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ABSTRACT

As universities have come to depend increasingly on international, non-native English-speaking graduate students to teach many of the undergraduate courses, they have created International Teaching Assistant (ITA) programs in order to provide ITAs with the cultural, pedagogical, and linguistic skills needed to instruct in an American university setting. While research has contributed much to the discovery of linguistic factors affecting ITA effectiveness and has argued for greater attention to pedagogy and cultural training in ITA courses, few studies have investigated what the development of these pedagogical skills actually looks like in training, or traced the changes ITAs make in order to become more recognizably teacher-like. This has left a rather large gap in the literature between the design phase of ITA training programs and their actual practices in the classroom.

This dissertation investigates what pedagogical skills one pre-service ITA develops in one particular practice during a semester-long training course. The practice of interest is the dialogic lecture, which is a particular kind of interactive lecture that seeks to engage or ‘dialogue with’ the students in discussion during class time. The corpus of analyzed data is comprised of four instances of one pre-service ITA’s participation in the practice of dialogic teaching for a total of 29 minutes of interaction collected over a period of 8 weeks. In the study, I utilize a framework of language socialization in tandem with a theoretically compatible framework of language use, interactional competence (IC). The IC framework is interested in the description of interactive practices and the resources individuals utilize to participate in them. Using primarily conversation analysis (CA), I investigate two components of the IC framework (i.e. action sequencing and participant frameworks) in order to capture the dynamic unfolding of the specific practice of the dialogic lecture, as well as how the patterns of participants’ participation in this practice changes over time.
The analysis of the component of action sequencing showed several changes in the ways the ITA structured and performed the sequences in the dialogic lecture. First, the ITA became more attentive to the importance of establishing and maintaining engagement and rapport with his students during both the opening and closing sections of the lecture through attention to verbal greetings, leave takings, eye contact, and body positioning. He also became more explicit in the discourse markers and announcements used to signal transitions between sections of the lecture, indicating increasing awareness of the importance of organizational markers to lecture clarity. Lastly, he showed an increasing repertoire of verbal leave taking phrases. In terms of development in participant frameworks, changes were found in the ITA’s orientation to the roles of teacher versus student three different areas: (1) increases in the use of classroom-specific language, (2) leave-taking practices, and (3) spatial and non-verbal orientation to the “teacher” space. These changes provide evidence of the ITA becoming more recognizably teacher-like over the course of the semester.

This study contributes to the literature in several areas. First, it presents evidence of how development can be traced longitudinally using CA, thereby expanding the methods of inquiry one can use to study learning. Second, it illustrates how we can expand the object of analysis of what is learned in terms of interactional resources. Third, it shows how using a framework of IC expands what we know about how identity is locally constructed and displayed in interaction. Finally, it informs ITA educators by demonstrating how institutional constraints can affect dialogicality and by adding interactional competence to the areas in which ITAs are evaluated, thus shifting the discourse from one of ITA “deficits” to one of ITAs as skilled interlocutors who manage the resources they do have with their interlocutors in dynamic ways.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 International Teaching Assistants (ITAs)

In the last 30 or so years, American universities have seen a boom in international undergraduate and graduate student enrollment, particularly in the fields of Math, Science, and Engineering. To give a sense of the magnitude of this change, let us consider the case of China. In 1978, only 50 Chinese students were reportedly enrolled in universities in the U.S. (Burn, 1980, p. 54; Long, 1996). In contrast, by the year 1991, almost 40,000 Chinese students were enrolled in American universities at some level (Mangan, 1992). At the same time, there began a decrease in the number of U.S. students pursuing advanced degrees, particularly in those fields witnessing an increase in foreign-born students. In the field of Mathematics, for example, the number of American students pursuing degrees dropped by almost 50% (R. M. Smith, Byrd, Nelson, Barrett, & Constantinides, 1992). These changes have had an enormous impact on the make-up of American institutions, as university departments have become increasingly dependent on international faculty and graduate students to teach undergraduate classes primarily made up of American students. While the likelihood of undergraduate students having most of their classes taught by non-native speakers of English is unlikely (R. M. Smith et al., 1992), depending on the university and the field of study, at one time or another students will probably come into contact with non-native speaking instructors in the classroom.

Although international graduate students who enroll in programs in the U.S. may be experts in their respective fields, many of them have had no experience with a Western or U.S. model of education, as well as little or no actual interaction with native or expert speakers.
enrolled in those universities. In addition to these factors, many of these international graduate students have had little or no pedagogical training, but are expected to teach from the moment they enter the American university (Shannon, Twale, & Moore, 1998). These factors have led to friction between ITAs, the undergraduate student body, and the university itself. As the university struggles to promote diversity and recognize the advantages of having international perspectives available to students by employing ITAs, they must also balance this with complaints made by native-speaking undergraduate students that the quality of their education suffers from the communication problems between them and the ITAs (Bailey, 1984b; Plakans, 1997; Rubin, 1992; Rubin & Smith, 1990).

For these reasons, as well as legislative mandate, many universities have created ITA training programs in order to provide ITAs with the cultural, pedagogical, and linguistic skills needed to instruct in an American university setting. Needs analyses of ITAs have reported that ITAs need to possess not only grammatical and pronunciation skills, but also discourse-level interactional skills, the ability to interact with students in colloquial language, and genre- and register-appropriate vocabulary use (Bailey, Pialorsi, & Zukowski/Faust, 1984; Myers, 1994). As such, many ITA training programs have taken a skills-based approach to preparing ITAs for the classroom, expanding their focus to three main categories: culture, pedagogy, and language (Barnes, Finger, Hoekje, & Ruffin, 1989; Boyd, 1989; Byrd, Constantinides, & Pennington, 1989; Stevens, 1989). However, the relationship of each of these factors to one another is less clear (Hoekje & Williams, 1992), and individual programs have put varying emphasis on each factor.

Early ITA researchers focused on pronunciation and linguistic “issues” as a means of treating the larger ITA “problem”. Within these areas, ITA pronunciation (Anderson-Hsieh, Johnson, & Koehler, 1992; Hinofotis & Bailey, 1981; Stevens, 1989; Tyler, Jefferies, & Davies, 1988), use of discourse markers in conversation (Hoekje & Williams, 1992; Rounds, 1987; Tyler,
1992; Tyler et al., 1988; Williams, 1992), and linguistic and extra-linguistic strategic competence (Douglas & Myers, 1989; Hockje & Williams, 1992) have all been discussed in the context of their influence on teaching effectiveness.

Although linguistic skills are no doubt important, researchers have problematized too much of a focus on linguistic skills and urged for increasing attention to culture and pedagogy as well (Althen, 1991). They have also stressed the importance of general teaching abilities on undergraduate satisfaction and the ways in which great teaching skills could compensate for weaker linguistic skills (Bailey, 1984a); however, researchers have warned against treating particular pedagogical styles as cultural universals. Althen (1991) writes that this perspective “…overlooks significant cultural differences in people's ideas about how problems should be approached and how thoughts should be sequenced in an explanation” (p. 353). In other words, Althen argues that the cultural differences between the models of education and cultural norms of the ITA’s home country and the U.S. could affect how the ITAs perform in the role of TA as well as how they are perceived by undergraduates. As such, researchers have stressed the importance of cultural and pedagogical training in the norms of the U.S. higher education system.

While the above areas of inquiry have contributed much to the discovery of linguistic factors affecting perceived ITA effectiveness and have successfully argued for greater attention to pedagogy and cultural training in ITA courses, few studies have investigated what the development of these pedagogical skills actually looks like in training, or traced the changes ITAs make in order to become more recognizably teacher-like. Therefore, very little is known not only about what kinds of skills ITAs develop, but also about which social roles are invoked during the socialization of ITAs and how orientation to those roles changes over time. This has left a rather large gap in the literature between the design phase of ITA training programs and their actual practices in the classroom.
1.2 Aims of the Study

My study attempts to contribute to the above-noted gaps in the literature by providing insight into what kinds of pedagogical skills are developed as pre-service ITAs are instructed in the practice of dialogic teaching while attempting to take on the role of ITA. Although the literature has often positioned ITAs as deficient communicators in which they are talked about with reference to “problems” with their competence, usually entailing discrete linguistic items involving pronunciation and/or grammar (Bailey, 1984b; Plakans, 1997; Rubin, 1992; Rubin & Smith, 1990), a central concept of the current study is the reconceptualization of language as a process rather than as a product (Firth & Wagner, 1997, 2007). Looking at the development of pedagogical skills from this perspective is important because it not only allows us to respecify what is developed in ITA classrooms in terms of interactional skills or repertoires; it also allows us to reposition ITAs not as deficient communicators, but as interactionally competent interlocutors who deftly manage their roles and the roles of others in particular practices with the resources they both already have as well as develop.

The practice of interest in the current study is the dialogic lecture, which is one type of academic lecture and is one of the most important pedagogical practices in university life. The academic lecture has been called, “the central ritual for a culture of learning” (Benson, 1994, as cited in Bamford, 2005, p. 123). Academic lectures come in many types of styles but, as Goffman (1981) writes, “Traditionally, a [academic] lecture has been considered an institutionalized extended holding of the floor in which one speaker imparts his view on a subject using a slightly impersonal style” (p. 165). The language of the academic lecture tends to be conversational in style, using colloquialisms, personal pronouns to acknowledge audience members, and especially direct engagement with the audience members themselves (Biber, 2006). It is this engagement with the audience that marks this style of academic lecture as an interactive one. The dialogic
lecture is a particular kind of interactive lecture in which the teacher tries to get the students involved in the lecture itself through questions-and-answers, debate, etc., and attempts to develop a rapport with the students (Bamford, 2005; Morell, 2004, 2007). Although the importance of the dialogic lecture to university life has been established, very little research has looked at the structure of the dialogic lecture or how the pedagogical skills needed to engage in this type of lecture are developed over time (see however Rendle-Short, 2006, for an extensive analysis of the ‘interactive’ nature of the monologic lecture). Given the centrality of the dialogic lecture in the daily activities of ITAs, as well its centrality in ITA training courses, it is important to understand what the development of the pedagogical skills to do dialogic teaching looks like over time.

Because of the central importance of language, culture, and pedagogy in the ITA training classroom, a language socialization perspective is a particularly powerful theoretical framework for investigating the development of pedagogical skills during training (He, 2004; Kasper, 2006). A language socialization framework, which will be described more fully in Chapter 2, describes how individuals are socialized through language to use language. This framework is particularly adept at describing how individuals, in this case pre-service ITAs, are socialized into the role of doing being an ITA in particular interactive practices through explicit pedagogy and language use, as well as by constructing this role dynamically through language.

While a language socialization framework is adept at describing how individuals learn, one of the main aims of this study is to illustrate how a framework of language socialization may be combined with a theoretically compatible framework of language use, such as interactional competence (IC), in order to articulate what is learned in particular interactive practices in terms of interactional resources rather than as only discrete linguistic items. This framework is aligned with a broadly socio-cognitive perspective that conceptualizes language as process rather than product (Firth & Wagner, 1997, 2007), and is interested in the description of interactive practices and the resources individuals utilize to participate in them (J. K. Hall, 1993b, 1995, 1999;
Nguyen, 2004; Young, 2000, 2003). The IC framework also uses conversation analysis (CA) as a methodological tool in order to capture the dynamic unfolding of these practices, as well as how the patterns of participants’ participation in these practices change over time. The use of CA to document learning and development has been highly contested within the literature (He, 2004; Kasper, 2006; Markee, 2007, 2008; Seedhouse, 2005); therefore, in this study my intention is also to speak to those researchers interested in the analytical ways development can be documented using CA, while also illustrating the limitations of such an approach.

1.3 Research Questions

In order to investigate what kinds of pedagogical skills develop, my study is guided by two main research questions:

1. How does one pre-service ITA (Xu) construct and engage in the practice of dialogic teaching during a semester-long ITA course, specifically in the areas of action sequencing and participant frameworks?
2. In what areas, if any, does Xu show evidence of development of pedagogical skills during the practice of dialogic teaching over the course of the semester?

By understanding what pedagogical skills one pre-service ITA develops in the dialogic lecture over time and how he displays his orientation to particular participants roles over time, hopefully we will be able to see areas in which ITA programs can be improved, as well as bring to the fore additional areas of competence, such as interactional competence, in which ITAs could be trained.
1.4 Organization of the Dissertation

The dissertation is organized as follows. In Chapter 2, I begin by reviewing the current literature on the pedagogical skills of ITAs. Then, I present the theoretical framework of language learning that I am using in my study, which is language socialization. Next, I present a framework of language use, interactional competence, which I utilize in tandem with a language socialization perspective on learning. In Chapter 3, I begin by describing the participants examined in the study, as well as data collection procedures. Then, I explain the methods used to identify the interactive practice of the dialogic lecture in the data and present the analytical procedures I used for each of the two components from the IC framework investigated (i.e. action sequencing and participant frameworks), and give examples of how the data were coded for each component analysis. In Chapter 4, I describe the sequential organization of the dialogic lecture and the different sequence types employed in each lecture. In Chapter 5, I look at the different sequence types identified in Chapter 4 and report on changes in Xu’s ordering of these sequences over time, as well as how these changes in sequencing index development of Xu’s pedagogical skills. In Chapter 6, I shift the discussion to a description of the different participant frameworks enacted in the dialogic lecture. I also describe changes in Xu’s orientation to these different frameworks and how these changes show development of becoming more recognizably teacher-like over time. Lastly, in Chapter 7, I begin by describing the contributions this dissertation makes to the study of language learning, particularly from a CA perspective, and ITA research in general. Afterwards, I address some limitations to the study, as well as some areas in which future research can address these limitations. Finally, I provide some possible implications of this study for future ITA research as well as curriculum design.
Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

In order to understand what pedagogical skills of ITAs are developed in interaction, I first outline what the literature has reported to date on the pedagogical skills of ITAs. Afterwards, I operationalize the terms learning and development as they are used in this study and the theoretical assumptions this study makes with regard to language learning. I begin by describing the theoretical framework of learning that I am using in this study, which is language socialization (LS), how it fits within a generally socio-cognitive perspective of second language learning (SLL), and the literature using an LS perspective.

After describing language socialization theory, I introduce the framework of language use that I am using in tandem with LS in the current study, which is interactional competence. In that section, I first describe the history of this framework, both theoretically and analytically, and then discuss each of the components of this framework, as well as how researchers have come to use this framework to investigate development.

2.1 The Pedagogy of ITAs

Research into the pedagogy of ITAs began for the most part after ITA programs had begun to be created (Bailey, 1982; Nelson, 1989). In order to keep up with the influx of international graduate students coming into the U.S., many of which were funded on teaching assistantships, universities and the individual departments therein created training programs to

---

1 I am using the term socio-cognitive as an umbrella term for perspectives on language learning that consider social context and interaction to be central to language learning, rather than peripheral. Other terms within the same perspective that have been used to describe this point of view are sociocultural (as a general term and not referring to Vygotsky’s theory of development) (2000), social-interactional (Firth & Wagner, 2007), social practice theory (Lave & Wenger, 1991).
accommodate the need to prepare ITAs for service (Syverson & Tice, 1993). However, as Rounds (1987), Nelson (1989), and Boyd (1989) have all pointed out, these early programs did not treat ITA programs as English for Specific Purposes (ESP) programs, tailoring the curriculum to the particular needs of ITAs; on the contrary, most ITA programs focused on general language skills and made assumptions that training in general language skills would be enough to transfer to different settings. As these training programs developed, researchers found that “trainees arrive with a good command of the lexical and semantic system of the language… a general competence in the language” (Shaw & Garate, 1984, p. 22).

In parallel with this discovery, needs analyses (Bailey et al., 1984; Chism, 1987) reported the unique linguistic and pedagogical challenges ITAs faced. The general finding was that ITAs needed practice and success “in the required role of [TA] rather than the development of language skills in general” (Hoekje & Williams, 1994, p. 14). This realization has spawned a plethora of studies into the types of pedagogical skills and language ITAs need to become effective teachers in universities.

The types of pedagogical skills ITAs need do not vary from the types of skills college teachers in general need, although the types of strategies used to train ITAs in these skills may vary. These skills fall into four categories: creating the right atmosphere, facilitating student understanding of the material, managing the classroom, and doing being the teacher (Axelson & Madden, 1994). These skills have also been shown in the literature to be highly correlated with teaching effectiveness (Halleck & Moder, 1995) and involve contexts beyond the classroom. As such, researchers have also begun to look at the pedagogical skills needed to lead lab sections and office hours as well (McChesney, 1994; Myers, 1994; Myers & Plakans, 1991; Tanner, 1991) and have discovered that while many of the skills needed to become an effective teacher in a lab session or in office hours are similar to those needed in a classroom lecture, certain skills are
more emphasized over others. In the following sections, I discuss the major findings in each of these four categories of pedagogical skills.

2.1.1 Creating the Right Atmosphere

Building rapport with students and creating a supportive, inclusive, and interactive environment have all been deemed crucial to creating the right atmosphere in the classroom (Axelson & Madden, 1994; Bailey, 1983, 1984a; McKeachie, 2002; Nelson, 1989; Rounds, 1987; Stevens, 1989). Researchers note the importance of eye contact, smiling, calling students by their first name, using humor, using informal or colloquial language, and providing encouragement to students. Bailey (1984a), for example, found that those ITAs who used more inclusive pronouns, such as ‘we’, ‘our’, ‘let’s’, and ‘us’, were rated as more interactive and successful by their students. These observations were later confirmed by Rounds (1987), who found that the usage of ‘we’ occurred approximately three times as often by those ITAs characterized as successful than those characterized as unsuccessful. However, Rounds (1987) is also quick to point out that, “we is an effect of interactive teaching but can hardly be used to cause it” (p. 650, italics in original). What is clear is that inclusive pronoun usage is one strategy ITAs can use to promote solidarity with their students in an interactive classroom.

Regarding encouragement, in McChesney’s (1994) study on the language of office hours, she found that it was important for both TAs and ITAs to provide encouragement and positive reinforcement to students because of the already face-threatening nature of office hours. McChesney videotaped fourteen native-speaking TAs and fourteen native-speaking professors in order to examine the speech of office hours. Although ITA discourse was not the focus of the study, the study’s major goal was “to assist ITAs in using nativelike speech behaviors in office
hours” (p. 134). McChesney argued that because students usually come to see TAs, and by extension ITAs, about problems with their work and/or understanding of the material, they are already in a vulnerable place.

Axelson and Madden (1994) also contend that encouragement and praise are important in the follow-up move of a teacher-initiated question and answer sequence. In their study, Axelson and Madden looked at videotapes of TAs and professors in order to categorize the different discourse moves of three major contexts in which ITAs interact: the classroom, office hours, and lab sessions. They found that encouragement and praise can soften the blow of students publicly getting an answer wrong.

In a different case study investigating the factors that contribute to the successful development of an ITA, Smith (1993) observed and interviewed one particular ITA over an extended period of time. During this time, Smith showed that by finding a way to converge the ITA’s personal goals with the institutional goals of his teaching assignment, the ITA was able to become better at this role. Among the strategies this ITA used, Smith reported that one of the successful things he did was that he “encouraged student discussion and opinion even though it was a technique that was culturally unfamiliar to him because he had seen a [successful] American faculty member use that strategy” (p. 156).

Like encouragement and positive feedback, the use of informal and colloquial language has also been shown to be an important part of ITAs creating the right atmosphere for students. In her study of 35 lab ITAs, Myers (1994) found that in lab environments in particular, the most successful ITAs were highly skilled in the use of informal and colloquial language because, “the lab setting, with its task-oriented, pragmatic, roll-up-your-sleeves atmosphere, especially
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2 The holding up of native speakers as the model for non-native-speaking TAs is problematic in that it conflates being a native speaker with having good teaching skills. However, this issue is much larger than can be adequately covered at this time.

3 Axelson and Madden did not specify how many videotapes they looked at in each category.

4 It is unclear from their study whether ITAs were observed under a larger category of TAs or whether only native-speaking TAs were observed.

5 While Smith describes her observations as ‘extended’ and implies the study as being longitudinal, she does not actually specify how long she observed the focal participant. She only mentions that collection began in January, 1991.
encourages an informal register and can challenge an ITA trying to communicate with students” (p. 88). The studies of Myers and Plakans (1991) and Axelson and Madden (1994) came to similar conclusions, arguing that in labs, “the TA has an intense need to adopt an appropriate, informal style to stay afloat” (Axelson & Madden, 1994, p. 161). For example, in their study characterizing the different discourse categories used in classrooms, office hours, and lab sessions, Axelson and Madden (1994) found that the students in the labs rarely used technical terms for the equipment and other objects in the lab. Given their argument that students mainly set the tone in lab sessions, the researchers reported that an ITA who was asked about a spatula that a student referred to as a “pooper scooper” was unable to understand and therefore answer the student’s question.

2.1.2 Facilitating Student Understanding of the Material

The organization of classroom lectures as a means of facilitating student learning is a major part of the pedagogy needed to be an effective teacher. Both TAs and ITAs need to present lectures clearly and in an organized manner by emphasizing keywords, using examples to illustrate points, chunking information into logical segments, providing transitional and framing statements to help students follow the lecture, and linking information in the lecture to past and future information to situate it for students (Axelson & Madden, 1994; Halleck & Moder, 1995; Hoekje & Williams, 1994; McKeachie, 2002; Nelson, 1989; Rounds, 1987). Additionally, it is recommended that ITAs use visuals, such as PowerPoint presentations, the blackboard, or handouts to improve clarity of the lectures, especially when used to echo what is being explained in the lecture (Hoekje & Williams, 1994; Rounds, 1987; Stevens, 1989).

Much attention has also been given to the types and ways in which both TAs and ITAs use questions in the classroom. Researchers note that both TAs and ITAs should be able to use
and respond to student questions effectively in order to guide student learning (Axelson & Madden, 1994; Rounds, 1994; Tanner, 1991). This means asking questions that expand the discussion, such as *how* or *why* questions, rather than only use evaluative, information-eliciting, or display questions (McChesney, 1994; McKeachie, 2002; Myers, 1994; Rounds, 1987; Tanner, 1991). Evaluative questions, for example, take on additional importance in lab sections (Myers, 1994) and in office hours (McChesney, 1994). Of the 35 lab ITAs that Myers (1994) observed, the most successful teachers were ones who circulated among the students and took an active role in getting students to think about what they were doing in the lab through questions. Although McChesney (1994) used native-speaking TAs and professors in her study, and not ITAs, she found that those TAs who used evaluative questions in office hours to break problems into more manageable steps were more successful.

### 2.1.3 Managing the Classroom

The skills teachers in general need to manage the classroom have been deemed important for ITAs to have as well, although compared to other categories of pedagogical skills, this category has been severely underexplored in the literature. Both Axelson and Madden (1994) and McKeachie (2002) have discussed the importance of both TAs and ITAs being able to manage particular classroom duties. The skills of managing the classroom involve the ability to open and close a lecture, make announcements in the class, and defer students’ questions to another time. Additionally, Axelson and Madden (1994) cited the need to be able to revise the teaching plan if running out of time. Finally, they briefly discussed the importance of managing student turn taking, although in their study they found the management of turn-taking to be a much more active endeavor during lab sessions than in classroom lectures due to the fact that students often compete for attention in labs, often regarding how to use lab equipment.
2.1.4 Doing Being the Teacher

A fourth category of pedagogical skills that encompasses the other three categories is the management of social roles through doing being the teacher. For example, Eble (1983) and Stevens (1989) talk about the need for teachers, including ITAs, to develop a “teacher presence”, which Stevens describes as, “bound up in dramatic energy – the mask of confidence and demeanor the instructor assumes as he faces his students” (1989, p. 189). Stevens’ (1989) study reports on a year-long observation of a group of ITAs training in a ‘dramatic approach’ to teaching, which focused on embodied actions and rapport building with students. These ITAs were initially tested for levels of intelligibility on the SPEAK, TEACH, and IDEA tests. They were then trained in this dramatic approach and finally re-tested for intelligibility at the end of the year using these same tests, along with evaluations by their students on the effectiveness of their teaching. The result of the study showed how an increasing attendance to teacher presence and the teacher “space” through gesture, facial expressions, body positioning, and proxemics, helped ITAs become more intelligible on post-training proficiency tests and were rated more highly by their students.

Researchers also note the delicacy negotiating social roles between the ITA and students given that the ITA is an authority figure as well as a student. Oftentimes, ITAs struggle with whether to position themselves as peers or authority figures with the students. Unger-Gallagher (1989) argued that the ITA needs to play the role of both teacher and student in order to be effective. Unger-Gallagher’s article is theoretical piece meant to draw attention to the complex roles that an ITA must negotiate while trying to helm an interactive classroom and while trying to explore the different personas taken on during this process. She illustrated how the metaphor of the teacher’s role in a traditional classroom is that of teacher as commander. In contrast, she argues that a more interactive and effective teacher uses the metaphor of teacher as conductor.
The goal of the conductor is to make interaction occur “more easily and fluidly” between individuals (Unger-Gallagher, 1989, p. 276). Using this metaphor as a model, the participant roles go beyond teacher and student. In this model, “a continuous and explicit re-definition and clarification or roles must occur” (Unger-Gallagher, 1989, p. 279). Unfortunately, Unger-Gallagher did not provide any evidence of how these roles are actually dynamically managed in interaction. What is clear, however, is that researchers agree that ITAs need practice doing being in the teacher role as an important part of the training process.

In an oft-cited study describing the different teaching styles of ITAs, Bailey (1984) introduced a typology of ITAs. Based on her earlier dissertation (1982), Bailey used survey and ethnographic data to investigate the factors involved in ITA effectiveness. Her findings into the ways in which ITAs interacted in the classroom allowed her to categorize them into five distinct types of ITAs. These have been labeled (1) the active unintelligible, (2) the mechanical problem solver, (3) the knowledgeable helper/casual friend, (4) the entertaining ally, and (5) the inspiring cheerleader. Bailey’s research indicated that the ITAs in categories 3-5 (i.e. knowledgeable helper/casual friend, entertaining ally, inspiring cheerleader) exhibited more interactive teaching techniques (e.g. use of inclusive pronouns, smiling, eye contact) and were consequently considered more effective ITAs by their students. The strength of this study lies not in the typology itself but in the evidence that particular pedagogical skills could be empirically linked to ITA effectiveness.

2.1.5 Development of Pedagogical Skills

While these studies have contributed much to what we know about ITA pedagogy, compared to the number of studies in the field of teacher education in general, they are still very few in number. Regarding ITA pedagogy specifically, there are very large gaps in the literature as
well. First, other than the present study and Reinhardt’s (2007) dissertation on the use of modal verbs in office hour simulations by pre-service ITAs, there are no studies on the pedagogy of ITAs during training nor on the development of ITAs’ pedagogical skills. While Myer’s (1994) study included ITAs who were taking an ITA training class concurrently with their teaching duties, the discourse during the training course was not the focus of the study, nor were the ITAs oriented to as trainees. The focus of Myers’ (1994) study was on the performance of the ITAs during their regular duties as lab assistants and they were oriented to as such. Additionally, although much of the focus in the ITA literature has been on what the types of skills ITAs need to teach effectively, none of these studies have investigated what skills actually develop during training or how these skills are displayed in interaction. My study contributes to this large gap in the literature by looking at what kinds of pedagogical skills one pre-service ITA develops in order to teach dialogically during an ITA course. In the next section, I describe the theoretical framework of language learning I am using in the current study, which is language socialization theory, with reference to additional theoretical frameworks that also fall into the category of socio-cognitive approaches to language learning.

2.2 Language Socialization

Language socialization (LS) is a theoretical framework for understanding the relationship between language, culture, and society. In general, socialization “...is the process through which a child or other novice acquires the knowledge, orientations, and practices that enable him or her to participate effectively and appropriately in the social life of a particular community” (Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002, p. 339). There are two primary and inseparable parts of the language socialization process: socialization through the use of language and socialization to use language. These parts are based on two primary assumptions about the nature of language, culture, and
socialization in this framework. First, language learning is intimately tied to the process of becoming a competent member of society, and second, the primary way in which this competence is realized is through language.

The LS framework falls within a generally socio-cognitive approach to language learning, which includes the complementary frameworks of sociocultural theory (SCT) (Lantolf, 2000; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Vygotsky, 1978) and situated learning theory (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Socio-cognitive approaches to learning stand in contrast to what have been considered “mainstream” approaches to second language learning (SLL) (Atkinson, 2002; Firth & Wagner, 1997, 2007). One of the most mainstream approaches is that of the Interaction Hypothesis. The Interaction Hypothesis, which was conceived by Long (1983, 1996), and later extended by the work of Swain and the Output Hypothesis (1985, 1995) postulated that through negotiating meaning in interaction, nonnative speakers (NNS) are better able to comprehend the target language, see where there are gaps in their own interlanguage, and then test their own hypotheses about the target language through the production of output. In this perspective, then, it is assumed that the conditions for SLL are enhanced by having L2 learners negotiate meaning with other speakers, native or otherwise. “Negotiation for meaning, and especially negotiation work that triggers interactional adjustments by the NS or more competent interlocutor, facilitate acquisition because it connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways” (Long, 1996, pp. 451-452).

A socio-cognitive approach to language learning (Atkinson, 2002; Firth & Wagner, 1997, 2007) also considers interaction to be central to the learning process, although in different ways than the Interaction Hypothesis. Socio-cognitive theories of language learning do not consider the role of interaction primarily to enhance learning. On the contrary, in socio-cognitive theories the
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8 The field of second language learning has often been referred to as second language acquisition, or SLA. While I recognize that the potential distinctions between learning and acquisition are contentious within the field of SLL, for the purpose of this paper I will use the term learning rather than acquisition.
context of the interaction itself, including the activity being done in the interaction, is considered
to be central to the language learning process. I choose to use the term activity rather than task
because “task” (as Coughlan and Duff [(1994)] use the term) refers to a “behavioral blue print’
that researchers employ to elicit linguistic data. An ‘activity’, however, describes what
individuals and groups actually do while engaged in some communicative process” (Lantolf &
Thorne, 2006, p. 251). In this approach, “Learning is an inseparable part of ongoing activities and
therefore situated in social practice and social interaction. In this sense, learning builds on joint
actions and as a part of a joint action it is publicly displayed and accomplished” (Firth & Wagner,
2007, p. 807). It is from this set of assumptions about the intimate ties between social context,
interaction, and learning that language socialization research emerged.

Language socialization research began in the 1970s in reaction to what was thought to be
narrowness in perspective in first language acquisition and child development research, and a
recognition that language learning and enculturation are part of the same process (Watson-Gegeo,
1992). It is argued that socialization begins from the moment of birth and that even the vocal, pre-
verbal, and verbal interactions between infants and adults have a hand in both socializing the
adult, as well as the infant, into the social roles and structures in place, illustrating the bi-
directionality of language socialization. For example, Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) have argued
that infants take part in socializing those around them into such social roles as caregiver, sibling,
or mother, depending on the context.

There are several tenets that are central to a language socialization perspective. One is
that socialization in general is an interactive process (Ochs, 1986; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1994;
Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). As such, language learning and enculturation are considered part of
the same process, and language learners are considered to be active agents in both processes
(Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986; Watson-Gegeo, 2004). This view was highly influenced by the work
of Hymes (1972) on communicative competence and Gumperz (1982), and acted in contrast to
the work of Parsons (1937) and Merton (1949), who argued for a more passive view of individuals in which they ingest social values and internalize them. LS research also falls more on the side of symbolic interactionism (Mead, 1956) in viewing the individual as an active agent in shaping themselves and the world. In this view, “Individuals do not automatically internalize how others see them and the rest of the world but rather have the capacity to select images and perspectives. In this sense, individuals and society construct one another through social interaction” (Ochs, 1986, p. 1). An example of how learner agency actively shapes the socialization process can be viewed in Morita’s (2000) study of the socialization of graduate students into the academic practice of Oral Academic Presentations (OAPs). Even though the instructors both modeled and gave explicit instructions on how to do the OAPs, some students still introduced variations on the styles presented. When one student was interviewed on the reasons for his variations, he explained that his use of variations in the OAPs was in reaction to what he perceived as “the theory-oriented discourse of the university, which he felt placed limited value on his expertise and experience as a school teacher” (Morita, 2000, p. 304).

Tied to the first tenet of LS research, a second major tenet also describes how language itself is not neutral, but carries social meanings. Thus, by studying language use, LS researchers can uncover the values and belief systems tied to a particular group. As Watson-Gegeo (2004) writes, “There is no context-free language learning, and all communicative contexts involve social, cultural, and political dimensions that affect which linguistic forms are available or taught and how they are represented” (p. 340). While other socially-informed research traditions are also interested in identifying the structural organization of linguistic events, LS research attempts to differentiate itself from these traditions, such as developmental pragmatics, by attempting to identify the ideological meaning that underpins every interaction and “how communicative practices of experts and novices are organized by and organize cultural knowledges, understandings, beliefs, and feelings” (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1996, p. 255).
A third fundamental tenet of LS research, which is also consistent with socio-cognitive frames of thinking and has been influenced by the ethnomethodological tradition, is the idea that most cultural knowledge is implied and viewable in the recurrent actions and routines of daily life rather than explicitly spoken about. Therefore, LS researchers often focus closely on routines and repeated actions of individuals. Peters and Boggs (1986) define interactional routine as “a sequence of exchanges in which one speaker’s utterance, by appropriate nonverbal behavior, calls forth one of a limited set of responses by one or more other participants” (p. 81). Experts maintain that repeated exposure to the language practices deemed important to the members of a particular community is the primary way individuals are socialized to become competent members of society (Ochs, 1993; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1996, 1986; Watson-Gegeo, 2004).

This focus on routinization is how a language socialization framework describes the mechanism of development. Through repeated practice in the social practices deemed important to the members of the community, children and other novices become socialized into those practices. Along with repetition, with guided instruction and observations of the practice being socialized into, the novice would develop by “…integrating code knowledge with sociocultural knowledge” (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2001, p. 289). It is this focus on routinization that sets LS theory apart from other sociocognitive frameworks of learning, such as sociocultural theory. While SCT does not necessarily deny the role of routinization in development, it is not considered to be the central factor in development as it is in language socialization.

**2.2.1 L2 Socialization**

While language socialization research emerged originally as a theory of child first language acquisition, there has been an increasing amount of studies done on L2 socialization. L2 socialization research focuses on the many of same issues as L1 socialization research, namely
how novices attempt to gain membership into different communities of practice through apprenticeship to use language and through language. What is unique to L2 socialization research is that (1) much of the L2 socialization research investigates adult learners, who have already undergone primary socialization in their native and potentially other languages, and (2) the implicit and explicit norms of interaction in the L2 may be conflicting with the cultural norms of the L1. Therefore, the negotiation of social roles becomes even more intensified as individuals attempt to straddle multiple languacultures (Agar, 1994).

As He (2003) writes, “in our analysis, it is sometimes not easy to tease apart that which is culture-specific from that which is classroom-specific...” in her discussion of the difficulties of LS research in the Chinese heritage classroom (p. 142). Nevertheless, LS researchers have made many discoveries, especially in the last ten to fifteen years, with regard to L2 socialization practices. Although more studies of L2 socialization in workplace and community settings are starting to emerge, along with additional calls from the field to delve into these domains (Brouwer & Wagner, 2004; He, 2003; Watson-Gegeo, 2004), the bulk of L2 socialization research still centers around the classroom. Pallotti (1996), for example, reported on a year-long ethnographic study that traces how a Moroccan child’s interlanguage development was linked to their interactional environment when learning Italian in nursery school. Pallotti made several interesting observations corroborating Platt’s (1986) own observations regarding children’s acquisition of linguistic items based on functionality. In the first month of schooling, Pallotti’s student acquired almost no nouns but instead relied on deictic referents like ‘this’ and ‘that’ in interaction. Pallotti attributed this to the fact that within the walls of the nursery, most objects and individuals being talked about were within the immediate physical context and therefore a deictic marker functioned quite well for reference. However, many adjectives or evaluative words were acquired within the same period of time. Pallotti argued that this can be explained, in conjunction with the paucity of nouns learned, because pointing and using deictics to differentiate most nouns
in the immediate vicinity is sufficient but concepts like ‘good’, ‘bad’, or ‘mine’ are not able to be differentiated by pointing. This study makes an important contribution to L2 socialization research in that it highlights the role interactional strategies play in linguistic development, a result also found by Kanagy (1999) in her study of kindergarteners’ usage of interactional routines as socialization mechanism in a Japanese immersion classroom.

Within a secondary school environment, He (2003) used Goffman’s (1981) concept of footing to investigate how students’ roles in the classroom were negotiated with the instructor and enacted in a Chinese heritage classroom. She found that a “competent” student in this type of setting was one who is “flexible with the shifting and/or multiple speech roles that s/he is expected to assume, and who is adaptable to the responsibilities and obligations associated with these roles” (p. 142). These findings embody the first tenet of LS research that language is an interactive process and individuals are active agents in this process. These results suggest an unsurprisingly dynamic classroom environment in which “the socialization functions...entail practice in talking collaboratively and cooperatively, exploiting the metaphorical function of speakership, appropriating or relinquishing authorship, withholding talk on a given moment, and listening between the lines and responding accordingly” (He, 2003, p. 142). Additional studies, such as Duff’s (1995) well-known work in Hungarian dual-language classrooms, also highlights the bi-directionality of language socialization in that, as students and instructors faced the educational changes taking place in post-Cold War Hungary, establishing the rules for interactive practices in the dual-language classrooms became a joint process in which both the instructor and students acted as socializers as well as socializees.

This negotiation of social roles has also played a major role in Rymes’ (1997) research in which she looked at the non-instructional discourse between NS and NNS of Spanish at a high school in Los Angeles. Focusing on the interactions between students and the interactions between students and school staff, Rymes uncovered a number of interactional routines that can
affect SLA, as well as routines that may suppress the usage of the L2 in those environments. She found that NNS of Spanish devised routines for displaying their knowledge of Spanish, but did not encourage its use for communicative purposes. By the same token, NS of Spanish were positioned in the role of “approving teacher” to recognize the NNS displays of Spanish usage. However, these NS did not engage with the NNS in Spanish during any communicative tasks. Lam (2004), in an uncharacteristic study of L2 socialization in a computer-mediated environment, also showed how two teenage Chinese immigrants in the U.S. were able to use a hybrid of English and Cantonese to develop a “collective ethnic identity” that let the subjects take on a new hybrid identity apart from either English-speaking Americans and Cantonese-speaking Chinese in their local contexts (p. 44).

Unlike the research in secondary schools, most of the work undertaken at the university level has focused more often on the interactional routines and practices used in socializing to use language. Ohta (1999), for example, examined how the use of interactional routines affected expressions of alignment between students and their instructor in a Japanese as a foreign language classroom. Ohta showed that one learner who was explicitly taught to use particular expressions of alignment in class and routinely practiced using these expressions with a classmate was able to use the alignment forms correctly and frequently in interaction. Hellermann (2006) also presented a microethnography of two adult ESL learners’ socialization into classroom literacy practices, thereby adding to other studies of L1 language socialization into literacy practices (Duranti, Ochs, & Ta’ase, 1995; Heath, 1983; Ochs, 1988). Hellermann looked at three particular classroom literacy practices (i.e. book selection, opening post-reading re-tellings, and completing and filing reading logs) and showed how the trajectories of becoming more interactionally competent in these three practices differed, which he attributed to the different ways each participant chose to participate in each practice. Morita (2000) additionally looked at a one specific interactional practice, oral academic presentations (OAPs), in her study of both NS and NNS graduate students.
in a TESL program. She looked specifically at how students were socialized into using the appropriate discourse to perform these OAPs and discovered that socialization into this practice, and the roles of expert and novice, were dynamically negotiated and bi-directional.

Rather than examine the explicit instructions a cultural expert made in how to use language, Poole (1992) was interested in the implicit cultural meanings conveyed by an expert during socialization through language use. Poole (1992) looked at an ESL course at an American university to see what kinds of cultural messages the instructor was giving her students through classroom interactions. In this study, she focused on how the asymmetric power relations were managed interactionally by the teacher and students. One of her major findings was that there was a tendency for the teacher to avoid overt displays of asymmetry in the classroom, a finding that has been noted for other contexts involving middle-class American experts and caregivers (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1994). These tendencies were achieved interactionally through false starts, pauses, and fillers during opening sequences, ease of praise giving, and the absence of stress markers during closing sequences.

In 2004, Watson-Gegeo proposed a paradigm shift in SLA that would embrace the values and tenets of language socialization research. In that article, Watson-Gegeo echoed many of the same arguments put forth by Firth and Wagner (1997) and other researchers working within a socio-cognitive perspective by calling for SLA researchers to “…make [SLA research] more relevant to learners’ actual experience” (Firth & Wagner, 2007; 2004, p. 342). As Watson-Gegeo argued, “[We need to focus] our attention on how learners are brought into or excluded from various activities that shape language learning” (Watson-Gegeo, 2004, p. 342). What the studies described above show is that a language socialization approach can lend insight into language acquisition beyond concepts of input and output and through embracement of the complicated, and sometimes messy, socio-political motivations and contexts surrounding socialization into a new community of practice. The issues brought to the fore in language socialization research also
“...have critical importance for linguistic minorities and immigrants, who often face social and political hostility or exclusion and may react to that exclusion with resistance” (Watson-Gegeo, 2004, p. 342). In the case of ITAs, this is especially true because they are expected to be both excellent instructors as well as speak near flawless English, and are often met with an unsympathetic and resistant audience if they are not both. However, very few studies have taken a language socialization approach to looking at ITA training and the interactional practices afforded them during this training.

2.2.2 Summary

In sum, language socialization is a theory of language learning that maintains that learning is primarily a social process, and is interested in how we socialize individuals into linguistic and cultural practices, primarily through the use of language. As a theory, LS describes the mechanism for development through explicit instruction and repeated practice in social practices. Additionally, LS researchers note the importance of learner agency in this process and, especially in L2 socialization, the sometimes-conflicting role the cultural and linguistic norms the L1 can play in the process. While an LS perspective can shed light on how we learn, it often describes what is learned as “code knowledge”. As such, using a framework of interactional competence in tandem with the theoretical framework of language socialization is particularly complementary and fruitful as a way to look at what is developed in the ITA classroom in terms of interactional resources rather than discrete linguistic items. This framework, its central tenets, and approach to language use and learning are reviewed in the following section.
2.3 Interactional Competence

Interactional competence (IC) is a framework of language use that is designed both with an interest in describing social interaction as well as looking at learning as the development of interactional skills (J. K. Hall, 1993b, 1995, 1999; Nguyen, 2004; Young, 2000, 2003). Where the strength of this model lies is that like other socio-cognitive models, it takes language learning to be locally situated, evidenced in the changing displays of participation in interactional practices, and argues that cognitive development is influenced by the social practices individuals engage in. However, unlike other socio-cognitive approaches to learning, it takes a special interest in the development of interactional skills. And while a description of the mechanism of development in this framework is still under-developed, which will be discussed in more detail in Section 2.3.5, this framework clearly defines what evidence of development would look like in interaction and defines a clear approach for the analysis of the development of these skills. In this section, I first describe the concept of interactional competence, which also acts as the domain of development in this framework. Next, I review the major tenets of the framework and the literature that helped form them. Afterwards, I provide a review of each of the components of the framework and how each of them has been traditionally analyzed in the literature. Finally, I discuss how this framework interested in description of social interaction has been expanded into one whose interest is also in the development of interactional skills.

2.3.1 Interactional Competence as Concept

Originally credited to Kramsch (1986), the concept of interactional competence was initially introduced to counter what Kramsch considered to be an over-simplification of the goals of the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines, which claimed to promote “communicative ability”, but in
reality implied that proficiency entailed grammatical competence, and that language learning in
general is an input-output process leading to linear acquisition of grammatical forms. Kramsch
bases her definition of interaction on Wells (1981), who defined interaction as “a ‘collaborative
activity’ involving ’the establishment of a triangular relationship between the sender, the receiver,
and the context of the situation’” (pp. 46-47). Since the time of Kramsch’s original use of the
term interactional competence, development of this concept into a framework of language use has
almost exclusively been done by Joan Kelly Hall (1993b, 1995, 1999) and Richard Young (2000,
2003), who have put forth a number of tenets guiding what the concept of interactional
competence entails. These tenets describe interactional competence as (1) co-constructed, (2)
specific to interactive practices, and (3) involve a number of interactional resources that
participants bring and use in a given practice.

2.3.2 The Tenets of Interactional Competence

The first central tenet governing interactional competence is that interactional
competence does not belong wholly to an individual but is jointly constructed. Co-construction
has been defined by Jacoby and Ochs (1995) as the joint creation of “form, interpretation, stance,
action, identity, institution, skill, ideology, emotion, or other cultural meaningful reality” (p. 171).
This idea of interactional competence being co-constructed stands in contrast to Canale and
Swain’s (1980, 1981) pedagogical implementation of Hymes’ communicative competence (1972),
which focuses on an individual’s skills within a social context. The idea of competence being co-
constructed is very much in line with other socio-cognitive concepts and theories, such as the
concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) in sociocultural theory. In sociocultural
theory, the ZPD is not a physical space but describes a metaphor for the difference peer or expert
assistance can make in accomplishing an activity compared to working alone. Working within the
ZPD, competence then can be found in “the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86). In other words, competence is co-constructed in interactions with more capable peers.

A second central tenet to the concept of interactional competence is that interactional competence is specific to interactive practices. Interactive practices are “culturally-mediated moments of face-to-face interaction whereby a group of people come together to create and recreate their everyday social lives” (J. K. Hall, 1993b, p. 145). The term itself is tied to a number of other concepts, namely speech event (Hymes, 1974), secular ritual (Moore & Meyerhof, 1977), text (Bakhtin, 1986), activity (M. H. Goodwin, 1990; Ochs, 1988; Vygotsky, 1978), and practice (Bourdieu, 1977). Interactive practices, much like speech events, secular rituals, texts, activities, and practices, contain certain kinds of recurrent actions marked by particular verbal (e.g. change in tone or key, use of particular opening or closing phrases) or physical boundaries (e.g. change in participants, participant roles) to indicate when they have started, ended, and another practice has begun.

The concept of secular ritual also brings into focus the repetitive and routinized nature of interactional practices as a way that participants continuously create and reify the boundaries and rules of each practice. This idea is also central in ethnomethodology in that in interaction, “knowledge” of how to do a particular practice procedurally is both created locally by the participants and made normative by doing the practice using the same set of procedures over and over again (Garfinkel, 1967; Heritage, 1984).

---

7 For the sake of continuity I will be using the term “interactive practices”. However, these practices have been term “oral practices” (J. K. Hall, 1993b) or “discursive practices” (Young, 2003) in other articles in conjunction with interactional competence.
The continuous creation and reification of a particular interactive practice also echoes the importance placed on routines as a language socialization mechanism. As discussed earlier, language socialization researchers argue that most cultural norms are implied but viewable in the recurrent everyday practices individuals participate in. Repeated exposure to the routines and procedures for doing particular interactive practices is then the primary way individuals are socialized to become competent members of society (Ochs, 1993; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1996, 1986; Watson-Gegeo, 2004).

While there is abundant evidence in the literature that participants gain competence in a particular interactive practice by repetition of doing that practice, there is also evidence that the skills one needs to participate in a particular interactive practice do not necessarily transfer to another practice, such as has been shown in advising sessions (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1993) or in students’ abilities to give both oral and written descriptions of pictures (Wu, de Temple, Herman, & Snow, 1994). Young (2003) has also showed how the skills needed to participate within the same practice, but across different disciplines, may be different. In his study of the office hours sessions between graduate students and undergraduates, Young compared two different graduate students’ participation in this practice, one of which was in the Math department and one of which belonged to the Italian department. He found that while there were some general interactional features that office hours sessions across both disciplines share, such as opening statements that quickly shift into a statement of the problem and lexical and syntactic choices that position the TA as expert and the undergraduate as novice, there were differences both in the types of topics that were invoked and how the actions in the office hours sessions were sequenced.

Unlike the similarities between secular ritual, practice, and routine, the notion of ‘practice’ adopted here, similar to Bakhtin’s (1986) concept of text, differs somewhat from traditional ways of describing a practice or speech event. In more formalist approaches to
characterizing a speech event, for example, there is an assumption that genre, one of the components of a speech event, is the more “stable” version and that the actualization of genre in practice is more a more variable, and thereby less interesting version. As Hall (1993b) has argued, this distinction does not hold for the definition of interactive practices used here because, “The two [versions of genre] exist as inextricable, yet dynamically interactive links in the larger conceptual unit of dialogue (Bakhtin, 1986)” (p. 147). However, interactional practices are speech events in that they are also conventionalized and are socioculturally constructed by members in interaction.

Hymes’ (1974) work with speech events, and especially his S-P-E-A-K-I-N-G grid, also helped to shape how a framework of IC would address the analysis of interactive practices. The S-P-E-A-K-I-N-G grid is an etic heuristic designed by Hymes used to identify and describe the contextual components involving speech acts. Each letter in the S-P-E-A-K-I-N-G model describes a different component argued to be relevant to the context of a speech act or event. However, as has been pointed out by Stubbs (1983), and again by Hall (1993b), Hymes’ heuristic was designed to be a general schema for researchers to reference when out in the field rather than a model for analyzing spoken data in interaction.

A third central tenet governing interactional competence is that when co-constructing a particular practice, individuals invoke a number of different interactional resources in order to accomplish the practice. These resources provide the analytical backbone of the framework of interactional competence in that they are the areas in which competence and the development of competence can be observed. Most of the work of developing an interactional competence framework has stemmed from the work of Hall (1993b, 1995, 1999) and Young (2000, 2003). However, very little empirical research actually applying this model has been carried out to date. As such, with the exception of Nguyen (2004), little if any research has investigated the individual components of the framework proposed by both Hall and Young, or attempted to
collapse two lists of components by both Hall and Young into a more concise list. Therefore, in the next section I first describe the components of interactional resources included in both Hall (1993b) and Young’s (2000) lists of components in the IC model before justifying combining the two lists into a more concise one. Then I describe how the components in this newly formed list may be clustered together for analysis. Afterwards, I discuss the ways in which each of these components has been analyzed in the literature. By creating a more workable list of components of the interactional competence framework, this allows me to use these components as a springboard to talk about how development in each of these component areas has been talked about in the literature and may be observed in the current study.

### 2.3.3 Consolidated Model of Interactional Competence

In Hall’s (1993b) article on oral practices, she proposes seven components that each practice has and is bound to. They are **participants**, **setting**, **content**, **purposes**, **participation structures**, **act-sequence**, and **rhythm**. The **participants** are considered to be all members of an interaction. The **setting** describes the spatial, temporal, and physical conditions the participants interact in. The **purposes** are the social and cognitive functions of each oral practice. The **content** describes “what does and does not get talked about; the plot (including the cast of characters and events); criteria for deciding who and what can be included as content” (p. 152). **Participation structures** centers around the concept of “floors”. They describe the turn-taking patterns in a given floor, as participants’ rights to a given floor. It also describes the ways in which individuals signal their orientation to a given practice. **Act-sequence** describes how a conversation unfolds chronologically in sequence. It also describes the linguistic and extra-linguistic construction of openings, closings, and transitions between sequences and activities. Finally, **rhythm** describes “the measured motion of the interaction; the underlying beat to which participants time their
utterances and those of their co-participants” (p. 152). While the concepts of participants, setting, content, purposes, rhythm, and act-sequence all stem from Hymes’ (1964) ethnography of speaking, participation structures are a concept much researched by Goffman (1981), C. Goodwin (2007a, 2007b), M. Goodwin (1990), Hanks (1996), and Philips (1972).

While Young’s (2000) list of IC components is similar in many ways to Hall’s (1993b) list, it differs in some ways as well. Unlike Hall’s list of seven components, Young only proposes six components. They are management of topics, rhetorical scripts, knowledge of specific register, strategies for turn-taking, participation framework, and ability to signal boundaries. Young describes management of topics not only in terms of preference for certain topics over others, but also “decisions as to who has the right to introduce a given topic, how long a topic persists in discourse, and who has the right to change the topic” (2000, p. 7). Rhetorical scripts describe the sequencing of acts in a particular discursive practice. Knowledge of specific register describes “the specific lexis and syntactic structures and semantic relations that characterize the [interactive] practice” (p. 6). Young describes strategies for turn-taking as the ability to know and use different turn-taking patterns relevant to particular interactive practices. Participation frameworks, like Hall’s (1993b) description, also describes how participants take on particular participant roles and ratify the roles of others in interaction. In Young’s final component, the ability to signal boundaries describes the means to successfully signal the boundaries of an interactive practice, such as openings or closings.

In order to show the benefits of condensing the two lists of components into one list, it is advantageous to present each list side-by-side so that we may visualize the similarities and differences of each of the components (Table 2-1).
Looking at the two lists side-by-side in Table 2-1, it is easier to determine which components may be grouped with others under one heading. First, we can see that Hall’s concept of *content* correlates with Young’s notion of *topic*. Both components mention what is being talked about in
interaction. However, Young’s *topic* also includes a sub-component including the management of topics, which allows for the study of topic shift. In the consolidated model, I will combine both the concepts of (a) topic as content and (b) management of topics under the general heading of *topic management*.

In a second grouping, one can see a connection between Hall’s (1993b) component of *act-sequence* and Young’s (2000) components *ability to signal boundaries* and *rhetorical script*. All three components are concerned with the chronological unfolding of conversation in sequence and the linguistic and paralinguistic formulae of openings, transitions, and closings as boundary markers between practices. And while openings and closings have traditionally been treated in CA as specific ritualized practices in and of themselves (Schegloff, 1968; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), these particular practices unfold in sequence. Therefore, they will be treated as action sequences. In the consolidated model then, I will subsume the components of *act-sequence*, *ability to signal boundaries*, and *rhetorical script* under the general heading of *action sequencing*.

A third grouping of components consists of *rhythm* and *strategies for turn-taking*. Hall’s (1993b) component of *rhythm* deals with timing and measurement of motion of the conversation. As she writes, it is “the underlying beat to which participants time their utterances and those of their co-participants” (p. 152). Both the rhythm and pausing of talk-in-interaction have been well-documented features of work on turn-taking in the CA, particularly in the TRP between turns (Moerman, 1987; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 2000b; Scollon & Scollon, 1981; Tannen, 1981, 1986). Their importance between turns and in keeping the floor within turns is similarly related to Young’s component of *strategies for turn-taking*. Additionally, one of the sub-components of participation structures proposed by Hall (1993b) refers to turn-taking patterns among participants. Therefore, I will combine these two components, along with this sub-component from participation structures, under the heading of *turn-taking*. 
Other than the sub-component of participation structures listed above regarding turn-taking mechanisms of participants, both of the components regarding participation from Hall and Young are relatively similar. Therefore, I will collapse these two components into a fourth category called *participant frameworks*.

Unlike the components listed above, Hall’s (1993b) components of *participants, setting,* and *purposes,* as well as Young’s (2000) component *register,* have no natural pairing. While *participants, setting,* and *purposes* are all crucial and omnipresent in any interactive practice, these components do not describe what participants “do” per se. These are not components in which a researcher can show evidence of development in, nor do these components allow for the possibility of assessment. For example, while one can document changes to the setting of an activity and the number of participants participating in this activity, the setting is not a ‘behavior’ or element of competence that changes. Therefore, while it is necessary to describe all three components when identifying and giving a detailed description of each interactional practice, I am removing them from the list of components of the analytical framework of interactional competence.

Young’s component *register* is also a special case because it describes the formal linguistic aspects and structure of particular talk. As Nguyen (2004) argues, “If the learner changes over time in his/her use of language in interaction, the question arises as to how the forms and structures of language might also change. Since register analysis helps the characterization of language forms in use, a comparison of language use across instances of a particular practice over time can offer insights about development” (p. 60). Therefore, I will also include the component of *register* as a separate category of IC.

In sum, I have collapsed both Hall and Young’s IC components into a more concise list of five components: (1) *topic management,* (2) *action sequencing,* (3) *turn-taking,* (4) *participant
frameworks, and (5) register (see Table 2-2). In the next section, I discuss how each of these components has been traditionally analyzed in the literature.
Table 2-2: Consolidated Model of IC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION (What is it?)</th>
<th>ANALYSIS (How will I look at it?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Topic management</td>
<td>• What does &amp; does not get talked about</td>
<td>• Topic identification as shifting set of referents (Brown &amp; Yule, 1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Who has the right to introduce/change a given topic</td>
<td>• Sequential ordering of turns in topic boundaries/shift:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Criteria for deciding who &amp; what can be included as content</td>
<td>o topic initiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How long a topic persists in discourse</td>
<td>o topic closings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o topic shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o topic change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Action sequencing</td>
<td>• Sequences of speech acts that help define a particular interactive practice</td>
<td>• Openings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unfolding of the plot</td>
<td>• Sequence of actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Linguistic &amp; paralinguistic formulae of openings, transitions &amp; closings</td>
<td>• Closings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Transitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participant frameworks:</td>
<td>• The ways in which participants in a practice take roles &amp; ratify the roles of others</td>
<td>• Goffman’s (1981) <em>footing</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The number of floors</td>
<td>o “speaker” as animator, principal, author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Turn-taking patterns of among participants in a floor</td>
<td>o “hearer” as ratified or unratified participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Goodwin’s (2007a,b) <em>interactive footing</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Turn-taking:</td>
<td>• Ability to know and use different turn-taking patterns relevant to different interactive practices</td>
<td>• Turn constructional units (TCU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The underlying beat to which participants time their utterances and those of their co-participants</td>
<td>• Turn relevance places (TRP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Turn allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Turn overlaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Silence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Register:</td>
<td>• Specific lexis &amp; syntactic structures &amp; semantic relations characterizing the interactive practice</td>
<td>• Identification of lexical bundles in typical register of practice(s) through comparative corpus analysis using MICASE, pedagogical materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Run general stats comparing students’ use of register with lexical bundles identified with particular register of the practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.4 Individual Components of Interactional Competence Model

2.3.4.1 Topic Management

Topic describes, “what gets talked about in the [oral] practice, that is, the recurring stories themselves with which the social actors concern themselves” (J. K. Hall, 1999, p. 147). Topic has also been referred to as “content” or “plot” in earlier work by Hall (1993b). What does and does not get talked about in a particular oral practice is part of the management of topics in conversation and is continuously negotiated. For example, in the particular oral practice of gossip talk (J. K. Hall, 1993a; see also Haviland, 1977) the content of the topic revolves around the “questionable social behaviors” of individuals not present during the conversation, or are talked about as if they were not present. The specific social behaviors deemed questionable are what are negotiated during interaction. Young (2000) also refers to topic not only in terms of what gets talked about or “preferences for certain topics over others”, but also includes the management of topics as a crucial part of this component, such as “decisions as to who has the right to introduce a given topic, how long a topic persists in discourse, and who has the right to change the topic” (p. 7).

In congruence with both Hall and Young’s separation of topic in ‘topic choice’ and ‘topic management’, there have been two major ways to analyze topic in conversation: (1) topic as a static entity or proposition, and (2) topic as a dynamically constructed process of shifting referents. The first way discusses topic in terms of a proposition that is invoked in conversation. Ochs and Schieffelin (1983), for example, define topic as, “a proposition (or set of propositions) expressing a concern (or set of concerns) that the speaker is addressing” (p. 72). This definition of topic is problematic however, especially if assuming interaction to be a dynamically unfolding
process. It does not recognize the fluidity of conversation but assumes that the topics in
conversation are fixed entities.

A second, more interactionally equipped way of identifying topic uses Brown and Yule’s
(1983) concept of topic frameworks. Brown and Yule argued for a more dynamic approach to
topic identification by centering on a shifting set of ‘referents’ that make up a topic framework of
various possible frameworks. This approach recognizes that topic itself is not static, but is
continuously negotiated as the conversation unfolds. It also relies on the analyst’s abilities to
recognize what the topic framework in a given conversation is and what the procedures
participants use to choose and negotiate topics (Brown & Yule, 1983; Zimmerman & Mellinger,
1998). Zimmerman and Mellinger (1998) talk about topic in terms of a ‘topical object’ that has a
‘title’ and a ‘focus’ of that title, that are made up of a subset of features describing the ‘topical
object’.

In addition to topic identification, a second approach to analyzing topic centers on the
identification markers of topic boundaries and topic shifts in interaction. Using primarily
conversation analysis, studies using this approach have focused on the specifics of the sequential
ordering of turns during topic initiations, topic closings, topic shifts, and topic changes. Button
and Casey (1984) describe a typical three-part sequence associated with topic boundaries.

The first part consists of a topic initial elicitor that is packaged as an inquiry
concerning the possibility of presenting a report of a newsworthy event. The
second part is a positive response to the first part and produces a newsworthy-
event-report that has the status of a possible topic initial. The third part is a
topicalizer; that is, it topicalizes the prior possible topic initial and provides for
talk on the reported event. (1984, p. 167)

Not all bids for initiation of a topic are successful though. In the following example, a “no-news
report” is made to deny consideration of the proposed topic of discussion.
In the above excerpt, F uses a topic initial elicitor (line 1) to find out if J has any new news to report as a topic. J denies this elicitation as a possible topic of interest by producing a “no news” report (‘not much’) and initiating a different topic (‘wuddiyuh know’). What is important to remember about any topic boundary/shift is that it serves to segment talk. “In closings [topic-bounding turns’) design marks prior topics, and provides for any newsworthy-event-report to be ‘further’ off the conversation. In openings, their design marks ‘immediately current’ events as first reportable items” (Button & Casey, 1984, p. 174).

Jefferson (1984, 1993) also contributes to the discussion on topic boundaries by looking at how individuals use particular interactional resources, such as minimal responses (e.g. ‘yes’), recipient assessments (e.g. ‘that’s good’), references to getting together, or conversational restarts, as interactional resources used to shift topics. For example, in the following excerpt from Jefferson (1993), the author shows how one participant (D) uses the minimal response ‘yah’ as resource to shift from talk on a haircut to one on a party (line 13).
In the above excerpt, A and D are discussing how to do a proper haircut (lines 1-12). In lines 11-12, A states that the ability to cut the hair around the ears is one ‘part I’ve got to figure out how to do’. In line 13, D produces an acknowledgement token (‘yah’) and then shifts directly into a new topic without pausing at a TRP, which would allow for D to take the next turn and continue the line of talk.

In addition to topic initiations and topic closings, some research has been undertaken to illustrate the differences between a topic shift and a topic change in conversation. According to Maynard (1980), a topic change involves “…an utterance which employs referents unrelated to prior talk in order to implicate a new set of mentionables” (p. 280). For example, in the following excerpt (2-3) two participants, Rich and Mark, are participating in an experiment in which they are being observed through a two-way mirror.
At the beginning of the excerpt, the two of them are discussing being observed through the mirror and the contents of an envelope that the experimenters left for them on a table. However, in line 9, Mark initiates a new topic that is unrelated to the general set of referents concerning the experiment the two of them are participating in. Rich then confirms this topic change by answering Mark’s initiated question in line 10.

A topic shift, on the other hand, refers to topic refocusing (Maynard, 1980; Zimmerman & Mellinger, 1998). Zimmerman and Mellinger (1998) discuss this phenomenon in terms of topical object/topical focus. They discuss how in a topic shift speakers may introduce a new topic that is still within the same subset of features of the original topical object. Maynard (1980) provides an excellent example of this in the below excerpt.
In this excerpt, George and Laura are discussing Laura’s university when he asks her if she goes home every weekend because she lives so close to school (line 3). Laura answers that she does not go home all the time (line 4), and when questioned about this by George, Laura reports that she is going to go to Berkeley next year because it is too close to home (lines 6-7). It is at this point that George refocuses the conversation by shifting the focus away from the talk of why Laura would not go home every weekend, namely a complaint that her school is too close to home, to a focus on why she is transferring to Berkeley. While the topic is still loosely concerned with Laura’s schooling and where she attends, the focus of the referents has shifted.

In sum, while topic has been talked about both in terms of propositions (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1983) as well as loosely related referents in a topic framework (G. Brown & Yule, 1983; Zimmerman & Mellinger, 1998), the second way is more in line with the IC framework’s way of talking about topic not only as what gets talked about in conversation but also as boundaries of topics and how topic shifts are realized in interaction.
2.3.4.2 Turn-Taking

In their seminal 1974 work outlining the organization and sequencing of turn-taking in face-to-face conversations, Sachs, Schegloff and Jefferson showed that although conversation may seem to be chaotic, in reality individuals follow precise rules that allow overwhelmingly for one speaker to talk at a time with minimal overlap. This organization of talk is built on an intricate system of turn-allocation and timing, each turn being directly relevant to and affecting the previous and subsequent turns.

The main parts of a turn together form a turn constructional unit, or TCU. The basic components of a TCU in face-to-face conversation are the turn and the transitional relevance place (TRP), or transition space (Sacks et al., 1974). A turn can be composed of anything from a word to a string of utterances or even, in some special cases, a complete narrative. Sachs et al. (1974) identify four main types of turn constructional units: sentential, clausal, phrasal, and lexical. A turn can be thought of as a complete thought, the completion of which signals a transition relevance place. The TRP is the point at an end of a possible completion of a turn when a transition to a next speaker becomes relevant. It can occur a short time before the completion of the present turn up until a short time after the beginning of the next turn. Schegloff et al. refer to it as the “beat” that can follow the potential completion of a turn (1977, p. 366); see also Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). In face-to-face conversation, a TRP can be signaled in a number of ways, including prosodic change, nonverbal gestures, and other turn-allocation devices (C. Goodwin, 1981; Mori & Hayashi, 2006; Olsher, 2004; Schegloff, 1996; Selting, 2007). And in fact, recipients look for and expect such cues towards the end of each turn.

The process of turn allocation in conversation indicates how individuals manage overlapping talk in conversation. As has been shown in the literature, the degree of overlapping talk that is allowed in conversation varies by cultures and contexts. For example, in Jewish-
American discourse, a high degree of overlap can signal a high degree of alignment among conversational participants (Tannen, 1981, 1986). Athapaskans (Scollon & Scollon, 1981), on the other hand, consider overlaps to be a dispreferred form and can cause the individual whose speech overlaps with the speaker who has the floor to be considered rude. Within a classroom context, turn allocation has been identified strongly with roles that the participants enact at any given time in interaction. In a typical teacher-fronted classroom, for example, turns are overwhelmingly allocated by the teacher through the IRF sequence (Cazden, 1988; Gutierrez, 1994; J. K. Hall, 1998; J. K. Hall & Walsh, 2002; Lemke, 1990; Mehan, 1979; Nassaji & Wells, 2000; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Wells, 1993).

During a TRP, speakers are faced with two main choices on how to further the conversation. They may select the next speaker or self-select to keep their turn (Sacks et al., 1974). There are several ways in which speakers may select the next speaker at the end of a turn. They can directly name the next person whose turn they are allocating next (e.g. ‘You bought something yesterday, didn’t you Stew?’), or they may initiate a first pair part (FPP) of an adjacency pair, such as a question, which would make the second pair part (SPP) of the adjacency pair immediately relevant. For example, in the following except Lori initiates a question, which is the FPP. This makes the SPP answer by Ben immediately relevant in line 3 and also serves to allocate the floor to Ben for him to answer.


<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ben: They gotta- a garage sale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lori: Where.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ben: On Third Avenue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also many ways speakers can maintain their own turns. One way is for a speaker to speed up his or her own speech at the end of their turn, thereby not leaving any space at the TRP for another speaker to take over the floor. Another way would be to announce or ‘preface’ that he or she will be taking an extended turn in order to keep the floor. This is often the
case during narrative tellings (Jefferson, 1978). Additionally, speakers may also use specific syntactic projections, such as *if/then* clauses or numbering to indicate a list is in progress, as the means to continue their turn uninterrupted (Jefferson, 1990; Schegloff, 1996; Selting, 2007).

Turn-taking mechanisms, as outlined by Sachs et al. (1974), have also shed light on the importance of silence in conversation. Silence in conversation has been shown to convey a variety of intentions. For example, silence after an utterance and within a TRP may signal the end of a turn and availability of the floor (Sachs, 2000). Silence may also indicate misunderstanding or disagreement (Pomerantz, 1984). As a general rule, Sachs et al. (1974) have said that if a speaker specifically selects another speaker for the next turn in the TRP, then the beat of silence following the end of the speaker’s turn is not treated as silence but as the beat preceding the next speaker’s turn. However, if the lapse in talk extends for a period longer than a beat (i.e. more than 0.2 seconds), then the lack of continued talk in this space may be treated as problematic.

In sum, an analysis of turn-taking mechanisms involves observations of the ways speakers both organize and allocate theirs and others’ turns-at-talk. Within a classroom context, turn allocation has been identified strongly with roles that the participants enact at any given time in interaction. In a typical teacher-fronted classroom, for example, turns are overwhelmingly allocated by the teacher through the IRF sequence. This sequence and its importance to an instructional environment will be talked about in more detail in Section 2.3.4.4 on *action sequencing*. Within the ITA class under investigation, the ITAs are being socialized to take on a teacher persona but within the context of them being students. Therefore, it will be important to take the IRF sequence into account when discussing how individuals manage their own turns and those of others in interaction.
2.3.4.3 Register

Register is defined by Young (2000) as “specific lexical and syntactic structures and semantic relations that characterize the [interactive] practice” (p. 6). Linguistically, a register, according to Biber (1994; see also Conrad, 2006), is marked by a high frequency of items such as nominalizations, specific vocabulary, prepositional phrases, or particular adjectives collocated together called “lexical bundles”. For example, Biber (1999) compared the distribution of *that*-clauses to *to*-clauses and found that *that*-clauses occur more often in conversational discourse and *to*-clauses more often in written, academic texts, and that *that* is often ellipted from the *that*-clauses in those conversations. In another register study, Prince, Frader, and Bosk (1982) discovered a high frequency of hedging by doctors in Intensive Care Units in hospitals, which they attribute to the doctors’ attempts to make answers sound “fuzzier”. Registers may also serve to reinforce different social roles. In an excerpt provided by Young (2003) between an ITA and a student in an office hours session, the data show how the ITA’s use of technical and specific lexis particular to the field of Mathematics versus the student’s use of non-specialist terms helped to reinforce their social roles as “expert” and “novice”. Using the same excerpt, Young (2003) also demonstrated that the ITA’s particular use of indexicals, such as ‘we’ versus ‘they’ reflected her self-construction as an “insider” in the Math community versus the student’s “outsider” status.

Traditionally there have been two main methodological approaches to the study of register: corpus-based linguistics (CBL) and systemic functional linguistics (SFL). Corpus-based linguistics relies on computer applications to quickly scan texts and uncover frequency counts and collocational patterns of lexical items. Biber (2006), for example, performed a corpus-based register analysis on the spoken and written texts comprising the TOEFL 2000 Spoken and Written Academic Language Corpus (T2K-SWAL) in order to profile university registers. Within the office hours sub-corpus, which is composed of 11 texts (roughly 50,400 tokens), Biber discovered
discourse patterns particular to office hours sessions, such as the use of ’okay’ and ’so’ as the most common discourse markers, and that half of all conditional clauses began with ’if you’, which highlights that conditional clauses “cushion the force of directives by providing possible options and anticipating alternatives” (2006, p. 77). Corpus-based approaches to register analysis can be powerful tools, especially in the initial identification of features specific to a particular register. However, although corpus-based studies of language use are common, most rely on written rather than spoken texts. McCarthy (1998) has often mentioned that one of the main reasons for this is that spoken language corpora are notoriously more difficult to create and, because of the transcription requirements, those transcription conventions make it more difficult to tag segments of speech within the corpus itself.

In sum, register involves the use of lexical and syntactic structures particular to a specific social group or practice. In conducting an analysis of register as a component of IC, it will therefore be useful to conduct collocational searches using corpus-based techniques. These searches would allow for the observation of what social roles the ITA and his students index in interaction, and how those roles may change over time. For instance, given that one of the pedagogical goals of the ITA course is to have the ITAs orient to the role of teacher, a corpus-based approach to register would allow us to see any increases in the use of classroom-specific or teacher talk.

2.3.4.4 Action Sequencing

The action sequence, or act-sequence as it is referred to by Hall (1993b), is concerned with the sequential organization of conversation as it unfolds in practice. Components of practices that have been studied in regard to action sequencing include openings, closings, and transitions (Jefferson, 1973; Schegloff, 1968, 1979, 1986, 2002; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Because these
components are recurrent and often follow a particular script, what can be revealing is observing how participants negotiate and adapt to these recurrent practices on a moment-to-moment basis and over time. Methodologically, the most often used procedure for studying action sequencing has been conversation analysis because of its focus on the sequential organization of talk-in-interaction. In one of the most well-known CA studies of openings in conversation, Schegloff (1968) looked at the opening turns taken from 500 conversational openings on the telephone to a disaster center in order to deduce a common set of practices used by individuals organize their talk. What Schegloff was interested in was not the fact that in two-party conversations generally only one person talks at a time; he was interested in the procedures individuals took in conversation to determine who would talk first (i.e. distribution rule) and how those individuals would enter into an “orderly sequence of conversational turns” (p. 1076). Schegloff found, for example, that overwhelmingly in telephone openings the person who answers the phone assumes the right to speak first, and that the telephone ringer serves the function as a means to ‘summon’ the individual who is being called. Together, this recurring set of two turns constitutes what has been called a SUMMONS-ANSWER sequence.

For identification of the sequential organization of troubles talk, Jefferson (1988) used a large corpus of data that included troubles-talk sequences and found “a series of recurrent, positioned elements” that “could be grouped into a rough segmental order” (p. 420). Once the recurrent sequences were identified, she used this to create a loose template characterizing not necessarily every single sequence found in that template, but every recurring type of sequence found. For example, looking at how Jefferson (1984, p. 420) outlined the ‘exit’ out of troubles talk, we can see a list of general actions that can occur during this point in the conversation:

F. Exit
   a. Boundarying off
      i) Conversation Closure
ii) Conversation Restart
iii) Introduction of Pending Biographicals
iv) Reference to Getting Together

b. Transition into Other Topics

Within the classroom, the INITIATION-RESPONSE-FOLLOW-UP (IRF) sequence has been found to be an ubiquitous part of the instructional environment (Cazden, 1988; Gutierrez, 1994; J. K. Hall, 1998; J. K. Hall & Walsh, 2002; Lemke, 1990; Mehan, 1979; Nassaji & Wells, 2000; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Wells, 1993). Almost always teacher-initiated, the IRE sequence has been typically shown to begin with the initiation of a question (I), followed by a response to the question by the student (R), and ending with a third move in which the teacher evaluates the correctness or appropriateness of the student’s response (E). While shown to be both restricting in the types of responses in which students can engage, as well as maintaining teacher control over a classroom (Cazden, 1988; Gutierrez, 1994) the IRE sequence has also nevertheless been found to be a crucial part of the socialization process for students into the cultural configurations of classrooms, especially for knowledge into ways of orienting to knowledge transmission in the classroom (Heap, 1985).

In a re-imagining of the IRE sequence, Wells (1993) found that if one looked more closely at some supposed IRE sequences, especially in the third move (E), the seemingly restrictive sequence actually allowed greater and more varied student participation and opportunities for learning than were previously thought to exist. Instead of purely evaluating the correctness or appropriateness of a student’s response, Wells found that in the third position, teachers often took the opportunity to request clarifications, expansions of answers, justifications, and other ways of engaging students in the interaction. Recognizing the diversity of these possible moves, Wells re-termed the evaluation part of the sequence follow-up (F), an extension of Sinclair and Coulthard’s (1975) F for feedback.
In sum, action sequencing describes how a conversation unfolds in sequence. Because of its data-driven nature rather than application of pre-specified categories of sequences, conversation analysis has been shown to be an effective method of looking at conversation in sequence and is in line with the IC model’s description of what action sequencing is. Additionally, because of the ubiquity of the IRF sequence in classrooms, an analysis of the ITA classroom should also seek to understand the role, if any, that this sequence plays in the organization of the class.

2.3.4.5 Participant Frameworks

Participant frameworks (PFs) describe how participants adopt different social roles and manage those roles and the roles of others in interactions. Negotiating participation roles has been included as an important aspect of interactional competence by both Hall and Young. While many researchers have worked on the idea of participant frameworks (e.g. R. Brown & Gilman, 1972; Hanks, 1996; Silverstein, 1976), none perhaps have discussed the concept of participant frameworks in talk more than Erving Goffman. Goffman’s (1981) concept of footing describes the alignments people make between themselves and others in conversation. Goffman’s work disputes the notion of a conversation as simply between a speaker and a hearer, and instead illustrates how individuals’ roles shift according to how they orient to what is being said. A “speaker” can be the animator, principal, or the author at any point in the conversation. The animator is the “talking machine”, the individual actively producing the utterance. The principal, on the other hand, is “someone whose beliefs have been told, someone who is committed to what the words say” (Goffman, 1981, p. 144). Even though their beliefs are being represented in the utterance, the principal is not necessarily the person who is uttering the message. The author is the person who “has selected the sentiments that are being expressed and the words in which they
are encoded” (Goffman, 1981, p. 144). It should be noted that a speaker could embody all three roles, which make up the production format of an utterance, at the same time. The role of “hearer” is also multi-faceted and can represent a participant as ratified or unratiﬁed. A ratiﬁed participant is one who is acknowledged to be legitimately present during the conversation at hand, whether that person is addressed, unaddressed, listening, or not listening. An unratiﬁed participant, on the other hand, is one who is considered a bystander of the interaction, such as someone who unintentionally overhears the talk or someone who has been eavesdropping on the conversation. Both unratiﬁed and ratiﬁed participants may inﬂuence the shape of conversation, and unratiﬁed participants may become ratiﬁed participants at any point in the conversation.

Within the domain of education, researchers have found that participation patterns can and do aﬀect classroom encounters and outcomes. For example, Philips (1972) found that diﬀering participation patterns between the classroom and community directly and negative aﬀected the performance of Native American students in school.

While the work of Goffman on participation frameworks is certainly the most inﬂuential, the work of Charles Goodwin (C. Goodwin, 2007a, 2007b) on interactive footing has both problematized and extended Goffman’s work in ways more aligned with those in CA. Goodwin (2007a) maintains that while Goffman provided a complex picture of the speaker, he relegate the role of the hearer as “cognitively simple”, with only a few categories (e.g. Addressee, Overhearer). Thus, Goffman’s model “cannot provide the analytic resources necessary to describe how participants build utterances and action by taking each other into account within an unfolding process of interaction as talk unfolds, i.e. the essential mutual reﬂexivity of speaker and hearer(s)” (C. Goodwin, 2007a, p. 45). Interactive footing, on the other hand, looks at how all the participants in a conversation actively orient to one another both verbally and non-verbally as the conversation unfolds. It is also highly connected to the concept of co-construction. Therefore, the speaker is no longer positioned as the center of the activity, but as part of the emerging dynamic
framework co-created by all the participants. For example, in Figure 2-1 below, Goodwin presents an example of how an embodied participant framework is co-constructed.

In this figure, Goodwin presented an example of a father helping a daughter with her homework. Goodwin argued that by coupling his answer with a pointing gesture to the correct answer while gazing down to where he was pointing, and then back up to his daughter (line 6) to make sure she was co-orienting to where he was pointing, the father was able to make sure he and his daughter were creating a field of mutual co-participation to the activity at hand. Goodwin argued that,

The interactive organization of embodied participation also constitutes what might be glossed as a cooperative stance, that is a demonstration that by visibly orienting to both other participants and the environment that is the focus of their work, an actor is appropriately cooperating in the joint accomplishment of the activity in progress. Unlike, for example, the furniture in a setting, actors are agents with the ability to position their bodies elsewhere, and by doing so to disaffiliate from the events in progress. (2007b, p. 59)
In a study of the opening sequences in doctor-patient interactions, Robinson (1998) showed how by studying not only the participants’ talk but also their gesture, gaze, and body orientation towards one another, we can see why it has been documented in the literature on medical interactions that the doctor overwhelmingly initiates the sequence in which the patient discloses his or her chief complaint. Previous research had suggested that the asymmetrical power relationship between the doctor and patient accounts for the perceived dominance in opening sequences (Maynard, 1991). However, Robinson’s study showed that it is not necessarily the asymmetrical power relations that lead to doctors initiating chief complaint sequences. Instead, it is the ways in which doctors use a combination of gaze and body orientation to attend to (e.g. gaze and torso turned toward the patient) or disattend to a patient (e.g. shifting gaze away from the patient) that lets him or her control the discourse and cue the patient as to when he or she should or should not give their chief complaint.

Within a university setting, Joanna Rendle-Short (2005, 2006) looked at nine monologic academic lectures in computer science to see the ways in which presenters used and structured their embodied actions. She showed that even during periods of silence in monologic lectures, speakers do not just stand there. They maintain a connection with the audience members using a combination of gestures, body positioning, and gaze that indicate their co-presence in the talk. For example, even in moments in which the speaker stopped talking to flip to the next slide on the overhead projector (OHP), the speaker kept his torso fixed towards the audience while his gaze was down at the OHP in order to indicate attention to two activities at once (see Fig. 2-2).
In sum, participant frameworks describe the ways in which participants in a given practice orient to particular roles and ratify or do not ratify the roles of others. They do this both linguistically and extra linguistically through their gaze, gesture, and body positioning as well. While the work of Goffman (1981) did much to explicate the importance of participant frameworks and illustrate in detail the complexity of roles that the speaker takes on in interaction, Goodwin’s concepts of interactive footing and embodied participant frameworks capture the importance of both co-construction and the unfolding moment-to-moment orientation to participant roles in interaction, which is central to the IC framework. For these reasons the use of interactive footing is more align with the analysis of PFs in a framework of interactional competence.

Figure 2-2: From Rendle-Short (2005, p. 192)

FIGURE 6 pause.3 (line 20)
• looking at the computer
• right hand almost on the mouse
• left hand remains in home position
• body still partially turned toward the screen
2.3.5 The Development of Interactional Competence

The framework of IC did not initially deal with learning, but dealt primarily with language use. In fact, researchers describe that one of the major criticisms against using a framework that employs conversation analysis is that it was designed with an interest in describing language use, not learning (Firth & Wagner, 2007; Kasper, 2006; Markee, 2007, 2008; Seedhouse, 2005). Researchers have justified using CA to look at development and learning by arguing that CA is an excellent methodological tool for showing how participants display their understanding of a given situation as the conversation unfolds on a turn-by-turn basis. Therefore, by looking at the ways participants display their understanding of a social practice through use of interactional resources in that practice over time, we may be able to see changes in their understanding of that practice as well. Where researchers disagree is in what theories of learning, if any, are needed explain the learning process, given that CA is not a theory of learning. Those researchers using CA to investigate development have taken one of two approaches to address this issue. First, most researchers doing work in this area to date have maintained that because CA is not a theory of learning, we can combine a framework of language use (i.e. interactional competence) that utilizes CA methods with compatible, more well-developed theories of learning (Hellermann, 2006, 2007; Nguyen, 2004, 2008; Young & Miller, 2004) in order to investigate development.

A less-explored argument is that researchers interested in using CA to look at development do not need to look outside of CA itself for explanations of what learning looks like (Kasper, 2008; Markee, 2000, 2007, 2008). These researchers reference CA’s ethnomethodological roots for an explanation of changing participation patterns as socially distributed learning. The concept of socially distributed learning is an extension of Schegloff’s (1989) paper on socially distributed cognition that argues that CA, based on its
ethnomethodological roots, defines knowledge in terms of procedures, meaning participants
display their understandings of the world around them in the ways they respond to interlocutors’
turns and design their turns for others. By observing longitudinally how participants display their
understanding of a practice, we may be able to observe changes in their displayed knowledge of a
given practice.

In the following sections, I review the literature to date that has investigated the
development of interactional competence and then address one particular challenge to the study
of using an IC framework to look at development, which is to describe the role of individual
learning.

2.3.5.1 Studies of Development of IC

In the last five to six years, a few studies have emerged that have chronicled the
development in interactional competence. One of the earliest and most notable studies comes
Nguyen reports on a longitudinal study following the development of IC in two pharmacy
students as they partook in a pharmacy internship. During this time, Nguyen interviewed,
observed, and videotaped their interactions with clients and colleagues over a period of eight
weeks. She then performed a detailed analysis of language use in each of the component areas of
the IC framework before looking at development in each of these areas as well. Nguyen (2004)
showed that the two pharmacy students showed evidence of development in the areas of action
sequencing, topic management, and participant frameworks. For example, both participants
learned to transition more smoothly between actions, which Nguyen attributed to an increased
competence in the sequencing of actions. They also learned to more strategically position
themselves as ‘expert’ with clients and during advice-giving sequences. For one participant in
particular, she became much more elaborate in the language she used and the way she structured her actions during advice-giving sequences with clients as well. While the two pharmacy students showed evidence of development in the areas of action sequencing, topic management, and participant frameworks, they did not show evidence of development in turn-taking strategies. This is an important discovery because it shows that interactional competence does not necessarily develop uniformly or in all areas, but can occur in specific areas.

Nguyen’s (2004) main contribution in the study to the IC framework, in my opinion, is in making a compelling case justifying how development can be looked using an IC framework. She writes,

[D]evelopment thus involves changes that an individual makes over time, but at the same time, it is made possible and is exhibited in negotiable interaction in specific social practices. Signs of development then can be observed in the individual learner’s displayed use of interactional resources over time in a recurrent social practice. (Nguyen, 2004, p. 32)

She goes on to say that “Its [IC framework] strength lies in its power to draw from other well-established research traditions in order to build a framework for the study of language use and development that has strong theoretical foundations and clear guidance for analysis” (Nguyen, 2004, p. 32). In other words, the IC framework is able to talk about development because it draws on particular ideas from other theoretical frameworks, such as SCT, situated learning theory, and language socialization theory, in order to talk about how language is used and developed. For example, the IC framework borrows from the ideas of language socialization theory such as the idea that individuals become more competent in particular practices and they practice them over and over with a more expert other.

Other recent studies have also begun to look at the development of interactional competence as changes in the displays of particular interactional resources in the same interactive practice over time. Markee’s (2008) study looked at how one particular student integrates the word prerequisites into his interactional repertoire of preparing university course descriptions in
English over a period of two days. Markee showed how the course instructor and the student first co-constructed the definition of the word prerequisites in class. Then, through explicit correction and instruction, the student began to use and appropriate the word on his own. In this study, Markee talked about interactional competence in terms of ‘interactional repertoires’, a term he derives from the work of Hundeide (1985) and describes as something akin to “repertoires of typical episodes” (Markee, 2008, p. 3).

The integration of a particular linguistic form into the conversational repertoire is a finding also reported by Hellermann (2007). In another study of the development of IC, Hellermann (2007) looked at how six beginning adult ESL students did opening sequences in dyads over a period of at least 2 years. He observed that students took a particularly “unusual” phrase used by the teacher (‘what is your book?’) in an earlier task and integrated it creatively into their own language in subsequent dyad work over time. In the same study, Hellermann also found development of IC in the strategies the students used (i.e. pointing in conjunction with talk) to co-construct mutual orientation to the beginning of the task. Finally, he also reported how one student co-opted a particular phrase used by a previous task partner in subsequent pair-work as a means to solicit a new task partner.

In another study by Hellermann (2006), he studied how two adult ESL students became more interactionally competent in three classroom literacy practices (i.e. book selection, opening post-reading re-tellings, and completing and filing reading logs). Hellermann found that both students became more interactionally competent over time in each of these practices, but that the trajectories of their learning differed because of the different ways each participated in a given practice. For example, in the book re-telling event, one student was able to develop more elaborate ways to evaluate books, as well as co-opted the term ‘so-so’ introduced by his instructor. The second student, on the other hand, started with a higher level of competence in assessing books than the first student. Instead of choosing the books labeled ‘easy’ to read, she
chose books that required a higher level of reading comprehension. Additionally, while the first student only began to be able to answer the question ‘Did you like this book?’ with the phrase ‘yes’ plus ‘because’ late into the second semester, the second student was able to use this phrase from the beginning of the course. Nevertheless, student two also showed an increase in the types of elaborations made over time when assessing books.

Whereas Hellermann chose to combine the IC framework with language socialization to look at development, Young and Miller (2004) combined IC with situated learning theory in their article on the development of participant frameworks in the practice of revision writing during office hours sessions between an ESL writing instructor and an undergraduate. The authors transcribed four videotaped revision sessions over a period of four weeks. Using the concept of legitimate peripheral participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991), Young and Miller showed the processes the novice (i.e. undergraduate) took to move from peripheral to fuller participation in the process of doing revision talk. The authors found changes in two particular areas of interactional competence (i.e. sequence organization of acts and turn-taking mechanisms) that indexed this shift to fuller participation in the practice. In the earlier sessions, the instructor took on most of the responsibility of identifying the areas in need of revisions and proposing the changes to the revisions. However, in later sessions, the student took on more responsibility by identifying areas for revisions himself, providing rationales for these changes, and incorporating changes into writing without waiting for approval from his instructor. Additionally, although early on the student most often used minimal acknowledgement tokens (e.g. ‘okay’, ‘yeah’) in response to the instructor’s talk, by the end of the four weeks the student used full turns to respond to the instructor.
2.3.5.2 The Role of Individual Cognition

While those studies expanding the framework of IC to include an interest in development and learning have added much to what we know about what changing participation patterns look like in interaction, one area that has still presented a challenge to those studying the development of interactional competence, and those working within the sub-field of CA-for-SLA\(^8\) in general, is role of individual cognition in learning. As mentioned earlier, the concept of *interactional competence* is differentiated from that of *communicative competence* in that rather than focusing on an individual’s skills within a social context, a model of interactional competence posits that, “...abilities, actions, and activities do not belong to the individual but are jointly constructed” (Young, 2003, p. 27). One critique that has been made of conceptualizing competence as located outside of the individual is that it does not leave room for an individual to have any knowledge of their own that they themselves take with them from context to context. As McNamara (1997) argues,

> If we are to take the position that everything is co-constructed in interaction, then it seems that we may only have performances, in Hymes’s sense of ‘instance of use’, not performance in the sense of underlying potential, ability for use. How are we to generalize from those actual instances? And how are we to speak of communicative competence as residing in the individual if we are to ‘include’ the hearer in the speaker’s processes. (p. 455)

While this is an excellent point, those using an IC framework to look at development, at this point, have addressed this critique in one of two ways. The first way is to dismiss it as out of the purview of CA-development studies completely. As Kasper (2006) writes, CA practitioners do not deny the existence of the individual mind, but that “intrapsychological states and processes are outside of CA’s analytical scope” (p. 84). Kasper’s argument highlights what other researchers have said to be the limits of using CA to investigate learning. Because CA takes knowledge to

\(^8\) While the current study is not an SLA study, much of the work in the field using CA to investigate learning and development has been within L2 classrooms or L2 learning environments. Therefore, while the current study does not fit into that category, some researchers have used the term CA-for-SLA as a catch-all term for anyone using CA to look at learning.
displayed in interaction, CA is able to analyze what is directly observable in interaction. And, as Markee (2008) has noted, it is possible that only a small part of the learning process is directly observable in interaction. Therefore, while CA can describe what is directly viewable, it has nothing to say on the “cognitive and affective states, beliefs, and reflections that are not documented in interactional conduct yet which learners introspectively experience as real and significant” (Kasper, 2006, p. 92).

A second, related way of discussing the issue of individual learning is by recognizing that learning is an individual process but can only be accessed through co-constructed interaction. As such, an IC framework looking at development has the capability of showing what has developed (i.e. the places in which there are changes in the way individuals use particular resources in interaction), but at this point is incapable of independently describing what goes on cognitively during the learning process. Therefore, the most common approach taken in the study of the development of interactional competence is to combine this framework of language use with other socio-cognitively compatible theories of learning that do explicate the role of the individual in development. For example, both Nguyen (2004) and J. K. Hall (1995) have made the argument for turning to sociocultural theory for insight into the mechanism of development. Nguyen (2004) writes, “seeing interactional competence as specific to interactional practices also explains what makes learning possible; Repeated participation in interactive practices on the social plane will help the learner develop appropriate uses of language on the individual plane” (p. 36-37).

Additionally, Hellermann (2006, 2007) has successfully combined IC with language socialization theory, and Brouwer and Wagner (2004) and Young and Miller (2004) have used situated learning theory in conjunction with a framework of IC as well. Therefore, while it is debatable whether an IC framework can convincingly describe the learning process of interactional competence, the literature has shown that when combined with other socio-cognitively
compatible theories of language learning, it is more than capable of illustrating what development of interactional skills look like over time.

2.4 Summary and Conclusions

In this chapter, I have showed that although much of the focus in the ITA literature has been on what types of skills ITAs need to teach effectively, none of these studies have actually investigated what skills actually develop during training or how these skills are displayed in interaction. I also showed two main approaches to combine theories of learning with CA to study learning. Although avoiding use of an external theoretical framework by invoking ethnomethodological principles would solve the criticism that use of CA demands not invoking an a priori theoretical framework, using ethnomethodology as the theoretical backbone of a study of learning is still problematic because ethnomethodology provides no account of why we learn, nor does it provide any procedures to investigate this question. While the use of CA in and of itself is not interested in this question, SLA researchers are. And while CA can answer what is learned, researchers should not have to invoke separate theories of learning when shifting to an analysis of why we learn. By combining CA with other socio-cognitive theories of learning, we would be able to use the same theoretical framework to answer both what and why questions. Therefore, I will be using the theoretical framework of language socialization in my study. While an LS framework can provide the backbone for understanding how individuals, such as ITAs and other novices, develop the interactional skills necessary to participate in the practices they need to engage in on a daily basis, it does not describe what is learned in terms of interactional resources. As such, in order to answer the question of what kinds of interactional skills ITAs develop, it is advantageous to combine this framework with a framework of interactional competence. An IC framework is not only theoretically compatible with a language socialization framework, but also
has a well-defined approach for the analysis of the use and development of interactional skills. Together, these two frameworks allow me to investigate the following two research questions that guide my study:

1. How does one pre-service ITA (Xu) construct and engage in the practice of dialogic teaching during a semester-long ITA course, specifically in the areas of action sequencing and participant frameworks?

2. In what areas, if any, does Xu show evidence of development of pedagogical skills during the practice of dialogic teaching over the course of the semester?

In the next chapter, I describe the data, methods, and analytical procedures I took in this study in order to answer the two main research questions posed above.
Chapter 3

Methodology

In this chapter, I outline the procedures and analytical methods I used in order to answer the two research questions that guide my study. First, I present a description of the data I collected in the study, including background information on the participants and the ITA course. Second, I report on the data collection procedures I utilized, as well as the subset of data that were selected for analysis. Finally, I provide a detailed description of the analytical procedures I used in the study to be able to (1) identify the sequence organization and participant frameworks enacted by Xu in the dialogic lecture, (2) describe systematic changes in the ways Xu structured these sequences and oriented to these frameworks, and (3) describe the ways in which these changes evidence the development of Xu’s pedagogical skills.

3.1 Data

3.1.1 Background of ITA Course

The ITA course observed in this study was an English as a Second Language (ESL) course called American Oral English for International Teaching Assistants. This course is the third in a three-course series designed for graduate student, non-native speakers of English to provide them training in the academic discourse of being a teaching assistant in their respective departments. Students must receive an A in this course before they are permitted to begin active teaching duties in their departments without restriction. Placement in the course is made by first passing both lower-level courses in the series with a grade of A, or by receiving a score in the
range of 230-249 on the pre-screening Oral English Proficiency test. Each section of the class has a maximum of 13 students.

I was able to gain access to the site because of my involvement in the ITA Program at the university where the data were collected. I selected this particular course section to observe for three reasons. First, it was a course section in which I was not the instructor and therefore could remain more objective about the interactions in the course. Second, the course instructor Tabitha was considered to be an excellent instructor, which I hoped would help contribute to the development of the ITAs’ pedagogical skills. Third, the physical location and configuration of the classroom had space for me to both store the cameras when I was not using them to videotape and set up the desks in a configuration favorable to recording multiple participants’ talk.

I observed that the students felt self-conscious being video-taped for the first few days based on their comments to me after class during the first week. However, given that I was there every single day and became acquainted with the students as the semester went on, after the first few days the students appeared to become comfortable with the camera, or at least looked directly at the cameras less frequently, and told to me in personal communication that they sometimes forgot the cameras were there.

### 3.1.2 Participants

The pre-service ITA under investigation is named Xu⁹, who is a male of Chinese descent. At the time of data collection, Xu was a second-year graduate student in the Physics department. He did not take any lower-level ITA courses but was placed directly into the ITA course under investigation based on his score on the pre-screening oral proficiency test.

---

⁹ Pseudonyms were used for all participants in the study.
In addition to Xu, there were eleven other students in the course, all of Asian descent, and one instructor. These students were members of many different departments within the university, although all of the departments can be categorized as those in the fields of Science and Engineering. The majority of the students were placed directly into the ITA course instead of taking earlier, low-level ITA courses, although the data informing exactly how many students were directly placed into the course based on their scores was not available to me. The course instructor, Tabitha, was an experienced ESL teacher in her late 20s and a first-year PhD student at the time of data collection. She had taught this particular training course two times before the current semester. Tabitha is a white, American female from the mid-Atlantic region of the U.S.

I selected Xu as the focal subject because, while observing the ITA course each day, I got the impression that he appeared to become a better teacher over time. Additionally, he passed the post-evaluation exam, thereby receiving approval to teach by the course instructor. If my observations, as well as Xu passing the post-evaluation exam, indicated that Xu developed better teaching skills over the course of the semester, then the development of these skills should be demonstrable empirically. Therefore, I chose Xu in order to see what my impressions were based on empirically and which identifiable pedagogical skills contributed to my impressions.

3.1.3 Data Collection Procedures

Data were collected during the summer 2007 semester. In the summer session, the students and teacher met four days a week for 75 minutes each day over a period of eight weeks. This totaled approximately forty classroom contact hours over the eight-week period. The data were collected via videotaping. The corpus of videotaped data consists of all forty classroom contact hours, as well as office hours sessions, and a thirty-minute post-evaluation exam (see Table 3-3 below).
The post-evaluation exam is an oral exam conducted by two external evaluators and consists of a general question about teaching, an office hours role-play scenario, and a ten-minute dialogic lecture. The purpose of recording all official classroom interactions, the office hours sessions with students, and the post-evaluation exam was to provide a fuller picture of how a classroom community of ITAs develops from the beginning of the course, as well as to look longitudinally at the development of pedagogical skills. Many studies of classroom discourse only observe classroom interaction at certain points during the semester. However, they are not able to provide a complete picture of the development of particular pedagogical skills during training. As Schieffelin and Ochs (1996) note,

Continuous recording of interaction enables analyses of how novices become competent in recognizing shifts from one type of communicative context to another. A continuous detailed record provides a basis for establishing the extent to which children and other novices utilize diverse linguistic and nonlinguistic structures to signal and interpret shifts in communicative act, activity, identity, affect, and knowledge of interlocutors (M. H. Goodwin, 1990; Ochs, 1979; Schieffelin, 1979; Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986). (p. 253)

In order to record the interactions of the entire class during every regular class session, three video cameras were used. The students were grouped into two groups or “pods” of six desks that were pushed together. Two cameras were placed at the back of the classroom, each focused
on a particular pod of desks. A third camera was placed at the front of the classroom, facing outwards towards the students. In addition, the teacher carried a wireless microphone and tabletop microphones were placed on the students’ desks. On days in which the students did teaching simulations in front of the whole class, each student was hooked up to a wireless microphone and one video camera was placed at the back of the room. During the simulations, two tabletop microphones were also placed around the room to record any questions and/or comments from students. During the office hours sessions, one camera was placed in the corner of the room and a tabletop microphone was positioned next to the student and teacher. For the post-evaluation exam, one camera was set up in the back or side of the classroom and each student had a wireless microphone attached to him or her. After data were collected, all oral interactions were transcribed using Transana video transcribing software. Figure 3-1 below shows the classroom set up during classroom taping sessions.

---

Figure 3-1: Classroom Set-up
3.1.3.1 Data Subset

Of the more than forty hours of data collected, a smaller subset of data was used in the analysis itself. Because the interactive practice under investigation is the dialogic lecture, each instance of Xu engaging in the simulated practice of teaching dialogically was selected and transcribed\textsuperscript{10}. In total, there were four instances of dialogic teaching by Xu over the course of the semester. The first lecture (D1) was 5:24 minutes in length and was recorded on July 13, 2007. The next lecture (D2) was 7:17 minutes in length and was recorded one week later on July 20, 2007. The third lecture (D3) was 6:17 minutes in length and was recorded on August 10, 2007. The last dialogic lecture (D4) was 9:50 minutes in length and was recorded on August 15, 2007. The first three dialogic lectures were done during classroom time and the fourth lecture took place during the post-evaluation exam. A visual representation of this subset of data can be seen in Table 3-4 below.

\textsuperscript{10}The activity of the dialogic lecture was determined by the course instructor’s directions. Therefore, I looked only at instances in which the instructor gave directions to “teach dialogically” and did not impose my own judgment of whether the teaching was dialogic or not.
3.2 Data Analysis

After all the data had been collected and all instances of Xu doing teaching dialogically were transcribed using conversation analytic transcription conventions, I analyzed all of the data by paying close attention to both verbal and non-verbal actions in the data, asking (1) what is going on here between the participants? and (2) why that now?

In this section of the chapter, I provide a more detailed description of how I identified the interactive practice of the dialogic lecture. Then, I provide justification for analyzing only two components of the interactional competence framework, i.e. *action sequencing* and *participant frameworks*. Finally, I describe the procedures I took to analyze each of these components in the data.


3.2.1 Identification of the Interactive Practice

As was discussed earlier on the section on interactional competence in Chapter 2, interactive practices are “culturally-mediated moments of face-to-face interaction whereby a group of people come together to create and recreate their everyday social lives” (J. K. Hall, 1993b, p. 145). In order to address the first research question, I undertook two specific tasks: (1) identify the practice of the dialogic lecture, its boundaries and organization, and (2) describe the organization of the practice in detail, including the generic features and sequences of the practice and the spatio-temporal characteristics of the setting. In this section of the chapter, I outline the procedures I used for identifying the practice of the dialogic lecture.

Interactive practices, much like speech events (Hymes, 1974) or communicative events (Saville-Troike, 2003), contain certain kinds of recurrent actions marked by particular verbal (e.g. change in tone or key, use of particular opening or closing phrases) or physical boundaries (e.g. change in participants, participant roles) to indicate when they have started and ended (or interrupted) and another practice has begun. As Saville-Troike (2003) explains, “the designation of some events may be inferred from the fact they are given different labels in the language, and may be identified as categories of talk, but some are not neatly differentiated” (p. 24).

The first method I used to identify the practice was to look for instructions from the course instructor, Tabitha, to practice doing dialogic teaching. For example, before Xu’s second dialogic lecture, Tabitha told him, “Hey Xu you can go ahead and begin.” Xu’s immediate launch into the opening of the dialogic lecture following Tabitha’s statement signified to me the boundary between whole-class talk and Xu’s teaching simulation.

The second method I used to identify the boundaries of talk was to use my insider status. Even though I was not the instructor of the particular class, I am an ITA instructor in the same program as Tabitha and had taught the same course as the course instructor several times before.
This experience, as well as the extensive knowledge I had about the course curriculum, allowed me to identify the interactive practice when it was being done, as well as the verbal and non-verbal boundaries of this practice. For example, I was able to identify when the practice began because typically the course instructor sits down at the back of the classroom, passes out evaluation forms to the other students, and gets the timer ready before giving permission to the student when it is his or her turn to begin.

3.2.2 Selection of Focal Components of IC

I have chosen to analyze only the IC components of action sequencing and participant frameworks for the present study. The rationale for using these two particular components is two-fold. First, as I began analysis of the data, the sequencing of the dialogic lecture, along with the various participant frameworks used, became especially salient. For instance, because the dialogic lecture is performed as a class-within-a-class, orientation to particular participant roles over others became especially important for successful completion of the activity. One of the goals of the course is for the ITAs to orient to the role of a teacher teaching rather than a student giving a presentation. Therefore, looking at participant frameworks in particular is an especially useful way to look at shifts in participant roles over time. Second, all of the components of the IC framework are interrelated and therefore the other components not included in my analysis are still relevant to both action sequencing and participant frameworks. For example, the use of a particular register incorporating technical Physics terms into the lecture plays a large role in orientation to and negotiation of an EXPERT—NON-EXPERT framework. Finally, action sequencing naturally involves turn-taking, control of the floor, and which topics are talked about. As Hymes (1974) writes, “all aspects of a speech event are aspects from one point of view [and] that all aspects may be viewed in terms of any one factor” (p. 201). Therefore, I have only
provided analyses of the components *action sequencing* and *participant frameworks*, although recognizing potential connections between all components.

### 3.2.3 Action Sequencing

The action sequence, or act-sequence as it is referred to by Hall (1993b), is concerned with the sequential and organizational development of conversation as it unfolds in practice. Elements that have been studied in regard to action sequence include openings, closings, and transitions (Jefferson, 1973; Schegloff, 1968, 1979, 1986, 2002; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Because these practices are recurrent and often follow a particular script, what can be revealing is observing how participants negotiate and adapt to these recurrent practices on a moment-to-moment basis and over time.

#### 3.2.3.1 Identification of Sequence Types

Methodologically, the most successful procedure for studying *action sequences* has been the use of conversation analysis because of its focus on the sequential organization of talk-in-interaction. For identification of the organizational structure of the dialogic lecture, I employed a procedure used by Jefferson (1988) for identification of sequential organization of an activity. She used a large corpus of data that included troubles-talk sequences and found “a series of recurrent, positioned elements” that “could be grouped into a rough segmental order” (p. 420). Once the recurrent sequences were identified, she used this to create a loose template characterizing not necessarily every single sequence found in that template, but every recurring type of sequence found. I used a similar procedure. For example, in the early stages of analysis, I sketched out a rough outline of the macro-organizational structure of each of the dialogic lectures
in order to discern the functions of each type of sequence on different parts of the lecture (Figure 3-2).

Once I had sketched out a rough outline of each of the four lectures, I looked for transitional markers in the discourse that signaled shifts to different sections of the lecture. These markers often took the form of explicit announcements like, “Now is a good place to stop.” These discourse markers helped me identify each of the recurring sequence types within a particular macro-section of the lecture, which could then also be grouped into a loose chronological order. From there, I looked at the talk within each of these macro-sections in order to identify the different sequence types occurring. Once I was able to identify each of the sequence types in a particular macro-section, I analyzed each one and picked out any variations in these sequences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Acknowledge prev. speaker</td>
<td>I. Permission to begin by T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Intro topic that will be covered</td>
<td>II. Acknowledgment of permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Ask Q(s) about material re: today’s topic</td>
<td>III. Greetings*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Announces that they’ll go through Qs one-by-one</td>
<td>IV. Intro topic that will be covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Repeats Q 1</td>
<td>V. Relate back to previous lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Gives answer to Q 1</td>
<td>a. Ask Ss if they remember topic of last time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Defines concept(s) associated with answer 1</td>
<td>b. Tells topic of last time and how it links to this week’s topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Gives an example of concept 1</td>
<td>c. Q about last time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. Repeats Q2</td>
<td>d. Explanation of how Q links to this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Gives answer to Q2</td>
<td>VI. Defines topic of today’s talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. Explains concepts rationalizing answer 2</td>
<td>VII. Asks Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII. Gives answer to Q3</td>
<td>VIII. Someone gives answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII. Explains concepts rationalizing answer 3</td>
<td>IX. Confirms correctness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV. Example of concept 3</td>
<td>X. Expands on answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV. Intros next speaker &amp; their plan</td>
<td>XI. Gives example/analogy of concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI. Greets next speaker</td>
<td>XII. Summarizes concepts learned thus far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XIII. New Q&amp;A sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XIV. Announces that’s what he’s going to talk about today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XV. Check if Ss have Qs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XVI. Announces they can start now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XVII. Greets next speaker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D3</th>
<th>D4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Greeting</td>
<td>I. Greeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Intro topic that will be covered</td>
<td>II. Intro topic for today and plan of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Q1-2 (Ask, confirm, expand)</td>
<td>III. Q1 (Ask, confirm, expand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Ask Q3</td>
<td>IV. Q2 (Ask, confirm, expand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Confirm A3</td>
<td>V. Example to illustrate A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Repeat topic for today</td>
<td>VI. Ask Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Q4 on today’s topic</td>
<td>VII. Confirm A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Confirm A4</td>
<td>VIII. Repeat topic for today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. Expand on A4</td>
<td>IX. Q4 (Ask, confirm, expand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Q5</td>
<td>X. Intro 2nd topic of lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. Example to contextualize Q5</td>
<td>XI. Q5 (Ask, confirm, expand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII. Confirm A5</td>
<td>XII. Intro 3rd point of lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII. Expand on A5</td>
<td>XIII. Q6 (Ask, confirm, expand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV. Q6-7 (Ask, confirm, expand)</td>
<td>XIV. Example to illustrate A6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV. Announces end of lecture</td>
<td>XV. Further explanation of 3rd point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI. Summarizes what has been learned today</td>
<td>XVI. Announces end of lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII. Announces the “take-away” of lecture</td>
<td>XVII. Open floor to Qs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII. Assign homework</td>
<td>XVIII. S asks Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX. Preview next week’s topic</td>
<td>XIX. Answers Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX. Open floor to Qs</td>
<td>XX. Re-announces end of lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI. Remind Ss of office hrs for Qs</td>
<td>XXI. Summarizes what has been learned today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII. Greetings</td>
<td>XXII. Announces the “take-away” of lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXIII. Assign homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXIV. Preview next week’s topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXV. Re-announces homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXVI. Greetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3-2: Early Outlines of the Dialogic Lecture**
3.2.3.2 Development in Action Sequencing

Once all of the sequence types within a macro-section had been identified, I lined up each of the sequence types for a particular macro-section in chronological order. This allowed me to identify any systematic changes in the structuring of those sequences. An example of what this looked like over time in the opening greetings can be seen below in Table 3-5. First, in the greeting space of the first lecture (D1), Xu thanks the previous lecturer for his talk (line 12) before moving on to describe the plan for the day (lines 13-14). In D2, after permission is given by the instructor to begin (line 1), Xu begins to give the plan of action for the day before self-correcting and greeting the students (line 4). In subsequent lectures (D3 & D4), we see Xu change the ways he structures the first two parts of the lecture by greeting the class first (D3, line 1; D4, line 1) and then presenting the plan of action for the day after the greeting (D3, lines 1 and 3; D4, lines 1, 3-5).
Table 3-5: Raw Data of Sequences for Analysis of Development -- GREETINGS

Table 4-1: D1 (1-9)

1 B: next (. ) uh: Xu will introduce (. ) the second topic
2 (. )
3 B: thank you
4 (1:4)
5 S8: +Ss applause
6 + (4:2)
7 X: (xxxx)
8 + (8:3)
9 x: +pens on wireless mic, back facing audience
10 X: +(clears throat)
11 x: +walks around to the back of the desk, turning to face class
12 X: thank you for Bai' for his (. ) wonderful opening? GREETING
13 um (. ) I'm going to talk about: what kind of
14 instructional' behavior' can motivate students.

Table 4-2: D2 (4-6)

1 T: hey +Xu you can go ahead and begin (. ) sorry
2 X: +Xu starts walking up to the front of the class
3 (. )
4 X: +it's alright (. ) uh:. +today I= ++the (. ) llo SISR/
5 x: +puts head down
6 x: ++lifts head turning to board
7 x: ++turns to face audience
8 everyone today +our topic will be the kinematics
9 x: +turns to face to board
10 in the one d dimension (. ) before I go over the
11 concept of the dynamics and kinematics um: do
12 you still remember what I talk about

Table 4-5: D3 (1-2)

1 X: hello everyone. +today I'm going to talk about the GREETING
2 x: +puts head down
3 (. ) one dimension motion (. ) under the gravity (. )
4 so (. ) lets begin with (. ) two questions (0.7)

Table 4-5: D4 (1-2)

1 X: um: good morning everyone' (. ) +today we are GREETING
2 x: +puts head down
3 going to talk about the one dimensional motion.
4 (. ) under the influence of the gravity (. ) our
5 plan today will start with the
3.2.4 Participant Frameworks

Participant frameworks describe how participants adopt different social roles and manage those roles and those of other participants in interactions. Interactive footing (C. Goodwin, 2007a, 2007b) describes Goodwin’s approach to the study of participant frameworks, which looks at how all the participants in a conversation actively orient to one another both verbally and non-verbally as the conversation unfolds. Therefore, the speaker is no longer positioned as the center of the activity, as in Goffman’s footing (Goffman, 1981), but is part of the emerging dynamic created by all the participants. In order to acknowledge this unfolding moment-to-moment orientation to participant roles, I used Goodwin’s notion of interactive footing in my analysis.

3.2.4.1 Identification of Participant Frameworks

In order to identify the different participant frameworks enacted in the discourse, like Nguyen (2004) I again looked turn-by-turn at what each participant was doing at any given time, asking myself, “At this moment, what participant role could the speaker be projecting for him/herself and for others?” (p. 293). By evaluating the participant roles on a turn-by-turn basis, this afforded me the opportunity to let the particular roles relevant to the interaction emerge from the data itself rather than have me impose pre-specified categories, such as “teacher” or “student”. The particular linguistic cues I looked for to index particular participant roles were those of personal pronouns, deictic references (e.g. ‘this class’), and verbs indicating beliefs about membership or knowledge of something (e.g. ‘I know’, ‘you are’). For example, in the below
excerpt we see Xu explicitly orient to his and his classmates’ roles as students in the ITA course by referencing the course instructor and their collective experiences in the ITA course.

Excerpt 3-1: D1

79  X: (.) and the last thing is that (.) not only (.)
80  you need to let students know your expectation
81  (.) however the most important thing is you need
82  to make them to believe (1.0) it is realistic
83  for them (.) for example at the beginning of the
84  118 Tabitha said all of ↑us will be is good
85  enough to pass the this 118? and get all get a
86  (.) and that’s kind of (0.9) to:: made us to
87  believe’ that his- her- expe- expectation is
88  realistic for us. so that’s an example [(.)] so: now
89  n: [nods]

We see explicit references to Xu’s role as a student in the ITA course in line 84. Specifically, he makes a specific reference to the course instructor Tabitha and what Tabitha ‘said’ (line 84) for all of ‘us’ (line 84) to pass ‘this 118 [course]’ (line 85), using the deictic reference ‘this’ to recognize that the current class in question is the ITA course. Additionally, the use of inclusive ‘us’ (lines 84, 86, 88) indicates that Xu is orienting to both the other classmates and himself as members of the ITA course.

3.2.4.2 Development in Participant Frameworks

After identifying the relevant participant frameworks enacted in the data, I lined up all of the references found indicating orientation to a particular participant role in chronological order. This allowed me to look for changes, both verbally and non-verbally, in orientation to a particular
participant role over time. For example, I looked at the types of announcements Xu made in the pre-closing of the lecture and found that over time, Xu showed an increase in use of classroom-specific language (Table 3-6).

| Table 3-6: Development of Increasing Use of Classroom-Specific Language |
|---|---|
| D1: | PREVIEW |
| D2: | SUMMARY |
| D3: | SUMMARY - HOMEWORK - PREVIEW - OFFICE HOURS |
| D4: | SUMMARY - HOMEWORK - PREVIEW |

In the first lecture (D1), Xu previewed the next lecturer’s topic. In the second lecture (D2), he summarized his own lecture. In lectures three and four, we see a change in the language he uses though. In addition to a summary of the lecture, which can be found at the end of any academic presentation and is not necessarily specific to a classroom environment, Xu assigns homework, previews the next lesson, and informs students of his office hours. The inclusion of these types of announcements would be considered evidence of a shift to use more classroom-specific language that also indexes a shifting orientation to the role of teacher in a classroom.

### 3.3 Summary

In this chapter, I have situated the focal data used to study Xu’s development of pedagogical skills while doing dialogic teaching into the larger context of the ITA Program of the university and the ITA course in which he was observed. I began by describing who the participants in the study are, the point of entry of my access to their ITA course, and the procedures for collecting data from the site. Then I described the procedures I used to analyze the components of action sequencing and participant frameworks from the framework of interactional competence. For each component, I illustrated the procedures I used for identifying
the sequences and participant frameworks enacted in the talk during each dialogic lecture, followed by the procedures taken to investigate development in each of those areas as well.
Chapter 4

Sequence Organization in the Dialogic Lecture

This chapter is organized as follows. First, I explain the surrounding details that are constitutive of each lecture, including topic, ordering of sequences relative to one another, and participants involved. Next, I provide a general architecture of the dialogic lecture, as constructed by Xu (Figure 4-1).

As described earlier in Chapter 3, the data come from four lectures presented by Xu over a period of one month. I refer to these lectures as Dialogic 1 (D1), Dialogic 2 (D2), Dialogic 3 (D3), and Dialogic 4 (D4). In lectures D2 through D4, Xu is the only presenter of each lecture. The topic of D2 is ‘kinematics’. For lecture D3, Xu was instructed to expand on the topic in D2 and make it “even more” dialogic. The topic of D3 was ‘one-dimensional motion under the influence of gravity.’ For D4, Xu presented on the same topic as in D3 after having received feedback by his course instructor.

The first lecture (D1) is presented in a slightly different format than the subsequent lectures. In D1, Xu is one of four presenters of the lecture. In this lecture, Xu and his three other group members were assigned the lecture topic of ‘motivating students in the classroom.’ The group was permitted to divide the teaching roles in any manner they wanted under the restraint that the entire lecture be no longer than fifteen minutes, with another five minutes for questions and answers at the end if needed. The group chose to split their larger topic into sub-topics, with each group member teaching one sub-topic as an autonomous lecture, and the first and last lecturers providing an introduction and conclusion for the group as a whole. Xu’s position in this lecture was as the second lecturer. Therefore, in order to look at sequence organization in this particular lecture, I first analyzed Xu’s part of the lecture as an autonomous unit and then looked
at the patterns of opening and closing sequences made by the first and last presenters in order to see if particular sequences that were not used by Xu in his sub-lecture were accomplished by other members of the group whose roles designated them to introduce or conclude the lecture.

Because of the nature of the four-person dialogic lecture, some of the sequences accomplished in the lecture were designated as *conditional* rather than *optional* or *mandatory*. They are *conditional* because the ordering of the presenters relative to one another in D1, in some instances, determined which individuals would perform a particular sequence. The designation of *optional* versus *mandatory* components was decided by the frequency of occurrence in the data. For instance, Xu included some type of PLAN OF ACTION statement in all four dialogic lectures; therefore, it was designated as a *mandatory* component. On the other hand, a TAKE AWAY point was not announced in every lecture and so it was designated as *optional*. A complete architecture of the dialogic lecture, including those sequences designated as *mandatory*, *conditional*, or *optional* can be seen in Figure 4-1 below.
I. Opening
   A. Greeting@
   B. Plan of Action (Announcement)

II. Review
   A. Pre-Announcement of IRF*
   B. Initiation-Response-Follow-up Sequence

III. Lecture
   A. Repeat plan of action (RPOA) (Announcement)
   B. Pre-Announcement of IRF*
   C. Initiation-Response-Follow-up Sequence

IV. Pre Pre-Closing
   A. Announcement
      1) End of Lecture@
      2) Summary@
      3) Take-away point*
      4) Homework*
      5) Previews Next Lecture*

V. Pre-Closing
   A. Opens Floor to Questions (Offer-Accept/Decline)@
   B. Question-Answer sequence*

VI. Closing
   A. Delayed Offer-Accept/Decline sequence*
   B. Leave Taking@

*Indicates actions that are optional
@ Indicates actions that are conditional

Figure 4-1: Architecture of the Dialogic Lecture
4.1 Pre-Activity

In this ITA classroom, the opening of the activity of the dialogic lecture is bounded by permission from the instructor to begin\(^\text{11}\). For example, before Xu’s second dialogic lecture, Tabitha told Xu, “Hey Xu you can go ahead and begin.” This permission by the instructor mirrors similar findings in the classroom in which the start of student-student pair or group work is bounded by instructor directions to begin completing the activity (Hellermann, 2007, 2008).

4.2 Opening

There are two major sequential components comprising the opening in the dialogic lecture, (A) the GREETING and (B) the PLAN OF ACTION. The opening section serves to establish a state of mutual participation and orientation to the activity at hand, as has been documented elsewhere in the literature (Goffman, 1963; Hellermann, 2007, 2008; Schegloff, 1997).

4.2.1 Greeting

The GREETING sequence of the opening is accomplished by a verbal greeting as well as body positioning and gaze that lead into the verbal greeting. The body positioning of the instructor before the verbal GREETING sequence is optionally marked by a downward gaze and body positioning away from the audience. In cases in which there is downward gaze and body positioning away from the audience (Figure 4-2), as Xu utters the first pair part (FPP) of the verbal GREETING, he turns to face the audience and his gaze is lifted and he steadily looks out at the audience. An example of this can be seen in Figure 4-3.

\(^{11}\) One exception happens when Xu is the second speaker in a four-person group lecture. He begins after the applause ends for the first speaker, after which he moves to the front of the class, taking the microphone from the first speaker and beginning. However, before the first speaker of the group lecture begins, the instructor does in fact give them permission to start the presentation, which lends additional evidence that the opening of this practice is bounded in this way regardless of the speaker.
In the one case of no downward gaze or body positioning away from the audience, Xu begins greeting the audience while keeping his hands at his side and his gaze outward (see Figure 4-4 below).
There is one action in the verbal part of the GREETING sequence. This action is a verbal greeting by the instructor. In Excerpt 4-1, we see the verbal greeting by Xu in line 1 (‘good morning everyone’).

Excerpt 4-1: D4

1  X:  um:  good morning everyone’ (. ) +today we are GREETING
2  x:  +puts head down
3  going to talk about the one dimensional motion.

There is only a micro-pause between this greeting and the next statement. This lack of pausing to allow for a response to the verbal greeting suggests that a second pair part (SPP) response is not a preferred response to the FPP greeting. In fact, research into academic lectures and presentations has shown that, at least in the monologic part of an academic presentation (i.e. the time when there is no invited audience participation), the regular turn-taking mechanisms are suspended (Bamford, 2005; Goffman, 1981; Rendle-Short, 2006). In these situations, the main speaker—the instructor—may hold the floor for an extended period of time without interruption. That appears to be the case here as well.
Sequentially, the GREETING sequence is the first element of the opening. This is exemplified in line 1 of Excerpt 4-2 and Excerpt 4-3, respectively. In Excerpt 4-2, the FPP of the GREETING is ‘hello everyone’ (line 1). The falling intonation signals the end of a greeting statement, indicating a transition relevance place (TRP). However, no response (as expected) is made in this TRP, only a direct continuation into next section by Xu.

Excerpt 4-2: D3

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X: hello everyone. +today I’m going to talk about the GREETING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>x: +puts head down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(. one dimension motion (. under the gravity (.))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>so (. lets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Excerpt 4-3, there is a verbal greeting of ‘good morning everyone’ in line 1. Following this verbal greeting is a direct launch into the next section.

Excerpt 4-3: D4

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X: um: good morning everyone’ (. +today we are GREETING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>x: +puts head down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>going to talk about the one dimensional motion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(. under the ↑influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each case, Xu begins the lecture with a verbal greeting before announcing the PLAN OF ACTION. The fact that the GREETING is expected to occur before the PLAN OF ACTION is marked by the self-initiated self-repair (SISR) that Xu undertakes in line 4 of Excerpt 4-4.
As we can see, Xu begins the PLAN OF ACTION but stops before he states what he plans to do and initiates a self-repair and performs the GREETING instead. He then moves on to the PLAN OF ACTION.

There is one exception to the occurrence of a GREETING sequence. In Excerpt 4-5, there is no explicit verbal greeting as in Excerpt 4-2, Excerpt 4-3, and Excerpt 4-4. This instantiation differs from the other three in that, in the first three, Xu is the first and only lecturer. In the example illustrated in Excerpt 4-5 (D1), he is the second in a four-person lecture. In this case, the first lecturer, Bai, performs the opening. To illustrate this example, the beginning of Xu’s part of the lecture acknowledges the initial opening by Bai in Excerpt 4-5. We see in this excerpt, line 12, an acknowledgment of Bai’s part of the lecture by Xu rather than a greeting of the audience and a preview of the PLAN OF ACTION for the lesson.

Excerpt 4-4: D2

1  T:  hey +Xu you can go ahead and begin (.). sorry  
2  x:  +Xu starts walking up to the front of the class  
3  (.).  
4  X:  +it’s alright (.). uh:: ++today I- +++he (.). llo  
5  x:  +puts head down  
6  x:  ++lifts head turning to board  
7  x:  +++turns to face audience  
8  everyone today +our topic will be the kinematics  
9  x:  +turns to face to board  
10  in the one d dimension (.). before I go over the  
11  concept of the dynamics

SISR/ GREETING
Excerpt 4-5: D1

1 B: next (. ) uh: Xu will introduce (. ) the second topic  
2 (. )  
3 B: thank you  
4 (1.4)  
5 Ss: +Ss applaud  
6 + (4.2)  
7 X: (xxxx)  
8 + (8.3)  
9 x: +puts on wireless mic, back facing audience  
10 X: +(clears throat)  
11 x: +walks around to the back of the desk, turning to face class  
12 X: thank you for Bai’ for his (. ) wonderful opening?  
13 (. ) I’m going to talk abou:  

At first glance it might appear that a GREETING sequence is an optional component of the
opening. However, if we look at this particular activity as one whose roles have been distributed
among the four participants then we can see that the GREETING still occurs at the beginning of the
lecture but has been taken up by the first speaker, Bai (Excerpt 4-6), rather than Xu, who is the
second of four lecturers.

Excerpt 4-6: D1 (Bai)

1 B: okay (. ) let’s begin. hello everyone ++(. ) today GREETING  
2 b: +claps hands together  
3 b: + +claps hands together  
4 B: our group will talk about motivate student.  

Thus, the GREETING appears to be conditional on who is performing first in the lecture, rather
than optional. In all subsequent lectures, Xu is the first and only lecturer and performs a
GREETING as well.
4.2.2 Plan of Action

Following the GREETING sequence in the opening is the PLAN OF ACTION. The PLAN OF ACTION is an ANNOUNCEMENT sequence. This sequence is comprised of one action – a verbal ANNOUNCEMENT. Excerpt 4-7 illustrates a typical PLAN OF ACTION sequence.

Excerpt 4-7: D3

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X: hello everyone. today I’m going to talk about the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(. ) one dimension motion (. ) under the gravity ←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(. ) so (. ) let’s begin with (. ) two questions ←</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following a verbal greeting in line 1 (‘hello everyone’), Xu begins the PLAN OF ACTION by announcing, ‘today I’m going to talk about the one dimensional motion under the gravity.’ This verbal announcement represents the FPP of this ANNOUNCEMENT sequence. There are four micro pauses in this excerpt. However, only the third micro-pause (line 3) functions as a transition relevance place (TRP) between the PLAN OF ACTION and the next part of the lecture. In this space, any response to the newsworthiness of the ANNOUNCEMENT would be appropriate. However, there is no response in that TRP, indicating that there is no second action in the sequence.

4.3 Review

The review section of the lecture follows the PLAN OF ACTION. The review is comprised of two sequences, an optional PRE-ANNOUNCEMENT sequence and an INITIATION-RESPONSE-FOLLOW-UP (IRF) sequence. Additionally, it may involve explicit orienting markers, both organizational and temporal, which situate each of these sequences relative to one another and the lecture as a whole.
4.3.1 Pre-Announcement of IRF Sequence

The PRE-ANNOUNCEMENT sequence is an optional component of the review, deployed to orient the students to an impending IRF sequence. The three possible trajectories of the PRE-ANNOUNCEMENT sequence can be seen in Figure 4-5 below.

![Figure 4-5: Three Trajectories of PRE-ANNOUNCEMENT Sequence](image)

The configuration of this sequence in the dialogic lecture is a variation of the “I’ve got + [characterization]” form of a PRE-ANNOUNCEMENT often deployed in general conversation, as depicted in the example below from Schegloff (2007).

---

12 There is some variability in the literature on use of the term pre-announcement or pre-question in cases coming before questions. Schegloff (1990) has implied pre-questions as one type of a larger category of pre-announcement, Nguyen (2004), on the other hand, has chosen to refer to specific pre-announcements by type (e.g. pre-question), rather than the class of pre-announcements as a whole. However, even if a pre-question could be one way of describing a particular kind of pre-announcement, I have chosen to use pre-announcement as the blanket term to cover all types of pre-announcements used.
In line 1, Ben pre-announces that he ‘got’ some information ‘that’s wild’. In line 2, Bill confirms the newsworthiness of this information by asking Ben to tell what it is. Ben then makes the actual announcement in lines 3-4 that he pre-announced in line 1.

The PRE-ANNOUNCEMENT sequence in the dialogic lecture has two, rather than one, parts. The first part is “I’ve got a question” (A1) and the second part is “the question is…” (A2). These two parts initially appeared to be one longer PRE-ANNOUNCEMENT, which is illustrated in Excerpt 4-9.

Excerpt 4-9: D1

| 9-10 | X: thank you for Bai’ for his (. ) wonderful opening?               | A1  |
|      | um ( . ) I'm going to talk abou: what kind of                        |
|      | instructional' behavior' can motivate students.                      |
| 12   | But beffore I sta:rt that (. ) topic I would like                   |
|      | to ask couple questions (.hh) +for example?(. )                    | A1  |
| 14   | x: *holds up one finger                                             |
| 15   | the first question=is+ ↑what kind of expect- ah                    | A2  |
| 16   | ih- e- expectation is better to motivate a                         |
| 17   | student (. ) is ↑higher the- higher the uh (. )                    |
| 18   | expectation better? or lower the expectation (1.0)                 |
| 19   | better. (. ) what do you think                                     |

In lines 12-13, Xu remarks, ‘I would like to ask couple questions,’ and, following a slight hesitation (.hh), goes on to announce in lines 13 and 15, ‘for example the first question is.’

However, in Excerpt 4-10 and Excerpt 4-11, we see that these two parts do not constitute one longer part, but can be distributed separately and function as individual PRE-ANNOUNCEMENTS, although they represent the only two types of PRE-ANNOUNCEMENTS that occur. In Excerpt 4-10, we see the first part of the PRE-ANNOUNCEMENT that constitutes “I have a question” (A1) (line 3). Instead of the second part “The question is…” (A2) occurring directly
after the first part (A1), letting us know that a question is forthcoming (as in Excerpt 4-9 above),
the instructor launches directly into the question (lines 3-4) without also pre-announcing “the
question is…”

Excerpt 4-10: D3

1  X: hello everyone. today I’m going to talk about the
2   (. ) one dimension motion (. ) under the gravity (.)
3   so (. ) let’s begin with (. ) two questions (0.7) do A1
4   you still remember what’s one dimension?(1.3) what
5   one dimension is

Several lines later (line 11), in Excerpt 4-11, before a second IRF sequence is initiated, the
instructor inserts the second part (A2) of the PRE-ANNOUNCEMENT (e.g. “The question is…”).

Excerpt 4-11: D3

11  X: one direction (. ) +so (. ) the next question is A2
12  x: +looks down at paper
13  X: (. )+ what’s gravity. I think it’s um (. ) something
14   (learned) ten years ago. (1.4) do::s (. ) does
15   some- (. ) somebody still remember what’s gravity?

The PRE-ANNOUNCEMENT sequence has two important functions for the unfolding
lecture. First, it orients the students to an impending IRF sequence, during which time their
participation will be requested. Second, this sequence, like any pre- sequence, makes the
sequence it announces sequentially relevant as the next sequence.

4.3.2 Initiation-Response-Follow-up Sequence

The INITIATION-RESPONSE-FOLLOW-UP (IRF) sequence is central to an
instructional environment (Cazden, 1988; Gutierrez, 1994; J. K. Hall, 1998; J. K. Hall & Walsh,
2002; Lemke, 1990; Mehan, 1979; Nassaji & Wells, 2000; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Wells, 1993), and in this case is central to the review section. Unlike almost all other sequences involved in the dialogic lectures here, the IRF sequence involves verbal interaction between the instructor and students. There are two main trajectories of the IRF sequence in the review section of the lecture, both of which occur in a third, follow-up (F) position\(^\dagger\) (see Figure 4-6).

\[\text{I-R-(F)}\]

\[\text{Evaluation (E)} \quad \text{Acknowledgement (F}_{\text{ack}}\text{)}\]

\[-E\quad -E-F\quad -F_{\text{ack}}\quad -F_{\text{ack}}^-R^-R^-F_{\text{ack}}\]

\[-I_{\text{rep}}^-R_1^-R_2^-I_{\text{rep}}^-R^-E-F\]

Figure 4-6: Trajectories of the IRF Sequence in the Review

The first trajectory shows the sequence closing down with an evaluation (E), although an additional follow-up move commenting on the evaluation does occur in a variation and a sub-variation of this trajectory. In the second trajectory, the response (R) is followed by an acknowledgement of a response (F\(_{\text{ack}}\)). Within this second trajectory, there are two variations as well.

\(^\dagger\) Although this sequence has been often documented in the literature as IRE, where the E describes an evaluatory 3\textsuperscript{rd} move by the instructor, this label does not always accurately reflect the diversity of 3\textsuperscript{rd} moves used in the classroom. Therefore, I will use the term F (follow-up) as a general classification of all possible follow-up moves, with an evaluation (E) being one such possible move.
In cases in which the trajectory of the IRF sequence ultimately leads to an evaluatory move (E) (n= 9 of 12), there are two variations that unfold in the sequence, with one sub-variation. The projections of this trajectory are illustrated in Figure 4-7 below.

![Figure 4-7: Trajectory of the IRF Sequence Leading to an Evaluation (E)](image_url)

In the first variation (I-R-(E)), the follow-up move is a positive evaluation of the response given in the second move. For example, in Excerpt 4-12, a question is initiated (I) in line 24, which makes relevant the response (R) in line 26. The sequence is then closed down with a positive evaluation (E) in line 29 ('yes').
In the second variation of this trajectory, there is first an evaluation (E) in the 3rd move, followed by an additional follow-up move (F) within the same turn. This variation unfolds as I-R-(E-F). In Excerpt 4-13, we have an example of this outcome.

Excerpt 4-13: D3

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X:</td>
<td>begin with (.) two questions (0.7) do you still remember I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>what’s one dimension? (1.3) what one dimension is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SU:</td>
<td>one (way) R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X:</td>
<td>yeah it’s one freedom E/F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, there is a question initiated in lines 3-4 (‘do you still remember what’s one dimension’) and reworded in line 4. A student response in line 6 (‘one way’) is followed by a teacher evaluation in the third move (‘yeah’) (line 8). Finally, the sequence is closed down in the fourth move (line 8), which is an expansion of the response in line 6 (‘it’s one freedom’).¹⁴

Excerpt 4-14 demonstrates a sub-variation of this second variation (I-R-(E-F)). In this case, this excerpt shows how a second question (I₂) can be deployed in orientation to the student’s response, or in this case a lack of response (R₀), as a means of eliciting a response to the original

¹⁴ Note the ‘yeah’ or ‘exactly’ stand in contrast to ‘okay’ as an evaluation, rather than acknowledgement, token in the third position.
question (I). This attempt at eliciting a response to the original question then leads to a final, sequence-closing evaluation (E) and follow-up move (F).

Excerpt 4-14: D2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>so who can (0.5) find a relationship between this ball’ and the motion detector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>what are the relationship between this ball (0.6) actually it’s a (1.1) tennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>have anyone watch a tennis game?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>+yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>+nods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>so can you find any relationship between the motion detector and the tennis game?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>detect the speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>(xxx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>yes (.) so (.) when someone serve (.) they will have</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the excerpt above, the original question is initiated in line 26. A long pause (2.6 sec) indicates a no response to the question (line 28). This silence makes relevant to Xu several options for a next action, including abandoning the question altogether or responding to the question himself. Xu chooses to re-word the question as the next move. This rewording is met with silence (line 31). The same options as above are again made relevant in response to the silence. Instead of utilizing these options, a sub-question (line 32) is initiated, whose response (line 34) reveals either the possibility or impossibility of responding to the initial question because the students would have indicated they have enough contextual knowledge of tennis to be able to interpret what Xu was asking in the original question. Sequentially, this is a very important move because, by introducing a sub-question and its response, the instructor is able to discern if the original
question is even answerable. Once he has found out that the students have enough knowledge of what tennis is to be able to answer the initial question, it makes relevant a final rewording (lines 37-38) of this question.

The second main trajectory of the IRF sequence in the review closes in the follow-up move with an acknowledgement of a response given (Fack) (n= 3 of 12).

![Figure 4-8: Trajectory of the IRF Sequence Leading to an Acknowledgement of Response (Fack)](image)

In the first variation of this trajectory, the sequence unfolds as I-R-(Fack). We can see this in Excerpt 4-15 below.

**Excerpt 4-15: D4**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>X:</td>
<td>only one (. ) freedom (0.5) so: (0.5) th- (0.7) do you</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>follow me?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>H:</td>
<td>yes. I-</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>X:</td>
<td>okay. so let’s move to the second definition.</td>
<td>Fack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line 19, a question is initiated (‘do you follow me?’)\(^5\). This move is followed by an affirmative response in line 21 (‘yes’), which is in turn followed by an acknowledgement of this response in line 22 (‘okay’).

In the second variation of this trajectory, instead of the sequence shutting down after the initial third Fack move, additional responses to the initial question are solicited (F1). This sequence

\(^5\) This type of question is commonly referred to as a comprehension check (Rounds, 1994), in which the instructor checks with the students to make sure they follow his or her explanations or questions. However, a comprehension check is only one type of IRF sequence in which the 3rd move is an Fack.
unfolds as I-R (F_{ack}-F_{I}-R-F_{ack}). Following any additional responses made (including no response),
these responses make relevant additional acknowledgements of those responses (F_{ack}) before
closing down the sequence. Excerpt 4-16 provides an excellent example of this.

Excerpt 4-16: D1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>okay yeah. okay the second question is that is it a good thing to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tell the student what they need to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.). to succeed. (.). in your course. (0.8) is it a good? thing or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a bad thing’ (0.6) if you tell them how to do it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>it really depends on (1.1) the class and what you want to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>okay one answer’ any (.). one would like to guess? (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>anyway (.). okay (we already get) one answer so let’s move to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>third question (0.7) the third question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In lines 28-32, Xu initiates a question (I). This makes relevant a student’s response in lines 34-35.
In line 36, Xu then acknowledges (F_{ack}) the response made in the previous turn (‘okay one answer’) and then solicits additional responses from other students (F_{I}). The silence (R_{Ø}) in line 37 makes relevant an acknowledgement of this silence. This acknowledgement is made in line 38, thus closing down the sequence.

While each of the twelve IRF sequences in the review section of the lecture either projects a follow-up move that ultimately ends in an evaluation (E) or an acknowledgement (F_{ack}), one of these sequences unfolds in a manner that exhibits characteristics of both (Excerpt 4-17).
In Excerpt 4-17, a question is initiated in line 14 (‘what kind of expectation is better to motivate a student’), which is then reformulated in lines 15-17 so that only two responses are made relevant (i.e. higher or lower). One student responds with one of the two relevant answers in line 22 (‘I’ll say higher’). Xu then positively evaluates this response in line 24 (‘yes’). Being an either/or question, a positive evaluation of one response would render other possible responses incorrect. However, instead of closing the sequence down, Xu solicits other responses from students (line 26) (‘so anyone else would like to guess? is higher’). This solicitation is met with a one-second pause (line 28), followed by indistinguishable talk by a student (line 29). The lack of response in line 28 and the indistinguishable talk in line 29 are then acknowledged in lines 30 and 32 (‘okay’), before being positively evaluated within the same turn (‘yeah’), thereby closing the sequence down.
The question raised by the unfolding of this sequence is why Xu continues to solicit additional responses to the question when (1) the question allowed for only one of the two relevant responses to be acceptable, and (2) Xu had already evaluated one student’s response as the acceptable one in line 24. One possible explanation is that although the students oriented to the original follow-up move (‘yes’) as an evaluation (E) of one response as correct, rendering any other answers as necessarily incorrect, Xu may have intended the ‘yes’ as an acknowledgement token (Fack) rather than as an evaluatory token. This would explain why the sequence continued through a series of solicitations of additional responses rather than be closed down.

4.3.3 Orientation Markers

Orientation markers mark the review section of the lecture as separate from the topic of the day’s lecture sequentially in that the sequences in the review come before the new information about the topic is presented. These markers consist of lexical words and phrases that demarcate spatial and temporal relations, such as now, first, or before, and position the sequences in a particular section relative to one another. We can see an example of how an organizational marker is used in Excerpt 4-18 to locate particular review questions as occurring before the topic talk on ‘what kind of instructional behavior can motivate students.’

Excerpt 4-18: D1

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>X: thank you for Bai' for his (. ) wonderful opening?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>um (. ) I'm going to talk abou: what kind of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>instructional' behavior' can motivate students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>but bef: : t re I sta: : rt that (. ) topic I would like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>to ask couple questions (. hh)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this excerpt, after Xu announces the PLAN OF ACTION (lines 10-11) (‘I’m going to talk about…’), he announces that an IRF sequence will come organizationally before the execution of
the PLAN OF ACTION (lines 12-13) (‘but before I start that... I would like to ask [a] couple questions’). In a second example (Excerpt 4-19), we see a similar lexical phrase to the one used in Excerpt 4-18 (‘before I’) that organizationally locates the review section before the new topic on ‘kinematics’ (‘before I go over... do you still remember’) (lines 6-9).

Excerpt 4-19: D2

5 X: today our topic will be the kinematics in the one dimension (.) before I go over the concept of the
6 dynamics and kinematics um: do you still remember
7 what I talk about last time on my presentation
8 on my teaching?

A temporal orientation marker, on the other hand, serves to explicitly mark the material in the review section as previously learned or covered at a different point in time. A temporal marker often, although not always, occurs within the initiation of the IRF sequence. An example of when it occurs during the initiation is present in Excerpt 4-20.

Excerpt 4-20: D2

5 X: today our topic will be the kinematics in the one dimension (.) before I go over the concept of
6 the dynamics and kinematics um: do you still remember what I talk about last time on my presentation
7 on my teaching?
8 (0.9)
9 X: okay. let’s (0.9) anyone still remember?

In line 7, Xu initiates the question asking whether anyone remembers what he taught in the last lecture. A preface asserting ‘before I go over...’ (line 6) before the use of question lexical items ‘do you still remember’ (lines 7-8) and ‘last time’ (line 8) indicates that a review of the previous lecture (‘what I talk about last time’) (lines 8-9) will take place before the lecture section talk on today’s topic of ‘kinematics’.
We can also see in Excerpt 4-21 that a backward-looking indication of the *review* does
not have to occur within an IRF sequence, nor does it have to occur at the beginning of the *review*
itself.

Excerpt 4-21: D4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>X: okay. so let’s move to the second definition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>(0.7) what do you think (0.8) is the definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>of the gravity (.). wha- (0.5) what’s gravity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>X: I s- I know it’s- (.). you all learned that a long  ←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>time ago from high school physics (.). so (.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>what’s gravity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructor initiates a question (‘what do you think is the definition of gravity’) (lines 21-22)
and then adds that the term being asked about in the question was probably learned in the past
(lines 24-25). By asserting that this item is something that was probably ‘learned a long time
ago’, it marks the IRF sequence itself as a review of previously learned information.

### 4.4 Lecture

#### 4.4.1 Repeat Plan of Action

Like the *PLAN OF ACTION* occurring in the *opening* section, the *REPEAT OF THE PLAN OF
ACTION* (RPOA) is an *ANNOUNCEMENT* sequence. Also like the *PLAN OF ACTION*, there is one
action in this sequence, which a verbal announcement. However, instead of acting as a
transitional boundary between the *opening* and the *review* portions of the lecture, the RPOA acts
as a transitional boundary between the *review* and *lecture* sections. In Excerpt 4-22, we see Xu re-
announce the *PLAN OF ACTION* (lines 57-58) and then move directly into the “new information” of
the *lecture* in lines 58-59.
In lines 57-58, Xu produces a FPP ANNOUNCEMENT (‘let’s focus [on] those three questions one by one’). Although the actual utterance is unintelligible following this FPP, what is clear is that there is no second action in the sequence, indicated by the lack of pausing by Xu to allow a response and no interjected responses by audience members. Directly following the RPOA, Xu continues on to the next part of the lecture.

The RPOA is different from the PLAN OF ACTION sequence or other ANNOUNCEMENT sequences in the dialogic lecture in that the information alluded to in the RPOA is temporally and structurally imminent rather than in the future. For example, in Excerpt 4-22 above, the use of ‘let’s focus’ clearly locates the RPOA in the present tense. Unlike the pattern of the opening PLAN OF ACTION, there is no “we will do this, but first…” In the RPOA, the “but first” has now passed and the new information is ready to be presented now.

In another example (Excerpt 4-23), Xu first marks the RPOA as forward looking by using the phrases ‘what we are going to study’ (line 58) and ‘we will study’ (line 59) in the future tense, but then shifts to the present tense directly after by saying ‘now let’s talk’ (line 61), thereby explicitly marking the new information as imminent.
4.4.2 Pre-Announcement of IRF Sequence

In the lecture section, there are two instances of a PRE-ANNOUNCEMENT sequence occurring, both directly before an IRF sequence. Unlike in the PRE-ANNOUNCEMENT sequences in the review section, there are only two trajectories of the PRE-ANNOUNCEMENT sequence made in the lecture section. The first announces, “I’ve got a question” (A1), followed by the question. The second announces, “the question is…” (A2), followed by the question.

An example of the first trajectory is illustrated in Excerpt 4-24.

Excerpt 4-24: D2

| 78 | X: okay (.) now I ask the second question (.) now I’m moving the ball (.). in this direction (1.7)       |
| 79 | (0.6) moving the ball (.). in this direction (1.7)                                                   |
| 80 | (watch/with) my hand (1.6) so (0.5) which one we will focus on when we study the kinematics (.). m- the force |
| 81 | from my hand? (.) or the velocity of the ball. (.)                                                   |
| 82 | which one should we focus on (.) anyone’ want (.)                                                   |
| 83 | answer?                                                                                           |

In line 78, we see the first part of the PRE-ANNOUNCEMENT “I have a question” in the form of ‘now I ask the second question’. This move is followed by a direct initiation of the question (‘which one [will we] focus on when we study the kinematics’) (line 80). Although it might appear as if Xu is making a statement about the focus of the lecture rather than a question in line...
80 (‘we will’), the context indicates that he has inverted the word order of a question mistakenly rather than intending to make a statement. This is evidenced in his re-wording of the question several lines later. Instead of saying ‘which one we will focus on,’ Xu re-words his question into ‘which one should we focus on’ (line 83). Furthermore, Xu’s intention for this utterance to be a question rather than a statement is clear in that, following this re-wording of the question, there is a follow-up question asking if anyone wants to answer (lines 83-84).

Excerpt 4-25 demonstrates the second trajectory of the PRE-ANNOUNCEMENT sequence, in which Xu pre-announces ‘the question is…’ before asking the question.

Excerpt 4-25: D3

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>X: that by yourself later. (0.6) ↑now the next question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>is that (1.0) for the gravity (0.6) (xx) will affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>the (.) different mass of material. (.) for example if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>I have (.) a small piece of metal’ and a big ball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>(0.5) this one’s heavier (.) this one’s lighter (.) if I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>let go at the same time which one will hit the ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>first.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In lines 43-44, Xu pre-announces ‘now the next question is…’ before the question itself is launched in line 44 ‘for the gravity (xx) will affect the different mass of material.’ As in Excerpt 4-24, Xu mistakenly inverts the word order of the question so that it appears as a statement (‘will affect’). Additionally, like in Excerpt 4-24, Xu immediately rephrases his question with the correct word order for a question (‘which one will hit the ground first’) (lines 48-49).

4.4.3 Initiation-Response-Follow-up Sequence

There are three main trajectories of the IRF sequence that project from the follow-up (F) position in the lecture section, which can be seen in Figure 4-9 below.
Unlike in the review section, the trajectories are not divided along the lines of (1) leading to an evaluation (E) or (2) leading to an acknowledgement of response (F_ack). In the lecture section, all thirteen instances of IRF sequences lead ultimately to an evaluation of some form. However, the unfolding of each trajectory is dependent on the acceptability of the response (R), as indicated in the moves subsequent to the response. In this third follow-up (F) position of the sequence, the trajectory of the interaction is altered in ways that deem the response of the previous turn (1) acceptable, (2) unacceptable, or (3) partially (un)acceptable. Within these different trajectories, there may be further variations depending on a fourth move following the original third, follow-up move.

The first trajectory occurs when the initial response is treated as acceptable, and has two variations, which can be seen in Figure 4-10 below.
Within these cases (n= 6 of 13), the first variation looks like I-R-(E-F). There is first a question by the instructor, followed by a response made by a student. In the third move, a direct positive evaluation is made first, followed by a comment (F) on why the response is acceptable. We can see an example of this variation in Excerpt 4-26 below.

Excerpt 4-26: D4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>X: which way you think it’s going to happen I mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>happened before it move faster? and faster’ or it moves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>slower or slower or it moves at a constant speed. (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>which way you think it can describe the motion of this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>ball. (0.5) faster? or faster’ (. ) constant speed (. )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>slower- or slower which one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>H: faster?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>X: yes. (. ) because (. ) if anything (. ) in a (. ) ideal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this excerpt, there is a question in line 64. Following a micro-pause in line 66, there is a reformulation of the initiated question (line 67). After a 1.1 second pause (line 70), there is then a response made in the next turn (line 71) by a student. This response makes a follow-up move.
relevant in the next turn, which is done with a direct positive evaluation (‘yes’), followed by a rationale for the acceptability of the response (‘because…’) (line 72).

A second variation of this acceptable trajectory projects a series of follow-up moves comprised of a follow-up question (F₁), a response to this follow-up question (R₂), an acknowledgement of this response (F_ack), a direct positive evaluation (E), followed finally by a justification for the acceptability of the response (F). This sequence looks like I-R-(F₁-R-F_ack-E-F) and can be seen in Excerpt 4-27 below.

Excerpt 4-27: D3

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>X:</td>
<td>if I let go which a piece of paper?(.). and a ball.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.). which ones (will) hit the ground first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Ss:</td>
<td>the ball</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>X:</td>
<td>because why?</td>
<td>F₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>SU:</td>
<td>because of friction</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>SU:</td>
<td>(     )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>X:</td>
<td>okay? (0.7) exactly (.). because air has the air</td>
<td>F_ack/E/F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>resistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In lines 63-64, Xu initiates a question. The students respond to the question collectively in line 66. Following a 0.5 second pause in line 67, a follow-up question is made in the third position (line 68). This question makes relevant the responses by students in line 70 and 71. These responses are then acknowledged (‘okay’), evaluated (‘exactly’), and finally commented on the reasons for their acceptability (‘because the air has the air resistance’) in lines 72-73.

The second main trajectory of the IRF sequence occurs in ways that project an unacceptable response (R) in the third move (n=3 of 13). There are two variations of this second trajectory, which can be seen in Figure 4-11 below.
The structure of the first variation is I-R-(E). In Excerpt 4-28, for example, the initiated question in line 32 makes relevant either of two answers as the response (line 36). However, in line 37, the response in line 36 is treated as unacceptable. This is done with follow-up comprised of an indirect negative evaluation of the response (E), using the word ‘actually’ and a comment on what an acceptable answer would be. Although the student’s actual response is unintelligible (line 36), the word ‘actually’ is used in conversation “to imply that one would expect the fact to be the opposite of that stated” (actually, n.d.; see also Clift, 2001). This implicit negative evaluation stands in contrast to a direct negative evaluation of a response (e.g. ‘No, your
answer is wrong.’) in that it does not directly state that an answer is unacceptable.

Unacceptability is implied in the concurrence of the student’s response with the use of a contradictory lexical marker (e.g. ‘actually’), along with a response Xu states as one that is acceptable. This trajectory is different from an acceptable trajectory in that, following the evaluation (E), no additional follow-up move is made justifying why the response is unacceptable. In Excerpt 4-28 above, Xu uses the word ‘actually’ to make an indirect negative evaluation of the response, but does not explain why the response is unacceptable. In an accept trajectory, a follow-up move occurs after the direct positive evaluation in a way that explains why this response is acceptable.

In the second variation of this unacceptable trajectory, there are at least three moves beginning from the third position. Following the initiation and response, the third move is a follow-up move (F₁) that solicits another response. The fourth move is the second response and the closing move is an implicit negative evaluation of the second response (using an ‘actually’ plus acceptable answer format). This structure looks like I-R-F₁-R-E. Excerpt 4-29 below illustrates how this variation unfolds.
Excerpt 4-29: D4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>X: if I put at the same height and I le- let them go together which one will hit at the ground first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>(1.3) G: the heavier one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>X: how bout you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>H: mm yeah the heavier one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>R1 (1.0) F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>x: drops both objects at the same time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>H: oh sh[: : ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>X: actually (.) they hit at the ground exactly at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>the same time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, Xu initiates a question in lines 81-82 to which a student responds in line 84. This response projects a follow-up move that solicits another student’s opinion. In line 86, another student responds by agreeing with the first student’s response. Finally, in line 90, the sequence closes down with an implied negative evaluation of both students’ responses using an ‘actually’ plus acceptable answer format.

The last main trajectory of the IRF sequence in the lecture section is a sequence in which the follow-up move changes to indicate a partially (un)acceptable response (n=2 of 13). This trajectory is illustrated in Figure 4-12 below.
In each variation of this trajectory, the follow-up position projects some evaluation of the initial response as being partially (un)acceptable. However, the difference between this trajectory and the acceptable trajectory is that in this trajectory the follow-up move does not project a direct positive evaluation plus a reason for the acceptability of the response (‘yes’ plus ‘because’). Instead, like the unacceptable trajectory, there is a solicitation of additional possible responses in the third move.

In this trajectory, there are two sub-variations in which we see two different outcomes projected: (1) the sequence is closed down after a positive evaluation of the response occurs in the turn following subsequent responses (using a ‘yes’ plus ‘because’ construction), and (2) the sequence is closed down after a follow-up move implicitly deems the response unacceptable (E) (using an acceptable response plus ‘however’ construction). In Excerpt 4-30, we see the former situation unfold.
A question is initiated in line 84 (‘why do you think for the same air resistance force you would affect the ball less’), which is reformulated in line 86 and then again in line 88. A student produces a dispreferred response in the following turn (lines 92-94). This turn is dispreferred because it does not produce a SPP response to the question but instead initiates a new question (R₁). In the next turn (line 95), Xu makes a positive evaluation of this response (‘exactly’) in the third position. However, within the same turn, instead of taking up the question initiated in lines 92-94, the original question is repeated, prefaced by a ‘however’ phrase. This re-initiated question is then taken up and responded to in the next turn (line 100). Although the student’s response in line 100 is unintelligible, it is responded to with a positive evaluation in lines 101 and 103,
thereby closing the sequence. This final move, using an ‘accept’ plus ‘because’ format, follows the trajectory of an acceptable sequence.

In the second variation of a partially (un)acceptable response, the sequence closes by partially denying the acceptability of the responses, which can be seen in Excerpt 4-31 below.
Excerpt 4-31: D2

118  X: concept (.). so: (.). the last one I will give you a
119       question and see if anyone will volunteer to (.).
120       answer them
121 (0.9)
122  X: we are ↑talking about in one d dimension (0.6) would
123       anyone (.). like to (.). answer this question? (.)
124       what’s one d dimension.
125 (1.2)
126  K: "line"  R₁
127 (.)
128  X: pardon?
129  K: a line (.). line  OI
130 (1.1)
131  X: okay? (.). anything else?
132 (.)
133  X: jus- (.). ↑that’s (.). definitely correct (.). but  E
134 (.) any answer other than a line?
135 (2.3)
136  P: [(xx)]  R₂
137  W: [vector?  R₃
138 (1.1)
139  X: pardon?
140 (.)
141  P: (forward vector)  SR/R₁rep
142 (1.1)
143  X: yes? (.). ↑that’s still a line  Fack
144 [(.]
145  W: {((laughs))}
146  X: so-
147  W: vector  R₃rep
148 (0.7)
149  X: vector?
150  W: yeah:
151  X: uh: vector is (.). correct. um: (.). however’ (.). one  E/F
152       dimension means one freedom
153 +(.)
154  W: +nods
In this excerpt, Xu initiates a question in line 122. There is a response given in line 125, followed by an embedded, other-initiated self-repair (OISR) sequence. In the follow-up move (F₁) (line 130), an acknowledgement token (‘okay’) is produced as well as solicitation of additional responses by Xu. This solicitation unfolds in the same manner as the initial follow-up move in an unacceptable sequence. However, this response is not deemed totally unacceptable, as Xu cuts himself off in line 133 and asserts that the response in line 125 is ‘correct’. The fact that Xu would initiate a self-repair in line 133 in order to evaluate the acceptability of the response in line 125 suggests an awareness that a solicitation of other responses in the follow-up move is typically a marker of an unacceptable response in the unfolding IRF sequence. Therefore, by re-orienting to and positively evaluating the original response (R₁) in line 125, these actions indicate that the solicitation of other responses does not mean a totally unacceptable response has been made.

Next, the solicitation for other possible responses is repeated in line 134. This re-initiation is taken up and responded to by two students, Pei (R₂) (line 135) and Wook (R₃) (line 136). Over the next several turns, there are two other-initiated, self-repairs regarding the responses produced (R₂ and R₃) by the two students Pei (line 136) and Wook (line 137). Finally, the sequence closes without reaching a true resolution like those found in an acceptable sequence or in an unacceptable sequence. Instead, the final move (lines 151-152) is constructed in the manner of a partially acceptable answer through a direct positive evaluation of the previous responses along with a ‘however’ phrase. Then, an acceptable response is given by Xu, thus bringing the sequence to a close. By presenting the answer to the original question, Xu successfully brings resolution to the sequence himself. The closure of this sequence differs from that of a totally unacceptable sequence although, in that there is some type of positive evaluation before commenting on the correct answer. In an unacceptable sequence, there is no positive evaluation; there is only an indirect negative evaluation of the response that is comprised of ‘actually’ plus acceptable answer.
Of the thirteen instances of IRF sequences in the lecture, two did not fit into any of the three trajectories. The first example is shown in Excerpt 4-32.

**Excerpt 4-32: D2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>X: um:: (.) okay (.) so let’s talk about something not related to physics (0.5) uh (.) have any ↑one of you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>I think about’ (1.3) why (we/you) are human beings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>su: [((laughs))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>[(.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>X: why you are live (.) why you are here (.) have any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>one of us think about this question?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>W: (this is a) philosophy question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>w: [((laughs))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>X: [yes. (0.7) so that’s not related to physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>t: ((giggles))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>X: okay? (.) we know th- we know that couple (. ) of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example, there is an initiation of a question (lines 94-95) and then a reformulation of this question into two questions (line 98). In the next turn, a student produces a dispreferred response that is not a response to the question itself but challenges the validity of the question (line 100). In the follow-up move (line 102), Xu makes a positive evaluation of the student’s response, thereby legitimizing the claim to the invalidity of the initial question. This type of follow-up move occurred before in a case when a dispreferred response was given by a student, which is shown again in Excerpt 4-33.
In the case of Excerpt 4-33, a question is initiated in lines 84-86 and then is reformulated in lines 86-90. A student makes a dispreferred response in lines 92-94 by initiating a new question. In the third move, Xu positively takes up and responds to this new question. However, in this particular case, following the positive evaluation of the response (R), there was a re-initiation of the original question to solicit additional responses beginning with the word ‘however’. In Excerpt 4-32, however, there is no re-initiation of the original question posed. Instead the sequence is abandoned.

A second example of an IRF sequence that does not fall into any of the categories is shown in Excerpt 4-34 below.
In this example, there is an initiated question made by Xu in line 111. This question is reworded in the form of a confirmation check by Xu in line 113. A student responds to this check in line 114. However, instead of making an evaluation or an acknowledgement of the response in a follow-up move, Xu proceeds with the lecture, thereby shutting down the sequence with no follow-up move at all.

### 4.5 Pre Pre-Closing

The pre pre-closing section follows the lecture and precedes the pre-closing. The pre pre-closing is comprised of a series of ANNOUNCEMENT sequences that are associated with the content of the lecture but are no longer new information about the topic itself. Like other ANNOUNCEMENT sequences in the dialogic lecture, the pre pre-closing ANNOUNCEMENTS are comprised of one action, which is a verbal announcement. These ANNOUNCEMENTS take the form of an END OF LECTURE announcement, a SUMMARY of the lecture, a TAKE-AWAY point of the lecture, assignment of HOMEWORK, and a PREVIEW of the next lecture.

In addition to these specific ANNOUNCEMENT sequences, there are a number of transitions from the lecture to the pre pre-closing and from the pre pre-closing to the pre-closing. These transitions are marked both verbally and non-verbally, and their design is important to the overall
architecture of the dialogic lecture because they indicate an organizational shift from forward-looking sequences to backward-looking sequences. These transitions, which include the pre pre-closing ANNOUNCEMENTS, as well as examples of how these pre pre-closing ANNOUNCEMENTS are used, are described in more detail below.

### 4.5.1 Verbal Transition Markers

The shift from the lecture to the pre pre-closing section is marked verbally by either an explicit ANNOUNCEMENT of the END OF LECTURE, a SUMMARY of the lecture, or both. In cases in which both an explicit END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT sequence and a SUMMARY of the lecture are made, the ANNOUNCEMENT of the END OF LECTURE occurs before the SUMMARY. In Excerpt 4-35, we see an example of both an END OF LECTURE and SUMMARY ANNOUNCEMENT done in succession.

**Excerpt 4-35: D3**

| 120 | X: there (.) ss- (0.9) and (1.4) so:: I think it’s a              | END OF LECTURE |
|     | good place to stop. (.) so today we talk about                  |                |
| 122 | the gravity we talk about how object move (.)                  | SUMMARY        |
| 123 | and the influence of gravity.                                  |                |

While there is no lengthy pause after the ‘so’ in line 120, the lengthy pause (1.4 sec) occurring before the word ‘so’, in conjunction with an elongated ‘so’, serves to mark the transition to a new phase of the lecture. Research has shown that topic-closing environments in monologic talk usually contain some type of summation or resolution (Rendle-Short, 1999, 2003, 2006). These summaries and resolutions are also always accompanied by some additional prosodic cues, such as falling pitch, intonation, or volume, and faster speech. Additionally, the use of discourse markers such as ‘so’, followed by a pause, have been shown to indicate a transitional space
(Bolden, 2006; Raymond, 2004; Rendle-Short, 2005; Schiffrin, 1987). This ‘so’ is followed immediately by an END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT that this is ‘a good place to stop’ (lines 120-121), followed directly by another ANNOUNCEMENT of the SUMMARY.

In Excerpt 4-36, we see a case of a SUMMARY made without an explicit END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT.

Excerpt 4-36: D2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>X: so: (1.0) in summary I talk about the (0.7) SUMMARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>kinematics of the and thermodynamics the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>difference between those two concept (. so: (.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The transition to the pre pre-closing is marked initially by an elongated ‘so’ (line 116), followed by a one-second pause, and then an explicit SUMMARY of the lecture. There is no explicit END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT before the SUMMARY, although the elongated ‘so’ and pause before the SUMMARY do indicate verbally a transition point in the lecture.

In Excerpt 4-37, we see a variation of a transition to the pre pre-closing, in which, after an END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT is made, there is a direct move into the pre-closing section. Then, Xu shifts back into the pre pre-closing to accomplish other ANNOUNCEMENT sequences and a second END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT is deployed, followed by a SUMMARY.
In this example, there is an initial ANNOUNCEMENT of the END OF LECTURE in line 165. However, instead of making a summation directly after announcing the end of the lecture, as in the previous examples, Xu moves directly into a pre-closing situation in which the floor is offered to anyone with a question. There are then several turns in an exchange between the instructor and the students, which will be discussed further in the next section on pre-closings. What is important to our discussion of pre pre-closings is that instead of moving straight into a closing sequence following a pre-closing sequence, Xu re-initiates the pre pre-closing (line 182) by explicitly announcing the END OF LECTURE again and SUMMARIZING what has been discussed. The
sequential import of the \textit{pre pre-closing} occurring after the \textit{lecture} but before the \textit{pre-closings} is clear. Although there was a specific \textsc{ANNOUNCEMENT} earlier (line 165) that it was a ‘good place to stop’ the lecture, discussion of the lecture continued when the floor was opened. Organizationally, there would have been no need to re-announce the end of the lecture at that point. However, by re-announcing the end of the lecture in line 182, it strengthens the sequential relationship between the \textsc{end of lecture} and \textsc{summary}, suggesting that a \textsc{summary} needs to follow the \textsc{end of the lecture announcement}, not the \textsc{open floor}. Had a \textsc{summary} been an optional part of the \textit{pre pre-closing}, the turn following the shift to the \textit{pre-closing} could have led to the \textit{closing leave taking} rather than back to the \textit{pre pre-closing end of lecture} and \textsc{summary announcements}.

\textbf{4.5.2 Non-Verbal Transition Markers}

While the explicit verbal \textsc{announcements} made in the \textit{pre pre-closing}, specifically the \textsc{end of lecture} and \textsc{summary}, indicate the transition from the \textit{lecture} portion to the \textit{pre pre-closing}, these verbal cues alone do not indicate this shift. There are several non-verbal cues made by the instructor as well. Only in tandem with these non-verbal cues, specifically body positioning, gaze, and gesture, do the verbal cues completely indicate a transition to the next part of the dialogic lecture.

In Excerpt 4-38, as Xu ends the \textit{lecture} section and begins the transition from the \textit{lecture} to the \textit{pre pre-closing} (line 117), he first lowers his gaze down to his notes on the desk, thus withdrawing engagement with the audience (see Figure 4-13).
As he begins the SUMMARY of the topic through explicit naming of the topic of the lecture, he lifts his gaze to the board while turning his body away from the audience toward where the name of the topic is written on the board (Figure 4-14).
By focusing his attention and body orientation towards where the title of the lecture is written as he announces it, Xu emphasizes both aurally and visually what the main topic of the day is. As soon as he begins to summarize the points covered about the topic, his body and gaze shift back to the audience (Figure 4-15).

Figure 4-14: Non-verbal Transition Markers: Looking at ‘Kinematics’ on the Board
This act of looking down at his notes and turning his body away from the audience is a recurrent pattern as Xu transitions from the lecture to the pre-closing. We see in Excerpt 4-39 that after the last statement about the topic in the lecture section, Xu looks down at his notes, turning his body towards the desk (Figure 4-16).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt 4-39: D3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>119  X: check your textbook it should be somewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120  +there (.) ss- (0.9) and (1.4) so:: I think it’s a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121  x: +looks down at notes on desk, turning body toward desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122  good place to stop. (.) so today we +talk about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123  x: +turns &amp; looks up at class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124  the gravity we talk about how object move (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125  and the influence of gravity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF LECTURE  SUMMARY
At this point, with his gaze and body still averted, he announces the END OF LECTURE (lines 121-122). As he begins the SUMMARY in the pre-pre-closing, however, he lifts his gaze and turns his body to re-engage with the class. Unlike in Excerpt 4-38, Xu does not orient towards the board when making the explicit ANNOUNCEMENT in the SUMMARY of the name of the topic just covered. However, if we look at the background in Figure 4-16 above, we can see that the title of the lecture is not written on the board. If Xu’s orientation towards the board when announcing the title of the lecture functions to emphasize and focus the class on the topic both visually and aurally, then without the topic written on the board there is nothing to orient to visually and thus there is no need to turn towards the board.

In Excerpt 4-40, we see Xu once again lower his gaze at the moment he announces the END OF LECTURE (lines 164-165).
Excerpt 4-40: D4

X: okay. so it’s a good place to stop for

x: looks down at desk

x: puts notecards on desk

x: turns to look at board

today’ do you have any question?

H: it was all very clear

G: yeah [yeah it] also has something to do with the=

X: [“okay”]

=shape of the ball right?

X: yes.

G: it’s a cause it the air can go around it [( ]

X: [yes

that’s a very important point that’s why people

make the bullet (1.0) something like that [(.)=

G: [mhm]

X: they have a sharp point they can (1.0) cut

down the resistance force from the air.

G: mhm

(.)

X: so: let’s wrap up that

END OF LECTURE 2

x: looks down

x: sets chalk down

x: looks down

+++turns body to board

+x: today’ we talk about that (0.5) the one SUMMARY

x: points at board

dimensional motion under

the influence of the gravity. (.) and one thing

you need to remember is that in a so called ideal

world which we don’t have (0.8) any air surround

us’ (0.7) the (0.5) gravity applied from any mass

regardless of its mass=
Additionally, this time Xu not only orients his body positioning and gaze towards the board as he announces the topic of the lecture in the SUMMARY, he also adds a deictic gesture of pointing to the title written on the board as well (Figure 4-17).

![Non-Verbal Transition Markers](image)

**Figure 4-17: Non-Verbal Transition Markers**

### 4.5.3 Additional Announcement Sequences

Other than the ANNOUNCEMENTS of the END OF LECTURE and SUMMARY, additional ANNOUNCEMENT sequences optionally occur during the pre pre-closing section. These ANNOUNCEMENTS are the assigning of HOMEWORK, a PREVIEW of the next lecture, and the TAKE AWAY point. The TAKE AWAY point can be defined as a piece of information or statement that the instructor deems the most important point of the lecture to remember. As previously stated, each of these ANNOUNCEMENTS is comprised of one action, which is a verbal announcement. This is illustrated in Excerpt 4-41 below.
In lines 120-121, Xu makes an END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT (‘so I think it’s a good place to stop’). There is a micro-pause between the END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT and beginning of the SUMMARY ANNOUNCEMENT (‘so today we talk about’). Although the discourse marker ‘so’ is used before each of those two ANNOUNCEMENTS, indicating a transition to a new ANNOUNCEMENT, no space is left at each transition relevance place (TRP) for a response to the newsworthiness of each ANNOUNCEMENT. The same is true in the TRPs between the additional ANNOUNCEMENTS in this excerpt. After the falling intonation on the last syllable of ‘gravity’ (line 123), indicating the end of the SUMMARY and a TRP, there is no second action made before the ANNOUNCEMENT of the TAKE AWAY point in lines 123-128 (‘the only information you need to remember today is...’). In line 128, the falling intonation on the word ‘studying’ indicates the end of the TAKE AWAY point and a TRP between that and the next ANNOUNCEMENT, the assignment of HOMEWORK (‘so we have no homework today’). However, there is no second action made in this space, nor is there space left in the TRP between the assignment of HOMEWORK (after the falling intonation on ‘today’) (line 129) and the PREVIEW of next week’s lecture (‘next week we
will start…’) (lines 129-130). Therefore, we can conclude that a series of ANNOUNCEMENTS may be made in succession in the pre pre-closing section as the only action in each sequence.

Additionally, while each of these ANNOUNCEMENTS (e.g. TAKE AWAY, HOMEWORK, PREVIEW) may be made in the pre pre-closing, they do not appear to be mandatory components, as evidenced by the fact that not every ANNOUNCEMENT is made in every excerpt. In Excerpt 4-42, for example, the only pre pre-closing ANNOUNCEMENT sequence present is the SUMMARY (line 116).

Excerpt 4-42: D2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>X: so: (1.0) in summary I talk about the (0.7) SUMMARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>kinematics of the and thermodynamics the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>difference between those two concept (.). so: (.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>the last one I will give you a question and see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>if anyone will volunteer to (.). answer them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This stands in contrast to Excerpt 4-41 earlier, in which we saw all of the above-mentioned ANNOUNCEMENTS of the pre pre-closing present.

It is important to note the role of the pre pre-closing to the overall organization of the dialogic lecture. The pre pre-closing acts as the “housekeeping” portion of the lecture in that it provides a space to make any ANNOUNCEMENTS about the class that are separate from the lecture content itself.

---

16 One may argue that presence of each of these components is in fact a requirement of the pre pre-closing, but that perhaps he had not mastered the structure of the dialogic lecture yet by the end of the training course and that is why not all the different ANNOUNCEMENT sequences were used in every pre pre-closing. However, if this was true, we should see a gradual increase in the number of ANNOUNCEMENT sequences over time rather than more used in the earlier lectures than the later lectures.
4.6 Pre-Closing

The pre-closing in the dialogic lecture comes after the pre pre-closing and before the closing section. It consists of at least one, although sometimes more, sequences. The first sequence is that of an OFFER-ACCEPT/DECLINE sequence. After all ANNOUNCEMENT sequences are accomplished in the pre pre-closing, Xu then produces an OFFER of the floor to the audience to ask questions about the topic. There are two different trajectories that this sequence may take. The first happens when a student accepts the OFFER of the floor. The second happens when the OFFER is declined, which is then followed by a transition to the closing section. We can see these two trajectories in Figure 4-18 below.

---

**Figure 4-18: Two Trajectories of the Pre-Closing Sequence**

An example of how the first trajectory unfolds, in which an OFFER of the floor is initially accepted, can be seen in Excerpt 4-43 below.
In this excerpt, following a SUMMARY ANNOUNCEMENT (line 166), Xu produces an OFFER of the floor in the form of a question (line 167). This OFFER is accepted in the following turn by a student through an initiation of a question (line 168). The OFFER of the floor in the form of an invitation for questions invites a second sequence in this section, a QUESTION-ANSWER sequence. By inviting a question, a SPP acceptance would naturally take the form of the question that was invited and thereby make an answer sequentially relevant. This QUESTION-ANSWER sequence is different from an IRF sequence, however, in that it is not typically a three-part sequence (i.e.
there is no follow-up move). In the case of this excerpt, the question asked in line 168 makes sequentially relevant an answer, which is done in the following turn (line 170-177). A student then initiates another question in the next turn (line 178), which makes relevant the instructor’s answer in the following turn (line 179). After the end of his turn, the instructor makes another pre-closing offer of the floor, which makes relevant either an acceptance of the floor (marked by a question) or declination of the floor, which is marked by silence. In the case of the above excerpt, the silence (2.4 sec pause) by the audience after this offer of the floor indicates a declination of the floor and a move into the closing section may begin.

In Excerpt 4-44, we see the other possible trajectory for a pre-closing sequence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt 4-44: D3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>129  X: homework today. and (. ) next week we will start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 in two dimension motion? do you guys have any question?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 (2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133 okay if any questions please come to see my office hour’ (. ) it should be in the (. ) website</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this excerpt, an initial offer of the floor is made (‘do you guys have any question’, lines 130-131) but is declined through silence (2.3 sec pause) in line 132, which makes a shift to the closing section possible.

4.7 Closing

The closing is the final section of the dialogic lecture and comes after the pre-closing section. It is bounded by either applause at the end or silence. Transitioning to the closing is sequentially dependent on a declination of the floor in the pre-closing. We will first look at how this transition from the pre-closing to the closing is successfully accomplished by Xu. Then we
will describe the two sequences that occur in the closing section, a DELAYED OFFER sequence and a closing LEAVE TAKING.

4.7.1 Transition to the Closing Section

The transition to the closing section of the dialogic lecture occurs during a third turn of an OFFER-ACCEPT/DECLINE sequence. This third turn occurs in the pre-closing only when someone declines the floor. The declination of the floor here comes in the form of silence by the audience. It is after this silence/declination that a third, follow-up turn is made by the instructor. This turn comes in the form of an acknowledgement token (e.g. ‘okay’). In Excerpt 4-45, we see how this trajectory unfolds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt 4-45: D2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>185  X:  anything else?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186  x:  +(2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187  x:  +looks around room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188  X:  +okay:. (.)+ ++ +++so’ (.) +++let’s get started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189  x:  +turns away looking down at desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190  x:  ++picks up notes from desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191  x:  +++turns to face audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192  x:  +++starts walking back to desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193  Ss:  ((cla+pping))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194  X:  +welcome the next speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After an initial acceptance of the floor by one of the students, which turned into a Q-A sequence, Xu makes another pre-closing OFFER of the floor in line 185 (‘anything else?’). This second OFFER is met with a declination of the floor in the form of silence (line 186). Once this declination is made, it makes relevant a third turn in the sequence, in which an acknowledgement token is produced by the instructor (‘okay’) (line 188). This acknowledgement token, instantiated
by an emphasized and elongated final syllable, closes down the OFFER-ACCEPT/DECLINE sequence and allows for the closing sequence to begin.

Excerpt 4-46 shows another example of this trajectory unfolding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt 4-46: D3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>129 X: homework today. and (.) next week we will start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 in two dimension motion? do you guys have any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 question?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 (2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133 X: okay if any questions please come to see my</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134 office hour’ (.) it should be in the (.) website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 and the (.) of this class you can check it by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 yourself’ (.) and have a good day goodbye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After a declination of the pre-closing OFFER in line 132, the sequence is closed down with an acknowledgement token by the instructor (‘okay’) (line 133).

While in Excerpt 4-45 and Excerpt 4-46 we see smooth transitions from the pre-closing to the closing sections of the lecture, Excerpt 4-47 and Excerpt 4-48 provide exceptions. In Excerpt 4-47, there is no OFFER-ACCEPT/DECLINE sequence at all following the pre pre-closing ANNOUNCEMENT previewing what the next speaker’s topic will be (lines 117-120).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt 4-47: D1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113 X: so if they have their own choice (.) they will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 be (.) more interested in your homework (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 however definitely you cannot (.) let them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116 choose their exam °I mean I don’t need to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117 explain why° (.) and the next our another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 speaker will talk about how: we treat the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 grades and how to motivate students (.) by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 respond to their work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 (+1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122 x: +starts to walk back to his seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 X: +welcome Nianzu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124 x: +indicates to Nianzu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because there is no OFFER-ACCEPT/DECLINE sequence in Excerpt 4-47, it is no surprise that there would be no transition from a pre-closing sequence to a closing sequence. Like many of the other differences in sequencing between the first example of dialogic teaching (D1) and the other three (D2, D3, and D4), the speaker order of the four-person lecture seems to affect which sequences are included in Xu’s part. Because Xu is not the final speaker in the four-person group lecture (D1) (as shown in Excerpt 4-47), it is understandable that he does not perform the pre-closing and closing sequences that happen at the end of that particular lecture.

In Excerpt 4-48, we see another variation of the transition to the closing section unfold.
An initial pre-closing OFFER of the floor (line 167) is accepted by a student, who initiates a question about the lecture (line 170 & 172). This question makes relevant Xu’s answer in line 173, which then leads to a second question initiated by the student (line 174). This question is then answered by Xu in lines 175-180. In previous dialogic lectures given by Xu, at this point in the pre-closing, Xu reinitiated an OFFER-ACCEPT/DECLINE sequence. However, we do not see this occurring in Excerpt 4-48. What we do see is an acknowledgement token (e.g. ‘mhm’) produced by a student in the turn following Xu’s answer to the question (line 181). There could be many potential reasons why Xu did not make a second pre-closing OFFER of the floor. However, while
there is no explicit verbal OFFER-ACCEPT/DECLINE sequence made, the third turn in that sequence, an acknowledgement token (‘so’) is made (line 183). This indicates, at the very least, that some form of closure or transition is occurring.

4.7.2 Closing Sequences

Once there has been a successful transition into the closing section, two sequences may occur. One is optional and the other is mandatory. These are the DELAYED OFFER of the floor (optional) and the closing LEAVE TAKING (mandatory).

The DELAYED OFFER of the floor is an optional OFFER-ACCEPT/DECLINE sequence that puts a condition on when and where the offer can be accepted, meaning this delay makes the offer valid only during a future time, such as during office hours. This, in essence, postpones completion of that sequence until a later date and time. We see use of this sequence in Excerpt 4-49.

Excerpt 4-49: D3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>X: homework today. and (. ) next week we will start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>(.) in two dimension motion? do you guys have any OFFER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>question?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>(2.3) DECLINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>X: okay if any questions please come to see my ACK/OFFER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>office hour’ (. ) it should be in the (. ) website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>and the (. ) of this class you can check it by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>yourself’ (. ) and have a good day goodbye LEAVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>TAKING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this excerpt, after providing an acknowledgement token (‘okay’) (line 133), Xu makes an additional OFFER to answer any additional questions during his office hours (‘if any questions please come to see my office hour’) (lines 133-134).
A second sequence that occurs in the closing section is the LEAVE TAKING sequence. This is the only compulsory sequence in the closing section of the lecture. It is compulsory in that it is present in every lecture and has been stressed as the most important part of the closing by Tabitha in class discussion. This sequence has one or two moves. The first move is always a verbal leave taking. In the first three lectures, the second move is applause by the audience. In the last lecture, there is no second move. An example of this sequence, comprised of both a verbal leave taking and applause, is illustrated in Excerpt 4-50.

---

Excerpt 4-50: D3

| 133  | X: okay if any questions please come to see my office hour’ (. .) it should be in the (. .) website and the (. .) of this class you can check it by yourself’ (. .) and have a good day (. .) +goodbye LEAVE TAKING | ACK/OFFER |
| 134  | X: +looks down at notes |
| 135  | + (0.8) ++ |
| 136  | X: [ +smiles |
| 138  | X: [ [+smiles |
| 140  | SS: [ ((clapping)) APPLAUSE |

In this excerpt, we see a verbal LEAVE TAKING in the form of ‘goodbye’ and a response consisting of applause by the audience (line 140).

The case in which applause is not the second move of the closing LEAVE TAKING sequence occurs in the fourth lecture and can be seen in Excerpt 4-51 below.

---

Excerpt 4-51: D4

| 194  | X: gravity. (. .) so two dimensional will be means that it can move either in left and right and then move up and down together. (. .) so we will study then next week (. .) um (1.6) yeah as I said no ← |
| 195  | ← |
| 196  | ← |
| 197  | ← |
| 198  | ← |
| 199  | ← |
| 200  | ← |
| 201  | SU: thank you |
In line 199, Xu produces a verbal leave taking in the form of ‘goodbye’. Following this move, there is a 1.2 second pause instead of applause (line 200). Following this silence, the evaluator in the role of student tells Xu ‘thank you’ (line 201).

The LEAVE TAKING in Excerpt 4-52 shows an exception to the goodbye-as-leave-taking form the other closing LEAVE TAKINGS take.

**Excerpt 4-52: D1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>X: and the next our another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>speaker will talk about †how: we treat the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>grades and how to motivate students (.) by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>respond to their work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>+(1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>x: *starts to walk back to his seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>X: +welcome Nianzu LEAVE TAKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>x: *indicates to Nianzu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>((clapping)) APPLAUSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this excerpt, Xu produces a FPP verbal leave taking (‘welcome’) of the next speaker, which mirrors that of an opening GREETING in that it is welcoming rather than expressing goodbye. This particular example, although, is from the first dialogic lecture, and given that Xu is the second of four speakers and needs to welcome the next speaker in their lecture, it is understandable why the closing LEAVE TAKING looks like an opening GREETING.

### 4.8 Summary

In this chapter, I presented an architecture of the dialogic lecture as constructed by Xu. I identified six sections of the lecture (i.e. opening, review, lecture, pre pre-closing, pre-closing, closing), as well as their constitutive actions. One of the main things that was discovered in uncovering the sequence organization of this lecture is further evidence of how institutional discourse is socially co-constructed. For example, there are many differences in the trajectories of the sequences involved in the dialogic lecture that differ from those in “everyday conversation”.
One example of this is in the GREETING sequence. In a typical GREETING sequence in everyday conversation, the first pair part (FPP) is a greeting and the second pair part (SPP) is a return greeting as well.


(Two colleagues pass in the corridor)
1 A: [Hello.
2 B: [(almost inaudible)] Hi
3 (Pause: B continues walking)
4 A: ((shouts)) HELlo!

However, in a greeting sequence in the dialogic lecture, a return greeting is neither expected, nor left space to accommodate.

A difference between the dialogic lecture and everyday conversation can be seen during both PRE-ANNOUNCEMENT and ANNOUNCEMENT sequences. In everyday conversation, it is typical for an interlocutor to comment on the newsworthiness of the item being announced (Schegloff, 2007).

Excerpt 4-54: From Schegloff (2007, p. 39)

1 Ben: F_pre Hey I got sump’n that’s wild
2 Bil: S_pro What.
3 Ben: F_b Y’know one a’ these great big red fire alarm boxes
4 thet’r on the corner? I got one.

It is this comment above that sequentially projects whether the ANNOUNCEMENT proceeds or not. However, in the dialogic lecture, PRE-ANNOUNCEMENTS and ANNOUNCEMENTS are given without expectation of comments on the newsworthiness of the item announced. It is possible though that the asymmetrical power relations between the teacher and students renders any comments unnecessary, as all ANNOUNCEMENTS made by the course instructor are considered newsworthy.

By understanding the foundations of the organization of the dialogic lecture, as well as what makes it institutional discourse, we can now use this architecture as a template to examine
changes in Xu’s usage of these various actions over time. In the next chapter, we will look at how
Xu changed the ways in which he ordered the sequences identified in the dialogic lecture over
time, indicating development of particular pedagogical skills.
Chapter 5

Development in the Construction of the Dialogic Lecture

In this chapter, I use the general architecture of the dialogic lecture described in Chapter 4 to look for changes over time in Xu’s performance of the dialogic lecture. Even though the activity of “teaching dialogically” is a simulation occurring in an ITA training course and not an actual classroom, part of the training process is to get the ITAs to treat the lecture as if it was actually occurring in the classroom. Therefore, development in pedagogical skills in this activity would be evidenced in shifts in behavior that are reflective of a teacher in an actual classroom rather than a student giving a presentation in a training course. Changes in how Xu orients to different participant roles in the dialogic lecture will be discussed in more depth in Chapter 6. In this chapter, however, I look at changes in how Xu sequences actions over time reflect development of particular pedagogical skills.

In looking for changes in sequencing, I focused on three main aspects: (1) ordering of actions, (2) structuring of actions, and (3) transitioning between actions. Ordering of actions is concerned with inter-sequential actions. Structuring of actions, on the other hand, deals with intra-sequential actions. Finally, transitions between actions are those moves, both verbal and non-verbal, that indicate the borders between two different actions. Changes in each of these areas are discussed in detail below.

5.1 Ordering of Sequences

Changes in how Xu ordered sequences were observed in two places in the dialogic lecture. In the first area, I noticed changes in the sequencing between the GREETING and the PLAN
OF ACTION sequences in the *opening* section. In the second, Xu changed in the number and order of ANNOUNCEMENT sequences made in the *pre pre-closing* section.

### 5.1.1 Greetings – Plan of Action

As discussed Chapter 4, the *opening* section of the dialogic lecture has two sequences. The first is a GREETING sequence and the second is a PLAN OF ACTION ANNOUNCEMENT sequence. In the changes Xu makes in ordering between the GREETING and PLAN OF ACTION sequences we can see a moment of cognition enacted by Xu in which he self-repairs. This self-initiated self-repair shows his awareness of the ordering of sequences in the lecture. As has been discussed, the GREETING is important as the initial part of the dialogic lecture because it establishes a state of mutual participation (C. Goodwin, 1981). As was discussed earlier, due to the nature of Xu’s position in the four-person dialogic lecture in D1, Xu does not perform a GREETING, but moves straight into the PLAN OF ACTION following a comment thanking the previous speaker (Excerpt 5-1).
After Bai performs the first part of the group lecture and introduces Xu as the next speaker, Xu does not greet the audience, but instead acknowledges Bai’s opening part of the lecture (‘thank you Bai’) (line 12) before moving directly into the PLAN OF ACTION (‘I’m going to talk about…’) (lines 13-14).

In D2, the above-mentioned self-initiated self-repair occurs, which unfolds in Excerpt 5-2 below.

Excerpt 5-2: D2

1  T:  hey +Xu you can go ahead and begin (.). sorry                              ←
2   x:  +Xu starts walking up to the front of the class                            ←
3   (.).
4  X:  +it’s alright (.). uh:: ++today I- +++he (.). llo                            ←
5     x:  +puts head down                                                      ←
6     x:  ++lifts head turning to board                                        ←
7     x:  +++turns to face audience                                               ←
8     everyone today +our topic will be the kinematics                        ←
9     +turns to face to board                     ←
10   x:  in the one d dimension (.). before I go over the concept of the dynamics and kinematics um: do ←
11   you still remember what I talk about                                   ←
12   →
We see Xu begin the lecture by starting to give the PLAN OF ACTION (line 4). This is indicated by the temporal marker ‘today,’ which often co-occurs with the PLAN OF ACTION. However, he interrupts himself (‘I-’) and self-repairs (line 4), starting again with a greeting of ‘hello everyone’ (lines 4-5) before performing the PLAN OF ACTION (lines 8 & 10) after the GREETING. Additionally, Xu’s non-verbal language reinforces the importance of using the GREETING as a means of establishing mutual orientation with the audience. If we look at Xu’s gaze as he initially gives the PLAN OF ACTION, his gaze moves from looking down at his notes before he begins speaking (line 5) (Fig. 5-1) to up at the blackboard (away from the students) as he begins the PLAN OF ACTION (line 6) (Fig. 5-2). It is not until he self-repairs and begins the GREETING that he shifts his gaze to the audience and orients to them (line 7) (Fig. 5-3). Only after he establishes engagement with the audience does he turn his gaze away again to the board as he begins the PLAN OF ACTION again (line 9) (Fig. 5-4).
Although Xu’s self-repair in D2 shows his awareness of the ordering of the GREETING relative to the PLAN OF ACTION, we see this change enacted without the need for an explicit self-repair in D3 (Excerpt 5-3).
In line 1, Xu makes a GREETING (‘hello everyone’) and shifts smoothly to the PLAN OF ACTION with no pauses or hesitations (‘today I’m going to talk about…’).

Excerpt 5-4 shows evidence of stabilization of this ordering of actions by the time of the fourth lecture (D4).

In line 1, Xu produces a verbal greeting (‘good morning everyone’). Following a micro-pause, he shifts to produce the PLAN OF ACTION ANNOUNCEMENT (‘today we are going to talk about…’) (lines 1 & 3). In addition to the stabilization of the verbal greeting, the combination of keeping gaze with the audience while performing the GREETING appears to have stabilized as well by the time of the fourth lecture Excerpt 5-9). In this excerpt, Xu keeps his gaze on the audience until beginning the PLAN OF ACTION, at which point he looks down.

5.1.2 Pre Pre-Closing Announcements

The pre pre-closing section of the lecture consists of a string of ANNOUNCEMENT sequences, which I earlier referred to as the “housekeeping” part of the lecture. What is
In D1 (Excerpt 5-5), Xu makes one ANNOUNCEMENT during the end of the lecture, which is understandable given his status as the second of four lecturers in D1. This ANNOUNCEMENT is a PREVIEW of the next speaker’s topic, which Xu makes before moving directly into the closing LEAVE TAKING.

Excerpt 5-5: D1

117 X: and the next our another speaker
118 will talk about how we treat the
119 grades and how to motivate students
120 (. ) by respond to their work
121 +(1.0)
122 x: +starts to walk back to his seat
123 X: +welcome Nianzu
124 x: +indicates to Nianzu
125 ((clapping))

In the second lecture (D2), we again see only one type of ANNOUNCEMENT, a SUMMARY of the lecture. However, because of a shift from the pre pre-closing back to the lecture and then the shift from the lecture back to the pre pre-closing, this SUMMARY ANNOUNCEMENT is made twice. These actions are presented in Excerpts 5-6 and 5-7 below.
In the initial ANNOUNCEMENT of the SUMMARY, Xu produces an explicit SUMMARY ANNOUNCEMENT, indicating an initial shift from the lecture to the pre pre-closing (lines 116-118). However, instead of making additional pre pre-closing ANNOUNCEMENTS, Xu initiates an additional question for the class (‘would anyone like to answer this question’) (lines 123-124).

This shifts the talk back to the lecture section from the pre pre-closing. However, once this IRF sequence in the lecture is closed down, Xu re-initiates a SUMMARY ANNOUNCEMENT (lines 166-167, Excerpt 5-7), which serves to transition from the lecture back to the pre pre-closing section.

So far in lectures D1 and D2, Xu has only made one type of ANNOUNCEMENT in each of the pre pre-closing sections (i.e. PREVIEW & SUMMARY), although the SUMMARY ANNOUNCEMENT has been made twice in D2. As we move into the third lecture (Excerpt 5-8), we start to see a marked increase in the number and type of ANNOUNCEMENTS Xu makes in this section.
First, there is an END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT made (‘so I think it’s a good place to stop’) (lines 120-121), which indicates a shift from the lecture to the pre pre-closing section. This ANNOUNCEMENT is followed immediately by a SUMMARY (‘so today we talk about…’) (lines 121-123), a TAKE AWAY point (‘the only information you need to remember today…’) (lines 123-128), assigning of HOMEWORK (‘so we have no homework today’) (lines 128-129), and finally a PREVIEW of the next week’s lecture (‘next week we will start in two dimension motion’) (lines 129-130).

In D4 (Excerpt 5-9), we can see a similar pattern as in D3 regarding the number and order of ANNOUNCEMENT sequences made in the pre pre-closing section.
okay. so it’s a (. ) good place to stop for today
(0.5) do you have any question?
(5.5)

it was all very clear

yeah [yeah it] also has something to do with the=
[okay]

=shape of the ball right?

yes.

it’s a cause it the air can go around it {}

that’s a very important point that’s why people
make the bullet (1.0) something like that {}

[mhm]

they have a sharp point they can (1.0) cut
down the resistance force from the air.

mhm

( .)

so (1.6) let’s (0.5) wrap up that n- today we talk
about that (0.5) the one dimensional motion under
the influence of the gravity. (. ) and one thing
you need to remember is that in a so called ideal
world which we don’t have (0.8) any air surround
us’ (0.7) the (0.5) gravity applied from any mass
=mhm=

=will be identical. (. ) they will not have no
difference at all that’s what we need to remember
today. (0.6) so (. ) we don’t have homework this
week (. ) and next week we will study the two
dimensional motion (. ) under the influence of the
gravity. (. ) so two dimensional will be means that
it can move either in left and right and then
move up and down together. (. ) so we will study
then next week (. ) um (1.6) yeah as I said no
homework so it’s (. ) enjoy your weekend’ so see
you next week. goodbye
In this excerpt, there is first an initial END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT (‘so it’s a good place to stop for today’) (line 165), although instead of additional SUMMARY ANNOUNCEMENTS directly following the END OF LECTURE, this ANNOUNCEMENT is followed by a shift to the pre-closing done by an OFFER of the floor (line 166) and two intervening QUESTION-ANSWER sequences (lines 169-180). After these sequences close down, a second END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT is deployed (‘so let’s wrap up that’) (line 182), which serves to shift the talk back from the pre-closing to the pre pre-closing. This END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT is then followed by a SUMMARY (‘today we talk about…’) (lines 182-184), a TAKE AWAY point (‘one thing you need to remember…’) (lines 184-191), assignment of HOMEWORK (‘we don’t have homework this week’) (lines 191-192), a PREVIEW of the next lecture (‘next week we will study’) (lines 192-197), and finally a reiteration of the HOMEWORK ANNOUNCEMENT (‘as I said no homework’) (lines 197-198). A visual representation of the changes Xu makes in sequencing of ANNOUNCEMENTS in the pre pre-closing is illustrated in Table 5-5 below.

Table 5-7: Development in ANNOUNCEMENT Sequencing in the Pre Pre-Closing.

| D1: | PREVIEW |
| D2: | SUMMARY |
| D3: | END OF LECTURE − SUMMARY − TAKE AWAY − HOMEWORK − PREVIEW − OFFICE HRS |
| D4: | END OF LECTURE − SUMMARY − TAKE AWAY − HOMEWORK − PREVIEW |

The importance of these changes to the development of Xu’s pedagogical skills is two-fold. First, over the course of the last three lectures (D2, D3, D4), Xu becomes increasingly more specific in the discourse markers he uses to signal junctions between these two sections of the lecture. As McKeachie (2002) notes in his book Teaching Tips, “Whatever your system, indicate signposts to tell students what is ahead, transitions that tell students when you are finishing one topic and moving on to the next, key points or concepts, and links such as ‘consequently,’ ‘therefore,’ and ‘because’” (p. 57, italics in original). The END OF LECTURE especially acts as an
explicit signpost at the junction between the lecture section and the pre pre-closing. Additionally, the changes in the content of the PREVIEW ANNOUNCEMENTS to connect the current lecture with future ones show development in Xu’s ability to link present and future information in a cohesive way that situates the topic of the lecture for the students (Axelson & Madden, 1994).

Also important with regard to the organization of these pre pre-closing sequences is that along with the general increase in the number of ANNOUNCEMENTS made over time, the types of ANNOUNCEMENTS being added were increasingly of a ‘classroom-specific’ nature (e.g. homework). These stand in contrast to general ANNOUNCEMENTS that could be made in any type of presentation, such as a SUMMARY or explicit marking of the END OF THE LECTURE. The nature of these ANNOUNCEMENTS indicates shifting participant roles in the lecture, which will be taken up more fully in Chapter 6.

5.2 Structuring of the Sequences

The intra-sequential ordering of actions is how the moves within one particular sequence are ordered relative to each other. Although it has been shown in the dialogic lecture that turn-taking is generally suspended and therefore sequences often take the form of ANNOUNCEMENTS or single-action moves, there were several changes found in how Xu structured the sequences over time. These changes took the form of (1) increases in the number of elements Xu included in a sequence (i.e. explicit macro-level discourse markers used in the PLAN OF ACTION) (2) changes in how Xu performed the third move of the pre-closing OFFER sequence, and (3) increasing linguistic and pragmatic complexity in the closing LEAVE TAKING.
5.2.1 Plan of Action

The PLAN OF ACTION is characterized by a number of discourse markers (Schiffrin, 1987) and other cohesive devices (Thompson, 1994), and more specifically, macro-level discourse planning markers (i.e. meta-statements about the organization of or transition points between major parts of the lecture) (Chaudron & Richards, 1986). Over the course of the semester, we can see a marked increase in the number and explicitness of the macro-level discourse markers used by Xu, as evidenced in the PLAN OF ACTION. In D1 (Excerpt 5-10), for example, there is a single PLAN OF ACTION statement (lines 10-11) describing the topic of the lecture.

Excerpt 5-10: D1

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>X: thank you for Bai’ for his (. ) wonderful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>opening? um (. ) I’m going to talk about: what kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>of instructional’ behavior’ can motivate students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>but before I start that (. ) topic I would like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to ask couple questions (.hh)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no additional temporal or organizational markers, save the fact that this is “the topic” is originally implied by the phrase ‘I’m going to talk about’ in line 10, followed by an anaphoric reference to it as “the topic” in line 12.

In D2 (Excerpt 5-11), we see the addition of a temporal marker ‘today’ (line 4) that puts the lecture into the context of the course as a whole, as well as an explicit marker of what the “topic” is (‘our topic will be…’) (lines 4-5).

Excerpt 5-11: D2

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X: uh:: today I- he (.) llo everyone today our topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>will be the kinematics in the one d dimension (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>before I go over the concept of the dynamics and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>kinematics um: do you still remember what I talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>about</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, in lines 6-8, the “topic” is further put into order explicitly through mention of a review of past information (‘before I go over…’), which will be discussed before moving on to the actual lecture section.

In D3, there is also an explicit temporal marker ‘today,’ again placing the lecture into a larger course context of the present lecture versus past or future lectures, which can be seen in Excerpt 5-12 below.

Excerpt 5-12: D3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X:  hello everyone. *today I’m going to talk about the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X:  +puts head down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(. one dimension motion (. under the gravity (.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>so (. let’s begin with (. two questions (0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in D2, instead of explicitly marking the “topic” of the lecture as such, Xu marks it implicitly (‘I’m going to talk about’) (lines 1 & 3). However, unlike in D2, he does not explicitly mark the upcoming review section by saying “but before I”. Instead, he moves directly into the review questions themselves with a PRE-ANNOUNCEMENT of the upcoming review questions (‘so let’s begin with two questions’) (line 4).

It is in D4 (Excerpt 5-13) that there is really a significant increase in the number of explicit macro-level discourse markers used.
In line 1, Xu begins the PLAN OF ACTION ANNOUNCEMENT with an explicit temporal marker ‘today’, followed by an implicit topic description, ‘we are going to talk about’ (lines 1-2). At this point, real expansion in the explicitness in the PLAN OF ACTION that is not present in the other lectures occurs. We first see Xu make an explicit reference to ‘our plan’ (line 3), which is then followed by a series of discourse markers describing the order of actions in the lecture. This can be seen in the explicit references ‘start with’ (line 4), ‘second part’ (line 6), and ‘then…summary’ (lines 9-10).

The explicitness of this PLAN OF ACTION provides a verbal roadmap that students can understand even if they do not ultimately understand the lecture itself. Much research has explored the effect of discourse markers on lecture comprehension by both native speakers and non-native speakers (Chaudron & Richards, 1986; Ellis, Duran, & Kelly, 1994; Thompson, 1994; Tyler, 1992; Williams, 1992). Chaudron and Richards (1986) found that lecture comprehension was most affected by increases in macro-level discourse markers rather than micro-level discourse markers (i.e. markings of inter-sentential relations). Additionally, Williams (1992) found that when ITAs were able to plan their speech compared to unplanned, spontaneous speech, they tended to use more explicit and overt markers for discourse planning. In these cases,
comprehensibility of non-native speaker lectures became significantly greater. Therefore, I would argue that these changes in number of and explicitness in discourse marker usage in the PLAN OF ACTION indicate a positive developmental trajectory towards understanding the importance of organization to clarity for students.

5.2.2 Pre-Closing

Changes in how Xu accomplished the pre-closing OFFER sequence were also observed over time. These changes occur in the follow-up move to a declination of the floor by the class. In D1, due to Xu’s position in the four-person lecture, he does not make an OFFER of the floor, and therefore does not produce a follow-up move. In D2, we see the first instance of Xu using a follow-up move after he initially offers the floor to his students, which can be seen in Excerpt 5-14 below.

Excerpt 5-14: D2

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>X:</td>
<td>anything else?</td>
<td>OFFER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ (2.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>x:</td>
<td>+ looks around room</td>
<td>DECLINE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>X:</td>
<td>+ okay: (.)+ ++ + + so’ (.). + + + + let’s get started</td>
<td>Fack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>x:</td>
<td>+ turns away looking down at desk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>x:</td>
<td>+ + picks up notes from desk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>x:</td>
<td>+ + + + turns to face audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>x:</td>
<td>+ + + + starts walking back to desk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Ss:</td>
<td>((clapping))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>X:</td>
<td>+ welcome the next speaker.</td>
<td>LEAVE TAKING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the close of the original Q-A sequence in the pre-closing, Xu makes an OFFER of the floor a second time (line 185). This OFFER is met with silence (line 186), which indicates a declination of the offer of the floor. Xu acknowledges this declination of the offer of the floor (‘okay’) (line 188) and then moves on to the closing section.
The significance of the follow-up move in Excerpt 5-14 is revealed in comparison to the way Xu accomplishes this follow-up move in D3 (Excerpt 5-15).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt 5-15: D3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>129 X: homework today. and (.) next week we will start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 in two dimension motion? do you guys have any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 question?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 (2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133 X: okay if any questions please come to see my</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134 office hour’ (.) it should be in the (.) website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 and the (.) of this class you can check it by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 yourself’ (.) and have a good day (.) +goodbye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137 x: +looks down at notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138 ++(0.8)+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139 x: ++smiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 [((clapping))]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In lines 129-130, Xu makes an OFFER of the floor, which is met with silence (line 132). As in Excerpt 5-14, Xu acknowledges this declination of the floor with an acknowledgement token (‘okay’) (line 133). What is different from Excerpt 5-14 though is that, following this acknowledgement token, Xu produces a second OFFER of the floor in a manner that defers the OFFER to another time. This deferred OFFER extends the possibility of interaction between Xu and the students because it suggests that future interaction could take place during his office hours (lines 133-134). It also shows the important pedagogical skill of being able to defer student questions to another time, which is especially relevant if running out of time. As Axelson and Madden (1994) note, “The classroom teacher also needs to be able to defer a student question for another time and decide who needs to have an opportunity to respond or to question when numerous hands are up. These skills are a major part of classroom management and contribute to the right atmosphere as well” (p. 166). This deferred OFFER of the floor is also significant in terms of linking and interactivity because it shows a willingness to continue to dialogue with
students beyond the confines of the lecture, thereby providing for potential future interaction with the students.

In D4 (Excerpt 5-16), there is also an offer of the floor that is accepted and a Q-A sequence accomplished. Although a follow-up move to this Q-A sequence is made, it is accomplished differently than in either D2 or D3.

**Excerpt 5-16: D4**

| 165 | X:  | okay. so it’s a (. ) good place to stop for today | END OF LECTURE₁ |
| 166 | (0.5) |  |  |
| 167 | do you have any question? | OFFER |
| 168 | (5.5) |  |  |
| 169 | H:  | it was all very clear | DECLINE₁ |
| 170 | G:  | yeah [yeah it] also has something to do with the= ACCEPT₁-Q₁ |
| 171 | X:  | [okay] |  |
| 172 | =shape of the ball right? |  |
| 173 | X:  | yes. | A₁ |
| 174 | G:  | it’s a cause it the air can go around it [{ } | Q₂ |
| 175 | X:  | [yes | A₂ |
| 176 | that’s a very important point that’s why people |  |
| 177 | make the b↑ullet (1.0) something like that [{.}= |  |
| 178 | G:  | [mhm] |  |
| 179 | X:  | =they have a sharp point they can (1.0) ↑cut |  |
| 180 | down the resistance force from the air. |  |
| 181 | G:  | mhm |  |
| 182 | (.) |  |  |
| 183 | X:  | so (1.6) let’s (0.5) wrap up that n- today we talk | END OF LECTURE₂/ SUMMARY |

Although Xu does make a *pre-closing* offer of the floor in the above excerpt, which is subsequently taken up in a Q-A sequence, as the Q-A sequence closes down, Xu makes neither a follow-up move acknowledging the close of the sequence nor a second *offer* of the floor (present or deferred) to make sure there are no other questions. What this difference indicates is that while Xu might be moving towards the structuring of the sequences he made in D2 and D3
(i.e. making sure all questions have either been answered or offered to be answered at a later time), this ordering is not yet stabilized.

5.2.3 Closing

In the case of the closing LEAVE TAKING, the structure of the closing LEAVE TAKING sequence does not fundamentally change over time. It still has two moves, a verbal leave taking performed by the instructor and either applause by the students or no response. Where there is change, however, is in the linguistic and pragmatic complexity of the verbal LEAVE TAKING move itself.

In D2 (Excerpt 5-17), Xu does a verbal leave taking (line 123) that is comprised of a greeting word (‘welcome’) plus a reference to the next ‘speaker’, although the next speaker is not explicitly referenced by name.

Excerpt 5-17: D2

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>X: anything else?</td>
<td>OFFER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>+ (2.4)</td>
<td>DECLINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>x: looks around room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>X: okay: (.)+ ++ +++so’ (.) +++let’s get started</td>
<td>ACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>x: turns away looking down at desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>x: picks up notes from desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>x: turns to face audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>x: starts walking back to desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Ss: ((clapping))</td>
<td>INTRO NEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>X: welcome the next speaker.</td>
<td>SPEAKER-LEAVE TAKING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In D3 (Excerpt 5-18), there is an expansion of the LEAVE TAKING sequence to include a new element.
In line 133, Xu produces an acknowledgement token (‘okay’) to a previous declination of the floor, followed by a deferred offer of the floor in lines 133-136. After this offer sequence, Xu shifts from the pre-closing to the closing with a verbal leave taking that is expanded from previous leave takings in D1 and D2. In this leave taking move, the phrase ‘have a good day’ is added before the greeting word ‘goodbye’. This statement indicates an increasing sensitivity to politeness markers in English, the ritualized nature of goodbyes in English, and, in terms of sheer numbers, requires more words to produce than a single leave taking word alone. Also in this example, there is no reference to the next speaker. While this will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 6 on participant frameworks, it is important because it also shows Xu’s increasing orientation to his role as a TA rather than as a student giving a presentation in a class. In a real classroom, there would not be other presenters giving full lectures back-to-back within the same class.

In D4 (Excerpt 5-19), we see even more evidence of sensitivity to politeness markers and some evidence of pragmatic awareness.
In this excerpt, a PREVIEW ANNOUNCEMENT (‘so we will study…’) (lines 198-199) and HOMEWORK ANNOUNCEMENT (‘yeah as I said no homework’) (lines 199-200) are made in succession as part of the pre pre-closing. Following these ANNOUNCEMENTS, Xu moves directly into the closing by producing a verbal leave taking (lines 200-201). In this leave taking, Xu produces the phrase, ‘enjoy your weekend’, which is similar to the use of ‘have a good day’ in D3 (Excerpt 5-27). This phrase indicates use of an increasingly sophisticated repertoire of closing phrases, being that ‘enjoy’ is linguistically less frequently occurring than ‘have’, and ‘weekend’ is less frequently occurring than ‘day’ (AskOxford.com, 2009). Additionally, ‘have a good day’ is a formulaic sequence, often learned as an unanalyzed chunk (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992).

Producing ‘enjoy your weekend’ requires the ability to parse the parts making up a leave taking phrase and then use them creatively (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992). The phrase, ‘see you next week,’ also shows pragmatic sensitivity because it shows Xu trying to develop rapport with his students, which has been deemed crucial to creating the right atmosphere in the classroom (Axelson & Madden, 1994; Bailey, 1983, 1984a; McKeachie, 2002; Nelson, 1989; Rounds, 1987; Stevens, 1989). Moreover, by adding ‘see you next week’, Xu does not treat the lecture as autonomous, but links it as one in an ongoing course.

We can see a visual representation of Xu’s development in the LEAVE TAKING sequence in Table 5-6.
5.3 Transitioning Between Actions

5.3.1 Transition from Lecture to Pre Pre-Closing

In the transition from the *lecture* to the *pre pre-closing* section, changes in Xu’s behavior can be seen in the types of transitional devices employed and smoothness of the transition. In D1 (Excerpt 5-29), the only transitional device used to shift to the *pre pre-closing* is markedly quieter speech at the end of the *lecture* section. Otherwise, Xu moves directly from statements in the *lecture* to a PREVIEW ANNOUNCEMENT of the next speaker’s topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt 5-20: D1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116 X: let them choose their exam °I mean I don’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117 need to explain why° (.) and the next our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 another speaker will talk about ↑how: we treat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 the grades and how to motivate students (.) by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 respond to their work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In lines 116-117, Xu makes a statement in the *lecture* section. As this statement comes to an end, the talk becomes markedly quieter (‘I mean I don’t need to explain why’). The literature has shown that quieter speech and/or falling intonation are often used to indicate that a speaker’s turn is coming to a close or that some part of the talk or topic is ending (G. Brown & Yule, 1983; Coulthard & Montgomery, 1981; Rendle-Short, 2005; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). In line 117, we see a shift to the *pre pre-closing* through an ANNOUNCEMENT sequence PREVIEWING the next
speaker’s topic. Other than the quieter talk, there are no pauses, hesitations, or any other explicit verbal marker signaling the transition from the lecture to the pre pre-closing.

In D2 (Excerpt 5-21), we see an explicit transition made between the lecture and the pre pre-closing through use of a SUMMARY ANNOUNCEMENT (‘in summary I talk about…’).

Excerpt 5-21: D2

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>X: so (.) outside of physics major nobody really</td>
<td>LECTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>talk about that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>su: (softly laughs))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>X: so: (1.0) in summary I talk about the (0.7)</td>
<td>SUMMARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>kinematics of the and thermodynamics the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>difference between those two concept (.) so: (.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to this type of ANNOUNCEMENT, Xu uses the word ‘so’ with an elongated syllable and pauses for one second. The use of ‘so’ in turn-initial position has been well documented in the literature as a discourse marker indicating that some shift or change in the talk is imminent (Bolden, 2006; Johnson, 2002; Raymond, 2004; Stivers & Robinson, 2006). Additionally, pauses have also been shown to mark changes in the flow of talk, sometimes as a topic transition marker. The transition to the pre pre-closing is completed in this excerpt with a rising intonation contour on the word ‘summary’, thereby emphasizing the shift to the SUMMARY portion of the pre pre-closing section. Although not the smoothest of transitions, these devices show Xu’s developing attentiveness to making explicit shifts in parts of the talk.

Although still marked by hesitations and disfluencies, we see an even more explicit and prolonged transition from the lecture to the pre pre-closing in D3 (Excerpt 5-22).
Following the word ‘there’ (line 120), Xu begins to shift to the *pre pre-closing* from the *lecture* section. Like in D2 (Excerpt 5-30), this transition from the *lecture* is marked by pausing (0.9 and 1.4 seconds) and an elongated ‘so’. What changes in D3 is the addition of a false start (‘ss-’) (line 120) and the use of an explicit END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT sequence. Although Xu uses a SUMMARY in D2, the END OF LECTURE is an even more explicit transitional marker because it explicitly announces itself as the specific point in time that the *lecture* section is ending. For example, in D3 the END OF LECTURE is ‘it’s a good place to stop’ (lines 120-121). Although a SUMMARY is made at the beginning of the *pre pre-closing*, it is not as explicit about the role of itself as a transitional point as the END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT is.

The importance of the changes in Xu’s behavior to utilize an END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT sequence as a transitional device is made apparent in D4 (Excerpt 5-23).
In D4, instead of hesitations and pauses as transitional devices, Xu uses the discourse marker ‘okay’ with a downward intonational contour, signifying finality (line 165). Following ‘okay’, ‘so’ is used, but with no elongation of the vowel sound. In addition, Xu makes another END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT (line 165), which allows for a smooth transition to the pre pre-closing. The importance of this particular ANNOUNCEMENT sequence as a transition between the lecture and the pre pre-closing becomes apparent several lines later. Following the initial END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT, Xu offers the floor to students for questions (166), which indicates a shift to the pre-closing. Following an acknowledgement token by a student (line 180), a second END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT is deployed (line 182). While an explicit ANNOUNCEMENT of the END OF LECTURE marks a shift from the lecture to the pre pre-closing, it is also a marker of
the potential beginning to other pre pre-closing ANNOUNCEMENT sequences. As was discussed earlier, pre pre-closing ANNOUNCEMENT sequences are typically grouped together. Therefore, the END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT also serves an organizational marker to students that other additional ANNOUNCEMENT sequences are likely imminent.

5.3.2 Closing

With regards to sequencing, we can see changes, both verbal and non-verbal, in how transitions out of the closing section are made. Although Xu’s role as the second of four speakers in the group lecture in D1 does not require him to make a final verbal leave taking that says goodbye to the class, he is still required to transition his speaker role as the teacher to the next teacher in the group. In D1 (Excerpt 5-21), Xu does this by moving directly from a pre pre-closing PREVIEW ANNOUNCEMENT (lines 117-120) to the closing LEAVE TAKING.

Excerpt 5-24: D1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>X: explain why° (.) and the next our another PREVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>speaker will talk about †how: we treat the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>grades and how to motivate students (.) by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>respond to their work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>+(1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>x: +starts to walk back to his seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>X: +welcome Nianzu LEAVE TAKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>x: +indicates to Nianzu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Ss: ((clapping))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This transition begins with a one-second pause (line 121), during which time Xu begins walking back to his seat. Following the pause, and while walking back to his seat, Xu performs a closing LEAVE TAKING (line 123). The changes in body positioning (i.e. turning his body to the side) as he walks back to his seat and lack of eye contact with the audience signal disengagement with the class while performing the closing LEAVE TAKING (Fig. 5-5).
In D2 (Excerpt 5-25), Xu’s first solo lecture, he is required to take leave of the class as a whole. He does this through a more prolonged transition to the *closing* from the *pre-closing*.
In line 185, Xu makes a second offer of the floor (‘anything else’), which is declined through silence in line 186. This declination is acknowledged by Xu with an elongated token ‘okay’ in line 188, and is followed by two micro-pauses and the use of ‘so’ (line 188). These verbal markers and hesitations indicate the shift to the closing section.

Non-verbally, Xu disengages with the audience during this transition as well. This is marked by the withdrawal of gaze and turning of the body away from the audience (line 189) (See Fig. 5-6).
At this point, Xu picks up his notes and says ‘let’s get started’ (line 188). The tense used suggests that he would be starting the lecture section imminently. However, I illustrated earlier that Xu misused tense in the lecture section as well. Following this statement, Xu makes a closing LEAVE TAKING by welcoming the next speaker (line 194). The FPP of the LEAVE TAKING sequence occurs after Xu starts walking back to his desk while the audience is producing SPP applause, indicating that it is delayed compared to previous leave takings. This delay, along with the location where Xu is standing while performing the LEAVE TAKING (i.e. far away from the front of the class), suggests that Xu’s ability to transition out of the closing is not stabilized, but that he does have some understanding that a LEAVE TAKING needs to be made. This is evidenced by the fact that even though the audience has oriented to the lecture as having closed (i.e. clapping), Xu performs the verbal leave taking, even if it is not while directly standing in front of the class (see Fig. 5-7).

Figure 5-7: D2 LEAVE TAKING
In D3 (Excerpt 5-26), we see a change in Xu’s leave taking behavior. In this lecture, Xu does not walk away from the front of the room back to his seat while performing the LEAVE TAKING, but remains at the front of the class.

Excerpt 5-26: D3

Excerpt 5-26: D3

In the above excerpt, we see Xu produce a longer verbal leave taking (‘have a good day goodbye’) than in the two previous lectures (line 136). However, instead of demonstrating engagement with the class members when performing this verbal leave taking via eye contact, Xu looks down when doing the leave taking (line 137) (Fig 5-8). Following a 0.8 second pause, only then does he look up at the audience and smile, thus demonstrating some engagement with them. Thus, while Xu remains in the physical space at the front of the class while facing the audience during performance of the closing LEAVE TAKING, thereby indicating increasing awareness of the importance of embodying the teacher space (Eble, 1983; Stevens, 1989), Xu’s averted gaze signals his lack of awareness of the importance of eye contact to remaining engaged with and building rapport with his students (C. Goodwin, 1981; Stevens, 1989).
In D4 (Excerpt 5-27), we see changes in Xu’s pedagogical skills from the closing to the post-closing period of time that reflect awareness of the importance of the verbal leave taking and the importance of body positioning and eye contact to engagement and rapport with his class.

In this excerpt, we see Xu make two pre pre-closing PREVIEW and HOMEWORK ANNOUNCEMENTS in lines 198-200. Following this reiteration of ‘no homework,’ Xu shifts from the pre pre-closing to the closing section using ‘so’, a micro-pause, and a verbal leave taking statement (‘enjoy your weekend so see you next week. goodbye’) (lines 200-201). This transition is made with only one hesitation (‘it’s (. ) enjoy your weekend’). What is most stable by the time of this lecture though is Xu’s non-verbal cues. During this verbal leave taking, not only does Xu remain in the physical space at the front of the class with his body positioned in front of the audience, he performs the
leave taking while maintaining eye contact with the class and not looking down (Fig. 5-9). These changes indicate development in spatial and gestural awareness in order to maintain engagement with the audience.

5.4 Summary

In this chapter, I have shown that even in a relatively short span of time (approximately one month), there are several concrete changes in the way Xu structured and performed the sequences in the dialogic lecture. These changes occurred inter-sequentially, intra-sequentially, and in transitions between sequences as well. These changes have shown development of Xu’s pedagogical skills in a number of ways. First, Xu became more attentive to the importance of establishing and maintaining engagement and rapport with his students during both the opening and closing sections of the lecture through attention to the importance of verbal greetings, leave takings, eye contact, and body positioning. Second, Xu also became more explicit in the discourse markers and announcements used to signal transitions between sections of the lecture, indicating
increasing awareness of the importance of organizational markers to clarity of a lecture. Lastly, Xu showed an increasing repertoire of verbal leave taking phrases, which also illustrates developing pragmatic sensitivity to the ways in which teachers can build rapport with their students by linking the present lecture to future meetings with students. In the next chapter, I look at additional ways Xu showed development of pedagogical skills, focusing instead on how Xu negotiates different participant roles over time and shows increasing attentiveness to the teacher role.
Chapter 6

Participant Frameworks

In this chapter, I describe the participant roles Xu orients to in the dialogic lecture as well as changes in the orientation to those roles over time. Although the focus is primarily on Xu’s actions, the other participants also work to position themselves and Xu in different participant roles as well. Therefore, this chapter will focus on how Xu constructs and shifts orientation to different participant roles while illustrating how students positions themselves vis-à-vis the roles Xu orients to. The participant frameworks discussed in this chapter are (1) EXPERT—NON-EXPERT and (2) STUDENT—TEACHER. While both of these frameworks are enacted in the lectures, findings reveal that in the participant framework of STUDENT—TEACHER, Xu showed increasing orientation to the role of teacher and embodying the teacher space, which was one of the main pedagogical goals of the activity.

6.1 Enacted Participant Frameworks

6.1.1 EXPERT—NON-EXPERT

In this section, I describe the different ways in which the participants in each of the dialogic lectures co-construct doing being an expert or non-expert during the talk. The process of doing being an expert is dynamic and can involve both collaborative construction by participants as well as competing constructions that seek to reject participants’ claims to

17 Like Nguyen (2004), I am using the word “expert” to denote the act of doing being an expert, rather than describing someone as having expertise. Expertise implies a state of being or having knowledge. On the contrary, the process of doing being an expert is dynamic and may change in an interaction at any given time.
expertness. Within this section, first I discuss the ways in which all the participants collaborate to construct participant roles for themselves and others. These ways are (1) the co-construction of the teacher’s expertness while constructing the students’ inexpertness and (2) co-validated claims of expertness by the participants. I then show the ways in which participants make competing claims of expertness and how participants both negotiate and deny these claims in interaction. The main ways in which this happens are through students’ rejections of the teacher’s claims at expertness and through the teacher’s rejections of students’ claims at expertness. Finally, I discuss the ways in which Xu uses the process of defining terms and (2) announcements of the take away point in the pre-closing to self-position himself as being expert.

6.1.1.1 Co-construction of Teacher’s Expertness and Students’ Inexpertness

In this section, I demonstrate how Xu and the other participants in the dialogic lecture collaborate to position Xu as expert and the other students as non-expert. The first example occurs during the pre-closing section in the second dialogic lecture (D2) in which Xu opens the floor to questions.\(^{18}\)

\(^{18}\)One could make the argument that the entire activity of the lecture, especially inviting questions from the audience, makes an assumption that the speaker is an expert who can answer questions because of his or her expertise on a topic. However, I argue that while this may be true, participants do not always actively orient to a speaker as expert.
In line 166, Xu announces the END OF LECTURE, followed by an OFFER of the floor to questions (line 167). This offer is responded to in the form of a question (line 168). As Pomerantz (1988) described, when speakers request information through the asking of questions, they “make implicit claims about their own state of knowledge and imply expectations regarding the recipient’s knowledge” (p. 365). Therefore, the student’s request for information about the fourth dimension (line 168) implies that he does not have knowledge of that topic but expects Xu to. Xu demonstrates expertness of the topic when he provides an answer in lines 170-177. Although Xu has been positioned as expert to this point, the student’s clarification request in the next turn (line 178) indicates that he is trying to position himself as having some knowledge of the topic based on the information thus given and is therefore is not completely non-expert. Although Xu’s response is partially unintelligible, Xu then appears to weakly validate the student’s claim at
having knowledge (uh…is…), but then positions himself as a *more* expert other, making a clarification beginning with ‘but’ (line 179). Weak validation comes from the fact that whatever word comes between ‘uh’ and ‘is’ is likely to be a noun, which seems to construct Xu’s response as likely as a ‘yes, but’ phrase. Following this clarification (lines 179-184), Xu offers the floor again (‘anything else’) (line 185). The lack of challenge to Xu’s clarification signals that no one has any further challenges to Xu’s knowledge of the topic at hand.

A second technique that Xu uses to position himself as expert in the above excerpt is through the strategic use of pronouns and references to the Physics community. In line 170, Xu calls on his membership knowledge of the physics community in order to index his relationship to those considered experts in Physics. He initially uses the pronoun ‘they’ (line 171) to refer to what the Physics community ‘are talking about’, signaling that while he is not a member of the community, he has insider knowledge of their practices. Then, he continues to position himself outside of the Physics community by using inclusive ‘we’ to signal that he and the rest of the class are part of the group of people who typically think of time as linear (‘we always think about times is the one flow thing like water’ (lines 171-172). This stands in contrast to Physics people, who know that time is not conceptualized in this way (‘that’s definitely not the case’) (line 174). However, Xu then re-positions himself as part of the Physics community by using ‘we’ again in line 180, which juxtaposes physicists against those experts in the Math community who have been dealing with higher dimensions in different ways than the Physics community. This juxtaposition appears to validate why knowledge of the fourth dimension is not relevant to the conversation at hand. Although those experts in the Math community may deal with higher dimensions, the Physics community does not, and Xu, as a member of that community, is authorized to claim that information irrelevant to the lecture.
In Excerpt 6-2, we see another instance of collaborative construction of Xu’s expertness and the students’ non-expertness. However, in this example, this positioning of expertness is initiated by Xu rather than by the student.

Excerpt 6-2: D4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>X: which way you think it’s going to happen I mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>happened before it move faster? and faster' or it moves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>slower or slower or it moves at a constant speed. (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>which way you think it can describe the motion of this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>ball. (0.5) faster? or faster' (.) constant speed (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>slower- or slower which one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>H: faster?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>X: yes. (.). because (.) if anything (.). in a (.). ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>situation. (.). I mean just in a perfect world (0.7) for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>example just no table underneath or: no hand holding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>that so anyway move faster and faster (.). because of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>gravity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the lines leading up to the above interaction, Xu is holding a tennis ball and is planning to drop it to describe the concept of kinematics. In lines 64-69, Xu initiates a display question to the class, asking what will happen when the ball drops. After a 1.1 second pause (line 70), a student tentatively responds (line 71). She gives a candidate answer, although the rising intonation suggests the tentative nature of her answer, thereby inviting confirmation and evaluation from a more expert other (Xu). After another pause (0.5 seconds), Xu positively evaluates her response (‘yes’) and then expands on her answer by describing why her response is correct (lines 73-77). In addition, while the student’s response invites an evaluation by Xu, Xu’s acceptance of this invitation by making a positive evaluation of her response also lets him position himself as someone expert enough to evaluate others’ knowledge on the topic. Furthermore, as Xu provides extra information about why her guess is correct, he displays additional expertise on this topic.
6.1.1.2 Co-Validated Claims of Expertness

The data indicate that in many cases both the teacher and the students may orient to expertness at any point in the interaction. During those times, the participants may co-validate each other’s claims at knowledge, although to different degrees.

6.1.1.2.1 Revoicing

One of the main ways each of the participants constructs and validates expertise for him- or herself in the dialogic lecture is through the process of revoicing during IRF sequences. Revoicing has been defined as “the re-uttering of another person’s speech through repetition, expansion, rephrasing, and reporting” (Forman, Larreamendy-Joerns, Stein, & Brown, 1998, p. 531; see also O’Connor & Michaels, 1993; 1996). Revoicing has also been compared to Goffman’s (1981) concept of animation. As O’Connor and Michaels (1993) note, revoicing works “as a resource for explicitly depicting participants while simultaneously anchoring academic task structure and, thus, situating those present in relation to each other in ways that are relevant for their socialization into the community of learners envisioned by the teacher” (p. 322).

While O’Connor, Michaels, and many other researchers have looked at revoicing and its roles in the TEACHER—STUDENT participant framework, in the data here the action of revoicing is made more transparent during orientations to the EXPERT—NON-EXPERT participant framework.

In Excerpts 6-3 and 6-4 below, the responses and follow-ups given to initiated questions provide the space to validate each participant’s claims at expertness.
In lines 3 and 4, Xu pre-announces and then initiates a review question (‘do you still remember what’s one dimension?’). Following a 1.3 second pause, Xu reformulates the question. A student then produces a response (‘one way’) (line 7). By responding to this question, the student positions himself as having some knowledge of the topic at hand. This response is then positively evaluated (‘yeah’) (line 9). By positively evaluating the student’s response, Xu (1) positions himself as someone expert enough to be able to evaluate others’ claims of knowledge on the topic and (2) validates the student’s claims to knowledge. Additionally, Xu revoices the student’s response into more technical language (‘it’s one freedom’) (line 9). This action not only positions Xu as more expert than the student by showing more technical accuracy in the choice of terminology, it also shows that the student allows Xu to be positioned as a more expert other because this reverting of the student’s own answer is left unchallenged by the student himself.

In Excerpt 6-4, we see another example of reverting the student’s response.
In line 22, after the discourse markers ‘okay’ and ‘so’, which signal an impending shift in the topic at hand, Xu pre-announces a shift to topic talk about the ‘second definition’ of gravity (‘let’s move to the second definition’). Following this PRE-ANNOUNCEMENT sequence, Xu initiates and then reformulates a question about the definition of the term gravity (lines 23-24). Following a period of silence (1.3 sec) indicating no response, Xu comments possibly on the reason for the lack of response, namely that the students would have learned this information a long time ago in high school and therefore they would not necessarily remember (lines 26-27). An alternative possibility is that he is reminding them that they learned this information before and they should know the answer. Following this comment, Xu re-initiates the question (line 27), which is followed by another pause (1.4 sec) before two students provide candidate answers (lines 29-30). While the first student’s response is unintelligible, the second student answers that gravity is ‘the attraction between two objects’ (line 30). Like in Excerpt 6-3, these candidate
answers serve to position the students as demonstrating some knowledge of the topic. After another pause (0.8 sec), Xu positively evaluates this response (‘exactly’), which validates their claims (line 32). In addition to this validation, Xu revoices the second student’s response by substituting ‘earth’ and ‘object’ (lines 32-33) for her response of ‘two objects’ (line 30). This revoicing allows Xu to demonstrate his greater expertise by using more precise technical terms than the student. Like in Excerpt 6-3, this positioning as a more expert other is left unchallenged and is even confirmed by the use of an acknowledgement token (‘mmhm’) in line 36.

6.1.1.2.2 Additional Co-validated Constructions of Expertness

Although co-validated constructions of expertness are primarily done through the process of revoicing, in one case this co-construction occurred in a different manner. In this example (Excerpt 6-5), Xu uses an analogy with layperson language to reposition the students as knowledgeable but less expert.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt 6-5: D3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Like other examples shown earlier of co-validation of expertise, the above excerpt occurs during an IRF sequence. In lines 63-64, Xu again asks for the students’ opinions of which object will hit the ground first if dropped together. The students collectively respond in the next turn (‘the ball’) (line 65). In the follow-up move, Xu extends the sequence by requesting justification for this response (line 67). Two students respond to this question in lines 69 and 70. In line 71, Xu first acknowledges these responses (‘okay’) and then positively evaluates them as correct (‘exactly’). These actions therefore validate the students’ claims at knowledge while positioning Xu as expert enough to be able to evaluate such claims. Xu then keeps the floor and further demonstrates his expertise by explaining in more detail why the students’ responses were correct. In order to do this, Xu uses an analogy comparing the movement of a fish in the sea to the concept of air resistance on the objects on display (lines 71-78). Like the process of revoicing in earlier excerpts, Xu uses the students’ responses as a launching point to position himself as a more expert other. However, unlike those excerpts, instead of increasing the level of technical language used to explain the concept, Xu uses non-technical language in the form of an analogy. The use of non-technical language serves to position the students as laypersons without access to the technical expertise to understand the topic at the level he himself does.

6.1.1.3 Students’ Resistance to Teacher’s Claims of Expertness

Although uncommon throughout the data, occasionally the students demonstrate resistance to the teacher’s positioning as expert. An example of this can be seen in Excerpt 6-6 below.
In this example, Xu initiates a question (lines 94-95) that he discloses is not related to Physics. By acknowledging that this question is not related to Physics, it effectively positions him as someone whose normal domain of expertise is in Physics but is also knowledgeable enough to step out of that domain to include others possible domains of expertise. This question is initially met with laughter by the students (line 96), suggesting that they acknowledge how unusual a non-Physics question is in a Physics lecture. Following this laughter, Xu reformulates the question into two questions (lines 97-98). In the next turn, a student produces a dispreferred response in that it is not a response to the question itself but challenges the validity of the question, which in turn challenges Xu’s positioning as knowledgeable enough to propose a question outside of his perceived field of expertise, which is Physics (line 99), although this laughter could be perceived as a mitigator of this as a challenge. In the follow-up move (line 101), Xu makes a positive evaluation of the student’s response, which overlaps with laughter by the students, thereby legitimizing the claim to the invalidity of the initial question. In line 103, Xu produces a change of state token (‘okay’), effectively abandoning the sequence and backing off the student’s challenge to his expertness.
In Excerpt 6-7 below, we see another student challenging Xu’s positioning as expert. However, unlike in the preceding example, Xu does not accept this challenge but uses the challenge as an opportunity to construct the talk so that both the student and Xu may claim knowledge of the topic at hand.
At the beginning of Excerpt 6-7, Xu is holding up two items and initiates a question asking for the students’ opinions of which one will hit the ground first if dropped at the same time (lines 81-82). Following a 1.3 second pause (line 83), a student produces a response (‘the heavier one?’)
In the next move, Xu redirects the question to a second student (‘how bout you?’), who responds to this question in line 86 (‘mm yeah the heavier one’). Following this response, Xu drops both objects (line 88). This action is followed by a student-produced token of surprise in line 89, which partially overlaps with an implicit negative evaluation of the students’ responses by Xu (lines 90-91). This implicit negative evaluation is responded to by a student with an agreement token (‘yeah’) (line 92) but is overlapped with a dispreferred response by a second student. The second student’s response is dispreferred because it challenges Xu’s negative assessment based on previous statements made by Xu (lines 93-94). Xu then initially validates this student’s challenge of his earlier explanation (‘exactly’), which positions her as having knowledge on the topic, before clarifying his response (‘I mean…’) (lines 95-96). She then produces an agreement token (‘right’) (line 97), signaling acceptance of Xu’s clarification. In lines 99-111, Xu further clarifies his explanation by stating ‘just I mean I didn’t want to bring up the resistance force of the air at the beginning’ (lines 106-107). This statement allows Xu to position himself as always having been in possession of the knowledge the student challenged, but chose not to bring it up in the conversation, thereby preserving his expert status. Following this clarification, there are no further objections made by any of the students. The lack of objections is evidenced by the acknowledgement tokens used during Xu’s extended turn (line 101, 108) and no response to Xu’s direct question asking if there were any further disagreements (line 113).

6.1.1.4 Teacher’s Resistance to Students’ Claims of Expertness

In addition to occasional occurrences in which the students may challenge Xu’s claims at expertness, in some cases Xu challenges the students’ claims at expertness without validating them. One such example can be seen in Excerpt 6-8 below.
In line 28, Xu pre-announces a question (‘the second question is’), which is followed directly by the question itself. Following a long pause (3.6 sec), a student responds to this question (lines 34-35) using a dispreferred response that does not answer the question in either way proposed by Xu. This move functions to position the student as expert because (1) it is not made with any tentativeness and (2) it provides an answer to the question outside the realm of acceptable answers offered by Xu. Therefore, it suggests that the student is positioning himself as potentially *more* expert on this topic than Xu because he is able to comment on options that even the expert does not suggest as possibilities. However, Xu challenges this positioning by the student. In the follow-up move, Xu produces an acknowledgement token (‘okay’) of the student’s response but makes no evaluation of it. Instead, he re-opens the floor to other possible responses (line 36). This request for additional responses is met with silence (6.3 sec). In line 38, Xu then acknowledges the lack of responses, as well as the original response made by the student, before moving on to the next question (lines 38-39). By producing an acknowledgement token of the student’s response without evaluating or commenting on it, Xu implicitly rejects the response as unworthy of comment. Therefore, it appears as if he rejects the student’s attempts to position himself as a more expert other.

---

**Excerpt 6-8: D1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>X: okay yeah. okay the second question is that is it a good thing to tell the student what they need to do to succeed. (.). in your course. (0.8) is it a good? thing or a bad thing’ (0.6) if you tell them how to do it (3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>W: it really depends on (1.1) the class and what you want to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>X: okay one answer’ any (.). one would like to guess? (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>X: anyway (.). okay (we already get) one answer so let’s move to the third question (0.7) the third question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We see another example of Xu challenging a student’s positioning of himself as expert in Excerpt 6-9 below.

Excerpt 6-9: D3

43 X: †now the next question is that (1.0) for the
44 gravity (0.6) (xx) will affect the (. ) different
45 mass of material. (. ) for example if I have (. ) a
46 small piece of metal’ and a big ball. (0.5) this
47 one’s heavier (. ) this one’s lighter (. ) if I let go
48 at the same time which one will hit the ground first.
49 (0.7)
50 SU: the big [one
51 SS: [the same
52 SU: the same
53 (1.5)
54 X: actually it’s difficult to (. ) s- †see that but if
55 you measure it carefully they hit the ground (. ) exactly
56 at the same time. (. ) the (. ) main point of gravity is
57 that it’s regardless of the mass. (. ) so no matter you
58 are †heavier you are light (1.2) they have the same
59 (0.7) speed when they hit the ground. in a so called
60 ideal world of course we know it’s (. ) no such uh
61 system called ideal world (. ) SO (1.5) it’s kind of
62 contradict to our intuition because we all know that
63 if I let go which a piece of paper?(. ) and a ball. (. )
64 which ones (will) hit the ground first

As in previous excerpts, Xu again proposes a question soliciting students’ opinions of which of two objects will hit the ground first when dropped at the same time (lines 43-48). Following a 0.7 second pause, several students provide candidate answers to the question, with partial overlap in responses (lines 50-52), thereby positioning them as having some knowledge of the topic. After another pause (1.5 sec), Xu implicitly rejects the students’ responses by explaining that the objects will hit the ground at the same time (lines 54-57), using an ‘actually plus acceptable answer’ format that was found to be a typical phrase used when Xu treats a student’s answer as unacceptable (see Chapter 4). This implicit rejection thereby challenges the students’ claims of
knowledge and positions Xu as a more expert other who has not only the knowledge of the correct answer but is also expert enough to evaluate others’ responses. Unlike in Excerpt 6-7 though, Xu’s explanation is not challenged, thus allowing him to continue to demonstrate expertness on the topic interrupted (lines 57-64).

### 6.1.1.5 Self-Positioning of Xu as Expert

#### 6.1.1.5.1 Defining Terms

Because of the many extended turns that the dialogic lecture affords, there are many opportunities for Xu to position himself as expert that go uncontested by the students. One of the ways in which Xu accomplishes this self-positioning as expert is in the action of defining terms. We can see an example of this in Excerpt 6-10 below.

**Excerpt 6-10: D2**

| 54 | X: so: (0.6) let me start with the definition of | ← |
| 55 | kinematics (0.7) what is kinematics (.). kinematics |
| 56 | is the (.). des†ri‡ion of how a object (0.5) move |
| 57 | (2.5) just (0.8) when you study? um um (.). the |
| 58 | (position/prediction) as a function of time (.). you |

In line 54, Xu announces a shift in topic to a discussion of kinematics through the use of an elongated ‘so’, a 0.6 second pause, and the phrase ‘let me start with…’ Xu then initiates a question in line 55, asking ‘what is kinematics’. However, instead of waiting for a response, Xu answers his own question (lines 55-56), strongly suggesting that a response by the audience was not expected nor desired.
6.1.1.5.2 Take Away Point

A second way that Xu positions himself as expert is during the ANNOUNCEMENT sequence of TAKE AWAY point in the pre pre-closing section. As discussed in more detail in Chapter 4, the TAKE AWAY point describes a piece of information that the instructor deems the most important point of the lecture to remember and occurs within the pre pre-closing section of the lecture. Additionally, like other ANNOUNCEMENT sequences in the pre pre-closing, there is no expected response to this ANNOUNCEMENT. These actions, or lack thereof, present an interactional opportunity for Xu to position himself as expert. By announcing what information is the most important for the audience to remember about the lecture, it presumes that Xu is expert enough to decide what is and is not worth knowing about the topic. Examples of these TAKE AWAY ANNOUNCEMENTS made without an expected response are illustrated in Excerpts 6-11 and 6-12 below.

Excerpt 6-11: D3

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>and the influence of gravity. the only information you need to remember today is that (.) in the so called ideal world. (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>(trust/just) the gravity regardless of the (0.5) how heavy you are or (.) the mass of the (.) object you are studying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Excerpt 6-12 above, Xu announces the TAKE AWAY point (lines 123-128), marking the primacy of this particular information over other potential points with the phrase ‘the only information you need to remember today is…’ In Excerpt 6-12, we see a similar pattern.
In line 182, Xu shifts from the lecture section of the talk to the *pre pre-closing* by announcing the END OF LECTURE. He then makes a SUMMARY ANNOUNCEMENT (‘today we talk about…’) (lines 182-183) before announcing the TAKE AWAY point. This TAKE AWAY point is marked by the phrase (‘the one thing you need to remember’) (lines 184-185). At the end of this ANNOUNCEMENT, Xu repeats the importance of this information as the TAKE AWAY point (‘that’s all we need to remember today’) (lines 190-191).

### 6.1.2 TEACHER—STUDENT

In addition to the framework of EXPERT—NON-EXPERT, a more common framework that participants orient to over the course of the four dialogic lectures is that of TEACHER—STUDENT. While the participant roles of teacher and student have traditionally been treated as default and static roles in the classroom (Love & Suherdi, 1996; K. Richards, 2006), I show that orientation to this particular participant framework is more dynamic in nature, with individuals shifting orientations several times within a given interaction. This section of the chapter is divided into two sub-sections: (1) orientations to the role of student and (2) orientations to the role of teacher.
6.1.2.1 Orientations to the Role of Student

This section is also divided into two sub-sections. The first describes instances during LEAVE TAKING actions in Xu’s dialogic lectures in which the participants orient to the role of student in the ITA training course rather than as a teacher and students in a Physics class. The second looks an interaction in the lecture section of the dialogic lecture to see how Xu actively orients to himself and the audience members as being students in the ITA course.

6.1.2.1.1 Leave Taking

LEAVE TAKING actions are one of the most ubiquitous places to see shifts in orientation to particular participant roles because they serve as the boundaries between two different activities in which different participant roles may be relevant. In Excerpts 6-13 and 6-14 below, we see how both Xu and the audience members distinctly orient to the role of student in an ITA class rather than as a teacher giving a lecture in his own classroom or students in a Physics lecture.
In lines 113-117, Xu explains a point from the lecture section to the students. In line 117, Xu indicates a shift from the lecture section to the pre-closing by making a PREVIEW ANNOUNCEMENT of the next “speaker’s” topic (lines 117-120). While in this particular case Xu is the second in a four-person group lecture, and therefore there would indeed be someone teaching after him, he references the next person as a “speaker” rather than a “teacher”.

In general, within the ITA course and university classes, it is typical for students to give presentations throughout the semester. Typically, following a presentation, audience members clap when the presenter is finished. However, in a teaching situation, it is atypical of students to clap after class ends, at least within American universities. Within this particular ITA training course, student teaching simulations typically take place on the same day in back-to-back “lectures”. Therefore, before and after Xu teaches, another student will or will have just taught as well. However, during the process of ITA training, the students are asked to suspend reality and practice “doing” being the teacher or student in a class. Thus, in line 125 when the students clap during Xu’s leave-taking, they appear to be orienting to their roles as student peers in the ITA course rather than as students in Xu’s class.
In Excerpt 6-14, we see a similar orientation during LEAVE TAKING actions, only in this example Xu is not expected to have another “teacher” “lecture” after him as part of a group lecture.

Excerpt 6-14: D2

185  X:  anything else?  
186    + (2.4)  
187  x:  *looks around room*  
188  X: +okay:. (.)+ ++ +++so’ (.) +++let’s get started  
189  x: +turns away looking down at desk  
190  x:  ++picks up notes from desk  
191  x:  ++++turns to face audience  
192  x:  +++starts walking back to desk ←  
193  Ss:  ((cla+pping)) ←  
194  X:  +welcome the next speaker. ←

In line 185, Xu makes an OFFER of the floor to questions as a pre-closing action. There is a 2.4 second pause indicating a declination of the offer of the floor. Following this pause, Xu first acknowledges this declination of the offer of the floor (‘okay’) and then announces the END OF LECTURE. As Xu announces the END OF LECTURE, he begins walking back to his seat (192). As he starts walking back to his seat, the students begin clapping (line 193). During this clapping, Xu greets the next speaker. First, unlike in the previous excerpt, Xu does not have another group member coming up to teach after him. There will, however, be other student peers in the ITA class who will give their “lectures” after him. In that case, he would need to take a seat and let the next “teacher” go. As previously mentioned though, one pedagogical goal of the course is to pretend to be a teacher in one’s own classroom. Thus, both Xu’s greeting of the next “speaker” in line 194, as well as walking back to his desk as he performs leave-taking actions, indicate his orientation to the role of student in an ITA course giving a presentation rather than to the role of

---

19 As previously shown in Chapter 4, even though Xu’s use of tense suggests the beginning of the lecture, his lack of starting a new segment of the lecture following this announcement, as well as the orientation of the students to it being the end of the lecture, clearly indicates that it a grammatical error.
teacher. Furthermore, the clapping by the “students” also shows them orienting to their roles as student peers in the ITA course, as was the case in Excerpt 6-13.

6.1.2.1.2 Lecture

During his lectures, as we have seen in Xu’s control of the turn-taking structure through use of the IRF sequence, Xu primarily orients to the audience members as students in his class rather than as student peers in ITA course. However, in one case, we see Xu explicitly orient to his and his classmates’ roles as students in the ITA course by referencing the course instructor and their collective experiences in the course. This is illustrated in Excerpt 6-15 below.

Excerpt 6-15: D1

79 X: (.) and the last thing is that (.) not only (.)
80 you need to let students know your expectation
81 (.) however the most important thing is you need
82 to make them to believe (1.0) it is realistic
83 for them (.) for example at the beginning of the ←
84 118 Tabitha said all of ↑us will be is good ←
85 enough to pass the this 118? and get all get a ←
86 (.) and that’s kind of (0.9) to:: made us to
87 believe’ that his- her- expe- expectation is
88 realistic for us. so that’s an example [(.) so: now
89 n: [nods] ←

In this excerpt, we first see an extended turn in which Xu explains a particular point in the lecture section about how to keep students motivated in class (lines 79-83). In lines 83-88, Xu then provides an example to support his point. Next, in line 88, he makes a meta-statement announcing that the previous statement was an example of the point he had been explaining. Pedagogically,
the students in the ITA course are encouraged to bring in real-life examples in order to connect their lectures to real-life situations. That said, they are not specifically instructed to bring in examples from the current classroom context. However, in 83-88, Xu clearly orients to his and his classmates’ roles in the ITA course with references to the course instructor Tabitha. Specifically, he makes a specific reference to what Tabitha ‘said’ (line 84) for all of ‘us’ (line 84) to pass ‘this 118 [course]’ (line 85), using the deictic reference ‘this’ to recognize that the current class in question is ITA course. Additionally, the use of inclusive “us” (lines 84, 86, 88) indicates that Xu is orienting to both the other classmates and himself as members of the ITA course. While not all of the students non-verbally react to this explicit reference to the ITA course, at least one student nods in agreement (line 89) after Xu gives his example. This non-verbal agreement suggests that the student validates Xu’s orientation to this particular participant framework.

6.1.2.2 Orientations to the Role of Teacher

As previously discussed, one of the goals of the activity of doing the dialogic lecture is to take on and orient to the role of being the teacher in one’s own classroom. Like orientations to the student role, orientations to being the teacher are dynamic, with explicit orientations to this role shifting, even mid-utterance. In this section, I show the ways in which Xu actively orients to the role of teacher, specifically during the PLAN OF ACTION sequence and through the use of classroom-specific language.

In Excerpt (6-16), we see Xu shift from the PLAN OF ACTION (‘today our topic will be the kinematics in the one d dimension’) (lines 5-6) to the review section of the lecture.
As he makes this shift, he initiates a review question, asking if anyone still remembers previous information provided in his last lecture (lines 7-9). In the midst of this question, he performs a self-initiated self-repair (SISR) to change from a reference to the lecture as a presentation to one as teaching (line 8). This SISR illustrates a moment of displayed cognition in which we can actually see a shift in orientation from the role of student giving a presentation to that of a teacher teaching.

6.1.2.2.1 Classroom-Specific Language

While it is sometimes difficult to discern differences between a classroom presentation and a classroom lecture due to the fact that even “interactive” lectures can structurally and sequentially look like monologic presentations, references to classroom-specific “language” is one differentiating feature. By classroom-specific language, I am describing those references made in a class lesson that specifically situate classroom-specific activities, like the assigning of homework or office hours. In Excerpts 6-17 and 6-18, we can see how Xu orients to the role of teacher by the use of classroom-specific language.
This excerpt begins with a shift from the lecture section to the pre pre-closing through an END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT (lines 120-121), followed by a SUMMARY of the day’s lecture (lines 121-123) and an ANNOUNCEMENT of the TAKE AWAY point (lines 123-128). Following these ANNOUNCEMENT sequences, Xu announces that there is no homework assignment for the day (lines 128-129). This reference to homework shows a clear orientation to his role as a teacher because, in the classroom, only the teacher has the authority to assign homework. Following the ANNOUNCEMENT of no homework, Xu PREVIEWS the lecture for ‘next week’ (lines 129-130). The reference to ‘next week’ also indicates orientation to the teacher role because it positions the present lecture as one in a series of classes throughout the semester, as would be the case if teaching in real life. In contrast, individual student presentations are not typically given in class every week, but happen at specific intervals over the course of the semester. After this PREVIEW ANNOUNCEMENT, Xu makes a pre-closing offer of the floor to questions (lines 130-131). This offer is met with no response (line 133). Xu then produces an acknowledgement token of this declination of the floor (‘okay’) (line 133) before making a deferred offer of the floor to bring
questions to his office hours (lines 133-134). This direct reference to office hours clearly shows him orienting to the teacher role because only teachers hold office hours. Additionally, by referring to meeting students outside of class time at a later point, it references this being one class in a semester of classes in which the teacher would meet with students to discuss their work. Finally, Xu makes references to the ‘website’ (line 134) of the ‘class’ (line 135), which explicitly references this as a class in which his “students” can look up his office hours as the “teacher” and would likely contain information of class content.

In a second Excerpt (6-18), we can see a very similar case of Xu’s orientation to the teacher role through classroom-specific language.
As in the previous excerpt, Xu shifts from the *lecture* to the *pre pre-closing* by making an *END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT* (line 182), followed directly by a *SUMMARY* and a *TAKE AWAY* point (lines 184-190). After this *TAKE AWAY* point, we again see direct references to the assignment of homework in lines 191-192 and in lines 197-198. Additionally, we can see temporal references to the class being one in many future classes, as ‘what we need to remember today’ (lines 190-191) is juxtaposed against ‘next week [what] we will study’ (line 192). Together, these references show how Xu uses classroom-specific language to orient to the role of teacher.

### 6.2 Changes in Participant Frameworks

Several changes in orientation to participant roles were noted in the data. However, all of these changes occurred in the TEACHER—STUDENT framework and not the EXPERT—NON-
EXPERT framework. Evidence of development in participant frameworks indicated Xu’s increasing orientation to and recognizability in the role of “teacher” versus “student”. This development was observed in three areas: (1) increasing use of classroom-specific language, (2) leave-taking actions, and (3) spatial and non-verbal orientation to the “teacher” space.

6.2.1 Classroom-Specific Language

In the case of classroom-specific language, over time Xu decreased in explicit references to upcoming “presentations” by other students in the ITA course and increased in the number of explicit references to upcoming “classes” using classroom-specific language.

Excerpt 6-19: D1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>X: so if they have their own choice (.). they will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>be (.). more interested in your homework (.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>however definitely you cannot (.). let them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>choose their exam “I mean I don’t need to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>explain why” (.). and the next our another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>speaker will talk about how: we treat the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>grades and how to motivate students (.). by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>respond to their work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>+(1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>x: +starts to walk back to his seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>X: +welcome Nianzu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>x: +indicates to Nianzu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Ss: ((clapping))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first lecture (D1), Xu previews the next student’s ‘presentation’ by reference to the next ‘speaker’ (lines 117-118) rather than ‘teacher’, and in so doing indexes his orientation to the student role.

In the second lecture (D2), again Xu welcomes the next ‘speaker’ (line 194), implying that they are giving presentations rather than teaching, but does not reference the next speaker’s topic specifically.
The above two excerpts (6-21 and 6-22) show an orientation to Xu’s role as student in that they reference the activity as being a single “presentation” in a class he would be evaluated on, after which another student would present. Any references to upcoming “classes” rather than “presentations” would evidence a shift in orientation to reflect his role as a teacher who is ending a lecture in a class but would have another lecture the following week, as would be the case in a typical university classroom. It is in the third and fourth (D3 & D4) lectures that we start to see change in this direction.
Following earlier pre closing ANNOUNCEMENTS of the END OF LECTURE (lines 120-121), SUMMARY (lines 121-123), and TAKE AWAY point (lines 123-128), Xu announces that there is no HOMEWORK assignment for the day (lines 128-129). This reference to homework shows a clear orientation to his role as a teacher because, in the classroom, only the teacher has the authority to assign homework. Unlike in D1 and D2, Xu PREVIEWS the lecture for ‘next week’ (lines 129-130). The reference to ‘next week’ indicates orientation to the teacher role because it positions the present lecture as one in a series of classes throughout the semester. This stands in contrast to individual student presentations, which are not typically given in class every week, but happen at specific intervals over the course of the semester. In lines 133-134, we also see Xu make an offer of the floor to bring questions to his office hours (lines 133-134). This direct reference to office hours clearly shows another example of orienting to the teacher role through classroom-specific language. Finally, Xu makes references to the ‘website’ (line 134) of the ‘class’ (line 135), which
explicitly references this as a class in which his “students” can look up his office hours as the “teacher”.

In Excerpt 6-22, we see similar uses of classroom-specific language in D4 that contrasts greatly with the lack of such language in D1 and D2.

Excerpt 6-22: D4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>X: so (1.6) let’s (0.5) wrap up that n- today we talk END OF LECTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>about that (0.5) the one dimensional motion under SUMMARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>the influence of the gravity. (.) and one thing TAKE AWAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>you need to remember is that in a so called ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>world which we don’t have (0.8) any air surround</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>us’ (0.7) the (0.5) gravity applied from any mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>SU: =mhm=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>X: =will be identical. (.) they will not have no TAKE AWAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>difference at all that’s what we need to remember TAKE AWAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>today. (0.6) so (.) we don’t have homework this HOMEWORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>week (.) and next week we will study the two PREVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>dimensional motion (.) under the influence of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>gravity. (.) so two dimensional will be means that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>it can move either in left and right and then PREVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>move up and down together. (.) so we will study HOMEWORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>then next week (.) um (1.6) yeah as I said no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>homework so it’s (.) enjoy your weekend’ so see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>you next week. goodbye LEAVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>(1.2) TAKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>SU: thank you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like in D3, in addition to earlier PRE PRE-CLOSING ANNOUNCEMENTS, like an END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT, a general SUMMARY of the lecture, and a TAKE AWAY point, Xu assigns HOMEWORK for ‘next week’ (lines 191-192, 197-198), and PREVIEWS ‘next week’s’ lecture. (lines 192-194, 196-197). These references to future expected meetings between him, as the teacher, and his students, as well as assigning his “students” homework, show a clear shift in orientation to an embodiment of the role of teacher rather than student. We can see a different visualization of these changes in the usage of classroom-specific language in Table 6-1 below.
Table 6-9: Development of Increasing Use of Classroom-Specific Language

| D1: | PREVIEW |
| D2: | SUMMARY |
| D3: | SUMMARY – HOMEWORK – PREVIEW – OFFICE HOURS |
| D4: | SUMMARY – HOMEWORK – PREVIEW |

6.2.2 LEAVE TAKING Actions

In the case of the second area of change, LEAVE TAKING actions, changes in these actions also instantiate this movement from student to teacher. In the first two lectures (D1 & D2), rather than taking leave of the class, which is what is expected to happen at the end of a class, the ITA introduces the student who is giving the next part of the lecture.

Excerpt 6-23: D1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>X: so if they have their own choice (.) they will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>be (.) more interested in your homework (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>however definitely you cannot (.) let them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>choose their exam °I mean I don’t need to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>explain why° (.) and the next our another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>speaker will talk about °how: we treat the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>grades and how to motivate students (.) by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>respond to their work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>+(1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>x: +starts to walk back to his seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>X: +welcome Nianzu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>x: +indicates to Nianzu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Ss: ((clapping))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The transition out of the activity through LEAVE TAKING actions begins with a one-second pause (line 121), during which time Xu begins walking back to his seat (line 122). Following the pause,
and while walking back to his seat, Xu performs a closing LEAVE TAKING (line 123) that welcomes the next ‘speaker’ by name.

In D2, Xu still welcomes the next ‘speaker’ (line 194), although does not call him by name, possibly because he does not know who specifically will be teaching after him.

Excerpt 6-24: D2

185  X: anything else?
186    +(.2.4)
187  x: *looks around room
188  X: *okay:. (.)* ++ ***so’ (*.)* +++let’s get started
189  x: *turns away looking down at desk
190  x: ++*picks up notes from desk
191  x: ***turns to face audience
192  x: +++starts walking back to desk
193  Ss: ((clapping))
194  X: +welcome the next speaker.  ←

In D2, after making an offer of the floor to questions, which is responded to by silence (lines 185-196), Xu picks up his notes and says ‘let’s get started’ (line 188). The tense used suggests that he would be starting the lecture section imminently. However, no additional lecturing comes after this statement and that the audience orients to this statement as some sort of END OF LECTURE statement through their applause, which strongly suggests that the use of the present tense is a grammatical error. Following this statement, Xu makes a closing LEAVE TAKING by welcoming the next ‘speaker’ (line 194).

By the third lecture (D3), there is no explicit orientation to other upcoming speakers, only a verbal leave taking of the class by saying goodbye (line 136).
Finally, in D4, not only does Xu not make explicit reference to upcoming presenters while he says goodbye, he makes reference to fact that he will see these students ‘next week’ (line 199).

While Xu only makes explicit references to the next ‘speaker’ in the first two dialogic lectures, the absence of these explicit references in the third and fourth dialogic lectures is significant.

Because suspending reality to embody the role of the teacher in one’s own classroom is one of the pedagogical goals of the activity, not orienting to the fact that there will, in fact, be another person giving another “presentation” after him is considered evidence of positive development.

Additionally, any overt references to it being a class in which he is the teacher, such as references to seeing the students next week, is also evidence of positive development according to the pedagogical goals of the activity.
We can see this shift over time from explicit references to the next “speaker’s” “presentation” to no explicit references to it as a “presentation” represented visually in a different way in Table 6-2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-10: Closing LEAVE TAKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1: WELCOME + (SPEAKER) NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2: WELCOME + SPEAKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3: HAVE A GOOD DAY + GOODBYE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4: ENJOY YOUR WEEKEND + SEE YOU NEXT WEEK + GOODBYE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.3 Spatial & Non-Verbal Orientation to Teacher Space

The last area of change takes place through embodiment of space and non-verbal language of the teacher. Research has shown robust evidence that the position of the teacher at the front of class is the canonical image associated with someone being perceived as a teacher (McGregor, 2004; Stevens, 1989; Van Tartwijk, Brekelmans, Wubbels, Fisher, & Fraser, 1998). Therefore, by learning to embody this “power spot” (McLaren, 1986), one may increase his or her recognizability as performing the “teacher role.” In addition, research has shown that maintaining gaze with an interlocutor is one of the primary means for establishing rapport and signaling engagement in a conversation (C. Goodwin, 1981).

In the first and second lectures, (D1 and D2) Xu appears to physically embody the role of a student. In both lectures, he begins walking away from the front of the class back to his seat as he introduces the next speaker, with body turned to the side and gaze averted (D1, line 122; D2, line 192). This body positioning and gaze are also represented in Figures 6-1 and 6-2 below.
Excerpt 6-27: D1

113 X: so if they have their own choice (.) they will
114 be (. ) more interested in your homework (. )
115 however definitely you cannot (.) let them
116 choose their exam °I mean I don’t need to
117 explain why° (.) and the next our another
118 speaker will talk about °how: we treat the
119 grades and how to motivate students (. ) by
120 respond to their work
121 +(1.0)
122 x:  °starts to walk back to his seat
123 X:  °welcome Nianzu
124 x:  °indicates to Nianzu
125 Ss:  °(clapping))

Figure 6-1: D1 LEAVE TAKING
Excerpt 6-28: D2

185  X:  anything else?
186  + (2.4)  
187  x:  + looks around room  
188  X:  + okay: . ()+ ++ +++ so’ () +++ let’s get started  
189  x:  + turns away looking down at desk  
190  x:  ++ picks up notes from desk  
191  x:  +++ turns to face audience  
192  x:  +++ starts walking back to desk  
193  Ss:  ((clapping))  
194  X:  + welcome the next speaker.  

Figure 6-2: D2 LEAVE TAKING

By the time of the third lecture, he remains at the front of the class during the verbal leave taking, although during this time he also averts his gaze as he says goodbye. (see also Fig. 6-3).
During the verbal leave taking (line 136), instead of demonstrating engagement with the class members when performing this verbal leave taking, Xu looks down when doing the leave taking (line 137). Following a 0.8 second pause, only then does he look up at the audience and smile, thus demonstrating some engagement with them. Thus, while Xu remains in the physical space at the front of the class facing the audience while performing the closing LEAVE TAKING, his averted gaze signals that he is not totally engaged with the audience.
By the time of the fourth lecture, Xu appears to have fully taken on the role of the teacher.

Excerpt 6-30: D4

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X:</td>
<td>gravity. (.) so two dimensional will be means that it can move either in left and right and then move up and down together. (.) so we will study then next week (.). um (1.6) yeah as I said no homework so it’s (.). enjoy your weekend’ so see you next week. goodbye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU:</td>
<td>thank you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6-4: D1 LEAVE TAKING

During this verbal leave taking, not only does Xu remain in the physical space at the front of the class with his body positioned in front of the audience, he performs the verbal leave taking while maintaining eye contact with the class and not looking down (see Fig. 6-4). These changes in
body positioning and gaze over the course of the four dialogic lectures indicate development in spatial and gestural awareness in order to maintain engagement with the audience.

6.3 Summary

In this chapter, I showed that participant frameworks are dynamically co-constructed in interaction, with several different frameworks being enacted within even a short span of time. The frameworks Xu primarily oriented to in the data were those of EXPERT—NON-EXPERT and TEACHER—STUDENT. In addition, changes in how Xu oriented to participant frameworks were found over time within the framework of TEACHER—STUDENT. Changes in Xu’s orientation to the role of teacher versus student were found in three different areas: (1) increases in the use of classroom-specific language, (2) leave-taking practices, and (3) spatial and non-verbal orientation to the “teacher” space. These changes provide evidence of the development of Xu becoming more recognizably teacher-like over the course of the semester, which was one of the primary pedagogical goals of the activity and of the course as a whole.

---

20 This is perhaps understandable though, given that Xu is the only Physics student in the class. Whether he is acting in the role of student or teacher, he is still the only Physics expert in the class.
Chapter 7

Discussion and Conclusions

In this dissertation, I have provided a close analysis of the development of the pedagogical skills of one pre-service ITA over the course of a semester-long training course. Looking at this ITA’s behavior while practicing doing dialogic teaching, I have traced the development of two components of the interactional competence framework, i.e. action sequencing and participant frameworks, in this practice over time. In this final chapter, I address the contributions the findings in this study make to both those studies using CA to look at development, as well as the ITA literature in general. In particular, I look at this study’s contribution to methods of inquiry of studying language learning, its contribution by expanding the objects of analysis of what is learned, and its contribution by locally situating the notion of identity in interaction. Then, I discuss some limitations to the study as a whole and how those limitations may be addressed in future work. Finally, I discuss the potential usefulness of this dissertation to those interested in ITA education and curriculum development, as well as how we might be able to shift the discourse talking about ITAs.

7.1 Contributions to CA & ITA Literature

One of the main issues that this study confronts is the efficacy of using CA as a means to study development and learning. As discussed in more detail in Chapter 2, this study embraces a socio-cognitive perspective on learning that conceptualizes learning as a process rather than product. Additionally, this study has employed primarily conversation analysis as a methodological tool in the service of looking at development over time. These two facts are not
without conflict within the field of Applied Linguistics. The debate between interactionists and sociocognitivists has become one of the most heated debates in the field of Applied Linguistics in the last ten years. This is especially apparent in Firth and Wagner’s (1997) piece calling for a reconceptualization of the field of SLA, the articles in response to their article, and a special issue of the *Modern Language Journal* in 2007 that revisited the debate spawned by Firth and Wagner’s article ten years earlier. Within this debate, the sub-field involving researchers using CA as a means to look at learning is now generally regarded as CA-for-SLA, although as I have pointed out in Chapter 2, using CA to look at development is not constricted to SLA studies only, as the current study has demonstrated. These studies have provided what Markee and Kasper (2004) have called “the impetus for a whole new generation of empirically grounded research into how cognitive SLA might be respecified in sociocultural terms” (p. 491). And while many scholars have advocated for the potential of using CA to look at learning (Firth & Wagner, 1997, 2007; Hall, 2004; Kasper, 2006; Markee, 2000, 2007, 2008; Markee & Kasper, 2004; Seedhouse, 2005), this approach is not without its challenges or detractors.

Among the challenges to using CA to look at development are (1) being able to define the object of learning and (2) providing evidence of not only development but also learning while using a framework that defines learning as a process rather than a product. These challenges also involve the question of how CA-development studies are able to appropriate a framework of language use for the study of development, as well as how researchers are able to look at data longitudinally when CA practitioners, as a rule, do not rely on data outside of the immediate context for analysis. Additionally, another challenge is how these types of studies describe the individual’s development of interactional competence. While the empirical results of the current study do not contribute to the discussion of why individual development occurs or how learning affects an individual’s cognitive mechanisms, in the following sections I discuss how the current

---

21 See Chapter 2 for a more in-depth discussion of how a socio-cognitive perspective describes learning as a process and the ways in which it defines both the object of learning and mechanism of development.
study contributes to the literature by presenting evidence of (1) how development can be traced longitudinally, thereby expanding the methods of inquiry one can use to study development and possibly learning, (2) how we can expand the object of analysis of what is learned in terms of interactional resources, (3) how using a framework of IC expands what we know about identity and how identity is constructed and displayed in interaction, and (4) how my analysis can speak to ITA educators and the professional development of ITAs.

7.1.1 Methods of Inquiry

While CA studies have been very successful at describing the mechanisms for social life in action (Wagner, 2004), what is less well-tread territory are studies investigating learning as “systematic and structural change of knowledge and skills (whatever they may be)” (Brouwer & Wagner, 2004, p. 32; see however Hellermann, 2007; 2008; Nguyen, 2004; Young & Miller, 2004 for longitudinal studies that have been done). It is in this particular area that the current study is able to contribute.22 First, the data in this study are longitudinal and track the same set of participants doing the same interactive practice over time. One of the methodological challenges to using CA to look at development is in the collection of longitudinal data. Because a social-cognitive view of learning takes context not as a variable to be controlled but as an inseparable part of the interaction itself, and because CA is only interested in naturally-occurring data, it is challenging to record the same constellation of participants, practices, and contexts occurring naturally over time. However, by recording the entirety of the ITA training course over the course of the semester, I was able to go back and find all instances of Xu practicing doing dialogic teaching during the course of the semester.

22 While it is debatable whether or not the developments documented in the analysis are evidence of learning, the methods of inquiry used are the same for investigating both.
Another related contribution this study makes methodologically is in the diachronic, rather than synchronic, nature of the data. Synchronic data is collected periodically over a certain period of time in order to show “snapshots” of the learners’ progress over time. The advantage of this approach is that, “Since CA provides a detailed description of events of talk-in-interaction, lining up the ‘snapshots’ over a span of time can give us an idea of how individuals’ competence changes and develops” (Nguyen, 2004, p. 508). While stringing together “snapshots” of interactions over time can illuminate a lot about the language learning process longitudinally, \textit{diachronic} data collection can provide an even richer picture of the process. Because there was constant recording of the classroom through the entirety of the semester, I was able to record every instance of Xu doing \textit{being} a dialogic teacher in the classroom during his training, thereby supporting a more \textit{microgenetic} analysis of the construction of the dialogic lecture over time. A synchronic approach provides a longitudinal view of learning, but cannot say for sure if and when particular interactional resources are used for the first time during a practice. A diachronic approach, on the other hand, can explicate these things.

7.1.2 Expands the Object of Analysis

As Markee (2007, 2008) and Kasper (2006) point out, one of the main issues confronting those doing CA to look at learning and development is if learning is reconceptualized as a process, what is the object of learning. The idea of reframing language learning as a process rather than a product is a radical departure from the work of “mainstream” SLA researchers who “view the object of inquiry as in large part an internal, mental process” (Long, 1997, p. 319). As described in more detail in Chapter 2, both the object and goal of learning those employing CA to look at development are interactional competence, and interactional competence is composed of a number of interactional resources that participants use to participate in a given practice (e.g.
action sequencing and participant frameworks). While many researchers have argued that longitudinal studies should investigate “the emergence of learning,” they also contend that there are no research procedures available in SLA for these kinds of studies (van Lier, 2000, p. 250). It is in this area that the current study is also able to make a contribution. The IC framework expands the object of analysis of what is learned as well as provides a clear set of procedures for analysis of its development. As Hoejke and Williams (1994) note:

Our knowledge of discourse competence is far from comprehensive. For example, some rules for making an effective oral presentation can be taught, such as including an introduction and conclusion, using repetitions and clear framing statements, and so on. However, many more features have yet to be described, such as appropriate encoding of topic and information focus, consistent tracking of referents, and other elements of cohesion in text, which are features nonnative speakers often omit. (p. 21)

The above quote by Hoejke and Williams illustrates the possibility of categories of discourse competence to be expanded beyond what has already been discovered regarding the explicit rules of how to construct an interactive practice, such as what discourse markers to use or how to do an introduction or conclusion in a presentation. This dissertation has contributed to what we know about the language used in constructing the dialogic lecture in areas beyond even those discussed by Hoekje and Williams and in studies of learning. Traditional SLA studies have often focused on the acquisition of discrete linguistic forms, using a language as product metaphor. Even CA studies, Brouwer and Wagner (2004) have argued, have focused on the ways in which linguistic forms are ‘locally’ learned through interaction (cf. Markee, 2000; Markee, 2008). While the learning of linguistic forms is certainly an important endeavor, if we are to stay true to the goal of conceptualizing learning as a process, then the objects of inquiry for the study of language learning from a socio-cognitive view must include more than only linguistic forms. They must also include the various conversational repertoires individuals develop in order to become part of a particular community of practice. This is where the current study’s empirical implementation of the interactional competence framework becomes important. The IC framework articulates what
is learned as a set of resources individuals deploy in interaction to manage their relationships with others in a given interactive practice on a turn-by-turn basis. Although this framework recognizes that the practices individuals engage in using these resources have linguistic instantiations, the IC framework shifts the object of analysis by investigating how learners do things with those linguistic instantiations.

One area of change that we saw in this study that moves beyond acquisition of forms is changes in sequencing and transitions. In the opening of each lecture, Xu showed increasing attention to the placement of a GREETING before moving directly into the PLAN OF ACTION for the lecture. In Xu’s first solo lecture (D2), we saw a very pivotal point in which Xu begins the PLAN OF ACTION before cutting himself off and self-correcting himself to GREET the audience and then proceed with the PLAN OF ACTION (‘uh:: today I- he (. ) llo’). After this point, in each subsequent lecture, Xu smoothly sequenced the GREETING as the first part of the opening before moving onto the PLAN OF ACTION. This self-initiated self-repair is important because it shows Xu’s awareness of the ordering of sequences, which is then realized in the changes Xu makes in subsequent lectures to do the GREETING and the PLAN OF ACTION.

This ordering also shows development in Xu’s awareness of how a GREETING can be used to establish mutual orientation with others at the beginning of the lecture (C. Goodwin, 1981). As Xu starts the PLAN OF ACTION in D2, his gaze moves from down at his notes to up at the board. But when he begins the self-repair to do a GREETING, his gaze shifts to the audience and he smiles. In subsequent lectures (D3 & D4), Xu maintains gaze with the audience when he does the GREETING and does not look away, thereby recognizing the importance of gaze in establishing mutual orientation to an activity.

Related to the idea of sequence organization are developments in the ability to transition between sections of the lecture. Development in the ability to transition shows how repeated practice with others doing dialogic teaching allowed Xu to become smoother in his transitions
between the *lecture* and *pre-closing* sections, which is evidenced by fewer pauses and hesitations during transitions over time. Additionally, Xu showed an expanded repertoire of transitioning devices to move between the two sections, including more explicit discourse markers (e.g. the *END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT*). These changes are significant because they show how learning is located not only in form but in the way resources are deployed in interaction. Although I did not investigate any changes in *acquisition* of linguistic forms (i.e. the emergence of new linguistic forms in his talk), Xu does become more conventional in the ways in which he deploys discourse markers to shift more explicitly from one section of the lecture to another. This increasing conventionality of Xu’s transitioning expressions illustrates what language socialization researcher would call evidence of success in participating in a practice in normative ways, which is one of the goals of language socialization (Ochs, 1993; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1996, 1986; Watson-Gegeo, 2004).

Another way that this study contributes to an expanded conceptualization of what is learned is in documenting change in proxemic awareness to the “teacher space”. As was discussed earlier in Chapter 6, the role of “teacher” has been strongly linked in the literature to the image of the teacher in front of the classroom facing the students (McGregor, 2004; McLaren, 1986; Van Tartwijk et al., 1998; Wubbels & Brekelmans, 2005). One of the pedagogical goals of the ITA course was for the students to take on the role of teacher and become more recognizably “teacher-like”. As Xu changed his body positioning and gaze during the course of the semester to remain at the front of the class while actively looking at his students during performance of the verbal leave taking, I would argue that this is evidence of development of becoming more recognizably teacher-like. These changes in how Xu positions his body and gaze in relation to the students during LEAVE TAKING actions also provide evidence of learning that encompasses paralinguistic actions (e.g. body positioning and gaze). When combined with changes in how Xu verbally performs the leave taking to actively shift orientation from the role of student to the role
of teacher, the totality of Xu’s actions provides strong evidence that learning is embodied and that attention to paralinguistics and proxemics is crucial to study of the learning process (Stevens, 1989). Additionally, to my knowledge, no other study at the time of this writing has provided systematic evidence of development of spatial orientations as linked to particular participant frameworks, although researchers have documented the importance and influence of proxemics and spatial relations to the management of relationships in interaction and the power structures involved (Crookes, 2003; E. T. Hall, 1966; Tauber & Mester, 1994). Stevens (1989), for example, showed how ITAs trained in a “dramatic” approach that involved increased attention to gesture, eye contact, body position, and proxemics reported higher scores of intelligibility and effectiveness on a post-evaluation oral proficiency test. Stevens’ study is also important because it provided evidence of a link between embodied action and teaching effectiveness. However, he did not provide any evidence of what the discourse of the ITAs actually looked like in the training course. My study takes Stevens’ work one step further by providing evidence of what development of these skills actually looks like in interaction.

7.1.3 Locally Situates the Notion of Identity

Another contribution this study makes with regard to language learning as a process is in locally situating the notion of identity. Within the emic/etic divide among researchers, CA practitioners question the a priori membership categories assigned to participants at the beginning of a study, such as NS versus NNS. CA practitioners, as a rule, do not automatically assign participants to a given social category unless there is evidence in the data itself that the participants themselves are orienting to those categories. The benefit of looking at identity in this way is that it allows us as researchers to see what roles the participants themselves consider to be
relevant to a particular context and the ways in which those identities are invoked in situ (J. K. Hall, 2004; Mori & Zeungler, 2008).

In the ITA literature, Unger-Gallagher (1989) argues that an interactive teacher needs to take on the role of both teacher and student in order to be effective. While Unger-Gallagher rightly acknowledges that participant roles are not static but negotiated in the classroom, her analysis seemed to imply that while instructing, the teacher needs to act in the role of teacher, and when facilitating discussion with students the teacher needs to take on the role of student. By employing CA, I have shown that participant roles in the classroom are even more fluid and dynamic than associating particular roles with particular activities. For example, in the data we were able to see how Xu positioned himself as a Physics expert, as a classmate of the other students in the ITA course, and as a teacher in different ways during the same activity of dialogic teaching. Additionally, we saw how both Xu and his students oriented to different participants frameworks at the same time, thereby calling for the negotiation and validation of each other’s claims to those identity roles through talk on a turn-by-turn basis.

In terms of development, we were also able to see in the data how Xu changed in his orientation to a particular participant role over time while his students did not. In the case of the closing LEAVE TAKING, while Xu both verbally and non-verbally shifted his orientation from the student role to the teacher role over time, the students continued to orient to Xu in the role of student giving a presentation through the persistent use of clapping as a second pair part to his verbal leave taking. As was discussed in Chapter 4, clapping is considered a typical action to mark the end of a presentation but not the end of a classroom lecture. Therefore, while Xu showed development in his orientation to a particular participant role, whose orientation to that role is also a pedagogical goal of the course, the students did not show development in this area. While the students’ development, or lack thereof, was not the focus of this study, their lack of
development orienting to the social role of students in a Physics class only highlights Xu’s own development towards becoming more recognizably teacher-like.

7.1.4 ITA Program & Professional Development

The present study can inform ITA program and professional development in two main ways. The first way is in illustrating areas beyond linguistic and pronunciation skills in which ITAs can show competence. One of the major findings in the study showed how one student developed and displayed interactional competence in areas not traditionally used to test ITAs (i.e. action sequencing and participant frameworks). For example, Xu showed much change in the ways he structured sequences within the dialogic lecture, as well as how he transitioned between various parts of the lecture. Additionally, he showed changes in his orientation to various participant roles in the practice, becoming increasingly more recognizable in the teacher role.

Although researchers have noted the importance of ITAs embodying the role of teacher and balancing that role in juxtaposition to the role of student, the literature had not explored what developing competence in taking on the role of the teacher might look like discursively until now. Also, given the number of different participant frameworks enacted in the classroom by Xu, ITA program developers should help ITAs develop more awareness of particular participant frameworks and how they might help ITAs negotiate those roles with undergraduates in their own classrooms. For example, ITAs could be shown the ways in which techniques such as revoicing can be used to position oneself as an ‘expert’ in a particular field in class as well as how to position one’s students vis-à-vis that role.

By adding interactional competence to areas in which ITAs are evaluated, we can also help shift the discourse away from one of ITA linguistic “deficits” and show how ITAs can be repositioned as skilled interlocutors who manage the resources they do have with their
interlocutors in dynamic ways. For example, if only looking at language as a product, we would be unable to see the gains Xu made in his transitioning abilities over time. As discussed in more detail in Section 7.1.2, Xu showed developments in the ability to transition between sections of the lecture. These changes were evidenced by fewer pauses and hesitations during transitions over time, as well as an expanded repertoire of transitioning devices to move between the two sections, including more explicit discourse markers (e.g. the END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT).

In addition to the significance of these developments as expanding the object of analysis of what is learned, Xu’s transitioning abilities provide a powerful example illustrating that we, as ITA educators, should not allow ITAs to be positioned as deficit learners because of their accents. Through a reconceptualization of language as a process, we can see that Xu comes into the ITA course already with interactional resources for successfully transitioning between lecture sections, thus demonstrating evidence of being interactionally competent in a number of areas. As such, I would argue that ITA program developers should include interactional competence as an area in which ITAs be given awareness through instruction so that they can be shown how to better use the resources they already have to successfully negotiate interactions as well as build new repertoires, such as Xu did.

A second way this study adds to the discussion of ITA program and professional development is that the results suggest a number of contradictions between what ITAs need to be able to do in the classroom and in interaction with students versus what criteria they are evaluated on in exit exams. For example, in the ITA classroom observed in this study, the instructor explained that the ITAs needed to teach dialogically and expand their interaction with the students. She suggested role plays, small group work, and debate as examples of how to get students involved. In essence, her verbal instructions stressed the importance of “interactive” teaching skills on doing dialogic teaching successfully, teaching techniques that take time to demonstrate. However, the ways the instructions they were given for doing dialogic teaching
were in tension with the institutional constraints set up by the university. In the intensive summer session of the ITA course, each class only met for 75 minutes per day, four days a week, for eight weeks. Therefore, it was often the case that four, five, or even six students needed to “teach” on a given day to leave enough time to cover everything in the course. We can see the effects of these institutional constraints play out in the ITA class observed. For example, the instructions on the assignment sheets for doing each dialogic lecture (see Appendices B and C) and Tabitha’s verbal instructions additionally reinforced the tensions between keeping students’ awareness of time limits while expanding the discourse with one’s students. Also, at a maximum, students were only given between 5-10 minutes to teach. If interactive teaching involves exploring student responses and actively pursuing and integrating their ideas into the dialogue, then 5-10 minutes is potentially not enough time, and ‘interactivity’ (e.g. extended student responses and discussion) is often sacrificed at the expense of ‘pace’ (Burns & Myhill, 2004). Therefore, these time constraints should inform those involved in ITA curriculum design to re-evaluate what we should expect students to be able to do within a course because there are contradictions between the requirements of the curriculum and the inherent time constraints of a 75-minute class meeting, four times per week, over an 8-week period. If we want them to teach interactively, then we need to find a way to foster the conditions for such an environment. If we cannot, then we need to re-evaluate just what can be done within certain time limits and ask ourselves whether interactivity is even possible within the parameters of how the course curriculum has been designed.

One solution to this problem that Boyd (1989) has called for suggests a shift to a more education-based curriculum for ITAs rather than a focus on ITA training. Boyd defines training as “skills training for a specific job” (1989, p. 195). Education, on the other hand, involves “the development of knowledge and skills, as well as attitudes, values, and sensibilities” (Boyd, 1989, pp. 195-196). In defining the differences between the two, Boyd (1989) remarks on the advantage of education-based training of ITAs.
Were we to think of ITA courses as part of the professional education of future professors and researchers, we might reach slightly different conclusions about the curriculum, particularly in the area of teaching. For one thing, professional education, unlike training, has broad, long-range goals. Rather than offer answers to immediate job-related problems, it provides ITAs with the tools required to form their own answers and, indeed, to pose their own questions. (p. 196)

Although the findings in this study clearly show areas in which particular skill development is successful, a shift to a more reflective and long-term, goal-based ITA curriculum may allow students to connect more with the underlying principles of dialogic teaching and therefore claim a more personal stake in their own development as educators. This is an issue much discussed in the teacher education literature (J. C. Richards, 1987), especially in the recognition that a “micro-approach” to teacher education affords us the opportunity to teach particular techniques (e.g. questioning patterns, wait time), but does not afford the kind of reflection one does in a “macro-approach” to teacher education in order to work on developing into the kind of teacher one wants to become (J. C. Richards, 1987).

A second contradiction that is fore-grounded in the data is that legislative mandate does not accurately represent the multi-faceted areas in which ITAs can and should display competence. According to Pennsylvania State law, any individual teaching in a state institution of higher education must be “fluent” in English (Casey, 1990) before he or she is allowed to teach and must be evaluated on his or her level of fluency. In other words, at the core of what ITAs must have, within the state of Pennsylvania, is fluency in English, and the post evaluation exam used to evaluate the ITAs only evaluate them in the areas of fluency, comprehensibility, and pronunciation. However, the question then raised is how do ITA program developers resolve the tension between creating training programs designed to target mainly ‘fluency’ when needs analyses have clearly shown a much larger array of cultural, pedagogical, and linguistic skills needed to competently perform in the role of ITA? While one of the main elements of the post-evaluation exam was to do dialogic teaching, the categories in which students’ interactional
competence in doing dialogic teaching were evaluated were in the areas of pronunciation, fluency, and comprehensibility. On the one hand, these categories allow us to highlight some of the important linguistic instantiations that are part of one’s interactional competence, thereby fulfilling the legislative mandate; however, the additional pedagogical skills of becoming more recognizably teacher-like are not evaluated. Therefore, the areas in which the students were actually evaluated included only some of the criteria presented to the students as important to doing dialogic teaching. While ITA program development is guided by legislative mandate, the way the law in Pennsylvania is currently written is in tension with parts of what needs analyses and the literature has shown us to be important for them to learn to become teachers.

7.2 Limitations of the Study

In addition to the institutional constraints that may affect the classroom discourse, I wanted to address two limitations of the data. First, although on most days there were three cameras placed strategically in different corners of the classroom, and tabletop microphones placed on the students’ desks, only one camera was placed at the back of the room during presentation days. Therefore, the camera was only able to capture the facial expressions and gestures of the teacher and not the students. That said, the cameras were able to capture the audio of everyone in the room, including the students, as well as the video of the teacher’s reactions to the students’ responses. Not being able to see the students’ facial expressions and gestures limits the extent of the analysis because, in order to gain an emic perspective of the surrounding talk, conversation analysts attempt to transcribe as many verbal and non-verbal cues that the participants themselves have access to in order to make sense of the talk as it unfolds. As my analysis has shown, gesture and spatial orientation can be just as important to the conversation as
the talk itself. For example, in Excerpt 6-15, Xu orients to his and the other participants’ roles as students in the ITA course.

Excerpt 7-1: D1

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>X: (.) and the last thing is that (.) not only (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>you need to let students know your expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>(.) however the most important thing is you need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>to make them to believe (1.0) it is realistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>for them (.) for example at the beginning of the ←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>118 Tabitha said all of ↑ us will be is good ←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>enough to pass the this 118? and get all get a ←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>(.) and that’s kind of (0.9) to:: made us to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>believe’ that his- her- expe- expectation is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>realistic for us. so that’s an example [(.) so: now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>n: [nods ←</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Without the student’s head nod in line 89, we can still see verbally how Xu explicitly orients to the role of student in ITA course, such as in a specific reference to what Tabitha ‘said’ (line 84) for all of ‘us’ (line 84) to pass ‘this 118 [course]’ (line 85), using the deictic reference ‘this’ to recognize the current course of reference. However, with the student’s head nod (line 89), we are able to see an additional layer of understanding that illustrates how this framework has been co-validated by Xu’s students. Therefore, without the analyst’s knowledge of this nod, the argument for orientation to this particular participant framework is slightly weaker, although not invalid, because it relies on Xu’s verbal record alone to support the argument. As Rendle-Short (2006) notes, “Even by simply analyzing the speakers’ talk, it is possible to show the orderliness of seminar talk, to show how presenters are behaving, both verbally and non-verbally, in terms of making choices that are aligned to the recipient design of the talk” (p. 10).
A second potential limitation of the study is the lack of ethnographic interview data collected from the students. As Schieffelin and Ochs (1996, p. 254) proclaim, “Native speakers do not rely on the spoken record alone - neither should we.” Therefore, ethnographic methods such as in-depth interviews, as well as detailed field notes, are considered to be one of the cornerstones of socio-cognitive research, particularly for those using a language socialization framework. Part of the reason why language socialization researchers have relied on ethnographic data, including field notes and interviews however, is that they often study social groups of which they are not already members and need those additional sources to help them interpret the data. While CA does not, as a rule, consider interview data as part of the analysis in order to keep as much of an *emic* perspective on the data as possible, CA practitioners do rely on their membership knowledge in order to be able to interpret data. However, interview data with Xu about his attitudes towards teaching and conceptualization of what it means to be dialogic could have added an extra layer to understanding *why* Xu made some of the choices he did. As Smith (1994) has argued, “Prescriptive approaches to ITA development may force ITAs into adopting behavior imposed from outside rather than within. ITAs do not own change that occurs primarily in response to demands of an ITA development program, and they may easily discontinue the behaviors when the pressure is off” (p. 54). In the following section, I address how future research could address the question of *why* Xu developed the skills he did.

7.3 Future Research

While the current study is able to contribute to the discussing of *what* skills are learned and illustrate the ways those skills develop over time, one question that is not explored in the study is that of *why* Xu developed in these areas and the role that socialization played in this process. Language socialization research, for the most part, utilizes ethnographic data and
approaches to analysis to explicate the socialization process and provide a grounded analysis of why participants learn and act in particular ways (Duff, 1995, 2003; Watson-Gegeo & Nielsen, 2003). Although a full-blown analysis of why Xu develops the skills that he does is beyond the scope of this section, below I provide an example of what an analysis of this sort might look like in future studies, focusing on the role explicit instruction may have played in changes to the ordering of pre pre-closing ANNOUNCEMENTS Xu made over time.

7.3.1 The Role of Instruction in Development: Pre Pre-Closing Announcements

One of the areas in which Xu appears to have been influenced by explicit instruction is in the case of pre pre-closing ANNOUNCEMENTS. On the first day of the new unit on dialogic teaching, the course instructor Tabitha began the day with a whole-class discussion about the differences between teaching and presenting. The rationale for this discussion (as reported by Tabitha in the talk itself) was that the students had just finished up doing teaching monologically a few days before and Tabitha wanted to illustrate the ways their teaching was more presentation-like than teaching-like. During that initial discussion, Tabitha asked the class as a whole what they thought came in the conclusion\textsuperscript{23} of a teaching lecture. In the excerpt below (7-1), the students demonstrate some knowledge of how one closes a lecture. Note that while Xu does not actually speak in this excerpt, he is present and the video shows his torso and head move to orient to who is speaking during each turn, indicating his co-presence in the conversation.

\textsuperscript{23} Even though Tabitha refers to the closings as encompassing both pre pre-closing ANNOUNCEMENTS, the pre-closing, and closing LEAVE TAKING, my analysis showed that these are distinctly different parts of the dialogic lecture.
In this initial discussion (7/9/07), three typical pre pre-closing ANNOUNCEMENTS are given by the students as things they know that typically go into the conclusion of teaching: HOMEWORK, a SUMMARY, and a PREVIEW of the next lecture. At this point in the course, these are the only pre pre-closing items that are mentioned, or will be mentioned, until a more focused discussion on closings almost one month later on August 8th, 2007. We know from earlier chapters that in the time between this initial discussion and the later class on closings that Xu gives two dialogic lectures. The first is given four days after this initial discussion (7/13/07) and the second is given a week after that (7/20/07). We can see in Table 7-1 below that during those first two lectures, the only pre pre-closing ANNOUNCEMENTS Xu makes are a PREVIEW of the next speaker’s talk and a SUMMARY of the lecture.
Although he does not include an assignment of HOMEWORK initially, which we know from Excerpt 7-1 that he knows is included in a typical closing, it is likely that a more focused discussion between Tabitha and the students on closings on August 7th significantly influenced the types and sequential order of the pre pre-closing ANNOUNCEMENTS Xu made in his final two dialogic lectures.

On August 7th, Tabitha gave a 75-minute lesson on closings in dialogic lectures. The purpose of this lesson was two-fold, as per her own announcement in class. The first reason was to spend more time on the differences between teaching versus presenting, as many of the students were continuing to end their dialogic lectures in a manner considered to be more presentation-like than teaching-like. The second reason was to help the students prioritize which closing information was the most relevant to the closing section, especially if they are running out of time at the end of their classes. During this class, the students first brainstormed as a whole to come up with all of the different items that could be in a closing. This initial list was generated on the blackboard and was comprised of “announcements”, “homework”, “summary”, “take home message”, “questions from students”, “plan for the next class”, and “saying goodbye”. Next, the students were split into small groups and asked to prioritize these items into the most important item to remember when closing a lesson to the most expendable item if pressed for time. Following this group work, the students posted their lists on the board and then discussed as a

---

24 In the class discussion, Tabitha collapses the END OF LECTURE ANNOUNCEMENT with the SUMMARY into the general heading of summary.
whole class any differences of opinion, with Tabitha also weighing in on what she thought. In 
Xu’s group, they originally listed (in descending order of importance) the following elements of a 
closing: “saying goodbye”, “homework”, “questions from students”, “announcements”, 
“summary”, and “plan for the next class”. Following the whole-group discussion, however, the 
group decided on the following list order: “saying goodbye”, “homework”, “summary”, 
“announcements”, “questions from students”. Notice that “questions from students” moved 
significantly down in the list of things you have to do in a closing. One of the reasons why is that 
Tabitha explained to students that when you are short on time, you can tell students that they can 
either email you with further questions or come to your office hours. Two days after this 
discussion, Xu gave his third dialogic lecture. In this and in his fourth dialogic lecture, which was 
made one week following D3, Xu announced all of the elements his group decided needed to be 
in the closing, including an announcement that if students had additional questions, they could 
come to his office hours.

The inclusion of these items points to the likely influence of explicit classroom 
instruction and the group discussion led by Tabitha on closings, especially what I have termed a 
defered offer of the floor in Chapter 4 (i.e. office hours availability). As Hall (1999) writes, “I 
argue that guiding students to detect patterns used in the interaction through the systematic study 
of interactive practices…will facilitate the development of interactional competence in the second 
language” (p. 142). This guided practice in reflecting on the important parts of closing a lecture, 
which ones are the most important and why, serves as an example of this type of facilitative 
instruction.

Although Xu did include more pre pre-closing ANNOUNCEMENTS in D3 and D4, his 
ANNOUNCEMENT of OFFICE HOURS in D3 was not repeated in D4. While no two interactions are 
identical, this variability in inclusion of an OFFICE HOURS ANNOUNCEMENT supports the idea that
learning is also an extremely personal event in which a learner makes active choices in what resources they decide are important to the interaction.

In sum, while it is impossible to attribute any one factor as the reason why one learns to do a new set of skills given the complexity of the large set of contextual and cultural-historical factors of a learner’s biography that come into play, there does appear to be some correlation between shifts in Xu’s behavior and the explicit instruction he received in the training course. Given the affordances provided by a language socialization framework for the investigation of socialization processes, future research may provide value insights into an important part of the learning process, which is why learning takes place.

7.4 Concluding Remarks

In this study, I have attempted to look at the ways in which one pre-service ITA develops pedagogical skills during the practice of doing teaching dialogically during an eight-week ITA course. While this study provided evidence of development in the areas of action sequencing and participant frameworks, there are many more questions raised by the project in addition to the question of why Xu develops the skills he did, namely in the areas of ITA discourse and curriculum design. For one, the study only investigated one learner over an eight-week period. While this case study does not claim to provide generalizable results, it does beg the question of how typical Xu’s performance is in his learning process. A study looking at more students may find even more generalizable patterns of construction of the dialogic lecture, as well as individual variability in those practices. ITA researchers have also increasingly called for looking at domain-specific discourse and how differences in fields affect the linguistic patterns used (Hoekje & Williams, 1994; Rounds, 1987; Young, 2003). Future research could look at how the discourse patterns in Physics differ from those in, say, Mathematics or Communications. Additionally, the
language used in giving a lecture is very different from other aspects of being a TA, such as doing office hours or leading a lab session (McChesney, 1994; Myers, 1994). It would be interesting to see and compare Xu’s development of skills doing other practices (e.g. office hours) over time as well to see if and how development of interactional competence in different practices occurs within the same instructional setting.

In sum, by expanding the methods of inquiry we use to study development and learning, as well as the objects of analysis of what is learned, and by locally situating the notion of identity in interaction using the interactional competence framework, this study has allowed us to add a new dimension to what we know about the ways in which ITAs develop their pedagogical skills. These efforts also contribute to the much-needed shift in the terms of discourse surrounding ITAs so that they are no longer positioned as a “problem”, but as competent communicators who are able to use a variety of interactional skills successfully in interaction.
Appendix A

Transcription Notations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open square brackets</td>
<td>[You</td>
<td>Overlapped talk begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colon</td>
<td>uh:</td>
<td>Lengthened speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyphen</td>
<td>but-</td>
<td>Cut-off speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital letters</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>Louder speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underline</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>Emphasized speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equals symbol</td>
<td>so=</td>
<td>Latching speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parentheses</td>
<td>(it)</td>
<td>Uncertain transcription of utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series of x’s</td>
<td>(xxxx)</td>
<td>Unintelligible speech marked by syllables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italicized text in double brackets</td>
<td>((laughing))</td>
<td>Non-verbal actions not accompanying speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period encased in parentheses</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>A pause &lt; two-tenths of a second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number encased in parentheses</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td>Pause length &gt; two-tenths of a second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>Falling intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apostrophe</td>
<td>has’</td>
<td>Slightly rising intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question mark</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Rising intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up arrow</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Higher pitch begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down arrow</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Lower pitch begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees symbol around text</td>
<td>°but°</td>
<td>Softer speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period followed by hhh</td>
<td>.hhh</td>
<td>Audible inhalation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hhh followed by period</td>
<td>hhh.</td>
<td>Audible exhalation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small text preceded by one</td>
<td>+smiles</td>
<td>Indicates non-verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or more plus signs</td>
<td></td>
<td>actions coupled with talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more plus signs before or</td>
<td>+I said+</td>
<td>Indicates start or end to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after talk</td>
<td></td>
<td>coupled non-verbal action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Dialogic Lecture (D2) Instructions

Teaching Task #2 - Explaining a Concept Dialogically

In this activity, you will select another concept from your Case Study and will teach this concept dialogically (interactively) with your classmate using the kinds of interactive strategies we have been exposed to throughout the semester. You will have 7 minutes for this Teaching Task. Because you must teach dialogically, you should be very aware of timing issues.

As we have learned, you should have a “well-marked roadmap”:
- Relate this concept to what you probably would have done previously
- Present a brief preview
- Organize your content logically
- Use organizational markers throughout
- End in an appropriate fashion

To accomplish this task, you are expected to:
1. integrate student participation—teacher initiated questions, student initiated questions, and any other form of student activity
2. develop rapport with students through thoughtful language usage—encouraging student participation, integrating student responses, acknowledging correct answers, and clarifying incorrect or semi-correct answers
3. use recovery tactics in case of difficulties

As we have stressed the importance of appropriate pronunciation of key words, this assignment requires you to collect relevant vocabulary words again.

On the lines below, write any words that are important and/or common when describing this concept that are difficult for you to pronounce.

1. __________________ 2. __________________ 3. __________________ 4. __________________
5. __________________ 6. __________________ 7. __________________ 8. __________________
9. __________________ 10. ________________ 11. __________________ 12. ________________

Consult a dictionary or speaker. Identify primary stress and reduced syllables. Highlight Diss
Appendix C

Dialogic Lecture (D3) Instructions

Teaching Task #4
Teaching Dialogically

Just like Teaching Task #2, this is a dialogic teaching task. Unlike Teaching Task #2 I will be looking for even more interaction, proper openings, proper closings, etc. This teaching task will be used during your Exit Interview.

Things to keep in mind
1. You will have 6-8 minutes. **No more than 8 minutes.**
2. You will be using questions and interaction with your students – you may use students as models, demonstrations, brainstorming... anything to get the students involved.
3. Plan about **4-5 minutes** of explanation because of the interaction.
4. If appropriate, you should explain the importance of this concept and place it in a context.
5. Remember you should adapt your teaching to the level of knowledge in the classroom – a **non-expert audience with a wide variety of levels.**
6. Use handouts, visual aids, models, the chalkboard, or the overhead.

To accomplish this task, choose an appropriate concept and then:
1. prepare several paraphrases
2. **prepare examples and/or an analogy**
3. prepare several questions to ask students to find out what they understand
4. be prepared to check that students are following you
5. be prepared to check whether students have questions
6. **have a strategy for making sure students are “with you”**
7. think about questions students might ask and try to have responses ready
8. **be prepared to use student names**

On the lines below, write any words that are important and/or common when describing this concept that are difficult for you to pronounce. Practice pronouncing them (including in phrases/sentences).

1. ___________________  2. ___________________  3. ___________________
4. ___________________  5. ___________________  6. ___________________
7. ___________________  8. ___________________  9. ________________
Appendix D

Dialogic Lecture (D2 & D3) Evaluation Form

Evaluation Sheet (Dialogic teaching)
100 Points

Name: _________________________

Language skills (40 points):

Pronunciation (out of 15) _____
Words/Sounds to work on:

Fluency (out of 15) _____

Comprehensibility (out of 15) _____

Presentation Skills (20 points):

Introduction (out of 5) _____

Use of transitions & verbal road-mapping (out of 5) _____

Clarity (out of 5) _____

Conclusion (out of 5) _____

Interactive Teaching Skills (40 points):

Asking Questions (What kinds of Q types are used? Are they varied?) (out of 10): _____
What Qs (including Y/N, closed answer Qs):
Qs that guide Ss learning (What does this mean? What’s a reason for this?):
Comprehension checks (Is everyone with me?):
Clarification requests (Could you say that again?):

Responding to students’ Q & A (Providing feedback to Ss responses; Responding clearly to Ss questions; Doing Clarification requests; Relating Ss responses instructional focus?): (out of 10) _____

Body Language (eye contact, gestures, body position)
(out of 10): _____

Eliciting students’ responses (Encouraging Ss to answer your questions; getting Ss involved; wait time) (out of 10): _____

Additional comments:
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