, specifically NESB Students D, N, and Y, and ESB Student A, had so little involvement as to remain virtually ‘invisible’ in the discursive sense and in terms of identity within the classroom discourse community. Apart from NESB Student B, what set the NESB
participants apart from the ESB students was that all interactions were essentially dyadic interactions with the teacher. Instances of NESB students addressing ESB students, for example, NESB students C and I, went unanswered and unacknowledged. The students in the ESB group, in contrast, interacted with each other as well as the teacher. The only ESB-NESB student interactions of any significance were those involving NESB Student B. Responsive activity facilitated emergence of discursive identities and the attendant membership of the discourse community. This opened an additional dimension of negotiation between and among the student participants themselves, but one that was restricted almost exclusively to ESB students.

Thus, while all students, in principle, practised silent responsive understanding in relations with the discursive text, for some this defined their discursive identities and their opportunities for learning. For others, their identities entailed an extension of the opportunities into a relation with the text as active negotiators, with the teacher and other students, of its unfolding. For learning, the distinction between the opportunity of a delayed response and one involving active negotiation had significant implications for both the active participant and the silent listeners in an unfolding discourse.

8.2.3.2 Actively responsive negotiation of the discursive text

The distinction between the two groups was more complex than one of either active responsive listening or silent responsive understanding. The ways the two groups of students were involved in the two broad practices across the four discursive relationships differed.

Although an essential element of the discursive context of the classroom was collectively constituted in and through the practice of silence by all students, it was evident across the four discursive relationships that differences in the ways silence was practised contributed to the discursive student identities that emerged. For ESB students, ‘listening’ was actually often more active, more verbalised than truly silent, and an opportunity to participate in negotiation of the text. This was evident in practices such as frequent acknowledgement and back-channelling during utterances of the teacher and other students, support of student questions and answers, and joint construction. Although these practices did not always involve substantive contributions to the discursive text, they served to make listening actively visible or transparent, to establish students’ identities as both learners and knowers, and to position them as co-authors of the discursive text.
The practice of ESB students of frequent affirmation of utterances of the teacher in the role of giving is an illustrative example. This practice positioned students in one perspective as co-knowers. They became validators of the teacher’s propositions and co-negotiators of an authoritative dialogical discourse, although admittedly from the position of learners in relation to the expertise of the teacher. Affirmative back-channelling and acknowledgements allowed the teacher to continue in dialogue with the vocally active listeners in negotiation of a mutually agreed text without verbal validation from the silent (predominantly NESB) students. Silence as a response to utterances of the teacher in the role of giving, on the other hand, arguably positioned listeners as expressing “unconditional allegiance” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 342) to the discursive text. In this classroom, silent participants were privy to the text negotiated by the teacher and active listeners, and this is an important distinction, revisited in what follows. The evidence that NESB students acknowledged and back-channelled when directly addressed by the teacher magnified the differences in practices. The readiness of students in the ESB group to speak during teacher utterances when not directly addressed to acknowledge, to interrupt, or jointly construct, set them apart. It was the germination of their identities as knowers, ready to contest or contribute to the discourse, and, in an institutional context that associates talk with learning, of their identities as learners. This way of involvement in negotiation of the discursive text foreshadowed the dominance of ESB students’ contributions to the text throughout the four discursive relationships. The concomitant shifting between discursive roles, and between the roles of learner and knower, pointed to the constitution by actively responsive students of particular learning opportunities through modes of participation in the classroom and academic discursive communities. As a mode of participation, silent responsive understanding arguably constituted qualitatively different opportunities.

The practices of the actively responsive students, predominantly from the ESB group, contextualized the participation of less active students mostly from the NESB group, in the broader classroom interactive environment (Zhou, et al., 2005). Rather than ascribing the disparity in the participation of the two groups entirely to attributes of the NESB students (e.g., the language proficiency to enable following the English language interaction in the first place, issues of face, issues of anxiety to do with English-language performance, or historical sociocultural practices), the interplay of these attributes with the practices of the other participants offers a more insightful perspective. In this classroom the positioning of the NESB students on the periphery of the interaction can be at least partly attributed to the actively responsive participation of the ESB students. ESB students seized most of the discursive opportunities offered by the teacher to the whole class in the form of offers through comprehension/satisfaction checks and through demands for missing information or for confirmation of validity. In addition, ESB students adopted the roles of giving and demanding
far more frequently. Erikson (1996, p. 37) uses the term “turn sharks” to characterize students in school classrooms who attempt to answer when another student is nominated by the teacher. Although there were instances of this, in this postgraduate classroom where few teacher questions were directly addressed to individuals, it offers an apt image of the prompt, often simultaneous, responses of students in the ESB group to discursive opportunities offered by the teacher. This finding is evidence of a practice reported in interview by participants in Nakane’s (2002) study of silence in Japanese university students.

Seizure of opportunities offered by the teacher, in conjunction with their frequent adoption of the roles of giving and demanding, meant ESB students dominated interaction with the teacher and other students, or more accurately, with each other. In addition, students in the ESB group were actively responsive as indirect addressees of the questions and statements addressed to the teacher and, in far fewer instances, to other students. This type of active response to the unfolding discourse was in strong contrast to responses of students in the NESB group. The less active students experienced fewer opportunities to “expose and test their understandings” (Linell, 1998, p. 80) through negotiation in the immediate context of their dialogic relations with the co-text. All students were discursively positioned for much of the time by the teacher’s utterances in the roles of giving and demanding. He directed the unfolding of the discourse even when he asked questions, because the questions functioned primarily to negotiate giving information. Students who were actively responsive outside these constraints, and adopted the roles of giving and demanding, created their own opportunities to participate in negotiation of an authoritative dialogical discursive text. In doing so, they can be seen as making visible their evolving internally persuasive discourses, to generate “tentative meaning-exploring dialogue wherein the positioning of interlocutors is flattened, and speakers and listeners are co-producers” (Toohey & Waterstone, 2004, p. 294) of meanings that constitute the discursive text.

The dominance of students in the ESB group was mitigated in some ways by the teacher. While there was no evidence that the teacher in this classroom problematised the silence of students with attempts to elicit contributions from less active students in either group, there was some evidence of direct address or nomination to generate contributions from NESB international students, but the students were those most active across all discursive relationships. The practicum report, although this may not have been the primary intention, provided students who perhaps require a little more time to be ready to contribute responses (e.g., Ellwood & Nakane, 2009; Hellstén & Prescott, 2004) opportunities to respond to the teacher and, in some instances, other students. The numbers of demands the teacher did address directly to individual students in the two groups were very similar. However, he directly addressed more demands to NESB students during their reports of the practicum experience than in whole-of-class interaction.
This perhaps elicited more talk than might otherwise have been the case, but was in response to the immediate co-text of utterances students had contributed as previous speakers. These circumstances were in marked contrast to the address of demands, for example, to selected individuals who were not the previous speaker in the context of whole-of-class interaction.

The willingness of students in the ESB group to take up discursive opportunities and in other ways occupy the discursive space of the classroom does not necessarily of itself confirm that this prevented or frustrated other students’ intentions to participate. It is accepted that the willingness and readiness of less active NESB students to participate was influenced by the variables listed earlier. The argument proposed is that findings of the study suggest these factors influence participation in the discursive context of the practices of actively responsive students and the teacher. Ultimately, what is of interest here is not who wanted to participate, but who did and the implications of that.

The talk of ESB students constituted a discursive context in which student contributions were dominated by these same students, but this was not to the complete exclusion of utterances from NESB students. Across Discursive Relationships 2, 3, and 4, in which students self-selected or adopted the roles of giving and demanding, NESB students such as Students O, B, W, I, C, and H, contributed to the interaction on more occasions than ESB Student A, for example. In DR3, several ESB students made fewer demands than NESB Student O, although, as noted, the two sequences of demands made by Student O meant that in most instances, as direct addressee, she was sustaining, rather than initiating, the discursive relationship. In one respect, the participation of individual students in this class reinforces the need (Ellwood & Nakane, 2009; Renshaw & Volet, 1995) to look beyond reductive essentializations of cultural groups, including Australian students, or international NESB students in general.

The ESB group included the most actively responsive students but also one of the least active students, Student A. As in Renshaw and Volet’s (1995) study of tutorial participation, individuals in both NESB and ESB groups differed in the extent of their participation. Broad cultural background was but one element of the unique circumstances of individual students (Renshaw & Volet, 1995). This was exemplified not only by differences within the ESB group, but also by NESB Student I who shared Chinese nationality with Students Y and D, but who was much more actively responsive across the discursive relationships. Within the NESB group, Students O and B, in particular, and Student C, had all experienced a semester of Australian study prior to the investigation. Their participation, of Students B and C in particular, was perhaps some evidence of what is often seen as a necessary adjustment (Prescott & Hellstén, 2005; Renshaw & Volet, 1995) to the discursive practices of the Australian
In summary, students in this classroom experienced opportunities for learning in relations with the discursive text in and through the practices of silent responsive understanding and of active response. Collectively, the ESB group of students were much more actively responsive than the NESB group of students. In and through mutually co-constituted discursive contexts and identities, they contributed more substantially to the negotiation of the discursive text. Although participation of individual students in negotiation was necessarily constrained by the classroom context, students in the ESB group were more involved in negotiation of the meanings that constituted the text. Hence, they shaped and directed the text towards meanings that voiced their personal histories and sociocultural resources. Thus, some students actively participated in negotiating authoritative dialogical discourses (Morson, 2004) and voiced internally persuasive discourses that emerged in some of the dialogue between students and the teacher or each other. Others, the silent students, to take the extreme instances, participated at best vicariously through silent responsive understanding in the learning opportunities that other students actively sought. The social world of the classroom influenced individual participants in diverse ways. In turn, those diverse ways meant that some participants influenced the social world more than others.

8.2.4 Negotiation and language choices in realization of co-constitution of the discursive text

Participation of students in the two groups differed not only in quanta but in types of negotiation that were involved. On a more delicate level, language selected by participants realized differing types of discourses for learning. As noted more than once in Chapters 4-7, the disparity in quanta sometimes constrained meaningful and/or conclusive comparison of ways students in the two groups participated. Within these constraints, language choices in systems of interpersonal meanings offer an understanding of the participation of students as learners and knowers. This adds a crucial dimension to differences between the two groups already identified in quanta of utterances or frequency of participation. Differences in ways students in the two groups participated in negotiating meanings were evident in all four discursive relationships.
8.2.4.1 Discursive relationship 1

When the teacher addressed the whole class in the role of giving, responses of individual students positioned them as learners and knowers in relation to the text and the teacher. Students in the ESB group responded frequently to the teacher’s statements addressed to the whole class. They acknowledged and validated meanings he proposed, establishing their mutual acceptance of the discourse as authoritative, but dialogic (Morson, 2004), on the basis of shared understandings. The addition of students’ voices to that of the teacher’s points to the discursive generation of meaning and thinking mediated by the utterances of the teacher. To acknowledge affirmatively as these students did made visible relations between internal discourses and the co-textual discourse that is critical to learning. The responsive students positioned themselves in discourse in relation to the teacher, the expert and primary knower, confirming his authority as sharers of his knowing, positions arguably underpinned by extant or emerging conceptions of themselves as knowers as well as learners.

Affirmation was not the only outcome of dialogic ‘struggle’ with the authoritative voice of the teacher. Responses in DR1 foreshadowed the adoption by ESB students of the roles of giving and demanding to shift to DR3 and DR4, and of self-selection to give on demand in DR2. In these roles students negotiated meanings more explicitly in role relationships that positioned teacher and students in discourse in which the authority of knowing was frequently more collaboratively shared.

There were notably fewer instances of NESB students negotiating acceptance of the teacher’s utterances addressed to the whole class in DR1. This positioned NESB students in relation to the teacher in a more authoritative or even authoritarian (Morson, 2004) discursive relationship. Although this relative silence could have been a consequence of difficulties experienced in following the interaction, the capacity of at least some of the students to acknowledge and respond to teacher utterances when directly addressed suggests this was not necessarily so. By their silence, these students endowed the teacher’s utterances with authority unmitigated by indications of any evolving dialogues of understandings. Silence functioned to suggest unquestioning acceptance of the meanings proposed by the teacher. Only rarely was any discord voiced in the adoption of the roles of giving and demanding to negotiate meanings. The practices of these more silent students mediated relationships in and with the discourse that differed from those of more actively responsive students. That is, the discursive text functioned in diverse and dynamic ways in relations with individual students’ varied responses to the unfolding discourse. While utterances of the teacher in the role of giving were sometimes dialogised in discursive relations with actively responsive students, they simultaneously
constituted a transmission-style monologic text in discursive relations with silent students. This broad distinction between the discursive positions of the two groups of students was reinforced by the types of negotiation and the language choices of students in the other discursive relationships.

8.2.4.2 Discursive relationship 2

In DR2, NESB students self-selected to answer far fewer of the teacher’s questions addressed to the class. They responded mainly to WH- interrogatives that demanded displays of prior knowledge, and that positioned them as active participants in construction of an authoritative classroom discourse in which reified propositions were reaffirmed rather than negotiated or questioned or tested. ESB students answered these types of questions too, but also self-selected to answer teacher demands for confirmation that demanded they test and evaluate the validity of teacher utterances. The teacher’s retention, for the most part, of the role of primary knower in DR2 suggests his intention was to position students in negotiation of an authoritative dialogical text, not to surrender his authority in directing the discourse. However, the responses of ESB students to these demands were diverse.

Contribution in many instances of additional information positioned ESB students as knowers and negotiated and tested the authority and place of their voices in the discourse. In other instances the realization of responses as demands for confirmation questioned their own knowing and authority more directly, reinforcing the discursive authority of the teacher, but nonetheless negotiating the place of their voice in the discursive text. ESB students seized opportunities offered by the teacher’s questions to position themselves as knowers in ways that levelled the discursive relationship with the teacher, negotiating tensions between their knowing and the authoritative discourse of the teacher. This occurred with sufficient regularity to contrast with the preference of NESB students for interactions in which they accepted the teacher’s positioning of them in what was essentially confirmation of already negotiated and agreed authoritative discourse.

The contrast between the two groups’ engagement in negotiatory discourse that ensued when they answered different types of teacher questions was additionally reinforced by the language choices of students. In their answers to both types of interrogatives, ESB students used various clause types – declarative, sometimes functioning as questions, and interrogatives – as well as modal operators, Adjuncts and interpersonal metaphors to discursively position themselves and their addressee/s in relation to the negotiability of their utterances. In the realization of their answers to WH- interrogatives, NESB students relied on clauses in declarative mood
functioning as statements and on polarity rather than modality to position themselves and addressees. The certainty carried by these choices of NESB students was arguably authoritarian (Morson, 2004) rather than negotiatory. This was perhaps not the site of new or evolving learning, but the confirmation or reproduction of an extant discourse.

The central question at this point about the types of questions NESB students choose to answer and the language they selected to realize those answers revolves around their individual circumstances. These were a nexus of their situations in the classroom as (what amounts to) NESB English-language learners and of evolving, historically and socioculturally grounded, discursive resources and practices. From the perspective of students as language learners, in addition to the constraints on participation already mentioned (nervousness/performance anxiety, etc), NESB students may not have the resources of modality at their disposal to participate in negotiation of the discursive text in the way that ESB students did. From the sociocultural perspective, the students may have the language but such negotiation with the teacher or other students in the open discourse of the classroom may be practices they have not experienced and/or do not value. Whatever the underlying circumstances, the outcome suggested here is that different types of opportunities for learning ensue. If the goals of internationalisation of university classrooms in Australia include participation in classroom learning of the sort valued and privileged in those classrooms, NESB students in this classroom had little opportunity to do so.

If NESB students are to participate in the types of interaction privileged in these classrooms, their language learning is perhaps best conceptualised as participation in discursive practices of the target language community rather than “simply knowing how to express, in a new language, familiar ideas from an old cultural context” (Young, 2008, p. 4). Perhaps the onus lies as well with the processes of language testing that regulate the entry of NESB students to Australian university classrooms. If more emphasis is placed on capacities to participate in discursive practices that constitute Australian classrooms, and that are valued as outcomes, preparation of students may follow. That said, it was clearly evident in this study that an English-speaking background and education does not of itself lead to parity of participation. The utility of using broad groups for comparison is balanced by the virtue of recognizing diversity within as well as between the two groups. The findings of this study underscore for teachers in internationalised postgraduate university classes the importance of individual circumstances (Renshaw & Volet, 1995) in understanding difference as “varied participation in the practices of dynamic cultural communities” (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003, p. 21), rather than reductively in terms of ethnicity or nationality or region of the world. Nonetheless, in broad terms, variations in participation meant some students more than others influenced the social world of the classroom that in turn
influenced the individuals that constituted the class. Additionally, variations in language choices meant students who did participate influenced the social world of the classroom in different ways.

8.2.4.3 Discursive relationship 3

Divergence in the discursive positions the two groups constituted through language choices when realizing negotiations was equally evident in DR3. As active responses to the unfolding discourse, student questions were broadly interpreted as dialogical contributions to negotiation of an unfolding authoritative dialogical classroom discourse. For individuals, testing, challenging or questioning the discourse was judged indicative of an evolving inner discourse. What set the two groups of students apart here was not only the greater participation of ESB students as questioners of the unfolding discourse but the way they negotiated this evolving understanding in interaction to generate discourse open to all the participants. In so doing, ESB students contributed much more significantly to what Matusov (2007) terms “future authoritative discourse. (and) Dialogical authority …(that)… results from a combination of reified past and anticipated future internally persuasive discourse” (pp. 233-234).

In making demands, students ostensibly invested the authority of knower in the addressee, usually the teacher. However, the positioning of students and addressee as knowers was more complex. Although each interaction was unique, in general terms addressees were positioned most strongly as knowers in the case of WH- interrogatives where the student explicitly identified missing information only addressees could provide. The various realizations of demands for confirmation discursively positioned students making demands rather differently across a spectrum of certainty of their own knowing. The tagged declarative functioning as a demand, for instance, explicitly questioned students’ own certainties, while the declarative functioning as demand was an assertion of knowing for which confirmation was the expected response. Polar interrogatives were the demands for confirmation in which students were most open to negotiation, contradiction being equally likely as confirmation, and thus, the positioning of the student as knower most clearly exposed as emergent. Questions asked by NESB students were demands for confirmation. However, the majority were realized in declarative clauses functioning as questions. This expressed expectation of confirmation, not contradiction, of propositions and this implied a positioning as knowers. The questions demanded confirmation of their internal dialogue with and negotiation of the classroom discourse, rather than negotiation situated in the interaction of the unfolding classroom discursive text. This could be interpreted in terms of suggestions in the literature that various cultural practices to do with face (of the teacher and the student) and risk-taking influenced classroom questioning. However, the
focus here is on the outcome, the ways these students’ contributions negotiated the text and their own and others’ learning.

ESB students also asked questions realized as declaratives. However, they asked many more questions realized as polar interrogatives, which expressed their uncertainty about the outcome of the negotiation. They conducted the negotiation of their own active responses to the discourse in interaction with the teacher and other students. ESB students also made demands for missing information, which NESB students did not. This tested the discourse in different ways and positioned the participants differently. Nonetheless, it was a questioning of the discourse and it negotiated the active responses of these students interpersonally rather than internally. Essentially, ESB students positioned themselves discursively in a variety of ways, including the realization of some questions as tagged declaratives, which made visible in the interaction the explicit testing of their own internal dialogues with unfolding co-textual discourse.

The two groups differed in DR3 in the address by ESB students of questions to other students. However, as noted in the previous section the addressees were, with few exceptions, students in the ESB group. There were far fewer in total than those addressed to the teacher. There were sufficient to support findings of other research that suggests NESB students from certain cultural experiences of classroom relations and discourse see the authority of the teacher and relationships with other students in a different light from students whose experience of Australian classrooms leads them to see their own knowledge and contributions, and thus those of other students, as potentially valuable. However, any conclusions must be tentative. The data were limited and there were great variations within the ESB group. Most interesting in this aspect of the discourse were the language choices of ESB students in positioning themselves in relation to student addressees. Less modalization of propositions than in utterances addressed to the teacher points to qualitatively different discursive relationships in which students positioned themselves with greater certainty in negotiations of meanings. This complex aspect of the ways postgraduate students negotiate meanings in whole-class interactions deserves further investigation to develop understanding of the role of student-student interaction in postgraduate classroom learning.

8.2.4.4 Discursive relationship 4

ESB students responded more actively to the discourse in DR4, in adoption of the unsolicited role of giving, than they did in the role of demanding. As adult learners with experience in the broad field of teaching, and in some cases in second or foreign language teaching, they were
well positioned to contribute their voices to the academic discourse community and the community of language teachers. Although the NESB group enjoyed similar circumstances, their contributions were considerably fewer and briefer. They also were positioned more objectively through relatively limited use of modality and interpersonal metaphor. They were just as likely to be revoicing authoritative discourse as negotiating it. The contributions of ESB students, on the other hand, sometimes challenged or contested or evaluated the authority of emergent discourse in terms of the authority of their own experiences or evolving understandings. ESB students negotiated their positions in these interactions both subjectively and objectively through selection from throughout the interpersonal systems of meanings.

Utterances of students in the role of giving frequently elicited responses from the teacher or other students who themselves adopted the role of giving in turn or the role of demanding. This generated some sequences of dialogue in which another student or “the teacher (was) an equal partner … in discourse without additional authority beyond the persuasive power of his or her critical argument” (Matusov, 2007, p. 234).

Thus, as knowers, the actively responsive (mainly ESB) students positioned themselves as equal partners in the discourse and co-authored with the teacher and other students a dialogue of diverse voices that constituted an important element of the learning environment. This interaction of the authoritative discourses of the teacher and the internal discourses of the actively responsive students had the potential to produce a persuasive dialogue against which all participants had the opportunity to test emerging understandings. What is particularly ironic in this classroom is that what were possibly the most diverse voices and the voices that may have offered meaningful potential for learning through dialogical tension were those of the more silent participants.

To summarize, it was following students’ adoptions of the roles of giving and demanding that ongoing dialogues between individual students and the teacher or other students emerged. When individual students actively responded and resumed or shifted between the roles of demanding/giving to negotiate or test meanings with their respondent, the interplay between discourses was embedded in the discursive text with which other participants interacted. This exposed participants to a diversity of voices but, apart from the teacher, the great majority were voices of ESB students. The comparatively limited instances of NESB students adopting either of the roles meant opportunities to engage in sequences of dialogue were correspondingly limited. Not only did NESB students contribute fewer utterances in these roles, they continued the interaction in relatively fewer instances as well. The notable exceptions were the sequences that involved NESB Students O and Y, who continued interaction following adoption of the role of demanding, and shifted roles during the extended sequences that followed. These were
exceptions. What they demonstrated was the capacity of NESB students to engage in discursive activity in favourable circumstances, and they highlighted the absence of this sort of interaction on other occasions. In contrast, there were regular instances of ESB students participating in sequences of interaction. They were much more likely to continue interaction, particularly in resumption of the role of giving, but also to adopt the role of giving following the making of a demand. In broad terms, NESB students continued in the role of secondary knower, endowing the teacher as the authoritative voice, whereas ESB students shifted to the role of primary knower and discursive equals with the teacher.

What emerged ultimately from the interactions of students and teacher in all the discursive relationships was a set of internally persuasive discourses that constituted a starting point, an authoritative dialogical discourse, a point of tension, for the ensuing classes and for students to continue to question as they engaged in positioning themselves in the discourse of their academic studies inside and outside the classroom. The influence of students in the NESB group on the negotiation of that discourse and their actively responsive participation in the discursive community was limited. The discourses of this internationalised postgraduate classroom were negotiated primarily by the local students and the teacher.

8.3 Significance of the method

Limitations of the method of data collection have been noted. The shortcomings of the data recording instruments and consequent recognition of the need to exclude elements of classroom verbal interaction, as well as the configuration of the venue, are acknowledged to have constituted methodological weaknesses that had the potential to significantly limit findings. Future research must aim to address these aspects with the aim of capturing as complete a picture as possible of ways both ESB and NESB students participate in negotiation of meanings.

The analytical tool of systemic functional linguistics (SFL) generated rich findings. The systems for realization of interpersonal meaning provided a framework for uncovering several dimensions of dialogic relations of classroom participants. At the semantic level of speech function, the framework of discursive relationships that was applied to the social situation of the classroom, laying the first-order social roles of student and teacher over the second-order social roles of speech roles, offered a framework for probing the ways students participated in negotiation of the discursive text. The system of MOOD generated insights into the dialogic meaning-making relations of students with the unfolding text and permitted distinctions between ways students were involved. The delicate analysis of modality in particular provided capacities to understand the more subtle positioning of speakers and addressees in negotiations.
of meanings, and findings produced insights into classroom dialogue as opportunities for
learning.

The dialogue model of language was especially valuable in reconceptualising the researcher’s
approach to analysis of spoken interaction. At the stage of proposing the investigation, the
focus in approaching spoken interaction was firmly on utterances that constituted the classroom
discursivtext as the key to describing and understanding the ways students were involved in
negotiation of meanings. During the process of data collection and analysis, attention turned to
the role of addressees and listeners in multiparty classroom interactions and the importance of
including this in a description of participation in spoken interaction. While it easy to note the
invisibility of silent or quiet students and class them as non-participants in interaction, and
perhaps non-participants in learning, conceptualising interaction dialogically provided a basis
for looking beyond talk when considering the ways students were involved in classroom
interaction.

The possibility cannot be discounted that NESB students did not have at their disposal all the
potential meanings available through selection in the systems of interpersonal meaning. In
social semiotic accounts of language this imposes a considerable restriction on the ways these
students can negotiate participatively the exchange of meanings and constitution of social
situations and processes. In these circumstances, the interpretation of findings of this study
could need to be reconsidered. On the other hand, if this constraint on meaning making is the
case, what the analytical method revealed was the varying extents to which the participative
capacities of these particular students were limited by the demands of learning in a language
other than their first. This reinforces the challenges faced in classrooms that value the spoken
word as a means and an indication of learning. Given the mediative role accorded language in
learning, reflected in interactive classroom learning tasks such as problem based learning, it
reinforces research (e.g., Hawthorne, et al., 2004) that has identified links between NESB and
at-risk academic performance. Further research is necessary to confirm the findings made here
but the nexus between language and learning focuses attention on the processes of learning in
an additional language, particularly when there are issues surrounding proficiency. In any
event, the analysis found what did happen in the selected classroom, and the ways students did
negotiate, and in that, SFL proved to be a productive method of answering the research
question.

The selection of SFL as analytical tool in the method of answering the research question was
validated. It proved to be a means of analysing spoken interaction that revealed the dialogic
dynamics of classroom interaction, the negotiation of meaning, and the potential of particular
dialogic features for learning.

8.4 Implications for teaching practice and institutions

This was not a study of teaching practice, but the pivotal role played by teachers in whole-of-
class interaction was explicitly embedded in the framework of discursive relationships, and
reflected in findings that provided clear evidence discursive practices of the teacher played a
key role in providing opportunities for students to participate in spoken interaction. Equally,
there was clear evidence of variations in the role of agency of students in creating opportunities
for participation. If talk is accorded primacy in classroom learning, then access to participation
in internationalised classroom discourse needs to be explicitly structured by teachers as a
response to a diversity of discursive resources and practices. Teachers can plan opportunities,
such as the practicum report in this classroom study, that embed discursive spaces so students
do not have to compete to be heard. As discourse unfolds, the evidence from this study is that
without explicit offers of discursive opportunities, interaction is dominated by active responses
of ESB students who answer the teacher’s questions and adopt the roles of demanding and
giving. If NESB students are to have opportunities to negotiate active responses, and there is
some evidence in this study that given opportunities they do so, then teachers need to adopt
discursive practices that open spaces for this to happen. Variations in participation of students
in whole-of-class experiences emphasises the importance of course planners and teachers
offering varieties of learning modalities that offer opportunities for interaction with the
discourses that constitute coursework learning. In particular, findings suggest contexts for
activation of silent responsive understandings could play a valuable role. Forums or other
modalities for voices of students to be heard and for others to listen, perhaps outside
classrooms, could play a valuable role.

From a different perspective, teachers can reflect on the role of silence in classrooms and
encourage listening to other voices as well as talking. This study has highlighted the silence of
both NESB and ESB students and supports reconsideration by teachers of the role of silence in
classrooms and learning. Studies such as this that aim to position diversity within difference
alert teachers to the inappropriateness of generalising a relationship between the types of broad
cultural groups found in internationalised classrooms in Australian universities and particular
discursive practices.

The study also directs attention to the perspective of classroom interaction as negotiation and
offers teachers a framework for understanding the significance of student participation as
negotiation in discursive relationships from the perspectives of primary and secondary knowers. The analytical framework of the study offers a theoretically sound way for teachers to consider the practices they encounter or observe in interaction with their students. In postgraduate classrooms the participation of students as knowers in the role of giving would seem to be an important aspect of potential for dialogic learning. Encouragement of students to participate as knowers in internationalised classrooms has the potential for negotiation amongst, and appropriation of, diverse voices.

From an institutional perspective, if the types of language choices revealed in this study are confirmed through further investigations, there are implications for English for Academic Purposes programs, and conceptions of cognitive academic language proficiency, as well for language testing programmes for Australian university entry may need to consider whether students need to have the potential of the systems of interpersonal meaning language of negotiation in their active language repertoire.

### 8.5 Recommendations for future research

Some aspects of the findings have been identified as worthy of confirmation through further research. In discussion of findings of this study, it was argued that opportunities for different types of learning emerge from the practices of talk and silence. Theorisations about silent responsive understanding require exploration through different methods of inquiry to penetrate beyond observable aspects of classroom interaction. This is not the first call to re-evaluate the place and meaning of silence in classroom interaction. Sociocultural approaches that draw on Bakhtinian conceptions of dialogue should be able to accommodate silent responsive understanding in models of socially interactive learning. This is an issue that has relevance for students irrespective of language background.

Findings of the study suggest that participation of ESB and NESB students differs not just in the rate of participation, which has been the extent of some studies, but in the selections of language made in utterances. As noted in the comments on method, differences identified in the analysis have important ramifications, if not for the capacity of NESB students to negotiate meanings in nuanced and possibly more productive ways, then for the ways they position themselves for opportunities to learn through discursive negotiation of meanings. The language selections of the two groups of students, and more specifically of individuals in the groups, differ in ways that suggest variations in language selection realize variations in ways of dialogic learning through spoken interaction. This merits further investigation.
The delicate analysis of the language choices of students suggests that further study of this aspect of classroom discourse might provide valuable evidence to guide development of interventions. Further research may confirm that NESB students’ language-learning needs include the discursive practices of the Australian classroom. If the types of language choices revealed in this study are confirmed through further investigations, language testing programmes for Australian university entry might consider whether students need to have the potential of the systems of interpersonal meaning, the language of negotiation, in their active language repertoires.

Methodological limitations provide directions for what could be fruitful investigation. First, the study of negotiation of meanings in postgraduate coursework classes in a variety of teaching spaces and configurations has the potential to both challenge and expand the findings presented in this study. Overcoming the shortcomings of data recording methods that led to the exclusion of elements of classroom interaction in this analysis, while challenging, could produce a more complete picture of ways both ESB and NESB students are involved. In particular, interaction in small-group mode and in a variety of compositions of ESB and NESB students could complement the whole-class approach taken in this study and contribute to a more complete picture of negotiation in this type of classroom. Investigation of peripheral dialogue and self-talk in classrooms has a significant contribution to make in understanding the responses of students to whole-class discourse because “what happens at the margins on instructional conversations feeds into the discourse and affects what is taught and what is learnt” (Bannink & van Dam, 2006, p. 284). Silence was not as pervasive in the selected classroom as the transcribed data suggest. The issue was collection of the data. Understanding may be neither as silent nor as delayed as this investigation has concluded. If this type of data can be generated there is potential to illuminate several aspects of the broader problem addressed by this investigation. For example, it would help to predict and explain how individual participants respond to and negotiate their appropriation of meanings realized in and through the classroom discursive text. Second, the roles students play in scaffolding other students in negotiation and appropriation of these meanings. Also, it shed light on whether there are variations in the ways students from different English language backgrounds are involved.

The findings draw attention to particularities of discursive relationships in the postgraduate coursework classroom and opportunities for learning. First, students in the selected classroom adopted the role of giving more frequently than the role of demanding. This suggested they made significant contributions to the discursive text as primary knowers, negotiating from their own positions of authority. This practice added to the diversity of voices in a way that was qualitatively different from adoption of the role of demanding. While the teacher did not cede
authority, there were numerous instances of teacher and student/s interacting in discursive relationships in which “the teacher (was) an equal (though perhaps more skilful and knowledgeable) partner in discourse without additional authority beyond the persuasive power of his or her critical argument in the discourse” (Matusov, 2007, p. 234). Second, the grammatical realization of students’ demands positioned students as secondary knowers in nuanced ways that merit further investigation as well. The dynamics of this aspect of spoken interaction in postgraduate classroom settings is an area for further investigation of the ways learning is negotiated and accomplished at this level.

8.6 Conclusion

Internationalised postgraduate classrooms offer opportunities for the socio-historical experiences of international students to enrich the dialogue with diverse voices. In the selected classroom, Language Teaching in Practice, the international NESB students were language learners with experiences of social practices in diverse socio-historical contexts that could represent those the ESB students would come to encounter in classrooms in which they were training to work in. The diversity of the classroom was one of its strengths as a context for specific learnings it had as its goal. This study investigated only one of the modes of learning that constituted the experience of Language Teaching in Practice, the teacher-fronted classroom, but that mode was a central element of the course delivery. It was ironic that in the selected classroom, despite the acknowledgement of the teacher of the diversity of cultural backgrounds and approaches to learning and his expressed desire to include diverse voices and enrich learning, the voices of NESB students were rarely heard:

T: … because this is/ you know/ we’re/ this is the Western classroom/ one thing we ought to be able to do in the western classroom is engage in that sort of/ that co-construction of knowledge where what we’re trying to do is to develop our knowledge about teaching and we’re going to co-construct it/ and we’ve got a/ we’ve got a big group here and we’re privileged/ because we don’t just don’t have Western thought in this room/ we’ve got a fair bit of Asian thought too/ Middle Eastern thought/ it’s all different and it’s all/ it’s all quite legitimate and/ and I’m sure it’s going to add to our/ to our better understanding of what it is we’re doing … (2.1:521-529)

The issue in internationalised classrooms is opening the space for voices that differ to be heard. In English-medium classrooms, NESB students find themselves in situations that privilege the practices of ESB students. The ways students are involved in negotiation of meanings in internationalised classrooms are characterised by variation. While regularities can be observed, practices cannot be generically associated with categories based on nationality or ethnic
background. Although difference is the recurring theme in studies of internationalised classrooms, closer examination of difference reveals diversity.

The privileging of talk in Australian university classrooms, predicated on the association of learning and talking, is an underlying premise of much of the literature on the participation of NESB students in Australian university classrooms that advocates support of transition and adjustment of NESB students entering classrooms. This study suggests that, if the capacity of NESB students to speak up is necessary for a diversity of voices to be heard in the discursive texts negotiated in classrooms, it is not only participation *per se* that is important but also the selections of meanings made by speakers. Perhaps, if a diversity of voices is to be heard, what is required in Australian internationalised classrooms is a mutual adjustment. The value of listening to other voices, the practice of active and silent response that is an element of the irreducible relation of spoken interaction, needs consideration. If talk is valued, it doesn’t make sense to devalue listeners. Neither does it make sense to listen to only a few voices.
References


Chanock, K., & Cargill, M. (2003). Who are Australian non-English-speaking-background (ANESB) students and how do they differ from other students? In A. Bartlett & K. Chanock (Eds.), The missing part of the student profile jigsaw: Academic skills advising for Australian students from non-English speaking backgrounds. Canberra: Academic Skills and Learning Centre, A.N.U.


Iedema, R. (1996). 'Save the talk for after the listening': The realisation of regulative discourse in teacher talk. Language and Education, 10(2/3), 82-102.


http://www.msu.edu/course/phil/492/phil492/fall2002/asquith/waltonkeynote.html

and Management, 20(2), 161-173.

Watkins & J. B. Biggs (Eds.), Teaching the Chinese learner: Psychological and
pedagogical perspectives (pp. 3-23). Hong Kong: CERC/ACER.

Conference of the National Council of Teachers of English, Louisville, Kentucky,

Wells, G. (1993). Reevaluating the IRF sequence: A proposal for the articulation of theories of
activity and discourse for the analysis of teaching and learning in the classroom.
Linguistics and Education, 5, 1-37.

April 1994.


Wertsch, J. V. (1980). The significance of dialogue in Vygotsky's account of social, egocentric,
and inner speech. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 5, 150-162.

Resnick, J. M., & Teasley, S. D. (Eds.), Perspectives on socially shared cognition (pp.

London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

approach. In L. P. Steffe & J. Gale (Eds.), Constructivism in education (pp. 159-174).
Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

questioning: An analysis of classroom discourse across the university. Communication
Education, 43(4), 299-311.

research task. Language and Education, 11(2), 125-139.

Wicks, R. (1996). Effects of English language proficiency on the academic performance of
international students: A USQ study. Distance Education, 17(1), 196-204.

Williams, M. (2002). Generalization in interpretive research. In T. May (Ed.), Qualitative
research in action (pp. 125-143). London: SAGE Publications.

Wilson, K. (2003). Assisting ANESB students to acquire academic language skills. In A.
Bartlett & K. Chanock (Eds.), The missing part of the student profile jigsaw: Academic
skills advising for Australian students from non-English speaking backgrounds.
Canberra: Academic Skills and Learning Centre, A.N.U.

primary school classroom in England. In R. Barnard & M. E. Torres-Guzmán (Eds.),


8.6.1 Appendix 1: Ethical clearance

Dear Mr Walker

I write further to the additional information provided in relation to the provisional approval granted to your application for ethical clearance for your project "Interaction in internationalised university tutorials" (GU Ref No: CLS/36/05/HREC).

The additional information was considered by Office for Research.

This is to confirm that this response has addressed the comments and concerns of the HREC.

Consequently, you are authorised to immediately commence this research on this basis.

The standard conditions of approval attached to our previous correspondence about this protocol continue to apply.

Regards

Gary Allen
Manager, Research Ethics
Office for Research
Bray Centre, Nathan Campus
Griffith University
ph: 3875 5585
fax: 3875 7994
email: g.allen@griffith.edu.au
web:
## 8.6.2 Appendix 2: Participants and Coding

T – Teacher/Greg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NESB</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>ESB</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>People’s Republic of China</td>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>Roslyn</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Leanne</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>People’s Republic of China</td>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>People’s Republic of China</td>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.6.3 Attachment 1

Transcripts of classroom data. (CD attached)
**CLASS 1: SESSION 1**

T – Teacher/Greg

S/SS – Student/Students (where unidentifiable)

A - Allan
B - Bruce
C - Carl
F - Frances
I – Isabel
M – Melanie
H – Hannah
R - Roslyn
K - Kate
L - Leanne
J - Jack
W - Wendy
O - Olivia
E - Erica
G – Gail
N – Natalie
D – Debbie
Y - Lucy

(Ian - teaches another course in the programme)
T: alright so what we’re going to do tonight is ah basically prepare ourselves for what
we’re going to do on Saturday because it’s a big day Saturday

F: yes

T: um and ah this’ll be this is where we’ll be on Saturday in this room here and hopefully
it’ll be standing room only

K: have you had many responses Greg

T: yeah lots lots

K: I’ve done my bit a bit of advertising (inaudible)

T: oh well done well done and Ian tells me he he came along last night also with more of
more of more of the stuff that he ran off

SS: yeah/ yes/ mmm

B: yeah yeah

F: we got rid of em
24  T: got rid of em yeah

25

26  F: put them up

27

28  T: well you know it pays off because today I got a number of calls that ah came from
29  people who’d actually seen those flyers that ah that he gave out last night and
30  ahm it’s not just for um not just for English but ah but one fellow for for ah Arabic
31  he’s interested

32

33  K: one Bruce

34

35  T: oh no no no there’s more there’s more than that there’s more than that a number=

36

37  B: last semester it was the most popular

38

39  T: =a number of people have said that they want to they want to get involved in Arabic

40

41  K: you should’ve put your picture in the corner

42

43  T: yes okay so yes so what we’ve got to do is to work out what what’s expected of of us
44  of you this Saturday and ah basically what we’re trying to do is ah is work out
45  whether they’re what classes these people’ll go into right ((2)) and ah that lends
46  itself to the topic for tonight which is to do with needs analysis (which) is basically
what we’ll be involved in okay ((2)) that’s the issue of needs analysis and we’ve got
an extremely complex-looking diagram there looking on the first page of the
analysing learners’ needs umm and it’s a it’s a typical David Nunan kind of diagram
which you can see everything’s inter-related um what we’re going to do in the in
terms of analysing needs is try and find out what it is that we need to
teach these these learners now there are two different types of needs there’s
what we’re going to call objective needs and there’s subjective needs objective and
subjective needs and the objective needs are those which um which are to do with
the language alright ((2)) what language are we are we going to teach the subjective
needs are basically ah it’s to do with how we’re going to actually do the teaching
both are very important aren’t they it doesn’t matter how well you can define
what the language is that the learners want to learn if you ignore the second one the
subjective needs how you’re going to go about teaching that and that’s the ah the ah
the stuff that you’ve been doing in your discussion board a lot of you have been
looking at that issue haven’t you even if you haven’t put anything on the discussion
board yet and you’ve just been reading the discussion board you’re going to see that
they’re that people are very very ah serious about you know how you actually go
about teaching whatever it is that you that you’re teaching and that’s to do with
needs too that’s that’s the two types of needs that we’re going to be looking at that’s
the objective needs what language how do we specify the language that we’re going
to teach and subjective needs ah how do we decide how we’re going to teach it that
that language okay ((2)) so they’re the they’re the two things we’re going to look at
now the way in which we’re going to get around we’re going to do this is by ah
basically interviewing people and that’s going to be what you’re going to be doing on Saturday you’ll be required to interview um a certain number of a certain number of people and you’ll be looking for clues as to what it is you’re going to teach them and clues as to how it is you’re ought teach them right ((2))those two things

K: one on one interviews Greg ((2))

T: one on one interviews yep yep yep you’ll ah and ah those of you who who are going to be teaching Chinese or Japanese or Arabic ah you’re not going to need to do the same type well you’ll be doing the same sort of interview but you can get down very very quickly to the business of actually teaching those of you teaching English you won’t be doing any teaching on ah on Saturday you’ll (inaudible) that should be the biggest number we’ll be in a bad we’ll be in a bad way if it’s not the biggest number ah it should the biggest number should be the people who are going to be here coming along to learn English and you should be um you should be prepared to be interviewing at least four people each maybe even more there have been years where where ah ah you’ve we’ve had people having to go off to different different rooms around the place and there’ve been queues waiting outside waiting to get in to be interviewed and sometimes people have had to had to interview about ten people but ah we’ll by the end of tonight hopefully you’ll you’ll know what it is the you you should actually be interviewing them about and how you’re going to extract the information from them alright ((2))
I: and so if you’re teaching Chinese or Japanese you should prepare for a teaching plan

T: yeah you should be able to actually do some teaching um you you it’ll be very introductory stuff ah so it’s not going you don’t know who the people’ll be at this stage=

I: mhmm

T: =how many you’re going to have=

I: mhmm

T: =or any thing like that but you want to find out from them again the same sorts of things basically as the people who are going to teach English are going to be finding out and that is what’s their background what previous study have they engaged in=

I: yes

T: =what level basically are they at but it won’t be quite as varied as the sorts of levels that the people who’ll be teaching English will be dealing with=

I: okay
T: okay ((2))

I: yes

T: I think from past experience that you’ll be dealing mostly with beginners

I: yes

T: the Japanese and the Chinese and the Arabic classes are generally beginners and that’s
what you should be thinking about when you’re thinking now what am I going to do
on Saturday um I’m going to have an introductory introduction introductory sort of
a lesson=

I: mmm

T: =to Chinese or Japanese or Arabic okay ((2)) and you’ve done it before Bruce so
you’d you know=

B: mhmm

T: =that the people that you’ll be dealing with are beginners and you’ve done it too Olivia
so you know that people you’ll be dealing with are beginners
B: mhmm

T: um alright so although we’re going to be mainly focussing tonight on our tonight on
the discussion of needs on the analysis of needs of teachers of learners of English
nevertheless what we say about that also applies umm in a way to what you’ll be
doing with your Chinese and your Japanese and your Arabic okay ((2)) now if you
look at your at your ah at your study guide here you’ll see that I’ve broken down the
ah this objective needs into ahm the issues of discourse okay ((2)) it’s an analysis of
discourse we’ve been I’ve been saying the the the sorts of things that you’ll be
teaching about language ought to ought to concern you should be concerned with
the field of discourse that you’ll be teaching you should be ah also interested in in
issues to do with tenor of discourse and you should also be interested in mode of
discourse are those terms familiar

SS: yes mmm

T: yeah those are these are terms that you’ve you’ve struck before in other in other places
((2))

SS: yes

T: okay Ian’s been talking about it ((2))
T: okay

I: we just learn it

T: just learn it ((2))

I: yes

T: gee we coordinate things well don’t we so let’s hear what you ah what you um understand by field of discourse what sorts of things will you be dealing with if you’re going to focus be focussing your needs analysis on the field of discourse

B: something like the subject or the content of the course

T: yep content of the course yeah what what is tell me about how how we’re going to get to that what sorts of questions might you ask

O: what kind of situation where you use language
T: yeah where yeah what do you want to use language for what do you want to use English for what do you want to use Chinese for um cause basically if you talk about and you ask people what are they coming along for they say oh we’re coming along to learn English ah or we’re coming along to learn Chinese that’s a very big topic you know what does it mean it doesn’t mean very much at all until you start thinking in these sorts of terms does it what subset of the English language are you interested in in learning and ah that’s ah where your field of of discourse comes in um and basically ah in the group that we’ll be dealing with on Saturday there’ll be two broad divisions that’s the big broad divisions to start with because we’re in a University and because you’ve been not just you but other people have been distributing these flyers and things ah all round the campus um advertising that that ah that we’re here to help you if you’re having difficulty with English if you’re a student here the sort of English likely that you’ll be wanting to have help with is English to do with the stuff you’re studying=

SS: mmm right yes

T: =so that leads to a whole one whole classification of of field of discourse English for academic purposes okay ((2)) and basically that’s very broad too isn’t it=

SS: mmm yeah yes
T: =you know cause the ah the ah needs of a of somebody who’s who’s studying a course
    in humanities for example and they’re studying history and those sorts of subjects
    they might be doing psychology sociology and so on are probably markedly
    different from the the needs the linguistic needs the linguistic demands that subjects
    like mathematics and chemistry and physics and so on are going to put on on the
    students so in your interview when you strike somebody who says I’m a student
    then you’ve got to find out things like what sort of student are you what areas are
    you studying and you’ve got a limited amount of time in this ah in this course
    you’ve got ah what have you got about at the very most nine weeks that’s what it’ll
    turn out=

L: =it’s nine teaching weeks isn’t it ((3)) [nine Saturdays

T:       [nine yeah well nine weeks including this Saturday

L: yeah so eight teaching weeks ((2))

B: [ooohhh

R: [eight teaching [weeks for English yeah

T:       [so eight teaching weeks yeah eight teaching Saturdays
I: [eight teaching days]

SS: [((inaudible))]

T: so for the for you guys the Chinese teachers you might be able to say it will last for the
you you’ll do nine nine weeks but for the teachers of English ah you won’t be doing
any teaching at all this week and your teaching will start the following week now
why I why we raise that is that um is that you’ve got to be a little bit selective too
because of time constraints as to what you’re going to be teaching there’s an
enormous amount of stuff that you could just under that one classification English
for academic purposes =

B: =mmhmm=

T: =aahhm what are you having difficulty we you we need to find out what individuals
are having difficulty with what they they feel as though they could that ah do with
help in and so on okay (2) so you need to talk to them about what sorts of things
what are some of the issues that are apart from just the actual content that they’re
that they’re actually going to be studying in the area what are some ah

K: well we need to find out what level of proficiency they’re at at the moment
T: absolutely yeah and that’s going to be big part of tonight we’ll be looking the issue of proficiency

L: the difference between their oral proficiency and written proficiency

T: okay do you have do you do you want help with your the written language or the spoken language alright ((2)) and if you want help with the written language do you want help with how are we going to divide that up reading and writing=

SS: [writing

T: =alright now you might they might say they want help with everything umm and ah that’s probably true but maybe what we’ve got to do is to ah is to try and narrow things down a little bit a little bit more ahh for the purposes of of the ahh of the finite amount of time that ah that we can spend with them

L: do we have to have a specific field such as economics or whatever do we

T: it’s a big issue that one and it’s a good question so what do you think about that ahm Leanne’s Leanne’s question is what if it is a specific field like economics or what is it if it’s a specific field like nuclear physics ahm what if it’s a specific field like this or that
E: aren’t you going to have a special class for those people

T: [no no no ah I’ll take the nuclear physicists and you take the economists

SS: [((lots of laughter and comments such as: you take it; etc))

J: Greg I think that you’d still be dealing with fairly specific genre you know um like
even if it’s sort of um someone who’s ah studying um physics or whatever they’re
still going to have to write certain kinds of assignments case studies or

T: are they

J: ah well some certain types maybe ahm

T: uh huh could be

L: what about the mathematicians and

T: what about yeah okay Leanne Leanne’s in fine form tonight she’s throwing up the
difficult ones what [about the mathematicians

J: [they’d need to write well they’d need to write some kind of a
report on um statistics on some statistics some research report kind of thing
T: is that maybe a a a fond hope or a

J: oh I’d say there’d be some there’d be some kind of genre that’d kind of thread
through=

T: uh huh

J: =the different um the different ah you know courses that might people might be
studying

T: yep

L: so do we need to let them know as we’re interviewing them you know that that they’re
not necessarily going to get I mean if you see that they’ve got a a quite unique field
I think we need to point out that=

T: yeah

L: =at a very early stage that um it won’t be one on one=

T: exactly yeah
L: necessarily tailoring to their specific needs

K: with a subject specific language tute

T: that’s right yeah the reality of the situation is that you’re going to have classes with more than one person in them well we hope we do anyway ahm ahm and ah and the minute that happens then it means that you’re going have to be you’re going have diverse class groups aren’t you so I think you’ve got to disabuse them of the belief that they’re going to come in here and find a a teacher of nuclear physics=

SS: mmm yeah

T: cause they’re not ah and ah my economics um you know is about all I can do is is check that the balance in my in my internet account is balanced and that’s about my knowledge of of economics and I I I think probably that would apply to number of people in the room um so so you know we’re here that’s the that’s one thing that we need to be clear about if if they think that they’re going to come in here and get help with how to read a chemistry book ah their chemistry book then probably they’re not we might be able to help them I think what Jack is talking about too is related to this we might be able to help them with aspects of reading academic texts um but it’s going to be fairly broad ahh

R: mmm broad mmm mmm
J: you know well like scanning or skimming you know [those kind of (technical)]

T: [we can teach study skills can’t]

J: yeah yeah

T: =we can teach some study skills which is a bit of a problem ahh it’s a it’s debateable whether whether it’s it’s particularly useful what we’re going going you know if that’s all we’re going to do but anyway that’s that’s what EAP very often for this for this same reason this is going to be like that for us is you know even in a ELICOS centre umm EAP is generally going to have to be general English for academic purposes

J: but you know like what they do for example with IELTS test which is the kind of test instrument that I’m pretty much most familiar with is they they try to throw in a broad selection of um you know topic material=

T: yeah

J: =in the practice of you know when you’re testing for those skills
J: so I suppose if you were teaching you know if you were teaching those kind of ah those
    broad kind of um reading skills=
T: uh huh
J: =then you might just chooses a based on your needs analysis you might choose a range
of reading material that’s sort of appropriate for various students and try to cover it
that way
T: yeah yep that’s right mhmm yeah it’s not going to get down to the huh I I’ve I’ve told
some of you this one before I think is I when I was in England I was doing my
masters degree at Essex university and it was in the era when English for specific
purposes was was coming in very popular and Essex university was making a heap
of money out of ah out of English for specific purposes course and they used to
bring in whole hosts of people from particular discipline areas um and ah thay’d
they’d give them a course on whatever it was ah the English of that particular area
and they used to try and get it specific as specific as they could and the most
specific one I ever came across in my life was try this for for specificity English for
Argentinian artificial inseminators
SS: [((inaudible))]
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K: [you’re joking

J: what’s the acronym

T: English for Argentinian artificial inseminators cause they’d had the they had an

 agriculture section they had an agriculture faculty at Essex university and ah they’d

 been developing techniques in artificial insemination and ah [yeah eh ((2))

J: 

J: EFAIs

T: yeah and so the ah and Argentina as you know is very big in the cattle industry

L: that’s still very much vogue in in Europe that’s swinging back again to specific

 English courses yeah

T: that that really is a very specific English course yeah

L: yeah I worked on an English for cardiology=

T: mm yeah yeah
L: =project in Italy and they had they had about fifteen or twenty very specific courses

that they were starting to develop=

T: yeah

L: =(inaudible) which seemed to me to be ahm

T: very specific

L: well you you develop very specific vocab=

T: mmm

T: =yeah

L: =but in doing that I mean even if you’re a cardiologists you’ve got to have other

general communicative skills=

T: uh huh
L: they actually lost that they’d lose out on those other general communicative [skills

T: [yeah

that’s right yeah they you know the classic ex another classic example and this still
goes on ah English for air traffic controllers

SS: yeah mmm

T: ah [and it

L: [and outside their narrow parameters

T: exactly yeah and I think I’d be much more confident if I thought the air traffic
controllers had a slightly broader [(English)

SS: [((inaudible))

T: yeah that’s right yeah ahhm but they’re they’re all important issues yeah the ah just
how how specific we’d be our answer to that in this course is we can’t be specific
we can’t possibly be that specific and we we we we won’t have for a whole host of
reasons we’ve got so many variables ahhm that that’ll be coming into play that if
we can make a broad division
J: mhmm

T: into academic English for academic purposes and the other broad division which we’ll just call general English ahh we’ll be happy if you like you might within English for academic purposes be able to ahhm break it down into ahhm maybe reading and writing and listening and speaking or something like something like that ahhhm

L: Greg is the age range is the age range with those doing English quite diverse too or do we tend or do you tend to get a a narrow [range

T: [it’s really narrow it’s it’s a university they’re adults in fact for various reasons I think I mentioned this before we we’re we’re not going to have kids=

SS: mmm yeah

T: =ahh in the class because for various reasons

L: older adults though quite often have a different sort of way of learning because they learnt in a much in a in a different era so that they

T: yeah
L: do you get many kind of over fifties types [((inaudible))

T: [not in the not in the EAP group no I think

the EAP group would be would be university age um and not ah and not older

university students they’re all fairly um

L: you notice that that that different attitude to what learning is with older students

T: yeah

L: and sometimes it’s a bit more of a a slower learning curve to get them into into into

something that’s [((inaudible))

T: [that’s right

E: [the thing is though they’re coming from different cultures where

often they have a different approach to learning anyway

L: but older tends to be sometimes a double

E: ((inaudible/ even more))

L: yeah=
T: yeah a double whammy there I think

L: =it’s sometimes harder harder to get them to change I think younger people sometimes
are a little more flexible if to get if you’re trying to mould them to do something or
become a bit interactive older students=

T: yeah

L: = sometimes don’t handle that change [(all that well)

T: [the interesting thing is that ah sometimes you
do though get get classes which consist of older and ah and younger students and
that can put problems and the one that I’m thinking of particularly I told you about
the puppets last week didn’t I ((2))=

SS: mmm yeah yep

T: =about the ah the Thai Thai soldiers ah being terrified by puppets ((2)) ahhm there was
another interesting thing about that group too was that it it had people from a whole
range of different ranks=

SS: mmm
T: =and so you had say a general in amongst them=

H: general

T: =and also the business coming to Australia was a bit of a junket for some of them too
so you’ve had people who were who were ah who were to be looked up to and had a
lot of prestige and and power and so on and then you had privates right down to the
to the low lowest of the low the thing and this usually equated with age too and the
problem there was a really interesting one and this’d you you’d appreciate this one
Erica that ah the um the younger ones were much quicker but you had this thing
about about status=

K: high status low status

T: =and face=

SS: mmm

T: =and so on and so you’d ask them a question and ah you knew that all the young guys
knew the answer=

SS: mmm
T: =but they weren’t the and dumb old general sitting up the back thinking and he but

none of the young ones were prepared to embarrass him and cause him to lose face=

SS: mmm

T: =and so it was a real impediment you and of course you know there were ways around

it and I’m sure that you being experienced teachers would come up with ways to get

around this but at the beginning it was a bit of a bit of a shock ah thinking now how

do I how do we handle this ah without sort of um making everybody miserable

ahhm how would you handle that how would you handle that

L: in pairs or small groups

R: groups

T: yeah

L: not (break them)

T: exactly yeah you wouldn’t ah you wouldn’t embarrass the general in front of all of the

troops ah so you’d have less chance of doing that if you got them into smaller

groups
J: put all the high ranking officers [in one group

R: [together yeah

T: yeah and you’d give the general special tasks to do too

L: easy ones

T: yeah yeah

R: [he could (report on) all the answers

I: [when the general comes here he’s a student

T: what’s that

I: when the general comes here he’s a student too=

T: well that’s

I: =you should treat everyone equally
T: oh well nobody’s nobody’s equal in this world are they [in anything

K: [((inaudible)) status before

L: and the social cultural things are the hardest to break down=

T: they

L: =cause they’re going to go back quite often at the end of their [learning=

T: [that’s right yeah mmm

yeah it’s

L: =(inaudible) try and set one culture in the classroom but the minute they step outside

the door they’re back into their other culture

T: yeah that’s right yeah

E: also I was just just when you were saying that I’m just wondering um the the whole

gender issues within the cultures too then would play a part=

SS: mmmm right yeah
E: =as in like more in my experience I had this Tanzanian mum who spoke to me in
English for three years fine and then one day her husband was there and all of a
sudden she had very broken English and you know couldn’t speak=

T: ah

E: =and couldn’t understand and everything and I’m just wondering whether other well
obviously other cultures would have that problem too=

T/SS: yeah mmm

E: =so in that sense would we be thinking of breaking them into male female groups or so
they didn’t so that didn’t create

T: it’s an issue isn’t it=

K: [mmm

R: [an issue to address

T: =it’s an issue that you that and all of this stuff that you’re going to do on Saturday
potentially is going to going to give you the data=
SS: mmm yeah

T: =that on which you’re going to base you’re ah you’re the sorts of decisions [that
you’re going to make

L: [I think

you need to try at least try and if it’s so uncomfortable that their language suffers
then you go to plan B but I think you’ve=

T: yeah

L: =more or less got to because=

T: or C D and E you know

L: = they’re (here in Australia) C D and E (if you need to)=

T: yeah yeah

L: =but here in Australia that you should be trying to mimic what happens in our society
in the classroom but if it doesn’t work and interferes with their learn ability to learn
or speak=
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T: yeah

L: =then=

E: [yeah

T: [mmm

L: =you do what works

T: yeah I think that’s that’s really good that all those all those issues those points that you’re that you’re raising there and it occurs to me as you’re talking that ah that what we’re talking about is are the issues which are which are at the very heart of multiculturalism=

SS: mmm

T: =aren’t they you know that multiculturalism doesn’t mean everybody goes and does their own their own thing or anything like that that’s the way the press would like to see it=

SS: mmm yes yeah
T: and if you if you think if that’s what we think then we’re doomed to fail because it can’t work that’s societies can’t work like that there has to be this something to do with a with a core of some sort and how you define that um and then then the then the ah the provision for people to within that their own individuality yeah and that’s the way it’s got to that’s the way the things got to operate um otherwise it just doesn’t operate um and so yeah how you do that and all these suggestions that you’re coming up with in the classroom you can’t just give it a formula for that

SS: mmm

T: because for different groups things’ll be different different configurations things’ll be different and ah and you got to classically what you got to do and your ESL teachers are really good at this I think you’ve got to respect the ah the the individuals within the within the group ahmm and so you’ve got to modify things um depending upon what the class what class you’ve got in front of you I’m sure that’s the way it got to operate

R: so we need to have establish common questions and things we’re going to ask people

((2))

T: yep

R: and then do we we should then have a say in how these people are grouped=
T: yes

R: =we come we should be able to come together and sort of=

T: yeah

R: =talk about that=

T: yeah I’m going

R: =there are issues because we you know interviewing different people

T: yep Roslyn I’m what I’m going to do is ah later on we we’re not going to do it now because it ah there’s I I want you to come up with some of these things that’s basically the new sheet that was developed last um in the summer school by one of the people in the in the summer school I had something that wasn’t anywhere near as good as that it was just a list of questions but ah but whoever did the person who did this was pretty talented at this type of thing she had good skills and ah and I I while you may like to modify some of this I think basically what you know what you’ve got here is is an instrument which will yield some good information and you do you’ll fill in one of these for every single student and then and that’ll include stuff to do with um with proficiency levels we’ll talk about that soon um and what
we’ll do next Tuesday night is we’ll have these all filled in they’ll be filled in from
the previous Saturday and we’ll spend a lot of time in discussion as to how we’re
going to put individuals into the most appropriate classes for them so that’s that’s
what it’ll that’s what comes out of it at the end alright ((2)) um

L: Greg do we then generate a like an attendance list so we can do we does that generate
an attendance list do you keep those types of

T: no no all we need to do with this is ah is you have a class list it will let’s say it it
breaks up into ah into ten groups that’s what we’ve we’ll analyse it down into um
and ah then we then the individuals who who have a particular group will get the
sheet the sheets for for their particular group and you can have your own class list
based upon that and ah you can the do with that what you will um I I like marking
the roll not just because I’m checking attendance because I want to try and learn the
names if at all possible as quickly as possible um so that’s that’s what that’s what’ll
happen there and then they’ll be yours that that those sheets there so so as you as
your for your for your individual class um trying to come up with something to
teach appropriate to teach them you can be referring back to that interview to those
interview sheets [all the time

L: [then I then I teach that class for eight weeks in a row ((3))

T: yeah yeah you and probably and it depends on numbers
L: mhmm

T: and probably somebody else working with you mhmm okay ((2))

J: I I just can’t help thinking that you know there’s a couple of things there was

something that came up from ah somebody was talking who was writing on the
discussion board

T: mhmm

J: ahm Nat Natalie mmm

F: Natalie yeah

J: yeah

N: yeah

J: hi

N: hi
J: it was um it was talking about you know being in a language class=

T: yeah

J: =and you know with all the discussions going on and that sort of thing and absolutely

sort of hating that situation and not responding well to it=

T: mhmm

J: =but when the teacher asked at the end of the lesson saying you know how was the

lesson and answering sort of you know good I I actually one of the people I work

with or work for is Chinese and she was a language student for a long time and um

she was telling me the other day that one of the things she absolutely hated saw no

value in no point in but went along with was working in pairs=

T: mm

J: =she just couldn’t see the value of talking with ah um another student who had the

same kind of problems as her=

T: mm mm mm

J: =ah and didn’t feel she was getting any benefit because this person just was the same

level as her so she wasn’t going to you know feeling that she was getting any
leverage out of that and not only she felt that but but and numerous other students

felt that way=

T: mm

J: =but they would when asked directly by the teacher you know how’s the lesson going

she’d say fine you know=

T: mm

J: =so this kind of subtext that might be there in a class that you’re just not going to know

[about=

R: [know about mm

T: mm

J: =um by sort of direct questioning you know that there’s you know

T: depends on the sort of questioning too doesn’t it

J: yeah but I mean [there are a lot of
F: [and if also if she changed sorry= 

J: no 

F: =but if she changed the group so she’s not stuck with the same person she’s not benefiting from that 

J: no no she her [problem 

F: [oh it was just pair it didn’t matter who she was with 

J: yeah yeah yeah well her problem was with the concept of = 

F: oh I see 

J: =of having to learn of having a teacher= 

R: ((inaudible)) 

J: =wasn’t who was not you know like= 

F: oh teaching out the front
J: =talking to her or=

R: ((inaudible)) expectations

J: =you know interacting with her or correcting her=

SS: ((inaudible))

F: oh

J: =but rather I and also something sometimes having teachers who and I’ve actually seen
this too teachers who who maybe are not focussed on the pairs either=

F: right

J: =so they’re just letting them the pairs ah speak [to each other

F: [and they might be doing something else

J: yeah yeah and doing something else maybe writing on the board or something like that
you know and seeing no value in you know speaking with somebody at her own
level=
F: right

J: =so I mean we have that ah communicative framework to to sort of to think through and to work from but to students who just are not from that background [you know= SS: mmm yeah

J: =um so what I mean to say is there might be things going on in the classroom that as a teacher coming from a western background you’re not aware of you know

T: [true

R: [cultural issues

SS: [((many comments))

L: [sometimes you do need to train them but also not overexplain but sometimes a very short explanation of why you’re doing a task is [((inaudible)) useful

T: [I I think that’s absolutely right Leanne the ah you know you’ve got to present our paradigm haven’t you haven’t we
T: and and why and what’s the rationale for that paradigm I think we do know what our students’ paradigms are too because we we if we don’t at this stage you after you teach for a while you’ll learn and after you read about it ahm you start to get that that understanding because there’s a hell of a lot written about um about how how students from other cultures have different learning styles and about things to do with learning strategies and all of that sort of thing so you know it’s not as though we’re going to shocked that um that say Japanese student for example in her heart of hearts may not altogether appreciate um full-on strong versions of the communicative approach

J: mmm

T: um we’re we’re aware of that and if we’re aware of that and but we don’t do anything about that seems to me to be silly now for example by doing by doing something about I mean just explaining because the Japanese students and the Chinese students for example we can’t expect them to have read up about communicative language teaching when they come to the class um and in here we come all they can perceive is that this teacher is doing something which is quite different from what I’m used to back in my culture this isn’t this isn’t the paradigm that that we’ve operated on
and why is he doing that is he incompetent ahm the the answer to that can be anything really ahm [the

E: [but they can see it as being ill-prepared too=

T: it can be yeah

E: = if you’re not just passing on information which is what they sometimes expect

T: yeah exactly yeah so there’s all of those sorts of things that I think that we need to need to take into take into account ah we’re getting on with that I think to the area of um of the subjective needs aren’t we

SS: mmm

T: you know this is the the how we go about teaching it we let’s just stick with the what for a little bit longer what it is we’re going to teach and it’s but the thing is that that questionnaire will give you data for both of those issues both the how and the what but let’s just focus on the what and so I don’t think there’s any problem is there with the ah with field of discourse when we’re looking at field of discourse we’ve said one big division is going to be English for academic purposes the other
big division is going to be a general what we’re calling for want of a better name
general English

L: they want to communicate

R: mmm

T: yeah that’s right

J: mmm

T: yeah and and that can be ah depending upon again what data we get from our questionnaire from our interview sheet and that could be in terms of which of the which of the modes is it listening speaking reading and writing and what are working ah or is it some sort of combination of those and so on so see all of that is objective data this is the what of what it is we’re going to be we’re going to be teaching um now what about the what about the other oh hold on before we get on to that still on still on field of discourse ahm we’ve got EAP we’ve got general English but I think we can break general English down a little bit too

J: yeah what about vocational you know people that do they have a vocational need

T: yeah
K: or what they might need to do in their work as they speak general transactional English

T: yeah or social English or whatever you like to call them yeah mm and people will say that they and sometimes we’ve found that we’ve made big mistakes in in some of this we’ve ah even in the in the first big division we’ve assumed because because student A is doing a university course that student A wants English for academic purposes whereas we find out later on that student A no student A doesn’t want English for academic purposes student A in fact wants a more general type of English so that they can just talk they can feel more at home with in the society that they’re in so so even at that stage where it seems obvious if these are students then they’re going to want English for academic purposes you can’t really you really need to probe a little bit more deeply there and ask a few more questions it may be they want general English alright ((2)) um so yeah there’s vocational stuff then there’s the general stuff which will help them to integrate within into the within the society and then there’s another one a bit related to that I suppose which we might call survival English um alright ((2)) so there’s so there’s a there’s a fair sort of a division there too your survival English obviously is likely to be ahm more at the at the early stages you know it’s the more elementary levels and here we’re getting into ah another important consideration here is ah is what level of proficiency are these people at and we’re going as I said we’re going to spend a bit of time looking at how we how we actually determine levels of proficiency for the purpose of
making up our classes because we think it’s a good idea for us to ah to see that as being one of the important criteria don’t you that proficiency

SS: oh definitely oh yes mmm

T: we’re not going to necessarily although you know I’m sure that if we wanted to put our minds to it we could come up with some sort of a rationale for saying=

K: a mixed ability group

T: =we’re going to have a mix we’re going to have a heterogeneous group but I we’re not going to do that ah we could do it but we’re not going to we’re going we’re going to try and find out what levels of proficiency people are at and we’re going to put beginners with beginners advanced students with advanced students as much as we can

L: over eight weeks that’s probably where’d they be happier

T: sorry

L: over eight weeks I’m sure that’s where they’d be happier
T: I think so yeah I think so we’re not going to do too much of that sort of experimenting
with this group at least okay

H: so Greg in that case I mean we we will take students for interview ((inaudible)) the
learner and then I mean supposing you have two students at different categories of
different levels=

T: mhmm

H: =then do we like exchange with other teachers=

T: oh absolutely

H: =so that we can keep them put them together in the same [proficiency level

T: [yes yeah the people that you

actually interview on Saturday you have no ownership of=

H: no ownership yeah

T: =of them at all you know ah=

SS: ((inaudible))
T: =you sit down you sit down with them and you get you get=

H: ((inaudible))

T: =their their their data and then and then on ah and then when you come along the following Tuesday night=

H: oh okay

T: =then we put things together and=

H: together and then

T: =then you get (a bit) of ownership=

H: you get yeah

T: =then you can own the students alright ((2))

SS: ((inaudible))
T: okay so that’s that’s right um so I’m sure you can see the the sorts of things that that
this first little field of discourse in terms of the actual language you’re going to
Teach ah in a in a very I suppose a conventional sense where that’s going to lead you
in terms of the language you’re going to teach what sorts of what sorts of things if
you were writing a textbook of English would you expect to to get out of that what
aspects of language you know that first analysis that that first type of field of
discourse type of analysis

J: ah vocabulary

T: yeah vocabulary yep obviously if they’re going to be ahh if they’re going to be
wanting to know things about the banking you know how to how to go and
negotiate things though banking’s probably a bad one to take because you never
nobody goes to banks these days

K: you don’t actually talk to anybody

T: you don’t talk to anybody that’s right you got to be able to work a computer that sort
of needs (are) you know

J: the idiomatic expressions that [sort of thing
T: [yeah that’s yeah let’s let’s suppose we’re ah we’re going to a shop and we’re going to go there and see if we can buy a pair of shoes or something like that then yeah we need to have a whole lot of vocabulary that you could imagine would fall under that sort of heading ahm so that’s that’s one area what aahm is it just vocabulary

J: [no it’s the grammar as well

T: yeah that’s right

F: the grammar the ability to ask questions

T: yep yep all of the aspects of =

F: grammar

T: = of syntax and yep ahm what else

J: functionality of language maybe (2)

T: pronunciation
SS: mmm yeah pronunciation

I: culture ((2))

T: culture yeah what about that pronunciation one ahm ah what ah what are we going to do there could you imagine it leading to pronunciation lessons

L: if there was a general or if there was a need of quite a large number of [(inaudible)]

T: [mmm this is an interesting one really isn’t it because ah what have (we) got we hope we’ll get some ah we hope we’ll get some Chinese we hope we’ll get some Vietnamese we hope we’ll get some some people from Saudi Arabia we hope we get people from um from ahm [Africa

K: [(inaudible) Somalia

T: well the whole works we hope we’ll get the lot don’t we we hope that we have a really interesting sort of a a group of now we might even get some Europeans alright ((2)) ah some French and some Italians and some

L: when pronunciation is interfering with communication then obviously= 50
K: yeah

L: =it’s got to be addressed

T: yeah

M: I think just um if if it wasn’t if it’s sort of a problem for some students but not others

point them in the direction of an appropriate um source=

T: uh huh

M: =for their own sort of study in that area like there’s lots of books out there where it

says if you’re a Spanish learner then you’re going to have problems with these

sounds and so the students can have a look at that if you had only small groups of

nationalities =

T: yeah

M: =and not sort of a if you had a large group of Chinese students then obviously you

could have a look at that=

T: mhmm
M: =and ah some of them might cross over with the other students but you could just refer them to some texts or something

T: yeah mmm

L: or use your good students as models=

T: mm

L: =I mean they can still they could still be having speech production and while the others are practising [(inaudible)]

T: [yep so I think there’s a couple of things here one thing Leanne you said before was ah if it’s interfering with communication=

SS: mmm yeah

T: =then then yeah I suppose we’ve got to address it haven’t we that’s that’s if it’s ah if it’s something which simply marks them as a as a Spanish speaker of English ah but is not interfering with communication then we probably would would say if we had more time then maybe we would work on that but it’s not a top priority so in other words what we’re going to be doing is prioritising ah and we got to and I don’t
think there’s any any place for us giving having general pronunciation lessons ah
you know going through the phonetic alphabet or anything like that and ah because
for some people it’d be useful at a I at a particular point in time but for others it
wouldn’t be because it’s not their problem

SS: mmm

T: alright ((2))

L: the most difficult student I’ve had recently is a Saudi student I’ve never had one before
we’re on the verge of addressing his pronunciation problem but he had a speech
slight speech impediment=

T: oh well see that’s a problem

L: =and he was a beginner but I didn’t know I hadn’t heard enough of English being
spoken by him to see to tell whether he really had a speech impediment=

T: mmm yeah

L: =or something else was happening and it ended up being a slight speech impediment
so we just ignored=
1189  T: yeah

1190  

1191  L: =well not ignored but didn’t highlight that he had other problems=

1192  

1193  T: yeah

1194  

1195  L: =apart from (inaudible) as well as (inaudible) [he got he only got a one one

1196  (inaudible)=

1197  

1198  T: the first time

1199  

1200  L: =sometimes you had to be a little bit gentle [(inaudible)

1201  

1202  T: [that’s right yeah we’re we’re not into

1203  rectifying speech impediments

1204  

1205  L: no no

1206  

1207  T: we don’t really know how to do that

1208  

1209  M: or accent training some people think that pronunciation’s like actually accent training

1210  I had a German student once who came to me for a pronunciation lesson and he
wanted RP you know he wanted the Queens English and I was like I’m not going to
I’m Australian I’m not going to teach you Queens English=

T: yeah

M: =and but just had a totally different idea of what pronunciation should be=

T: mmm

M: =rather than it just sort of being correct speech=

T: yeah

M: =and making yourself understood=

T: yep

M: =and that sort of thing whereas other people have a genuine concern because they
ty... they want to say something and they’re aware that every time they say this word
that they’re misunderstood=

T: mm
M: =and someone understands it to be another word and it really frustrates them=

T: yeah

M: =why they can’t make the sound and sometimes they they’ll come they might come after class or something and ask you why they can’t make the sound and could you help them to try and work on it or something

L: sometimes they can’t hear the sound

M: yeah

L: [(inaudible)]

T: [well I think that’s the that’s the starting point of pronunciation isn’t it=]

SS: mmm

T: =ahm establishing whether in fact the learner can identify the sound and because often it’s because the phoneme which which isn’t a phoneme in that in their own language=

K: in their own language mmm
T: =you know the ah the l r distinction that we have that we think is so basic=

SS: mmm yeah

T: =and yet it’s not it’s not a phonemic distinction in lots of Asian language it’s it’s phonetically different but it’s not phonemically you know the difference=

SS: mmm yeah

T: =phoneme is if it’s significant phonemically different means it’s significantly different in other words it will make a difference to meaning if we get it mixed up ah but it doesn’t make a difference say in Thai to say aroyma or aloyma to the Thai Thai doesn’t see that as difference just a they just they can hear I’m sure they can hear a difference between the two but it’s not a it’s not it doesn’t affect meaning

B: it’s not a distinctive feature

T: yeah it’s not a distinctive feature mmm that’s right

E: I think anyway uhm for Australian society noone pronounces everything the same anyway like
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T: not only in Australian society anywhere

SS: mmm yeah

M: yeah Essex

E: I mean when I was just the other day I was in a preschool class and this man the this man had come into the class and was trying to teach this little boy how to say spaghetti and he’s going spa hetti and I he kept making this child repeat it exactly the same it didn’t sound like spaghetti at all and I thought you’re teaching him the wrong thing but you know it (wasn’t) to him but yeah it was just so but then I think to him he thought that everyone sounded liked that

T: yeah

E: I think lots of people say people always make fun of the way I pronounce things you know so

T: well there anyway these are the issues these these are the things that in the area of field of discourse that that’s the sorts of these are the sorts of things we’re going to have to include in our in our syllabus
R: just just on that another thing comes to mind is what about people with a learning
disability=

T: ohhh

R: =because I’ve I have had ESL children in my class oh not many but a few each year
and occasionally you’ll get one with a learning disability and it takes you a while to
catch on to that=

T: mmm

R: =because you don’t you know you you think it’s the language barrier but it’s not

T: mmm well it is [as well as yeah

R: [yeah yeah it is as well as but you know at first you don’t think that
but then it sort of=

T: yeah that’s right

R:= you know so that there could be some difficulty with a learning disability
but see there are personality variables too which you which are going to make a difference aren’t there I know we there was year after year after year when we first started doing this about eight or ten years ago there was this Vietnamese guy kept coming back=

((inaudible))

every time every time and time and time again and I reckon I reckon he was not understandable in Vietnamese=

yes

because he was a nervous sort of a guy he spoke very very very quickly and got everything jumbled up everything mixed up there was nothing we could do with that you know I mean who knows why he was like that ah but it wasn’t the sort of thing we weren’t going to make any difference to him there we just kept him calm um

((inaudible))

and he was happy he felt as though he was doing something he knew that there was but I I felt very bad about it I couldn’t really say to him look there’s nothing we
can do for you you’re a psychologically you’re a bit of a problem um or you’ve got
a problem we couldn’t say that

K: yeah but your friends might have

T: and he was coming along and we could see that he was frustrated and the teachers
were frustrated too

E: he’s not coming any more is he

T: you’ll find out guess who’s class he’s in but you’ll be kind and sympathetic

SS: ((inaudible))

T: yeah so that’s the same sort of thing you know=

R: yeah mmm

T: =we can’t do much about that and we’ve just got to we’ve got to have we can’t send
them send them away so but yeah okay that that’s field of discourse now what about
tenor of discourse
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K: well it’s basically you know how we were talking before about rank and status and
  gender and=

T: that’s right

K: =sex that sort of thing that’s going to come in under tenor at this point isn’t it ((2))

T: that’s right exactly yeah exactly if we start thinking about in any of the the I I I like the
  idea of of as a as a sort of a working principle basing things around tasks okay ((2))
  so it’s an easy it’s an easy way of analysing what it is people have got to do and if
  we can say okay they’ve got to do these sorts of tasks and if we can use task as our
  as our basic unit for ah for what it is we’re going teach or our not so much as basic
  unit but organising unit for what it is we’re going to teach then we can start
  analysing things in terms of contexts and participants and so on what are likely to
  be these issues that um ah that Kate’s just mentioned status

R: gender

T: yeah um gender that’s another one

R: age

T: age yeah
L: religion

T: all of these are important aren’t they and they all have an impact upon upon the choice of language that we’ll need to make to use to use language appropriately because that’s what tenor of discourse is all about isn’t it using language appropriately field of discourse that’s straight out ah representational meaning okay ((2)) that’s straight how what are the things that I need to say these are they ah this one is who I want to say them to and the fact that I’m going to be saying it to this person and under this circumstance has implications as to my language choices and ah and that’s where you’ll ah and what what aspects of language will come in there then no longer vocabulary is it although there is an element of vocabulary I suppose coming under that but basically we’ll be

M: formality and language [((inaudible))]

T: [yeah and how how does that get realised within the within English degrees of formality and ((inaudible))]

J: [register]

R: [social ((inaudible))]
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I: auxiliary ((inaudible))

T: yeah what do we call them those aux auxiliary

SS: modals ((inaudible))

J: [so modality

T: [modals modals so we’re in about on about modality aren’t we okay so that

that’s that’s the sort of thing we’ll be looking at there and I’m when I said before

we don’t need to worry about vocabulary that’s not right we do because they’re

they’re different ah degrees of formality that’s

K: in word choice

T: yeah in choice of words that we make and that that’s pretty important

J: so pron comes in there in a way in [terms of

T: [what
J: ah pronunciation comes in there=

T: pronunciation

J: = in terms of um ah intonation and you know the the tone=

T: yep

J: = tone of the language and

T: yeah and yep that’s right intonation patterns yeah

L: it’s also important to get them to sometimes body language the Japanese students come to me saying I need something and you you’ve got to you’ve got to try and ((inaudible)) it’s very important before they go out into the community if there’s something that’s very particular that’s very physical in their language you stop them from doing that as well

T: yeah

L: I mean the Italians doing ((inaudible)) all the time as well and they don’t understand you got to try and make them aware that that’s very particular to their culture=
T: yep yep mhmm

L: =and we the students here would not be new arrivals though ((3)) they’d probably be
more likely to have been here a little while wouldn’t they ((2))

T: [oh you get a variety ah you’ll get some of
them who are quite new

J: mmm

T: um and ah even though they’re even even those who aren’t new arrivals probably still
there’s these areas which they’re not very familiar with and they could they
could be real problem areas that they that have been causing them all sorts of
problems more serious problems perhaps than um than their bad grammar or their
ah choose choosing the wrong wrong ah vocabulary items ahm sometimes it’s this
at this area here which can which can really impede the way in which they’re
accepted

SS: mmm yeah

T: if they get this stuff wrong if they they’re seen as being you know I can tolerate their
bad grammar but I can’t tolerate their their being so impolite
SS: mmm yeah that’s right

T: um and that’s the that’s a that’s an important that’s an important issue and that’s where that’s this part here

J: do we ah do sort discourse markers comes in there a bit as well too you know

K: mm

T: that that actually comes in the in the next one I think [in the mode of discourse it tends to fit [in there

J: [oh okay

C: [(it could be) linguistic functions

T: functions

C: (linguistic) functions

T: yeah and this is this is the area of pragmatics yeah where you ah the way in which we realise certain functions how do we know such and such a thing is a request for example ah it sounds as though it’s something else you know aren’t you cold aren’t
you cold sounds as though it’s a request about ah not a request a an inquiry about your physical well-being but it could be a request to close the window couldn’t it

SS: yeah mmm

T: you can imagine a context where aren’t you cold really means please close the window um and ah anjd that’s again is in this sort of area here in the area of of of ah of of ah interpersonal [functions of language

L: sometime the language differences though when you ask a negative question sometimes in some countries you ask if you want to answer positively you answer negatively

K: mmm

T: oh that’s a that’s a headache yeah that’s a real headache and ah and um

L: picking that up

T: yeah um and I think we even as native speakers we sometimes have a bit of bit of difficulty with that I do um

L: you don’t want to go do you no I don’t can mean yes I do [or vice versa
T: [that’s right yeah]

K: didn’t you go did you not go yes I did not go means [((inaudible))]

SS: [((inaudible))]

T: [yeah yeah it’s a problem it’s a problem area]

J: linked in with that sort of question about modality isn’t there something to do with imperatives you know the use of the imperative

T: yeah that’s right yeah it’s that’s to do that’s to do with mood isn’t it

J: yeah

T: that’s the area of mood um mood and modality

L: some countries don’t say please either [some of our European]

J: [(exactly) right Scandinavians like my wife]
L: yes they’re just everything’s in imperative and for them it’s quite polite

T: yeah that’s right yeah

J: there’s no word for please in Danish there’s no word no

T: is that right

J: you have to say it in a very roundabout way (that)

T: yeah

K: is that so

J: yeah

T: you’re married to a Dane aren’t you

J: I know I speak Danish I know I know

L: maybe she just hasn’t told you the word (yet)

J: no no I really do speak Danish no the only thing=
T: please Jack

J: =the only thing you can say is um and it’s very rare for them to say that they can say

((Danish phrase)) and that means um will you be sweet and do that but imagine

saying that to your boss or something like that=

T: yeah

J: =will you be sweet and do that so this is there’s not a way to do it unless you say

((Danish phrase)) that’s possible

T: yeah well that’s right that’s the other one

J: but without please

T: mmmhmm yeah [or would you mind

L: [some

J: ah no

T: no that doesn’t happen in Danish
J: no no [((inaudible))]

T: [it certainly happens in English doesn’t it we’ve got [would you mind

R: [would you mind

J: [yeah but they think it’s too

they think you’ve they think that you’re pussy pussyfooting around the topic if you
do that you know what I mean ((2)) if you go into that really [((inaudible))

T: [well see that’s the

that’s the that’s you’ve just raised a very important issue there is ah is the the actual
ah illocutionary force of certain utterances you know that’s ah what they actually
mean what’s intended by them and ah=

J: mmm

T: =and the English are continually being misunderstood=

J: mm

T: =by northern Europeans=
J: sure

T: =who tend to be much more direct in ah in their choice of language and we then are perceived as being insincere and indirect=

K: [and imprecise yeah

T: = you can’t trust them=

SS: [yeah mm

J: [sort of

T: =whereas they get perceived by us as being just the opposite

J: sort of verbose or something like that yeah

T: no no we tend to see them as being impolite

J: yeah but I mean the the Danes would see us as=

R: unnecessarily verbose
J: sort of being a bit sort of verbose ((inaudible))

T: yeah exactly

K: [using too many words]

J: [waffling around the point yeah]

T: and of course the Asians then see us as being as being too direct

SS: mmm

T: um as ah as too direct to the extent of being of being impolite so we’re all we’re all in a beautiful situation here we’re all going to understand each other and ah and our whole lives thinking that people who come from any other culture

K: how rude

T: so they’re they’re the sorts of issues then that you that you are going to come come across and how do you get to that to that stage you do it by looking at what’s what sorts of uses do we do this particular student want to put the language to okay ((2)) what are the tasks the student will have to engage in what are the scenarios which
which exist within those tasks who are the participants and all of those sorts of things will then lead you to down to the pay-dirt if you like of what language in order to do this we’re going to have to teach and then the only one we haven’t haven’t touched on is ah mode of discourse=

J: [mmm

T: and here we’re looking at the way in which the language language operates ah to make meaning the language itself operates

E: Greg our assignment’s sorry our assignment’s a ten week plan yet we’re only doing eight weeks so we should write a different plan to ah

T: yeah I’m not too worried about that it’s just that the ten week was was ah was set as a as a sort of arbitrary figure

E: so you can use the plan that you do for your eight weeks ((2))

T: oh yeah

E: yep

T: absolutely yeah
J: [if you’re smart

T: [if you wish if you wish you don’t have to but if you wish you can you can use it you can use anything you like ah [provided

E: [just it’d be silly to do two

T: oh absolutely yeah

SS: mmm yes yeah

E: you know

T: the the the reality is of course that the important thing isn’t the plan itself so much as the rationale explaining why it is you’re going to you’re going to design this particular course and the way it’s designed okay ((2))

E: so then that means that if you’re working alongside someone their plan will be the same as you ((3))

T: could very well be
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E: their rationale will just be different ((inaudible)) ((3))

T: yeah that’s right yeah see this stuff we’re talking about now is the stuff that you’re going be writing in your um in your assignment this is the stuff which is going to say okay why did I put this in how did I organise this course why did I organise it in this way so all these issues that we’re talking about now that you’re going to put in there that’s that’s this stuff will go in your rationale okay ((2)) so mode of discourse here we are ah what what do we include under this what sorts of things are we going to include under mode

I: mode is the role language plays

T: that’s right

I: whether it’s written word or spoken form

T: okay alright so that’s the that’s the that’s the big division isn’t it

SS: yeah

T: how do you decide whether it’s um what what do you look at to decide whether it’s going to be spoken or written
K: do you look at the tasks that are being performed

T: exactly it goes right back doesn’t it to looking at looking at the tasks and the task is if you if it’s telephone conversation if that’s important

SS: mmm yes

T: then obviously it’s not written mode is it there may be some instances where there will be some writing goes on during a telephone conversation I can can you think of any time when you actually put pen to paper

J: oh when you’re taking notes taking notes

R: taking a message

T: [that’s right take a message

K: [taking a message yeah

SS: yeah mmm

SS: ((inaudible))
T: yeah see and that depends on the task doesn’t it it’s not that sort of that sort of telephone conversation will be a particular kind of telephone conversation it’ll it won’t be a won’t be a friendly chat it’s more likely to be much more transactional where somebody is ringing up to make an appointment so the task might be if you do decide it’s important make an appointment making an appointment and making an appointment in this case it’s going to be making an appointment over a telephone um and and you know we’re getting a particularly specific sort of a task there and the fact that it now this is a good example to take because it it does illustrate something important about mode because all of that is to do with mode isn’t it=

SS: mmm yeah

T: =ahm so tell me how how it is to do with mode what is there peculiar about that particular task in terms of mode

K: because you’re you’re listening and [you’re speaking

R: [you’re speaking and writing

T: yes mmm and those of you who’ve operated in a second language um are there aspects of um of telephone communication which makes it different=

J: [yeah sure
1782

1783  F: [oh yeah

1784

1785  T:=I mean make it more demanding

1786

1787  R: [it’s more difficult

1788

1789  K: [oh because it’s not face to face [do you mean [without seeing

1790

1791  T: [that that’s right that’s right [yeah exactly yeah

1792

1793  F: [((inaudible)) (ends quickly)

1794

1795  E : [((inaudible))

1796

1797  O: register or genre

1798

1799  T: sorry

1800

1801  O: genre or register right register or genre genre or

1802

1803  T: genre genre yeah

1804

80
1805  O: very hard to pronounce

1807  T: yeah that’s right ahm so there’s a whole lot of things there aren’t there that are that
1808    that’ll that are to do with with language=

1810  R: no body language

1812  T: =don’t worry about don’t worry about the content of what it is you’re saying we can
1813    have a whole lesson here focussing specifically just on the the ah the the mode of
1814    the discourse=

1816  J: mm

1818  T: =because it’s cause there’s certain characteristics which do present problems that put
1819    heavy demands on us if we’re learning another language and this is where you and
1820    this is why isn’t it for some of these things we will include some writing because
1821    because ah we’ll there’s a whole host of reasons why the written language does
1822    things differently and is used for certain purposes that the spoken language isn’t
1823    used for what’s one of the things that the that the written language does that the
1824    spoken language doesn’t why do you make notes

1826  K: to record
1828  R: to record
1829
1830  L: [so it lasts
1831
1832  T: [to record yeah well it’s going to be permanent isn’t it if you you you’re not supposed
to put bugs on the phone and so you can’t get permanent information that way
1834  unless you tell the person that you’re doing it ah so you’ve got to do it in the written
1835  form ahm so you know that then brings in that other mode of discourse that’s
1836  happening ah coincidentally with the spoken mode so it’s so it’s a complex one ahm
1837  what about your ah English for academic purposes course where do you find the
1838  modes getting getting mixed
1839
1840  K: in lectures
1841
1842  T: in lectures that’s right in lectures um ((inaudible))
1843
1844  C: so we have to deal with cohesion and coherence
1845
1846  T: you will but let’s let’s not race into that just yet let’s let’s keep on pursuing this one ah
1847  in lectures we’re going to find that there’ll be the spoken mode there’ll be listening
1848  (inaudible) and you’re going to being having to write at the same time ah and it’s a
1849  particular kind of writing there’ll be abbreviations there’ll be all sorts of things if
1850  it’s effective writing it could in fact be writing in your in the student’s first language
too I’ve sat down and watched Chinese and Japanese students taking lecture notes
and ah very often there’ll be a mixture=
K: =mmm yeah=
T: =of ah of English and Chinese characters and so on in those in those lectures notes
now [there’s a
E: [if you’re doing research if you’re doing research so you’re interviewing
people but you’re also [writing
T: [that’s a that’s another one that mixes up things doesn’t it that mixes up
modes yeah mmmm yep
R: flow charts and stuff
T: yeah then you’re getting a whole range of other things happening now aren’t you
you’re getting you’re getting other aspects where diagrams and and ah and those
sorts of things which are not strictly written language um yeah there’s a whole
range of these things that you’re going to get from from analysing what about ah
what about another common ahm activity that goes on in academic purposes the
seminar mmm seminar presentation ((inaudible)) if you the the sorts of things that
are that I in the studies that I’ve seen of overseas of international students one of the
things that they find most puzzling of all in certain international students anyway

with certain backgrounds is this business of seminars it’s a peculiar thing that we’re
not always sure ourselves what exactly constitutes a seminar um the ah what do you
see as constituting a seminar what do you see as being a typical sort of activity that
goes on in a seminar

J: it’s a student presentation

SS: ((inaudible))

T: okay so student presents ah and there we’ve got an interesting that’s that’s one whole
genre isn’t it=

J: mmm

T: =ah because we the student presents and what are they doing when they’re presenting

SS: speaking

K: and reading

T: they’re speaking but what have they done prior to that
SS: writing / ((inaudible))

T: they’ve done writing yeah they they’ve taken notes probably they’ve done writing there’s a whole range of things there in fact I’ve often said that that if to people who’ve been saying oh I’ve got this EAP course to teach on Saturday mornings what am I going to do

J: mmm

T: ahm not a bad idea to focus on a seminar presentation and say okay by the end of this five weeks or whatever it is ah you will do a presentation a seminar presentation and what we’re going to do in these five weeks leading up to that is prepare you for that presentation and you you’d be covering a tremendous amount of [academic

R: [could be a

powerpoint presentation

T: could be powerpoint yeah could be all of this stuff there’s all of the various modes there’s ah there’s it allows the person to actually ah perhaps even gear it towards their particular content area if they’re if a they’re economists then they can do a seminar presentation to do with economics and it’s quite legitimate to do that ah so there’s that happening but there’s also the group that aren’t doing the presentation but are still at the presentation you’ve got other members of the of the of the class
there and they’ve got other roles to play too so yeah it’s not a bad it’s not a bad sort of a way to organise and EAP course around seminar presentations because it is an area that ah that international students do find to be difficult and worrying and so you could be doing them a good a good service by helping them with that ahm so they’re the issues they’re the sorts of things of the one that Carl ah was talking about we’re down at the level now of of the of the way in which texts hang together and so we’re dealing here and of course we’re dealing here with discourse and we’re dealing with things like cohesion and coherence and the way in which these are produce that these are produced and that leads us to whole range of of ah of grammatical points that we that we can include in it all so all of that is going to be all of those sorts of things that we’ve just outlined briefly there are the sorts of things that you’re going to get by by engaging in this interview um but you noticed you get to them based upon inference you’re inferring all of that all of those objective needs by by going back to way in which the by going back to the data that you gathered in your interviews right and that’s we’ll stop there because it’s about time we had a break um but ah we’ve only just got on to the what it is we’re going teach now we’ve got to get on the how it is we’re going to go about teaching it and we’ll do that when we when we get back okay ((2))

END OF RECORDING
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T: okay alright in terms of ah in terms of needs analysis one of the important things that
ah has been coming up in our discussion although we haven’t formalised it yet is
this issue of proficiency and that’s the other thing we’re going to have work out
ahm next ah next Saturday the proficiency level of each of each student now what
ah what we’re going to use to do that is a scale called the it’s that these days is
called the ISLPR it used to be called the ASLPR it stands for international second
language proficiency rating scale that’s the ISLPR the ASLPR stood for the
Australian second language proficiency rating scale but basically it’s the same scale
and you can have one of these each take one and pass the others on now that one
you’ll notice that one’s copyright in 1985 or something there is a in the library
we’ve got the latest edition of it which is in the nineties late nineties um in your ah
in your ah study guide you’ll find there’s a section on the ISLPR in there ahm
which has a whole lot of information which you might you might read but what
we’ll do tonight is ah is go through this ahm this actual rating scale here you
haven’t got the rating scale itself in your ah in your study guide there should be
some there should be enough copies for everybody good has everyone got one now
(inaudible) you got a copy I’m the only one that hasn’t is there a spare copy out
there good have a look at the way it’s set out on the second page you’ll notice there
it lists ahm proficiencies in the on each page it’s got ratings and descriptions of
what these different levels of proficiencies might be all altogether there are five
broad headings I think you can probably get out of the dark can’t you five broad
headings ahm it goes from it goes from zero through to five zero is no language at
all five is native-like um
F: so is it used just in Australia or is it used in other countries as well

T: versions of well the ISLPR is used ah is used fairly widely throughout the world

F: okay

T: ahm one that is used very very normally commonly is the what’s called the IELTS

F: yeah I know that one yeah

T: yeah yeah we’re not going to use the IELTS because it’s too comp too complicated for us to use on a Saturday morning

F: oh okay

T: this one is ah this one’s nice and simple to use so that’s this is what we’re using this will serve our purpose ahm we we don’t want we don’t really need anything

anything all that precise for what we’re going to be doing=

F: okay
T: =on Saturday morning alright (2) um basically what’s what it’s doing on these in
    terms of proficiency is attempting to describe what sort of behaviour you should be
    able to expect people to be able to to engage in at different levels of proficiency and
    it’s worked out on ah ah in terms of listening speaking reading and writing okay
    ((2)) so somebody might be a level two on reading ah a level three on listening and
    so on and so every person has a profile if you’re a native speaker you’re by
    definition your profile is 5 5 5 5 okay ((2)) ah if you’re a non-native speaker but a a
    very good ahm non-native speaker of English then you probably will be 4+ some
    skills might be 5 ahm in there may be some skills you you you ah prefer above
    others and so you might find that ah students that have learnt English as a as a
    second language in a naturalistic sort of environment probably have high skills
    higher skills in listening and speaking than they do in reading and writing ahm
    that’s it depends upon how you were taught what sorts of skills were emphasised in
    the in whatever the program was when you learnt whatever language it is for
    example my case with French my reading and writing skills are better than my
    listening and speaking skills because I was taught using a grammar translation
    approach where we didn’t we didn’t actually speak any French and no the teacher
    didn’t know how to speak French=

SS: ((inaudible))
T: =the teacher the teacher was able to read it though and write it and and taught it and
we were and our examination was an examination which depended upon the written
language rather than the spoke spoken spoken language

I: same with with us

T: it’s similar to you guys yes

I: my cause my reading’s best I have passed the IELTS exam my reading is 8.5

Y: 8.5

I: yeah that’s pretty good

T: yeah that’s very good yeah

I: mmm

T: that’s on IELTS ((3))

I: yes
T: yeah yeah yeah I was looking there’s a student that’s coming out from China soon and
ah and she’s got ahm she’s got um not as good as you cause she’s got about 7.5 we
we require we require people in the who come into the masters program to be at 6.5
okay ((2)) that’s the that’s the entry level with no skill an average of 6.5 with no
skill lower than 6 I think it is and ah that’s that’s that should be adequate in terms of
language if you can reach those sorts of levels you should have an adequate
command of the language adequate to be able to cope with the academic demands
of the course um it’s the reasons that people people do badly or whatever in the in
the course is not so much to do with the language as that probably there are other
things as well cultural cultural things and so on and ah and you becoming integrated
with into a program all those sorts of things can be but everyone in this room for
example ah has proficiency high enough to cope with ah with the with this course
okay ((2)) um so what we’re trying to do when we um when we ah are trying to rate
somebody’s proficiency is we’re trying to match up behaviours that we’re
observing with the scale okay ((2)) to see if what the person that we’re interviewing
on Saturday in spoken language could be located somewhere on this scale right
((2)) and we get try and get as close as possible to that so what you’ve got to do is
make yourself very familiar with this scale by Saturday and ah and so that when
you sit down with your person you’re listening not just to what they’re saying ahm
not just the because you must that whole section that we’ve just done in that first
hour was was was dealing with that we were saying when you sit down with them
you’re finding out what they want to use the language for and that’ll give you that
that sort of detail but now what you’ve got to do something else concurrently with
that you’ve got to listen to their language not just what they’re saying but how they’re saying it and see if you can match them up on this scale here so what we’re hoping you’ll be able to do at the end when you’re when you fill in your form interview sheet you will end up with um a at end of it you’ll end up by giving them a rating now I should give you these now not much point in them sitting out on the front desk there

L: so Greg should we really mainly look at the speaking proficiency levels or

R: it’s all we’re going to have time to do isn’t it ((3))

T: well no I want you to give an estimate at the end of the day for listening speaking reading and writing okay ((2)) okay ((2)) at the end of the day an estimate on those

J: that assumes that you’re going to get them to do some reading ((2))

T: no no [no

R: just by talking to them ((2))

T: you’re not ah you’re going to you’re from what you from what they say about reading what they say they do and so you’re going to infer it their level okay ((2)) now that’s that’s fine it’ll it’ll be it’ll be reasonably it’ll be
accurate enough for our purposes okay (2) now this obviously obviously you’re if you sit down to do your interview and you have this whopping great scale here with you you’re going to be all the they’re going to say what’s happening why is this person interviewing me they seem to looking at this scale all the time no no you’re not that’s not what I want you do I want you to familiarise yourself with this scale before before Saturday and I’ve going to give you a shortcut

E: sorry can I just say also I the school I was at in London because we had so many non English speaking (inaudible) they actually did up ahm a couple of sheets the same thing but we just and we just each child we had to highlight and date just like the year two net a continuum like you’ve got here=

T: mhmm

E: =so I don’t know if I can find it amongst all my stuff but I don’t know if anyone’s interested

T: yep this might do the job for us

E: oh okay

T: okay (2)
158  E: I won’t worry ((inaudible))

160  T: can I just have one of these

162  K: so we’ll do one of these on each student=

164  T: yes

166  K: = that we’re interviewing ((3))

168  T: yes

170  J: we could actually just give it to them=

172  T: no no no

174  J: =if they knew how to use it

176  T: well you could

178  J: and then but then you’d be able to test them on their reading levels

180  T: but the problem might be the problem might be that they might not be able to read it
J: you’d be able to get their reading level [probably if you do that

T: [that’s the problem that’s the problem you’ve

got to remember this okay ((2))

O: do we have to do with the chinese learners do this

T: broadly broadly I think it’d be a good exercise for you to do it yeah yeah

J: there’s going to be a [lot of (inaudible)

T: [but yours are going to be down I imagine yours are going to be

down round about the one=

R: new beginners

T: =level one so it’s not a big deal with the Chinese and Japanese isn’t it Olivia

O: yeah

T: I wouldn’t imagine that they’d be much above one
O: yeah

T: okay

O: so do we have to do the English interviews with the Chinese learner

T: no you you you ah with I I’d say with the Chinese ones you sit down with them and you find out what it is they want to do in the language and you assume that they are very very low proficiency they’re beginners absolute beginners it’s more a it’s the people who are going to teach English who are going to have a bigger range and this becomes a more difficult but a very still a very easy task this is believe me a very easy task that you’re being asked to do okay ((2)) I’ll and I’ll explain why it’s an easy task

SS: ((inaudible))

T: you don’t think it’s an easy task ((2))

R: no I’ve never done this before

T: okay you want to hear why it’s an easy task for a start

I: yeah
T: yeah let’s do that for a start um do you think you’d be able to pick somebody who’s at level zero

SS: [yes mmhmm

R: [I think we’ll be able to do that

T: do you think you’d be able to pick someone that was level five

SS: yes yep

T: they’d be they’ll be a native speaker and you’ll have to say you shouldn’t be here here

here’s your twenty dollars back alright ((2)) so there the you don’t worry about

those ones so there there we’ve got rid already of two whole scales okay now ahm

the ah the people who are students who are in the university actually studying you

know by definition they’re at 3+ okay ((2)) at least 3+ otherwise they can’t come in

because 3+ equates to an IELTS of 6 alright ((2)) so 3+ that’s so anyone that’s a student we’re going to we we know that we we can we don’t even have to ah worry

about their proficiency um we can just say that they’re already 3+ they’re they’re

and if they don’t want to do EAP well and good but we’ve still got them they’re three three plus so you’ll find that they’ll be advanced in the advanced group
anyway okay so that gets rid of that whole so that then brings us down now to this this small number between 1 and 3 doesn’t it=

SS: yes yeah

T: =about 2+ one and three now do you think that you would be able to classify people somewhere that this one you might mightn’t be able to say with great accuracy that this one is a two plus or anything like that but do you think you could distinguish somebody that’s a one from a three have a look at the descriptors and I think you’ll you’ll suddenly get a surge of confidence okay ((2)) there’s no problem distinguishing a one from a three so basically all you’re doing is just the little ones on the on the borderline between two and a three between a one and a two or a one plus and a two okay ((2)) so as you’re talking to them you’re thinking now this person yeah you got you got you’ll have this with you see this is a much easier one than the big one this is what this is what they this this is the this is the one that you use for for self-assessing yourself if you’re studying French or Japanese or something like that but you can imagine how the person that you’re talking to could be assessed on the strength of this why I’m giving you this for the same reason as Erica was saying before it’s much simpler and you can can do this one and bearing in mind that you’re only worried about a small range of of of ah you know degrees here okay now and if you get it wrong if you said this person is a two and they’re really a one plus or a two and they’re really a two plus it doesn’t matter does it (inaudible) it doesn’t matter in the slightest ah they get into the class you put them
in them class we believe you when you bring these things along those ah sheets the interview sheets when you bring them along next Tuesday we’ll say yep Kate knows exactly what she’s talking and Kate says this one was a two this one’s a two and therefore this one belong and this one going on the other data you’ve got on that interview sheet this one wants language for this particular reasons okay we’ll group this one together with other people that are at that level and who also want language for that very same reason and they’re in the same group let’s call them ahm upper intermediate upper intermediate general English upper intermediate there we are ah come the next Saturday they come to the class and they sit down one of your colleagues has them in their class because they’ve they’ve drawn them as their (group) out of a lucky lucky dip that we’re going to have next ah next next ah Tuesday night so at the end of next Tuesday night you’ll have your class and you’ll know who the who the people are in it you get in there with them you sit down and you find that Kate was wrong ahm because you’ll either find that in one of two ways this person is far better than anybody else or this person’s far worse than anybody else what are you going to do go and stone Kate to death [no

K: [chop an arm off

T: no all we do is say oh look I’ve got a better class than this for you a much more appropriate class you come with me happens all the time that’s what happens in the normal English college anyway isn’t it people are getting moved all the time

14
L: that’s where personality comes in some students like to be the they’d rather stay and be the best person in the class rather than the worst=

T: yeah

L: =and others are the opposite they would rather be the bottom and be totally challenged=

T: yeah

L: =they don’t always want to go where [((inaudible))]

T: [no no and if they say if they scream and rant and rave and ((inaudible)) their fingernail marks all around the wall you say no no it’s okay you stay where you are]

L: you’re happy there

T: yeah that’s here we leave them and they can be happy in hell they can be king of hell so it’s not bad is it you know it’s it’s not difficult just treat it as it’s going to be fun because you’re going to sit down with these people and you’re going to make some nice friends on on a Saturday that’s who they are they’re nice friends they you’ll find that they’ll all be coming and they’ll all want to learn ah not one of them
will be there who doesn’t want to learn and ah you have something to give them ah
that they that nobody else can give them and ah they’re going to be appreciative of
it ahm so you’ll it’ll it’ll be fun so treat it that way you’re going to meet some
interesting people find out about them find out what they did and what their stories
are and ah that’s the way to approach it and you’re going to give them you’ve got
something to give between and between next Saturday and the following Saturday
you’ll have organised something for them to get them on their journey towards
some towards wherever they want to go so if you think of it like that then it’s gee
you should be paying for this you are aren’t you okay ((2)) so any do you think you
understand that yeah now as as you’re not going to give them a reading test or in a
way you are giving a bit of a reading test you can give them a bit of a reading test if
you like ahm but ah but no you won’t have enough time probably to do that you just
talk to them about about their reading habits do you read=

R: a newspaper

T: = the newspaper do you yeah do you know do you read books what sort of books do
you read in English ahm would you like to what what would you like to be able to
read as a result of this course and so on

J: so you you’re saying that we improvise on this ((3)) we expand this ((3))
T: oh yeah this is a checklist really isn’t it and ah and you’re not going to be tied anyone
got a spare one any spare interview sheets around you’re not going to be tied to that
let’s go through it and talk about what how how you’ll go about using this ahm first
one just get their name it says student to spell that they don’t fill this form in okay
((2)) you fill the form in and you ask them to spell their name spell it out loud
alright ahm and you write it down and that’ll tell you a lot about them because
they’re if they’re low level proficiency or even if they’re moderately high in
proficiency spelling is difficult in another language you’ve got to be able to you’ve
got to pronounce the letters ah and ah and their preferred name ahm you know as
you’ve seen in this class here we’ve got Lucy and ah we’ve got Isabel and we’ve
got Debbie and so on okay ((2)) so preferred name that’s what we’re talking about
there ahm address email and so on date of birth some people have said oh religion
oh I don’t know about that ah that’s up to you if you feel uncomfortable saying
what’s your religion or if you think it’s going to make them uncomfortable ahm
most of the mainland Chinese are going to say none and ahm that’s fair enough ah

L: do we if they’re a bit nervous do we just we do we tell them what we do with this sheet
after we’ve finished with it sometimes they might think it’s going to some
government =

SS: ((inaudible))
L: = ((inaudible)) if they do seem a bit nervous do we just say this is only for me for teaching and learning and then it’s destroyed

T: yeah absolutely yeah mmm I I don’t think we’ve generally we don’t generally find anybody worries they they understand I’ve I’ve told them when they’ve rung me up over the phone and they said what are we going to do on the on Saturday I say well on the Saturday all we’re going to do is we’re going to ah enrol you so we’re going to ask you some questions so that we’ll get you in the right classes and if they’ve yeah just reiterate that that point

L: some our Chinese we ran some free courses in Sydney and they in Chinatown in Sydney and quite often I don’t know whether they were just very suspicious but they would not give that kind of detail=

T: oh okay

L: = even a mobile number they were quite=

K: that’s just Sydney

L: =quite concerned we were going to pass on information somewhere

T: oh it’s don’t worry about that if that’s the case then that’s that’s fine yeah
K: in Sydney they’re all weird

T: we we’re not here to to worry them um the what we’ve found that ah is that um it can be quite valuable if you get a we’ve found that that when people for example you what you we’re going to be we’re going to have about two weeks and then Easter the and that’s part of a vacation period here there’s a week off so I think it’s altogether about two Saturdays they miss yeah now you get often get dropouts at that stage they oh it’s nice to sleep in on a Saturday morning not amongst the teachers ((inaudible)) it’s just the students we’ve found it’s been very helpful very effective if the teacher when that’s happened has rung them up and said oh we really missed you ah last Saturday did you forget it’s on and ah and then they come in if your class disappears then you got a problem because ah you’ve got to assessed on ah on this ahm in your teaching practice so so it’s well worthwhile for example having their phone number so you can get in contact with them or even email number if they’ve got it ah certainly there’s certainly some certainly the students are going to have email numbers it’s a good effective way of getting in contact with them um I think it’s best if you have a look at those questions and then if you if you need some explanation for any of them ask me ((inaudible)) okay let’s go through it and have a look now if you want me to explain something go ahead or if you want to make comments about any of them or if you think you’d like to see an additional bit of data included
L: Greg last time what what was the breakdown roughly between beginners and the more proficient like was it one quarter three quarters or [half and half]

T: [yeah there was a there was a very small beginners group very small beginners group and it was all around the intermediate level there was a there was a rather small advanced group okay ((2)) and the and the if you define try to define what you mean by advanced it depends on depends on what numbers you’ve got there ah because what we what we’ll try and do is just make sure that that each of you has round about the same number in your class and that simply means that we might have more intermediates intermediate classes alright ((2))

J: I think there’s there’s a question there=

T: yep

J: =that’s leading towards something that I was getting at in those questions I put on the on the discussion board=

T: yeah

J: =which is actually based on something that I I read in other voices by Ruth Wainjrab
431  T: aha mhmm

432

433  J: ahm and she she does a she’s got a very good in that book ah other voices she’s got a
434   very good article on a a girl she who she calls Katrin or something like that who
435   was a German speaker learning English in Australia=
436

437  T: mhmm

438

439  J: =and um ah there are some questionnaires for the students in it it’s a nice approach and
440   she gets at the idea of of learning styles=
441

442  T: mhmm

443

444  J: =you know finding out about learning stylkes by asking about what sort of activities
445   were common in the English class that in the English class that you were in that you
446   remember most vividly=
447

448  T: mhmm

449

450  J: =and then she’s there’s another question there that says um and you know which which
451   activities did you did you like which activities did you find beneficial and which
452   activities didn’t you find beneficial=
T: mhmm

J: =you know so kind of digging a little bit deeper into that area=

T: mhmm

J: =of prior study=

T: mhmm

J: =you know to try to get at um to try to dig up a little bit of information on the the students’ potential learning styles

T: alright yeah yeah if if people want to do that there’s there’s enough space there for you to to dig=

J: mm

T: =if you want to dig the more information the remember the more information we’ve got ah the better on on students and so a note there which in one of those places indicating something about what you think about their learning styles wouldn’t go astray
J: so I suppose if you put um student’s learning style there question question and then you
could just um oh I don’t know maybe put down one or two questions like that

T: um yeah or even maybe at the um right down the bottom on that page you got a lot of
room on that last page=

J: mm

T: =if you think there’s other additional information that might be helpful to who
remember that ah one of your colleagues will end up with the form=

J: right

T: =and it could be helpful for them in the way in which they organise their course

J: because otherwise you’d have to experiment on the first day you go in on the first day
and you don’t know=

T: mm

J: =if you’re dealing with somebody who’s=

T: exactly
J: =people who are really analytical

T: yeah

J: or what

T: yep

J: you might come in at quite the wrong angle

T: mhmm yep alright ((2))

M: how long do we spend with each student and then sort of do we say after that okay

T: the longer the better actually ah ahm you know except that if you’ve got if we’ve got a really big number of people there then it becomes the shorter the better

SS: yeah mmm okay

T: alright ((2)) ahm

F: so like ten minutes ((2)) fifteen ((2))
R: [you’ll tell us on Saturday ((3))]

T: well you’ll know [you’ll know]

R: [you’ll say fifteen minutes is enough ((2)) or [some you know ((2))]

T: [yeah well you know fifteen minutes is a is a good length of time to be talking to somebody ahm but you might you’ll probably find that you’ll take longer ahm but if you’ve got a if you’ve got ah hundreds of students there let’s say ahm then ah then you’re going to have we’ll probably then put you into different rooms around the place because we’ve got heaps of rooms booked for the for these courses um and then you’ll go off there and people will come follow you or go with you and then they’ll wait around and most this is normally happens is the first person you do you take a long time and ah everyone’s sort of ah mumbling and groaning in the background because they’re waiting to come in you get you tend to realise that as twelve o’clock comes around and you’ve still got still got ten people

R: who are waiting

T: yeah then you start speeding up
R: in the last ten minutes

T: yeah sometimes it gets down to that

G: could we be possibly later than twelve on Saturday

T: only if it’s only if you let that happen I think you want to try and try and pace yourself

so that you’re out of here by twelve because they’ll want to be out by twelve won’t

they

F: yeah they will

R: [so if we

G: [I mean if we know we’ve got a certain amount of students we just logically we can

divide the time=

T: you got it

G: = into segments and say okay well

J: it’s like like I mean six students at fifteen minutes you only that’s an hour and a half

and that’s it
T: yeah yep

R: so at the end you’re just going to say goodbye see you next week and they’re going to know to come back here (2) you’re not going to call them back in together (2)
or=

T: no

R: = you’re going to tell them that at the beginning (1)

T: what’ll happen what’ll happen this is this is what we’ll be doing um they’ll all come in here every single student comes in here at the beginning on Saturday ah I’ll welcome them introduce you people to them and give you a great build-up you know we’ve got you here at great expense and ah you know you’ve ah we’ve imported you you’re the top teachers in your own countries and all this sort of stuff got you in here

R: flown you in

T: flown them in flown you in introduce you all to them and um and then I’ll tell them about what’s expected of them what we’re going to do this is what’s going to happen today and after you after you’ve had your interview you’re free to go today
apart from Chinese and Japanese and ah and Arabic students who who’ll be off to
the room and you’ll probably want to want to give them a little lesson

Y: I I wonder about for how many ah learners will want to learn Chinese ((2))

N: and Japanese

R: [how many people in their class

T: [oh lots

Y: a lot of

T: there will be lots

I: [we have lots of teachers

Y: [oh so we will [((inaudible))

T: [and you’ve got lots of teachers

Y: so we will have um an interview for all these students who want to learn Chinese on

the coming Saturday ((2))
T: no no no no no the Chinese ones what you’ll do there is we’ll um we’ll put them
we’ll give you rooms and we’ll send the Chinese students to those rooms and you
guys can ah can make some sort of division amongst them=

I: including the ah

T: =you can do that easily=

Y: uh huh

T: = you can say who’s done no Chinese before okay ((2)) and when they that’s that’s the
beginners class and who’s got who’s done some at high school for example okay
((2)=

Y: but

T: =and how many of you are there one two three four five

Y: so ah that is we may I guess maybe also some of the learners some learners could have
an advanced level of in Chinese ((2))

T: mhmm maybe it’s never happened before but maybe
Y: I met one I met a guy last week who went to China for to learn Chinese for about two
over two years [I guess ah
T: [mhmm well he’s a rarity no he’ll be a rarity they’ll they’ll mainly
be they’ll mainly be beginners=

Y: uh huh

T: =now we may not be able to accommodate him=

Y: ahhh

T: =in which case he’s he gets his twenty dollars back and goes home alright

Y: so we just teach the beginners ((2))

T: the beginners and those slightly above beginners I would think (they’ll) come along
and see what’s happening anyway [and just

Y: [I’m just worried about what I should teach in
the first lesson ((3))
R: [she’s wants to know what to prepare for= 

T: [yeah

Y: [yeah some teaching materials ((2))

R: =I think should she prepare for beginners or [((inaudible))

T: [I no I think what you can do with them is you can you can have a talk to them and and ah and work something out in the class and that’ll be plenty do do something for begin do something for beginners generally assume they’re beginners but then um but then you can you can [modify it

Y: [some-

T: I beg you pardon

Y: to arouse their interest in learning Chinese

T: I think you’ll arouse their interest anyway=

SS: ((inaudible))
T: =no no you’ll be it’ll be fine you there’s no problem with with the Chinese the
Chinese group

Y: I think I think=

T: no problem

Y: =I think everything will be new to them they’ll enjoy it

T: eh

R: everything will be new to them they’ll enjoy it so

Y: yeah

T: see they’re what they value highly is the fact that they that we have all these
native speakers ahm and ah whether they’re advanced advanced doesn’t mean much
when it comes to a foreign language=

SS: mmm yeah
T: =it it’s it’s quite low you know it’s about level two on the ISLPR that’s advanced all
the rest are down zero minus one=

SS: ((inaudible))

T: =mmm so so you not going there’s they’re going to get a lot of value out of you
(you’re) simply the ((inaudible)) in that first don’t worry the first lesson isn’t a big
problem for you guys because you do you do have something to give them

I: because I haven’t taught Chinese before

T: you haven’t what have you taught

I: I teach I teach English in my country

T: teach it in the same way you teach Chinese teach you know whatever mhmm

B: (inaudible) last semester we asked them to complete this form=

T: mhmm

B: =ah but I don’t think we need this we need we don’t need to ask all the questions (on
this) page here ah last time we we interviewed them ah but this time I was thinking
that just to save time just distribute the form to the students this is for Arabic only
not for English courses=

T: mhmm

B: =and they will complete the fill that portion out themselves I think that is a good idea
to do to do it like that

T: yeah because you got a different reason for getting them to fill that form in you’re just
getting information from them we’re with the people who are doing English
teaching English they’re going to not just get the information but they’re also want
to gauge their English levels so it doesn’t matter much ah Bruce what you do with
that just get the information from them get them to fill it in if you like=

B: yeah okay

T: =it doesn’t matter same with you know same with Chinese and Japanese too but you
might find that ah that you get something out of actually sitting down with them and
actually talking and asking them questions=

B: mhmm

T: =ah so you might do a bit of both [with them
B: [yeah yeah I think so it’s important this is for needs analysis for the needs analysis]

T: yeah

O: so we have to come to the classroom at ten o’clock this Saturday ((3))

T: here

O: yeah here ((2))

T: yeah

R: before ten ((2))

O: before Saturday ah before ten o’clock ((2)) or (((inaudible))

L: [at ten to ten or [something like that]

T: [yeah be be here before ten yeah be here before ten and ah and then we’ll get them all in here and then we’ll um we’ll take out the Chinese take out the Japanese take out the ah the Arabic ah
class members and ah we’ll you’ll have rooms you’ll have your individual rooms
allocated to you in the and that’ll leave us just with the English ones alright ((2))

M: Greg will you bring the copies of this (((inaudible)))

T: [oh yes yeah no I’ll be bringing plenty of copies mhmm I’m going to be really optimistic

M: [yeah

SS: (((inaudible)))

T: you bring along these though okay ((2))

M: yeah

T: these and it’s not so important that bring along the ah the full full thing but you should
actually study that full full thing before before Saturday but just bring along this so
you’ve got it here with you so you can quickly check you just verify oh this person
looks like this level and I’ll bring you plenty copies of the of the interview sheet
alright ((2)) okay so anything else on there so make sure that you that you’ve that
for every student that you ah that you talk to that you fill in one of these and fill in
everything ahm you know I don’t want to we don’t want to come in here next
Tuesday and find some of these ISLPR ratings here seven if you you know you think you have no idea what level it is put a rating in anyway ah it’s bound to be it’s bound to be fairly close because that’s really what we need to have with us next next Tuesday alright now as you go through that you can probably see there are ah we we’ve we only talked before the break about the ah about the objective needs we didn’t get on to the subjective needs but you can probably see how some of these questions here will lead you to ah the subjective needs now there are two types of subjective needs there are those subjective needs which are going to determine how you teach the class that’s to do with learning styles and ah and learning strategies and all of that type of thing ahm personality variables and so on all of those will contribute to to how people learn learn the language but then there’s another aspect another thing just on subjective needs which lead to language specification too and that’s ahm and that’s where they talk about what sorts of things they like to do and there’s a lot of those in here too alright (2) ahm you so you’ll that will be lead you to being able to come up with activities but also also topics this is especially important for ah people who are like the Chinese and the Japanese and the also people teaching Arabic teaching that sort of information where you don’t necessarily have a great deal of of things in the community that your students are going to do not nowhere to the extent that people who are studying English have things in the community that they need to do things that they need to do in their in their academic purpose courses and so on so what you what they you might find from them is that they they like sport or they like fashion or they like this or they like that they’re very much subjective needs they’re not the big important objective
needs that you get when people say oh I I really need to to talk to the doctor I
need to know how to describe health problems I’ve got with the doctor and this sort
of thing ahm whereas that’s not the sort of thing that you’re going to find people are
going to ask you about if you’re teaching Chinese in Australia ahm they’re more
likely to say oh I I I like things to do with Chinese art or I like Chinese history and I
like and that helps you then you can include make sure you include topics like that
in your ah in your in your class and that’ll really help obviously with motivation
okay ((2)) I like Chinese food ah=

SS: ((inaudible))

T: =don’t underestimate the importance of food when it comes to teaching language it’s
very important music is another one all of these sorts of things are things that you
can have in your in your in your course ahm that doesn’t mean to say that you you
people who are teaching English don’t can’t have them you can have them too in
fact it’s ah there’s some really interesting things that are with with food that you can
do ah if you if you believe that it’s important that ahm that the learners integrate
themselves into the into the community ahm I’ve seen some really good lessons
where the students actually love what they’re doing um on based around found ah
where the teacher the the ESL teacher has encouraged the learners to bring
along recipes in English so their own (yeah) ah the the stuff that that comes from
comes from their culture
M: you can make yourself a nice recipe book that way

T: yeah exactly and it and you’re going to have the bulk of the people who who you’ll be teaching will be will be women there’s no doubt about that that’s and it and it’ll be very strange if it’s not ahm and ah and it’s just as you’ve said they there’ve there’ve been one of the outputs of ah of some of these classes has been just that and they’ve exchanged recipes you know the you might have somebody from from Africa somebody from China somebody from Japan somebody from wherever and they all bring in their recipes and sometimes they’ve actually not only written them out but they’ve actually brought them along and and demonstrated=

K: lunch on Saturday

T: =and we’ve had lunch=

SS: ((inaudible))

T: =and I just make sure that I’m along to ah to that that day to ah to to check your teaching okay ah so there yeah that’s they’re all that’s this is why I say you’re going to have fun this is going to be great fun you’ll enjoy this alright ((2)) okay so anything else that you want to know about the what’s happening on Saturday
B: yeah I think that I’d like what to know what the classrooms what equipments will be available in the classroom

T: ah now that varies as you know ahm now standard equipment is standard equipment television and [ah

B: with a video

T: with a video yeah video and ah overhead projector and that’s about all we can guarantee

B: I see

T: in every all the tutorial rooms will have that will have those two things some of them have provision like this one for powerpoint ah video ah we can also so do the others ah but computer yeah that covers powerpoint ahm audio audiotapes ahm DVDs CDs ah but not many have all of those things in them

K: and there’s whiteboards in every room aren’t there ((2))

T: there’s whiteboards in every room yep mhmm yeah

L: with markers ((2))
T: not not not with markers no

F: [not ones that work

SS: [((inaudible))

T: yeah

J: when you when you said there’s TVs in every room

T: there’s TVs

J: TVs with a video player=

T: with a video yeah

J: = and and DVD player ((2)) or not

T: no no there’s not necessarily DVD mhmm

J: okay
T: okay ((2))

J: it’s getting harder to get stuff on video

T: I know I know I know ahm the ah but ah yeah it hasn’t DVDs haven’t arrived in every room yet video videos have anything else ((2))

J: so if we wanted to play a tape ah we’d have to bring along our own equipment ((2)) a CD ((2)) we’ve have to bring a CD player along ((2))

T: you would yeah

L: do you have whiteboard erasers Greg [in rooms or

T: [some some rooms have them ah this one doesn’t seem to have one tonight oh yes it I think there’s a big trade in these things they seem to disappear people people may be eating them

K: chux will do

T: chuck what

K: you can just [bring a chux can’t you
R: [bring your own a chux cloth]

SS: [((inaudible))]

T: oh paper yeah well I think it’s important then if we if you have don’t have any any further questions that you hear from the very mouths of the people who invented the ISLPR ah what it’s all about and we’ve got this’ll ((inaudible)) take us right up til the til the end ((starts video recording)) can you see that

K: not really

T: no ((inaudible))

SS: ((inaudible))

T: no over here

SS: ((inaudible)) /still can’t see

T: I think we’ll throw everything in today no no good

SS/T: ((inaudible))
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