Aston University
Birmingham

Trainer talk

structures of interaction in teacher training classrooms

Simon Harris

2012

Aston University

Trainer Talk: Structures of Interaction in Teacher Training Classrooms

Simon Anthony Harris

Doctor of Philosophy

ASTON UNIVERSITY

November 2010

Thesis Title: Trainer talk: structures of interaction in teacher training classrooms
Student: Simon Anthony Harris
Degree: PhD
Submission: 2010

Summary

The subject of this research is interaction and language use in an institutional context, the teacher training classroom. Trainer talk is an interactional accomplishment and the research question is: what structures of talk-in-interaction characterise trainer talk in this institutional setting? While there has been research into other kinds of classroom and into other kinds of institutional talk, this study is the first on trainer discourse. The study takes a Conversation Analysis approach to studying institutional interaction and aims to identify the main structures of sequential organization that characterize teacher trainer talk as well as the tasks and identities that are accomplished in it.

The research identifies three main interactional contexts in which trainer talk is done: expository, exploratory and experiential. It describes the main characteristics of each and how they relate to each other. Expository sequences are the predominant interactional contexts for trainer talk. But the research findings show that these contexts are flexible and open to the embedding of the other two contexts. All three contexts contribute to the main institutional goal of teaching teachers how to teach.

Trainer identity is related to the different sequential contexts. Three main forms of identity in interaction are evidenced in the interactional contexts: the trainer as trainer, the trainer as teacher and the trainer as colleague. Each of them play an important role in teacher trainer pedagogy.

The main features of trainer talk as a form of institutional talk are characterised by the following interactional properties:

1. Professional discourse is both the vehicle and object of instruction - the articulation of reflection on experience.
2. There is a reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction.
3. The professional discourse that is produced by trainees is not evaluated by trainers but, rather, reformulated to give it relevant precision in terms of accuracy and appropriacy.

Institutional Interaction- Teacher Trainer Talk- Interaction and Feedback in Training Classroom Interaction - A CA Approach to Institutional Discourse - Sequence and Identity in Training Classroom Interaction.

Dedication

This is for Gloria and Margot, with love and thanks.

List of Contents

4

Chapter 1   Trainer talk: structures of interaction in teacher training classrooms

1.1   The Research Topic

The subject of this research is interaction and language use in an institutional context. *Institutional interaction* is talk-in-interaction concerned with the achievement of practical goals or tasks, where the professional or institutional identities of participants are engaged or "made relevant" (Drew and Heritage, 1992: 3, 4). This notion of institutional interaction or institutional talk (IT) applies to interaction and activities in my own institutional setting: **teacher training classrooms**.

Teacher training has in common with other forms of teaching and learning the centrality of interaction and dialogue. The present research views training like teaching as an interactional accomplishment, and asks the question: what structures of talk-in-interaction characterize trainer talk in this institutional setting?

There are two main reasons why research in this area is useful and necessary: the first relates to the specific institutional context, while the second concerns methodological approaches to institutional interaction. In each case, this research will be adding to what has been done, while exploring new areas.

In language education, there is a substantial body of research into language classrooms (for standard overviews, see Chaudron, 1988; Brumfit and Mitchell, 1990). Research into institutional interaction has examined traditional, formal secondary or high school classrooms (McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979). There has been some research into feedback on observed teaching practice (see Zeichner and Liston, 1985; Hyland and Lo, 2006; Vasquez, 2004; Waite, 1992; 1993) but nothing to my knowledge on teacher training classrooms. The current research can build on and elaborate findings in these other settings, especially in view of two additional dimensions it adds:

1. Teacher training classrooms can be considered non-formal institutional settings (see Drew and Heritage, 1992:25). As I shall explain in Chapter 2, the distinction between formal and informal rests largely on different turn-taking systems. The closer an institutional setting is to conversation, the more informal it can be considered. The more that turn-taking is pre-allocated and non-negotiable, the more formal it is in these terms. The focus in IT work until now has been on formal classroom settings. This means more control on the part of professionals, more turns shaped as questions from them, more liklihood of client turns as answers, less chance of turn and sequence initiation by clients.

2. In contrast to the front stage, professional-client interaction which characterises formal institutional settings, the teacher training classrooms in focus are back stage institutional settings, with professional-professional interaction the main form of talk, and so prospectively different turn-taking systems and related interactional practices (Sarangi and Roberts, 1999).

In the absence of hard data on teacher training classrooms, this research will open this particular 'black box´ (see Seedhouse, 2004; van Lier, 1988 on language classrooms) and describe what happens inside it. Trainer training and teacher training require a database, and a greater awareness of the nature of this form of classroom interaction and its relationship to learning to teach.

In a broader context, it is hoped that the research will add to knowledge of generic forms of institutional interaction, providing a comparative basis for examining varieties of turn-taking systems and characteristic institutional sequences.

1.2   Topic Choice and Approach

The choice of research topic is closely related to the first reason for doing the research. For almost 20 years I have worked as a teacher of teachers in a range of institutional settings and course types, theoretical and practical, pre-service, in-service, leading to degree or professional qualifications. These courses have been offered by institutional bodies in Mexico and in the UK. The significant growth in interest in research into language classroom interaction in this time, evident in writing on teacher education (eg Richards and Nunan, 1990; Wallace, 1991; Freeman and Richards, 1996; Roberts, 1997; Richards, 2000) and classroom research dealing with second language acquisition and teacher development (Nunan, 1989; van Lier, 1988, Lightbown and Spada, 1999; Edge and Richards, 1993; Wallace, 1998; Freeman, 1998), contrasts notably with the lack of research into teacher training classrooms.

Here is professional work done through language and interaction with only anecdotal and intuitive knowledge of how it is done. In the short term it is worth describing teacher training processes empirically. In the longer term, research of this kind can provide a basis for understanding how trainees learn to teach, the contribution made by the training classroom (as opposed, for example, to teaching practice), and the practices and attitudes that seem to contribute to trainee success.

Recent years have seen a move away from what might be termed a transmission approach to teaching, in education generally and in language education (see eg the discussion in Roberts, 1997; Delamont, 1983; Edwards and Mercer, 1990; Brumfit and Johnson, 1979). There has been a growing recognition and emphasis on teaching and learning as essentially a dialogue or conversation (eg Laurillard, 2002; van Lier, 1996). What is of interest to a researcher is what forms of dialogue characterise how this kind of teaching is 'done' , how relevant knowledge is constructed through processes of interaction. What are characteristic structural features of these processes?

Seedhouse (2004) has provided a categorisation of structures of interaction in language classrooms using conversation analysis methodology. My research will build on his in teacher training classrooms.

Conversation Analysis (CA) is an approach to the analysis of talk-in-interaction which places an emphasis not on language for its own sake, but rather on how participants in a piece of interaction mutually construct interactional order and get things done through their talk. Over the last 20 years CA approaches have developed a strong comparative research tradition in what has been called **institutional interaction**, **institutional talk**, or **institutional discourse** (Drew and Heritage, 1992; Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). My research proposes to work in this tradition. I propose taking a collection of training courses and selected sessions from a sample of them as my institutional discourse settings and to focus on interactional sequences in these sessions as the differing structures of interaction in that institutional context.

CA concerns itself with a 'collection' of cases or examples, usually from a range of anonymous settings in terms of people and identities (see ten Have, 1999). It is concerned with fine-grained, detailed analysis of talk, and with how a given context of talk-in-interaction is constituted. A teacher training classroom and the activities that characterize it are constituted through talk-in-interaction and so CA is an appropriate method of 'observation' for my own analysis. However, as I shall explain in Chapter 2 and 3, an interest in institutional contexts has led CA to broaden its definition of context, and so its methodological base.

1.3 Aims and objectives

Drew and Heritage (1992: 37) point out that, whatever their research orientation, analyses of institutional interaction rely principally on 'sequential phenomena' to substantiate institutional features. Different kinds of sequential organisation or patterns are the consequence of different kinds of action or activity. Constructing or establishing knowledge in a training classroom may vary depending on such factors as the kind of knowledge, the information state of givers and receivers, the numbers of people involved, and the uses to which the knowledg will be put. Sequences of talk in interaction in this setting might be expected to pattern in ways that reflect these different structural aspects and tell us about different forms of training or trainer talk, or, in conversation analysis terms, how members 'do´ these sorts of activities (Sacks, 1984b; Schegloff, 1992b). Identifying different types of activity sequence, the tasks that they perform, and the ways in which they coincide with or differ from those found in other institutional settings, especially the language classroom, is one set of intended outcomes.

Sequential phenomena are also windows into a wider world. They are a framework for looking at the people behind the practice and the broader influences at work in the construction of this particular set of shared habitual practices. They lead out into what Geertz (1973) has termed 'webs of significance' beyond interaction. Trainers and trainees, in 'doing training sessions' are, at the same time, enacting, reinforcing, adapting shared - sometimes non-shared or conflicting - categories and frames, relevant rules, procedures and identities in this institutional setting.

My research will therefore seek to answer two related questions:
1. What structures of sequential organization characterize this form of institutional interaction?
2. How do these structures represent the central activities in this type of setting: building knowledge, enacting and developing relevant professional identities and roles, and at the same time marking wider institutional boundaries and constraints?

Chapter 2   Institutional Interaction: Foundations and Findings

1   Introduction

In chapter 1, I discussed the topic of my research and I located it in the CA approach to the study of institutional interaction.   In chapter 2 I shall selectively discuss the literature on institutional interaction with the following general aims:

- To discuss fundamental concepts underlying the nature and generic forms of institutional interaction
- To identify areas of relevant research on institutional interaction in classroom settings, to examine key studies in this area and review findings which are relevant to my own research.

Before going on, I should note two important assumptions about my approach to reading and research. The first is that a review of the literature and data collection and analysis are not linear, mutually exclusive processes: they are synchronous, cyclical and mutually dependent. While initial reading will be loosely connected to data analysis, it will become more and more dependent on it as the research develops. Only through analysing the data and discovering themes and avenues for interpretation do you recognise which literature will be most relevant to your research topic. In sum, the literature review is a means to an end, not an end in itself, and is developed alongside data analysis. You move back and forth between the field and the library (see Silverman, 2000: 229, 230; see also Wolcott, 1990, in Silverman, p230)

A second, related assumption is that in a piece of qualitative research like mine, where data is collected from one kind of institutional setting, the literature serves as a resource for generalization, something I will come back to in chapter three.

2   Institutional Interaction: Foundations

My approach to institutional talk (IT) in teacher training classrooms takes Conversation Analysis (CA) as a basis for its methodological and analytical framework. In this section, I shall review theory and research in CA and IT with the aim of establishing defining features of IT and relevant analytic concepts on which my research will draw and build.

2.1 Conversational Structures

> "Conversation is not a structural product in the same way that a sentence is - it is rather the outcome of the interaction of two or more independent, goal-directed individuals, with often divergent interests. Moving from the study of sentences to the study of conversations is like moving from physics to biology: quite different analytical procedures and methods are appropriate even though conversations are (in part) composed of units that have some direct correspondence to sentences." (Levinson, 1983: 294)

This quotation from Levinson is intended to draw attention not so much to analytic procedures and methods at this point, but to the special nature of the findings to come from these methods. In particular, the idea that analytic products will embody structures of interaction, and that these structures are constituents of a special kind of social organisation or order, which is dependent to a significant degree on the participants and their locally grounded actions.

Levinson (1983), Heritage (1984), Drew & Heritage (1992), Clayman & Maynard (1995), Hutchby & Wooffitt (1998) and Wooffitt (2001) provide major 'programmatic statements' or overviews and key findings on CA. I want here to identify which concepts and findings will be of special relevance to my own analysis, using the framework suggested by Drew and Heritage (1992: 17).

Activity focus

Rather than culture/context or language CA begins from *'the interactional accomplishment of particular social activities*.' In 'Notes on methodology' and 'On doing being ordinary', Sacks (1984a; 1984b) discussed the object of his sociological interest and the methods he proposed to investigate it. His was a new kind of social science (see also Silverman, 1998) where talk-in-interaction was regarded as a kind of social activity in its own right, as opposed to traditional concerns with how people and their activities are determined by wider social structures. In this 'self-organizing' approach to social settings and social interaction, he shared common ground with Garfinkel (1967) and Goffman (1959; 1963; 1983).

For Garfinkel, the basis of social order was to be found in the way that participants in social settings used methodical practices to produce, make sense of and so render accountable features of local circumstances (Boden and Zimmerman, 1991). Goffman (1959; 1967; 1974; 1983) argued for the authenticity of the social situation and its *interaction order* as an object of study. Every time that people come together in a public or semi-public place, the order that underlies such gatherings cannot be taken for granted. The structuring of participation, the processes of producing this order and allocating participation rights, must be the focus of attention. While acknowledging that resources for these structuring processes come from the wider social order, Goffman's primary concern was what he saw as a for-here-and-now order that is importantly a local production (performance, in his dramaturgical terms) and so a legitimate ethnographic object.

Goffman and Garfinkel and Sacks had different views of data collection and analysis, and of the way in which you related the macro to this micro order, but the primacy of the interaction order was a view shared by all three.   This led to a further shared methodological imperative of not taking this order for granted but rather asking how it was done or created.

In an ethnomethodological tradition, CA could therefore be said to take a problem-solution approach to analysis (ten Have, 1999). How do participants - members - make sense and create order? This led Sacks (1984a; 1992) to the view that there is an underlying machinery and 'rules' for conversation to which participants orient, and it is for signs of this orientation in interactional sequences that analysts must look. Whether these are in fact rules (as opposed, for example, to social patterns or tendencies), whether they are shared by parties to the interaction, and whether, when following them, participants do so for psychological rather than purely 'structural' reasons, are all methodological questions. I will return to them in Chapter 3 (see Taylor and Cameron, 1987; Moerman, 1988; Toolan, 1989; Sanders, 1999).

The activity focus of CA is a conceptual starting point for analysing the talk-at-work that occurs in a teacher training classroom. Trainer talk and the teaching work it does occurs through different structuring processes. How trainer talk is done and what structures result, represent my topic and analytic problem.

Sequential analysis

The focus on social actions (rather than just utterances or sentences) implies analytic attention to <u>interactional units</u> - turns and their following turns, the activity sequences which linked turns produce. A significant paper in this respect is Sacks and Schegloff´s 'Opening Up Closings' (1973) - its complement being Schegloff´s 'Sequencing in Conversational Openings' (1968; and see too Schegloff, 1986).

At one level, 'Opening up Closings' deals with topic transition: how participants move from being *in* a conversation to moving *out* of and closing it, and how the closing sequence is structured. Sacks and Schegloff place this concern in the wider context, and so review central features of CA topics and methods. In doing so, they discuss the cornerstone of the CA approach - its process and project: a concern with sequences, and so a movement beyond linguistic or functional units to longer sequences. **Turns** and **adjacency pairs** are identified as the basic features of conversational activities (analytic units for a CA researcher) and defined (1973: 293, 295-6).

The turn-taking 'machinery' operates to ensure the occurrence of two basic features of conversation: that no more than one person at a time speaks, and that speaker change occurs. While this machinery can account for the orderliness of ongoing conversation, it cannot on its own manage something like closings. Adjacency pairs, with their two-person, two-part typology, provide for close ordering of conversational activity. They do this through the sequential implications that follow first pair parts, and through the structuring of conversational sequences in the service of different kinds of conversation-enabling tasks - in this case closing a conversation. For the analyst, adjacency pairs also represent 'the architecture of intersubjectivity' and thus a form of next-turn-proof as to what participants are doing and how they are displaying their understanding of what they´re doing (Heritage, 1984; Sacks and Schegloff, 1973: 289-298; ten Have, 1999:17-24: Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974: 728; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998: 15-17)

The discussion in Sacks and Schegloff is noteworthy in that:

❑ It defines the two central units of interactional analysis
❑ It notes their implication in the building of extended sequences, such as the organization of topic talk and of closing sections - the build-ups, the construction, the accomplishment
❑ It recognises the use of basic structures and extended sequences to constitute an overall structural unit which we can term 'a conversation' (see Schegloff, 1987 for the use of such resources in analysing a single conversation)

Aside from their centrality to the analysis of institutional talk-in-interaction, these processes also constitute a significant product: a body of findings about conversational sequences that provides a basis for comparative analysis with talk in institutional settings.

Context through interaction

Heritage´s (1984:256 et seq) characterisation of context in interaction stresses the notion that interactional activities are both *context shaped* and *context renewing*. That is, any turn and the action it represents are shaped by preceding turns and the larger environment in which they occur, while also themselves forming a context for the next action in a sequence and how it will be understood.

We can therefore view the idea of context as, on the one hand, a local construction, put together on a turn-by-turn basis and so potentially transformable in the same way. On the other hand, Heritage suggests that it will also be partly shaped by wider contextual features. Activities, their sequential analysis and a concern with the locally produced and managed context of interaction are fundamental concepts underlying the CA approach. They are the boundary markers for the structures to be found in any form of interaction.

In institutional interaction these features of the sequential context are present but in important respects transformed. The methodological issue that is central to a CA approach to institutional interaction is the extent to which an analyst will be able to rely on the context of interaction alone to 'reproduce' or display these features and their institutionally particular transformations.

2.2   Institutional Structures

Boden and Zimmerman (1991), Drew and Heritage (1992), Sarangi and Roberts (1999) and Arminen (2005) are four important reviews of research and findings on talk at work. They set out basic concepts and characteristics, identify key issues and developments, and draw together papers with related findings. Together with a paper by Drew and Sorjonen (1997), which reviews institutional interaction research findings and sets an agenda for future work, these sources provide a framework for establishing a definition of institutional talk, identifying important analytic concepts, and through them examining the relationship between conversational and institutional structures of talk-in-interaction.

Characteristics of Institutional Talk

An important strategy for defining institutional talk in a CA approach is to compare its interactional features with conversation.   Drew and Heritage (1992: 22) identify three features of institutional talk which distinguish it from its conversational parent and which can be treated as indexicals of institutionality:

1. *It involves orientation to some **goal, task or identity** (or set of them) conventionally associated with the institution in question*.
Institutional talk is task-based but these tasks also embody professional identities. In other words, in such settings there is something special about who people are which is signalled by what they do and how they interact. Doing 'institutionally relevant activities and in doing so orienting to the relevance of …institutional identities' (Drew and Sorjonen, 1997:93) are at the centre of institutionality. In this respect, sequence, identity and task are intimately related, and signalled linguistically and interactionally.

2. *It may involve special or particular **constraints on contributions***.
Behind sequences and the tasks they embody lies turn-taking, its configuration of certain kinds of sequences, and its preclusion of others. This is the basis for 'constraints on contributions'. To put it another way, in Drew and Heritage´s narrow definition of institutional talk, there will be a differential distribution of turn types. So for example, questions are for professionals, answers for clients or lay people. Further, the questions and answers that are allowable and their sequential location are also a feature of institutional turn-taking. Even in less constrained inter-professional institutional settings like teacher training classrooms, there will can be expected to be constraints of some kind on who speaks, what they can say, when, and how.

3. *There are **special kinds of inferences** in institutional contexts*

Finally, while conversation may rely for its inferential framework on general maxims or principles of the kind set out by Grice (see Grice, in Cole and Morgan, 1975; Levinson, 1983: ch 3), institutional varieties expectably have special rules or procedures for 'reading between the lines'. These inferences are reliant on participants´orientation to turn-taking constraints (what will be treated as an allowable contribution) and an orientation to relevant institutional identities - the allocation of context-dependent functions and interpretations to forms and their sequential location (Drew and Sorjonen, 1997: 104). The local knowledge (Geertz, 1983) of special tasks, professional identities, ways of doing and calling things in this institutional context is a cultural resource which may be opaque to outsiders.

One other notable aspect of these three layers of institutional talk is that they can be treated as an embedded organisational hierarchy. Tasks/activities and the professional identities of those involved represent the basic organisational unit for 'noticing' institutional sequences. Establishing activity types will entail attention to the turn-taking systems that help to shape them, and the inferences that such activities and their goals allow participants.

These three characteristic features of institutional talk identified by Drew and Heritage are a useful starting point for my own conceptual framework, but there are two limitations which I will address.

Front Stage and Back Stage in Institutional Talk

In their introductory essay to *Talk at Work*, Drew and Heritage (1992: 3) state that the studies collected there are of institutional interaction which is task-related, with at least one participant representing a formal organisation of some sort, and that the tasks are accomplished through talk-in-interaction between professionals and lay persons.

In keeping with a CA approach, IT is activity-centred, but in contrast to 'doing conversation', where there is no necessary goal or task to accomplish beyond 'having a conversation', IT is goal and task related. Getting patient information in order to make a diagnosis, examining a witness in a courtroom, interviewing one or more people on TV, teaching in a classroom: these are examples of task-based institutional talk.

One problem with viewing institutional interaction as professional-lay person talk is that it unnecessarily restricts the notion of talk at work. If one accepts this boundary it would certainly exclude teacher training classroom talk from being properly considered institutional. In a training classroom, where talk-in-interaction is arguably between professionals, or professionals and professionals in training, the lay-professional division, with its inbuilt asymmetries of participation and institutional know-how (Heritage, 2004), is much less clear. Drew and Heritage´s characterisation is too restrictive and requires expansion.

Sarangi and Roberts (1999: 19 et seq) make an important distinction between **front stage** and **back stage** in work settings. They point out that in Drew and Heritage´s theoretical discussion in Part 1 of their book, and in most of the research papers in Parts 2-4, the exploration of institutional talk is defined in terms of the 'public face of the institution'. In other words the dominant concern is the **front stage**, and they suggest that this is too confining a research focus. They argue convincingly for the importance of **back stage** talk at work in the construction of professional knowledge and identity.

None of the papers in Sarangi and Roberts` collection deal with classroom interaction, but certain back stage activities in medical settings, rounds of the wards or case presentations for example, point to the importance of the interaction between doctors and doctors-in-training for the creation of professional voice and identity, teaching and learning, and for the recognition of different institutional routines or activities and the roles they play. There are parallels with teacher training sessions, which are essentially a back stage form of institutional talk.

While the distinction between front and back stage is, as Sarangi and Roberts (1999: 23) suggest, a useful heuristic, at the same time it draws our attention to the connections between front and back stage, and often to the blurring of definitions. The point is that workplace studies need to be aware of the distinction. This awareness leads to a recognition of different types of people involved in workplace communication, different areas of 'performance', links between them, and the movement of participants between front and back. For a researcher to make sense of what is happening in one institutional site it may be important to gather information not only from there but also from other sites. In the same way that members rely on different kinds of knowledge which come from different sources and sites to carry out their work, so too must the researcher (see Sarangi and Roberts, 1999: 24)

Interactional Order and Institutional Order

A second potential limitation of Drew and Heritage`s three characteristic features of institutional talk is that, when explored in front stage settings they seem to confine analytic focus for the most part to a micro-level concern with *the interaction order* - how the 'social facts of workplace life…are interactionally accomplished (Goffman, 1983; Sarangi and Roberts, 1999:7).

The **interaction order** is one dimension of institutional talk and in the case of training classrooms the interactionally accomplished tasks and sequences which constitute a session are clearly central. However, they need to be set in the wider context of **the institutional order**.

> Broadly speaking, all institutions are made up of shared habitual practices (ie interaction orders) which can be understood with reference to their own history and tradition. (Sarangi and Roberts, 1999: 3)

This knowledge base has been called **the institutional order**, a body of transmitted recipe knowledge, 'knowledge that supplies the institutionally appropriate rules of conduct' (Berger and Luckman in Sarangi and Roberts, p3). This local knowledge or institutional culture will be on view in the routine practices that shape the interaction order, but probably not completely. There are two kinds of discourse we are dealing with here: **professional discourse**, or 'what professionals routinely do as a way of accomplishing their duties, and **institutional discourse**, or 'those features which are attributed to institutional practice, either manifestly or covertly, by professionals (and clients)' (Sarangi and Roberts, 1999: 15).

It is too simplistic to tie professional discourse to the interaction order and institutional discourse to the institutional order. Nevertheless, there is an important sense of one discourse realised in a set of interactional practices while the other is embodied in a set of institutional ideas or abstractions, what everybody knows but does not necessarily explicitly talk about. In the same way, I would argue, institutions can be concrete, physical things - a university, a hospital, a company - as well as something more abstract - the field of education, medicine, social work.

In teacher training classrooms, trainers and trainees enact their professional discourse in institutional settings - school classrooms, language institute classrooms, university classrooms - but the institutional discourse which infuses them reflects the social institution of teacher education and, to some extent also, the rules and regulations of the awarding institution for the course in question.

To return to Drew and Heritage`s definition of institutional talk, I have argued that if those three features are viewed only as relating to front stage settings and only as reflections of the interaction order, then they provide an overly restrictive view of institutional talk.   In my study of a back stage institutional setting, to understand what is happening, it is necessary to embrace both dimensions or orders of an institutional context - **interactional and institutional**.

> ...workplace communication needs to be analysed at various levels: as recipient-designed and sequentially organised; as tuned to local context and participant structure; as drawing on members`lived experiences and background assumptions; as argumentation and reasoning with ideological underpinnings.
> (Sarangi and Roberts, 1999: 26)

This is not so much a definitional issue as a methodological one; namely, how does an analyst know when the institutional order (context) is procedurally relevant to the interactional order? (Schegloff, 1991; 1997; Arminen, 2005). This 'relation between stable communicative practices and *in situ* talk is often understood as a matter of trying to connect "macro" (social structure) with "micro" (talk) or, alternatively, the "present" with the "historical" (Makitalo and Saljo, 2002:48). I will take up this question in Chapter 3, but in the next section I will suggest a way of reconciling the two contexts or forms of order.

2.3 Institutional Identities

Institutional Talk (IT) in a CA approach has been characterised for the most part in sequential terms. But forms of institutional interaction are created by particular sorts of people doing particular kinds of tasks. Institutionality is in important respects co-terminous with institutional identity.

In this section I will begin by discussing key elements in a CA approach to studying identity. I then go on to look at the second strand of Harvey Sacks' sociological project, **Membership Categorization Analysis** (MCA), which aims at elaborating the way that stored cultural (and sub-cultural or institutional) knowledge is deployed in talk-in-interaction; or in CA terms, how categories are generated in (and through) interactional sequences. Finally, I will suggest ways in which MCA offers a way of linking micro to macro in the analysis of Teacher Trainer Talk.

A CA Approach to Identity

Recent treatments of identity inside and outside institutional contexts all share a fundamentally social constructionist (Berger and Luckman, 1967) view of identity as **a social process**. This underlying premise has drawn together different perspectives in their anti-essentialist orientation (there is no one basic self, but rather varieties), a discourse and practice centred approach, a close focus on the interactional and local management of social categories and language, and a consideration of the effects of global processes on the management of local identities.

Central to these more recent treatments of identity is the notion that identities are presented, negotiated and established through talk or discourse. Sarangi and Roberts (1999: 37) note the role of institutional discourse in not only producing contextually appropriate activities - teaching and learning for example - but also, and with particular reference to backstage institutional activities, in serving as a means of socialisation into a profession. So, for example, through engagement in teacher training activities, trainees construct professional knowledge, they learn relevant routines and practices, and vocabulary and terminology associated with what they do and how they talk about what they do. Sarangi and Roberts use Fairclough´s formulation to capture the dynamic and interactive construction of these processes of self/identity construction - "discourse creates people as much as people create discourse" (p37).

This notion of discourse identities in conversational and institutional settings does not mean an internal, psychological sense of self. Discourse identities are, rather, a *noticeable orientation to* and classification of a participant`s status in developing talk-in-interaction. Identities are sequentially developed and displayed and this is at the heart of a CA approach to identity. This interactional construction of identity means importantly that the identity of any one participant is classified by how they stand in relation to others in the interaction (see Mori, 2003:147; Goffman, 1981; Benwell & Stokoe, 2006: ch 3).

However, there are theoretical and methodological issues which divide scholars of identity along lines extending to the study of other social processes. These differences centre on conceptions of the relationship between language and social life, the role of the researcher, and the methodology for data collection and analysis (De Fina, Schiffrin and Bamberg, 2005:6).

The study of institutional identity in talk at work has foregrounded these sorts of differences in approach, and contributed to a continuing methodological debate in which analytical perspectives have been not just a resource but also a topic for research in the area. In this sense, research interests have mirrored angles of approach to the central analytical concept of **context** in studying institutionality. A wide-angle view of context in institutional talk will go beyond the talk to treat with cultural, political and historical forces and examine how they shape the interactional behaviour and identities of participants. A narrow angle view of context brackets or excludes analytical recourse to the external institutional order and instead looks to the local context, the interaction order, and how participants constitute institutional settings and identities *in situ* (Sarangi and Roberts, 1999; Goffman, 1983; ten Have, 1999). This reflexive relationship between institutional identity and methodology is embodied in the question posed by ten Have (1999: 165):

The crucial point in all this seems to be where one locates the 'centre of gravity' for understanding interactional phenomena: in the local interaction and its procedural infrastructure itself, in the general institutional arrangements, or in the institutionalized power of one category of participants over another.

Conversation Analysis (CA) can be placed at the narrow-angle end of what is a continuum. A conversation analytic approach to institutional talk takes as its central idea **sequential context**, and the constitutive function of sequential actions in creating and renewing this context, while at the same time making meaning for participants and enabling them to produce different kinds of interactional events (Heritage, 1984: 290). Sequentiality is tied to the ethnomethodological notion of **indexicality**, where linguistic and interactional features of the talk point to the processes of identity creation, performance and labelling occurring in a sequential context. Identity is 'an oriented-to production and *accomplishment of interaction*' (Benwell and Stokoe, 2006:36) and inherently tied to the sequential development of context.

This approach could be characterised as one of methodological restraint, and in its purest form would exclude the analytical use of the sorts of identities which might materialize in a wider, political or cultural framing of context (De Fina et al, 2005: 15; Antaki and Widdicombe, 1998; ten Have, 1999). This restraint is exerted not only on the range of contextual resources, but also, relatedly, on the analyst. In a series of papers, Schegloff (1991; 1992a; 1997) has argued for the importance of being able to point to sequential and indexical evidence which signals *participant orientation* to identity, institutionality or whatever situated behaviour is at issue. In the case of identity, given the multiple ways in which a participant can be categorised, which is relevant? Schegloff's answer is that it is an identity which is demonstrably <u>relevant</u> for participants (the plural is intentional here) and <u>consequential</u> in relation to the joint production of a particular sequence or aspect of social behaviour. The participants not the researcher are doing the analysis.

Analysts with different perspectives on where the centre of gravity should lie, feel that this preference for the **proximal** (micro) context over the **distal** (macro) makes for an impoverished analysis (see Duranti and Goodwin, 1992 for a discussion of these two terms). Such an 'indigenous context' will only tap into the overt and explicit, and so miss a lot: people do not always explicitly reference things; institutional processes, tasks and identities are not always apparent without knowledge of and reference to the wider context and its historical antecedents - practices, ideologies, culture; and so the potential for making connections between local and global social identities and group membership is not realized (Sarangi and Roberts, 1999; Hak, 1999; Billig, 1999; Wetherall, 1998; De Fina, Schiffrin and Bamberg, 2005). In response, CA researchers might say that while they may be poor, they are methodologically honest in their preference for the empirical over the theoretical, the situated over the pre-determined, what people actually do over what analysts think or say they do.

A CA approach to the study of institutionality and institutional identity clearly raises a number of methodological issues, to which I will return in Chapter 3. I have identified the most relevant to my own research: the question of how much information from the distal context is required to understand how the interactional order indexes the institutional order.

Membership Categorisation Analysis (MCA) is one area of ethnomethodology which offers a window onto the wider institutional order and can complement CA's concern with sequentially produced institutionality through its focus on cultural and institutional knowledge and categorial identities. In the next sub-section I discuss this analytic concept and its place in a CA study of institutional identity.

Membership Categorization

Harvey Sacks' sociological project, his 'interactional linguistics' (ten Have, 2004), was centred on 'describing the methods people use in doing social life' (Sacks, 1984a: 21). There were two main areas of interest in this mapping of ethnomethodological territory: conversation analysis and membership categorization. For Sacks, the two went together: the doing of conversation (machinery for organizing and sequencing of talk) and the knowing what you and others were doing in the saying (machinery for structuring and organizing knowledge for use in interaction). However, Sacks' publications were largely concerned with the *sequential analysis* of talk, and it wasn't until the posthumous *Lectures on Conversation* (1992) that this second theme in Sacks' work became apparent.

The concern of **membership categorization analysis** (MCA) is with people and who they are seen as, or who they wish to be seen as, how people do and recognize descriptions of themselves and others (Schegloff, 2001; Wowk and Carlin, 2004; Butler and Weatherall, 2006:443; Stokoe, 2009). It has therefore become an important analytical tool in studies of social identity which focus on the production and negotiation of identity in talk. Hester and Eglin (1997) have called the interactionally organized process of membership categorization 'culture-in-action' and it provides a potential bridge between micro and macro levels of concern with the relationship between language and social life (Housley and Fitzgerald, 2009).

Many of the concepts Sacks uses in membership categorization are derivable from his famous example taken from children's stories of "The baby cried. The mommy picked it up", and the accompanying question of how we draw on our common sense knowledge to link the two (Sacks, 1972b). Sacks' answer to this question was that our knowledge of people is organized in categories (baby and mother, teacher and student, for example). A person can be classified or classify themselves in any number of ways, so that his solution to how people choose from the options available was the *Membership Categorization*

Device (MCD), an explanatory machinery whereby people hear categories as collections or sets, such as *family*, *occupations* or *school* (Sacks, 1972a; 1972b).

MCDs have rules of application governing their use. The two major rules Sacks proposed governing category selection concerned *economy* and *consistency*. The economy rule says that it is referentially adequate to label someone with just one category and so link them to one collection – a *teacher* does not also have to be labelled woman, white, liberal, mother, Big Brother watcher. The consistency rule says that if you use a category from one MCD to describe a person, then other members will come from the same collection – classifying someone as a *trainer* will mean that other people can be categorized in terms of other categories from the MCD, in this case *trainee* (Sacks, 1972a; Butler & Weatherall, 2006; Hansen, 2005).

In view of the range of choice available to people, selection from these alternatives *in situ* can carry very strong implications for 'the sense we attach to people and their behaviour' (Silverman, 1998:79). However, we come up against people's frequent lack of explicitness in their interactional naming and sense-making practices. Sacks's response to this was the notion of C*ategory Bound Activities* (CBAs). These are activities which we (members) expect to be done by people from a particular category or categories (Sacks, 1992; Hester and Eglin, 1997). CBAs allow us to work backwards, as it were, from activity to person. If we identify someone's activity - asking questions about different ways of teaching grammar, for example – we can work out what their social identity is likely to be, a *trainer*. Working from the other direction, if we know someone's identity, then we can also identify the kinds of activities they might (should) be involved in. Teachers and trainers ask questions, give instructions, provide feedback, give explanations. (Silverman, 1998: 83).

The close ties between categories and category bound activities make MCDs 'inference rich'. They are essentially cognitively stored, interactively tapped cultural reservoirs: "a great deal of the knowledge that members have about society is stored in terms of those categories"(Sacks, 1992: 40).

Following Sacks, CBAs have been extended to include further features that can be 'conventionally imputed' on the basis of someone's category membership. These other category-bounded predicates include expectations, rights, obligations and competences (Hester & Eglin, 1997; Silverman, 1998). Silverman (1998:85) has suggested that these add a moral and normative dimension to cultural knowledge, in that how we define an activity is 'morally constitutive' of it. If I say that a teacher rarely asks real questions in a classroom, for example, it may suggest a negative assessment of the teacher in that they are avoiding or failing to perform an activity appropriate to their professional identity.

Imputing these category-bound social norms is easier with a particular type of MCD, which Sacks (1972a) termed the *Standardized Relational Pair* (SRPs). These are paired (team) categories that can be heard to go together, with certain rights and obligations held to attach to each pair member – mother-baby, friend-friend, for example (see Silverman, 1998: 83; Butler and Weatherall, 2006: 444).

Sequence and Categories

MCA adds a potentially significant dimension to a CA informed approach to the study of institutional identity because categorial identities are linked closely to activities, and so to talk-in-interaction. The various characteristics, motives, responsibilities, competences and so on that go to make up how people are seen and see themselves are displayed in and indexed by activities. Activities are, in an interactional sense, a 'small culture' (Holliday, 1999), a rich inferential package of common sense knowledge informing social organization.

Although he approached social interaction from a rather different angle than CA, Goffman's main concern was also how the outside was brought in (or pointed out) in explicating how social encounters have their own for-the-moment interaction order, and how people orient to behavioural expectations and the face work associated with a particular public encounter (1963; 1983).

All this is not to say that identity ascription is a straightforward matching of identity with activity for participants. The fluid, changing nature of talk-in-interaction will mean that multiple identities, organized in a variety of MCDs, may be in play through the course of a particular piece of interactional work. This is especially so in ordinary talk, where, after openings, there is not such a sense of interactional urgency as there is in institutional talk: participants have no particular place to go in sequential terms.

Sacks' view of MCA as 'machinery' embodied a structural approach to 'seeing' how identity is constituted in interaction. In any given piece of talk, we have said that a participant will have a repertoire of identities to draw on. At some point in the interaction, an orientation by one or both of the participants to one of these identities will also display which aspects of a selected identity are relevant. So, a teacher may be categorized or categorize themselves as traditional, reflective, learner-centred, innovative; and a learner-centred teacher could be characterised as careful listener, pair and group work user, and so on.

CA & MCA in Sacks' conception were interrelated elements in a structurally framed interactional linguistics whose interest in powerful, context-free general structures of social action brings it closer to Chomsky and the structures underlying transformational and universal grammar, than to sociolinguistic approaches to the study of language. In these terms, MCA is the semantics to CA's interactional syntax.

This parallel with sentence grammar also points us to the nature of the relationship between sequence and categories in MCA. Structural analysis of the sentence works horizontally and vertically along two important dimensions: the syntagmatic axis (the rules of sequencing) and the paradigmatic axis (the choices from systems available in different sentence slots) (Huddleston, 1984; Halliday, 1985). While CA concerns itself largely with the syntagmatics of interaction, MCA focuses on the paradigmatics. This two-tiered, layered texture to interaction seems to be what Sacks had in mind in a passage from the end of his lectures.

> We have mentioned varieties of types of organization and proposed that adjacency pairs were used in various types of organization. One of the sorts of interests raised by talk like that can be developed in the following way. Imagine a surface of some sort, and we are now proceeding to characterize that surface in terms of conversational sequential types of things. Since the things we're talking about are serial it's imaginable that for lots of them they are in some way *serial linked* on the surface – this follows this, this goes after this position, etc, etc. – rather than focusing on another aspect of things, which is the way that different types of organizations may be layered onto each other. So the surface is thick and not just serial. Which is to say that a given object might turn out to be put together in terms of several types of organization; in part by means of adjacency pairs and in part in some other types of organizational terms, and one wants to establish the way in which a series of different types of organizations operate in a given fragment, i.e. in a given, quotes place, on the surface. (1992, Part II: 561 et seq)

So, for example, Sacks' turn-generated, sequential categories, like caller-called, or questioner-answerer, also exist at a membership or social level in their orientation to who people are and what activity they are involved in.   Heritage and Sefi's (1992) well known instance of an exchange between a first time mother and a health visitor shows how an observation by the visitor on the baby's apparent hunger is heard by the mother (but not the father) as a doing of institutional identity and related category incumbency in its possible implication that she is not feeding it properly, so getting an account or explanation from the mother. Fitzgerald and Housley (2002) provide another example of category-sequence ties in their analysis of radio call-in shows and how different aspects of the host-caller SRP are sequentially occasioned. Consider a recently overheard example taken from a teacher training context:

A. I think she did well in involving students, lots of questioning and elicitation.

B. Well, there were a lot of display questions there, weren't there.

Place this exchange in the sequential context of a conversation between two classroom observers following a lesson. A characterises the teacher as one who encourages student talk, but the placement of the comment from the other observer on the nature of these questions in this sequential slot can be heard as a competing identity ascription. The frequent questions are usually display questions and so more reflective of teacher concerns with control than true student involvement.

Sequence and categorization are both important in answering the question of "Why that now?" for participants as well analysts of social interaction (Hansen, 2005; Watson, 1997; Silverman, 1998; Psathas, 1999). In Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson's (1974) seminal paper, the notion of restriction seen as distinguishing institutional from ordinary talk was embodied principally in forms of turn-taking. These speech exchange systems ranged along a continuum with the unconstrained, **locally managed** turn-taking of ordinary conversation at one end; at the other, is more formal institutional talk - news interviews, some classrooms and courtroom talk for example, where turn-taking is essentially pre-allocated.

Much recent research into institutional talk has also come to embrace varieties at the more informal end of the speech exchange continuum: medical interviews, radio talk shows, social service encounters, many classrooms, and business meetings (see Drew & Heritage, 1992; Sarangi and Roberts, 1999; Mirivel and Tracy, 2005). This expanded framework has moved the locus of analytical concerns in 'probing institutionality' down to more 'conversational' levels of sequence organization and situated task (Heritage, 1997: 169; 2004: 225). Institutionality is talked into being in a sequential context through enacted categories which enable participants to 'share ..specialised and expert cultural knowledge in pursuit of institutional goals' (Benwell and Stokoe, 2006: 100). We can say, then, that institutions are crucially lodged in categories/identities, and 'act on the basis of categories to pursue their tasks' (Makitalo and Saljo, 2002: 59).

If institutions do indeed think in terms of categories and these are 'occasioned' (Jayyusi, 1984) or sequentially derived, then, as I have already suggested, MCA offers the possibility of linking the interaction order to the institutional order, connecting 'the technical organization of conversation to richly experienced human reality…where people are living their lives, performing their roles, living their culture.' (Moerman, 1988: 22). For Sacks, culture was an inference making machine: a descriptive apparatus, administered and used in specific local contexts. Viewed in this analytic perspective, MCDs are not *impositional* but, rather, *derivational*: we use them to impose sense and order in context. This is why 'categorizers and categorized closely attend to the positioning of categories' and MCDs should be viewed as 'local, sequentially organized devices designed and administered by members' (Silverman, 1998: 90).

Institutional activities are shaped by goals and, in top down driven instances, assign identities. In less constrained institutional settings we might expect a greater range of identities from which to select, and more choice on the part of the participants in selecting which identities to 'do'. Institutional activities and identities are intimately related. As Sarangi and Roberts (1999: 11) suggest, the question of how professional knowledge and identities are constituted in interaction vis-á-vis a given institutional order or setting is a central question for an investigation of institutional talk.

Identities which may be oriented to and displayed in talk-in-interaction can be categorised in two broad ways. In his useful paper, Zimmerman refers to

a) **discourse identity** - tied to sequential features, for example story teller/recipient, caller/listener, questioner/answerer etc
b) **situated or social identity** - related to the activity or situation, for example the various ways of being a doctor or teacher (in training)

Zimmerman also suggests that there is a third kind of identity, not related to discourse or particular situations - **transportable identity** - which is 'latent, speaker-related' (p90)

Zimmerman´s notion of situated identity offers us a useful heuristic.

> They (situated identities) are the portal through which the setting of the talk
> and its institutional surround....enters and helps to shape the interaction,
> which in turn actualizes the occasion and its institutional provenance." (1998:
> 95)

At the more specfic level of particular kinds of institutional interaction, however, Zimmerman`s notion of situated identity is somewhat restrictive. His discussion is in the context of calls for emergency services. This formal context of institutional talk establishes a stable, one-dimensional situational identity or footing - that of citizen-complainant/call-taker-dispatcher. The situated identity may allow us to distinguish between the question/answer patterns on display here and in other formal settings like courtrooms and some classrooms. But it does not serve as a basis for comparison or possible typological applications to more informal, diversified institutional settings.

Zimmerman's formulation is an important analytical insight, especially in the way that situated identities lead us outwards to the wider institutional order and discourse. However, it will need stronger grounding and development in informal, frontstage and backstage institutional settings. This is another methodological issue I want to take up and explore further in Chapter 3.

Identity is an important form of categorization, of self and others and the activities social members are engaged in, and is a basis for inferential work. *Categorization* is clearly a process which is at the heart of activities of all kinds and requires closer consideration in the establishment of a conceptual framework which seeks to embrace interactional and institutional dimensions.

3   Classroom Interaction as Institutional Interaction

Having reviewed relevant research into institutional interaction in general, conceptual terms, I shall now look more specifically at classroom interaction as my institutional research area. I shall briefly review potentially relevant areas of research into classroom interaction and then focus on activity sequences as an area for more detailed treatment.

3.1 Research into Classroom Interaction

Classroom research studies can be divided into educational research into primary and secondary classrooms (eg Phillips, 1972; Cazden et al, 1972; Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975; McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979; Heath, 1983; Cazden, 1986; Doyle, 1986; Green and Dixon, 1994, 2001; Lerner 1995) and university classrooms (eg Benwell, 1999; Stokoe, 2000; Dyer & Keller-Cohen, 2000; Basturkman, 2000: Morita, 2000; Benwell & Stokoe, 2002; 2006). While not all these studies work within a CA tradition, there is nevertheless a concern to characterize this kind of social and cultural context. In this sense there is some affinity with IT research, and areas of comparative interest.

A second line of classroom research is the now substantial body of work on language classrooms. This has been concerned with three main topics:

1 *Classrooms as Social and Communicative Settings*: Understanding language classrooms in sociolinguistic terms (eg Allwright, 1984; Breen, 1985; van Lier, 1988; Johnson, 1995; Duff, 2001; Seedhouse, 2004)
2 *Language learning*: Features of classroom interaction which contribute to second language acquisition (see Chaudron, 1988; Ellis, 1994; 1997; Hall, 1998; Hall and Verplaetse, 2000; Markee, 2000; Seedhouse, 2004)
3 *Language teaching*: Classroom interaction and language pedagogy (Brumfit and Mitchell, 1990; Allwright and Bailey, 1991; Edge and Richards, 1993; Seedhouse, 2004)

Above all else, a focus on language classrooms has been driven by the recognition that there is currently no paradigmatic approach to methodology, and that knowledge of what happens in these classrooms must be a basis for identifying effective teaching and learning practices. One study which uses a CA methodology and describes language classroom discourse as a form of institutional talk is Seedhouse's (2004) language classroom work. Seedhouse found 4 main varieties of classroom interaction distinguished by a reflexive relationship between pedagogic focus and the organization of interaction (turn taking and sequence) (2004: 101). As the pedagogic focus varies, so the organization of interaction varies.   My own research takes the fundamental institutional task (of teaching teachers how to teach) and examines interactional practices for getting it done, use Seedhouse's findings and methodological approach as a starting point and comparative measure for my own study.

In all forms of classroom research there is a range of focus, which is understandably dependent on outlook, purpose and method. Major resulting differences can be traced along the following sorts of continua:

- macro-micro
- pure/understanding-applied/action
- classroom-classroom and its wider context
- classroom practices as topic-classroom practices as resource
- learning processes-social processes

(see Duff, 2002; Zeungler and Mori, 2002)

A common thread running through most of the work that has been done on all kinds of classrooms has been a focus on the nature and pedagogic implications of classroom interactions - 'the forms and functions…., how these interactions are shaped and become meaningful, and what the implications may be for student learning.' (Zuengler and Mori, 2001: 283).

Findings about structures of classroom interaction and the structuring processes that underlie them are clearly of relevance to my own work. In the following two sections I want to examine exemplars of research into two key processes in shaping classroom interactions and differentiating them from other kinds: turn-taking and sequential patterns or structures.

3.2   Turn-taking in Formal Settings

McHoul's (1978) paper on turns at formal talk in content classrooms, uses Sacks et al`s (1974) turn-taking rules for conversation to note significant differences in his classroom speech exchange system. His summary rule which distinguishes conversational speech exchange systems from those found in the classrooms he examined is that 'only teachers can direct speakership in any creative way' (1978:188). In technical terms, this produces the following differences from conversational turn-taking in terms of the transition and distribution of turns:

- The potential for gap and pause is maximised
- The potential for overlap is minimized in that the possibility of the teacher (or a student) opening up the talk to a self-selecting student first starter is not accounted for; nor is the possibility of a student using 'current speaker selects next' technique to select another student accounted for.
- The permutability of turntaking is minimised (80% of classroom talk was teacher talk)

In comparison to conversational talk, where extended turns will often require pre-sequence work to arrange for a suspension of rules (see eg Sacks, 1984a; Schegloff, 2007), classroom talk, says McHoul (1978: 208, 209), is characterized by the significant presence of teacher monologues and intra-turn pauses, with no fear of losing the floor. In other words, a heavily pre-allocated system in which the locally managed component is largely the domain of teachers, there is no 'floor fight', and student participation rights are limited to the choice between continuing or selecting teacher as next speaker (McHoul, 1978: 211). One final finding of note is that in this institutional setting social or situated identities were firmly embedded in differential participation rights and obligations, and this differential was found to depend largely on the teacher`s control of of creative 'current speaker selects next speaker techniques…' (McHoul, 1978:211; and see Sacks et al, 1974:718). From a management of interaction viewpoint, in a setting where there are 30 or more possible next turn speakers, controlling turn-taking is obviously a major pre-occupation. In pedagogic terms of course, there may be alternative views as to appropriate turn-taking practices.

In his constitutive ethnography of classroom lessons, Mehan (1979) dealt with turn-taking or structuring procedures on a more functional level, examining what a particular turn was doing and developing categories of turns and patterns. It is clear from his treatment that the pre-allocational, teacher-dominated features of McHoul`s classrooms were also present in Mehan`s and we can consider their characterization of turn-taking as foundational for classrooms as institutional settings.

If we include language classrooms in this representation, it does not affect it significantly as an institutionally unmarked phenomenon. Language classrooms have language as their content, and so we might find more concern with extended learner turn constructional units for practice purposes; there is also the embedding of different types of language practice activity that there isn`t in content classrooms, and so the greater likelihood of other sorts of - albeit temporary - turn-taking systems on view (Seedhouse, 2004; Markee, 2000). We may think (or like to think) that contemporary language classrooms are more democratic, more level ground in turn-taking terms, but that still has to be proven. van Lier (1988), Markee (2000), and Duff (2002) do not seriously challenge the prevalence of an agenda-driven, significantly teacher-controlled, unequal power turn-taking environment as a superordinate structure or structuring resource.

While McHoul`s version of classroom turn-taking practice is still an important reference point, it has to be stressed that it is located at the extreme of Sacks et al`s continuum of speech exchange systems, or Drew and Heritage`s formal-informal categorisation of institutional talk. Such a classroom is suspiciously monolithic: there is one floor, one type of activity, one type of teacher and student, and, it is worth adding, one methodological strategy for looking at it. These are of course exaggerations, but the point is that not only do we need to move along our formal-informal continuum, we also need to take a closer look at how, within a single classroom setting, participants themselves might move back and forth along it, and in doing so signal a set of distinguishable institutional practices. This is what Seedhouse (2004) has done for language classrooms and this is what I want to do for teacher training classrooms.

The further along the continuum one moves, the less possible it is to talk of being governed by one turn-taking system, the more important it is for an analyst to look for indexicals of what seem to be different systems and then link them to other possible constituents of the structuring & turn-taking selection process. Even within what is ostensibly one system, it is possible to identify quite different types of turn (van Lier, 1988: ch 5; Mehan, 1979: ch 3; Seedhouse, 2004: ch3). Different types of activity and purpose, teacher and students, classroom groupings, classroom numbers and subject matter, different stages of the classroom group life (Mehan, ch 4, notes that turn-taking procedures are not necessarily a given at the beginning of a course, but are a constructed and sometimes negotiated process) are all variables that can influence turn-taking.

My teacher training classrooms have their fair share of trainer monologues and trainer turn allocation, but they also have smaller numbers to manage, a greater variety of turn types (questions and answers figure less - trainee answers to trainer questions are less canonical turn types), less trainer pre-packaged input, more trainee self-selection and turn initiation. Something else about training classrooms that influences turn-taking practice is that the content is teaching language. In a parallel fashion to language classroom embeddings, the training classroom will be driven in some way by methodological concerns. The structuring of interaction is not just doing trainin- but modelling different ways of doing it - good practice for trainees to adapt to their own settings. This is very much related to the back stage rather than front stage nature of the setting. All of these elements point to forms of turn-taking which will in some respects be different from conversation and different from formal-front stage classrooms. Comparative analysis can tell us in what ways.

Research on turn-taking has taken place for the most part in formal, front stage classroom contexts, has tended to treat these as representative of all classrooms, and to treat turn-taking practice as part of one system. Perhaps above all else, there has not been a close enough concern with the linkage between turn-taking and activities or task goals, with reference to the definition of institutional talk discussed in 2.2.2.

3.3 Sequential Structures: Contrasting Approaches

Investigation of turn-taking in formal classrooms has been closely tied to the production of characteristically institutional sequences or patterns, which 'display participants`orientation to a distinctively institutional variety of talk' (Markee, 2000: 71). The one-speech-exchange-system-fits-all findings of McHoul and Mehan can be expected to create a similarly singular structural pattern at an interactional level.

The teacher initiation of turn sequences embodied in formal, pre-allocated turn-taking systems creates an environment for an interaction pattern that has been variously termed Initiation-Response-Feedback IRF (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975), Initiation-Response-Evaluation IRE (Mehan, 1979), and Question-Answer-Comment QAC (McHoul, 1978).

> There is probably nothing that symbolises classroom discourse quite as much as this structure, the much-noted IRF exchange…..It is obviously designed for instruction and a special kind of instruction to boot, namely one in which instruction is 'delivered' and the deliverer must check constantly that the recipients are actually receiving, or have received at some earlier point, the instructional material or point in question.
> (van Lier, 1996: 149)

> The overwhelming pervasiveness of reflexive tying leads me to believe that this structure, which establishes symmetry within three part and extended interactional sequences, is a basic organisational structure of classroom lessons…it seems to be the glue that binds entire interactional events together.
> (Mehan, 1979: 76)

Here then is a structure which is proposed as a major interactional feature of classroom/institutional discourse with an underlying instructional purpose or broad task goal: to teach and test. In positive pedagogic terms, IRF is seen as an effective means of retaining teacher control over the monitoring and guiding of student learning. However, there has been criticism of IRF on both pedagogic and interactional grounds. The demand to display knowledge and then the evaluation of what is produced, is viewed as an embodiment of the power and control of the teacher, deterring student involvement and precluding joint construction of discourse (van Lier, 1996; Allwright & Bailey, 1991; Hall, 1993; Ellis, 1994). The IRF has typically been viewed as the structural support for a transmission model of education rather than its constructivist counterpart.

Interactionally, there are two lines of development I want to take up. While IRF, like turn-taking, has often been construed in monolithic, broad stroke terms, there has also been work on classroom discourse which suggests a more varied, and extended structural phenomenon, in terms of form and function. At the same time, there remain doubts as to the validity of this structure in terms of discriminating between different institutional contexts, and the too ready imposition of external, analytically constructed categories on the orientations of participants.

A number of research studies have looked more closely at the I, R and F moves and identified further varieties of each (eg Mehan, 1979; Nasajji and Wells, 2000; van Lier, 1988; 1996; Basturkmen, 2000; Cullen; 1998, 2002). Indeed, Mehan went further and showed how topic-related sets of IRF sequences could build into the structure for a whole lesson event, as suggested in the quote at the beginning of this section. The IRF pattern has been under-valued and under-analysed in some quarters. It does not have to be viewed as a restricted interactional variety any more than as a restrictive pedagogic variety (see Laurillard, 2002 for the centrality of teacher-led dialogues to university teaching).

In one recent re-evaluation of the IRF pattern, Nassajii and Wells (2000: 376) suggest that the 'same basic IRF structure can take a variety of forms and be recruited by teachers for a wide variety of functions, depending on the goal of the activity that the discourse serves to mediate'. Their research on Canadian elementary and middle school classrooms draws attention to the importance of task-structure link. They also break down the teacher/student minimal pair approach to roles and identities and note a range of teacher and student identity tied to different sequences.

Despite the greater variability of IRF structures than is allowed by critics, it remains a top-down, externally grounded approach, arguably insufficiently able to discriminate differing pedagogic goals and activities, beyond very general notions of teaching, or institutional identities, beyond the default teacher-student. Drew and Heritage (1992:14-15) criticize the speech act approach to IRF taken by the Birmingham group of applied linguists and their context-free, grammar of discourse embodied in exchange structures and abstract specifications of well-formed or ill-formed discourse.   As Drew and Heritage (p15) point out, this leads to two analytic problems at the two crucial contextual levels: the sequential and the social.

First, despite attempts by researchers to break down the different parts of the pattern, this has still been done in general functional terms (eg Mehan`s 4 categories of elicit, or Nassaji and Wells's 6 categories of follow-up move function). Indeed it seems at times that functions are being equated with tasks.  This seeming functional specificity is still too general to distinguish between different institutional settings (doctor`s offices and classrooms, traditional v other kinds of classroom).

A second problem, again noted by Drew and Heritage (p15) is the failure (at least in Sinclair and Coulthard`s model) of IRF to embrace significant social relations and identities. The linguistic rules were made to stand for social relations.

Essentially, IRF categories strip interaction of <u>context</u> in a number of senses. Interactionally (and so, methodologically) the IRF at its most canonical largely removes the locally managed and contingent elements that are central to a jointly constructed sequential context (van Lier, 1996:152; cf Lee, 2006; 2007; 2008). Institutionally, the level of generality at which IRF operates fails to distinguish between different settings or contexts and their institutional character. The consequence is '…to treat conduct that is clearly informed by considerations of task and teaching philosophy as something that could be treated exclusively in linguistic terms.' (Drew and Heritage, 1992:15).

Seedhouse (2004) contrasts the discourse analysis (DA) approach embodied by IRF with a CA/Institutional Discourse (IT) approach, arguing that a CA perspective is more flexible and dynamic. IRF cycles 'perform different interactional and pedagogical work according to the context in which they are operating,' and the sort of variable approach to context embodied by CA is therefore necessary for a valid and adequate description of L2 classroom interaction (2004: 63, 64).

I have noted that the key argument in Seedhouse's IT approach to classroom interaction is that there is a reflexive relationship between the pedagogical focus of a lesson and the organization of turn-taking and sequence. With the varying of pedagogical focus or task comes the varying of interaction. Each change of focus makes for a change of 'context' in CA terms. This IT perspective is opposed to the monolithic classroom turn-taking and sequential structures embodied in IRF (2004: 101 et seq).

3.4   Institutional Contexts and Identity in Teacher Training Classrooms

Institutional Contexts

I said in chapter 1 that teaching and learning of any kind is accomplished through interaction (Vygotsky, 1978; Laurillard, 2002). In a back stage, informal institutional setting such as a teacher training classroom, IRF can only be a starting point for analysing structures of trainer talk-in-interaction. If, however, we approach the IRF pattern from a sequential perspective, then while allowing that IRF is 'a major resource for teachers and students in organizing their lessons as a course of action' (Lee, 2006: 695), a sequential analytical framework forces us below and above the contextual surface, helping us to recognize the different interactional and pedagogical work IRF cycles perform according to the context in which they are operating (Seedhouse, 2004: 63).   A conversation analytic approach moves us away from abstract functional categories to a concern with contingency: contextually sensitive turn-taking systems and types of interactional sequence.

The data for Seedhouse`s study of classroom interaction were taken from a range of mostly informal institutional settings, and so evidenced a greater variety of context in sequential terms.  Teacher training classrooms are also at the informal end of Sacks et al`s speech exchange continuum, and so a similar variety of sequential patterns can be anticipated, although the different nature of pedagogic purpose in these institutional settings will lead to different labels, and, possibly, different sequences. These different interaction contexts have an impact on the participation rights and roles of both trainers and trainees.

An analytic objective of my own research will be to develop a relevant typology of interactional sequences in teacher trainer talk, grounding it in the reflexive relationship between pedagogic aims and interactional organization. The greater variety of institutional structures brings us back to questions of institutional identity.

Identity

Seedhouse`s reworking of IRF patterns locates the typology he develops in varieties of **discourse identity** (see the earlier discussion of Zimmerman's (1998) tripartite classification). He pays little analytic attention to identity, largely because he does not see the contextual variation in discourse identities as producing equivalent variations on the default or 'master' identies of *teacher* and *student*. In this monolithic view of **situational** or **institutional identit**y, he shares common analytical ground with Zimmerman.

Richards (2006) draws attention to the ways in which variation in discourse identity in classroom settings can mark an orientation to Zimmerman`s third identity category, **transportable identity**, with significant consequences for participation and for a movement along the continuum of speech exchange systems towards something closely resembling the unmarked interactional variety of conversation. However, he too appears to accept **teacher-student** as the standard relational pair (SRP) of Sack's membership categorization description.

In teacher training classroom settings I want to draw on Membership Categorisation Analysis to open out and distinguish situational identities, viewing them as more varied and activity-tied, and with a closer resemblance to transportable identity, where a range of categorial identities are available for members to orient to, through their naming or referential practices or through the activities that are constituted in their talk-in-interaction (see Benwell and Stokoe, 2006; Drew and Sorjonen, 1997; Fitzgerald and Housely, 2002). I therefore want to build on and refine Seedhouse`s CA-based approach to varieties of interaction and turn-based identities in my analytic framework.

3.5 Teacher Educator Identity

Zimmerman's categorisation of discourse/situational/transportable identities is a way of grouping a great range of membership categories, and in an institutional context the tie between discoursal and situational is useful definitionally speaking. The discourse identities constrain and index situational in this stripped down and more constrained context. They tie to the institutional task that is being performed.

But the question that interests me here is can we go beyond the Standard Relational Pair of teacher-student or, in this case, trainer-trainee? Doing so requires breaking down situational identity via background information (my own experience and the literature on identity, teachers and teacher educators) and the demonstrable orientation to varieties of identity in the institutional context of teacher trainer talk. In this section I want to review work on identity in teacher educator contexts.

We should first distinguish between teacher educator competence as know-what and as know-how, knowledge of the subject and knowledge of how to teach it. The two are linked to the foundational educational concepts of Transmission and Construction (for llanguage teacher training see Roberts, 1997; McGrath, 1997; Williams, 1999).

Murray and Male (2004), Koster et al (2005) and Korthagen et al (2006) identify different areas of teacher educator (TE) competence in training teachers in any subject area:
a) content knowledge competence
b) pedagogic competence
c) organisational competence
d) communicative & group dynamic competences
e) personal and developmental growth competences for working with adult learners – facilitator and stimulator of reflection as an element in this
f) model - the idea of a model and provider of professional vocabulary, language for trainees – language to talk about work. They can get some of that from books but are also dependent on modelling.
g) the TE as reflector on practice in practice

For the most part, teacher educators see themselves as constructivists rather than transmitters of information: "As a teacher educator, I see myself as inducting my students into a professional community that involves dialogue and debate, as its members collectively endeavour to understand the complexities of their professional lives." (Doecke, 1994)

What kind of expertise do teacher educators need, then, within these various fields of competence? Wubbels and Hoornweg (in Smith, 2005: 178 et seq) list 8 functions of TEs:

- facilitator of student teacher learning process
- encourager of reflective skills
- developer of new curricula
- gatekeeper – via summative assessment (179)
- researcher
- stimulator of professional development for school teachers
- team member
- collaborator

Of those 8 functions, there is currently a much greater enabling, reflection-pushing role for TEs (the first two TE functions on the list). However, we should guard against one dimesional constructivist models of the training process. Enabling teachers to reflect on their teaching is clearly central to current views of teacher training processes. At the same time trainers will need to deliver received knowledge from research and writing on linguistics and training methodology (see Wallace, 1991: 15).   What is common to the enactment of all forms of TE identity is their basis in forms of interaction.

Smith (2005:182 et seq) also takes a comparative look at standards between American, Australian, Dutch and Israeli TE contexts and finds a number of common expectations regarding roles and identities:

1 TEs are expected to be model teachers, able to articulate practical knowledge and 'bring practical experiences to a theoretical level'

2 TEs are expected to be involved in creating new knowledge – both practice (materials, curricula) and theory (research, publications)

3 TEs should be involved in teacher education inside and outside institution and take leadership roles

4 TEs should be involved in their own ongoing professional development and that of others

Smith looked at a research study of 40 novice Israeli secondary teacher education college graduates and 18 teacher educators from secondary level to look at differences in perception between trainers and trainees as to what it means to be a good teacher educator. For trainees, practising what you preach was the most important quality of a good TE, followed by recent classroom experience which matches their own, with useful feedback and a metacognitive approach to teaching (explaining why and how) and support as a third looked for quality.

For teacher educators, enhancing reflection & creating understanding of education were key for their approach to trainees, followed by the importance of self-reflection and ongoing development. Empathy and understanding were also high on the list. Interestingly, and by contrast, there was a noticeable lack of any emphasis on 'input', 'modelling', chalk face credibility. (2005: 184). Smith found that the most important difference between the two groups was that for trainees the ability to articulate tacit knowledge was top of the list, whereas this was not mentioned by TEs. And also trainees wanted TEs to have tested & tried out theories not just talk about them (more of the practice what you preach angle) (p186).

In identity terms, Smith's research suggests that trainees were more concerned with trainer as fellow teacher who could talk about teaching from experience. We might view this as a wish for trainers who have gone through their own reflective teaching cycle and could talk about it. Trainers emphasized more 'traditional' constructivist elements.

It is clear that trainer/educator identities are closely connected to modelling, but of a rather different kind from that associated with transmission views of training. Loughran and Berry (2005) usefully distinguish two levels of modelling which link to Smith's trainee and trainer preferred strategies. They view modelling as operating at 2 levels. The first one is essentially practising what you preach – doing as you would have your students do – 'active and engaging activities' as opposed to a transmissive approach (2005: 194). The second level is the meta-learning one, where you think out loud about what you're doing and why – uncovering teaching strategies, reflecting on action and what lies behind it: 'Learning about the teaching and learning being experienced'.

Robinson & McMillan (2006) find TEs viewing themselves first and foremost as teachers (of teachers) and so in the classroom to pass on experience and theory-in-practice, expertise and ideas. Hands-on, at the chalkface experience brings credibility and respect is the message. (2006: 331)   This TE 'model' is essentially an apprenticeship one (see Wallace, 1991; 1996 for ELT) with two main strands:

pedagogic – present and demonstrate good teaching
pastoral – we care about the students
(2006: 331, 332)

Bearing in mind that all the research done on TE identity has come from interviews and narratives, the balance between **telling** trainees about teaching and getting them to **reflect** on it is surely context dependent – the trainees, the trainer, the stage of the course, the kind of course, and so on. And of course training is not necessarily a conscious process; what to pull out of training sessions is not easy, because trainers are not always conscious of why they do what they do, and because they are not sure which of the many points will be most useful to the trainees at any given stage in their course and experience (Loughran and Berry, 2005: 200). A classroom interaction-based perspective on trainer identity will provide important insights into enactment of trainer identities and interactional patterns that frame them.

In ELT the reflective model of teaching and teacher training (see Freeman, 1991; Roberts, 1997; Trappes-Lomax and McGrath, 1999) is dominant, but there is little research on teacher educators in ELT to give substance to this or other views. Research in education suggests that even within the ranks of teacher trainers, a variety of identity and related pedagogic strategy are in play. An important focus in my research will be to use CA and MCA to track identity in my own institutional setting.

Drawing on research on teacher educators in education, there seem to be four main areas of identity to explore in institutional interaction:

1 Pedagogic identity: the way you train and the strategies you use
2 Interpersonal identity: how you communicate with and relate to trainees
3 Linguistic identity: modelling language for teaching and talking about teaching
4 Transportable identity: cultural factors, the kind of teacher you are in your own classroom transported to a training classroom, more personal factors

3.6   Teacher Training Classrooms

The research on classroom discourse patterns and turn-taking will be useful as a comparative resource. The teacher training classroom, because of its location on the informal end of the formality continuum, and its back stage institutional context, presents new analytic and descriptive ground.

I said in Chapter 1 that there is a dearth of research into teacher training classroom discourse in comparison to what has been done elsewhere, but there are two topics from the literature relevant to my research:

1. Theories of teacher education
2. Methodology in training classrooms

Theory and practice in Teacher Training

There are models for training teachers which suggest what should happen in the classroom, but which remain to be explored in terms of their impact on practice, and more than this, on practice in a particular context (Freeman & Richards, 1996; Nunan & Richards, 1991; Roberts, 1997; McGrath, 1997; Grenfell, 1998; Trappes-Lomax & McGrath, 1999).

Grenfell (1998: 29 et seq) points out the complex nature of the process of teacher socialization and professionalization, and of links between educational culture and the school-based culture in which teachers on initial training courses are daily submerged. 'The emerging picture is of a complex institutional structure into which individuals enter with all their own biographic idiosyncracies. The development of professional knowledge is both the process and the product of interaction between these two' (p30).   The variability of the process of socialization in different settings, and the mediating contributions of a training course and other factors are still in need of exploration and research. As Grenfell concludes, so much of the writing about teacher education has been context free when it needs to be more context-sensitive.

My concern is the extent to which different approaches to training are recognized categories of knowledge and practice, evidenced in interactional practice and from institutional and individual particulars in a given context.   The theory of training teachers constitutes one obvious component of the institution and the institutional discourse that characterizes it.

The literature on teacher training classrooms has in common with that of language classrooms a primary concern with effective and appropriate training procedures. Unlike language classrooms, this has no grounding in research-in-context. Indeed a major resource for training methodology activities is still the language classroom, and the experience, concerns and personalities of teachers working in it (see Britten, 1985a, 1985b; Freeman, 1989; Wallace, 1991; Woodward, 1991; 1992; Freeman and Richards, 1996; Borg, 1999a, 1999b). Debates are based on processes of teaching and learning rather than training (see eg Willis and Willis, 1995; Cameron, 1997). Moreover, rather than the training classroom itself, it is, perhaps understandably, what happens in the teaching practice classroom, or in feedback outside it, which preoccupies trainers and trainer trainers (see Swann, 1993; Salisbury, 1999; Lubelska et al, 2000; Hockly, 2000).

McGrath (1997) and Roberts (1997) are two exceptions to an approach which tends to characterize training in terms of teaching. McGrath identifies 4 major kinds of input option in training classrooms: feeding, leading, showing and throwing. These are paralleled in Roberts` three main strategies for trainers in terms of input: propositional (feeding and showing), analytical (leading) and experiential (throwing). Rather like Krashen´s comprehensible input hypothesis, they make sense intuitively, but have no empirical foundation.   They do, however, provide analytic leverage on institutionally recognized and constrained categories of practice, as well as providing a very approximate framework for identifying different types of training activity and the tasks they perform.

To summarize, the literature on theories of teacher education and the implications it points to for good practice could be said to constitute one element of the wider institutional context - the institutional order - which exerts an influence on forms of training classroom interaction and resultant structures (see Nunan and Richards, 1991; Freeman and Richards, 1996; Grenfell, 1998; Trappes-Lomax and McGrath, 1999). Writing on approaches and methods suggest categories of training classroom practice in terms of session types, sequences, and so on. Trying to trace the extent to which they shape or are transformed in interactional contexts will be an important analytical concern.

In the longer term, effective training and teacher learning practices are the main concern; but in the short term, an awareness of how things happen in this setting is a necessary pre-requisite.

4   A Framework for Analysing Institutional Talk

In discussing the literature in this chapter, I have looked at generic features of institutional talk which distinguish it from conversation. A task and goal based approach to talk is a central idea. And it brings with it constraints on participants and contributions, together with special kinds of inference associated with the context and goals driving the talk in it.

I then went on to consider a number of key concepts central to the analytical approach to institutional talk I will be taking: activity types, speech exchange systems, membership categorisation and identity. I looked at research in classroom interaction with special attention to the sequential context of interaction and to relevant identity issues. I concentrated on one area which has figured heavily in the literature: the IRF pattern as representative of classroom discourse, mostly in formal settings. Moving beyond formal, primary and secondary classroom settings may lead to different, more locally relevant patterns. Seedhouse's IT approach to analysing L2 classroom is a starting point for my own.

I noted the absence of empirical work on the sequential context of teacher training classrooms, but suggested that the literature on approaches to teacher education (including identity) and the description of methodological practice in general terms, will be relevant to a consideration of the wider institutional context represented by the notion of 'the institutional order' and the different kinds of identity made relevant in interaction that signal it.

My research on teacher training classrooms as an institutional setting and trainer talk as a variety of IT seeks to build on and add to work on IT in a CA tradition, in two main ways.

1   Methodology

- There has been a focus on sequential analysis in CA at the expense of more broad based sociological concerns (Hester and Eglin, 1997; Hester and Francis, 2000; Lynch, 1993; Lynch and Bogen; Watson, 1992, 1997, 2000). So, with respect to identity, for example, the concern of CA has been largely turn-generated discourse identities (Zimmerman, 1998; Psathas, 1999). Institutional talk has also focused on sequential analysis, with a comparative approach as a cornerstone. In educational settings, identity has been tracked through sequential analysis (see for example Benwell & Stokoe, 2002)

- A sequential focus has meant a separation of CA from MCA. But I have argued that a careful reading of Sacks' lectures and other work suggest that his was an integrated approach to the study of interaction, how it was organized and how it organized knowledge in interaction. Institutional talk has evidenced plenty of MCA work (see Benwell and Stokoe, 2006: 100) in institutional settings, but very little that seeks to bring together CA and MCA. Fitzgerald and Housley (2002) & Housley and Fitzgerald (2002) with their work on radio call-in shows are exceptions.

- Most MCA work has been on everyday social interaction, with descriptions relating to personal or social characteristics (transportable identities). In institutional talk, there is a tendency for omnirelevant or standard relational pair of teacher-student, doctor-patient, trainer-trainee, student counsellor-student counsellee (He, 1995; Benwell and Stokoe, 2006). There is not the variety of identity as in OC.

2 Description

My work breaks new ground methodologically in its complementary use of CA and MCA in institutional contexts and its exploration of situational identity. It also breaks new ground in terms of research into classroom interaction as there is no CA based study of the organization of teacher trainer talk.

Chapter 3   **Data & Methodology**

Introduction

This chapter describes and justifies the research process in my case study of institutional discourse. It is organised around 5 fundamental methodological questions:

1. **How did I go about the research**? - In this section I will be concerned to establish my study of the structure of interaction in teacher training classrooms as an example of institutional interaction which seeks to build on the findings from Seedhouse's study of turn-taking and sequence in language classrooms.

2. **What strategies informed the data collection and analysis**? - I will set out the particularities of a constructivist CA approach to analysis. Central to my analysis of institutional interaction is the idea of context and how it is bounded. I will describe my own conceptualization and its implications for data collection and analysis. Finally I will discuss the research questions which framed my study.

3. **How did I collect the data**? - The basis for selection, the methods used, the reasons for choosing them, their appropriacy. In this section, I will discuss and justify with reference to methodological strategies the use of tapes and transcripts as the main source of data.

4. **How did I analyse the data**? - The steps involved in analysing the data, the process of generating analytic statements. In this section I discuss my own CA-guided procedures for inductive analysis and their use in analysing institutional interactio.

5. **What is the basis for my interpretations and explanations**? - In this final section, I discuss issues of validity and reliability in qualitative research and how they apply to a CA informed analysis of institutional interaction. I will discuss the measures I took to enhance validity and reliability in my own research, with special attention to questions of generalizability.

Section 1   **Theory and Methods**

1.1 A Conversation Analytic Approach to Context

> "CA is the study of recorded, naturally occurring talk-in-interaction….(the aim) is to discover how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns at talk, with a central focus being on the *sequences* of action generated…..the objective of CA is to uncover the tacit reasoning procedures and sociolinguistic competencies underlying the production and interpretation of talk in organized sequences of interaction. " (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998: 14)

Any study of language in context must first define what it understands by this central idea of **context**; the answer will shape methods of data collection and analysis.

For CA, talk-in-interaction is viewed as a domain of activity in its own right, not as the expression of the physiological or psychological idiosyncracies and dispositions of talkers, or a reflection of their place in or shaping by wider social structures. Talk-in-interaction is constitutive rather than reflective of context. CA´s sociological founders viewed conversation as a basic form of social organization, in that "it operates in, and partly organizes, what would appear to be the primordial site of sociality: direct interaction between persons " (Schegloff, 1987: 208). How is this order (context) created? The sequential context of the interaction is what counts in CA. Sequential patterns observable in these contexts transcend particular places or times or people and refer to the machinery or technology that 'works' the interaction (Sacks, 1992).

CA is not interested in analyst theories, but in the "theories-in-use " of participants (or members) in conversation (ten Have, 1999: 32). In this, CA embodies the ethnomethodological approach to social analysis pioneered by Garfinkel (1967). Ethnomethodology is interested in the common sense reasoning and practical theorizing underlying everyday activities. From close and detailed analysis of people's practices, we might identify the theories or rules (the machinery) which organize them. CA therefore is both **context-free**, in traditional sociolinguistic terms, and yet **context-sensitive**, in its own terms (Heritage, 1987; Atkinson and Heritage, 1984; Silverman, 2000).

The most important methodological consequence of CA´s separation from such bucket theories is a scarcity of ethnographic sensibility and methods. Audio (or video) recordings and the voices of 'members' found on them are allowed to speak for themselves and the sequential context they capture. The special kind of observation represented by tapes and transcripts found in 'pure CA' (ten Have, 1999) places it in a methodological world of its own.

The application of CA to studies of institutional talk has confronted researchers with the methodological tensions between CA and ethnography, two analytic traditions which share a concern with detail and a bottom-up, empirically grounded framework for more general observations on social life, but which differ in the methods they use and, above all, in the methodological reach of their view of context.

In the next section I will examine CA informed approaches to institutional talk and the relation of ethnography to them, using the discussion to frame my own methodological stance.

1.2   Institutional Talk and Context

IT has been called Applied CA (ten Have, 1999: 162) in its concern first with how institutional interactions are organized as such, and second because of the 'implicit or even explicit use of CA-inspired studies to support efforts to make social life better in some way.' At the heart of Applied CA studies have been two methodological dicta:

1. Take **sequential context** as a focus.
2. Take **ordinary conversation as a 'reference point'** for understanding institutional talk.

In linguistic terms, the conversational machinery is viewed as unmarked talk-in-interaction, whereas IT is marked in its varying degrees of comparative restriction. In social organizational terms, IT is studied in order to discover 'how institutional interactions are organized *as* institutional interactions', or, how they are talked into being (ten Have, 1999: 161; Heritage, 1984: 290).

Studies of institutional talk using a CA approach, have thus taken up the 'invitation' of Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) to start a comparative investigation of speech exchange systems (see ten Have, 1999: 163). They have also seemingly adhered to the ethnomethodological view of the locally constituted and organized basis for social interaction, where, in this instance, institutional talk as institutional action is seen to be constitutive of institutional settings and identities (ten Have, 1999: 164).

Schegloff (1991; 1992a; 1992b) resists extending the CA notion of sequential context, and thus the sources of information and the interpretations on which it rests. Analysis must justify working outwards from transcribed talk only through the orientation of the participants, or the demonstrable *sequential consequentiality* for them of institutional factors in the interaction. Schegloff 's methodological caution questions "the co-optation or preemption of a sequential feature of the talk by a social-structural formulation of its context" if it isn't needed (1991: 64).

It is unfortunate that Schegloff´s cautionary tales about the primacy of proximal elements have been made to represent a CA/IT view of institutional context (see eg, Lynch and Bogen, 1994; Hester & Francis, 2000). The reality is that there is a **proximal-distal continuum**, as I noted in chapter 2, and many IT studies fall closer to the distal than the proximal. What is of interest here is the basis for moving from proximal to distal context and the information sources drawn on in doing so.   Discussing CA's central question of 'why that now?' (here at this juncture of talk), Schegloff (1998) stresses that this is not CA's question so much as that of members in the conversation. It is the pervasiveness of the question for members which occasions its centrality in CA work. However, Schegloff (p416) goes on to note that how members answer the question, or appear to do so, may in fact lead into a wider angle of analysis.

Silverman (1999) has proposed a reconciliation of differing methodological standpoints, arguing for a distinction to be made between *how* and *why* questions, with CA being most important in answering the initial *how* question (a member's *why* question), while more culturally and politically referenced work <u>may</u> be relevant to the *why* questions posed by an analyst. Schegloff's comments suggest that CA's methodological caution does not preclude analytical interest in the wider context, but reassert the kind of warrant needed to justify it. The relationship between interactional order and institutional order necessitates a consideration of the relationship between CA and ethnography in my own research.

Applied CA & Ethnography

I have noted that CA has much in common with ethnography in its detailed consideration of situated behaviour and activities. Its concern with the interaction order in micro contexts also has connections to Erving Goffman, who could be described as an ethnographer of situations (see Goffman, 1964). However, unlike Goffman, CA did not make a distinction between **ritual** procedures and **system** procedures, viewing culture/procedural rules as evidenced in participants' interactional behaviour.

The analytic transparency seen as a distinguishing feature of CA is embodied in its data collection methods, again contrasted with what has been viewed as the dangerously subjective filter of the participant observer in ethnography (Sacks, 1992: 27).   Pure CA is founded on a 'vulgar competence' assumed by CA analysts to stand for members' knowledge, but this may not be applicable to the task-based competence necessary for local institutional practices (Hester and Francis, 2000). This may mean that CA picks up conversational aspects but misses the task-based aspects that are constitutive of a particular institutional, workplace setting (see ten Have, 1990). The implication is that with Applied CA ethnographic research can provide 'virtual membership' of a particular institutional order, supporting rather than competing with recorded data (ten Have, 1999: 59).

The application of CA techniques to the analysis of institutional talk has arguably played an influential role in an acceptance by many CA analysts of the possible relevance and consequentiality of discoursal and cultural practices from outside the sequential domain, resulting in an acknowledgement of the methodological importance of distal context (eg Maynard, 1989; Drew and Heritage, 1992; Miller, 1994; ten Have, 1999; Silverman, 1999; Makitalo & Saljo, 2002).

Having said this however, a researcher's need for ethnographically gathered information beyond audio or video recordings to help them understand 'what is going on' is dependent on what they are after: the activity they wish to study, the aspects of interaction they wish to explore, the aspect of the organization in question they are focusing on, and how far they are 'virtual members' with respect to that focus (Duranti, 1997; ten Have, 1990; Drew & Heritage, 1992).

In the following two sections I shall describe my own view of the place of ethnographically gathered information in the analysis of my variety of IT and suggest how drawing on membership categorization analysis is an analytic resource in linking the categorial identities oriented to by participants in interaction to the wider institutional order.

Applied CA and Teacher Trainer Talk

I have said that my topic of teacher training classroom contexts builds on the work of Seedhouse (2004) into L2 classroom contexts. His aims were descriptive and methodological: describing the characteristic forms or varieties of interaction in this institutional context, and in doing so establishing an appropriate methodology (2004: 88). My own research has this dual descriptive and methodological purpose.

The size and variety of Seedhouse's database contributed towards his methodological purity, in CA terms, because of the relatively limited practical possibilities of gathering ethnographic information. In fact, Seedhouse (2004: 90-92) follows Silverman's proposal (1999: 407) regarding **directionality** and **timing.** First ask the how questions about how participants produce the local context, then ask the why questions about institutional and cultural constraints, but only based on details of the interaction and the orientation of participants to features of the macro context.

In these two methodological dictates, Seedhouse essentially adheres to the IT agenda set out by Drew and Heritage (1992: 5, 21) where an analyst must point to the participants' orientation to institutional characteristics of their talk (typically relating to task and roles) as a basis for relating this to the wider context. Not following them opens a researcher to questions of representation – the reliability of a piece of analysis, where it is the analyst not the participants who selects from the numerous exogeneous factors that may be relevant to making meaning in this interactional context. These two dictates underpin my own research methodology.

My 20 years of teacher training experience have provided a virtual membership of the institutional order of teacher training classrooms. But observing teachers and other trainers have led me to a strong belief in the primacy of the interaction order and its locally constructed and reconstructed underpinnings. I want to show through a fine-grained approach to the sequential context that the wider context is generally a luxury I can afford to do without (McHoul et al, 2008).

Structures of interaction in this kind of classroom, as in others, determine the opportunities for participation on the part of trainees. In participation structures are lodged the resources for reflection and knowledge construction, the practical techniques and the development of teacher identity that are at the heart of institutional task goals in this setting (see Roberts, 1997; Trappes-Lomax & McGrath, 1999).

A central concept in Seedhouse's work on L2 classroom context is the reflexive relationship between pedagogic focus and the organization of interaction (turn taking and sequence) (2004: 101). In his classrooms, the fundamental institutional goal is to 'teach the learners the L2' (p183). Achieving this goal leads to a set of institutional practices or forms of interaction (Drew & Heritage, 1992: 26; Seedhouse, 2004: 183). There are varieties of classroom interaction linked to pedagogic purpose (Seedhouse, 2004: 205). My own research takes the fundamental institutional task (of teaching teachers how to teach) and examines interactional practices for getting it done, in the first instance bracketing my ethnographic sensibility to establish the how questions, but if necessary drawing on it to examine why questions.

This inside-out/how-then-why view is an important strategy for keeping methodologically honest. You are 'watching conversation' (Sacks, 1992: 5), and finding out as far as possible how culture is 'done', what the outlines of this inference-making machine are (Sacks, 1992: 119). There will be gaps, questions, seeming irrationalities, and so on, which will perhaps lead you into the wider institutional setting and your own ethnographic knowledge, but lead you also, back to the tapes, to add these semantics to the syntax. Tapping into ethnographic knowledge in applied CA is the equivalent of tapping into vulgar competence in pure CA; in both it does not require leaving the office or the tapes to do fieldwork of a traditional ethnographic kind.

1.3   MCA and Methodology: Categories and Context

I want briefly to return to Harvey Sacks´notion of *membership categorization devices* (MCDs), as a further strategy for bridging micro and macro, interactional and institutional. In chapter 2 I discussed the nature of MCDs and MCA and identified levels of analysis at which they might tap into the institutional order of a teacher training classroom. Here I`ll add something about the practical methodological implications and in particular the role of MCA in exploring institutional identity in sequential contexts

"Categories simultaneously provide cultural resources and constituting possibilities for participants in *in situ* talk. By using them, participants make specific aspects of institutional context relevant as they engage in interaction."
        (Makitalo & Saljo, 2002: 59)

Categorization is a pervasive and basic human process, and it is therefore an attractively common sense analytic concept. In the context of CA approaches to institutional talk it also suggests the possibility of adding an often-missing dimension of content to process concerns.   There are three important methodological reference points for a MCA dimension to sequences of talk-in-interaction:

1. Categories in talk refer to people, things, situations and events.
2. Categories are directly referenced or they can be inferred from a social relationship or an activity bound to a particular category.
3. Categories are importantly signalled through sequential processes and lexical choice (Sacks, 1972; Maynard and Zimmerman, 1984; Drew and Sorjonen, 1997; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998: 179-185, 213-219; Silverman, 1998: chs 5 & 7; Makitalo and Saljo, 2002; Mori, 2003)

In sum, categories have associated expectations and activities. They allow us to label people and experience, and in turn provide a set of inferential resources which help us to understand and interpret the behaviour (and so identities) of people we label in activity-bound contexts.

In my own training classroom context I will first describe the forms of sequence organization that characterise teacher trainer talk. Within these different sequential contexts I will then draw on MCA and sequential analysis to examine the kinds of task that are done in these contexts and the different institutional identities in play.

In Section 1 I have examined the different elements that make up my methodological theory of context. My arguments for virtual institutional membership allied to sequentially constructed institutional identities drawing on insights from MCA seek to establish a study that is informed by an appropriate ethnographic sensibility in methodological terms while at the same time achieving this largely on CA's own terms.

Section 2   Data Collection

2.1   Data Selection

If the teacher training courses which I examined were the settings for my research, my cases (units of analysis, Huberman, 1994) in CA terms would be forms of interactional behaviour, sequential events or structures habitually found in that setting (see Heritage, in ten Have, 1999: 51).

My institutional study of sequential cases is defined at two levels:

Level 1. Turn-taking and sequence (Seedhouse's level)
Level 2. Sequence and activity or task (my additional level)

At level 1 my case is the study of teacher-initiated interaction in teacher training classrooms. It is a case which was largely defined <u>conceptually</u> (Miles and Huberman, 1994: 27; cf Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995) at an early stage of the analysis through the conceptual framework and research questions. In keeping with the CA practice of building a collection of cases exemplifying a particular conversational phenomenon (Heritage, 1988; Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998), and with the recognition that cases exist at different levels, my 'embedded' cases, or cases within a case (Miles and Huberman, 1994: 26), level 2, will be a collection of differentially classified (by task/identity, constraints of contributions, and inferential procedures) trainer-initiated event sequences.

Sampling Issues

Discussion of collections of sequential phenomena and within case sampling brings us to the question of how to select cases for a collection. Qualitative research is not driven by what Alasuutari (in ten Have (1999: 37 et seq) has called a *factist* perspective. This treats data as a statement about or a reflection of reality; it indexes a world that is not directly observable in its entirety; and so a sample in this perspective seeks to represent the wider population 'out there'. A *specimen* perspective, in contrast, views the specimen as part of the reality being studied, as an instance of a particular species - in our case traier talk in a training classroom. This second perspective reflects the CA approach which underlies my data selection.

Taken at face value, a specimen perspective suggests that one, or a few, specimens will do, and that their representativeness or quality (the extent to which they may be called good or bad specimens) is not an issue. In adopting the same analyst-as-naturalist metaphor for a discussion of CA methods, Heritage (in ten Have, 1999: 38) advocates a large collection of specimens from as many sites as possible, as a basis for a CA version of Linnean classification. This maximum variation strategy applies to phenomena - like stories, requests, explanations, for example - that are to be found in a variety of sites, and therefore vary. However, an interest in specimens likely to be found in certain places leads to a minimum variation strategy, confining the collection to one setting or a restricted sample (ten Have, 1999: 51, 52). In the wider context of qualitative research, this is purposive or theoretical sampling, where the selection and generalizability of cases is linked to theoretical propositions rather than populations (Silverman, 2000: 102-103).

My case selection is framed by a minimal variation selection strategy, but the 'nesting' (Miles and Huberman, 1994 29) within that case of subordinate cases requires a form of maximum variation, to identify and collect different kinds of trainer-initiated interaction sequences (TIIS). The choices I have made have been dependent on convenience and purposive sampling (see Silverman, 2000: 104). The teacher training settings in which I collected data were for the most part close at hand – in the teaching centre classrooms in the building in which I worked. In the teacher training courses which took place in these classrooms, I could anticipate finding specimens of TIIS which conformed to the institutional frame specified by Drew and Heritage (1992). Description and classification of these specimens would be informed by and inform methodological theory regarding

how IT works and what features and 'family resemblances' distinguished this particular form.

Sample Size

How many specimens of TIIS to collect? This was in the end a question of practicalities. Data collection took place over 2 years, 2002-2004. Working in Mexico City, I visited 2 of the 6 teacher training courses that took place over that time period in my workplace: one University of Cambridge DELTA (Diploma in English Language Teaching for Adults) and one ICELT (In-service Certificate in English Language Teaching) course. These courses generally had one weekly session of 4 hours over a 6 to 9 month time period, adding up to between 150 (ICELT) and 250 (DELTA) hours of input.

Visits to each course normally took place on a monthly basis, starting a month or two into the course to give the group a chance to develop ways of doing and speaking. The number of visits to each and hours of taping were

- DELTA: 5 visits - 20 hours of tape
- ICELT: 5 visits - 20 hours of tape

During an ICELT moderation outside Mexico City early on in the research, I collected a further 12 hours of taped sessions in 3 visits. These three data sources amounted to around 50 hours of taped training sessions. In CA terms, 50 hours of taped classroom interaction represents a considerable database (see Seedhouse, 2004), if we consider that transcribing one hour of audio recording can take from 10 to 20 hours, depending on the detail involved.

It was not intended that all the data be transcribed and analysed, but rather that a core of 5 training sessions, three from the DELTA and two from the ICELT would be transcribed and analysed to describe and classify seemingly foundational sequences. This core would then be the basis for moving outwards in the database - the kind of investigative sampling noted by Miles and Huberman in the quote above. For all the courses, I took notes while taping.

My strategy for selection and collection is based on building a collection of specimen cases of TIIS, with an emphasis on variation within the case rather than representation. I am selecting a sample of conversational sequences which are 'relevant to or appear in the wider universe' (Mason, in Silverman, 2000: 106). However, these relevant or sampleable units are theoretically or purposively defined: the three major indexicals of institutional interaction are not external or previous to their joint production and validation by participants in the course of talk in a setting where such units are likely to be found. The variety or range of case specimens in the sample aims at ensuring that it collects outlying or deviant cases, to put alongside more typical ones, so testing and probing the theoretical frame, and making for increased confidence in analytic conclusions (Silverman, 2000, 107; Miles and Huberman, 1994: 28). The relatively large database (in CA terms, see Seedhouse, 2004: 84) allows for continuing interaction between analysis, theory, and sampling.

- as new factors emerge it will be possible to increase the sample to accommodate them
- it will be possible to move from a relatively restricted focus initially to use the wider sample for later tests of emerging generalization
- unexpected generalizations during data analysis lead to new deviant cases (Silverman, 2000: 108)

My sequentially founded cases have been analysed in some detail in my four framing sessions and pursued where necessary into the further layers of context available in the database.

People and Procedures

The ICELT is an early in-service training course for English teachers with at least 500 hours of classroom experience. Trainees are usually non-native speakers. The ICELT (at the time of the research known as the Certificate for Overseas Teachers of English - COTE) has been central to teacher training projects in Mexico at university level, supported by the Mexican Ministry of Education.

The ICELT course I tracked had 12 participants from private language schools, private and public primary, secondary and high schools in Mexico City.   The ICELT Syllabus and Assessment Guidelines (2005) have this to say about the target candidature:

> ICELT candidates are likely to have very different levels of previous teaching experience. Some may have substantial previous English language teaching experience but little practical training; others may have been trained as primary/secondary teachers and now need to extend their skills to include language teaching. (p2)

This ICELT group reflected this mixed levels profile in terms of work context and years of experience. The language requirement for entry to an ICELT course is Cambridge First Certificate.   The ICELT course outside Mexico City was for university teachers at a state university.

The DELTA is a teacher training course for experienced teachers with at least two years teaching experience and 1200 hours of recent classroom experience. Participants are expected to have a degree and a previous training in ELT at pre-service or early in-service (eg ICELT). There is no specified language requirement for DELTA, only a requirement that an applicant should have a level of written and spoken English sufficient to follow the course and complete all assessed elements successfully (DELTA Pilot Syllabus Guidelines, 1998: 3). Institutions typically look for at least a Certificate of Advanced English or IELTS 7.5 as an entrance minimum for non-native speakers. The main aims of ICELT and DELTA courses are set out in Appendix 1.

There were ten trainees on my DELTA course, four native speakers and six non-native speakers. All the trainees except one (who taught at one of the three main British schools in Mexico city) came from one of the three large language teaching organisations based in Mexico City and with branches around the country. DELTA is required by Cambridge as a course for prospective teacher trainers, while the DELTA had recently become a requirement for teachers working in one of those centres.

For recording at the training sessions, I used a Coomber 2241 Stereo CD Cassette Recorder with unidirectional external microphone. Outside Mexico City at the state university ICELT, I used an Optimus portable tape recorder with external unidirectional microphone. The dates of course visits are shown in the table below.

DELTA	ICELT
8.2.2002	20.2.2004
26.3.2002	19.3.2004
7.6.2002	23.4.2004
5.7.2002	30.4.2004
19.7.2002	21.5.2004

Outside Mexico City, the recording visits to the state university ICELT were on the following dates:
- 1.2.2002
- 22/23.2.2002
- 8.3.2002

Ethics

The nature of qualitative research, involving as it often does 'an intimate engagement with the public and private lives of individuals' (Mason in Silverman, 2000: 201), raises ethical issues involving the values of the researcher and their responsibility to those studied.   Guillemin and Gillam (in Kubanyiova, 2008) have drawn attention to the tensions between *macroethics* and *microethics* and consequent issues confronting a researcher *in situ*. By *macroethics* they mean the procedural ethics related to seeking approval for a piece of research (especially if funded) from relevant institutional committees and the general ethical principles embodied in various professional codes of conduct. By *microethics*, they refer to a researcher's awareness of ethically important moments in the course of research, typically deriving from the relational nature of qualitative, situated research and the invariably changing nature of relations between researcher and researched.

The tensions arising from principles in pactice largely revolve around consent, anonymity and confidentiality of data and have been discussed by a number of scholars (see for example, Nespor, 2000; Richards, 2003; Walford, 2005; Wiles et al, 2008; Kubanyiova, 2008; Kaiser, 2009). I want to take each area in turn, to identify the issues and relate them to my own research.

Consent

Informed consent is essentially giving sufficient and accurate information about the research which is relevant to subjects' decision on whether to participate, and ensuring that consent is voluntary, for example by getting written or formal consent (see Punch, 1998: 170-174; Silverman, 2000: 201-205). A researcher needs first to ask when consent is needed, what form it takes, how far and for how long it extends, the degree of freedom on the part of research subjects in giving it, and the extent of the representation of the research by the researcher (and so the degree of honesty on their part) (Kent, 2001; Richards, 2003)

With trainers before the research and with all groups of trainees on my first visit to their classrooms, I told them what I was doing (describing training classroom discourse) and why (because nobody had done it before and that at some point it might be useful for training the trainers courses). I told trainers and trainees that when I had completed my research I would contact them to ask if they wished to have a copy of it. I also said that if I were to include any part of the research for publication, they had the right to refuse permission. In following these procedures I felt at the time that I provided honest and adequate information for informed consent; that those involved had a say in future public representations; and that all relevant permissions had been obtained. (Kent, 2000).

In retrospect, however, I recognise that I should have gone further and obtained written consent from trainees and trainers. The recordings which form the data for my research were made in 2002-2004. At that time, ethical issues were significantly less important than they are now, especially in my own field of applied linguistics, where 'situated' research projects (Kubanyiova, 2008) were not as commonplace as they are now, and where macroethical dictates from universities and professional organisations (in my case, BAAL, for example) were not what they might now be. The macroethical contractual element introduced by written consent would also provide a basis for the microethical element of periodic review with research participants to see if in fact my presence in sessions was making some or all subjects uncomfortable or had changed the way they viewed me and they wished to opt out or make changes. Microethical issues of this sort will often confront the researcher with individual as opposed to group ethics, making even more demands on them in terms of ethical decision-making.

Anonymity and Confidentiality

Wiles et al (2008: 417) note that confidentiality and anonymity are closely linked as the latter is a key element in operationalising the former. Anonymity involves not naming a person or research site and not disclosing information that would allow others to identify them. However most researchers agree that anonymity is hard to guarantee (eg Nespor, 2000; Walford, 2005), not least because the sort of rich and detailed description of people, places and activities at the heart of qualitative research makes deductive disclosure by outsiders a real possibility.

Holding back information in the interests of confidentiality could undermine the point of the research and is perhaps one of the central dilemmas facing a qualitative researcher, ' a conflict between conveying detailed, accurate accounts of the social world while protecting the identities of the individuals who live in that particular world (Kaiser, 2009: 139; Walford, 2005: 85).   Once again, almost a decade after the decision-making fact, I would have done things differently, certainly in terms of anonymity. I would not have located the research site or the courses running there. This may not have prevented the relevant 'local people' (Nespor, 2000: 549) from identifying the trainers involved if they read the research report, but it certainly would have preserved anonymity outside Mexico. In this respect, I would have better addressed a central macroethical issue.

It might be said that transcripts present less of a threat to anonymity and confidentiality/privacy issues than the interviews and participant observation studies that have framed ethical debates. While the three trainers in my research were colleagues and friends, I never at any point talked to them or the trainees outside the classroom, never as I saw it needed to confront the insider-friends issues (see Taylor, 2011). I assumed that the tapes would make for a relatively impersonal, arms-length representation of information. I felt that giving all those involved the right to a say in the nature and extent of future representation gave them an important degree of control over disclosure. This fitted with Kaiser's alternative approach to confidentiality (2009: 1636), where the researcher thinks ahead and shares with respondents, informing them of any changed plans and audiences during the research, and does not assume that confidentiality is the only option desired by subjects. The inductive nature of QI need not be compromised as long as there is continuing communication between researcher and respondents, but I now acknowledge that this was a second ethical problem of my research, this time a microethical one. There was no continuing dialogue or review of consent or confidentiality issues which would have addressed both macro and micro levels, ethical principles in practice.

In sum, the reflexivity at the heart of qualitative research extends beyond the construction of knowledge to ethical issues (Guillermin and Gillam, 2004; Kubanyiova, 2008) and this is something I was not sufficiently aware of when starting my research, almost 10 years ago. Each individual needs to tread their own contextual path, but self-consciousness and an awareness of the ethical issues is a first step in what is importantly a continuing process.

Reflexivity

Considering ethical issues is part of the reflexivity of the qualitative researcher. The perceptions of the researcher are shaped by their personality and values and by the nature of their interactions with the researched and in this sense the researcher is 'his or her own research instrument' (Punch, 1998: 158)

Reflexivity is the impossibility of separating the researcher from the research and its subjects. The researcher's identity can affect qualitative research in a number of different ways and at different points in the research process.

1 The selection of topic

2 Data collection

3 Writing up

(Taylor, 2001: 16-17)

Reflexivity revolves around questions of validity and reliability and I shall deal with these in more detail in Section 5 of this chapter. Here I want to look at Phase 2, data collection, and I shall briefly discuss the basis for my approach and consider the extent to which my relationship to research participants and the institution in my own particular context might have affected my own data collection and analysis.

The central methodological issue of *representation* and the identity of the researcher - the question of authorial presence - has to be seen as a challenge to be addressed, and accepted rather than avoided. If one accepts the inevitability, indeed the necessity of this presence, then the question is how to build it into the research in a systematic way. My answer to the question takes as its starting point the need for an 'intense methodological awareness' (Seale, 1999: 33). Perhaps self-awareness would be a more accurate term to describe this systematic accounting for research activities and results. This awareness is allied to a belief that there is a story to be told which, while very much shaped by the teller, still qualifies as non-fiction.

> "…we do not see reflexivity as undermining researchers´ commitment to realism. In our view it only undermines naïve forms of realism which assume that knowledge must be based on some absolutely secure foundation…..For us, the primary goal of research is, and must remain, the production of knowledge." (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995: 17)

Here is a position statement for what Hammersley later termed *subtle realism* (1998: 66). This specification of a fallibilistic framework for social research and its conception of truth and validity is founded on two assertions:

❑ No knowledge is certain, but knowledge claims can be judged in terms of their likely truth

❑ There are phenomena independent of us as researchers or readers of which we can have such knowledge

The danger of this approach, as Hammersley & Atkinson (1995: 21) acknowledge, is that, while accepting the idea of a social science, it runs the risk of confusing common sense knowledge with this science. How different is this from investigative journalism? The answer is that, unlike an investigative journalist, the social researcher has to work with footnotes, or what has been called an 'auditing trail´(Lincoln and Guba, 1985: 382; Bassey, 1999, 61; Seale, 1999: 44,45) This documentation of who said what to who, how and when, along with the researcher´s actions, changing views and roles, and interpretations has to be built into the research process and frame the writing. This is not intended to make the research replicable, but, rather, to provide

> " ..a fully reflexive account of procedures and methods, showing readers in as much detail as possible the lines of enquiry that have led to particular conclusions. This enables the reader imaginatively to 'replicate´studies, and also helps to ensure that claims are supported by adequate evidence."
> (Seale, 1999: 157, 158)

From the reader´s side, there is a methodology present too. This can be seen as a checklist of expectations, which differs significantly from the reader of Sunday newspaper exclusives. Hammersley (1998: 68) notes that, unlike journalists or people in their everyday lives, researchers specialise in inquiry. And there is a particular audience for these inquiries: a research community which provides a wider context for this specialisation and embodies rigorous investigation of claims to validity. This special and specialised writer-reader relationship differentiates research from other sorts of investigative writing.

Being read and being open are, then, two key notions in taking common sense into a more scientific realm. These are important as 'guiding ideals' (Seale, 1999) for my approach. I will need to show in my discussion of validity and reliability, that such ideas translate into systematic accounting procedures.

How might my position as employee of the institution or setting of the research have affected data collection and analysis? My employer supported the professional development of its staff and I was one of three or four trainers and consultants in the ELT section encouraged to do a PhD and supported financially in doing so. There was no contractual agreement that in return for financial support the institution would have any control on how I went about the research or on the shaping of the product. I am clear that my position in the institution was not a factor affecting process or product.

The three trainers who were research subjects were all long-time colleagues. Is there a danger that I might try to select, hide, avoid, soften, slant the evidence because of these relationships? I would point to two related reasons for maintaining that they did not affect data collection and analysis.   First, I was not doing ethnography, a participant observer reliant on interviews and observation (field notes) for my data, with their inherent problems of representation. There was no interaction with trainers before, during or after sessions, I did not discuss my research with them, they did not ask me about findings. Collecting the data over a number of sessions, and indeed the very nature of my relationship with trainers, meant that it would have been very hard for them to 'hide' their style and approach to training.

I did not know any of the trainees in the sessions I recorded and again did not interact with them inside or outside sessions. The only exception to this was with the DELTA group, with whom I did two guest training sessions, but after I had completed recording.

My second reason for arguing that relationships did not unduly influence collection and analysis was that while my research was broadly a discourse analytic study, its use of a CA approach and its reliance on tape recordings meant that participants could speak for themselves in important respects. At the centre of methodological strategy in CA is that while an analyst is intent on an 'emic' perspective (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995), to see things as far as possible as participants see and interpret them, it is the social members who do the interpretation, and 'seeing things' in this case is seeing how participants in talk-in-interaction make meanings in sequential contexts of interaction. As I shall discuss in the next section, tapes need translating into transcripts and there is much that can be lost in such translation, but again, being open about analytical procedures and their shortcomings remains a safeguard in a constructivist approach to the research context and its participants which takes subtle realism as its framework.

2.2   Data Collection Methods

In this section of the chapter I shall briefly review CA's aims and analytic strategies and the consequent primacy of audio recordings as data, showing how this data collection method is also appropriate to my own research.   I shall then examine issues concerning the relationship between tape and transcript and discuss how I have dealt with them. Finally, I look at the level of detail in transcription, the choices I have made and the reasoning behind them.

CA and its Method

In their introduction to *Structures of Social Action*, Atkinson and Heritage (1984: 1) set out the main aim of CA: 'the description and explication of the competences that ordinary speakers use and rely on in participating in intelligible, socially organized interaction.' Chomsky once characterised the search for deep structures as trying to map the inside of the sun. CA analysts do not face such a momentous task but there is still the problem of the 'invisibility of common sense procedures' (ten Have, 1990).

Garfinkel's (1967) solution to the problem was his breaching procedures. Ethnomethodologically informed conversation analysis turned to materials collected from naturally occurring occasions of everyday interaction through the use of audio- and video-recordings. The fact they were conversations was incidental; the important thing is that they happened; they were not hypothetical data. So they were accessible to observation and analysis (Sacks, 1992, Part II: 420). This was Sacks' answer to what he saw as the dilemma of sociology: how could it handle the details of actual events and handle them formally in terms of description (Sacks, 1992, Part I: 620). Tape recorded conversations could be typed out, replayed, studied again and again, and, in theory, the materials studied were also accessible to others (Sacks, 1992, Part I: 622). The macro concerns of social action and social order could be studied in the micro detail of conversations.

Tape recordings as primary data are, then, a reflection of CA's analytic aims. The methodological advantages they have are summed up by Atkinson and Heritage (1984: 4):

1. The are more accurate, detailed and reliable than field notes or recollection.
2. The analyst is exposed to a wide range of interactions and situations and analysis is less dependent on intuition, selective recall or experimental design.
3. A taped record allows repeated and detailed examination of interactional events and enhances the range and precision of observations.
4. They are available for public scrutiny.
5. Their availability in raw form makes them reusable and reexaminable in the light of new observations and findings.

My CA founded approach to analysing institutional interaction is grounded in the comparative method of sequential analysis: how do patterns of interaction differ from those of conversation? How do participants orient to institutional tasks and identities in the orders or structures of interaction?   This makes audio recordings and transcription more relevant than observation, text analysis or interviews (see Silverman, 2000: 90) in collecting data on the interaction order. I triangulate this comparative analysis through data from my institutional context, from other institutional contexts and from ordinary conversational contexts.

I have not chosen to use video recordings because I felt that in a relatively small room where I was observing, it would be intrusive and that there would be a greater impact on how participants behaved in that setting than there would if I used a tape recorder and a notebook. In practical terms, if I set up a video camera to record a training session, there would be difficulties in making sure that the camera would capture all the necessary particulars regarding participants and setting to understand what was going on.

While the absence of visual information has an impact on the reliability of the analysis in terms of possibly important information lost, the focus of my research on the sequential organization of interaction makes the reliance on audio tapes alone less of a serious threat to reliability. I am not trying to say anything about attitudes, relationships, movement, etc, and certainly nothing that a reasonable set of field notes could not capture.

Methodological Issues with Tapes and Transcription

Criticism of tapes as primary data source has derived from two main concerns. First, the narrowness of the database: the tape and only the tape. My earlier discussion of the central notion of context in CA and Institutional Talk and the allowance for the possibility of 'ethnographic particulars' being relevant to a description of the institutional order informing the interaction order means that I will need to justify my exclusion of interviews or systematic observation as relevant methods for information. I will do this in **Section 3.**

A second criticism concerns the relationship between tapes and data and the reality of CA's claim that the taped record should be allowed to speak for itself. In traditional observation, as I have noted in the preceding section, field notes and the 'observer's effect' on what is seen and recorded, and on the behaviour of the subjects, are central methodological concerns (see Ochs, 1979: 44). Tape recordings do not get rid of the problem of selective observation: it is just delayed until the moment 'the researcher sits down to transcribe the material from the audio or videotape.' (Ochs, 1979: 44)

As ten Have (2004: 43) has pointed out, transcription is one phase in the process of doing conversation analysis. As with any form of data collection, the process is inherently one of selection and reduction (see Miles and Huberman, 1994). ten Have italicizes the selectively reductive elements in the process as:

Original(inter-)action > *recording* > (audio/video record) > *transcription* > transcript > (action)*understanding* > procedural *analysis* > analytical argument. (2004: 43)

The reality is that, of course, transciption is a selective and theory-laden version of the original event (Atkinson and Heritage, 1984; ten Have, 1999). The problematic relationship between the (realist) tape and (constructivist) transcript (Ashmore and Reed, 2004) has been addressed by a range of researchers. The general consensus is that transcription is not so much translation as representation (see eg Ochs, 1979; Roberts, 1997; Green et al, 1997; Lapidat and Lindsay, 1999; ten Have, 1999, 2004; Tilley, 2003; Ashmore and Reed, 2004).

In my view, too much is made of what is as much a practical as an interpretive process. A compromise is necessary between detail and readability. Moreover, CA researchers are generally careful to stress that transcriptions are not data; the tape is the data, while transcriptions are a convenient reference or tool in the analysis of data   Transcripts are 'produced and designed for use in *close conjunction with* the tape-recorded materials that constitute the data base' (Atkinson and Heritage, 1984: 12; Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998: 73-74).

What seems to me important here relates to elements of the trustworthiness and credibility discussed by Guba and Lincoln (1985), an honest presentation of data, collection methods and analysis that are the basis for *authentication* by a reader (Edge and Richards, 1998: 351). Transcription should be principled as well as practical. The basis for selectivity should be clear in a report and should reflect what is known of subjects and setting as well as the researcher's questions or hypotheses (Ochs, 1979: 44; cf Richards, 2003: 199).

> The challenge for the transcriber is to produce transcriptions that are accurate and readable but that are also reflexive in how they make explicit to the reader the constructed nature of written talk and so the problematic nature of accuracy and readability.
> (Roberts, 1997: 68)

Transcribing Teacher Trainer Talk

A CA derived transcription system, whether narrowly or broadly conceived (see Dressler and Kreus, 2000) aims to uncover sequential features of talk. ten Have (1999: 80-89) sets out the different elements in transcribing taped materials that an analyst must consider in making decisions.

1. Words as Spoken
2. Sounds as Uttered
3. Inaudible or Incomprehensible Sounds or Words
4. Spaces/Silences
5. Overlapped Speech or Sounds
6. Pace, stretches, stresses, volume

These aspects of delivery and turn taking are all included in Seedhouse's (2004) approach to transcription drawing on the the standardized CA system for transcription, based on the work of Gail Jefferson (see Jefferson, 1985; 1989). Capturing these basic elements of delivery and turn-taking are reasonably well-established and I have adopted them in my own transcription system (see Appendix 2).

Within this basic framework, more fine-grained decisions are called for and when considering further detail, I drew on Richards' (2003: 199-2005) three criteria for transcription decision-making:

- fitness for the purpose - the features that are included match the research purpose and the interactional sequences in focus
- adequacy - of detail in the transcription
- accuracy - of sound to writing

Turn Taking

My research questions focus on structures of interaction in teacher trainer talk, so a principled approach to overlap, silences or pauses within and between turns would be important.   One decision I needed to make in this respect was whether to make interrupted turns consecutive or concurrent in terms of transcription. These two options are shown in Extracts 1 and 2.

Extract 1

S   I think that Stern's approach   was basically
T   yeah Fundamental Concepts
S   eclectic rather than trying to have a single way of teaching.

Extract 2

S   I think that Stern's approach-
T   yeah Fundamental Concepts-
S   was basically eclectic rather than trying to have a single way of
S   teaching.

The distinction may appear on the surface to be of little consequence, but in turn-taking terms, we may want to indicate when a turn is trying to take the floor (Extract 2) or is more akin to back channel support (Extract 1). This is clearly yet another close transcription call where the reader has to trust the transcriber. Because of my focus on participation structures and different types of speech exchange systems underpinning interaction, it seemed a distinction worth trying to make, and so I have tried to indicate each type when they occur, and relate them to the interactional context in which they are produced.

I have noted silences of over 1 second within trainer and trainee speech and have generally allocated significant silences to unoccupied turns, typically in the case of trainer questions. This seems a reasonable compromise in tracking pauses for thought, word searches, and so on, as well as for indicating possible turn constructional units (see Schegloff, 1996; 2007).

Aspects of Delivery

The main issue here concerns adequacy of transcription in relation to sounds. ten Have (1999) suggests that there are three options available:

- standard orthography throughout
- standard orthography most of the time with some modification to mark specially significant 'deviations'
- use modifications (eye dialect) continuously and as far as possible consistently

I have for the most part stuck to standard orthography (fitness and adequacy), except on rare occasions where eye dialect or unconventional spelling are relevant to analytic purpose and are used to mark a piece of interaction (see Coates and Thornborrow, 1999: 595; Richards, 2003: 202). One of the most common distinctions I have made in this respect is with 'yes' and 'yeah', where the former (often accompanied by :: symbols to indicate lengthening of the vowel and/or consonant) signals strong agreement and the latter normally functions as a continuer.

Finally, I have included where I felt necessary ten Have's (1999: 87) process elements of delivery: pace, stretches, stresses, volume, etc. All these elements seem relevant to different turn taking and sequential features of trainer talk, related aspects of delivery, and the shapes of participation structures produced.

As Richards (2003: 202) notes, the search for accuracy is a doomed enterprise. He advocates the most honest representation possible, given the resources at our disposal, and, I would add, the kind of interaction we are trying to represent. Returning to the same recording a number of times as well as using different machines if possible, are ways Richards recommends for trying to be more accurate (although Ashmore and Reed warn of the interpretive refractions or distancings of 'nostalgia' involved in further listenings). I have followed both these practical precepts, without wishing to suggest that they always lead to greater accuracy. What they do encourage is a greater awareness of the complexity of 'hearing what is said'. Listening again to an extract of talk that I could not transcribe has sometimes enabled a transcription; listening again to an extract that I have heard as unproblematic has sometimes led me to significantly different interpretations. However, it has also brought me up against the question to which there is only a practical answer measured in time available: how often do I go back to a taped extract?

In essence, a narrow v broad approach to transcription brings us up against issues of reliability v validity in a broader qualitative research context. A narrow (deep) system immediately raises issues of reliability, because perhaps no two researchers would transcribe the same way.

"An important benefit of broad transcription is that it requires a fairly small and easily learned set of symbols, therefore resulting in higher interjudge reliability. On the other hand a broader transcription may gloss over important distinctions" (Dressler and Kreus, 2000: 27)

Dressler and Kreus' broad transcription schema has 21 symbols, while mine has 23. With my research aims in mind I have leaned towards reliability over validity, while arguing that in terms of fitness for the purpose and adequacy, I have picked up important distinctions.

Tapes, Transcripts and Rich Description

I would argue that even with a more broad-based approach to transcription, that if taping and transcription take place in the same place, over time, then the tape and analytic immersion in it provide a characteristically CA form of rich description, not so much of people in groups and communities, but of the interactional sequences which are my cases. This is importantly because my claim to 'vulgar competence' is not grounded just in my general work experience. In OC, the detailed interactional analysis of a collection of what Garfinkel has termed 'fat moments' drawn from a range of sites might be sufficient to get at the underlying rules and machinery. In institutional interaction, the collection and detailed analysis of a series of interactional sequences from the same context over time (the minimal variation strategy I have noted) can provide the analysis with the sort of detailed sequential information which taps into the 'deep' structures of this form of institutional talk-in-interaction. Rich description for the CA analyst does not involve them moving too far from tapes and trancripts. This is another way of bringing the institutional to the interactional (see also Fitch, 1998; Makitalo and Saljo, 2002)

This longditudinal understanding of the 'messo context' (Day, 2008) - the local workplace represented in interactional sequences and previous interactions in that workplace - enables a rich description of the sequential contexts captured by the tape. This, along with a continuing reflectivity about the relationship between tape and transcript, is the CA equivalent of subtle realism.

Section 3   Analysing Institutional Data

3.1   Collections and Patterns: CA's Analytic-Inductive Approach

Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998: 95) identify 3 main stages in CA procedure:

1. Locate potentially interesting phenomena in the data (a kind of turn or sequence for example)
2. Collect a number of instances of the phenomena and describe one particular instance formally focusing on sequential context
3. Return to the data to see if other examples of the phenomena can be described in terms of this account or whether further data can be the basis for refining and clarifying

In essence, the first phase is empirical and descriptive, resulting in patterns (a collection of cases); the second involves more analytic or theoretical aspects focused on bringing out the 'endogenous logic' of the interaction (ten Have, 1999: 40).

> "The CA analyst tries to come to an understanding of what participants themselves take it they are doing; but to do that we need to have some access to the interpretive and inferential resources which the participants are relying on." (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998:113)

While CA has an established analytic procedure and related guidelines (see Silverman, 1998: ch 4 for a synthesis of Sacks' analytic maxims which were the CA template), there is obviously a danger of using the CA apparatus in a mechanistic way. In any interactional event, we might argue that participants have the structures or rules of interaction available as reference, but an analyst cannot assume and must show participants' orientation to the 'grammar rules for interaction' (Sacks, 1992), through third turn proofs, deviant cases, in-depth analysis, and so on.   For the analyst, it is not so much a case of following formulae or rules of description, but rather having the conversation analytic mentality (Schenkein, 1978). CA's rigorous empiricism does not preclude it from sharing common analytic ground with ethnography in its reliance to a greater or lesser extent on the insights and noticings of the analyst.

One important question arises as a prelude to stage one: what counts as a phenomenon? Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998: 110-111) note through a discussion of examples from the literature that the focus could be on formal (linguistic) features or sequential features. What draws together an often disparate range of devices is that the analytic interest lies in the interactional work they are doing.

Rather like ethnography, the starting point for a CA analysis is what Psathas (1999; see also Schegloff, 1996: 172) has called **unmotivated looking**. However, is this unmotivated browsing in data as unpremeditated a process as Sacks would have it, where '...starting a consideration and developing points on it does not require a hypothesis. It just involves sitting down at some point and making a bunch of observations and seeing where they'll go '(1992, Vol I: 664)? Certainly, the payoffs can be considerable, for as Sacks notes, time and again in analysing tapes and transcripts,

> ... what stands as a solution to some problem emerges from unmotivated
> examination of some piece of data, where, had we started out with a specific
> interest in the problem, it would not have been supposed in the first instance
> that this piece of data was a resource with which to consider, and come up
> with a solution for, that particular problem. (1984a: 27)

But I would argue that the accumulated noticings and analytic problems of CA research, whether they be of types of sequence (top down) and the actions they perform or features of the talk, forms (bottom up) and the actions they perform, will usually mean that an analyst will have something in mind, and this will sometimes be formalised in their research questions (or problems).

My own starting point was not unmotivated looking. Following Seedhouse's (2004) work, one key area for my looking in the data was different sequential contexts for trainer talk and the distinctive structures of interaction participants in these contexts produced. What similarities and differences were there in language and training classrooms in this respect?

My second main focus, the orientation to institutional identities and the management of institutionally relevant activities, drew on CA and IT work on identity, and aimed through comparative analysis to say something about institutional tasks and identities in this particular institutional context (see Drew and Sorjonen, 1997; Benwell and Stokoe, 2006). Such motivated looking was also part of the purposive sampling underlying data collection I noted in Section 2 (see ten Have, 1999: 51,52; Silverman, 2000: 104, 105)

3.2   Analysing Institutional Talk

In my approach to analysis, I will use Heritage's suggested analytic framework for probing the '"institutionality" of interaction' in a sequential context. He recommends probing at 6 main levels:

1. Turn-taking organization
2. Overall structural organization of the interaction
3. Sequence organization
4. Turn Design
5. Lexical choice
6. Forms of asymmetry
(2004: 225)

The restricted variety of talk that emerges from this sort of multi-levelled contextual analysis is characterized by turn-taking constraints or asymmetries, special tasks and identities, related sequential patterns and turns, and institutionally particularized inferential frameworks (Drew and Heritage, 1992; Heritage, 1997; 2004; Benwell and Stokoe, 2006). They create what Heritage and Greatbatch (1991) have called a unique fingerprint for each form of institutional talk.

These various layers of interaction frame the two fundamental levels of context for the study of institutional talk-in-interaction I established in chapter two and in Section 1 of this chapter:

- The proximal or micro context embodied in the sequential patterns of talk
- The distal or macro context indexed and oriented to by participants in the course of their talk in institutional settings.

Together, **sequence organization** (proximal-interactional) and **identity** (proximal-distal-institutional) provide a unique institutional fingerprint of structures-in-action (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991), 'the fingerprint being made up of specific tasks, identities, constraints on conduct, and relevant inferential procedures that the participants deploy and are oriented to in their interactions with one another.' (Heritage, 2004: 225) These two concepts are central to the analytic framework I use in chapters 4 and 5 to describe the **structure of interaction** (as defined in Chapter 1) in teacher training classrooms.

In distinguishing between turn-taking organization and sequence organization (rather than collapse the two), I follow Schegloff's classification of types of sequence organization, in particular his distinction between **sequential organization** and **sequence organization.** Sequential organization is the more general term and relates to how the relative positioning of utterances or actions are organized. In this sense, turn-taking is a type of sequential organization, 'because it concerns the relative ordering of speakers, of turn-constructional units and of different types of utterance.' (2007: 2). Sequence organization is the organization of courses of action through turns at talk, and sequences are 'the vehicle for getting some activity accomplished.' (2007: 2).

One set of rules oriented to by participants are those which organize *how* stretches of interaction are done in a meaningful and efficient way; the other set concerns *what* gets done in a particular interactional context. At both levels we may find certain kinds of turn and lexical choice (see Drew and Sorjonen, 1997), but the importance of the distinction for me is that one level of sequence organization is nested in the other, with the superordinate <u>sequential organization</u> being more environmentally friendly to some types of trainer tasks and identities - <u>sequence organization</u> - than to others.

Seedhouse's different types of sequential organization were linked to broad institutional goals, his variable pedagogic focus, and his institutional identities of teacher and student remained invariable. I want to try and specify in more detail the kinds of task that constitute a trainer's identity through talk-in-interaction and relate them to the different turn-taking contexts in which they are done. In doing this, I would also hope to be able to say more about the nature of a trainer's institutional identity, as evidenced in different tasks. Seedhouse's study provides a basis for analytic comparison at the level of sequential organization. I hope to build on it through my more explicit focus on the level of sequence organization.

The two levels of sequence organization will be characterised by greater or lesser interactional asymmetries, which again contribute towards the analysis of a particular institutional setting. Heritage (2004) mentions four types of asymmetry:

(1) participation
(2) "knowhow" about the interaction and the institution in which it is
(3) knowledge
(4) rights to knowledge

Asymmetries of participation are the most commonly associated with institutional talk, especially of the formal kind. Heritage acknowledges that the contrast between the symmetry of ordinary conversation and the asymmetry of IT is overdone.

> "…all social interaction must inevitably be asymmetric on a moment-to moment basis and many interactions are likely to embody substantial asymmetry…" (p236)

However, IT is unlike conversation in that there is a close link between asymmetries, tasks and identities. In classrooms, courtrooms and doctor's offices, institutional representatives commonly ask questions and require 'lay participants' to answer them. This asymmetry clearly allows for control of topic initiation, shaping and closing, among other things (p237).

Asymmetries of interactional and institutional knowhow are described by Heritage in terms of routine (the institutional participant) v uniqueness (the client or lay participant). Here and with asymmetries of participation, an important analytic question will be whether the role of teacher-in-training will have an impact on these two areas of asymmetry.

Asymmetries of knowledge can lead to what Heritage (2004) and Drew and Heritage (1992) term epistemological caution, where professionals 'avoid committing themselves to take firm positions'. But caution is also allied to epistemological superiority where 'expert authority' resides in access to (and rights of access to) a significantly greater knowledge base and related professional terminology. Again, one might anticipate differences in a training classroom, particularly with regard to the exercise of epistemological caution on the part of the trainer.

Heritage calls turn-taking organization and asymmetries "wild cards" in the institutional pack (p241). Sequential organization will affect all the other levels in terms of kinds of task, turn and lexical choice, while different forms of interactional asymmetry are embodied at all levels of institutional interaction and will be an important focus in my analysis of sequential organization and sequence organization.

3.3   Analytic Strategies

In this final part of Section 3, I want to consider practical analytic procedures for examining turn-taking and sequence organization. A range of analysts working within a CA tradition have suggested the components of a more detailed approach to looking at the data.

Pomerantz and Fehr (1997) propose the following steps:
- o   Select a sequence
- o   Characterize actions (in a sequence on a turn by turn basis)
- o   Consider language forms/packaging chosen and the structure/options these set up
- o   Consider timing and turn-taking
- o   Consider the identities/roles implicating in the ' doing' of actions.

The movement is from activity type (what's going on here in general terms) to sequential development > the wider context, inside-out, or as far as the inside and the observed orientations of participants will take you.

Aside from Pomerantz and Fehr, there have been quite a number of proposed analytic strategy procedures (see eg ten Have, 1999; Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998; Markee, 2000; Wetherall, Taylor and Yates, 2001; Silverman, 2002; Richards, 2003; Seedhouse, 2004; 2005). None of them are put forward as **the way** of doing conversation analysis, but, rather, can be seen as a sharing of analytic experiences. Pomerantz and Fehr's procedure is representative of the main steps noted in different procedural schemata.

I have drawn on all of them for my own approach to data analysis:

- Step 1   Classifying an Activity Sequence
- Step 2   Sequential Description
- Step 3   Interactional Patterns and Sequences
- Step 4 Institutionality and Context

Step 2 is at the heart of it all. In analysing sequential organization, an analyst will bring with them their CA 'toolkit' and checklist:

- turns and their relation to each other - interactional functioning or the business a turn does
- adjacency and related essential features
- turn construction/forms/audience design/preference organization/topic initiation and development/repair
(ten Have, 1999: 107)

This thick sequential description of often extended cases of institutional talk will be the basis for a continuing revision of ideas about what kind of activity is taking place, as well as a developing picture of noteworthy patterns and sequences, and the orientation to context displayed by participants in their construction of interactional sequences.
I have noted that mine is an analysis of institutional talk, and that institutionality is to be found above all in a comparison of sequence organization in my institutional context with ordinary conversation and with other institutional contexts, isolating the context-sensitive elements of sequence organization which sets IT apart from its context-free conversational benchmark (Heritage, 1984).

Section 4   Validity and Reliability

Analysis leads to interpretation and representation and the attendant need for the analyst to show the validity of their interpretations and the reliability of their methods for reaching them. Validity is the extent to which a representation of social phenomena is accurate (Hammersley, 1992). Reliability refers to the consistency with which instances are assigned to the same categories or classifications by different observers or by the same observer on different occasions (Hammersley, 1990). Here I will review issues regarding validity and reliability in qualitative research and then go on to consider these in the context of a CA based approach to analysing institutional interaction.

4.1   Issues in Qualitative Research

Altheide and Johnson (1998) note that with the greater recognition afforded qualitative research and ethnography over the past 30 years has come increased criticism and debate, as much if not more from within as from outside ethnography. This has been a consequence of the 'reflexive turn' (p284), which has led to a related focus on the ethnographer's role, the status of knowledge claims and in particular the validity of such relative and localized findings.   Key issues in the debates on validity are:

- o   representation - the problems of showing the realities of the lived experiences of the observed settings
- o   reporting - the extent to which a researcher's discourse may contain rhetorical features
- o   interpretation and voice - whose point of view is taken to report the findings (1998: 286)

In some respects qualitative inquiry (QI) is a victim of its own success. The multiplication of different ways of doing QI has led to the 'crisis of representation' described by Denzin and Lincoln (1998) and referred to in section 2.1.3 of this chapter. The focus of the discussion became a dual one: it was not just the the validity of fieldwork (the researcher in context), but what happened to the fieldwork when the researcher got back to the office (out of context) (Altheide and Johnson, 1998: 286; see too van Maanen, 1988). The dangers of selectivity and anecdotalism in the writing up of findings were further threats to validity (Silverman, 2000; 2001).

Perakyla (2004) reminds us that there is no single, coherent set of 'qualitative methods' applicable in all analysis of social interaction; rather, a researcher has a variety of ways of collecting and analysing social phenomena. One factor, objectivity, unites this range of qualitative methods, in so far as they 'claim an epistemic status different from common sense' or 'claim to report more than the research subjects' own descriptions of their circumstances' (p283). Enhancing objectivity is a concrete activity, but dealing with issues of reliability and validity will take a different shape in different methods (p284).

Edge and Richards (1998), in discussing such issues in a TESOL context, imply that whatever a researcher's response to issues of representation, one basic maxim is 'to thy own tradition or framework be true', in terms of what might be an acceptable warrant for the claims being made. The measures adopted to enhance validity and reliability should be coherent in the context of the particular approach or tradition that frames the research. This has underlied my approach to addressing these issues of representation.

4.2 Enhancing Reliability

Two ways of enhancing reliability with particular relevance to CA studies are noted by Searle (1999: 148): low inference descriptors and recording data mechanically. By low inference descriptors Searle means the recording of observations in terms that are as concrete as possible, including verbatim accounts of what people say, as opposed to researchers´constructions of what people say.

As Perakyla (2004: 285) points out, working with audio and video recordings and transcripts 'eliminates at one stroke many of the problems that ethnographers have with the unspecified accuracy of field notes and with limited public access to them.' (see also Searle, 1999: 158). This is of course dependent on the kind of care with transcription in terms of relevant detail and comprehensiveness and standardization of transcription methods which I discussed in Section 2 of this chapter. The discussions in ten Have (1999) and Moffatt and Moffatt (2000) are a reminder that choice of equipment is something to consider carefully in this respect.

Offsetting accuracy and public access, audio- and video-tapes may be problematic in terms of the inclusiveness of the data. Data loss may occur because it fails to capture temporal processes, ambulatory events, and the impact of texts ((Perakyla, 2004: 286). My research is not based on single encounters but a series of encounters in the same setting over a period of time. As I explained in Section 2, this takes a series of tapes from the same institutional setting beyond what Garfinkel (1967) terms a 'fat moment'.

Sacks' (1984: 26) often quoted dictum regarding the potential of recordings (being able to get his hands on the data, replay it and let others do the same), is indirectly addressing the reliability issue. However, it is worth considering the final part of the quote, where he says that others could look at what he studied and 'make of it what they could, if, for example, they wanted to be able to disagree with me.' Whereas the first part was addressing what LeCompte and Goetz (1982) would term internal reliability, the second part is arguably considering their other type of reliability, external. Sacks seems to be saying that being able to replicate a study doesn't necessarily mean that others would come to the same conclusion. Other points of view are welcome, but disclosure of how a researcher went about things is a pre-requisite.

If Lincoln and Guba's (1985) proposed audit trail as an answer to external reliability questions is perhaps asking too much, then Searle's compromise seems closer to what Sacks is suggesting:

> Replicability is enhanced by showing readers as much detail as possible of the procedures being used to generate the story being told. Reflexive methodological accounting in this spirit, based on a qualified commitment to a broadly realist position, enhances credibility and can improve the quality of qualitative research.
> (1999: 147)

I noted in **1.3** how Searle (1999: 158) underlines the hoped-for result of this type of reflexive account of procedures and methods: it enables the reader 'imaginatively' to replicate studies, and also helps to ensure that claims are supported by adequate evidence. Seedhouse (2005: 254) suggests that the availability of transcripts, together increasingly with the accompanying audio and video files on the Web, mean that CA accounts are more reflexively honest on this count.

In terms of internal and external reliability I have argued throughout the chapter that my study reflects the strengths of a CA approach. However, the more reliability there is in a piece of research, the more threats to validity there are likely to be. Searle (1999: 158) notes that while the transcription conventions of CA have considerable advantages in giving full details of data, relatively free from the interpretive 'tidying up' of field notes, this should be balanced against the narrowness of scope allowed by CA methods.

4.3 Enhancing Validity

In QI enhancing validity is a major part of the reflexive accounting process that should underly ethnographic work. Altheide and Johnson (1998: 291,292) argue that this focus on the process of ethnographic work must attend to the key interactions involved and their relationship to interpretation:

- the relation between what´s observed and the wider context
- relations between the observer, observed and setting
- the issue of perspective – is it the member´s or observer´s perspective that is used to interpret
- the role of reader in the final product
- the representational, rhetorical or authorial style in reporting

This analytic realism has connections to Hammersley's (1992) subtle realism in its belief in knowable, independent knowledge, but also in its acceptance that there is no direct access to this knowledge. This leads to a central form of interaction in constructing validity: that between the disclosing researcher and the validating research community. Edge and Richards (1998) call the descriptive and theoretical validation of a research representation by its readers *authentication* and *legitimation*.

Searle (1999) and Silverman (2000; 2001) both put **falsification** at the centre of concrete measures within the research process to enhance validity.

> Seeking out and attempting to account for negative instances
> that contradict emerging or dominant ideas is a core approach in a fallibilistic
> analytic strategy devoted to improving the quality of research accounts.
> (1999: 173)

Seeking out problem cases is at the heart of the process. In CA approaches, enhancing validity resides in three main processes revolving around falsification:

1. Next turn proof
2. Constant comparative method
3. Deviant case analysis

Rather than the analyst tackling validation v falsification, an inbuilt methodological resource is that the participants do it for them. Participants falsify or validate proceedings, displaying to each other their interpretation and understanding of what is going on in the next turn (Sacks et al, 1974; Atkinson and Heritage, 1984; Perakyla, 2004; Seedhouse, 2005; Schegloff, 2007).   In my own setting of institutional talk, as we shall see in chapters 4 and 5, the presence of significant stretches of interaction where there is only one speaker and next turn proof is delayed or perhaps never provided, means that it is not as important as it is in ordinary conversation. Nevertheless, it plays an important role in checking validity, for me as for any CA-informed approach to interpretation.

The constant comparative method requires finding another case through which to test out an interpretation (Silverman, 2000). In CA, this involves noticing a phenomenon in your database, whether formal or sequential, and expanding your analysis from one part of the data to others in search of other examples. In my own study, I took one of my core of 4 training sessions and focused on all instances of trainer talk I encountered, transcribed, analysed and generated a provisional collection of sequential categories, then went looking for falsification or verification in a more selective and focused fashion in the other core training sessions. This runs counter to the common advice not to proceed in a linear fashion, but rather to look for something 'interesting'. As I have explained in Section 2, my approach was something more than unmotivated noticing.

The constant comparative method can lead the researcher to the question of comprehensive data treatment (Mehan, 1979; ten Have, 1999; Silverman, 2000; 2001): the possibility that all parts of the data must at some point be analysed.   ten Have (1999: 134) suggests that comprehensive data treatment is most useful in accounting for order in 'a relatively structured core situation' and cites Mehan's (1979) work on formal classroom discourse, Maynard's (1984) study of legal plea bargaining, and, outside institutional interaction, Schegloff's (1968) telephone openings. I would argue that my study falls outside this frame, not in the sense that the phenomena I am interested in are less frequently occurring, but rather that they are in the first instance less clearly structured.

Looking for counterparts to Seedhouse's four kinds of turn taking and sequence contexts in an informal institutional setting with no previous work to build on meant that while my phenomena were very generally describable as structures of interaction in trainer talk, they were uncharted sequential waters. However, the occurrence of different structural varieties was frequent enough in my core training sessions that variations in the sequential phenomena identified were themselves sufficiently frequent to be analysed. At the same time, the additional sessions contributed to the sort of large database referred to by Perakyla (2004: 288), which could be dipped into as needed, to check on problematic variable features.

The constant comparative method embodies deviant case analysis as a major tool. Clayman & Maynard (in Perakyla, 2004: 293; ten Have, 1999: 137) suggest that deviant cases can be dealt with in 3 ways:

1. They can provide additional support for the analysis in that participants orient to the same considerations and normative orientations that produce the regular cases. So for example, in ordinary conversation, the first pair part of an adjacency pair creates a conditional relevance for an appropriate second pair part. If this is not produced, orientation to the rules or expectations will be observable in hesitations, excuses, accounts, and so on (see Schegloff, 2007: 58 et seq for a discusson of preference)
2. They cannot be integrated into the analysis and so it needs to be reconstructed (as in Schegloff's well known one deviant case in 500 telephone openings, where the caller spoke first, leading Schegloff to reconceptualize his opening adjacency pair).
3. A third type of deviant case is neither of the above, which leads to an explanation being sought from 'the individual contingencies of the single case.'

Seedhouse's (2004: 163 et seq) discussion of the preference organization of language classroom repair and his case (or rather many cases) of the 'missing "no"' led him to reformulate his ideas about what kind of evaluative feedback can take place in a 3rd turn slot in an IRF pattern (and having established the interactional 'what', he then went on to offer an ethnographically grounded (in the sense of drawing on his own knowledge of the institutional context) 'why'. His further exploration identified examples of unmitigated, bald 'no' but he was able to explain them through the interactional particularities of the sequences (p169, 170).

Deviant case analysis has had an important impact on parts of the analysis presented in chapters 4 and 5 in my institutional study.

Construct Validity

One area of validity that should be mentioned with special reference to the analysis of institutional interaction is *construct validity*: the relationship between theoretical concepts and observations meant to represent them. In my study of institutional talk this has particular relevance.

Perakyla (2004: 294) asks: what grounds does the researcher have for claiming that the talk he or she is focusing on is in any way 'connected to' some institutional framework? This is a question I have tried to address in section 1 of this chapter in my discussion of participants' orientation to the institutional context. In my research, Schegloff's (1991; 1992) *categorial relevance* and *procedural consequentiality* are important criteria for construct validity claims, and I look for them at different levels in Heritage's schema, with membership categorization devices playing an important role in linking interactional to institutional order.

Generalizability

CA is labour-intensive and works with relatively small databases, like other kinds of QI. To what extent can findings be generalized?

I have adopted two main approaches to generalizing my findings about teacher trainer talk. One of them is a variation on the comparative method at the heart of a CA approach to IT. Instead of comparing CA with IT, however, the comparison is between different forms of IT. Hammersley (1992) suggests obtaining information about relevant aspects of the population of cases and comparing our information with them. ie at its most simple, reading about other 'cognate studies' and comparing our findings with theirs. In my study, I have looked for other instances of institutional interaction with similar sorts of sequence organization, comparable tasks and categorial identities. Seedhouse's study has been a starting point, but medicine, business, university seminars and other professional contexts have also been relevant comparative institutional sites.

This comparison of devices and their functioning in different institutional settings has played its part in chapters 4 and 5. It has allowed me to generalize about some sequential and formal features shared by a number of institutional settings, while at the same time show how different practices are shaped differently in sequential terms in each setting, locally sensitive to context. As Silverman (2000: 250) notes, this form of comparative method allows for larger claims about analysis without leaving the library.

In important respects however, my concern is not so much with generalizability across forms of institutional interaction as with the uniqueness of my 'institutional fingerprint'. In this sense, my case is, like Stake's (1998), of intrinsic interest for its own particularities. The generalizations I seek are 'within the case' (Atkinson and Hammersley, 1983; Miles and Huberman, 1994) and so I would be looking to other teacher training classrooms. Here is where I must turn to the reader as my 'population'.

> In practice, both qualitative and quantitative researchers rely on the common sense of readers to establish whether the proposed receiving context (or 'population') is similar to the cases studied.....this means, that readers must always make their own judgements about the relevance of findings for their own situations. Threats to such transferability are dealt with most adequately if details, or 'thick descriptions' of the 'sending' context (or the 'sample'), are provided. (Searle, 1999: 108)

My second strategy for generalization is related to the first and is built into the approach to data collection discussed in section 2. This theoretical sampling (Silverman, 2000) is in essence choosing cases in terms of your theory, because they illustrate phenomena in which you are interested. My methodological theory of context, described in section 1, is grounded on the CA premise that conversation is ordered and organized by a set of *a priori* rules (Sacks, 1984b), and that a theoretical grasp of these rules underlying interaction is possible through the observation of how participants systematically orient to these rules in the course of natural interaction. Institutional interaction is defined in relation to ordinary conversation, in that it involves a reduction in the range of ordinary interactional practices, and a specialization and respecification of those that remain (Drew and Heritage, 1992; Heritage, 2004). Rather than empirical generalization, this is analytically grounded, with the basis lying in logic rather than probability. You are choosing your case for its power to explain rather than its typicality (see ten Have, 1999: 136; Seale, 1999: 109-112).

Silverman's (2000: 252) uses Glaser and Strauss' discussion of awareness contexts in relation to dying in hospital as an illustration of theoretical generalization. The question is not whether the hospitals in question are typical, but whether the experiences of dying patients are. Are structures of institutional interaction - sequential features of trainer talk in my chosen classrooms - typical of those elsewhere? My argument will be that they are. This is partly a matter of thick description and reader application but it is also involves theoretical generalization. In discussing generalizability in insitutional interaction, Perakyla (2004: 297) adds another dimension to the idea of theoretical generalization, possibility. ie the possibility that various practices can be considered generalizable even if the practices are not actualized in similar ways across different settings. The structures of interaction uncovered in my training classrooms and the interactional practices that produced them - the management of turn-taking, sequence organization, turn design and so on - may not be found in exactly the same shapes and forms in other training classrooms, but they could be, if we accept that the same array of interactional competences (*a priori* rules and methods) are available elsewhere.

4.4   Reliabilty and Validity in My Research

Perakyla (2004: 288) identifies 3 measures for improving the reliability of CA framed studies and I tried to follow them in my own research:

❑   The selection of what is recorded - a reasonably large database to be drawn on for analytic induction
❑   The technical quality of the recordings - the quality of the equipment and the arrangements of recording can guard against data loss (although in my own and other CA research inaudible turns or parts of them are ever present)
❑   The adequacy of transcripts - Perakyla advises on rich (narrow) transcription in the pure CA, Jeffersonian tradition. Given the nature of my form of institutional interaction and my concerns for accessibility, I have chosen a broad rather than narrow transcript.

For generalizability, I have relied on three main strategies

1. Comparative analysis - with other cases in the data, at different times, with different training and then classroom settings, with other types of institutional interaction and with common pattern types or ways of doing tasks, and finally going back to conversation analysis itself and the basic, 'primordial' form of comparison.
2. Possible or theoretical generalizations
3. Face validity - via the reader, who has enough analytic detail to do the 'lifting' work of transferring to other settings.

4.5   Methodology and Institutional Talk

In this chapter I have noted my descriptive starting point as Seedhouse's CA study of language classrooms. While adopting the same CA based approach to context as he does, I have added a second level of analysis to try and distinguish different elements of teacher trainer situational identity and have drawn on membership categorisation analysis in doing so. My two main objectives are methodological and descriptive, using a 'pure' version of Applied CA to study a form of institutional interaction that has not previously been described.

Tapes and transcripts are my main data collection methods and I have argued that a longditudinal approach to data collection in this way, allied to my own membership of this context, can provide an appropriately rich description.

Analytic procedures are grounded in a detailed analytic description of a relatively small number of cases, moving from a description of the interactional order to a consideration of the institutional features in terms of task and identity evidenced in them.

Finally, the relatively large database with which I have worked, my broad-based approach to transcription, my triangulation of the constant comparison method over time, my inside-out approach to analysis allied to next turn proof all seek to enhance the reliability and validity of my study.

In chapters 4 and 5, I will apply this methodological framework to the analysis of trainer talk-in-interaction.

Chapter 4   Institutionality in Teacher Trainer Talk: Interaction, Tasks and Identity

1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will examine teacher trainer talk at two sequential levels using the comparative approach to analysis I described in Chapter 3.

At the level of turn-taking, I will identify five varieties of interactional context or speech exchange system in evidence in teacher training classrooms. I will then go on to characterize the three main contexts in which teacher talk gets done. I will compare these contexts to each other in turn-taking terms and to Seedhouse's contexts in language classrooms. In each case I will note differences in participation structure embodied in these contexts.

Having established the broader sequential context, I will then go on to look at the sorts of task and related trainer identities that are constructed in each context, their particular signalling through turn design and lexical choice, and how this activity-grounded sequence organization is related to the wider sequential context.

Throughout the chapter and in the description of both levels of sequence organization, I will indicate what seem to be the pedagogic issues or questions which arise and, in places, suggest possible answers to these questions. However, in the main, I leave detailed discussion of the pedagogic elements to Chapter 6. In this chapter, my main concern is with describing one sequential side of the structure of interaction in trainer talk. In chapter 5 I address the other, feedback.

2. Turn Taking, Sequence Organization & Identity in Teacher Training Classrooms

Sequence Organization

We know that in CA terms, there are two major forms of organisation at work in any stretch of conversation - organising turns and sequences of talk, and, through them, organising topic (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973; Sacks et al, 1974; Lee, 1987). Relevant analytic questions are what kind of activity is occurring and what it is about. In both cases, it is the members or participants who 'decide'. As always in the analysis of talk-in-interaction, we are dealing with the relationship between talk and its context, in the sense that talk has an *indexical* (of the nature and process of a speech event or activity) and a *topical* function (see Hymes, 1974; Saville-Troike, 1982).

In the institutional context of an L2 classroom, van Lier (1988: 147) has used this distinction between activity orientation (how something is said and done) and topic orientation (what is said and done) to suggest 4 general interaction types ranging from activities which are **more activity- and less topic-oriented** (eg drills) to those which are **more topic- and less activity-oriented** (eg instructions, explanations). For van Lier, interaction types are an important basic step in framing different varieties of classroom interaction, in turn-taking/speech exchange system terms, relating them to degrees of teacher control, and so to the characterization of L2 classroom participation structures (see Philips (1972). Participation structures are 'the rights and obligations of participants with respect to who can say what, when, and to whom (Cazden, 1986: 19). Participation structures are central to distinguishing different forms of trainer talk in training classrooms, and so to describing in formal terms what gets done and how it gets done in this institutional context.

In a training classroom, the topic-activity distinction is also useful in developing a classification of types of trainer talk. However, in this institutional setting there is a significantly greater emphasis on topic in distinguishing different kinds of activities, less concern with how learners (the trainees) say or do something. This kind of language performative or recitative concern noted by van Lier (pp 150, 151) is largely absent as a pedagogic purpose in training classrooms, except when trainees take the role of language learners in an activity.

Seedhouse (2004: 101 et seq) offers an alternative 4 part typology of interaction types (see chapter 2), framed by a CA approach to institutional discourse, so that 'there is a reflexive relationship between the pedagogical focus and the organization of turn taking and sequence. As the pedagogical focus varies, so the organization of interaction varies'. Seedhouse thus differs from van Lier in that his typology is not grounded in a topic-activity axis, but in pedagogic focus.

Given the different pedagogic focus of training classrooms, the typologies of van Lier and Seedhouse cannot be adopted wholesale in identifying relevant interaction types that can block out larger structures of training classroom talk. However, as I said in Chapters 2 and 3, I want to build on Seedhouse's institutional approach to language classrooms for training classrooms, focusing on equivalents or alternatives to his whole class, teacher-led categories.

I have identified 5 interactional contexts which structure trainer talk, with differences in turn-taking and participation structures.

Table 1   Interactional Contexts for Trainer Talk

Context	Description
Expository	Trainer describes or explains – or leads trainees to do so – a concept, idea or fact
Exploratory	Trainer (or trainees) poses questions or issues for trainees to consider
Experiential	Trainees are invited to or offer their own classroom experiences and reflections on them
Demonstrative	Trainer and trainees take on the roles of teacher and students in a language learning activity
Procedural	Trainer explains how an activity will be carried out

Identity

In chapter 2 I said that Zimmerman's tripartite categorisation of identity was a useful starting point for examining institutional tasks and identity, but wanted to explore the notion of situational (institutional) identity. Seedhouse largely focused on discourse identity in his analysis and took the situational identity of teacher-learner as default, for good reason in terms of his typology.

In Chapter 2, I noted that there are four general categories of teacher educator identity suggested by the literature:

- pedagogic
- interpersonal
- linguistic
- transportable

All of these identities are potentially important in teaching teachers how to teach. How are they distributed in teacher training classrooms, and in which sequential contexts, for what pedagogic purposes? Membership categorization analysis was a tool for Richards (2006) in teasing out elements of transportable identity; it will be a tool in developing notions of situational identity in teacher training classrooms.

My main aim in Chapter 4 is to develop a description of what I take to be the three main interactional contexts (institutional structures) I have identified in teacher training classroom data in which knowledge is constructed: **expository, exploratory** and **experiential**. Procedural contexts are important to topic and agenda setting, but are very much trainer talk as monologue not dialogue. I assume that trainer talk is a variety of talk-in-interaction and that the stucturing processes underlying it have a close relation to the emergent product.

The basis for my description will be to distinguish these three different varieties of turn-taking and sequential context, relating them to forms of professional identity and tasks oriented to in these sequences. In identifying salient characteristics, as I noted in chapter 2, comparison with conversation and with other institutional contexts, particularly language classrooms will be central to the analysis. The relation of each context to the other in terms of types of interaction and types of task done will have an impact on teacher training pedagogy. Throughout this chapter and chapter 5 I will seek to identify what I consider to be the key pedagogic questions for discussion in chapter 6.

3 Expository Sequences

3.1 Trainer Talk and Transmission of Information

In training classrooms, one interactional context for trainer talk that **is** present in every lesson in addition to procedural contexts is the **expository context**. I have said that this is a sequence where the trainer describes or explains – or leads trainees to do so – a concept, idea, fact, methodological process or activity.

Expository input is a training classroom process that is largely under the trainer's control. Trainee contributions in expository contexts are moderated by the trainer and turn-taking and sequence in this context embody interactional asymmetries found in other institutional contexts (see Drew and Heritage, 1992: 47 et seq; Heritage, 2004: 236 et seq).

The analytic and pedagogic interest lies in the placement and turn-taking extent of trainer input in expository sequences and their effect on trainee participation and contributions. I will call the two main varieties of expository context **Initial** and **Deferred Trainer Input** to characterise them with reference to their sequential placement. First I describe characteristic interactional elements and their variations, and then consider orientations to institutionality in this context.

Initial Trainer Input

Extract **4.1** comes from a session in which the trainer spent the opening part reviewing with trainees what they covered last time. She then talks through a power point presentation on different learner styles. Each style has two or three descriptions of learner characteristics. In **4.1** the trainer is providing a third informational chunk about the *analytical learner*.

In lines 1-5 comes the early placement of information, with a reference back in line 3 to a confusion with another type of learner that trainees had had in a preceding extract. In lines 5-6 the trainer asks trainees why they think that introversion is characteristic of an analytical learner and gets 'concentration' and 'thinking, analysing' from two trainees in lines 7 to 9. The trainer accepts these responses in line 10-11 with a reformulation, ratified by the trainee response token in line 12. An additional piece of information from the trainer in lines 13 and 14 reinforces and underlines the jointly constructed 'they need their space/individual moment' characterisation of lines 7 to 12.

Lines 13 to 21 close this expository sequence with the application to teaching. In lines 14 to 16 the trainer refers back again to a trainee comment in suggesting that teacher and learner awareness is a first step to meeting the needs of this learner. Finally, in lines 16 to 21, the trainer suggests that this type of learner might lose out in the prevailing climate of communicative, happy-together classrooms.

In **4.1** the pedagogic focus is on characterisation of a learning style, which is **new information** to be transmitted to trainees. These kinds of task are in the hands of the trainer and require little of the sort of ground-clearing or preparatory work which is typically involved in extended turns-at-talk in conversation. Nor can we characterise the trainer turn in lines 1-5 as a first pair part of an adjacency pair where the 2nd pair part is taken by the learner (compare the *teacher prompt-learner production* adjacency pair noted by Seedhouse (2004:107). Following a short pause in line 5, where no learner moves to occupy the turn space, the trainer's *why..you* asks the question which initiates the checking understanding sequence in lines 5 to 11.

4.1

1	T	ok. so, (2.0) how else do these kind of learners process information.
2	T	well, these kind of learners show traces of introversion. again that's
3	T	why some people relate the individual learning preference to the uh
4	T	analytical preference.(2.0) but probably, why do you think this
5	T	happens, when they process information. why do they seem
6	T	introvert.
7	S1	because they need [to concentrate
8	S2	[because they are thinking they are, (3.0)
9	S2	analysing.
10	T	yes (S name), so they need their silent moment, their individual
11	T	moment.
12	S	uh huh.
13	T	they're isolated from the rest. (4.0) they also have a tendency to be
14	T	reflective and cautious in thinking (tasks). (3.5) now we have
15	T	learners who do need their time. (2.0) (S name) you said it in the
16	T	beginning. if we know who they are and most important if they
17	T	know who they are, chances are we can cater for them much more
18	T	effectively. (1.5) with all this boom of making lessons meaningful
19	T	and joyful, and you know (1.0) very HAppy classrooms, (2.0)
20	T	probably and I- I leave it up to you, probably food for thought,
21	T	we've been neglecting this (one).

If we consider the overall sequential organization of initial trainer input, the following components are normally present when a trainer provides information in this context:

1. initial input from the trainer
2. a question from the trainer to check understanding in some way or ask for trainees' own thoughts/reactions/relevant experiences
3. trainee response(s)
4. trainer summary and/or (re)formulation

These initial trainer input sequences are to be found in all parts of a training session. Interestingly, if we remove lines 5-11 from the sequence, remove any orientation to speech exchange, the transmission of information is still accomplished. We might say then that steps 2 and 3 in our four-part framework are optional. The trainer could have asked and then answered the question posed in line 5.

On the monologue-dialogue continuum, expository contexts with initial trainer input offer plenty of opportunities for the sort of lecturing format found in more formal classroom settings (Arminen, 2005:113). The fact that these unidirectional processes are noticeably infrequent in training classroom input is indexical of the particularities of this institutional context (the unique fingerprint referred to by Heritage and Greatbatch, 1991) and the nature of teacher training talk as a process. I will return to this question in discussing institutional identity.

Deferred Trainer Input

In **4.2**, which takes place in the opening stage of a training session, the trainer has written a number of terms up on the whiteboard and asked trainees to approach them as a glossary. They are then asked to write a definition or explanation for each of the terms. They do this individually for 5 minutes or so.   When they have finished, the trainer asks them to compare their ideas in pairs. Then the trainer goes through each term and offers it up for anyone to claim definitional rights*. Error* is the second of the terms that is discussed.

In line 1 the trainer repeats orally the initiating prompt he has written on the board. He does not select next speaker and after a slight pause a trainee offers a responding definition or gloss in lines 3-9, with response token continuer 'yeahs' from the trainer at lines 5 and 8 (cf Jefferson, 1993; Drummond and Hopper, 1993a; 1993b). In lines 10-12, the trainer accepts this definition and formulates a summary: 'they don't have a clue what's right'.

However, in lines 13-14, the trainee does some repair work on the trainer's formulation: suspecting that it is wrong is not the same as not having a clue. This covert repair is ratified by the trainer in lines 15-16 with another 'that's right' + revised formulation. The trainee`s 'mm hmm' in line 17 functions through its intonation as an acceptance or agreement rather than a continuer (see Gardener, 1997; 1998). The last word in the sequence goes to the trainer, in lines 18-22, where he takes up a term which the trainee has used at the beginning of his definitional answer turn in line 6. This is used to return 'error' to the wider task context of providing a gloss on a set of terms all related to language learning and errors. 'Mistake' is the next term on the whiteboard list.

The overall structural organization of this variety of expository context has 3 main sequential components:

1. trainer prompt or solicit
2. trainee response
3. trainer expansion and/or summary

4.2

001	T	um , error?
002		(2.0)
003	S2	ok, when students are making (1.0) doing something wrong and
004	S2	doesn't realize what they're doing=
005	T	=yeah
006	S2	=is wrong. you just don't know, they're attempting the language
007	S2	and maybe making- is doing so- is doing it wrongly.
008	T	yeah.
009	S2	(xxx) wrong words or whatever but they don' know.
010	T	that's right. they haven't got a clue that it's wrong or they maybe
011	T	they suspect it's wrong, they know they don't but they don't have a
012	T	clue what's right. yeah, yeah.
013	S2	they suspect it's right because they're using it, so maybe they don't
014	S2	really know.
015	T	that's right. so um a lack of knowledge, if they make a mistake, it's
016	T	a lack of knowledge.
017	S2	mm hmm.
018	T	um, and in fact you said attempt, um I can't remember whether he
019	T	he relates this directly to this but I think it's Julian Edge isn't it (in
020	T	the) book on errors where he he classifies some errors as attempts.
021	T	um, ok and that obviously is gonna link when we get there with
022	T	mistake, and so we can start, you know, linking things together.

We can see that in **4.2** the interactional context between the initial prompt and closing trainer formulation allows for the possibility of more extended turns, and so greater participation, from trainees. The trainer remains in control, but the sequential topic and action are more noticeably a joint production in lines 3-14. There is an answer to the trainer's elicit, but there is no necessarily exact wording of it. This and the greater trainee authority here (the topic is known to them) makes for more trainee input into its shaping, to the point of correcting a trainer formulation. The trainer's 'closure rights' in this sequence type are exercised with his final summarising *so* prefaced draft of *error* in lines 15 and 16, accepted by S2's *mm hmm* continuer in line 17 (for *so* prefaced formulations, see Heritage and Watson in Barnes, 2007; Bolden, 2009; 2010, and chapter 5).

The sequential commonality between the two forms of expository context is that the trainer has the first and last word. What comes in between is still under the control of the trainer but with varying degrees of contingency and so local management. We might characterise initial input as an 'I've got something to tell you' sequence, and deferred as 'Have you got something to tell me'.

3.2   Variations on Sequential Organization in Expository Contexts

Expansions or variations of initial and deferred trainer input turn components typically occur in the following sequential environments:
- where the trainer provides extended input in the first turn (initial)
- where the trainer segments information in a linked series of interactional chunks (deferred).
- where the the trainer invites experiential input from trainees (initial and deferred)
- where trainees report back from group or pair work (initial and deferred)

Extended Initial Input

Extract **4.1** is short in terms of initial input. There are longer opening turns in the data, but they are rarely characterisable as lecturing talk. Extract **4.3** is an example of extended initial input.

4.3

1	T	so one problem about it (editing) is the question of time. (4.0).
2	T	because it´s all very nice and so many wonderful ideas and things
3	T	we can do and I-I say that partly because of what you said Rob you
4	T	know about new versions new versions new versions. great! (1.0)
5	T	but..time. do you have the time. how much time do you have for
6	T	these things.
7	S1	well that´s the same for with me for the drafting I suppose. I mean
8	S1	even if you´re writing it there´s (always) the question of how many
9	S1	drafts can you do? in the time available.
10	T	I mentioned here..that something really has to kind of happen
11	T	between er draft and er editing (2.0) erm:: ..I´ve changed the
12	T	colours here (3.0) erm (1.0) and there seem to me to be two major
13	T	things that can- that need to happen. (3.0) one of
14	T	two things. perhaps both things.(5.0) from experience my
15	T	experience, um it seems to me that there´s very seldom certainly
16	T	with.. erm er with non-native writers but probably
17	T	with native writers as well, editing immediately after finishing a
18	T	draft. (2.0) erm it doesn´t seem to make much difference.
19	T	one of the ways I´ve explained it to myself is that a lot of
20	T	the computer or whatever, you just don´t see it. you don´t see
21	T	missing words, you don´t see grammatical mistakes, because in
22	T	your head as you're you're half reading and half kind of reactivating
23	T	the text in your head and you just miss things. I´ve found that with
24	T	myself. you know I´ve kind of you know, you know how we try to
25	T	finish something, edit, must get it off.. tonight and voom voom
26	T	voom send it off (enough) that´s fine. and I go back to to lo- and I
27	T	look at it. and when you´re reading what´s in my god mistake

28	T	the text is in your head or you think it is mistake, why why didn´t I
29	T	see these mistakes? and the way that I explain it is that - that you
30	T	need to let it cool off you need to distance yourself from it.
31	S2	to let it er-
32	T	settle.
33	S2	yes.
34	T	like a cake out of the oven.
35	S2	((laughs))
36	T	((laughs)) that´s right. so one thing that can help a lot between
37	T	drafting and er editing, final editing..is is that: give it a day. let it
38	T	cool off. and we don´t often do that perhaps do we. we tend to
39	T	again put writing work maybe within one class period and we do the
40	T	whole thing in one class period. and sometimes I feel if we spread it
38	T	over two, or over a weekend, you know we do some work on a
39	T	Friday and we pick it up again on a Monday, ..that er the students
40	T	will be able to see it much more clearly both linguistically, correct
41	T	linguistic mistakes, and logically and you know thematically, kind of
42	T	see be a useful part of the process. and the other thing of course is
43	T	feedback. that teachers (1.0) or possibly other students and
44	T	learners um provide the writer with some feedback. and that again
45	T	can be useful. so rather than the the teacher always receiving the
46	T	final product again, because what we end up here again is the
47	T	product obviously. (2.0) erm (5.0) erm the teacher or somebody
48	T	actually sees drafts. and then the draft at least as one would like is
49	T	rewritten on things which don´t make sense. so that´s one thing
50	T	which I think can be a useful part of the process. and the other
51	T	thing of course is feedback. that teachers (1.0) or possibly other
52	T	students and learners um provide the writer with some

53	T	feedback and that again can be useful. so rather than the the
54	T	teacher always receiving the final product again, because what we
55	T	end up here again is the product obviously. (2.0) erm (5.0) erm the
56	T	teacher or somebody actually sees drafts. and then the draft at
57	T	least as one would like is rewritten on the basis of that. but we need
58	T	something. we need a cooling off period, so that you can distance
59	T	yourself from the text, or we need some feedback from outside, the
60	T	teacher other learners, etc. so this can be useful. and all sorts of
61	T	options like that...hh (3.0) um hh. so like in many things the shift
62	T	has been very much from product and this is where we get all sorts
63	T	of other things coming in with er process. we see here that process
64	T	can be quite significant apart from..anything else and we can start
65	T	adding other things to the process. this,..cooling off, (5.0) and or
66	T	feedback (7.0) can be another part of the process. this can
67	T	obviously be done individually, in groups, whole class. so we have
68	T	different kind of er kind of things together, research as well, any of
69	T	these things can be done individually, pairs, groups, whole class,
70	T	(3.0) so we have different ways of handling the the process. and we
71	T	can combine them, they can be done individually, and then checked
72	T	in pairs or groups. erm any comments on that. do you see
73	T	adVANTages again from taking the process awAY from the isolated
74	T	individual and involving other people?

Extract **4.3** follows two related sequences. The first was a deferred trainer input sequence where trainees provided the main steps in the writing process with comments and summaries by the trainer on each contribution and step. The second was an initial trainer input sequence concerning the writing process described by methodologists and trainer resource books, where the trainer suggests that while this is what is supposed to happen, the reality is rather different. The trainer follows initial input with a question to trainees on their own views. This triggers a sequence where both trainer and trainees offer their own experiences. This ends with discussion of the time factor in drafting.

Lines 1-6 are the closing summary of the preceding sequence with a rhetorical question as the end point (not interpreted as one by S1 in lines 7-9). Lines 10 to 72 are a trainer monologue, broken by 3 brief trainee interventions in lines 31, 33 and 35. The trainer builds on what has come before to offer his own 'theory-from-practice' about time in relation to the final editing of writing. Following the 'there seem to me..' viewpoint marker, the advance organizer or projection for what follows comes in lines 12 to 14, with the 'two major things that need to happen', revised to 'one of two things. perhaps both things.', in lines 13-14. Lines 14 to 32 recount the first of the two things that need to happen, with the summary or maxim coming in line 30: "you need to let it (your draft) cool off you need to distance yourself from it".

In lines 36-42, the trainer then takes up this cooling off period and proposes the classroom implications for teaching writing. In lines 42-57 the second thing that needs to happen, feedback, is introduced as a further option to insert in the classroom writing process (referring back to the first extract where the trainer got the traditionally agreed steps in this process from trainees). The initial input of lines 10-72 is followed by a first pair part trainer question on the advantages of moving away from a solitary process to a more collaborative one in a classroom context, which sparks a further experientially grounded exchange.

This 'lecture talk' is characterisable not only in terms of its sequential location but also its topic status as not-known-in-advance (see Button and Casey, 1988/1989), and as a species of 'personal theory' (the trainer's this-is-the-way-I-see-it). The few examples of extended initial input of this sort are always contingent on a preceding expository sequence. They contrast with initial trainer input, which while it may have some loose topic connection with a preceding sequence, is built from known-in-advance, business-at-hand material and initiates a new input cycle (Button and Casey, 1988/89). Extended initial input of this kind is trainer-as-teacher rather than trainer-as-expert in terms of identity, and I will return to consider the extract in more detail in **3.4**.

Deferred Input in a Series

Extract 4.4 is an example of an expository sequence constituted by a linked series of deferred expository inputs from the trainer. It comes in a training session where the topic is Task Based Learning. The trainees have experienced a task-based lesson (a demonstrative context), identified the steps involved, and explored differences between a task-based lesson sequence and other types of sequence. The trainer is now wrapping up this phase of the session before going on to the second part of the session where the trainees produce their own task-based lesson by adapting course book lesson materials.

Having framed what is to follow procedurally in lines 1-4, the trainer then moves on to labelling the first stage in a TBL model, the pre-task, where the teacher sets the context or introduces the topic (lines 6-7). On the board, the trainer establishes a format for presenting the stages of the TBL model, with each stage labelled and the key pedagogic activities of teacher and learners in it noted (lines 11-12). Once the recording format is written on the board, the trainer then gets trainees to give her back the topic/context focus in lines 13-15 and 16-21, recording this and providing a check list summary formulation in line 22.

In lines 13-15 and 16-21, the trainer has elicited or asked for *introduce topic* and *provide context* as teacher actions in the pre-task stage. In line 23 the trainer asks what else happens and gets 'give instructions' in line 25. The trainer rather than the trainees expands on *instructions* in lines 26-37, using this slot for additional input.

The final step in labelling and recording what happens in the pre-task stage of the TBL model is to establish what students do while the teacher sets the context and gives instructions. This is done in lines 42-58. The trainer in fact gets what she wants in lines 42-45, but trainees do not interpret her 'ok' in line 44 as acceptance and topic closure. The proffering of two more student actions in lines 45 and 50 suggest that trainees anticipate a 'listing' turn. In lines 51-57, comes a final trainer expansion turn, but here it signals the end of the sequence by its summary of student action in the pre-task phase through repetition of 'setting the context' and 'giving instructions'.

4.4

01	T	….so that that's what can I get into each area and probably and
02	T	then talk a little bit more about what happens in each stage, mm
03	T	hmm, and then we'll talk about what sort of tasks we're talking
04	T	about. ok. (4.0) now the pre- pre- task as (name) called it, yes you
05	T	did your reading, good (name), well done. ok. the pre-task. very
06	T	very important that here, at this stage, er the the teacher sets the
07	T	context or introduces the topic. ok? now, what is- if you want we
08	T	can see it and if you've read the book, this book um (name), you
09	T	will also find here, this book is here ((tapping and pointing to book
10	T	on her table)), whoever wants to read it, mm hmm. just ask me and
11	T	I'll get it to you. now, the first thing, why don't we look at what the
12	T	teacher does, and what the students do. ((writing on the board))
13	T	mm hmm, now, what did I do? I as you said I introduced the..
14	S1	topic.
15	T	topic, so teacher introduces the topic ((writing)) (7.0)
16	T	and we need a topic we need to introduce this to set a,
17		(2.0)
18	T	(name) you know. something that you have to work on to
19	T	introduce the for the language.
20	S2	the context.
21	T	the context uh huh. ((writes on board))(7.0)
22	T	ok. so we set the context, we introduce the topic. uh huh, (2.0) and
23	T	what else did I do?
24		(2.5)
25	S3	give instructions?
26	T	yes. and this is crucial, this is if you if we are always hearing (from
27	T	tutors) that will always tell you "instructions, instructions, work on
28	T	your instructions", in this kind of model instructions are crucial. if
29	T	you noticed I realized I wasn't giving good instructions so I stopped
30	T	running it. uh huh. these have to be <u>all</u> presented from the
31	T	beginning because of what Rick said we don't want to-
32	S1	interrupt.

33	T	interrupt during the performance of the task. so ((writing))(4.0) set
34	T	instructions (3.0) for the performance of the task. uh huh? (2.0)
35	T	now, erm you may want to write them down for them. mm hmm.
36	T	you may want to give a copy of instructions to the group but they
37	T	they all have to know what to do, in the whole cycle. and and
38	T	(name) how many sta- how many activiti- how many phases do we
39	T	have in the cycle?
40	S	three di- different ones.
41	T	so you have to give instructions for the whole thing. uh huh? now,
42	T	what are the students doing.
43	S	(2.0) listening.
44	T	ok, they are listening.
45	S	following instructions.
46	T	not [yet, they are just]listening?
47	S	[oh, [(I see .. the first..)
48	S	[mm hmm.
49	T	here they are just listening. uh huh? so they listen carefully-
50	S	they discuss the topic.
51	T	ah yes there should be a discussion but very erm-
52	T	brief very brief it's more like a brainstorm if you want.
53	T	(4.0)((writing)) like the lead-ins we've been talking about you know
54	T	you want to sort of set them for English but also to introduce the
55	T	topic mm hmm (2.0) but there's not much of a communicative
56	T	activity or anything just the instructions and the topic is set. now,
57	T	we get into the task itself.
58	T	(8.5) ((writes))

While initial or first turn expository input is probably more straightfoward in the sense that it gives rise to less 'where is the input?' questions, this is not the case with deferred input. In CA terms it comes in the 3rd turn slot in a canonical sequence, which makes it more vulnerable to complicating insert and post expansion sequences, at least in conversation (Schegloff, 2007). In this deferred input in a series sequence trainer input is largely constituted by assessments and following formulations. We shall be looking at the connection between input, formulations and assessment in chapter 5.

4.2 and **4.4** mark opposite ends of the continuum in terms of deferred input sequence shape and extension. But both are built from the same turn design options deployed in third turn slots, with formulations (see Heritage and Watson in Barnes, 2007) foundational. In terms of participation structures, while there have been trainee turns in **4.4** they have been more constrained and trainer controlled than in **4.2**, if we consider their potential for expansion. Trainer questions are 'closed' in the sense that they are not open to a number of answers or formulations, and so do not open a space for further trainee contributions to input. It is the trainer who expands on and then summarises what she gets from trainees.

In both forms of deferred trainer input sequence, once again it is the nature of the action it performs - defining terms, labelling and recording methodological procedures - and the related respective knowledge states of trainer and trainees which are important contributors to the shaping of the interaction.

Experiential Input from Trainees

In **4.5** we see what follows the trainer's question at the end of **4.3**. Following a brief pause in lines 5-16, S1, given the floor by a trainer continuer in line 11, responds to the trainer question prompt drawing on their own experience. In lines 16-23 the trainee expands their response to supply their own humorous version of this-is-the-way-I-see-it, getting a clarification request from the trainer at line 19 and laughter and sick-joke groans from trainees and trainer in line 24.   In lines 25-29, S2 builds on this input, again drawing on their own experience, but this is a trainee-initiated topic change, and in line 30 the trainer brings this turn back into the activity loop, using a two pronged turn design device to get things back on sequential track: the

118

and so.. preface to their turn serving to link not turns but successive parts of an activity together (Schegloff, 2007: 215; Heritage and Sorjonen, 1994), and to once again articulate the unsaid as an upshot formulation rather than repair (Bolden, 2010).   The upshot is that the trainer is able to move to closure with his linkage of S1's alignment in lines 5-16 with the question posed in lines 1-3. Lines 39-57 are the closing trainer turn to this initial trainer input expository sequence.

Sequentially, the question in lines 1-3 has effectively handed temporary control over the sequence to trainees. There is an extended turn from S1, which opens up the interaction to self-nominating contributions from others, taken up in line 27 by S2.

Pedagogically, we can see in **4.5** the sorts of sequential and turn-taking dilemmas for trainers that arise with experiential input in expository contexts. Do you respond to it on its own terms and so signal what might be a new topic and sequence, or attempt through your third turn slot to integrate the trainee turn into a wider course of action? Or do you perhaps try to design your question turn in a more conceptual and exploratory fashion (although the trainer question in lines 1-3 arguably invites exploration)? We shall examine this issue in Section 4.5 but it raises important questions regarding distinctions between experiential and exploratory sequences and how they are managed within the broader expository context.

The various questions raised by an analysis of both kinds of expository context point to their potentially democratic participation structures through the **embedding** of other varieties of context in them, and so the opening out of interaction in terms of control and the institutional identities in play. There are no sequential hybrids in Seedhouse's language classrooms, but there are here. Experiential contexts take participants down in Woodward's (1991; 1992) four level role stack (language learner, language teacher, teacher trainee, trainer) from their trainer-trainee roles in the training classroom to joint occupancy of the teacher role in teaching classrooms, with a significant effect on sequential organisation, moving the speech exchange system in operation closer to ordinary conversation.

4.5

1	T	erm any comments on that. do you see adVANTages again from
2	T	taking the process awAY from the isolated individual and involving
3	T	other people?
4		(2.0)
5	S1	specially at the beginnning if they´re not used to doing this sort of
6	S1	thing it makes them feel less isolated, ANd er (3.0) less less like
7	S1	they´re failing because often when I do brainstorming again, on an
8	S1	individual basis with them and its they never did it before, and it´s
9	S1	for examination purposes and, I´ve got 5 minutes please 30 ideas
10	S1	in 5 minutes and you´ll be lucky to get TEN. out of the very best.
11	T	hmm hmm.
12	S1	and most of them are struggling to come up with five, it´s
13	S1	something they have to practice this and they feel better when they
14	S1	can disCUSS things with their peers. that´s why it´s always a good
15	S1	idea to have a model of what it is you´re expecting them to write.
16	S1	why is- why is capital punishment dog food.
17	SS	((laughter))
18	S1	(why is dogfood a model- of) capital punishment
19	T	dogfood?
20	S1	yes yes, I try to explain to them if I do it that first we freely
21	S1	associate ideas and er they can make selections and so I choose an
22	S1	outrageous topic, capital punishment. and er what are the
23	S1	advantages of capital punishment? free dog food.
24	SS/T	(1.0) ((groans and laughter))
25	S2	tha-that´s another problem with er our students. um they can
26	S2	maybe write but they don't have the ideas. and er they don't have
27	S2	they don't bring any input to what- to the page that´s more difficult
28	S2	than getting them to write good English, and to develop their
29	S2	language skills.

30	T	and so pairs, two heads instead of one, groups, three or four heads
31	T	instead of one.
32	S2	yeh cou- whole class yeah.
33	T	but obviously in the final analysis what you´re working towards is
34	T	the individual.
35	S2	yeah.
36	T	because in the final analysis the end of the learning process the
37	T	individual has got to operate alone usually. not always but usually.
38	S2	yeah.
39	T	so these options within the process are also very useful. the same
40	T	can be done with the organisation of ideas. you can have planning
41	T	done individually, pairs, groups, even whole class. you can have
42	T	individuals and then comparing and modifying things. so that can
43	T	also be brought in here. you can bring feedback at different stages.
44	T	possibly one useful stage for feedback is at THIS.. level. so we can
45	T	then bring in some feedback here. what some teachers do is they
46	T	actually get people to write plans with you know kind of maybe
47	T	paragraph boxes and kind of what's gonna go in the box more or
48	T	less, er on posters, stick em on the wall,. and and people go round
49	T	looking for plans.- looking at different pairs and different groups
50	T	plans. (1.5) which er which one do you like most and why? and so
51	T	again we can bring into this process we can bring in feedback not
52	T	just on the final product not just on the draft but even before that.
53	T	write a composition and I will grade it to the process, but of course
54	T	it is process as well as product because just as in the final analysis
55	T	it´s the individual that´s gotta be capable, it´s the PROduct in the
56	T	final analysis that matters. er er let me show you some er non-
57	T	native writers work .

Experiential contexts are embedded in both forms of expository sequence, so too are exploratory contexts, but as I shall explain in Section 4.4, while exploratory contexts lead to different participation structures in terms of the degree of trainee involvement, turn-taking organisation usually evidences a greater interactional asymmetry than in experiential contexts.

Expository Input from Trainees

The final variation on expository input sequences comes in a sequence where trainees report back from group work which involves a product of some kind - a lesson plan, materials, an activity, a strategy, for example - and in effect provide the input.

In **4.6**, we are in the final stage of the TBL session that was the subject of **4.4**. The trainer has asked trainees to look at coursebook activities and to turn them into a TBL cycle. In sequential terms, we might see trainee input as constituting a second pair part after the trainer sets the task, with the group discussion an alternative to immediate individual responses.

A number of groups report back and **4.6** represents one of them. In lines 4-13 comes the first part of the trainee input. Lines 14-22 are a trainer initiated repair/clarification sequence. In line 23-24 a trainer upshot formulation encapsulates the task, and invites the trainee reporter to go on, which they do in lines 25-44, with trainer continuers in lines 30 and 38. In contrast to other expository contexts, the trainer does not have the last word, or attempt to formulate a sequential outcome. The third turn slot following an extended trainee sequence is a positive assessment, but with no information as to why. The 'goods' (which are an assessment of sequence rather than content) are shortly followed by a sequence closing *ok*.

Clearly, trainee input has an impact on participation structures. Trainee group work, whether for expository, exploratory or experiential purposes, hands control of the content of the sequence to trainees. But the last word remains with the trainer, and here, rather than assess or evaluate content, line 49, in its high grade assessment (see Antaki et al, 2000), seems to address process rather than product concerns, something we will return to in chapter 5.

4.6

1	T	who else
2	S1	us
3	T	ok, so we go for (name) and (name).
4	S1	ok. first we are going to ask students if they have ever had
5	S1	problems with (1.0) neighbours and what kind of problems they've
6	S1	had. and then we're going to show them a picture of this couple,
7	S1	that they are (com-talking about) in the trial, you know the
8	S1	neighbours there. and but we're not going to, as you say- as you
9	S1	did, we're not going to show them the the article and we're going to
10	S1	te- ask them they vote-the task is going to be to discuss in groups
11	S1	what they think the problem with their neighbours were-was. and
12	S1	they have to present to the class what they want. what they
13	S1	thought. and then we're going to work with this article after that.
14	T	ok. just a minute. what is the goal they have to reach?
15	S1	to: present to the class what they think the problem was because
16	S1	they don't have the picture of the trial.
17	T	ok.
18	S1	they (don't have thexxxx).
19	T	ok. so they have to present these problems.
20	S1	uh huh.
21	T	ok.
22	S2	and they (see) the problem.
23	T	mm hmm, ok. good. so we have the task. yes. yes, (name)? ((eye
24	T	contact to suggest S continues)
25	S1	ok. um we have a pre task where we ask the students what do they
26	S1	feel when the neighbours play loud music and do not allow them to
27	S1	sleep. brainstorm with the whole group. then,
28	S1	in pairs we tell them they're going to pretend to be a couple named
29	S1	Mrs and Mr Fish.
30	T	mm hmm.
31	S1	and that they are going to present a case before the judge because
32	S1	of yah the judge because. they um-we explain them the situation.

33	S1	you're living in an apartment complex where neighbours, where a
34	S1	neighbour couple is always rowing and they don't allow you to
35	S1	sleep. you need to write your experience in a convincing way, to um
36	S1	fo- for the judge, (1.0) um in order for him, to remove that couple
37	S1	from the apartment building and put the in prison.
38	T	>mm<.
39	S1	um you will read your plea to the class and the class will decide
40	S1	which is the most convincing argument of all the ones in the class.
38	S1	um (1.0) then (1.5) we give them the original story after they
39	S1	report it, we tell them now this is what really happened, this is the
40	S1	story of Mrs and Mr Fish. and they compare their story with the
41	S1	article. (1.0) then, we going-we're going to use the Language Focus
42	S1	for language focus, one of the grammar questions where it says
43	S1	underline the two sentences with 'told' in the article, which one is a
44	S1	comment and which one is um [(..) (the best)
45	T	[but that you would do in the language focus
46	T	already.
47	S1	(2.0) after, after they compared after they compared their
48	S1	argument.
49	T	good. good. good. ok? (4.0) ok.

3.3   Institutional Identity in Expository Contexts

Institutionality is a sequential phenomenon. Participants' orientation to institutional identity is evidenced in sequential contexts. The institutional talk which is done in these contexts will be distinguishable from conversation or ordinary talk in and through two kinds of sequential context:

- sequential organization - turn-taking and overall structural organization (the shape of a sequence)
- sequence organization - the goal directed tasks that are constituted in sequences of talk.

The two contexts are clearly closely connected, with the tasks or activities that get done by participants in a sequence of talk being accountably done in the wider organizational context. Sequential organization enables sequence organization. Institutional tasks are observable in particular sequential habitats (see Heritage, 1988 in ten Have, 1999: 51).

I have said that institutionality (institutionally specific tasks and related identities) is a sequential phenomenon, but it is important to emphasize that this institutionality works at two levels (my discussion of Heritage's levels of institutionality in chapter 3 noted this point). Seedhouse's (2004) characterisation of turn taking and sequence in his language classrooms largely addresses Schegloff's (2007) level of **sequential organization**. His pedagogocal focus is 'reflexively related to a particular speech exchange system' (Seedhouse, p 101). Pedagogical focus in Seedhouse's terms is linked to my different interaction type contexts, but within each there is a variation in trainer identity related to the sorts of task being accomplished. This requires us to move 'down' to Schegloff's level of action and activity - **sequence organization**. It is here that Silverman's (1999) why (following how) question about sequence organization can be explored.

These two related sequential contexts (call them the outer and the inner, Seedhouse tracked the outer, I am tracking both) will also engender the interactional asymmetries (the special and particular constraints on allowable contributions noted by Drew and Heritage, 1992: 22) that mark institutional talk, and the particular linguistic resources and inferential frameworks (institutionally specific pragmatic meanings or inferences) for managing and constituting institutional tasks and identities in the training classroom. In making this twofold classification, I am employing Schegloff's (2007: 2) distinction between 'any kind of organization which concerns the relative positioning of utterances and actions' or the shape of turns and sequences (sequential organization) and the 'organization of courses of action enacted through turns-at-talk' (coherent and orderly sequences of actions for getting activities done).

These interactional orders will noticeably differ from conversation and so provide indices of orientation to institutional identity in a training classroom setting through their institutionally particularised ways of addressing generic organizational contingencies of talk-in-interaction:

1) The turn-taking problem - who should talk next and when.

2) The action-formation problem - how do language, body, sequential positioning contribute and conform to doing different actions and activities.

3) The sequence organizational problem - how are successive turns formed up to be coherent with prior turns.

4) The trouble problem - how to deal with trouble arising in terms of understanding and alignment.

5) The word selection problem - how do the elements of a turn and the activity it is doing get selected.

6) The overall structural organization problem - how does the overall shape of an occasion of interaction get structured and how does the placement of components inform the construction and understanding of the talk.
(Schegloff, 2007: xiv)

In this section I shall look at both types of sequential context and the varying ways in which they mark participants' orientation to their institutional identities and the institutional order that these identities embody.

Sequential Organization: Turn Taking and Identity

In expository contexts, the transmission and recording of concepts and procedures is the main focus. This general pedagogic focus is reflected in the trainer's control over turn-taking and topic introduction, in evidence in both **4.1** and **4.2**. This control is not absolute (in comparison with procedural contexts) and allows for a greater degree of local management and trainee participation, but it is nevertheless the trainer who has the election of tightening or loosening control in the organization of the sequence. As I have said, the opening and closing of the sequence, how it unfolds, what actions get done, and what topics get talked about are in the control of the trainer and in the service of transmitting ideas and procedures.

Consider topic control, the first of the two elements involved in sequential organization, and compare it to topic initiation and development in conversation. There seem to be two important differences in the institutional context exemplified in **4.1** and **4.2**. Button and Casey (1988/1989: 65) have suggested that in both conversation and institutional settings, participants face a generic problem 'in warranting the legitimate initiation of a topic which they *bring* with them to the conversation if their only resource for so doing is the prior talk'. If participants have business-at-hand they may not find an appropriate turn in which to introduce or initiate it. This is the case in conversation where what to talk about lies with both or all participants and, as with so much else in conversational contexts, is negotiated and managed locally, *in situ*.

Establishing an agenda or schedule of some kind is the pre-requisite or warrant for initiating a topic. In ordinary conversational contexts a **reason-for-call slot** immediately after telephone openings is a common way of doing this (Button and Casey, 1988/1989). This move indexes the accountability of participants to the sequential context and the why-this-here-now imperative of understanding and building talk-in-interaction. In institutional settings such as hospitals and business meetings, courts and classrooms, the establishing of a formal agenda before a meeting and, frequently, the responsibility of one person for setting this agenda are factors which make the agenda imposed rather than agreed or mutually oriented to. In **4.1** and **4.2**, the trainer sets the topics to be dealt with as part of the agenda/topic setting context which leads into the series of expository contexts which follow on each.

Moving into the closing of the topic is similarly distinctive in institutional talk in that it is one of the participants not both who controls when a topic is closed, without the need for a negotiated movement into this phase (cf Schegloff and Sacks, 1973).

The second element in sequential organization is turn-taking. In **4.1** and **4.2** the trainer controls who speaks and when, through questions and the checking and elicitational work they do (as in line 5 in **4.1** and line 1 in **4.2**), and the reformulation and summarizing to close the sequence (lines 10-22 in **4.1** and 15-22 in **4.2**).

The trainer's control of the floor holds for more extended expository contexts, at least in three of the four noticeable variations I described in 4.3.2. So in **4.4**, an example of deferred input in a series, the trainer's 3 extended turns, and the lack of the sorts of self-nominating trainee interventions that were present in **4.5** reflect the general pedagogic purpose. Trainee participation is largely called up by the trainer to supply labels for the blackboard presentation of the pre-stage teacher and learner actions in a TBL cycle. In lines 13, 16, 23, 38 and 42 trainer elicits or questions organize the sequence and the floor, with deferred 3rd turn input closing each element in the series, and, in lines 26-32 and 51-58 the trainer emphasizes or clarifies two of the labels.

The trainer is in control of turn-taking and topic at the beginning, during the development and at the end of an expository sequence. The interactional asymmetry of participation here is an index of the trainer's context-relevant situational identity of **information transmitter**. While continuing to display a sensitivity to interactional requirements, the trainer is largely concerned with transmitting *pedagogic facts* - information and ideas. Even in **4.5**, where turn-taking moves noticeably closer to conversation and there is a transition to another kind of sequential context, it is in the trainer's election to introduce it, and, as importantly, to signal its closure and a move back to 'base', as in line 32, when the trainer connects S2's turn in lines 27-31 to the topic and task at hand. Trainer control of turn-taking includes control over which turn-taking context is in operation.

In examining constraints on contributions in institutional talk, the focus has generally been on asymmetries of participation (see Benwell and Stokoe, 2006: 90). However, this is closely related to asymmetries of knowledge and rights of access to knowledge (Heritage, 2004: 236 et seq). In this latter type of interactional asymmetry, trainer talk is distinctive from other types of institutional settings and this is a consequence of its informal, back stage environment.

In contrast with the epistemological caution or witholding of knowledge (Drew and Heritage, 1992; Heritage, 2004) which is often indexical of differing knowledge states in professional-lay institutional interaction, in expository contexts the interactional enactment of the **expert** and **theorist** elements in the trainer's pedagogic identity (see chapter 2) requires displaying rather than witholding knowledge. We see this type of interactional asymmetry at play in the initial and deferred input turns of **4.1, 4.2 and 4.4** and the extended initial input of **4.3.** In **4.5,** the trainer's reversion from the transportable identity deployed in lines 5-41 to the expert identity of lines 42-62 not only displays this asymmetry of knowledge but also uses it to mark the movement from one sequential context (experiential) back to the base form in which it was grounded (expository).

One further particularity about interactional asymmetries in this institutional context is that the trainer's superior knowledge base does not give them sole ownership of the sort of 'specific expert authority' that will invariably be deferred to by lay people in other institutional settings (see Heritage, 2004: 239). The other side of the interactional coin from the trainer displaying knowledge is that the trainees too should do this, and be encouraged to do so. The overarching pedagogic purpose is learning to teach, developing teaching knowledge and skills. This requires trainees to develop and display knowledge and learn to do this in distinctive, institutionally specific ways. There is not the all-or-nothing quality of the witholding and displaying of knowledge we find in other institutional talk. Knowledge (and rights of access to it) is not one participant's <u>resource</u> for controlling interaction but a <u>topic</u> for both parties. The second turn component in deferred trainer input sequences are examples of sequentially relevant and warrantable trainee knowledge displays.

Having noted the importance of knowledge display for both trainer and trainees, we should nevertheless be clear that the turn space for trainee displays of knowledge remains firmly in the control of the trainer. The question of what counts as relevant topic knowledge, how much is displayed and when, is still controlled by the trainer and is partly a function of the sort of tasks and activities being constituted in expository contexts. The overall structural organization of each type of expository context is also related to tasks, in that the mapping of the interaction in sections or phases will help us to see the task orientation of participants and the stages involved in the construction of the task at hand. Heritage (2004) emphasizes that overall structural organization is not a fixed or once-and-for-all framework to fit data into (there is variation); it is something 'that we are looking for and looking at only to the extent that the parties orient to it in organizing their talk' (2004: 229-230).

Sequence Organization: Tasks and Identity

In the second part of this section I am concerned with explicating the connections between expository contexts and identity at the level of sequence organization. I want first to consider the link between discourse identities and the situational identities involved in doing the kinds of task to be found in expository contexts. I will then consider features of sequence organization that signal participants' orientation to institutional tasks and the content and procedural knowledge involved in task enactment in expository contexts.

Zimmerman (1998: 88) suggests that **discourse identities** are the frame – the conversational machinery – for situational or institutional identities, and that activities in a particular setting achieve their distinctive shape through the alignment of the two identities across participants, in this way the proximal and the distal contexts are linked interactionally. In an institutional setting, discourse and situational identity alignment constitute a context in which participants make meaning, draw inferences, get their work done. Institutional participants 'think in terms of categories…and they act on the basis of categories to pursue their tasks´ (Mäkitalo and Saljö, 2002: 59).

In turn-generated interactional sequences, **discourse identities** are defined by what participants are doing interactionally (Zimmerman, 1998: 85). Clearly the discourse identity of *summariser* is central to expository contexts, particularly extended ones. In extracts **4.4** and **4.5**, we see contrastive examples of the turn design involved in the trainer's summarizing role. In **4.4** in lines 33-34, the *so* prefaced gist formulation is contrasted with the *so* prefaced upshot formulation which follows in line 41. In **4.5** in line 32 the trainer's upshot formulation (which also gets the sequence back to the 'assessing a methodological strategy' (asking for opinions) task set in lines 1-3) is followed by the gist formulation of line 42, which leads into the closing deferred input in lines 42-62. *So* prefaced formulations serve to structure the stages and signal the close of an expository context.

This process-marking and product-wrapping role of trainer summaries remains the case when trainer talk is monologue rather than dialogue, as in the extended initial input of **4.3**. At line 13 the trainer introduces the task of giving a methodological opinion which is done in this expository context with his 'two major things that need to happen'. In lines 38 and 45-46 the trainer's *so* prefaced formulations bookend the first of the things that need to happen between drafting and final editing. In line 46 'and the other thing' introduces the second thing that must happen. In lines 49, 57, 65 and 67 the trainer's *so*-prefaced formulations are important in organizing the second part of this lecture sequence as well as in its audience design, through the highlighting of key ideas and elements in the discourse.

Teller, *ratifier* and *summariser* are discourse identities which importantly punctuate all the extracts and frame the tasks being done. They are an index of the controlling role played by the trainer in expository sequences, but they also relate to the relevant situational identities for the kinds of task or category bound activities (Sacks, 1992) performed in them. Giving or getting definitions, terminology, concepts, methodological procedures or opinions about them are tasks that recurrently call for these clusters of discourse identities in task enactment, and mark an orientation to the trainer's **expert/knower** institutional identity.

Sequential Organization, Sequence Organization, Tasks and Identity

Finally, I want to draw together a number of points made in this section, with particular focus on tasks, sequence and identity.   The shape or overall structural organization of an expository sequence - the presence, absence or variable development of the different phases in a sequence - and the sequential features action(s) being done in them, the interactional forms on display, both derive from the nature of the task being done and the information state of the trainees.

In **4.2** the trainer was getting a concept or definition from trainees, which could be accomplished with minimal expansion of input. In **4.4**, where the topic is a methodological process or procedure, the institutional task or business-at-hand requires a series of turns and inputs, with the trainer summarizing or expanding and emphasizing the trainee labelling of stages in this procedure.

In **4.2** trainees were being treated as authoritative speakers, in Schegloff's (2007: 170) terms, and the definitional task required them to display their knowledge. Offering the definition to trainees rather than giving it to them was contingent on their knowledge state. This was assumed to be known information and checking this knowledge state was a sequential context calling for the kind of display of knowledge from trainees I noted in the preceding sub-section. In **4.1** and **4.3,** where input comes in the initial turns, the knowledge in question is known by one rather than both parties, which arguably influences the choice of expository context option, and determines the extent of joint construction of input. In **4.4**, the known information on the part of trainees was the steps and actions in the pre-stage of a task based learning cycle. This information the trainer gets from the trainees. However, the trainer's glossing of the pre-stage actions in third turn position, rather than choosing to get them from trainees, or simply ratifying or summarising was a further indication of the asymmetries of knowledge shaping a particular task sequence. It was the trainer rather than trainees who was in a position to point out the importance for the teacher of giving all the instructions for all stages of the task, and to underline the brevity of discussion on the students' part in the pre-task.

I have said that the trainer control of topic nomination in this institutional context is one difference from the handling of topic in ordinary conversation. The other difference lies in the unfolding of a sequence like **4.2 o**r **4.4** and the task of getting known information or definitions from trainees. In conversation, topic-proffering sequences are commonly **recipient-oriented**, where the recipient is treated as in some way authoritative about the topic, because of experience or knowledge. The implication is therefore that it is the recipient who will 'carry the burden of the talking' (Schegloff, 2007: 170). Another feature of this kind of turn is that the recipient can elect to encourage or discourage the proffered topic, to accept or decline it. And finally, an often central feature is whether the response turn is contructed to be minimal or expanded. In topic-proffering sequences in OC, preferred responses involve expansion, whereas dispreferred responses close a sequence, in contrast to normal conversational practice, where preferred second pair part responses are typically sequence closure relevant - if they are not then they will often signal disagreement or misalignment (Schegloff, 2007: 169).

In the training classroom, trainees do not 'lead' the responses to topic nomination in the sense of having control over their unfolding and doing most of the talking. It will typically be the trainer who does the expanding and closing of the sequence. Nor do trainees have the option of accepting or rejecting the topic proffering of the trainer. The slight pause after the trainer elicit (in a 'yes/no' form - "do you know what error is?", "error, ideas?", **4.2**), unfilled by a trainer repeat or continuation marks the trainee floor. Unlike ordinary conversation, topic-recipients here do not carry the burden of expansion and do not have the option of a positive or negative 'stance' towards the topic (cf Schegloff, p171).

Finally, apart from what they tell us about situational identities, these expository contexts, particularly **4.5**, also open a window onto the nature of transportable identity in this institutional context. In Zimmerman's formulation, transportable identity is 'latent, speaker related' (1998: 90), something personal rather than situational. In training classrooms, transportable identity incorporates professional and situational elements as well as personal attributes, because of its links to teacher identity, for both trainer and trainees.

In this section I have tried to show how features of the organization of turns and tasks in expository contexts orient to and mark the institutional identities that are the centre of this particular institutional order.

3.4 Summary

There is no canonical way of transmitting information in a training classroom, in terms of where expository talk occurs in a session, the number of turns carrying the input, or the tasks carried out in this context. We have seen that both main forms of expository context have a number of common features, in particular the control over topic and turn-taking exerted by the trainer. This is most in evidence in the opening and closing of topic (more accurately, task) sequences, and the generally limited nature of trainee participation.

At the same time, within this relatively constrained turn-taking context, there is a degree of 'wiggle room' (Erickson, 2001) for the trainer in terms of how much input they give and how much they get from trainees. Task, topic and knowledge states are sequence shapers here. We have seen that there are elements of local management and, so, contingency, in this context. Sequential organisation is a joint production, albeit with an unequal division of labour.

What do expository contexts and their significant presence and deployment in trainer talk tell us about the wider institutional order? Roberts (1997: 12 et seq) reviews almost 50 years of language teacher education theory and tracks the move away from a model-based (craft) approach to a social constructivist approach. A social constructivist approach recognises the importance of the social and cultural context in shaping a teacher's development, and dialogue or talk as central to teacher learning (1997: 45). The fuel for this trainee talk is received knowledge from trainers and other teachers, trainees' own previous experiential knowledge, micro teaching and teaching practice (see Wallace, 1991: 15). An important trainer role is providing 'structures which offer teachers opportunities for collaborative talk' (Roberts, 1997: 45).

The prevalence of constructivist-reflective models for framing teacher education and training methodologies (Richards and Nunan, 1990; Wallace, 1991; Freeman and Richards, 1996; Grenfell, 1998; Trappes-Lomax and McGrath, 1999) might lead us to suppose that rather than being a default or unmarked context, expository contexts are increasingly marked and optional rather than obligatory. In fact, the expository context remains central to trainer talk and the interactional and institutional work it accomplishes. Yet as I noted earlier, while expository contexts are controlled by the trainer, they are not easily equated with lecturing formats for input.

For the most part they are locally managed and jointly produced, even if the joint production is evidenced more in participants' institutionally specific inference work in the recognition of roles and responsibilities in such sequences and their impact on interaction, than in participation structures marked by frequent and often self-nominating trainee contributions. Is the preference for dialogue of some kind rather than monologue in expository sequences perhaps a reflection of developments in teacher education methodology? At this point, we should certainly emphasise the centrality of interaction and dialogue to teacher training and teacher talk. Moreover, the nature of the structures of interaction in expository contexts suggest that we should be careful in equating transmission models of training with monologue/lecture input formats or in turn with expository contexts. This is something I return to in chapter 6.

The key question to arise from the description of the characteristic features of expository contexts is the link between these contexts, the kinds of participation structures they produce and tasks they enact, and teacher learning. The constraints on trainee 'fluency' exerted in training classroom expository contexts can be contrasted with language learning classrooms in a communicative era. Learner talk is encouraged, teacher talk discouraged, because learning to talk is seen as best done through both output and input. This key pedagogic question will be taken up in chapter 6.

I have shown in this section that expository contexts are flexible and adaptable in their ability to embrace and lead to other sequential contexts. While allowing for the production of a trainer's central pedagogic identity of expert, they also allow for other elements that make up their professional identity, fellow teacher, reflector, question poser, and so on. These more 'enabling' identities are also a part of learning to teach, and so developing one's own professional identity as a teacher. When we consider the place of expository contexts in teacher learning, the potential they have for organizing a variety of tasks and identities is a factor that must not be overlooked.   Goffman (1974) talked of conversation as a fire that would burn any fuel and expository contexts appear to display similar qualities in trainer talk.

4   Exploratory and Experiential Sequences

4.1   Introduction

In Section 3 I established the centrality of expository sequences to trainer talk and to the interactional accomplishment of input-related tasks. Far from being a lesser variety of interaction in trainer talk, expository sequences, together with the procedural sequences that introduce them, are obligatory.

In this section, I will examine the other two major interaction types in trainer talk:

- *Exploratory* – where the trainer poses questions or issues for trainees to consider
- *Experiential* – where trainees are invited to or offer their own classroom experiences and reflections on them

I am treating them together to some extent, because, as I shall show, they share important sequential features, one of which is their overwhelming dependency on expository contexts for their enactment in whole group interaction; they have no sequential life of their own.

This observation prefigures the analytic and pedagogic interest in this section. To what extent are the asymmetries of interaction and knowledge so characteristic of expository contexts in evidence here? The trainer`s control over what gets talked about and how – topic, turn-taking, tasks – is the most notable feature of sequential and sequence organization in expository contexts. Does this hold true here? How far do we approach conversational talk patterns in these sequences? What features do they share with expository sequences and what features distinguish them? What impact do these similarities and differences have on training classroom pedagogy? With these questions in mind I will first consider the two main varieties of sequence in these two contexts, those that are in some significant way independent of expository contexts, I will call this **exposed**, and those that are dependent on them, which I will call **embedded**.

4.2   Exposed Exploratory Contexts

These contexts are independent in the sense that they are not embedded in expository sequences but are sequentially marked off from them. This normally occurs through the trainer putting trainees into pairs or groups and posing a question to discuss.   Consider **4.7**. In **4.7**, the trainer follows a series of deferred input expository sequences on word formation by moving on to a projected second topic in the session, words in the mind. She has asked the trainees to work in threes and posed the question: what are the similarities and differences between the mind and a dictionary. The trainees have been talking about this for about 8 minutes before they report back on their discussion. They do this through a poster display.   The trainees have divided their poster paper into two columns, with *Dictionary* heading one column and *Mind* the other.

In adjacency terms, the first pair part in this extended sequence is the trainer's task setting: what are similarities and differences between words in the mind and in the dictionary. The pinning up of posters after the group discussion is the second pair part. The trainer opens up and extends the discussion in lines 1-2, through an invitation to find 'similarities' in the posters, allowing time for trainees to look at them in line 3 and then producing a reformulated prompt in line 4. Following the affirmative response from a trainee in line 5, the trainer elicits from trainees 'alphabetical order' as a feature of the dictionary which has been identified by all groups. One group needs to indicate to the trainer where their alphabetical order is in lines 11-12 and the trainer provides a summary of the similarity in lines 13-14, stressing the contrast with what happens in the mind.

4.7

001	T	ok, please can you think- hello…let´s find. let´s find- similarities
002	T	you think. what are as it were common consonants.
003		(17.0)
004	T	any similar ideas?
005	S	mm hmm.
006	T	which one.
007	S1	alphabetical order.
008	T	alphabetical order where.
009	SS	//dictionary//the dictionary//dictionary.
010	T	alphabetical order, alphabetical order..is there anything-
011	S	yes at the top=
012	S	=at the top, order, at the top=.
013	T	=alphabetical order. yes? alright? in dictionaries, as opposed to the
014	T	mind. does anybody think there is er an alphabetical order?
015	S2	we we were were (1.0)-
016	S3	discussing that.
017	T	uh huh.
018	S2	discussing whether they´re ordered or stored (xxxxxxxxxxx)
019	S3	whether they're ordered [or a-,
020	S	[(xxxxxx)
021	S2	just that they´re stored.
022	T	without the order, is that what you mean?
023	S2	(without an order, that xxxxxxxxx).
024	S3	that´s what they said! that's what they said!
025	SST	((laughter)). //(xxxxxxxxxxxx)//
026	S2	(xxxxxxxxxxxxxx) I said that there IS an order-
027	S	what's the (xxxxxxxxx).
028	S2	I didn´t- I didn´t say WHAT is the order. I don´t know it. but
029	S2	there IS an order. otherwise it wouldn´t be possible-I mean from
030	S2	my point of view, to store so many new words in (xxxxxxxxxx)
031	S4	(I think it still would, xxxx)
032	T	all right.
033	S	(we all know, nature is xxxxxxxxxx). ((laughter))
034	T	yes hang on, all right so both of you are saying, there, there
035	T	((pointing to poster)) lack of order. you said there's lack of order.
036	S4	but but (I didn't because you confused me).
037	T	ok, you tell me.

038	S4	we didn´t go into depth er cos we really haven´t got a clue what
039	S4	the- how the mind works, but er the idea of most frequently used
040	S4	words, the idea of a a (..) store which is used every- you know in
041	S4	every single situation.
042	T	mm hm.
043	S4	and er possibly then (1.0) I don´t know whether it´s related to
044	S4	each individual situation where like the words I use in this seminar
045	S4	are different from the words I use when I go to buy a bimbo from
046	S4	the shop or something.
047	T	right.
048	T/SS	((laughter))
049	S2	bimbo bread.
050	SS/T	((more laughter))
051	S2	(unrelated to xxxxxxxx).
052	S1	(xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx actually).
053	T	come on!
054	SS	((more laughter))
055	T	so….you would agree with (name) then that although it´s difficult
056	T	to say what the order is,
057	S2	>yes<.
058	T	right, we can´t really express this is the way in which my words are
059	T	organised in my mind, there is some order, that´s what you´re
060	T	saying-
061	S4	there is some order.
062	T	but what did, what did you say.
063	S5	well we said that words are ordered like a network incorporating
064	S5	different types of systems, in the sense that they´re stored but in
065	S5	order, that´s like an order of storage.
066	T	yes,
067	S5	>could [be<.
068	T	[there IS some sort of of (1.5) order in the way that words
069	T	are stored. they can´t be just (xx) up just like that you know and
070	T	there is some sort of order. now, which order, that´s the most
071	T	difficult thing right to find out. and even Jean Aitchison, with all the
072	T	research she´s done and other people who have worked on this,
073	T	agree it´s difficult to say this is the order, there (xxxxxx) to you
074	T	know more or less determining that there is some sort of order but
075	T	that´s still not altogether clear, mm hmm? but we can´t say

076	T	really all right. er that there is a <u>lack </u>of order- (1.0) there <u>is</u> <u>some</u>
077	T	order, within the mind. mm hmm?
078	S6	but um.
079	T	yes.
080	S6	but (we got- I said-) our point was was <u>that</u>. and the idea that
081	S6	there are, there are several ordering systems. that somehow are
082	S6	interconnected-
083	T	that´s right.
084	S6	so you know.
085	T	that´s right.
086	S6	you give somebody a word and you ask them to spit out words that
087	S6	sound the same and they can spit out quickly [a bunch of words.
088	T	[that´s right.
089	S6	or give them the concept and ask them to spit out a bunch of
090	S6	words=
091	T	= exactly. and and there are [simi-
092	S6	[erm synonyms, antonyms, s-names
093	S6	and similar words [or-
094	T	[so so, that´s absolutely [right
095	S6	[and somehow they´re
096	S6	all interconnected=
097	T	= and interre[lated
098	S6	[in a way
099	T	so if you think of a dictionary where you have the words in strict
100	T	alphabetical order and boom, you go like that and that's <u>it</u>. right. in
101	T	the mind,the many intricacies involved in ordering the words, (1.0)
102	T	(just the fact) are new. is what Tony just described as exactly like
103	T	that. you can remember or a word <u>comes</u> to your mind, through the
104	T	sound, through the concepts through- I mean there are millions of
105	T	things that you can relate to, and that´s how the words are
106	T	organised you know in your mind right. and they overlap. and they-
107	T	so, a very complex system, .hh [so-
108	S7	[-maybe some words are a trigger
109	S7	for other ones
110	T	that´s right. exactly. you have one word that can trigger others.
111	T	you know. so these networks are infinite, you know, in many
112	T	senses, they go on and on.

In line 14, the trainer's question which begins the next segment leaves 'in the mind' unsaid (while gesturing at the posters), but the jointly constructed trainee response in lines 15-21 takes it this way. S3's cataphoric 'that' in line 16, moved on by the trainer's continuer 'uh huh' in line 17, points to this question of 'whether words are ordered or stored' in the mind in line 18-21. In line 22, the trainer's other-initiated repair of what S2 and S3 are saying gets a jointly constructed rejection in lines 23-24, with the trainer's formulation being attributed to another group. S2 offers an account or 'defence' in line 26 and continues to line 30, asserting that she did in fact say there is an order in the mind. What she did not say is what it is. Line 31 brings disagreement from S4, acknowledged by the trainer in line 32, further reinforced (by his group partner) jokingly in line 33.   In line 34 the trainer first reasserts control over turn taking. Then in line 34 and 35, with a *so* + upshot turn (see Raymond, 2004) she returns to her formulation of line 22 and points to the posters of both groups for justification. This is resisted by S4 in line 36. S4's response suggests that the trainer is at fault for any misunderstanding (perhaps in the instructions or prompt in lines 1-4, which asks for similarities, when the original task instructions asked trainees for both similarities and differences). The trainer's 'ok, you tell me' in line 37 invites S4 to put the record straight.

In lines 38 to 46, S4 provides the requested explanation, with a 'mm hmm' continuer from the trainer in line 42 and a receipt and acceptance ´right´ in line 47. It is not clear at this point whether the acceptance is directed at the argument that there is an order, or at the more indirect suggestion that this order is related to frequency of use. Lines 48-54 are a humorous insertion sequence, with participants brought back good-naturedly to the task at hand by the trainer in line 53. In lines 55-60, the trainer pursues her alignment of S2 and S4´s views with another *so* + *upshot* formulation: you agree that 'there is some order' but that it´s difficult to say what it is. S4`s echo of `'there is some order' in line 61 finally accepts this formulation.

Starting in line 21 with the repair reformulation for S2, the trainer, S2 and S4, as group representatives (S3 was in S2's group) have constructed an agreed response to the question 'is there an order to words in the mind'. In doing so, they have negotiated a verbal refinement or perhaps gloss of position 1 (what the trainees seemed to be saying in writing the trainer's lack of order summary in lines 34 and 35), in position 2, which is summarised by the trainer in lines 55-60).

In line 62, the trainer invites another group to elaborate on their poster. S5's representation of his group's view is provided in lines 63-67. In lines 68-77, the trainer provides a revised summary of the story so far, adding S5's group's ideas to the mix as reinforcement for the main point of agreement, using it as evidence for position 2. However, it is notable that while both S2 and S5 have offered ideas as to <u>how</u> words might be ordered, the trainer has not incorporated them in her summaries.

The trainer's *mm hmm*? in line 77 acts as an invitation to speak to S6, who is another member of S5's group. In lines 80-98 S6 expands on S5's notion of networks and orders of storage to explain that theirs was not an argument for one order, but for a number of different but related ordering systems, with varying triggers. In lines 83, 85 and 88 the trainer's *that's right* is classifiable as an assessment (Jefferson, 1993). These can frequently signal speakership incipiency and topic shift by the recipient. Here they do not, although this is because S6 holds the floor. But in line 91, another assessment from the trainer, *exactly*, is followed by a bid for speakership, which is again resisted by S6 in lines 92-93. Jefferson (1993: 12) suggest that this sort of response from the speaker, 'intersecting an assessment in progress', displays an orientation to the shift implicature of this type of response token and functions as a move to counteract it. In line 94 the trainer initially appears to be moving towards another summary formulation with *so* but this is abandoned, perhaps in the face of the continuing intonation contours of S6's turn, to be replaced with an intensified assessment and her own affirmative synonym in line 97.

Lines 99-107 are the third trainer summary of what has been said in the extract, and, following S6's turn, it incorporates the proffered idea of orders rather than an order, 'millions of things you can relate to', a very 'complex' system. S7's alternative formulation of the same idea in lines 108-109 is acknowledged with an assessment by the trainer, who takes up speakership with it and brings the topic to an end in lines 111-112.

If we consider **4.7** in terms of overall structural organization the main sequential components of exploratory contexts are not notably different from those of expository contexts:

1. Trainer prompt/question
2. Trainee response
3. Trainer expansion and summary

However, there are features of sequential organization that characterise exploratory contexts as institutional talk and at the same time distinguish them from expository contexts. Most importantly, the trainer's control of topic and turn taking is different in exploratory contexts and this shapes the nature and extent of trainee participation and contributions.

In **4.7** the trainer introduces the topic, or, rather, the topic question of differences in organization of words in the dictionary and words in the mind. But this topic initiation is very different from **4.1-4.4**. It is different in two main ways: who develops the topic and how it is developed. Recall that in **4.1-4.4**, the information to be transmitted was largely in the trainer's knowledge domain. Trainees were involved in varying degrees, typically dependent on their knowledge state, but what got said and how it got said were under the trainer's control. This is not the case in **4.7**, which gives it more in common with **4.5** (when a trainer invitation for methodological opinion opens space for experiential input) and **4.6**, where groups report back on what they have produced.

The trainer initiates the topic and in this respect controls what gets talked about in general terms. But once the trainer has done this, it is the trainees who are responsible for topic development. This is because in exploratory contexts the asymmetry in knowledge states that shapes expository contexts is reversed in important respects. It is the trainees not the trainer who have primary access to this kind of knowledge. This means that it is the trainees who exert a significantly greater degree of control of the topic and this in turn exerts an influence on turn-taking and sequence organization.

We see in lines 68-76 that the trainer has a view on the question she has raised. We also see her working to move trainees towards this view, in lines 34-35, where she confronts S2 and S4 with their seeming **lack of order** position, and in lines 55-60, where she seeks confirmation from them on their reformulated **there is an order** position. However, it is the trainees who provide the input in this context. They know what they think, not the trainer.

In fact, it may be that the trainees do **not** know what they think, or have trouble putting it into words, as happens in places in **4.7**. It is therefore a large part of the trainer's role in exploratory contexts to help trainees express or shape their ideas and we can see this happening in lines 14, 22, 34-35, 37, 55-60, and 62. In expository contexts (particularly deferred input types such as **4.2** and **4.4**), the trainer is getting known-in-advance information from trainees and so trainee participation is constrained and the trainer is in control of what gets said in second pair parts and post expansion sequences. Here, the trainees are more in control of second pair parts in terms of what and how much gets said and, as importantly, their post expansion. The presence of recipiency confirming interactional response tokens (see Drummond and Hopper, 1993a, 1993b; Jefferson, 1993; McCarthy, 2003) at, for example, lines 17, 32, 42, 47, 66, is another feature of exploratory contexts, and can be viewed as working in tandem with questions and prompts to help trainees put their ideas into words.

One final comment about the particularities of topic control in exploratory contexts relates to closings. It is possible that in the trainer's mind, her summary in lines 68-77 was a closing, but the floor request from S6 in line 78, leads to **his** first pair part in lines 80-82 and a series of trainer continuers following. The trainees have 're-opened closings' (cf Schegloff and Sacks, 1973). The trainer's summary which does close the sequence in lines 99-112 is a product of trainee contributions, which have moved trainer and trainees on from the relatively simple formulation of order in the mind in 68-77 to something more developed and complex in 99-112.

The trainees have been the prime movers in providing the information which constitutes the final formulation by the trainer in lines 99-107. What counts as relevant knowledge here is not in the hands of the trainer in the sense that it is in expository contexts. In this respect the trainees have had the last word; but this must be qualified by the trainer's leading role in helping them to shape these words. Trainee control of topic has a perceptible impact on turn-taking and participation structure, with a significantly greater number of trainee turns and related control over what gets said, when and how it gets said. We cannot say however that this sequential organization is close to ordinary conversation, for in multi-party conversations there is no chairperson or moderator, who calls on parties to speak or to whom all contributions are addressed. It is noteworthy that in lines 22-36, where there is disagreement between trainees, what is said gets said to the trainer not to the person at whom the turn is really directed. There is one floor, overseen or moderated by the trainer.

In sum, in exposed exploratory contexts the trainer may not always have the first and last word and exerts significantly less control over what happens between opening and closing. Moreover, when the first and last words do come from the trainer they are not in the service of eliciting, providing or summarising known-in-advance information on the trainer's part, but in helping trainees with more or less thought-in-advance information or ideas which are consciously shaped in interaction – information that becomes known-in-interaction.

4.3 Embedded Exploratory Contexts

The other kind of exploratory context is dependent on expository context topics and sequences and arises from questions posed by the trainer at some point in initial or deferred input.

In **4.8**, the trainer has just provided trainees with extended initial input where the topic is remedial work on learner oral errors. He has discussed different learner patterns in getting things right and wrong, referring back to the opening of the session, where trainer and trainees had distinguished between errors and mistakes. The nature of errors will affect approaches to remedial work. His 'so I think a lot of thinking is needed here' looks back to the various questions and issues he has raised and is the bridge to an exploratory context in which the trainer invites trainees for their thoughts, providing a default option of re-presenting language in line 2.

If we recall the overall structure of initial input expository contexts, it is frequently the trainer who occupies the sequential slot following the input, with an invitation to trainees for examples or descriptions or a question to check understanding. This is the case in **4.8**, but the question is not checking on known information; it is seeking information that only the trainee has, and so opens up an exploratory context, however temporary this might be, with the reversed asymmetry of knowledge again having an impact on turn-taking and participation structures.

4.8

001	T	um so I think a lot of thinking is needed here. and would you would
002	T	you reteach things PPP style?
003		(4.0)
004	S6	well it depends on the I mean obviously if there- if it's a mistake then
005	S6	going through the whole presentation.
006	T	yeh.
007	S6	(I don't think) is is gonna, well it's just a waste of time.
008	T	mm hmm.
009	S6	I mean anyway if it I'm sure that within a class if you've got ten
010	S6	students, then probably half of them are making errors and the other
011	S6	half are making mistakes.
012	T	yeh.
013	S6	so maybe-
014	T	well maybe you- it's even more complex than that sometimes, and a
015	T	third are getting it right a third are making mistakes and a third are
016	T	making errors, yeh.
017	S6	yeah, so I mean you have to decide what to do in that situation=
018	T	=in order to involve everybody.
019	S6	yeh.
020	T	yeh.
021	S6	so getting the students making- well the ones that <u>know</u> can explain
022	S6	it to the ones that don't.
023	T	that's right, yeh.
024	S6	um though it would be I guess a briefer process or-
025	T	yeh.
026	S6	different, not presentation at all, rather a student centred explanation
027	S6	for something.
028	T	right.
029	S6	and then go straight into- but if if it's a general um aspect of
030	S6	mistake,
031	T	mm hmm.
032	S6	then go into kind of more quickly straight into some kind of activity.
033	T	right.
034	S6	or a game.
035	T	so if it was that kind of teacher led PPPish thing the presentation

036	T	would be very brief, you'd get into some-
037	S6	[yeh prac- oral practice student-student]
038	T	[hopefully oral student to student] that's right .so you'd be
039	T	more inclined to go for some kind of task where students could help
040	T	students. so probably um consciousness raising, no? probably along
041	T	the lines of consciousness raising.
042	S2	task based learning.
043	T	task based learning yeh.
044	S2	is a very good idea for remedial work.
045	T	that's right.
046	S2	because it's letting the students see that they probably do know the
047	S2	language already.
048	T	yeh.
049	S2	and er it's providing more of a context than probably a [PPP lesson]
050	T	[that's right]
051	S2	could.
052	T	that's right. so here you may be using a kind of mixture of things
053	T	with some things PPP for one reason or another, other times
054	T	something more com- you know task based learning, or
055	T	consciousness-raising, but here you'd be much more inclined to go
056	T	into a kind of TBL consciousness-raising approach for this kind of
057	T	thing.
058	S5	mm hmm
059	T	(2.0)((writing on board)) but, that may be plus some kind of practice
060	T	and the practice may be drilling.
061	S6	hhh hhh.
062	S5	mm hmm.
063	T	the practice may be fairly free practice or it might be some form of
064	T	drilling. but again you've got to try and make the drilling fun, and let
065	T	them see the REASon for it, and the end of it. you know kind of the
066	T	end purpose of it .
067	S5	mm hmm.
068	T	I think. so that they see it's not just it's not punishment, you're not
069	T	angry. (2.0) um ok, um...

The trainer's what-would-you-do question addresses teacher decision-making. In lines 4-20, S6 establishes the context for this decision-making, with the trainer's Interactional Response Tokens (IRTs) in lines 6, 8 and 12 marking recipiency, but his 'well' in line 14 indicates a problem with the trainee's class description in lines 9-11. His revised description in lines 14-16 is accepted by the trainee's 'yeah' in line 17. This IRT marks incipient speakership, with the trainee's '*so* + upshot' summary of the situation (and the problem – a very mixed learner group) in line 17 this time getting a sentence completion from the trainer in line 18, making explicit the importance of involving everyone in whatever strategy is adopted. The 'yehs' from trainee and trainer in lines 19 and 20 serve as an agreed ratification of this revised version.

In lines 21-34, the trainee develops his solution to the problem situation constructed in lines 4-20, with IRT continuers from the trainer at lines 25, 28, 31 and 33, and a self-repair by the trainee at line 29. It is noticeable that a full-blown assessment comes in line 23, and is followed by IRT continuers rather than preceded by them. In lines 35-41, the trainer provides a *so* prefaced 'let me see if I have this right' formulation of the trainee's solution. However, his additional proffering of consciousness raising as the type of activity that would be an appropriate alternative to a PPP style presentation, suggests that while S6's 'the ones that know can explain it to the ones that don't' in lines 21-22 is a clear enough starting point to finding an approach that would involve everyone, the description of what this might be in lines 24-26 is not. S6's 'briefer process', 'different', 'not presentation at all' and 'rather a student centred explanation' are too vague in specifying the kind of activity that might involve everyone. The trainer's **professional discourse shaper** role is on display in lines 35-41.

In line 42, S2 offers an alternative to the trainer's proposed activity type, which is developed up to line 51, with a series of assessment acceptance tokens from the trainer. In lines 52-57 the trainer offers a second *so* prefaced formulation of trainee ideas. The trainer's *here* in lines 52 and 55 have different cohesive ties. *Here* in line 52 retakes the *here* in line 1 and so the trainer's expository context review of the issues involved in remedial work that came before. The *here* in line 55 refers to the typical class composition sketched by S6 in 9-11 and filled out by the trainer in 14-16. The trainer adds the final practice component of S6's solution in lines 59-60, getting acceptances from S6 and S5 in lines 61-62. The trainer closes the exploratory context in 63-66 by once again filling out S6's 'oral practice, student-student' from line 37 with the kinds of practice possible. His stress on making drilling fun, again refers back to a point he made in the expository input.

In this embedded exploratory context, we find common ground with features noted in **4.7**. The trainer initiates the topic but it is the trainees who do much of the talking, having the turn-space to develop in relatively extended turns marked by the trainer's recipiency IRTs. Once again, while the trainer retains control over summaries or formulations of topic-up-to-now, trainees are able to reject trainer versions and replace or modify them with their own, as S2 does in line 42. In this sense, the last word is not necessarily the trainer's.

There are also differences from exposed exploratory contexts. The trainer is more involved in the construction of an answer to the question they posed in line 2 than was the case in **4.7**, contributing ideas in lines 14-18, 38-41, 52-57 and 63-69. This is doing something more than just helping trainees to shape their ideas; it is contributing directly to the shaping of input. We can interpret this by recalling what was said in the introduction to this section on the dependency of exploratory and experiential contexts on expository. But **4.7** suggests that there are degrees of dependency. The task framing question in lines 1-2 occupies the second slot in an expository context, and while the question has invited trainee contributions, the trainer's heavier involvement in shaping the product is arguably a consequence of the embedding, in that elements of the trainer role and identity in expository contexts are threaded through their sequential offshoots. Extract **4.8** unfolds in this wider expository context environment, where the trainer has contributed significant initial input to the exploration, and the exploration is building on this initial input, with the trainer thus having a greater pedagogic

'investment' in the outcome. This contrasts with the exposed exploratory context in **4.7**, where the trainer question was not grounded in preceding input.

As always, it is not just **where** factors (sequential context) but also **what** (topic and task) and the related distribution of knowledge factors which point to further reasons for a greater participation by the trainer in shaping a response to the initial question (Schegloff, 2007; 2010). The **4.7** topic was 'theoretical' and addressed abstract ideas; in **4.8**, the topic is more practical and concrete, where trainees are asked to propose methodological procedures. S6's response is grounded in experience, and the *you* and *they* pronoun usage by trainer and trainees throughout the sequence is referring to action by **you the teacher** in a given context. The trainer's participation in the sequence seems to be as much a fellow teacher as a trainer.

In exposed and embedded exploratory contexts, the trainer's main goal is to help trainees express and shape their ideas, but the nature of the latter will sometimes lead to a greater direct involvement by the trainer in this shaping and may call for other elements of trainer identity aside from professional discourse shaper.

4.4   Institutional Identity in Exploratory Contexts

The pedagogic focus in exploratory sequences is to stimulate analytical thought by trainees, to help them develop their own ideas and approaches, and to place often unfamiliar ideas or concepts in the context of current knowledge. This pedagogic focus is one aim deriving from the wider institutional goal of developing teacher knowledge and skills within a broadly social constructivist framework.

At the centre of this approach to teacher learning is the idea that **reflection** on the theory and practice of teaching can lead to change and development (Roberts, 1997: 44). As I noted in Section 4.3, in the wider institutional order language teacher development is viewed as a social process, with language and interaction at its heart (Calderhead, 1989; Freeman, 1996; Roberts, 1997; Williams, 1999). In discoursal terms, reflection is a form of talk-in-interaction. This conscious articulation of conceptions of practice - public theories, personal theories, knowing-in-action (Schon, 1987), ideas, beliefs and attitudes - is the engine for the reconstruction of practice which is at the heart of in-service teacher development (see Freeman, 1996).

Exploratory contexts are an important forum for these largely meta-cognitive processes. The role and situational identity of the trainer in these sorts of sequence, where it is experiential knowledge rather than received knowledge (Wallace, 1991) that is at a premium, will be different from the primary pedagogic identity of **expert/knower** of expositional sequences. Experiential knowledge is 'perceptual' rather than 'conceptual', so not something external to trainees but internal. The trainer/teacher educator has to help trainees 'reflect on the details of their practical experience' (Loughran and Berry, 2005: 198). **Enhancing or enabling reflection**, helping trainees to articulate this tacit, often unconscious knowledge, is central to the trainer's pedagogic identity in these interactional contexts (Smith, 2005; Robinson and McMillan, 2006).

There seem to be two main elements to enacting this **reflector** identity in trainer talk. The first element is a form of modelling or showing: the modelling of meta-learning in the language to talk about your own or others' practice and experience (Loughran and Berry, 2005: 94 et seq). The trainer as **discourse developer** - a modeller of the language and interpersonal skills for talking about teaching - is a <u>linguistic</u> component of their reflector identity (see Freeman, 1991, 1996; Wallace, 1991). The expression of the trainer's enabling role here is indirect, in that trainees may or may not 'notice' the modelling.

The second situational identity element is <u>pedagogic</u> and involves the 'leading' focus of exploratory contexts (McGrath, 1997), where the trainer prompts trainees to 'articulate what they know and put forward new ideas of their own' (Ur, 1996: 8). The trainer's **prompting and enabling** role here is more direct, where the trainer helps trainees to notice aspects of practice and to articulate these noticings. This sort of trainer responding to trainee input is **feedback** in the widest sense - helping them to formulate ideas in relevant and appropriate ways. We shall return to a consideration of it in more detail in Chapter 5.

In **4.7** and **4.8**, the trainer's reflector identity is in evidence in the sequential organization of topic and turn-taking and the sequence organization of relevant topic and goal related tasks.

Sequential Organization

The pedagogic focus in exploratory sequences is getting and shaping information and ideas from the trainees. The trainer identities in play have an important influence on sequential organization, largely in terms of two of the four interactional asymmetries Heritage (2004:236) proposes are places at which to explore the 'specific institutionality of interactions'.

The knowledge at a premium in exploratory sequences is tacit or internal, not 'out there'. I argued in **4.2** and **4.3** that this knowedge is of a kind that is not necessarily known-in-advance by the trainer, and may not have been consciously considered by trainees. It needs to be talked into being. This rather different **asymmetry of knowledge** is weighted towards the trainees, and it is their knowledge base that is in important respects superior to the trainer's here. The trainer-as-expert display of knowledge in expository contexts does not shape interaction in exploratory sequences, nor does their determining of what is relevant knowledge. Rather, it is the trainer's role in prompting and supporting trainees in articulating experiential knowledge that determines features of sequential organization.

The nature of the knowledge in play, the trainer's role in getting this knowledge from trainees and theirs in displaying it means that the **asymmetries of participation** found in expository contexts are not so much in evidence here. Notable markers of this sequential environment are the

Sequence Organization

The tasks that get done in exploratory sequences are all tasks that can also get done in expository sequences: giving explanations, proposing teaching procedures and strategies, comparing ideas, classifying and defining. But in expository sequences these tasks are largely in the hands of the trainer and are carried out with known-in-advance information (to the trainer and, sometimes, the trainees). They call forth the key discourse identities of **informer** and **summariser** (with the *so* + upshot drawing of implications a frequent lexical choice for framing a summary) which in turn mark the predominant situational identity of **expert/knower** on the part of the trainer.

In exploratory sequences, in contrast, these tasks call forth rather different identity features in the context of a reflective pedagogic focus. The trainer's discourse identity in this sequence type moves between questioner and responder. These turn-generated categories frame the overriding **reflector** institutional identity displayed in the trainee-led tasks.

In **4.7**, the IRTs in lines 17, 32, 37, 42, 47, 66 and 79 are responsive and give turns to trainees. This discourse identity of **receptor** enables trainees to articulate ideas about concepts related to practice. As trainees build and develop their ideas, they need to be clear about what they are saying. We noted that an important element of trainer identity here is **feedbacker,** helping trainees to notice and to articulate their noticings. In lines 22 and 37 the trainer questions prompt trainees to clarify their position. In lines 47 and 83-88, the trainer's acceptance of and feedback on trainee positions with assessment markers is a further responsive element in the trainer's reflector role.

The indirect receptor identity comes in the modelling of summary language in lines 55, 68-77 and 99-111. In lines 71- 77, the trainer refers to Jean Aitchison and related research, placing trainee ideas in a larger institutional context.

In **4.8** trainer recipiency is marked in lines 6,8,12, 20, 25, 31. **Feedbacker** or assesor of ideas comes with the free-standing and varying in strength assessments in 14-16, 23, 28, 33. There is also the clarificatory repair work in lines 14-16 with a dispreferred *well*-marked post expansion turn and utterance completing line 18, ensuring that the implications of the trainer repair for remedial work are made explicit. And there is a more extended assessment turn in lines 38-41, where the trainer adds consciousness-raising as a possible strategy.

Summarizing comes in 35-36 and 52 et seq. In both **4.7** and **4.8** the summary is of trainee input not the trainer's. However, it is the trainer who is in charge of the summary in both these exploratory sequences. While there is a trainee *so* + upshot turn in **4.8**, line 17 and 21-22, it is not a summary of the story so far but a given-this-then-that next step pointer. In exploratory sequences, a part of the trainer's reflector role is to 'model' summaries for trainees.

Extract **4.7** is exploring theory or concepts. Extract **4.8** explores practice. One feature of this difference is the use of *you* by the trainer and trainees.

In lines 1-2 of **4.8** the trainer poses the question of representing things PPP style with *you*. Here it seems that this plural *you* is addressed to the class. From lines 4-9, S6 uses *I* as the pronoun when describing his teaching context, but in line 9 switches to *you* when talking about the composition of a class. As Sacks (1992: 166) notes, this *you* refers to 'some category which includes everybody else'. S6's you-as-a-teacher includes both trainer and fellow trainees. The trainer's repair at lines 14-16 takes up the categorial teacher *you*, and in the jointly constructed *so* + upshot turn in lines 17 and 18 we see *you* 'gets used in specifying a proverb, or a proverbial type of frame' (Sacks, 1992: 167). In the trainer's two main summarizing turns, categorial and proverbial *you* is present.

In practice-focused explorations, it is perhaps natural that the trainer's transportable identity as fellow professional and teacher, colleague and collaborator is called into play. Categorial *you* marks this optional element of the trainer's **reflector** identity in **4.8**, while proverbial *you* is a marker of the discourse developing element. In **4.7**, while proverbial *you* is present in the trainer's final summary in lines 99-107 and in S6's turn beginning at line 86, its reference is to anybody else rather than to a particular category (Sacks, 1992: 166). This seems related to the exploratory topic and task.

The trainer's **reflector** identity in exploratory sequences has an importantly **synthetic** function in shaping interaction, typically aimed at pulling trainee ideas together, or helping them to do so. The greater participation of trainees is related to topic (and related knowledge states) and task. The trainer's continuing control of topic initiation (there are few trainee initiations of exploratory topics in the data), development (through questions, repair clarifications, staging summaries) and closing (via summaries) in exploratory seqences marks the trainer's situational identity and its linguistic and pedagogic focus on enabling trainees to articulate conceptions of practice.

4.5   Exposed Experiential Contexts

In experiential contexts, trainers invite trainees to draw on and share experiences concerning a particular topic. As we shall see, there are commonalities between exploratory and experiential contexts, but there are also differences.

Extract **4.9** is an example of an exposed experiential context. At the start of the second part of a training session, the trainer has asked trainees individually to make a journal entry on any writing work they have done with their class in the past week and for what purposes. Trainees are then put in threes and asked to share their journal entries. When the whole group comes together, the trainer first asks them to provide the purposes for which they used writing. In effect, the trainer uses trainee experience for <u>expository input</u>, the purposes for writing.

Prior to **4.9** the trainer close the sequence on purposes for writing, having recorded them on the board:

Purposes for Writing
   1. exam preparation
   2. general writing skills
   3. communication – work, personal
   4. different genres
   5. consolidate language in general

Following this expository element, there are three experientially grounded, trainee-initiated turns with trainer responses in lines 1-3 (S5), 13-23 (S6) and 63-66 (S7). In each case the trainee is returning to one of the listed purposes for writing to add further experiential input linked to their 'learners' own writing needs' . In each case the trainer adds his own experientially framed response. In lines 4-10 he adds applying for a scholarship to S5's tourism; in lines 24-41 and 51-61 he adds an important contextual factor to S6's input – S6 works in a school where English is the language of study, where groups are multilingual and where there are native speakers; and in lines 67-69 he adds levels of formality to S7's genre, his *you* in line 69 being directed at S6, acknowledging the common ground.

4.9

01	S5	and also that they don´t need it that-..if they´re going to function er er in
02	S5	the foreign language almost certainly <u>some</u> time along the way even if only
03	S5	to fill in forms, and if you´re going to actually be a tourist- [(xxxxxxxxx]]
04	T	[YEH, the-th]ese things just pop up out of the blue don´t they,
05	T	suddenly you have an opportunity for a scholarship or something and you
06	T	have to write a kind of- something of a fairly .hh lengthy thing about why
07	T	you´re you know applying for the scholarship and what you´ll do and etc
08	T	etc, ..and y´had no practice?-
09	S5	>yeh<.
10	T	get someone else to do it for you. suppose you have to do it there on site-
11	S5	ha ha.
12	T	heh heh, yourself.
13	S6	when it´s- something that I that I notice much more from teaching from
14	S6	teaching younger,..younger people is um..that they write in the beginning
15	S6	very much the way they speak. and that it really has to be pointed out to
16	S6	them first that- it has to be pointed out to them that that you know <u>*like*</u>, is
17	S6	not a y´kn- a word that is regularly used OTHer than in the sense of
18	S6	y´know style i-its not like..i-i- you know when you´re speaking it´s you
19	S6	know it´s when you´re speaking it´s 'oh whatcha do at the weekend?' and
20	S6	it´s like 'oh like I er I went out to the supermarket, I was (talkin to) some
21	S6	friends, and like er after that I er', you know what I mean like is-, that will
22	S6	appear, like will appear ten times you know in half a page (1.5) um…er
23	S6	they just write exactly the way they speak er::..
24	T	thi-this is more LIKEly er in your situation where English is being learned
25	T	as a second language, where there are native speakers among the kids,
26	T	..no? {S3: ((nods))} there are native speakers among the kids, they they
27	T	communicate- there-there are people with di- they are not monolingual
28	T	groups, there are people with different native languages and so therefore
29	T	English is the lingua franca, {S3: yeh} and so therefore you get these um,
30	T	er these characteristics of er of..er..the language being used for daily
31	T	communication, so you get things like 'like'. you know these things with
32	T	'like', same as in Spanish 'este' and- .hh but erm where people

33	T	are learning it as a FOReign language and they have less frequent contact
34	T	with the language er and er usually it´s with native speakers or with other
35	T	Mexican learners, you don´t get those mannerisms so much so they don´t
36	T	come into the writing so much it´s probably more common in YOUR
37	T	situation.=
38	S6	ok, mm.
39	T	because they they would use these things among themselves the native
40	T	speakers would, and they´d notice them in movies and things and pick
41	T	them up from movies and so on.
42	S6	right and they quite often use inappropriate words that they´ve heard or
43	S6	picked up in the playground (xxxx) and it's just like sorry you can´t say
44	S6	that.
45	T/SS	((laughter))
46	S6	you might have heard it but that´s.. you can´t do that,..
47	S7	like (xxxxxx) don´t exist.
48	T/SS	((laughter))
49	S6	yeh well it does exist and I might say it on a Saturday night after a few
50	S6	[drinks and] {TSS: ((laughter))}.
51	T	[we- we'll-] that´s right we´ll look at some of the aspects i-in a
52	T	moment, but I would suspect that for: most of you erm where you know-
53	T	the learners you´re dealing with are learning English as a foreign language
54	T	although some of them may get quite a high level now, some of them may
55	T	have lived abroad and so on, but the problems are more erm actually
56	T	interference and not kind of being able to think in English, and have the
57	T	language resources available for thi- for expressing themselves in English.
58	T	so much.
59	S6	uh huh.
60	T	whereas your kids are thinking in English but they´re thinking orally and
61	T	it´s not appropriate for writing.
62	S6	uh huh.
63	S7	also there´s the question of genre because obviously this is a MAJor
64	S7	problem, because ther- ther- there´s a translation of the genre. or the
65	S7	GEnres ar- are important differently in different (1.0) different (1.0)
66	S7	languages and -

67	T	and and er um levels of formality as well, so you do get students er using
68	T	'kids' inappropriately in a formal you know instead of 'children', which is er
69	T	similar to what you were mentioning, yeh.

In **4.9**, we find similarities between exploratory and experiential sequences embodied in the greater **participation** of trainees in input. This different participation structure is again founded on greater trainee control over topic and turn-taking, which in turn is related to the nature of the information involved and the knowledge state of trainees. We will return to this point in Section 4.7 and the summary in Section 4.8.

4.6   Embedded Experiential Contexts

In **4.10**, we see an example of an experiential context embedded in an expository one (recall **4.5** as an earlier example).

The trainer is showing a video of two Mexican learners talking about their attitude to being corrected. He asks trainees to look at the video the first time and focus on the attitudes of the two learners. What are they and how are they different? On the second viewing, trainees will then focus on the mistakes or errors learners are making. **Extract 4.10** starts with the trainer asking for comments on attitudes after watching the video segment.

In lines 1-11 we have an expository sequence opening with the trainer getting from S1 his classification of the girl's attitude, with acceptance by the trainer, who summarises in line 11. However, in line 12 S2's self-nominating 'well' signals a problem with the trainer's (and S1's) characerisation of 'traditional'. In lines 13-23 S2 sets out a more inclusive notion drawing on his own experience, with trainer recipiency response tokens marking the turn space to do so. It is not just educational authorities and teachers, but also students who expect a 'traditional' approach. In lines 24-26 the trainer adds an 'if not X then Y' formulation to S2's expansion of traditional, completed by S2 in line 27.

In lines 28-44 the trainer offers a further reported teacher experience from a conference presentation as a possible approach to implementing learner training. In lines 45 to 57, S4 shares a similar strategy and in line 57 moves to provide a possible rationale for this approach, but this in fact comes from the trainer, adding the rationale that his conference teacher/trainer gave with a summary of this in lines 58-70. In line 71, S1's self-nominating turn opens with *mm*, one of Jefferson's less-oriented to speakership incipiency markers, but does in an important respect change topic. From a learner training strategy for oral mistakes and teacher attitudes towards correction to an approach to correcting writing.

The trainer does not address the content of S1's turn in lines 80-82 but the form, an American conditional structure. Following his expression of mock disbelief and horror at using this structure, S1 provides a reason for this in line 87.

The trainer's *um ok* in line 106 brings the sequence back to where it began in lines 1-11 with 'so she has a traditional attitude' and provides a preview of the second part of the viewing task, which is to identify student errors or mistakes.

Lines 1-11 and 106-112 frame an expository context in which an experiential sequence is embedded. As with exposed experiential sequences, control of topic and turn-taking in the interposing experiential turns is not overwhelmingly with the trainer.

4.10

01	T	so, ok. it's a little bit kind of broken, the beginning of it. but you
02	T	can grasp pretty well two different attitudes now. er any comments
03	T	on their two different attitudes?
04	S1	(2.0) I think it seems (1.0) the girl is perhaps the more traditional
05	S1	attitude, because in most er educational systems the idea is that
06	S1	the teacher is the font of all knowledge and your job is to correct
07	S1	absolutely every little error.
08	T	yeh yeh yeh.
09	S1	because if you're not correcting you're really just lazy. (1.0) or
10	S1	maybe incompetent.
11	T	right. so she has a fairly traditional attitude, but that's her attitude.
12	S2	(well I feel inclined) well traditional I guess but it- I find students,
13	S2	th- that's the attitude most students will have.
14	T	yeh.
15	S2	that I've taught.
16	T	they actually want to be corrected=
17	S2	they get annoyed if you don't.
18	T	right.
19	S2	no I don't mean you have to be fascist about it,
20	TR	uh huh.
21	S2	but um, that er (some) they needed feedback from the teacher.
22	TR	mm hmm.
23	S2	regular feedback. [(correction)]
24	T	[right, so if]you feel you don't want to do that
25	T	for your teacher's reasons you have to get into a bit of learner
26	T	training one way or another, (1.0)
27	S2	or you're gonna get, it's gonna get detrimental to [the class.
28	T	[er there's a guy
29	T	called Paul Seligson er who's been here in Mexico a couple of times
30	T	I don't know if anybody [went to MEXTESOL]
31	S3	[mm hmm yes] ↓student centred↓
32	T	he he says that he um (2.0) has an approach to some groups, er
33	T	where he's been in an institution which's had that kind of you know
34	T	where he's been in an institution which's had that kind of you know
35	T	aura to it about you know teachers correct, students expect to be
36	T	corrected by the teachers. and the first lesson (1.5) that or

37	T	or at least if not the first one maybe he's making personal contact
38	T	then, but so the second lesson he corrects er all the time, corrects
39	T	students all the time right the way through.
40	S3	mm hmm.
41	T	and then the following lesson he doesn't correct at all. he just
42	T	focuses on communication, understanding and boom boom boom.
43	T	er and then the next lesson he gets them to discuss which they
44	T	preferred. and why why he um gave them these two options.
45	S4	I tend to the same thing actually, the students I tell them today I'm
46	S4	going to correct you every mistake you make,
47	S4	I don't correct every mistake, I correct most of them.
48	S4	and the next class I'll not correct a thing.
49	T	yeah.
50	S4	and just barrel on and then yes we'll do some kind of
51	S4	[and this is] what they prefer.
52	T	[↑interact↑]
53	S4	and some students will point out that we're not correcting them
55	S4	today.
56	T	yeah yeah yeah.
57	S4	but it's like..
58	T	give them give them- yes because otherwise I mean one thing that
59	T	he says is that if you ask students you know you know do you like
60	T	me to correct you a lot or not at all, they don't know until they've
61	T	felt it.
62	S4	mm hmm, mm hmm.
63	T	(2.0) and so (you kind of- that's) just an idea for learner training.
64	T	and so you have to give them the experience. they have to
65	T	experience what it's like to be corrected all the time, every damn
66	T	little thing you- mistake you make, and what it's like not to be
67	T	corrected at all. so you have to give them the experience,
68	T	so that they can (.) have some kind of judgement.
69	T	otherwise they're just, it's just kind of you know off the
70	T	top of their heads.

71	S1	mm because I mean when I teach ours writing I don't correct all
72	S1	their mistakes I just concentrate on one or two errors.
73	T	yeah.
74	T	and I tell them at the time. I <u>do</u> get people complaining, well you're
75	S1	<u>not</u> correcting all of this. and (..) it's a short course so I'm I'm
76	S1	rather restrained from what I can do and i-
77	T	yeah.
78	S1	if I would actually correct everything for them it'd be so
79	S1	demotivating for them that they'd never want to-
80	T	did- am I right or am I wrong did he say[if I would] correct
81	S3	[I would have] yes
82	T	every mistake they made?
83	S1	I didn't-
84	T/SS	((laughter from trainer and trainees))
85	S1	did I say that?
86	T/SS	//yes//yes//yes
87	S1	25 years in Canada.
88	T/SS	((laughter))
		((18 lines missing, where trainer tells an anecdote related to
		differences between British and North American English))
106	T	um ok. so, she has a traditional attitude, um, (1.5) her English is
107	T	pretty good isn't it. I mean bu- intermediate level
108	S2	mm hmm.
109	S3	yeh.
110	T	um, and pretty good intermediate level, I mean that little bit was
111	T	you know had characteristics of a non native speaker, but nothing
112	T	no no kind of big you know errors I don't think in it.
113	S1	oops ok
		((laughter))

4.7 Institutional Identity in Experiential Contexts

In experiential sequences, trainees are invited to draw on and share their teaching and learning experiences with a particular topic. We have seen (in **4.8** and **4.10** in particular) that there can be a blurring of divisions between exploratory and experiential contexts and this is not surprising when it is the trainees' experiences that supply significant parts of the data for discussion and analysis in exploratory sequences.

Consider some features of sequential and sequence organization that are shared by experiential and exploratory contexts:

- experiential knowledge is at a premium in both sequential contexts
- the levelling effect of topic knowledge states evidenced in exploratory contexts is also evident in turn taking and trainee participation in experiential contexts
- features of the trainer's reflector identity noted in exploratory contexts are also present in experiential contexts

However, the two sequence types differ in important interactional respects, and contribute in different ways to the overriding institutional goal of developing teacher knowledge and skills within a broadly social constructivist framework, with its central tenet of reflective practitioners, articulating conceptions of practice and in doing so changing and developing as teachers.

Sequential Organization

I noted in exploratory contexts that as it is largely experiential knowledge that is in play, not known-in-advance by the trainer, and that the focus is on trainees doing the talking, there is a greater interactional symmetry in evidence. In experiential contexts however, while the emphasis is still on trainees doing the talking, there are noticeable differences in how topics are developed and the kinds of turns that do this. Once again, this is related to the pedagogic focus, here encouraging trainees to share their particular classroom experiences.

While I have characterised exploratory sequences as mostly **synthetic**, experiential sequences in contrast are mostly **additive**. In **4.9**, each of the 3 trainee contributions is treated on its own terms, with the trainer adding his own experientially grounded input. In **4.10**, the three trainee contributions from S2, S4 and S1 are again 'case studies', with the trainer responding to each in its own topical and sequential context and adding his own vicarious experiential contribution.

In **4.9** and **4.10,** each trainee contribution, while bearing some relation with what went before, is not contributing to building <u>one topic</u> in the co-operative sense that topic is built in ordinary conversation, nor does it display the stepwise transition between topics evidencing the orientation to co-participants underlying topic initiation or build that is common in ordinary conversation (Sacks, 1992, Vol II: 564, 566). A 'lousy conversation' can be marked by a large number of new topic starts (Sacks, 1992, Vol II: 566), but this does not mark a lousy experiential sequence; in fact, it characterises it. We may also wish to add a further characteristic feature: its necessarily extended length to do justice to each case. Experiential talk is adjacency organized within each 'case' or topic, but it is topic organized in overall structure (Sacks, 1992, vol II: 569).

The additive nature of contributions to experiential sequences makes for less trainer control over turn-taking than in exploratory contexts, where the trainer is much more closely involved in the shaping of outcomes. In particular, while the trainer initiates the overall topic he does not necessarily close it summarily. More trainees are involved, more often and all three trainee contributions in **4.9** were self-nominating.

Sequence Organization

In experiential contexts, we find a different kind of discourse and a different kind of **reflector** identity for the trainer. Mercer (in Williams, 1999: 19) looks at the way that language is used as a social mode of thinking and distinguishes three kinds of talk in the discourse that occurs in groups.

- **Disputational talk -** is characterised by disagreement and individualised decision-making. There is little attempt to come together and be constructively critical.
- **Cumulative Talk** - is where speakers build positively but uncritically on what people say.
- **Explanatory talk** - is where participants 'engage critically but constructively with each other's ideas, challenges are justified and alternative hypotheses offered, reasoning is visible, and knowledge is made more publicly accountable

Experiential context topics are beads on a chain, and the generality of the task and superordinate topic (describing practice) makes for trainee input which is more <u>descriptive</u> of experience than <u>interpretive</u>. Cumulative talk is more characteristic of experiential contexts while explanatory talk is more characteristic of exploratory contexts. This in turn has an influence on trainer talk.

Categorial and proverbial *you* played an important part in the synthesizing and articulation of conceptions of practice in exploratory sequences. In experiential sequences, both uses are notable by their general absence. While there are examples of categorial *you* from the trainer in **4.9** and **4.10**, these are student *you* (or language user), reflecting trainee contributions. The trainer identity here marks their movement from the training classroom to the language classroom, where trainee turns are focused, and so to a **collegial** identity (Woodward, 1991).

In **4.10**, where the experiential is embedded in an expository context, we see a more reflective trainer identity linked to the pedagogic focus, which is in the first instance transmitting information, but can also accomodate reflection on both theory and practice. The categorial teacher *you* in **4.10** in lines 24-26 is arguably referencing the me-the teacher *you* in the preceding trainee turn, but the trainer's 'you have to get into a bit of learner training..' in lines 25-26 moves from local context to professional context. The intervening trainer turn which introduces an example learner training strategy is done experientially, through a fellow teacher, but the categorial and proverbial *you* of lines 63-70 make for a reflective summary in the wider expositional context.

Here again, we are one level down in Woodward's role stack and this has an impact on discourse and identity. In experiential contexts trainees are teachers and trainers are fellow teachers or **colleagues**. Trainee discourse is cumulative and mostly informal in **4.9** and **4.10**, exemplifying Freeman's (1991, 1996) notion of vernacular, local language. Compare these extracts with trainer and trainee language in **4.7** and **4.8,** which is significantly more professional. *Synonyms*, *acronyms*, *networks, error*, *mistake*, *PPP*, *task based learning*, *consciousness-raising*, are examples of the more professional language that marks exploratory, and indeed, expository discourse. The only examples of professional language here come from the trainer, in **4.10** with his 'learner training', and it is significant that this is in an embedded experiential context.

4.8   Summary and Conclusions

At the beginning of **4.7** I drew attention to sequential features that characterise both exploratory and experiential contexts in terms of sequential and sequence organization. Because trainee experiential knowledge is a primary resource in both contexts, the greater interactional symmetries of knowledge in evidence shape turn-taking and consequent trainee participation. While the trainer remains in control regarding topic initiation and task setting, it is the trainees who have greater responsibility for topic development, in contrast to expository contexts. There are more trainee turns at talk, more self-nomination from trainees, a greater number of trainer IRTs indicating continuing recipiency.

All this is not to say that the trainer is not in control. Indeed, the orbit of exploratory and experiential contexts around their expository earth exerts a gravitational pull, such that the closer they are, the more control a trainer exerts over the process and products of topic and task development. This is reflected in the sometimes small but significant variations in participation structure, moving from greater in embedded to lesser control in exposed, greatest in exmbedded exploratory to least in exposed experiential. When we looked more closely at what was happening in terms of identity, important distinctions became apparent and were of course related to the shape of sequential elements and the nature of the control exerted by both trainer and trainee.

Freeman (1996: 227) notes that for teachers to gain access to their thinking about classroom practice, they need to add **professional language** to **local language**, and so to tap into the meta-level in teacher learning. Local language is used to describe what happens in teachers' daily classroom lives drawing on their experience as learners and on the teacher's room in their own institutional environment. This language is their 'primary identity kit...expressing their tacitly held, unanalyzed conceptions of practice'. As trainees, however, teachers 'encounter the program's ways of conceiving teaching and learning, which are expressed in its *professional language*'. Articulation comes when teachers put the two languages together to reflect on and critique their practice (Freeman, 1996: 228).   .

The trainer's identity in exploratory sequences is grounded in their training classroom role as **reflector**. Sequential and sequence organization evidence this role. In experiential sequences, the trainer's fellow teacher and **collaborator** identity is foregrounded and the classroom in focus is the language teaching classroom. In **4.9** and **4.10**, when the trainer is a feedbacker and summarizer, they do this as a colleague and collaborator, rather than trainer. This is also reflected in sequential organization and sequence organization. In particular, the topic fragmentation and the trainer's 'case' approach to each trainee contribution is a feature of the **additive** rather than **synthetic** functioning of situational identity. The drawing of conclusions and generalizing that the trainer does in these sequences is not so much for **teachers-as-trainees** but for **teachers-as-teachers** in a particular context. Where trainers remain above the interaction in important respects in exploratory contexts, the levelling nature of experiential contexts means that they occupy the same interactional ground as trainees.

Formulations by the trainer in exploratory sequences serve to organize, integrate and represent trainee contributions, which is an important element in the linguistic and pedagogic trainer identities on display, and is closely related to the sorts of conceptual and methodological exploration tasks/sequences that are being locally managed and constructed. The secular language of experience which often marks trainee contributions will need more often than not to be moved into a professional context. This is not a priority in experiential contexts, where the trainer remains for the most part a teacher among teachers. The absence of one topic and of trainer closing summaries in exposed experiential contexts is a reflection of this identity. The greater presence of trainer process and product formulations in embedded experiential contexts, such as **4.5** and **4.10** point to the pull of expository context identities.

In this chapter I have explored the three main sequential options available to a trainer in whole class interaction. What contribution do these contexts make to the overall pedagogic goal of teacher learning? Is their predominance a positive or negative influence in this respect? Or is it more important to consider the tasks and identities done in these contexts and their relationship with the other two contexts, the division of functional and so pedagogic labour, and their combined effect on teacher learning? I shall return to this key question in Chapter 6.

Aside from questions about teacher learning, what do these three interactional contexts tell us about teacher training processes? I have said that the articulation of practice as a basis for its reconstruction is at the heart of in-service teacher development (Freeman, 1996). The articulation of practice involves interaction and dialogue between trainer and trainees and between trainees. If we consider the three main varieties of training classroom whole group interaction, the tasks that they perform, the trainer identities they call forth and the participation structures they produce, it is clear that talk of transmission v constructivist models, and a one-to-one form-function match for the three varieties of trainer talk will miss the point. It is the exploration of our varieties of interaction and their links to different trainer identities that will give us a clearer sense of what teacher trainers do and how they do it through talk-in-interaction.

Table 2 summarises the main features of the three main interactional contexts for trainer talk described in this chapter.

Table 2   Features of Three Interactional Contexts in Trainer Talk

	Sequence Structure	Variations	Turn-taking Tasks & Identity

Expository
 	
Pedagogic Focus:
Giving and getting concepts, ideas and procedures
	Initial Input:
	- input
	- question
	- response
	s - summary
	  Deferred input:
	    - Elicit
	- - Response
	E - Expansion
	    and/or
	Summary
		- Extended initial input
		- Deferred input in a series
		- Experiential input from trainee
		- Expository input from trainees following group work
			Turn-taking
			- Trainer control over topic and turn-taking
			Tasks and sequences
			- definitions, classifications, descriptions,
			Trainer Identity
			- expert, theorist, summariser, manager

Exploratory **Pedagogic Focus:** Modelling professional language, prompting and shaping trainee ideas about experience	- Trainer prompt or question - Trainee response - Trainer expansion and summary	- **Exposed** Normally when trainer puts trainees into pairs or groups to discuss a question - **Embedded** Arising from questions posed by trainer during initial or deferred input	**Turn-taking** - Trainer topic initiation, trainee topic development, more trainee turns and self-nominations **Tasks** - interpreting concepts, ideas, teaching strategies and procedures, problem-solving **Trainer Identity** - reflector, professional discourse modeller - synthesizing and shaping
Experiential Contexts **Pedagogic Focus**: trainees share experiences and views on a particular topic, most typically relating to some aspect of teaching and learning.	**Trainer nominates** - Trainer asks question or invites comments - Trainee(s) respond Trainer closes **Trainee self-nominates** - Trainee(s) comment(s) or asks question - Trainer responds - Trainee acknowledgement	- **Exposed** Normally when trainer puts trainees into groups or pairs to share experiences - **Embedded** Coming from trainer questions or trainee interventions during initial or deferred input	**Turn-taking** - Trainer OR trainee topic initiation - Topic knowledge with trainees - Topics in a series **Tasks** - Trainees describe actions, procedures, techniques, strategies, learners **Identity** - fellow teacher, colleague - adding to and linking experiences

Chapter 5   Feedback in Teacher Trainer Talk

1   Introduction

In chapter 4, I looked at the main structures of interaction in teacher training classrooms. Using a CA-framed approach to analysis, I described the characteristic sequential features of three of the five main interactional contexts (expository, exploratory and experiential) in which input is constructed through talk-in-interaction. Within each of these broader turn-taking and sequential contexts, I considered the different sorts of teacher trainer tasks and institutional identities enacted in these contexts.

If organizing training tasks and activities is a central element in a trainer's work, responding to trainee output is another. I have noted in section 4.4 the importance of trainee talk and its role in reflecting on and reconstructing practice in social constructivist models of teacher education. The trainer's response to trainee talk shapes what gets said and done, how much and by whom in this talk.

In ordinary conversation, recipient response, or, in communication systems terms, **feedback** on output, performs a number of important interactional tasks. It will attend to the 'trouble problem', where trouble in speaking, hearing or understanding talk is addressed and repair carried out (Schegloff, 2007). **Repair** addresses two of Goffman's (1981) system constraints on message reception, ensuring the maintenance of intersubjectivity and the successful continuance of a 'turn and sequence and activity' (Schegloff, 2007: xiv).

A further two forms of feedback provide information not on the quality of the signal but, rather, on the quality of the content. **Formulations** of what has been said will record and interpret a message, providing feedback on how well a speaker has addressed the 'word-selection problem' (Schegloff, 2007) while also offering possible alternative ways of saying things. Finally, feedback on what is being said in the form of **assessments** will provide information to a speaker on message content and the alignment of the recipient with that content.

These three forms of feedback I have outlined are sequentially organized and 'done', so that what gets done is closely related to where it gets done, its sequential location. In chapter 5, I will describe the sequential organization of

2   Repair

"...the organization of repair in conversation provides centrally for self-correction, which can be arrived at by alternative routes of self-initiation and other-initiation - routes which are themselves so organized as to favour self-initiated repair." (Schegloff, Jefferson, Sacks, 1977: 377)

This benchmark finding about the organization of repair in conversation has been the comparative starting point for studies of repair in institutional settings, in particular language and subject classrooms (van Lier, 1988; Markee, 2000; Seedhouse, 2004; Mchoul, 1990).

Repair, in CA terms, is dependent on what participants view as troubles or problems in speaking and hearing. It is a subjective phenomenon. The troubles as defined by participants are not necessarily 'objective': language errors in ordinary conversation are not always addressed, while 'correct' talk may be repaired. As Schegloff (2007: 100) puts it 'anything in the talk may be treated as in need of repair'. It is the overt efforts to deal with trouble-sources or repairables (potentially everything in a conversation) that mark a turn as doing repair.

In the institutional context of a language classroom, Seedhouse (2004: 143) links repair - the definition of what is repairable and what is trouble - to the pedagogic focus or activity. So too do Markee and van Lier, and they come to similar conclusions to those of Seedhouse concerning prevalent repair patterns. In language classrooms repair largely operates at the other end of the continuum from ordinary conversation (OC). In OC, self-initiated self-repair (SISR) is preferred. In language classrooms, other-initiated repair is preferred, with other-initiated self repair (OISR) being more frequent than other-initiated other repair (OIOR) (Seedhouse, 2004: 145; Markee, 2000: 110). In OC the speaker is largely in control of what is treated as repairable; in language classrooms it is the recipient, overwhelmingly the teacher.

Within this broad, pedagogically driven preferential context, the nature of the activity will determine whether repair is didactic or conversational, the focus on form or meaning, medium or message (Seedhouse, 2004: 158,159; van Lier, 1988: 190). The frequency of occurrence of different repair trajectories and their place on the conversational-didactic continuum (from SISR to OIOR) will be determined by the particular activity or sequence underway, and its foregrounding of form or meaning. We might summarise by saying that in this institutional context, OISR

initiation of this repair comes largely in next turn to the trouble-source and is determined by two main pedagogic considerations - is the focus on getting language right (acceptable to the teacher) or meaning right (understood by the teacher)?

Schegloff's (2000) analysis of Other-Initiated Repair (OIR) in conversation offers a number of findings which will be relevant to our consideration of OIR in teacher training talk.

1. Other-initiated repair (OIR) involves a sequence, is organized and structural, in contrast to self-initiated repair. (p208)

2. Other-initiated repair in conversation occurs overwhelmingly in the next turn after the trouble source. (making for a 3 part structure - trouble source, other initiation, self-managed repair) (p208)

3. Repair takes priority over turn-taking and adjacency, so that "any action type with this immensely powerful privilege of displacing any other due item must surely be restricted in its privilege of occurrence, and the repair opportunity initiation space represents that restriction and its consequence." ie repair takes place within a very narrow sequential window of opportunity (p208)

4. 90% of OIR in Schegloff's sample occurred in next turn. (p211)

5. In some institutional contexts, responding first and then doing OIR is canonical not unusual. (p220)

Against this background of research on repair in conversation and in language classrooms, the questions I shall consider here are:

- Is OISR the preference organization for repair in training classrooms?
- Is OI in this institutional context next-turn grounded?
- What repair trajectories predominate?
- How do they differ from conversational and language classroom repair?

These questions are all asked in an institutional fingerprint frame: How does pedagogic focus relate to sequential organization? In the same way that Seedhouse examined language classroom repair trajectories in different turn-taking and sequential contexts, I will look at variations in repair organization in expository, exploratory and experiential contexts

2.1   Repair in Expository Contexts

In expository contexts the focus is on the trainer describing or explaining concepts, ideas, facts, actions - or leading trainees to do so. Consider four training classroom extracts in order to highlight some gross characteristic features of expository context repair. All are deferred input sequences aimed at checking trainee understanding of ELT terminology.

5.1

1	S1	maybe it's for example, you make the students see a correct piece of
2	S1	language and contrast with <u>their</u> piece of lang- , with <u>their</u> piece of
3	S1	writing and they can I don't know-
4	T	that's cer- certainly a very logical kind of definition and and it could
5	T	have been applied to that. (1.0) I'm not sure that it is but it certainly
6	T	could be, but it's er- yeh?
7	S2	it talks about the contrast between L1 and L2.
8	T	that's right, normally it's used for that.

5.2

1	S	whereas in an error, it's just an attempt (1.0) so they probably not-
2	S	don't have the knowledge in order to produce it properly.
3	T	yeah. it may be more th- (...) an error may be more than an attempt
4	T	of course, cos it may be a fossilized error.
5	S	(what?)
6	T	so it's not attempt attempt attempt. it's a fossilized error, it's-
7	S	mm hmm.

5.3

1	T	ok. another way in which we form words , by (1.5) clipping. any idea
2	T	of what this means?
3	S1	I guess it could be getting rid of part of a word like thru like some
4	S1	people spell thru in the States.
5	T	er (1.0) I´m not sure about your example. it <u>is</u> getting rid of parts of
6	T	a word, definitely but um-
7	S2	abbreviation
8	T	why it´s yah, it´s making smaller words.

5.4

001	T	now (1.0) another way….oops ..sorry for that…acronym formation.
002	T	(2.5) any idea?
003	S1	the initials.
004	T	the initials of?
005	S1	the individual words.
006	T	the first letters of the-
007	S2	UFO.
008	T	Of?
009	S3	different words.
010	T	[UFO NATO NAFTA er for example.

First, consider sequential features of repair trajectories in the extracts. In **5.1**, S1 offers their explanation of the term *contrastive analysis* in lines 1-3. The trainer **other initiates** repair in lines 4-6. In line 6, S2 catches the trainer's eye and offers **other repair** in line 7, ratified by the trainer in line 8.

In **5.2**, S1 has been explaining the term *mistake* and their definition has been ratified by the trainer. But in lines 1-2 S1 goes on to contrast *mistake* with *error*. The trainer **other initiates** repair in line 3 and does **other repair** in line 4 with 'it may be a fossilized error' This gets a conversational open repair initiator (Drew, 1997) from the trainee himself in line 5, expansion from the trainer in line 6 and a seeming acceptance from the trainee in line 7.

In **5.3** S1 offers a formulation for *clipping* in lines 3-4. The trainer **other initiates** repair in lines 5-6, gets a self-nomination **other repair** from S2 in line and ratifies it in line 8.

In **5.4**, the trainer is looking at ways of forming words, showing them on an overhead projector and asking trainees if they know what each term means. In line 3, S1 offers 'the initials' and the trainer **other initiates self-repair** in line 4 and 5. But the trainer **other initiates** repair again in line 6 with a reformulation of S1's 'the individual words' in line 5. In line 7, S2 self-nominates **other repair** with an example acronym, which is not accepted by the trainer, who **other initiates** further repair in line 8 and whose 'of' with upward intonation indicates that her formulation in line 6 remains to be completed. In line 9 S3's self-nominated **other repair** is indirectly ratified by the trainer through her adding of examples to the

Sequentially, repair initiation is done in the turn following the trouble-source. It is initiated in all cases by the trainer. The second pair part of what is an insertion expansion adjacency pair (Schegloff, 2007: 101) comes in 'third turn' following the other initiation, except in **5.4**, where there are two further other repair initiations by the trainer in lines 6 and 8 before the other repair of line 9. *Multiples* is one category of other initiated repair which is 'past next turn position' (Schegloff, 2000: 212; Schegloff et al, 1977: 369). In **5.4** Multiple 1 and 2 are other-initiated self-repair (OISR), but Multiple 3 is other-initiated other repair (OIOR). While the organization of repair in language and training classrooms shares other initiation of repair as a characteristic organisational feature, OIOR is more frequent than OISR in training classrooms, a different balance from language classrooms. OIOR trajectories frame repair work in the extracts, and something else that stands out in training classroom expository contexts is that the <u>OR is as likely to be done by another trainee as by the trainer</u>.

In what ways is the sequential organization of repair in these expository contexts related to the pedagogic focus? If we compare training classrooms with language classrooms, we might feel that the focus on the message rather than the medium in training classroom expository contexts would lead to the organization of repair displaying features more characteristic of Seedhouse's (2004) meaning-and-fluency contexts than his form-and-accuracy contexts. In fact, repair in expository contexts is not conversational, in the sense of ensuring mutual understanding and intersubjectivity; it is didactic in van Lier's (1988) terms. Indeed, if we compare training classroom repair in expository contexts with repair in Seedhouse's (2004) form-and-accuracy contexts, there are interesting parallels.

1. In both, there is a concern with correctness - but in these training classroom contexts the focus is on getting facts or logic 'right' rather than with getting the grammar and vocabulary right.
2. In both, the trainer or teacher decides what is a trouble-source - they control repair sequence initiation.
3. In both, negative evaluations are mitigated - face work concerns (see Goffman, 1964; Brown and Levinson, 1978) shape other initiation turn design.

Perhaps the parallels beween repair in training classroom expository contexts and form-and-accuracy language classroom contexts are not so unexpected. In both classroom contexts language is a focus of repair; in both classroom contexts language is in important respects both medium and content; in the language classroom, grammar and vocabulary are the concern in form-and-accuracy contexts; in the training classroom professional language - understanding professional terminology, concepts and procedures and how to talk about them, is a major concern in expository contexts. Other initiated other repair, focusing on correctness but mitigating negative evaluations, is in evidence in all four extracts.

In **5.1** the trainer praises the logic of S1's definition and its possible application to 'contrastive analysis' by way of mitigating OIOR. The term could indeed be applied to the activity described by S1, but the trainer's 'that's right, normally it's used for that' in line 8 establishes prevailing institutional usage. In **5.2**, the trainer's OR in lines 3-4 is another kind of 'correction', a correction of S1's interpretation. The trainer's 'yeah' pays face work lip service in its acceptance that one interpretation of *error* could be to treat it as an *attempt*, before going on to do OR, adding to rather than replacing the trouble-source. In **5.3**, the trainee's explanation of *clipping* in lines 3-4 might seem an acceptable in-other-words formulation. But while the trainer appears to do mitigatory work with their partial acceptance of the formulation in line 6, it is clear from their unhedged acceptance of S2's alternative OR formulation in line 7 that the example had thrown doubt on the trainee's understanding. The trainer's 'making smaller words' in line 8 is indistinguishable from S1's 'getting rid of parts of a word', suggesting that *abbreviation* was the looked for 'right' answer in this context. Finally, in **5.4**, we come closest to getting 'the learner...to produce a specific string of linguistic forms' (Seedhouse, 2004: 144). In this case the string is 'the first letters of the different words, for example X,Y,Z'. The focus of repair work here is to get a **definition > example** (in that order) formulation from trainees.

The organization of repair in expository contexts is focused on the accuracy and rationality of professional meaning, as opposed to the accuracy of form of its language classroom counterpart. But most of the strategies for mitigating negative evaluations are of the type noted by Seedhouse for avoiding direct negative evaluation in form-and-accuracy contexts in language classrooms (p 164 et seq). For example, in **5.1** providing an explanation of why the answer is incorrect or not entirely correct without explicitly saying it is occurs in lines 4-6. In **5.2**, the trainer accepts the training classroom equivalent of an incorrect form and then supplies the correct form (line 3). In **5.4**, the trainer uses a combination of prompt (line 4), supplying a correct version (line 6) and repetition of what's correct up to the 'error' (line 8). Clearly, there are significant differences in ideas of correctness in the two institutional settings, but the way that repair is done shares common ground.

It is the prevalence of OIOR over OISR in training classroom expository contexts that sets them apart from language classroom form-and-accuracy contexts and underlines the importance of an institutionally specific pedagogic focus. In language classrooms, when a learner makes a mistake or error, while it is the teacher who initiates repair, the preference in form-and-accuracy contexts is for the learner to self-repair as part of the *noticing* that is linked to second language acquisition (see Ellis, 1994; 2003; Lightbown and Spada, 1999). Seedhouse (2004: 147) calls teacher-initiated peer-repair 'very interesting and unusual', but there is a further element in this trajectory that aligns it with self-repair and teacher control. van Lier (1988: 199) notes that whether it is the teacher or learner who does the repair, the repairer typically does not take the floor, but, rather, helps the speaker to continue their turn or start a new one. The teacher asks another learner to help and then returns to the producer of the trouble source for them to repeat the 'model' correctly, before finally closing the repair sequence. In language classrooms, for very good pedagogic reasons, repair in form-and-accuracy contexts focuses on the individual.

In training classroom expository contexts, repair moves away from the individual. This is partly a product of the turn-taking frame a trainer or teacher sets up for a sequence in which repair occurs. In Markee, van Lier and Seedhouse's extracts we do not know if the learner trouble-source was the result of a directed or open elicit from the teacher. In my training classroom data, there are few instances of directed questions or elicits. All four extracts are open elicits. The questions in **5.1-5.4** are for the class. Next turn repair by the trainer is not so much initiation of repair as rejection of a response, a no answer to a Yes/No question, however mitigated it may be. It is a 'no' in other words, reopening the floor for others to try their luck. Rather than other repair, trainee 'correct' responses in the extracts are tied to the original question and not part of a repair insertion sequence.

How do these features of sequential organization relate to pedagogic focus and institutionality? In training classrooms, teacher learning is as yet unmapped, and the relationship between the discourse of reflection in the classroom and the reflective dialogue of supervised teaching practice is unclear. Noticing is not yet a concept in teacher learning. However, while language classroom pedagogy continues to focus on learner production and interaction for noticing, in the training classroom, Krashen's (1982) comprehensible input would still seem relevant. Reception rather than production is more important, at least in expository contexts. This is not the model-and-repeat of form-and-accuracy contexts.

One further pedagogically related feature of repair relates to knowledge states. All four elicits are in expository contexts where there is less epistemological asymmetry between teachers and learners than in initial input contexts. Deferred input sequences suppose that knowledge is shared by the trainer and (some or all of the) trainees. Repair work focuses on making sure that <u>all</u> the trainees 'notice' professional vocabulary and the knowledge it carries. The greater frequency of OIOR in training classroom points to an absence of pedagogic concern with <u>who does the correction</u> and <u>who it gets done to</u>. Repair is less personalized and individual, more collective in this respect. In training classroom expository contexts, repair is significantly more of a collective enterprise, managed by the trainer but done by the class.

Variations

I have argued that OIOR is the prevailing repair trajectory in expository contexts. In this section I want to look at any differences in repair organization in initial input expository sequences and to consider sequences where repair initiation does not occur in next turn.

In chapter 4 I described the overall shape of initial input expository sequences as:
1. initial input from the trainer
2. a question from the trainer to check understanding in some way or ask for trainees' own thoughts/reactions/relevant experiences
3. trainee response(s)
4. trainer summary and/or reformulation

In this sequential context a repair sequence will normally occur following the trainer's question in stage 2, where the trainer checks comprehension (of what is often new knowledge or information) or asks trainees what they think. We should distinguish the sort of concept check questions of grammatical or lexical meaning done in language classrooms (see Scrivener, 2005) from the kinds of questions posed by trainers in the slot following initial input. Having presented or explained a concept or procedure, the trainer will typically ask trainees for their opinions, for the reasons or rationale, or for examples. As we saw in chapter 4, this will often involve trainees drawing on their own classroom experience and 'personal theories' and provide experiential or exploratory turn space.

There are three noticeable differences between repair in initial input and deferred input expository sequences. In initial input expository sequences

- The trainer is overwhelmingly the doer of other repair;
- the repair is focused on refinement of ideas or views rather than replacement and 'correctness' and is thus more conversational; and
- the repair is aimed at the producer of the trouble source as well as the repairable.

I will first examine the sequential features of trainer-initiated trainer repair (TITR) and then suggest institutional factors underlying them.

Extracts 5.5 to 5.7 all come from different points in a session on responding to student writing. In the sequence leading up to **5.5**, the trainer has been looking at ways of controlling written work and cutting down on the number of mistakes a teacher is faced with. In this case he has been talking about copying as one strategy for use with beginners and describing a number of different copying options. In lines 1-2 he wonders if students would respond favourably to this. In lines 3-7, with supportive assessments from the trainer, S3 offers a negative opinion, which the trainer treats as such in lines 8-10 in the course of doing TITR with his 'but again it's a question...', going on in line 12 to put the idea of copying into a broader context in which the strategy to be used should not be viewed on its own terms but in relation to what the learner problems are.

In **5.6** the trainer has been talking about correction codes as a tool for self-correction of learner written work. In lines 1-5 S1 suggests that codes are not helpful when students don't know what is wrong; indeed handing work back with correction code symbols could be demotivating. In lines 7-10, the trainer's *well-*prefaced repair again places S1's turn in a broader context, qualifying its dismissal of codes in the same way that he qualifies S3's dismissal of copying in **5.5**.

In **5.7**, the trainer has been talking about mechanical, drill type exercises, where learners follow models to produce two or three sentences. S3's turn in lines 1-10 proposes something less than complete control over learner writing, with a model being more of a prompt for their own production. In line 11 the trainer first concedes that S3 may be right, but then does TITR with his 'but again it's a question of level..'. In lines 12-19 the trainer emphasizes that writing is very much a learned skill and draws parallels between L2 learners and small children, where it is the small steps at the beginning that are important and the 'value added' (substituting some of the information in a writing model/frame, as opposed to S3's more ambitious idea) that makes such activities not entirely mechanical.

5.5

1	T	now again whether students would take to that or not . what do
2	T	you thin[k.
3	S3	[it's almost a Victorian [approach] towards
4	T	[yeh yeh]
5	S3	teaching clerks how to draft-
6	T	yeh.
7	S3	how to draft those dreadful letters.
8	T	yeh yeh. but again er think it's a question- but again it's a
9	T	question perhaps er you know before you write it off completely-
10	S3	no I'm not saying-
11	T	no no, no. but it's a question of what the problems are and you've
12	T	got a lot of people writing the way that the second First Certificate
13	T	writer writes, you know lots of careless things, and you put it to
14	T	them, you know, what about these problems (that need) editing.
15	T	and you know we're just not getting it, getting these clean copies.

5.6

1	S1	this isn't very helpful as it's just leaves them with this frustration.
2	T	yeh.
3	S1	if if- they need to be motivated to produce writing in the first
4	S1	place. and if you're giving it back like this, such a long process,
5	S1	it's..it's often eh-
6	T	well, I think the kind of codes become more useful as you rise in
7	T	level, where people become a bit more serious about things
8	T	perhaps, er and they they've got a fairly good grasp of English and
9	T	so they're prepared to deal with er a correction code, as well as
10	T	the linguistic code.
11	S1	mm.

5.7

1	S3	probably more than controlling something you can prompt it.
2	S3	(2.0) activating, you can activate their schemata in order to get
3	S3	more information and then they can write more about it.
4	S3	but if you just tell them write about a city, (2.0) and like a city,
5	S3	what.
6	T	sure. yeh.
7	S3	so you are giving them this first model, not only for them to follow
8	S3	the structure or for them to follow the organization of the
9	S3	paragraph, or the sentences, but also to make them imagine about
10	S3	other cities.
11	T	it may be, but again it's a question of level, isn't it. I mean when
12	T	you think of- how do children learn to write, I mean reading and
13	T	writing are learned skills as opposed to acquired skills for most
14	T	people. I mean people can acquire can become great nobel prize
15	T	winning you know through acquiring reading and writing, but most
16	T	people learn it at school. they learn reading and writing at school,
17	T	and writing more than reading. they- you know it's very much a
18	T	learned skill. how do children- what do children go through. well
19	T	children go through these little steps, don't they in fact.
20	S3	mm.
21	T	pretty mechanical in fact but they've got to add something to it. er
22	T	value added.

In all three extracts, the trainer seeks to refine trainee ideas, typically placing them in a broader more professionally aware context. In **5.5**, copying might help some learners overcome problems with writing; in **5.6** correction codes may not be helpful for basic level learners but could help higher levels; and in **5.7**, the restrictive model the trainer has in mind could be a first step for basic level learners and beginner L2 writers. In each case, the trainee initially aligns to input as a teacher in their own classroom; in each case, the trainer is in effect moving them up in the stack from the language classroom to the training classroom and the wider considerations at issue.

I have said that the trainer's topic alignment will also affect the organization of repair. In **5.5** and **5.7**, the trainer promotes an unfashionable idea: that L2 writing is a process of drilling as well as skilling, certainly at lower levels. Trainees accustomed to an emphasis on communicative pedagogy are perhaps resistant to this input. In **5.6**, it is the trainer who has in fact introduced a sceptical view of the usefulness of codes in the preceding talk, so that at an experiential level the trainee is in agreement. The trainer's repair work here is an institutionally framed formulation which in effect 'articulates the unsaid'. The other repair introduces a missing element inferrable from the addressee's turn, which 'might have or should have been said by the other but wasn't' (Bolden, 2010: 27). While correction codes might not be suitable at lower levels, they become 'more useful as you rise in level' (lines 7-8). Having made a good case against codes at basic levels, the trainee had failed to make the contrast with their usefulness at higher levels. In all three cases, the trainer is, in Goffman's terms, both author and principal of input (1981: 144) with a vested interest in getting a trainee to 'see' things from their side. Allied to the greater asymmetries of knowledge (of ideas, the language in which to express them, the contexts in which to consider and reflect on them) in initial input, repair here is not a collective enterprise; it is 'owned' by the trainer.

Not only is repair typically individual (done by the trainer), it is also individualized: directed to a particular trainee. Questions from the trainer are not checking understanding but checking on the state of a trainee's experiential-based knowledge or views on a topic, and so on what Allwright and Bailey (1991: ch9, 10) have termed in language learning contexts **receptivity**.   A significant focus of repair in training classroom contexts is on getting a repair recipient to look at (sometimes familiar) ideas from new angles, from a professional rather than a personal perspective, prioritizing a concern with broadening and complexifying perceptions rather than checking understanding of concepts (see Loughran and Berry, 2005).

If repair in deferred input sequences typically focuses on professional **accuracy**, in initial input sequences the focus is often on professional **appropriacy**. A trainer's institutional identity in both embraces elements of the pedagogic (expert and knower, reflector) and the linguistic (discourse developer)

2.2   Repair in Exploratory and Experiential Contexts

Experiential Contexts

There is little repair work in experiential contexts because in an important sense everyone's knowledge is weighted the same. So, SIOR and OISR are absent. When repair does occur in these contexts, it is done by the trainer and focused on relating individual experience in one context to those of other contexts. The concern is with contextual relevance of the description rather than with its precision or appropriacy.

In **5.8** the trainer offers a simpler, perhaps more central example of cooperative learning strategies at line 7, followed by an acceptance *ok.*

In **5.9**, the trainee's experiential contribution is one of a number in an experientially framed discussion of the purposes for writing (see **4.7** for the complete sequence). In lines 1-12, the trainee describes his students in negative terms as writing in the way they speak. In lines 13-22 the trainer responds to S's experience by characterising it as a 'type' of speech community in more general sociolinguistic terms, laying the groundwork for repair in line 22 signalled with *'but erm*...'. The repair shares a common element with exploratory context repair in its focus on relevance. But in this instance, it is not relevant precision that is at issue, but (trans) contextual relevance. S's speech community is a special case with no contextual relevance for other trainees.

5.8

01	S1	tell them that this is when you are unable to come, call somebody ah
02	S1	get together to do some homework. ah sometimes I say, you have to
03	S1	do page 19, how about if you and hey I'm gonna and oh::: and I say
04	S1	well divide the page int two parts and then assign half a page to your
05	S1	friend call them on the phone and then just change answers.
06	T	ok. or just simple pair work.
07	S1	mm hmm.

5.9

1	S	when it´s- something that I that I notice much more from teaching
2	S	from teaching younger,..younger people is um..that they write in the
3	S	beginning very much the way they speak. and that it really has to be
4	S	pointed out to them first that- it has to be pointed out to them that
5	S	that you know LIKE, is not a y´kn- a word that is regularly used
6	S	OTHer than in the sense of y´know style i-its not like..i-i- you know
7	S	when you´re speaking it´s you know it´s when you´re speaking it´s
8	S	'oh whatcha do at the weekend?' and it´s like 'oh like I er I went out
9	S	to the supermarket, I was (talkin to) some friends, and like er after
10	S	that I er', you know what I mean like is-, that will appear, like will
11	S	appear ten times you know in half a page (1.5) um…er they just write
12	S	exactly the way they speak er::..
13	T	thi-this is more LIKEly er in your situation where English is being
14	T	learned as a second language, where there are native speakers
15	T	among the kids, ..no? there are native speakers among the kids, they
16	T	they communicate- there-there are people with di- they are not
17	T	monolingual groups, there are people with different native languages
18	T	and so therefore English is the lingua franca, and so therefore you
19	T	get these um, er these characteristics of er of..er..the language
20	T	being used for daily communication, so you get things like 'like'. you
21	T	know these things with 'like', same as in Spanish 'este' and- .hh but
22	T	erm where people are learning it as a FOReign language and they
23	T	have less frequent contact with the language er and er usually it´s
24	T	with native speakers or with other Mexican learners, you don´t get
25	T	those mannerisms so much so they don´t come into the writing so
26	T	much it´s probably more common in YOUR situation.=

Exploratory Contexts

We saw in extracts **5.5**, **5.6** and **5.7** TITR being organized in response to what were in effect exploratory or experiential components of expository sequences. Trainees were offering opinions and viewpoints, talking about how they might handle a classroom procedure, drawing on their own experience of teaching and learners. 'Correctness' or accuracy is not at issue here. The repair is not on the medium, in the sense that there is a particular way of putting things, or particular words being sought, but on the message and the way it is argued or formulated, its appropriacy. It is unsurprising to find this concern with appropriacy at the functional heart of the organization of OIOR in full-blown exploratory contexts. It is a common thread linking the doing of repair in **5.10 and 5.11.**

In **5.10**, in lines 5-7 the trainer's repair complexifies and deepens a trainee idea. In **5.11**, having accepted the trainee's suggestion that copying can serve a further formatting purpose, the trainer goes on in lines 9-14 to push his broader view of mechanical and controlled writing tasks such as copying, attempting to move the trainee away from substituting elements to adding value and something more personal.

5.10

1	S	within a class if you've got ten students, then probably half of them
2	S	are making errors and the other half are making mistakes.
3	T	yeh.
4	S	so maybe-
5	T	well maybe you- it's even more complex than that, sometimes and a
6	T	third are getting it right a third are making mistakes and a third are
7	T	making errors, yeh.

5.11

1	S	you could also use that as a formatting tool as well in the sense that
2	S	you put up a letter, and you get them to copy and then, uh: uh: most
3	S	letters fall into certain categories-
4	T	yeh.
5	S	and they can practically [↑learn:↑ the forms and then just plug
6	S	[in
7	T	[sure
8	S	different words and-
9	T	that's right, sure. but again, I mean the trick really is making it not
10	T	kind of well maybe some Victorian teachers were pretty skilled at
11	T	motivating learners, I don't know, but you don't want it to be a too
12	T	boring and imposed task. you want to give it a little bit of competition
13	T	or a little bit of something, that get's them to do it. and you know it
14	T	may have some positive effects.

There are other such examples to be found in exploratory contexts. In these types of sequence, the trainer's repair is aimed at narrowing, broadening or deepening a trainee offering. It evidences the reflexive relationship between pedagogical focus and the organization of repair. The pedagogic focus of repair in exploratory sequences can be characterised as a concern with 'relevant precision'. This is important to the way in which information is discussed and evaluated in a range of institutional settings.

The effectiveness, accuracy, adequacy, appropriateness and so on of
such outcomes as these rely upon a fundamental property of language
use in these settings - the *relevant precision* with which some states of
affairs are described and reported. (Drew, 2003: 917)

To borrow a legal term, the duty of care regarding relevant and appropriate precision is somewhat higher in institutional contexts than it is in ordinary conversation, where there is greater tolerance for hyperbolic or exaggerated claims, particularly where they are closely related to the conversational task at hand - to strengthen or dramatize a particular description, for example. The trainer's talk is category-bound, related to their pedagogic identities of feedbacker and reflector.

In Drew's institutional examples, repair work is largely OISR, in that a witness, patient, or pupil are prompted to revise their description to give it a relevant degree of precision. In training classrooms, the relevant precision repair work in exploratory contexts is initiated and done largely by the trainer. One reason for this difference can be attributed to the subject matter and related knowledge states in play here. Methodological processes, learning strategies, linguistic concepts, and so on are somewhat different 'facts' or truths from the sort that are negotiated between witnesses and lawyers, doctors and patients. The trainer's epistemic superiority and activity-related identity shapes who does the repair and puts it on the record.

2.3   The Organization of Repair in Training Classrooms

I began this section on repair in training classrooms by establishing the main comparative bases for analysis: the organization of repair in ordinary conversation and, more importantly, in another institutional classroom context, the language classroom. I had four main questions which arose from these comparative standpoints. In language classrooms, other-initiated self-repair was the preference organization for repair. Did this hold true for training classrooms? Does other-initiated repair commonly take place in next turn, as it does in language classrooms and ordinary conversation? Based on the answers to these questions we should be able to say something about predominant repair trajectories in training classrooms and how they differed from language classrooms and ordinary conversation. Finally, what do the answers to these questions suggest about the place of repair in training classroom pedagogy?

Expository Contexts

In training classroom expository contexts, OIOR trajectories are more frequent than OISR, which contrasts with language classrooms. A further organizational contrast is that it is not always the trainer who does the other repair in OIOR, as the teacher typically would in a language classroom. OR is as likely to be done by another trainee as by the trainer. What are the functional underpinnings of these differences?

The organization of repair in expository contexts is focused on the accuracy and rationality of professional meaning as opposed to the accuracy of form of its language classroom counterpart. However, this concern with correctness of a different sort from the language classroom, still leads to similarities between training classrooms and language classrooms with respect to how repair is done. Facework and mitigated negative evaluation are in evidence here as they are in the language classrooms that Seedhouse examined.

The pedagogic focus on the accuracy and rationality of professional meaning takes two main forms which are linked to the different assumptions regarding knowledge states in deferred expository input as opposed to initial expository input contexts. In the former, the trainer is getting from the trainees because there is an assumption that this will often be known information. I have argued that the greater frequency of OIOR trajectories in these sequences and the mix of trainer AND trainee repair in third turns marks the general absence of a pedagogic focus on <u>who</u> does the correction and <u>who is the recipient</u>.

In the language classroom, noticing by individuals of inaccuracy or incorrectness is associated with language learning, and the production of correct forms is emphasized. In contrast, in training classrooms, repair in deferred input sequences focuses on making sure that <u>all</u> the trainees 'notice' professional vocabulary and the knowledge it carries. Repair is more of a collective concern because of the related influences of pedagogic focus and relative knowledge states of trainer and trainees. Repair in deferred input sequences focuses on professional **accuracy** in the description of terms or concepts or of methodological procedures or strategies. In initial input sequences, with their greater asymmetries of knowledge, the focus is on professional **appropriacy,** the assimilation and professional contextualization of frequently informal, experiential knowledge and more likely to be the subject of repair.

A trainer's institutional identity in both forms of expository context embraces elements of the pedagogic (expert and knower, reflector) and the linguistic (discourse developer).

Exploratory Contexts

The pedagogic focus of repair in exploratory sequences can be characterised as a concern with 'relevant precision' in Drew's (2003) terms. But we have seen that relevant precision in a training classroom is relevant <u>professional </u>precision rather than the often factual accuracy of patients and witnesses that is necessary in the doing of professional work. Methodological processes, learning strategies, linguistic concepts and so on, are somewhat different 'facts' or truths from the sort that are negotiated between witnesses and lawyers, doctors and patients. In training classrooms, the relevant precision repair work in exploratory contexts is more frequently initiated and done by the trainer, and because the knowledge in play is often experiential, the same focus on appropriacy and relevant precision we found in expository contexts is a concern here. The trainer's epistemic superiority and activity-related identity shapes who does the repair and puts it on the record.

3 Formulations

We saw the close links between repair and formulation in the preceding section, especially in exploratory contexts. In this section I will examine sequential and functional features of formulations and their place in the provision of feedback to trainees in whole class interaction:

- What gets formulated
- When and where?
- How is it done?
- What does it do in structuring institutional interaction?
- What are similarities and differences between formulations here and in other institutional settings?

3.1 Formulations in Institutional Talk

Heritage and Watson, following Garfinkel and Sacks, define formulations as 'characterizing states of affairs already described or negotiated (in whole or in part) in the preceding talk' (in Barnes, 2007: 278). They established two main categories of formulation or summary:

- **Gist** –summarizing previous talk through repetition or through the transformation or deletion of parts of it
- **Upshot** – drawing out the implications or formulating future action

Following Heritage and Watson, whose data were drawn from news interviews, researchers in a variety of institutional settings have established a number of other characteristic features of formulations:

- Formulations are more common in Institutional Talk because of their link to its goal directed nature, where achievement or agreement may need to be marked for the record.
- Formulations are the first pair part of an adjacency pair where the preference is for agreement in the 2nd pair part.
- *So* prefaces and pro-forms are common indexicals for formulations of previous talk.
- Formulations are category bound activities – they are normally done by the questioner.
- Formulations can perform a range of tasks which may vary depending on the institutional context.
- Formulations have two main functions: relational (representing mutual understanding or power asymmetries) and organizational (topic transition and closings)

(Button, 1991; Gafaranga and Britten, 2004; Antaki et al, 2005; Barnes, 2007; Bolden, 2010)

Before going on to look at formulation in trainer talk, it is worth underlining its essentially interpretive nature, indirectly in the case of gist, directly in the case of upshot. Indeed, Antaki et al (2005: 642) prefer to recast formulation into one definition, emphasizing the institutionally relevant, interpretive element: any commentary by one speaker, in any format, which may be taken to propose or imply a reworking of events described or implied by a previous speaker.

3.2   Formulations in Trainer Talk

This section is organized in three sub-sections:

1. Types of formulation
2. Sequential features of formulation
3. Formulations and identity

Types of Formulations

I have noted the two main categories of formulation identified by Heritage and Watson. In the case of upshot formulations, drawing out the implications from something that has been left unsaid, we can break them down into two sub-categories. The first presupposes an unexplicated version of gist and looks back in the talk, while the second looks forward in projecting some future activity or action (see Button, 1991; Gafaranga and Britten, 2004). This second kind of upshot formulation plays an important role in medical consultations and there are possible parallels here to drawing out the teaching implications from a discussion, which makes it worth trying to distinguish this formulating action from formulating gist. Finally, there is articulating the unsaid. These four types of formulation are all present in teacher trainer talk. Extracts **5.12 and 5.13** provide exemplification of their compositional features.

5.12

1	S1	well I think that (..) the level of proficiency depends on the learner.
2	T	mm hmm.
3	S1	y'know. but we all understand that the the HIGHest level of
4	S1	proficiency that a foreign person can have, might be according to
5	S1	different parameters, like the Cambridge [examinations] score-
6	T	[mm hmm]
7	T	that's right mm.
8	S1	things like this, no?
9	T	so it get's fuzzy, because you might say [well he-
10	S2	[extremely fuzzy.
11	T	yeh heh heh [he-
12	S1	[of course.
13	T	he speaks English as well as a drunk docker.

5.13

01	S	2.0) I kind of had a thought right now you know about these, erm,
02	S	when you're presenting grammar and you show a structure.
03	T	uh huh.
04	S	it seems that one of these tools that may be (xxxxxxxxx). (1.0) like
05	S	using these ARRows and things like that which allows the concrete
06	S	learner to kind of like come up with their own unique way of like
07	S	visually following their road, and then, but it also still works for
08	S	analytical learners, cos it does give a …(1.5)
09	T	mm hmm.
10	S	direct structure.
11	T	so you're talking about concrete learners VISualizing tenses or
12	T	structures?
13	S	uh huh.

Extract **5.12** comes from a sequence which has involved a discussion of interlanguage. Acceptable definitions have been elicited from trainees and agreed on by the trainer at an earlier point in the sequence, but there has been some discussion about when interlanguage 'ends' and someone can be said to be a proficient user. In lines 1-8 S1 gives her view on this with two IRT continuers from the trainer and a 'that's right' assessment in line 7. In line 9, the trainer does a *so*-prefaced upshot formulation of S1's contribution. Once again the *so* preface, together this time with the pro form 'it' and the formulating of something that can be implied from the foregoing talk are constitutive features of this kind of turn. In **5.12** the formulation embraces both kinds of upshot I referred to in the discussion at the beginning of this section. It looks backwards to the preceding talk to draw out the unexplicated gist of it, while also pointing forward to some kind of future action. In this case, in fact, the formulation provides no clear basis for decision making on stages of interlanguage when the evidence is so fuzzy.

Extract **5.13** comes in a session on learning styles and strategies and in a sequence where the trainer has been asking trainees for the sorts of classroom action teachers can take to raise awareness about learning strategies. In lines 1-10 the trainee describes his thought about showing a structure in a grammar presentation, with IRT continuers from the trainer at lines 3 and 9. At lines 11-12 the trainer initiates repair via their articulating the unsaid formulation 'so you're talking about concrete learners VISualizing tenses or structures?'.

The compositional features of this type of formulation in an institutional context differ in one significant respect from its conversational counterpart. In **5.13** the formulation in lines 11-12 is a request for confirmation of a missing element in the preceding talk that is inferrable from 'what was said or how it was said' and in these three elements it coincides with Bolden's (2010) characterisation of this formulation in ordinary conversation. However, in **5.13** there is an interrogatory intonation (in OC these formulations are usually declaratives) and the articulation is *so*-prefaced rather than *and*-prefaced. In ordinary conversation, articulating the unsaid is a form of affiliative repair: the repairing turn is helping the speaker out by extending or continuing their turn and the action that it is doing (Bolden, p27). An *and*-prefaced formulation <u>adds</u> to the turn; the *so*-prefaced formulation in **5.13** repairs and ends the turn. When we look at the wider sequential environment and the interactional work this formulation does, we will be able to suggest why there is this compositional difference.

Aside from articulating the unsaid, the compositional features of the three types of formulation do not differ in significant ways from their counterparts in other forms of institutional talk, such as medical and political interviews, business meetings and talk show phone-ins (see Heritage and Greatbatch, 1991; Button, 1991; Boden, 1994; Hutchby, 1999; Gafaranga and Britten, 2004; Antaki et al, 2005; Barnes 2007). The constitutive differences between articulating the unsaid in OC and IT can be seen as one index of institutionality.   If we now go on to look at the sequential environments in which the different types of formulation are to be found, and the interactional tasks and functions that they perform, we may find further institutional similarities while also noticing differences at this analytic level, which will serve to add to the particular institutional fingerprint of trainer talk.

Sequential Features and Interactional Functions
I will use an extended sequential context, or single case (see Schegloff, 1987) to explore sequential and functional features of formulations, with the key questions of where formulations appear and what they are doing in mind.

Extract **5.14** (the full sequence from which **5.12** comes) is from the session where the trainer wrote 8 terms on the board for trainees to gloss, with the term being defined here, *interlanguage*.

Formulations have been underlined and the first comes in line 18. S2 (in lines 6-9) and S3 (in lines 12-17) have both proffered definitions or explanations of the term 'interlanguage'. Each gets a ratifying assessment from the trainer (at lines 10 and 18). In lines 18-19 the trainer does an **articulating the unsaid** (ATU) formulation of S3's contribution, getting an assessment affirmation from S3 in line 20. It has a missing or unarticulated element from S3's talk, which is inferrable from it and is 'done on the addressee's behalf' extending the action in some way (Bolden, 2010:7). However, it is not done as an initiating first pair part of repair insertion sequence and although S3 does an affirmation in line 20, it intersects the trainer's ATU rather than occupying an implicated and projected 2nd pair part turn space. Nor is there an *and*-preface to indicate that the ATU is adding to S3's turn (Bolden, at p14, says that ATUs typically follow extended turns at talk and add forgotten items to the 'list'). As with the ATU in **5.13**, lines 18-19 appear to be doing different interactional business here, closing rather than extending a topic or part of one, organizing rather than affiliating, not adding to S3's idea but clarifying and refining it.

5.14

001	T	um, interlanguage?
002		(4.0)
003	S1	got big question marks here.
004	T	complete question marks?
005	S1	I guess, (don't [know)-]
006	S2	[it's all f]rom this black box thing between the first
007	S2	and the second language.
008	T	uh huh.
009	S2	um (2.0) between the language.
010	T	yeah, (obviously the-) yeah, that's right.
011		(1.0)
012	S3	is it the language that students use before you can call it really
013	S3	proficient?
014	T	(..) yeah, (..) when it's [really]
015	S3	[and du]ring the process when [they're-
016	T	[yeah
017	S3	learning.
018	T[1]	yeah, that's right. <u>I suppose that when it's really proficient they've</u>
019	T	<u>arrived, haven't they, so they're not [inter- heh heh any more</u>.
020	S3	[exactly
021	T	yeh yeh, but no not many people do, I mean not many [people]
022	S3	[(xxxxx)]
023	T	actually arrive at er-
024	S3	UNfortunately.
025	T	yeh unfortunately yeh, at er totally native like er command of the
026	T	second language. (1.0) um but it would- interlanguage would finish,
027	T	probably if you did arrive, uh huh, that's right.
028	S3	hah.
029	T	ok. I no longer speak interlanguage, I speak English like a like a
030	T[2]	native, yeh. (1.0) <u>so both ideas here that you suggested I think are</u>
031	T	<u>true</u>. and and er (name) looks as though he's got an idea or he's
032	T	puzzling [over something.
033	S1	[no no I'm puzzled to- so it suggests interlanguage is a
034	S1	almost (..) the majority of English speakers in the world are [using
035	T	[yeh
036	S1	interlanguage.

037 T[3]   yup. yup. .hh so you've got (drawing on whiteboard) L1 and you've
038 T   got native-like L2, (2.0) and the person with L1 starts learning
039 T   English (1.0) and so they start moving in this direction.
             ((a number of lines omitted - trainer deals with a late trainee))
056 T   um (2.0) and so all of this is interlanguage. (3.0) er so it's in
057 T   constant development, unless it's possible for it to reach a period of
058 T   absolute stagnation, or actually, deterioration. (1.0) ah so it's (1.0)
059 T   it's ah somewhere in between. and it is I can't remember who it was
060 T   er I've forgotten your names[from last time
061 S3   [NAme]=
062 T   =(name), (name). er (n-n-name)? [yeh
063 S3   [(yeh that's right, yah)
064 T   I think it was (name) I can't remember, but er the the language that
065 T   learners actually use, and I think that's quite important. it's not the
066 T   kind of controlled language production, although, that may indicate
067 T   what the interlanguage is like, but it's not the controlled language
068 T   pro[duction in the classroom,]
069 S3   [it's what the:y're   ]also able to produce.
070 T   that's right. what they have available for use, er in a conversation, in
071 T   in writing a letter, in any real use of the language.
072 S1   at at what stage does it become- do they become proficient, it seems
073 S1   a bit vague to me[(in some ways)]
074 T   [oh it is vague   ] yeh yeh.
075 S1   heh heh heh heh.
076 T[4]   yeah it is vague, we uh, this er all gets fuzzy round-
077 S1   [huh huh
078 T   [heh heh ha ha
079 S2   [uh hah hah hah
080 T   um s- (2.0)
081 S2   sorry, I was (xxx) probably a lot of books written on it I just-
082 T(5)   yeah. but I mean if if if you could actually kind of um um have an
083 T   interview with and a little bit of correspondence with, a learner at
084 T   different stages in their learning (1.5) er (..) you would access their
085 T   interlanguage, and you would be able to compare, well you know if
086 T   this little- this little bit of conversation I had, this correspondence I
087 T   had, er when he'd been learning English for 6 months, there was this.
088 T   this- his his English was like this. six months later it was like this.

089	T	like this, 6 months later it was like this, <u>and it's a continua- it's</u>
090	T	<u>continuous obviously. and so that's interlanguage</u>. <u>and it's kind of</u>
091	T	<u>developing</u> and, anything else you can say about it (name)?
092	S3	(2.0) well I think that (..) the level of proficiency depends on the
093	S3	learner.
094	T	mm hmm.
095	S3	y'know. but we all understand that the the HIGHest level of
096	S3	proficiency that a foreign person can have, might be according to
097	S3	different parameters, like the Cambridge [examinations] score
098	T	[mm hmm]
099	T	that's right mm.
100	S3	things like this, no?
101	T[6]	<u>so it get's fuzzy</u>, because you might say [well he-
102	S1	[extremely fuzzy
103	T	yeh heh heh [he-
104	S3	[of course
105	T	he speaks English as well as a drunk docker
106	SS	//((laughter))//
107	T[7]	you know heh heh. yeh yeh. <u>so it does get a bit fuzzy obviously</u>
108	T	<u>according to- as (name) says</u>, <u>but you get the idea that if you-</u>
109	S1	yeh.
110	T	<u>follow the learner, you'll be able to say he's stom- you know he's</u>
111	T	<u>stopped making those mistakes, his his you know he's got that that</u>
112	T	[bit seems to-
113	S3	[(you understand.)
114	T	<u>have got more native-like he's got that under control, but there's still</u>
115	T	<u>these things wrong</u>. [are we look at it nn hh
116	S1	[are we sorry. is just I don't
117	S1	know I don't want to take up too long but are we interlanguage
118	S1	teachers or English teachers?
		((the trainer's answer is omitted))
157	T	i(3.0) and you know you get a student who does perfectly well on the
158	T	test studying controlled work, and then you get you know discussion
159	T	going, or they write something and it all goes to pieces. <u>and and so</u>
160	T[8]	<u>(1.5) it's quite a significant concept really</u>.

The wider sequential context in which the ATU here and in **5.13** appear, together with distinctive compositional features, point to it functioning differently in this institutional context than in conversation. In ordinary conversation ATUs are 'about the addressee's domain of knowledge: they formulate matters that the addressee has primary epistemic rights to' (Bolden, 2010: 13). In teacher trainer talk, it is more often the trainer who has primary epistemic rights and exercises them, in this case, through an ATU formulation. It is the trainer who controls topic and task; the trainee is not the initiator or sole developer of the activity that is being done. We have seen in **4.3** and **4.4** that a key element in a trainer's sequentially evidenced identity is to shape and represent or formulate trainee ideas. This representational and interpretive role is especially important in expository and exploratory contexts, albeit ranging from concerns with professional accuracy to appropriacy. Asymmetries of knowledge and task related trainer identity determine the nature and function of ATUs.

There are parallels with diagnostic formulations in psychotherapy, which are typically reformulations or recastings of 'inchoate, ambiguous or deficient information' into an institutionally relevant format (Antaki et al, 2005: 632). This is the force of the ATU in **5.13,** and in **5.14** where the trainer adds missing information to make S3's idea of 'language students use before they are proficient' clearer in terms of the connection to the term <u>inter</u>language, which S2's 'between L1 and L2' had done more successfully. This kind of reformulation is also on view in the embedded exploratory context of **4.8**, in the trainer's formulations in lines 35-41. If the work of psychotherapy is to find the psychological in the mundane (Antaki et al, p630), perhaps we can say that an important part of the work of teacher training and the trainer is to <u>find the professional or pedagogic in the experiential.</u>

At lines 30-31, the trainer's gist formulation of ' so both ideas here that you suggested are I think true' offers a potential topic and sequence close. It also constitutes a variation on the repeating or transforming properties of **gist formulations** in its use of the anaphorically functioning procedural vocabulary of 'ideas' (see McCarthy, 1991) and the accompanying 'here' pro-form. However, the trainer has not forgotten S1's 'got big question marks here' in line 2 and returns to him in lines 31-32 to see if he wants to contribute a further 'idea' (definition) or remains puzzled.

In fact S1 does his own upshot formulation in lines 33-36, getting a ratifying assessment from the trainer. In lines 37-59 (with a trainee late arrival intervening), the trainer then does an updated **gist formulation** with visual accompaniment on the white board, which incorporates all three trainee contributions. In line 56, the trainer's **this** in 'and so all this is interlanguage' (with the *and* preface this time signalling its more normal discourse function of linking different parts, rather than linking to the previous turn as in ATUs) points to everything between his L1 and L2 time line poles on the whiteboard. This incorporates S1's idea. In lines 56-57, 'so it's in constant development' incorporates S3's idea. And in lines 58-59 'so it's in between' brings us back to S2's idea. We see here a difference between formulations in trainer talk and in ordinary conversation, as well as in other types of institutional talk, such as doctor-patient interviews. The formulation in lines 37-59 is not just aimed at a preceding turn, but at a number of them; it is a formulation not just of one participant's talk but of a number. Organizational dictates predominate over relational.

In this now embedded exploratory context, however, the sequential door has been opened. In lines 71-73, a self nominating S1 returns to the unaddressed question of when interlanguage ends, or a related definition of proficiency or native-likeness. S1's 'it all seems a bit vague' gets agreement from the trainer in line 76 and a pro-form prefaced **gist formulation -** 'this..all gets fuzzy'. Here is a formulation which is doing affiliative rather than organizational work, and is in a functional minority, here and elsewhere. However, it does not occur in a potential topic pre-closing slot, where it functions as a closing initiation device (see Button, 1991; Heritage and Watson in Barnes, 2007). Predominantly relational formulations in trainer talk typically occur in sequence-in-progress positions rather than sequence-in-closing slots. This is in contrast to ordinary conversations and to more affiliation- and consensus-conscious institutional environments such as doctor-patient interviews and meetings.

Rather than bring the sequence to a close, this third formulation is marked as story-so-far by the trainer's disguised ATU addition to the various ideas that constitute 'a definition of interlanguage'. In line 59, and following the name recall insertion, in lines 64-65, the trainer draws out an important missing element in the idea of interlanguage. In line 12, S3 asks if interlanguage is the language learners 'use' before they get proficient. It is questionable if S3 intended 'use' to imply only communicative, free production rather than controlled practice, but it is clear from what follows that the trainer had this 'missing element' in mind, and that he would not close the sequence without it.

In lines 82, the trainer indirectly answers S2's question through suggesting a find-out-for-yourself strategy: the hypothetical future action **upshot** of how a teacher might track a learner's movement through stages of interlanguage to proficiency. In lines 89-91, the trainer effectively closes the formulation he began in line 82, but this time a **gist**, which links back to and incorporates key words ('continuous, 'developing') from the previous story-so-far formulation of lines 37-59.

The sequence is not yet closed. The trainer seems do be doing relational work in returning to S3, whose line 12-13 contribution to the sequence opening introduced the idea of arriving at proficiency as a retrospective indication of interlanguage. This allows the trainer to repeat his line 76 formulation of 'it's fuzzy' starting at line 107 - but this time attributing it to S3 - as a response to S2. Following the initial **upshot** formulation by the trainer of S3's response at line 101 (rather than a gist response, the trainer goes back to his line 76 benchmark) and the humorous example of fuzzy measurement in line 105 (although S3's Cambridge exams measure is in this case more professionally appropriate), in lines 108-115 the trainer revisits in a slightly recast form his own formulation 6, incorporating the action research element (and answer to S2's question) into a new story-so-far.

In answering S1's question the trainer, in the missing lines 133-134, provides their own 'professional/technical' formulation of the term interlanguage, 'the language which is available for communication', and relates it to the wider professional context with a reference to Selinker and Pit Corder. This formulation is a final **gist**, which pays a sequential nod to trainee contributions but is very much an 'official' institutional label which wraps up the whole discussion (and which is a reminder that embedded exploratory contexts will still be drawn back to their expository task trigger, in this case glossing 'interlanguage').

The sequence-ending **upshot** formulation in lines 153-161 points to the predominantly organizational interactional function of formulations in teacher trainer talk: formulation is endogenous, in the sense that it is concerned with how the discussion relates to the training session agenda and what comes next, rather than to any immediate exogenous pay-off in the classroom.

Through a detailed analysis of an extended expository input sequence (lines 1-31, with a further learner initiated extension to line 71) and an embedded exploratory context (lines 72-118), I have tried to identify a number of distinctive sequential features of formulations in trainer talk, and suggest their interactional import.

1. **Organizational**: Gist and upshot formulations work largely to 'establish, record and preserve ...incrementally' the outcomes of the topic/task being done in the sequence (Barnes, 2007: 291). The two forms of trainer talk work together to bring a sequence to an acceptable close. Most formulations in this respect are versions of the story-so-far.

2. **Plural:** Unlike ordinary conversation or, for example, doctor-patient interviews (Gafaranga and Britten, 2004), trainer formulations are not addressed to the individual but to the collective: they work hardest at drawing together a number of trainee contributions from what has gone before, certainly in extended sequences. The occasional relational formulation along the way might acknowledge a contribution, but is subordinate to the main interactional aim.

3. **Autocratic**: Unlike meeting talk (Barnes, 2007), trainer formulations, while paying lip-service to the incorporation of trainee contributions are not shaped by consensual considerations. They are a record of 'agreement', but it is an agreement shaped by the trainer, typically couched in professionally accurate and appropriate terms, working on raw data from trainees but towards acceptable-to-the-trainer formulations. Unlike meeting talk and the chairman's role, for example, the trainer is not an equal, and is not there to mirror contributions and display consensus. In meeting talk, the absence of agreement is the preferred next turn, because it effectively ratifies and commits to the chairman's version of participant contributions (Barnes, 2007). In trainer talk, **5.14** indicates a different interactional import for the general absence of ratification turns following trainer formulations: they are interpretations of a collective whole. And unlike chairman talk in meetings,

have a general sense of what the outcome should be; a meeting chairman does not, and is dependent on participant contributions for their formulations.

4. **Process-Oriented**: In doctor-patient interviews and meeting talk, formulations are focused on action and outcomes. These formulations in other institutional contexts are largely exogenous or outward looking in terms of applications and action. In training classrooms, the formulations we have seen are as likely to be endogenous and inward looking, intent on fitting sequence organization with sequential organization, and connecting one sequence and its topic with another.

Expert/knower, **reflector** and **discourse modeller** identities are all in evidence in **5.14.** The sequence begins as <u>expository</u> and the potential pre-closings of topic/sequence formulations 1, 2 and 3 embody the trainer's **expert/knower** identity linked closely to providing an acceptable definition of 'interlanguage'. The trainee question and statement at lines 72-73 initiates the embedded <u>exploratory</u> context. Formulations 4, 5 and 6 address the question of when interlanguage ends, and 5 and 6 in particular point to reflective implications and applications (upshot formulations are seemingly task and identity linked here). Formulation 7 signals a return to the <u>expository </u>context and trainer as expert/knower, while formulation 8 closes the expository sequence and points ahead to another segment of the training session. End point formulations in medical and business or academic meeting contexts are normally exogenous, pointing to actions external to the sequential context, a course of medicine for the patient, a course of action following the meeting (Gafaranga and Britten, 2004; Barnes, 2007). In trainer talk this exogenous indexical of formulations is more common in exploratory contexts, and of course it has pedagogic implications, which we return to in chapter 6.

In expository contexts, it is the trainer's role to formulate ideas, with a more-or-less representation of trainee contributions, usually more trainer interpretation or translation than repetition and incorporation. We can contrast this with formulations in experiential contexts (see **4.9** and **4.10**), which serve to reinforce the trainer's collegial (I'm a teacher too), individual focus. This relational focus will sometimes try to link an individual contribution to the wider professional context. The relational concerns of experiential formulations contrasts with the organizational and collective focus of expository and to some extent exploratory formulations. In the exposed and embedded exploratory contexts of **4.7** and **4.8**, in-sequence formulations were related to individual contributions, but end-
sequence formulations were of the collective experience.

Extract **5.14** is an extended deferred input sequence, but **4.1** and **4.2** show us that in short expository sequences, formulations work to provide a sequence closing, a for posterity (collective) recasting of trainee contributions.

These general sequential features lead to a consideration of tasks and identity as a final level of analysis.

Formulations and Identity

Categories are activity bound (Sacks, 1992) and identity in trainer talk formulations is firmly grounded in overall pedagogic and more specific task-related aims. Trainer and formulations constitute a bound pair (Gafaranga and Britten, 2004). This is not just the case for gist but also for upshot formulations.

3.3 Summary

Formulations in conversation are affiliative in the extreme and in this respect they are directed at the preceding individual turn. In some forms of institutional talk (doctor-patient interviews) the affiliative element remains to the fore. But in trainer talk, formulations are organizational in the extreme, collective in their embracing of a number of preceding turns, and significantly interpretive in the often radical reworking of a trainee turn (in contrast to the descriptive, truly summative/integrative forms in other institutional contexts, particularly business meetings).

The next turn proof for these analytic interpretations lies in the general absence of a trainer projected turn space for trainee agreement or ratification of a formulation. In all of our examples, trainee agreement has been sequence-independent: it is not a preferred (and signalled as such) second pair part of a trainer formulation. Agreements have been of the uninvited, do-it-yourself variety and could be taken out of a formulation sequence with no noticeable disturbance.

The sequential context and location of formulations in training classroom talk ties them closely to tasks and identity. The trainer is not a decision recorder (as in meetings) or a decision negotiator (as in doctor-patient interviews). In the former, the absence of agreement signals the accuracy and inclusiveness of the formulation; in the latter, the presence of agreement signals the patient's acceptance of a diagnosis or treatment recommendation. A trainer needs accurately and appropriately to represent in professional terms trainee contributions. Because there is an asymmetry of knowledge in play, acceptance of a trainer formulation is not required, either as stories-so-far, or as pre-closings. The conduit role of a meeting chairman is underlined by the next turn initiation of a new topic by a participant rather than the chairman (Barnes, 2007). The autocratic, organizational and interpretive role of the trainer is signalled by their closing formulation, which does not implicate agreement, and which leads to the trainer, rather than trainees, initiating the next topic/task sequence.

4 Assessments

In this final section of chapter 5 I look at assessments, the role they play in the organization of feedback and in the interactional work of structuring talk-in-interaction in this institutional setting.

First I will briefly consider assessments in ordinary conversation and in other forms of institutional talk. I then consider assessments in trainer talk, the similarities to and differences from OC and other forms of IT, and how such characteristic features derive from the goals and tasks that underly institutional interaction in this particular setting. I will finally consider training pedagogy and how the way in which assessments are done contributes to teacher learning.

4.1 Assessments in Ordinary Conversation & Institutional Interaction

The work of Pomerantz on assessments is the starting point for identifying their characteristic features in OC.

> Assessments are produced as *products* of participation; with assessments, a speaker claims knowledge of that which he or she is assessing.   (Pomerantz, 1984: 57)

Assessments in Pomerantz's definition revolve around participation in interaction, which is related to two things - knowledge and speaking rights. If we decline the interactional opportunity to assess, this will usually be related to a speaker's lack of access to or insufficient knowledge of the event, object or person which is being assessed.

Pomerantz's study was part of a wider interest in exploring preference organization and her main focus was on assessments that occurred in 2nd turn position following an initial assessment. Pomerantz brings out the typically social nature of 2nd assessments, linked to politeness and face work, and the preference for agreement (Sacks, 1987). The conversational preference for agreement in 2nd assessments is marked by the 'trouble' or 'problem' features of dispreferred turn shapes: delays, variety of forms used, weak disagreements (Pomerantz, 1984: 65).

Goodwin and Goodwin (1992: 181) point up two further features of the social work of 2nd assessments.   Sequentially, assessment is 'intrinsically social in that it can provide for collaborative but differential participation'. In other words, the sequential location of an assessment can mark the relative information states of speakers in terms of the conversational topic and so too 'who goes first', in the case of 1st and 2nd assessment sequences. There is also an underlying cultural element, in that assessments are one of th places in talk-in-interaction where participants 'negotiate and display to each other a congruent view of the events that they encounter in their phenomenal world' – shared understandings that constitute culture (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1992: 182).

Second assessments then, are about agreement. But they can also mark disagreement and in doing so point to epistemic claims that are often embodied in 2nd assessment witholdings of agreement. Heritage and Raymond (2005) looked at 2nd assessments and disaffiliative elements, where the 2nd assessment asserts independence of some sort from the first.

In discussing the different ways in which 2nd assessments can assert an independently held and founded epistemic authority (and in some cases assert epistemic rights to 'pole position' in the 1st assessment slot), Heritage and Raymond (2005: 36) point out the conflict between face work and identity - pet owners, grandparents, owners of personal experience might feel they have as much if not a greater right to assess the topic at hand (see also, Raymond and Heritage, 2006)

In considering assessments in institutional contexts, the conflict between face work and identity, between social solidarity and institutional identity and its related distribution of knowledge, is one area of special interest. However, the two-turn 1st and 2nd assessment sequence that has been the subject of most research interest in OC is notable by its general absence from institutional contexts, certainly in training classrooms. Instead, the focus will be on exploring another kind of assessment identified by Pomerantz, assessments that take place in the course of an interactional sequence - during participation. In institutional contexts, these sorts of assessments are typically to be found in 3rd turn slots, following a question and answer pair in 1st and 2nd turns. In OC, one relevant point for assessments is after ' a sufficient and newsworthy answer to a question'. If there is no answer then it will be pursued; if there is, it can mean further talk from the speaker (Pomerantz, 1984; Jones, 2001).

This makes for a different shape in institutional contexts, and from the relatively scant research that has been done, the absence of 3rd turn assessments (in medical interviews - Jones, 2001), their sequence-closing and right answer ratification (in traditional classrooms - Mehan, 1979) are markers of institutionality. The turn design and sequence shaping functions of assessment in trainer talk will be the other main area of focus in this section.

Assessments are part of a broader-based category of interactional phenomena, **response or acknowledgement tokens** (Sacks et al, 1974; Sacks, 1992: 410; Schegloff, 1982). I shall adopt McCarthy's (2003) term Interactional Response Tokens (IRT). Jefferson's work is the most relevant to my own concerns in this section. She looked at 3 categories of response token: **minimal response** (*yes, yeah*), **recipient assessment** (eg *oh good, that's good, how lovely*) and **recipient commentary** (extended utterances which comment on something the speaker has said). In all three cases, the tokens concerned acknowledge talk recipiency while at the same time signalling topic shift:

This task can be accomplished with great dispatch with an acknowledgement token preceding a topical shift. It can be made rather more elaborate by employing an assessment, and yet more elaborate by inserting a commentary. (Jefferson, 1983/1993:28)

Drummond and Hopper (1993a; 1993b), in reviewing CA research and discussing their own, followed Jefferson in viewing stand alone *uh huh* and *mm hmm* as continuers, while *yeah* was a greater indication of speakership

Sacks et al (1974) included *ok* in their collection of continuers in extended turns, but in their paper on closings, Schegloff and Sacks (1973) show *ok* functioning as an initial closing turn, projecting a participant coordinated ending rather than a moving from recipient to speaker status (see also Button, 1988). However, Beach (1993) examined *ok* in other sequential environments and noted its dual function of ending a telling and as a projection device for a fuller turn on the part of the recipient.

There is one important qualification I want to make with reference to the functional labelling of different types of IRT in an institutional context, particularly a classroom. For Jefferson, and also Schegloff (1982), response tokens such as *yeah* or *yes* serve a dual function as mere continuers or to signal speaker and topic shift. The sequential location of tokens like *yeah*, *that's right*, *right*, *uh huh* in classroom talk, their production in a 3rd turn spot, which follows a 1st turn question, always from the same party, suggests a collapsing of the functional distinctions made between different tokens in conversation into one catch-all category of feedback or evaluation (Mehan, 1979; van Lier, 1996).

An analytical caveat follows. Even in institutional contexts, the contingent and locally managed construction of actions warns against the imposition of categories on interaction and underlines the importance of looking at what the participants are doing in order to say what their turns are doing (Drew and Heritage, 1992; van Lier, 1996; Lee, 2006; 2007).

4.2   Assessments in Trainer Talk

In training classrooms, trainer assessments typically come in 3rd turn position, following a question from them in 1st turn and a trainee response in 2nd turn.

A range of response tokens are at work in this 3rd turn slot and my concern in this section is to look for variations in their sequential behaviour and functioning paying special attention to different kinds of interactional contexts (expository, exploratory and experiential).

For exploratory purposes I will divide the consideration of assessment tokens in this section into two classes.

1 Weak assessments: eg *yes, right, that's right, ok* or *all right.*
2 Strong assessments:eg *exactly, absolutely, good, absolutely right*

Bearing in mind the analytical caveat in the preceding sub-section, this labelling is provisional. This provisional status would apply to whether or not a token is acting as a continuer, an acknowledgement token or an assessment token, and to the strength of an assessment and the evidence on which we base a determination (Jefferson notes the sometimes noticeable mismatch between an apparently strong assessment token and its sequential 'sincerity' - it signals strong interactional engagement, yet is immediately followed by topic and speaker shift, shutting down speaker expansion and signalling a topic disengagement completely at odds with the token of interactional engagement that has been produced).

Is this two types classification justified? Are tokens within a category doing the same or different work? What differences if any in function are there between occasions when tokens are freestanding and when they appear with further talk? What are the organisational links to topic management?

Response tokens operate in sequential contexts and have to be studied in these contexts, for it is only in this way that we have any basis for viewing their appearance in different turn slots in different types of sequence as significant in functional terms (see the criticisms of Drummond and Hopper's approach by Zimmerman, 1993; Schegloff, 1993).

I will first identify basic forms of assessment in compositional and sequential terms. I then go on to consider variations in these forms in different contexts of sequential organisation. Finally, I look at assessment and institutional identity.

Assessments: Basic Forms

Extract 5.15 is from the task based learning session that forms one of the core training sessions in the data. It comes from the same series of deferred expository input sequences as **4.4,** where trainer and trainees are describing and recording stages of the task cycle. They are now at the language focus stage.

5.15

1	T	so what did we do after that?
2	S1	after what?
3	T	after you did this, and you came to the front and and you said "we-", I
4	T	asked I gave you the original I read the original story and you
5	T	reconstructed it. and then?
6	S1	(1.0) and then we compared.
7	S2	we compared for the -
8	T	(xxxxxx) (name).
9	S2	we compared it with the first to see the differences, no?
10	T	yes. and so why what did I ask you to do then, I mean in that activity
11	T	what am I asking you to do.
12		(3.0)
13	T	when you compare, what did you notice when you compare= probably it's
14	T	not very evident here because you are (..) you know, proficient users of
15	T	the language, blah blah blah. think of your learners. Karen as you said
16	T	"my learners would have said this". imagine that your learners were
17	T	comparing the reconstructed text with the original. what would they have
18	T	noticed?
19	S3	that the struc- (xxxx) that they used different verbs for example, they
20	S3	wouldn't remember those ones.
21	T	ok, I think they that happened to you didn't it, that you said prepare and
22	T	so- did they discover something?
23	S3	they found different structures.
24	T	yes, yes, now, yes, now here this is slightly different because you did
25	T	produce- I mean accurate structures.
26	S	yes.
27	T	but probably your learners would have wrote it in the present.
28	S	mm.
29	T	probably they wrote, they would have written I mean they'd say
30	T	(xxxxxxxx) she's coming, she's getting into the house. and I gave or I'm
31	T	giving him or I give him a slice of bread.
32	S	uh huh.
33	T	uh huh, here you didn't see it because you were producing accurate
34	T	sentences. (1.0) but still there were things weren't there.

35	S	uh huh.
36	T	and you said it er (name). what happened?
37	S3	we discover information.
38	T	you discover something right?
39	S4	mm hmm.
40	T	ok. so that is (xxx) [name, the third stage, I think it's language erm
41	S1	[yes (xxxxx)
42	T	focus.
43	S1	mm hmm.
44	S2	yes.
45	T	now hopefully name there will be (xxx), because at least they will be
46	T	learning, uh huh. what kind of learning, (name).
47	S3	(2.0) self learning.
48	T	ok.
49	S3	is that it?
50	T	I'm laughing because we're going to get into the question raised soon so
51	T	YES. uh huh. Now this this actually has got can have two two phases or
52	T	two stages. uh huh. when you compared what were you doing, (..) when
53	T	you were comparing.
54	S4	reading.
55	T	reading and discovering and-
56	S5	analyse.
57	T	the discovery comes , yes, thank you (name).
58	S5	analyse.
59	S4	analyse.
60	T	the analysis of the language (3.0) and then we didn't really get much
61	T	into it (1.0) but (.) we could ask them to do what?
62	T	(1.0) imagine that, now you've got them they've discovered that they are
63	T	they should have written in past tense, uh huh, and then you can ask to
64	T	look at phrases with er,
65	S2	–ing
66	T	-ing, ok. all this analysis right? what do you think you could ask them to
67	T	do then?
68	S3	discuss.

69   S4   (xxxx).

70   S5   (xxxx).

71   T   have they produced?

72   S4   practised.

74   S5   with little tests.

75   T   yeh, well with the tests it's that probably you notice (..) they didn't

76   T   produce so you will prepare something in past tense (xxxxxxxx) right.

77   S6   but there isn't any real presentation of the structure

78   T   ah good question. that's the point, and that's what I wanted to talk about.

The first assessment token comes in line 10 following S2's question 'we compared it with the first...' in line 9. The first thing to note is that *yes* is followed by an upshot formulation, or rather an invitation to the trainee to provide one. (This is unusual and will be worth returning to, when we come to discuss pedagogic issues in chapter 6). *Yes* here is not a continuer in the sense of 'go on', nor is it an acknowledgement token in the sense of 'I am listening and I understand what you're saying'. It is a response to S2's 'am I right' intoned line 9 turn and functions as an assessment token of agreement or acceptance (Gardener, 1997). As frequently occurs in ordinary conversation it is followed by further talk, which changes speakership and topic (it should be noted that Jefferson, 1993 at page 8 allows that yeah + further talk can be shifting topic or moving from one topical line to another). Unlike ordinary conversation, it is produced in 3rd turn position, and the further talk that comes with it is done as a formulation or an invitation to provide one.

In ordinary conversations the minimal response or acknowledgment token *yes/yeah* plus further talk pays lip service to interactional engagement while moving speakership and topic on; it glances back only briefly. In contrast here, its coupling with a formulation frames *yes* as an assessment which holds up for collective inspection what has been produced by trainees and trainer and agreed to by the trainer. Furthermore, while the further talk in topic or topic line shift can be constituted by both statements and questions in OC, in trainer talk it is overwhelmingly done with questions.   We can compare these sequences as follows:

OC: statement > response token + statement or interrogative
IT: question > response > response token + formulation + question

The trainer's attempted elicitation of an upshot or implication in lines 10-11 is problematic, and the reformulation of the question in lines 13-18 suggests why. Once again there is uncertainty from trainees about the footing a response is expected to occupy, as teacher trainees or as learners. In lines 15-16, the trainer therefore asks trainees to think what their learners would have noticed in the activity, a reminder that while they are trainees at this point, they are analysing what they did as imaginary learners.

Following S3's response in lines 19-20, the trainer's 3rd turn *ok*, with its up-down-up intonation, is an assessment, but arguably distinct from the *yes* in line 10. It is not assessing the factual correctness of S3's contribution so much as its understanding of the procedural import of the trainer's question: trainees need to go down to a learner level in the process option stack. There are parallels to another insitutional context, the medical interview, where doctor *ok* in third turn is an assessment of the adequacy of a patient reponse (Beach in Condon, 2001: 494). The topic management function of *ok,* its pivotal and projective nature, its responsiveness to prior and next-positioned talk (Beach, 1993: 348) is also in evidence here. However, its link to a recast formulation elicit in line 23, points to a 'good, we're back on sequential track' deployment.

In lines 24-34, the trainer's *yes yes + now* prefaced/pro-form formulation articulates the unsaid in lines 27-31 (S3's different structures) in suggesting that real learners would have used present forms rather than past, and is accepted by various trainee acknowledgement tokens at lines 26, 28, 32 and 35. In line 36 the trainer's *and-*prefaced turn with its question to Erica seems to be retaking the original *yes +* invitation to formulate upshot from line 10, now that the trainer has established to whom the upshot relates. In line 37 S4 provides the appropriate professional vocabulary item to label what (would have) happened. The *ok* produced by the trainer in line 40 is not assessment *ok*, but functioning in its more usual organisational role, to signal topic or sequence close. The formulation that follows it is of the whole sequence so far and all the trainee contributions to it.

There is some evidence in line 49 for a distinction between the acknowledgement token function of freestanding *ok* and the assessment *ok + formulation*. Following S3's 'self learning' response in line 47 to the trainer's line 46 question, the trainer's *ok* in line 48 does not do the expected assessment and, in Pomerantz's terms, S3 pursues a response. This comes with the heavily stressed *yes + uh huh* in line 51. Because the trainer's line 51 IRT is so focused on prior turn, and not doing topic shift

In lines 53-60, the trainer establishes what sorts of receptive process are involved in discovery. The use of a series of formulations in response to trainee offerings points to another sequential feature of assessments in this institutional context. In sequential slots where gist repetition formulations are relevant, IRTs are not required; formulations do their work for them.

A further example of *ok* + formulation occurs in line 66, this time with *ok* marking the looked for response, although it seems that when they were interrupted in line 65, the trainer was moving to a 'they've done all this' preamble to a 'so now what' question.

Trainee responses to the 'what next' question in lines 68-70 are met by disguised trainer repair in line 71. In lines 74-76, the *yeh*.....*right* bookended assessment turn is arguably a version of Seedhouse's mitigated repair, where you accept a 'wrong answer' before going on to provide the right one. The trainer wants to get from trainees the second possible part of the language focus stage in a TBL lesson, where learners practice or produce the language they didn't (or got wrong) in the task but have noticed following it. S5's 'with little tests', in line 73 is effectively going off the topic and training task of describing a methodological procedure. We might suppose that having attended to face work, the trainer would go on to do the repair in the further talk turn space following *right*. But S6 intervenes in line 77 with their statement which is treated as a question by the trainer's strong assessment commentary 'ah good question', followed by a pro-form upshot formulation (another procedural vocabulary as formulation example) pointing back to line 77, and then forward in line 78-79 to the next topic.

Let us return to the questions about assessment tokens posed at the beginning of this section and suggest some answers based on the case study of **5.15**.

1. <u>Assessment tokens in trainer talk are accompanied by further talk</u>
The only instances of a freestanding response token are produced by trainees at lines 24, 32, 35, 39, 43 and 44 to mark 2nd pair part agreement with a trainer first pair part. The only freestanding trainer response token - *ok* - occurs in line 48 but the trainee's pursuit of a recognisable assessment reponse, marks this acknowledgement *ok* in an assessment spot as accountable. An assessment token needs company in its third turn slot to signal its assessment work.

2. <u>The further talk is normally a *so-* and/or *pro-form*-prefaced formulation</u> The formulation looks backwards to embody the gist or upshot of what has been assessed and forwards to the next step in the topic line or next topic. As in ordinary conversation, some response tokens are a signal of topic and speaker shift but the particularity of the further talk that accompanies yes and ok in third turns, always produced by 1st turn speaker are a marker of institutionality here.

3. <u>*OK* is functionally more varied than *Yes* for assessments</u>
Yes is only product-focused while *ok* is both product and process-focused. *Yes* + formulation is saying 'I agree with your understanding' - and this is what you said or is implied by it. The *ok* + token in line 21 can be glossed as saying something like 'yes, you understand me and what I'm doing'.

4. <u>'Strong' assessment tokens don't always appear in a 3rd turn slot and might be doing different kinds of assessment work</u>.
The only example of a 'strong' assessment token comes at the end of the sequence with the trainer's 'ah *good* question' + upshot formulation following a trainee intervention. The reason that it is a good question is not addressed to the content but to its production at this point in the sequence. It enables the trainer to move on to the next task/topic on the agenda, the differences between TBL and other methodological options for presenting language. As with *ok*, there is an emphasis on process.

If we look again at **4.1**, **4.2** and **4.4** (a companion deferred input in a series to **5.15**) there is further evidence to bear out the observations on assessment tokens in **5.15**. In **4.1**, in line 10 *yes* + formulation does an assessment of the preceding turn while moving the topic on to the next line of topic development. In **4.2**, the trainer's assessment token *that's right,* followed by a *pro-form* prefaced (*they, it*) formulation in lines 10-12, and a *so*-prefaced recast in 15-16 following the trainee intervention does assessment and topic shift. In **4.4**, we have the following assessment tokens:

- line 15 - repetition + gist formulation
- line 22 - *ok* + gist formulation (here doing the same product-focused work as yes/that's right/right)
- line 26 - *yes* + upshot formulation (and & pro-form prefaced upshot formulation)
- line 44 - *ok* + gist formulation

All of these assessments ratify what has gone before in the trainer framed interaction context and shift the topic to the next stage of the sequence, on the trainer's sequential terms.   They also further exemplify the core compositional and sequential features of assessments in trainer talk.

- They appear in 3rd turn in following a question/answer two part turn and are done by the trainer.
- The further talk that accompanies them is a trainer formulation, which looks back to the trainee turn but forward to a new topic, to another aspect of current topic, or is a pre-closing for the sequence.
- Sequential context does not affect the form of the token produced, but exploratory contexts, exposed or embedded, where the trainer's work of shaping and refining trainee ideas in professional terms is a pedagogic focus, will influence the extent of the recasting and interpretive work that formulations do, as I noted in Section 5.3.

All these extracts do, however, highlight a leading question to explore, which in turn will take us to consider assessments and a trainer's institutional identity. Are there 'strong' assessments in training classrooms, in the sense of praising trainee ideas? Extracts **5.16-5.20** contain examples of one strong assessment token, *exactly*.

Extracts 5.16, 5.17 and 5.18 come from a series of expository (with embedded exporatory) sequences, where the trainer and trainees look at a video of learners talking about how they prefer to be corrected. The trainer has asked trainees to watch the video right through and work in pairs to decide what mistakes learners made made and what were the reasons for the mistakes. Extract **5.19** comes from the TBL session and a deferred input expository sequence where the trainees and trainer are describing and recording stages and steps in a TBL lesson.

The only canonical example of an *exactly* assessment token + formulation in 3rd turn spot comes in **5.19**. In the other three extracts this is not the case. In **5.16**, while the *exactly* + gist and upshot formulations is compositionally regular, its sequential position is not in 3rd turn following a response to a trainer question. The 3rd turn assessment here has been done on S1's response in lines 3-6. S3's contribution in line 9 is an add-on and the trainer's overlapping *that's right* in line 10 is upgraded in line 11's *exactly* to be followed by a formulation update. In line **5.17**, again the trainer's 3rd turn assessment token + formulation has occurred earlier, but this time, S1's *but*-prefaced turn is more like repair than an add-on, but gets *exactly* + formulations nevertheless in lines 9-13.   In **5.18**, the trainer's potential assessment token + formulation is interrupted by S2 and S4 and so must wait until line 14, with the formulation delayed by S2's turn.

I want to take the trainer's 'I was going to say that' in line 14 as a pointer to the functioning of *exactly* in these and other, commonly, deferred input expository sequences. In **5.16**, **5.17**, **5.18**, S3 (with 'phonological' enabling the trainer to contrast this with grammatical), S1 (pointing out that the learner makes the same mistake with different verbs, so it isn't a native speaker mistake) and S4 (the same sound at the beginning of the following word) are effectively articulating the unsaid, but it is what has been unsaid by the trainer in their formulations. Trainees are repairing omissions, doing the trainer's work for them. These are things that the trainer was going to say but didn't.   In the normal 3rd turn spot in **5.19**, the *exactly* is arguably doing the same kind of work. But instead of being heard to mean ' this is what I wanted to say and didn't', we might hear *exactly* here as 'this is what I wanted you to say and you did', with the choice of *exactly* possibly emphasizing the importance of the assessed item to the formulation of deferred input to come.

5.16

01	T	(15.0) ((plays and pauses))

01 T (15.0) ((plays and pauses))

02 S1 I prefer being correct.

03 T right. (1.0) again it's a bit more complicated isn't it than that. because it

04 T sounds a little bit to me like I prefer to be correct-t-t. you know kind of as

05 T though there might be something else but he hasn't got the correct<u>id</u>. he

06 T hasn't got the kind of ID.

07 S2 mmmm.

08 T you know he's kind of-

09 S3 yes is it phonological[(mistake in)] the final consonant.

10 T   [that's right]   .

11 T <u>exactly</u>. so he may be, just just listen to it once more. but I suspect there

12 T is some kind of you know some little thing there but he hasn't got the ID.

13 T is the is the clear thing so it may be phonological more than grammatical.

14 T and so if the teacher responds by going through the grammar of the past

15 T tense, you're not responding to his problems correctly.

5.17

01 T that's right. so what he did is what lots of native speakers might do.

02 S1 mm.

03 T yeh I don't know what's the problem. (..)[yeh

04 S1   [but he (mentions it later) on he

05 S1 does the same mistake. and he's using a different verb from the verb to

06 S1 be. [and]that´s a mistake that native speakers don´t

07 T   [right]

08 S1 make=

09 T =right right <u>exactly</u>. so so that's an interesting point isn't it because it

10 T means that first of all we might say oh that's okay lots of native speakers

11 T say that. but then he does it with another verb which native speakers

12 T wouldn't do with it. so he doesn't do it for the same reasons that native

13 T speakers do it.

5.18

01	T	what you can't focus on is everything so what are you going to focus on.
02	T	let's just listen to it again and see if it's my mind or my ear. ((T rewinds
03	T	video and plays the utterance again)) what do you think.
04	S1	mm.
05	S2	I think he's pronouncing it but he's but he's got the –ing there it's just kind
06	S2	of he-he bites it-
07	T	[yes, yes-]
08	S3	[mm
09	S2	[it's kind of-
10	S4	[(it's also to do with) the next word after it is 'and', so there's a similar
11	S4	[kind (xxxxxx) similar kind of sounds so it's (obviously the
12	T	[yeh yeh yeh
13	S4	slurring again)
14	T	it-<u>exactly</u>. I was going to say that yeh. maybe [your slurring]
15	S2	[(xxxxxxxxxx)
16	T	yeh that's right, yeh yeh. (2.0) and I mean, one can only discover some of
17	T	these things, whether he in his subconscious or even in his conscious mind,
18	T	whether he actually has identified a strategy. if I talk fairly fast and slur
19	T	things a little bit, you know I sound better.

5.19

01	T	so there was like a what=
02	S1	=presentation
03	T	=a public presentation, right? why do you think it had to be done like that.
04	T	and that's important for the planning, I mean the report was public. mm
05	T	hmm, why?
06	S2	because it encourages you to write properly, because if all the class is
07	S2	going to listen, you don't want to be the dumb group that doesn't write
08	S2	well.
09	T	<u>exactly</u>. so, the planning is important because they are planning for a
10	T	formal presentation. ok?

5.20

01	T	ok. all that they know so far, right, hopefully the new structure as well but
02	T	all that they know so far. mm hmm (.) now, think of this. (1.0) you start
03	T	with that-
04	S1	and after what you know you add what you discover
05	T	<u>exactly</u>. uh huh. so, we're looking at a different way of doing things. uh
06	T	huh. I'm not saying this is better than the other or use it, I'm just saying
07	T	this is just a different way of doing things..

In **5.20** S1's completion of the trainer's assessment *ok* + formulation articulates what the trainer <u>was going to say</u> and gets an *exactly* and a sequence concluding formulation which looks back some sequential distance. Again, the trainee is taking words out of the trainer's mouth.

In ordinary conversation, 'well said' is praise for the <u>quality</u> of what has been said, both for the sentiments or ideas that are expressed and the way in which they are expressed. We might view *exactly* as the training classroom equivalent. But its institutionality is evidenced in 'praise' being directed at <u>when</u> something has been said and the ideas that it expresses in its sequential location. Note, then, that with respect to this second element, we are not talking of the quality of the content (how good it is), but its identity (what it is). The assessment-formulation link is important in understanding this distinction. The formulations following assessments embody what has been said and will often say it somewhat differently, putting trainee contributions into the trainer's words and typically into a more appropriate professional form. In **5.19**, the trainee has produced what was wanted by the trainer, raw materials for the formulation in terms of when and what; the formulation does the necessary further work of translating S2's trainee-as-learner voicing into a trainee designed (for notetaking, recording) upshot formulation. In **5.16**, **5.17**, **5.18** and **5.20** trainees contributions are not produced in the right sequential space but they are relevant in terms of what is being said, in that it is something that the trainer wanted to say or 'was going to say' in their formulations. *Exactly (what I...was going to say/what I thought/what was wanted/what I wanted)* is perhaps a more accurate representation of this assessment token.

5.21

01	T	now, isn't that what we want really in a presentation? in a PPP? we want
02	T	hopefully they will notice how the language works, but since we are not sure
03	T	we tell them. this is how it works and here's the exercise and er-
04	T	yes because this is the use of English, it's not a er grammar structure
05	S1	presentation.
06	S1	ok, ok, fair enough. good. good. now um, have they produced?

5.22

01	T	I mean do- do you need a PPP er-you know a presentation practice and then
02	T	production lesson first, y'know, and then do this?
03	SS	//no//=
04	T	(Name) ? yes, no?
05	S1	oh, I I think that it can be a possibility to introduce a new er new tense a
06	S1	new structure. and er if you do that, they notice the different structures,
07	S1	they're going to say oh we need to learn this structure. so er first of all you
08	S1	are introducing them the use and then the structure.
09	T	I swear to God Simon I didn't train them. (1.0) they are brilliant today, just
10	T	brilliant.

Alternative 'strong' assessment tokens in those slots might have been *well spotted* (in
5.16 and **5.17**) *good point* or even *well said* (in **5.18**). The organisational and
sequential focus of a 'strong assessment' token like *exactly* argues for assessment
doing different work here. This is reinforced if we look at how other 'strong
assessments' are used.

Extract **5.21** is part of a sequence which follows on from **5.15** and is towards the end of the discussion about whether a task based approach presents language in the traditionally understood sense. The trainer's *now*-underlined formulation of the discussion is is interrupted by S1, but their response in lines 5-6 to the trainer's rhetorical question is redundant. More importantly, it is a potential repairable, as it suggests that S1 has not understood the trainer's point that TBL is not so different from PPP in that it helps students notice how language works. The two approaches are different ways of doing the same thing - telling students. The trainer's *ok ok* chooses to ignore this and seems to be doing face work through it's 'yes, you could put it that way' intonation. The *good good* that follows is an assessment of the sequence and its successful outcome and signals a move to the next topic line.

In **5.22**, which comes at the beginning of the same sequence, we see the strong assessment token *brilliant* in lines 9 and 10 being produced not for the trainees but for the observer; and not for an individual trainee but for the group. Its delivery to someone other than the speaker of the assessable is the only seeming difference from Antaki et al's (2000) high grade assessments in survey interviews being directed at successful completion of a segment of the interview rather than at what a respondent has said.

Assessments and Identity

The compositional and sequential features of assessments I have described underline the dominant situational identity of expert/knower on the part of the trainer. They are the people who do assessments and in third turn following a trainee response. The formulations that invariably accompany the variable assessment response tokens serve to identify them as assessments in this context but also to indicate what exactly is being assessed.

The sequential placement and formulatory accompaniment of 'strong assessment' tokens points to a heavily process and organisation focus of assessments, and so to the importance of a trainer's **managerial** identity in successful or effective assessments. But more importantly they tell us something about the central place of this component of institutional identity in most aspects of trainer talk.

Seedhouse (1996; 2004) argues that the notable absence of negative evaluations in language classroom form-and-accuracy contexts, the case of the missing 'no', is a reflection of interactional face work, and that this concentration on relational matters is at odds with the pedagogic aim of encouraging learners to make errors or mistakes because they are seen as an important element in learning. In the training classroom, we have the case of the missing 'yes', or rather the missing 'good', excellent', 'well done', good point', 'original idea', etc, certainly in its commonly understood conversational sense of a strongly positive assessment. In the training classroom, it seems, assessment is not a relational matter, but an organisational one, directed at marking the stages and closing of a sequential context.

The nature of trainee talk here also contributes to our sense of this organisational function and the trainer's control over what gets said and how it is said. In Goffman's (1981: 144, 145) terms, trainees are viewable as **authors** of the words heard, in that they have selected the sentiments being expressed and the words in which they are encoded. But in legal as well as Goffman's terms we might say that the trainees are acting for a **principal** (the trainer), 'someone whose position is established..., whose beliefs have been told, someone who is committed to what the words say.' Indeed, it could be said that trainees are co-authors in that they are selecting or anticipating words their principal would want to use.

Assessment is sequentially focused but its accompanying formulations are not doing the sort of relational work that McCarthy notes they do in conversation.

In all cases, the use of nonminimal responses shows a concern on the part of listeners toward attending to the relational aspects of the conversation as well as performing the necessary feedback functions with which listeners cocreate the discourse with speakers. (McCarthy, 2003: 59)

Seedhouse's missing 'no' is at odds with pedagogic purpose and teacher identity. My missing 'yes' is not, or at least not ostensibly. But it raises the pedagogic issue that in making assessment in the training classroom an organisational affair trainers are not in fact making best use of its possibilities in contributing to teacher training pedagogy.

5   Repair, Formulation and Assessment in Feedback

In this brief concluding section to chapter 5 I want to draw out three important features shared by all three components of feedback in teacher trainer talk.

First, while all three provide feedback to trainees on their contributions, they do so as part of a larger whole, the co-construction of a form of institutional-talk-in-interaction. They contribute to the prcess of talking the institution (its structures of interaction) into being. Second, all three play different parts in this process. Repair and assessment are what might be termed the dark and the bright sides of assessment and focus on process, while formulations focus on product (see Heritage and Raymond, 2005; Linsdstrom and Mondada, 2009). However, the use of dark and bright is not to refer to affective or affiliative elements in feedback but to its overwhelming concern with organisation of interaction and its sequential imperatives. Feedback in training classroom is stripped bare of the strong affiliative element that is present in conversation. This leads to the third and most important point to arise in the chapter: feedback is part of the larger whole of teacher trainer talk and the organisation-driven construction of all three forms is a reflection of the orientation of participants to the demands of this interactional order and the particularities of the institutional order this orientation is indexing.

Table 3 summarises the main features of the different areas of feedback discussed in chapter 5.

Table 3   Feedback in Trainer Talk

Repair in Interactional Contexts	Expository	Exploratory	Experiential
	Focus On accurate (deferred input) and appropriate (initial input) professional meanings **Main form** - Other initiated other repair in next turn slot in deferred input - Trainer initiated trainer repair predominates in exploratory or experiential elements of initial input sequences **Distinctive feature** - Collective rather than individual focus, managed by trainer but done by class in deferred input - mitigated negative evaluation **Trainer identity** expert/knower, reflector, professional discourse developer	**Focus** Appropriacy of language and terminology, relevant precision of trainee ideas **Main Form** - Trainer initiated trainer repair **Distinctive feature** - shaping and refining trainee ideas in the context of professional appropriacy **Trainer Identity** - expert/knower, reflector, professional discourse developer - More emphasis on reflector and discourse developer	- Little repair in experiential contexts where everyone's knowledge is weighted the same. - When done, TITR usually aimed at linking different experiential contexts or drawing more general ideas out of trainee contributions.
Formulations	**Forms**	**Sequential Features & Interactional Functions**	**Trainer Identity**
	- Gist, upshot, articulating the unsaid	- Story-so-far in sequence, closing for the record summary - Organizational: establish and record outcomes - Synthetic and interpretive: pull together different contributions - Autocratic rather than consensual Process oriented:	- Expert/knower, reflector, discourse shaper, collegial (in experiential contexts) and more relational - contrast with decision recorder and decision negotiator roles in other institutional contexts, eg business, medicine

Assessments	Forms	Sequential Features and Interactional Functions	Trainer Identity
	- Weak assessment tokens: *yes, right, that's right, ok, all right* - Strong assessment tokens: *exactly, absolutely, good, absolutely right* - Tokens normally accompanied by *so* and/or *pro-form* prefaced formulation	- 3rd turn position following trainer initiation and trainee 2nd turn response - assessments normally accompanied by further talk (formulations) - ok addresses both process and product concerns - strong assessment tokens not always in 3rd turn slots - assessments largely organizational not relational, focused on topic development - strong assessments mainly address WHEN something is said rather than WHAT is said	- Trainers do assessments, so that **expert/knower** identity relevant - Organizational focus of assessments points to the centrality of trainer's **managerial** identity

Chapter 6   Trainer Talk and Institutional Interaction: Discussion and Conclusions

Part 1   Discussion

1   Institutional Context and Methodology

My study of the institutional talk-in-interaction represented by trainer talk and the way that it organizes training classroom interaction was conducted with two main research questions in mind:

1. What structures of sequential organization relating to trainer talk characterize this form of institutional interaction?

2. How do these structures represent the central activities in this type of setting: building knowledge, enacting and developing relevant professional identities and roles, and at the same time marking wider institutional boundaries and constraints?

In looking for answers to these questions and a description of this variety of talk at work, I have used a methodological approach grounded in Conversation Analysis and its sequential comparison of ordinary conversation and institutional interaction. Drew and Heritage's (1992) comparative definition of institutional talk took its goal/activity orientation as the key element and the adaptation of the interactional procedures of ordinary conversation to serve the needs of institutional activities and the institutional goals they reflected.

This comparative definition was my methodological starting point. However my methodological framework was different in where I looked for my data and in my broader-based theoretical notion of context, which sought to build on CA's bedrock sequential context.

My focus was on what Sarangi and Roberts (1999) have called the backstage of workplace encounters, borrowing Goffman's social life performance metaphor. Their frontstage and backstage corresponds to institutional interaction embodied, on the one hand, in encounters between professionals and clients and, on the other, between and across professional groups (1999: 20). Many of the studies of talk in medical, mediation and management settings gathered in Sarangi and Roberts focused on backstage data. My study of trainer talk in the context of interaction between professionals and professionals in training adds to the body of backstage studies of talk at work.

The methods and procedures of conversation analysis (CA) have been largely aimed at frontstage talk. Heritage's (2004) list of six basic places to probe the institutionality of interaction are all focused on the sequential context of interaction and comparative leverage with OC.

1. Turn-taking organization

2. Overall structural organization of the interaction

3. Sequence organization

4. Turn design

5. Lexical choice

6. Epistemological and other forms of asymmetry

As ten Have (1999: 170) notes, this shopping list is especially useful for students of an institutional interaction that brings professionals and clients together. A focus on the backstage has brought to the methodological frontstage the issue of the extent to which institutional order is entirely discernible in the interactional order. To put it another way can a narrowly focused study of the interactional order do justice to Duranti and Goodwin's (1992) two key dimensions of context:

- language as context - where language and interaction constitute and maintain contexts for talk

- extra-situational context - where the social, historical and cultural factors that have shaped a particular institutional discourse are found

If we accept that context must be approached from the perspective of participants and analysis must concern itself with the methods they use to make sense of and construct a particular context, how far is it necessary to go beyond the interactional context to understand these perspectives?

My study is grounded in a fine-grained analysis of institutional interaction in teacher training classrooms, and so in the interactional order and how it is constructed by participants. Where it breaks relatively new ground methodologically is in its concern with both the sequential organisation of context and the categorisation work of participants that is done in that context - 'categorising activities, knowledge, and, in particular, professional identities within a given professional order' (Sarangi and Roberts, 1999: 25).

Drawing on the work of Harvey Sacks and others into Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA), I have tried to add a (sub) cultural dimension to the sequential focus of CA and in so doing embrace the extra-situational context in this form of institutional talk. At the same time I have tried to add a sometimes neglected dimension to CA's analytic tradition, that of MCA (Silverman, 1998; Benwell and Stokoe, 2006). Analytic insights from membership categorization analysis have been used to link the two sorts of order that are the focus of my research questions: the interactional order and the institutional order. I have used membership categorization to explore the particular institutionality of this form of institutional talk which I have taken to be lodged in the identity-in-interaction of the trainer/educator.

My methodology and my research topic have taken the work of Paul Seedhouse on language classrooms as a starting point and sought to add to it and to other work on institutional interaction, in terms of subject matter and approach.

In this chapter I will first describe the features of this form of institutional interaction that I take to create the 'unique "fingerprint" talked of by Heritage and Greatbatch (1991). This fingerprint is made up of 'specific tasks, identities, constraints on conduct, and relevant inferential procedures that the participants deploy and are oriented to in their interactions with one another' (Heritage, 2004: 225). While doing this, I will suggest how my research has added to or leads to a reconsideration of previous work in applied linguistics, education and, above all, institutional interaction. In Part II of the chapter, I will go on to consider the possible pedagogic applications to teacher training methodology and practice, the methodological strengths and limitations of the study and the pathways for future research it opens up.

2 Trainer Talk

In describing trainer talk, its 'interactional architecture', I see my description as adding two important elements to Seedhouse's (2004) description of language classrooms:

1. Sequence organisation to sequential organisation: Seedhouse focuses in the main on the first level while I have focused on both.
2. Varieties of identity to situational identity: Seedhouse and other work on institutional interaction has largely worked with default identities (teacher-student, interviewer-politician, talk show host-caller, counsel-witness, for example) while I have tried to distinguish the various situational identities of the trainer and their relation to the different contexts of interaction, and so to training pedagogy.

My three interactional contexts (the turn and topic based sequential organization of trainer talk), expository, exploratory and experiential are the defining elements in this institutional talk-in-interaction. They provide the outer frame for the task and identity orientation that do institutional work within them (sequence organisation and the institutional categories that are oriented to in the process). In contrast to Seedhouse's three key interactional contexts (form-and-accuracy, meaning-and-fluency and task-oriented), the focus is on topic rather than language. The nature of feedback in these contexts still marks a training classroom concern with how things are said, but in the service of a different overriding pedagogic goal, which is not learning a language but learning how to teach one.   I will now explain why these three sequential contexts are foundational before going on to describe the relationship between them.

2.1   Expository Contexts

In expository contexts the pedagogic focus is on giving or getting methodological or linguistic facts and ideas and as in Seedhouse's language classroom, there is a close relationship between this pedagogic focus and turn-taking and sequence organization.

Sequential Organization

Topic and turn-taking are the twin features of sequential organization (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973).   In expository contexts, the pedagogic focus on the transmission and recording of methodological and linguistic concepts and procedures , leads to the trainer's complete control of topic initiation. This compares with OC, where work is required to warrant legitimate topic intitiation. Here, as in other institutional contexts, agenda and topic setting are in the hands of one person (Button, 1988/1989).

Unlike OC and some other informal, backstage institutional talk (IT) - business for example - the trainer also controls topic development. Of the interactional asymmetries noted as a characteristic feature of institutional interaction by Drew and Heritage (1992) and Heritage (2004), in expository contexts the respective knowledge states of trainer and trainees do most to shape sequential organisation. How much the trainees are taken to know will normally determine the choice of initial input or deferred input options. But we have seen that in both cases the trainer can and does control how a sequence is played out.

If the trainer has not already set the topic agenda, then a topic will be 'proffered' by them to trainees. In OC, topic proffering sequences are recipient-oriented, with the recipient treated as in the epistemic driving seat and as able to 'embrace or reject the topic', although the preference is that they will 'buy into' and expand it (Schegloff, 2007: 170-172). In trainer talk, topic-proffering in expository sequences is speaker-oriented, with trainees not in a position to accept or decline, or decide how much or how little to say. The question of what counts as relevant topic knowledge, how much is displayed and when is solely in the hands of the trainer. This control of the trainer over topic decisions is absolute. However, the tasks being done in expository contexts will also influence how much trainees contribute to input and I will come back to this in talking of sequence organisation.

Formulations are important in expository contexts, to summarize and close them but also, if they are extended (as in deferred input), to label the stages. In expository contexts, gist formulations are more frequent, and mark the organizational focus, looking back at the story so far. As with openings, closings do not require interactional work in expository contexts. The trainer decides when sequences and topics are closed, and these are normally marked by formulations and ok topic close signals (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973).

Moving from topic to turn-taking, questions, elicits and staging and closing formulations make this turn-taking context not so different from Seedhouse's language classrooms and other institutional settings, where the institutional representative occupies an incommensurate number of particular turn types.
The kinds of task and deferred v initial input are the most significant variables here, but the occupation by the trainer of initiating turns in a sequence is generally unvaried in expository sequences.

Turn-taking here is in the service of pedagogic facts, the basic raw materials of learning to teach - whether facts about language or teaching and learning. The trainer may choose to loosen control, as we saw, for example, in **4.5** and **4.8,** where the trainer switched contexts, but it was in the trainer's election whether or not to do so, what kinds of turn design to employ. We can therefore add turn-taking context to turn-taking as an important element in the trainer's control of sequential organization in expository contexts. This will have implications for training pedagogy, as we shall see in the second part of this chapter.

Asymmetries of participation are a consequence of this turn-taking control in expository contexts but we need to be careful about too easy dichotomies between the symmetries of conversation and the asymmetries of institutional talk, and too easy equation of asymmetry in one kind of institutional talk with that of others. Robinson (2001), Stivers and Heritage (2001) and Heritage (2004) have warned against oversimplifying distinctions between OC and IT.   Conversation is as likely to have substantial asymmetries of participation as institutional occasions. What is important here, as Heritage (2004) points out, is that asymmetry in conversation is not tied ' to any particular set of social roles, identities, or tasks'. In contrast in much institutional talk there is a close relationship between tasks and identities and discursive rights and obligations (p237).

This leads to my second point concerning the danger of assuming asymmetry is the same in different kinds of institutional talk. As I noted in Chapter 2 when discussing Drew and Heritage's definition of institutional talk, the heavy reliance on frontstage, professional-client encounters makes for a skewed view of the kinds of asymmetry that are important and how they can be institutionally particular.

Recall the four main kinds of interactional asymmetry noted by Drew and Heritage (1992) and Heritage (2004)
- participation
- interactional and institutional know-how
- knowledge
- rights of access to knowledge

The asymmetries of participation in evidence in trainer talk expository contexts, the control over topic initiation and shaping might lead us to assume that it is asymmetry of knowledge that underlies the asymmetry of participation in evidence. The 'functionally specialized, and superior knowledge bases can impart a specific expert authority' to claims in a given knowledge domain (Heritage, 2004: 239). But the backstage, professional-professional-in-training nature of this institutional context makes for a different epistemological outlook: there is not the caution of other professional settings (Drew and Heritage, 1992; Heritage, 2004). in expository contexts the interactional enactment of the **expert** and **theorist** elements in the trainer's pedagogic identity requires displaying rather than witholding knowledge. Moreover, knowledge displays in expository contexts are not just in the trainer's control. In deferred input sequences, trainee display of knowledge is relevant to the pedagogic focus.

If we accept the notion that teaching does not necessarily equate with learning (Nunan, 1987), then expository contexts are important places for this learning to happen. Trainer talk in these contexts can be equated with Wallace's (1991) expert, external knowledge. However, input is interactionally accomplished and requires uptake. The other side of the interactional coin from the trainer displaying knowledge is that the trainees too should do this, and be encouraged to do so. The overarching pedagogic purpose is learning to teach, or developing teaching knowledge and skills. This requires trainees to develop and display knowledge and learn to do this in distinctive, institutionally specific ways. There is not the all-or-nothing quality of the witholding and displaying of knowledge we find in other institutional talk. Knowledge (and rights of access to it) is not one participant's _resource_ for controlling interaction

displays. While the asymmetries in evidence in training classrooms are institutionally distinctive, this is because they are a reflection of the pedagogic focus and the particular institutional identities in play.

Having said this, in pedagogic terms the trainer's absolute control over turn-taking means that trainee knowledge displays depend on a benevolent dictatorship for turn space: relevance, quantity and location are all controlled by the trainer. Again the relative distribution of knowlege displays allowed by the trainer in expository contexts has connections to pedagogy.

Sequence Organization: Tasks and Identity

Definitions, classifications, descriptions (of language concepts or teaching procedures - strategies and techniques) are the kinds of task encountered in expository contexts. Some tasks are bigger (in sequential terms) than others (see deferred input in a series).

In expository contexts, teller, ratifier and summariser are key discourse identities which point to the wider situational pedagogic identity of **expert/knower** (see Doecke, 2004; Smith, 2005; Loughran and Berry, 2005; Robinson and McMillan, 2005). However, it is clear that an important part of the trainer's identity, as in the language classroom, is managing interaction. In all three contexts of trainer talk, the concerns of the architecture of intersubjectivity (Heritage, 1984) so central to conversation are equally in play.

Whatever the sequential activity, the trainer's process marking and product wrapping role remain constants. The managerial and organizational focus predominates in expository contexts with gist formulations key tools. The action implication upshots of other institutional contexts, such as medicine and business, are not present. Assessments are as likely to be on successful closure as on the quality of trainee contributions.

Feedback is the other side of the trainer's interactional input and it generally underpins the transmissional rather than reflective approach to pedagogy. The organization of repair in expository contexts is focused on the accuracy and rationality of professional meaning, as opposed to the accuracy of form of its language classroom counterpart. But most of the strategies for mitigating negative evaluations are of the type noted by Seedhouse for avoiding direct negative evaluation in form-and-accuracy contexts in language classrooms (2004: 164 et seq). So we may assume that while repair is largely organized to focus on content, there are also affective concerns.

Something else about repair in expository contexts sets it apart from OC and from language classrooms, and this is its predominantly OIOR trajectory. In training classroom expository contexts, repair moves away from individual to collective noticing. In language classrooms the predominace of OISR trajectories is related to SLA concerns of individual noticings. In training classrooms, the important noticing is done by the class, and so WHO does it is not so important, nor is the recasting in appropriate terms of an intial learner /trainee formulation. Allied to the greater asymmetries of knowledge (of ideas, the language in which to express them, the contexts in which to consider and reflect on them) in initial input, repair here is not a collective enterprise; it is 'owned' by the trainer. And in this, it is more an extension than a correction of input.

Feedback in expository contexts indexes their sequential frames. If repair in deferred input sequences typically focuses on professional **accuracy**, in initial input sequences the focus is on professional **appropriacy**. A trainer's institutional identity in both embraces elements of the pedagogic (expert and knower, reflector) and the linguistic (discourse developer).

The sequential context and location of **formulations** in training classroom talk also ties them closely to tasks and identity. The trainer is not a decision recorder (as in meetings) or a decision negotiator (as in doctor-patient interviews). In the former, the absence of agreement signals the accuracy and inclusiveness of the formulation; in the latter, the presence of agreement signals the patient's acceptance of a diagnosis or treatment recommendation. A trainer needs accurately and appropriately to represent in professional terms trainee contributions. Because there is an asymmetry of knowledge in play, acceptance of a trainer formulation is not required, either as stories-so-far, or as pre-closings. The conduit role of a meeting chairman is underlined by the next turn initiation of a new topic by a participant rather than the chairman (Barnes, 2007). The autocratic, organizational and interpretive role of the trainer is

It is noteworthy that in a context where one might expect displays of theoretical knowledge - references to readings, linguists and methodologists - these are largely absent. This infrequent display of 'theoretical' knowledge on the part of the trainer indexes a prioritising of managerial over expert/knower identity, even in a context where one might expect a predominance of the former over the latter. It is the trainer's identity as knowledgeable teacher that is more important for doing being knowledgeable. In this kind of learner-centredness, language teacher trainers appear to be meeting the same kinds of expectations of teacher trainees from other subject areas (Smith, 2005; Robinson and McMillan, 2006).

Researchers on teacher educator identity in ELT (Wallace, 1991) and in education (see chapter 2) have posited a reflective/constructivist model of teacher educator identity. Expository contexts are the default contexts for teacher talk in training classrooms, yet evidence little of this reflective model, not at least in the organization of interaction or the identities that are displayed.   But we have also seen that the control over sequential and sequence organization exercised by the trainer can also be loosened, to open out sequences into exploratory and experiential contexts. While expository contexts are important in providing the external transmissive input of Wallace's reflective model, it is clear that they do much more varied work and have the capability of providing a scaffold for all varieties of interaction (cf Seedhouse, 2004: 219 et seq). The possibilities of different forms of language use (Perakyla, 2004) occurring in expository contexts in trainer talk make them a flexible and adaptable pedagogic frame.

2.2 Exploratory Contexts

There are some parallels with Seedhouse's Task-Oriented Contexts here, but they take place in whole class interaction and the trainer remains in control of feedback. In exploratory contexts, the focus is on the trainees and on their views and opinions, largely based on experience.

Sequential Organisation

In terms of the topic, while the selection remains in the trainer's control, the focus is not on what trainers think or know, but what trainees know and think. The ideas come from trainees, with the trainer prompting helping them to express them.   Topic initiation is with the trainer, but topic development is with the trainees, helped by the trainer. While trainers usually have ideas about the questions they pose, there is not such a significant asymmetry of knowledge as in expository contexts. The input will frequently be the trainees' experiential knowledge. Trainer formulations here are important, because they shape trainee experiential talk in professional language terms.

The closer relation to the anyone-and-anything goes nature of OC is apparent in exploratory contexts. There are a greater number of trainee self-nomination turns and recipiency markers from trainers.   Trainer formulations in these contexts, while serving the same organizational function of expository contexts are much more focused on shaping this reflected-on experiential knowledge for professional purposes.

Despite the significant role of trainees in the development of topic in exploratory contexts, its intiation as well as its closing remain in the trainer's hands, and so we are still some way from the sequential organization of OC. The negotiation of openings, changes and closings of topic that are a part of the interactional architecture of conversation are not present here. The channelling of contributions through the trainer rather than between trainees underlines the centrality of the trainer's floor management function to this and other contexts of trainer talk. The still significant control over topic and turn-taking is underscored in the greater frequency of embedded exploratory contexts over exposed in the data. It is also present in turn design features, with the continuing dominance of trainer questions in initiating three-turn sequences and trainer occupancy of the 3rd turn slot. However, these questions are not of the known-information, display questions found in more formal classroom settings, or in language classrooms (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975; Mehan, 1979; van Lier, 1996). They are closer to information questions in their elicitation of Information that is known to trainees not the trainer (although the trainer will have their own teacher's view). The third turn slot is not an evaluation but an extension and/or formulation of the trainee's ideas.

Sequence Organisation: Tasks and Identity

The kinds of task that are done in exploratory contexts are similar to those in expository, centering on teaching strategies and procedures, problem-solution case studies, concepts and ideas. However, exploratory tasks largely focus on methodology, because this is the larger component of a course and trainees can draw on experiential knowledge in the task discussion. Moreover the sorts of so called consciousness-raising tasks on language in training classrooms are effectively deferred input expository tasks in that the information being sought is known-in-advance to the trainer. Extract **4.7** was a little different in this respect in that the question on similarities and differences between the organisation of words in the mind and in a dictionary allowed for different answers, particularly concerning the nature of the ordering of words in the mind.

If the expert and knower and transmitter of information are to the fore in expository contexts, it is the **reflector a**nd **professional discourse modeller** identities that are the predominant activity-bound categories in exploratory contexts. In the language awareness and, most frequently, teaching procedure tasks that are the subject of exploratory contexts, rather than professional accuracy, the trainer's role is focused on professional appropriacy, helping trainees to express ideas, translate experiential knowledge into professional frameworks. Unlike expository contexts these ideas are not thought-in-advance information (perhaps by the trainer, but not the trainees). They are developed in interaction and so play an important part in the reconstructing of practice that Freeman (1991; 1996) talks about.

In exploratory contexts, trainer identities in play mirror those of online forum discussion moderators (see Benwell and Stokoe, 2006: ch 7). Trainee ideas provide the contributions and the job of the trainer is to prompt contributions, weave and summarise them. Trainer formulations will often often recast trainee ideas into a more appropriate professional register or make connections to a wider pedagogic context.

This interpreting and enabling role in exploratory contexts is central to a trainer's situational identity and embodies two main elements. First is the modelling of language to talk about teaching and learning. This reflection could be on their own experience or that of the trainees. This is the linguistic and interpretive element in a trainer's identity in this context. Second is the enabling element, leading trainees to articulate and put forward ideas of their own, a key component of the trainer's pedagogic identity.

Feedback

In exploratory contexts the trainer's deployment of forms of feedback is central to the pedagogic aim of enabling trainees to draw on their experience in shaping their own 'theories-from-practice', and to the enacting of the two main elements of the trainer's reflector role in exploratory contexts I have distinguished.   Repair invites clarification, reformulating trainee contributions for relevant precision, or articulation of the unsaid. The close relation of assessments to formulations is embodied in the massively present assessment token + *so*-prefaced formulation. The nature of this relationship is marked here. Assessments are rarely directed at the content of what has been said, but serve as interactional bridges to the formulations which shape and refine trainee ideas.

Unlike Seedhouse's meaning-and-fluency contexts, repair is not significantly closer to conversational practice with a focus on getting the message across and mutual understanding. Repair in exploratory contexts is not concerned with what is said, but with how it is said. Importantly, ideas are less important than the language that is used to describe and interpret teaching and learning processes.

One aspect of feedback that marks exploratory contexts is the greater focus on the individual rather than the collective, at least when we examine in-sequence repair. The forms of feedback are organised to operate on individual contributions in-sequence. As in other training settings (see Loughran and Berry, 2005) the focus is on uncovering a trainee's experiential-based knowledge or views on a topic, and helping them to think about how this fits into a professional as well as a personal frame. On the other hand, end of sequence formulations in expository and exploratory contexts are both collectively designed, to integrate and officially record for the class individual contributions. Like expository sequences, formulations that close exploratory sequences are frequently collective in their sources of information and ideas, and in their design as for-the-record trainer shapings of trainee inputs (see Lee, 2007 on collective displays of information in third turn slots in language classrooms).

In both expository and exploratory contexts the last word is with the trainer and this will typically look back on what has been said rather than forward to what has to be done, in contrast to other institutional contexts (see Garafanga and Britten, 2004; Barnes, 2007).

Summary

In sum, I have noted that the trainer's enabling role in trainee explicating of experience in exploratory contexts is synthetic, pulling things together. However, while one consequence is that participation structures display less interactional asymmetries than in expository contexts, the trainer is still in control of openings and topic initiation (there are few trainee initiations of exploratory topics in the data), topic development (through questions, repair clarifications, staging summaries) and closing (summary formulations). In exploratory sequences the trainees are 'set free' sequentially, but not in the way that Seedhouse's language learners are in Meaning-and-Fluency contexts. Developing fluency and communicative competence is not the pedagogic purpose here.

The trainer's control over how exploratory contexts open, develop and close mark their situational identity and its linguistic and pedagogic focus on enabling trainees to articulate conceptions of practice.   But while the pedagogic focus is to work with ideas, there is a continuing focus on (professional) form in the expression of meanings. Moreover, enabling the expression of these meanings involves attention to building, developing and closing the contexts in which they are expressed. The trainer control over the levels of sequence organisation does not make the successful talking of institutionality into being necessarily any easier or less complex than in conversation. The managerial and organizational aspects of a trainer's pedagogic identity are necessary to the shaping and organizing the sequences in which trainee ideas can then be taken and shaped.

2.3   Experiential Contexts

In experiential contexts, trainers invite trainees to talk about and share experiences and views on a particular topic, most typically relating to some aspect of teaching and learning, as with the topics of exploratory contexts.

Sequential Organization

Here as elsewhere, the trainer introduces the topic. This can be through asking trainees to work in pairs or groups to share these experiences and then report back, or through the asking of questions or inviting of comments in an expository sequence, typically an initial input type, with the embedded experiential context coming in the slot following the input.

There are two distinctive features of topic and turn-taking in experiential contexts which on the one hand take them closer to conversation, while on the other marking out a training classroom as a particular type of institutional talk.

The sort of topic proffering that is done in experiential sequences is much closer to conversation than in either of the others. This time the topic is indeed recipient-oriented and in many respects the trainer 1st turn proffer fits Schegloff's description:

> The topic may concern something which is specifically, differentially, or even exclusively within the recipient's experience, or on which their view has special weight or authority. In that regard, the projected topic-talking sequence, if it does in fact develop from the proffer, will be one in which the recipient is likely to carry the burden of the talking - either because they are the only ones who could do so, or because they are the ones who *properly* do so. (2007: 170)

In experiential contexts, it is up to the trainee(s) whether they in fact choose to respond to the proffer, let alone do the preferred expansion following 2nd turn. Nor is there a preference for yes/no type questions that there is in conversation (Raymond, 2003; 2006; Schegloff, 2007), although this may be something that trainers wish to consider in evaluating the extent to which the response is extended. The trainee knowledge state is 'exclusively' within the trainee's experience and their control over the way a topic develops is even more notable than in exploratory contexts. We might say that it is the very same shared-with-OC qualities of topic proffering in experiential contexts that marks them in comparison to the other two contexts.

The second particularity of topic in these contexts is its fragmentation into individual cases or fat moments of experience. I noted in ch 4 the absence here of the building of one topic or the stepwise transition between topics that characterise ordinary conversation.   In contrast to conversation a large number of new topic starts (individual trainee experiences) in this type of sequence would be a positive rather than a negative feature (cf Sacks, 1992).

In comparison to exploratory contexts, then, trainer and trainee talk in experiential contexts is **additive** rather than **synthetic**; indeed the trainee experience 'drags' the trainer down in the role stack (Woodward, 1991; 1992), from the training classroom to teaching classrooms, with a noticeable impact on identity.   Trainer control over topic development and shaping is minimal in terms of the overall sequential organization; experiential contexts are much more dependent on sequence organization within each 'case'. The uniqueness of experience and the aim of verbalising and sharing it means that feedback on trainee contributions is generally absent - repair, assessments and formulations (certainly of record-producing, summative and synthetic variety) do not figure heavily in experiential contexts.

The even greater presence of self-nominating trainee turns, trainer recipiency markers and response to individuals and to their particular experience (as opposed to a concern for making it stand for something in evidence in other contexts) marks the sequential organisation here as closer to ordinary conversation.

Sequence Organisation, Tasks and Identity

The experiential focus is entirely on teaching or learning procedures. Discussion is of teaching strategies and procedures, problem-solution case studies. But the way these tasks and sequences are constructed exemplifies **cumulative talk** instead of the **explanatory** we find in exploratory sequences. In experiential sequences, we have the language of the staffroom rather than the training room: vernacular rather than professional.

The trainer's identity is importantly different in experiential sequences, even in those embedded in expository. I have said that in opening the doors to experience, the trainer is importantly handing over the keys to sequential development. And this is because they have stepped down in Woodward's role stack to a **collegial** identity, reflected in their language and relinquishing of control over a sequence's unfolding. However, this collegiality is not the same as the sometimes deployed trainer-as-teacher of exploratory contexts. There they are teachers who think about teaching and model the putting into words. In experiential contexts, the trainer's concern is not with the language that the trainees use to express their experience, but with **relating experiences**, **linking contexts**. The sort of repair done in experiential contexts is not on accuracy or appropriacy of language but on synthesizing contexts, relating one kind of experience to another, as a 'senior teacher' might do in a staffroom conversation.

In my discussion of Membership Categorisation Analysis in chapter 2 I noted its two dimensions of sequence and activity and categories of (sub) cultural understandings. The writing on trainer identities in education (Doecke, 2004; Smith, 2005; Korthagen, 2004; Korthagen, Russell and Loughran, 2006; Robinson and Mcmillan, 2006; Watson, 2006) suggests that an important part of a trainer's interpersonal identity is the fellow teacher and colleague, at least for trainees. I would argue that this largely staffroom-based identity is in evidence in experiential sequences, marked by the absence of organizational or feedback concerns that are present in other sequences. The trainer is one of us, another teacher, with their own stories to tell. Rapport and credibility in training classrooms are arguably dependent on the sequential and lexical doing of this identity we find in experiential contexts.

Summary

Trainer talk in experiential contexts is unique in terms of both levels of sequence organization and the identities displayed there. Topic control is absent; feedback is absent; the prominence of managerial identities in expository and exploratory contexts is considerably diminished here. The additive, interpersonal and collegial case approach of trainers to trainee experience brings them closer to conversation in experiential contexts than in any others. Experiential contexts also bring trainers closer to an important element of their situational identity.

> Whatever we may think about what it is to be an ordinary person in the world, an initial shift is not to think of an 'ordinary person' as some person, but as somebody having as their job, as their constant preoccupation, doing 'being ordinary'. It's not that somebody is ordinary, it's perhaps that that's what their business is. And it takes work, as any other business does.... that is the way somebody constitutes themselves, and, in effect, a job they do on themselves. They and the people around them may be coordinatively engaged in assuring that each of them are ordinary persons, and that can then be a job that they undertake together, to achieve that each of them, together, are ordinary persons.... We can see then that it's a job. You have to know what anybody/everybody is doing; doing ordinarily. And you have to have that available to do.
> (Sacks, Part IV, 216-217)

In my view, this 'ordinary person' identity is important to the overall institutional goal of helping teachers learn how to teach a language. Sacks goes on to discuss people who don't have being ordinary available to do, and must therefore specialise in some way (he uses the example of prisoners). The trainer is not, in fact should not be behind institutional bars, locked into their particular, out-of-the-ordinary person. They do being out-of-the-ordinary teachers in expository and exploratory contexts. The symmetries of institutional know-how that are another distinguishing feature of training classroom interaction ensure that doing being out-of-the-ordinary in such contexts is not something that is noteworthy or sanctionable, but expected and accepted as the work of these contexts. What is important here is that the trainer does in fact have doing being ordinary available in this institutional context (in comparison with other more formal settings, including classrooms), and that experiential sequences are where they can draw on this availability, this second language. Trainers don't remain above the action, they join in.

I want to return to this point when I look at the relationships between the three sequences and the institutionally related work they combine to do. The crucial question to arise is whether this exchanging of stories (about work) makes experiential contexts important in pedagogic terms. I return to this when I look at pedagogic implications.

2.4   Interactional Contexts and Institutional Talk in Training Classrooms

How do the three contexts relate to each other in terms of doing institutional work, the teaching of how to teach the L2? How do they embody the particular institutionality of trainer talk, its institutional fingerprint? In reviewing work on MCA in chapter 2 I noted that identity is the crucial link between the interaction order and the institutional order. As I said at the beginning of 2.2.3, forms of institutional interaction are created by particular sorts of people doing particular kinds of tasks. Institutionality is effectively co-terminous with institutional identity.

Seedhouse's study located his pedagogic focus in turn-taking and sequence organization with shapes and forms emerging all deriving from a particular pedagogic focus as a component part of teaching the L2 to learners. In all 4 of his sequential contexts, teacher identity was invariable. I have argued that in a training classroom, the different levels of role participation mean that holding identity constant misses important elements of institutionality; in particular it downplays the close relationship between pedagogic goals and being a particular kind of trainer or teacher. Forms of pedagogic identity importantly mediate between purpose and the shapes and forms that enact that purpose. Seedhouse's paradox of pedagogy and interaction in opposition (2004: 175 et seq) is an example of this. A different way of looking at this paradox is to view the avoidance by teachers of direct negative evaluation of learner errors as an indexing of the interpersonal aspects of a teacher's situational identity. In other forms of institutional talk this 'human factor' is not seen as a marker of institutional identity and is more easily classifiable as Zimmerman (1998) does, as transportable and not relevant to institutional tasks and underlying goals. In classrooms of all kinds it arguably is. We should be as careful of one-to-one links between pedagogic purpose-organization of interaction as we are about form-function links in language analysis.

While there are aggregate features we can draw out and assign, teasing out variations of identity can help to discriminate sequential variations that have an import for how we define pedagogic purpose. Because identity embodies both sequential and language phenomena, in this context it is arguably a more reliable index of institutionality.

In his study of 'being the teacher', Richards (2006) noted the way that the introduction of space for a learner's **transportable identity** (and the commensurate introduction of a teacher's) can have an impact on the discourse produced and on its communicative import. In training classrooms, the trainer's transportable identity as practising teacher and the views and experience from language classrooms that it encapsulates and imports has an equally significant impact on institutional discourse. The nature of the training classroom itself is in part responsible. As I have noted, in the training classroom the choice of stance or role through which identity is voiced is multiplied by 2 in contrast to what is available to the teacher in a language classroom. At one level the trainer is the trainer, talking to trainees as trainees; at the other level, a trainer can move down in the stack talking to trainees as a teacher with trainees as learners (in demonstrative contexts), or more importantly locating their

The other underlying cause for the centrality of this transportable identity lies in what the doing of being a trainer in training classroom contexts involves. I want to consider this question with reference to my three interactional contexts.

Being the trainer: the trainer as teacher

In **expository contexts**, we appear to have the most uncomplicated relationship with identity. The **display of expert knowledge, trainer as theorist , the transmission of information** (often other people's theories or information), the **feedbacker** on accuracy of professional concepts: all these are components of a trainer's **pedagogic identity** which are assumed to be at a premium in expository contexts; and in important respects they are. However, how are these identities displayed, how are they done?

One linguistic realisation of the expert/knower in expository contexts might be taken to be some reference to the literature and to fellow 'experts'. But this indexing of knowledge and access to it is generally absent. In **4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4** and **4.5**, there is no use of literature to reinforce or support the transmission of information or ideas. The expository repair work of **5.1-5.7** has no external reference. The series of formulations of **5.14** have only one formulation which includes reference to the literature, but interestingly enough it is not deployed to validate formulations or to supply quotes for them, but to note in passing who coined the term 'interlanguage' originally. Moreover, while the trainer is mentioning names he is also telling trainees not to worry too much about remembering them. In **4.2**, mention of Julian Edge is for organizational purposes, tying one expositional sequence to another. The alternating use of inclusive *we* with *you* (the teacher) in **4.1-4.5** signals the trainer's categorial membership of **trainer-as-teacher** and its relational pair of **trainees-as-teachers** (see Drew and Sorjonen, 1997 for lexical choice and institutionality). Linked to the absence of trainer-as-trainer's displays of authority-referenced expert knowledge, it suggests that an important element of trainer identity is linked to being a teacher and so to the teaching classroom as well as the training classroom.

In **exploratory** contexts, it is not the trainer-as-expert and knower that is important, but the **trainer-as-reflector** identity that is dominant, with its linguistic element of discourse modeller and its pedagogic focus of helping trainees to articulate experience in professionally appropriate terms. Here, the trainer-as-teacher voicing of this identity is even more central than in expository contexts. Trainee input will typically come from their own experience, and so it is what happens in the language classroom which is the focus for discussion, the trainer's assessments and formulations aimed at helping trainees to reflect on the details of their practical experience and to do this drawing on their own experience, connecting it to the trainees and to the wider institutional context. The trainer's use of Sacks's categorial and proverbial *you* in **4.8** was an indexing of the trainer-as-teacher that shaped how the reflector identity was enacted. In chapter 4, I noted that this contrasted with the absence of categorial language in **4.7**. But in **4.7**, the trainer identity is one of fellow language user and (as teacher) analyst (see Edge, 1988) and arguably also part of an importantly professional and institutional transportable identity.

In **experiential** contexts, we have seen that the **collegial**, interpersonal element of trainer identity is in play, the trainer as ordinary teacher, just one of you. This can be contrasted with the trainer's not-ordinary teacher of expository and exploratory contexts.   In all three contexts, however the category-in-sequence displays of trainer identity are based in the language classroom. Being a trainer is importantly being a trainer-as-teacher, not stepping out of the teaching and learning classroom but building from within it. In chapter 2, I noted the tensions between the teacher educator as knowing-what and knowing-how, knowledge of the subject and knowledge of how to teach it. The two are linked in training pedagogy in addressing questions of how the what is put across. One of the notable findings from educational research on the expectations of trainees concerning important teacher educator skills and competences was that top of the list was that a teacher trainer should be first and foremost a model teacher, able to articulate practical knowledge and 'bring practical experiences to a theoretical level' (Smith, 2005: 182). Practising what you preach and being able to step back and explain the why and the how grounded in your own experience was effectively demonstrating the theory-from-practice you proposed to enable in your trainees. For teacher educators enhancing reflection and creating an understanding of the professional context, together with empathy and understanding were prioritised. Input, modelling of teaching techniques, subject matter knowledge were not priorities.

Both trainees and trainers recognised that a reflective model was not something that was talked about or transmitted, but dependent on being enacted or done. It came from the bottom-up, from the classroom and from classroom experience, not from external, 'scientific' knowledge. The nature of trainer identity in expository contexts, where being the trainer draws heavily on being the teacher points to trainer credibility and acceptance being dependent, not on the extent of their professional and academic knowledge, but on the fact that they have developed their own theories from use, not from books but from the direct experience and conscious reflection on it that are the twin components at the centre of reflective models in ELT.

The Case of the Missing 'Yes': The Trainer as Trainer

Classrooms of any kind and assessment are inexorably linked. In the discussion of formal classroom settings in chapter 2, 3rd turn position in testing sequences was used to evaluate learner 2nd turn responses to teacher questions and evaluations and the evaluations could be positive or negative. In Seedhouse's discussion of the organization of repair in his language classrooms he noted the relational work that led to the significant presence of mitigated evaluations and so a missing 'no' in teacher assessments of learner language.

In the training classroom we have seen that there are parallels with the language classroom in the generally mitigated negative evaluations contained in trainer repair. But I have also pointed to the case of the missing "yes", in the general absence of strong assessment tokens that are to be found in other kinds of classrooms and in ordinary conversation. Trainees are not praised for their contributions in any of the three interactional contexts. There are few comments which praise the quality of a trainee contribution. When they come, strong assessments of the 'good', 'great', brilliant' sort are commonly directed at process and the successful organizational outcome of a sequence or part of it. In this, trainer high grade assessments have more in common with institutional contexts where key institutional tasks are focused on getting through a series of stages as quickly and efficiently as possible (Antaki et al, 2000).

In ordinary conversation, and in some kinds of classroom, assessments are affilliative and affective, focused on relationships and individuals. In training classrooms assessments are related to a trainer concern with keeping a sequence on track, to aligning the task-as-workplan as far as possible to the task-in-process (cf Seedhouse, 2004: 119), to collective and organizational needs rather than to individual.

The sequential placement and formulatory accompaniment of 'strong assessment' tokens, then, points to a heavily process and organisation focus of assessments, and in fact to all aspects of a trainer's work, and to an importantly **managerial** identity. Why is this predominant? Language classroom contexts can be extended but usually aren't, certainly not in whole class interaction. Training classroom sequences are notable by their extension, their insertion sequences and their post 3rd turn parts. Expository sequences can be short, like **4.1** and **4.2**, but they are more typically extended as in **4.3, 4.4 and 4.5**. The extended nature of these sequences calls for the kinds of fine-grained managerial and organizational skills that are relevant in ordinary conversation. Unlike other forms of institutional interaction, which can play out under the scaffolding of 'overall structural organization' with well-established turn-function slots (see Zimmerman, 1992; Robinson in Heritage, 2004; Gafaranga and Britten, 2004; Mehan, 1979), trainer talk in any of the 3 main interactional contexts is typically extended and so needs to be locally managed and constructed if it is to reach its pedagogic goals. It does not just happen but takes work, institutional work. The adaptation and specialization of this essentially conversational skill to multi-party settings in extended sequences is arguably central to a trainer's being-the-trainer identity.

This managerial identity is relevant to all three interactional contexts and important respects can be said to display the teaching know-how and modelling of good teaching practice that educational research in chapter two identified as a key skill in being a trainer. But this element of trainer identity is unique to training classrooms. While it might take as its starting point the language classroom, it is developed in the training classroom and is as much an embodiment of being a trainer as the trainer-as-teacher identity I have discussed. The two work together in the three different training classroom contexts to constitute institutionality and the work of being a trainer. Trainer-as-manager involves drawing on and displaying the trainer's **organizational** knowledge and attends to **sequential** business. Trainer-as-not ordinary-teacher attends to **language and discourse** business. These two key elements of a trainer's pedagogic identity call on organizational and language skills but not the trainer-as-methodologist. Being a trainer is not being a good teacher, but it is being good at talking about teaching and the experiences that it is based on and helping others to do so.

Being the trainer: the trainer as ordinary teacher

The third key element of trainer identity that chapters 4 and 5 have identified is the people skills of doing being an ordinary teacher that is especially relevant to experiential contexts. This **interpersonal identity** adds an important relational dimension to the organizational and discourse elements. Indeed we might argue that it is a hidden yet noticeable part of being a trainer. Being ordinary and one of you, is a crucial afilliative underpinning for the trainer-as-not-ordinary teacher, ad the trainer as trainer. Without this fundamental identity connection, the other two might not have a platform.

Being a trainer in training classroom contexts

Being a trainer, then has three important elements of institutional identity:

1 The trainer-as-teacher - a discourse-based identity
2. The trainer-as-trainer - an interactional management based identity
3. The trainer-as-colleague - an interpersonal, relationally based identity.

In all three training classroom contexts the different kinds of institutional sequence, their interactional architecture, exemplify the same kind of rational design of institutional interaction underlined by Seedhouse (2004: 181) and by Levinson (1992: 71), the way that devices are organized around a particular goal. A further shared characteristic of second language teacher training and second language language classrooms is their invariant core institutional goal. In language classrooms, the teacher will teach learners the L2, in training classrooms, the trainers will teach the trainees how to teach the L2.

The unique fingerprint of trainer talk in training classrooms which distinguishes it from language classrooms and other forms of institutional talk, and from ordinary conversation is constituted by the following interactional properties:

1. Professional discourse is both the vehicle and object of instruction - the articulation of reflection on experience.
2. There is a reflexive relationship between pedagogy (the institutional identities which embody this particular institutional order) and interaction.
3. The professional discourse that is produced by trainees is not evaluated by trainers but, rather, reformulated to give it relevant precision in terms of accuracy and appropriacy.
 (cf Seedhouse, 2004: 183,184)

It would be too simplistic to equate our three key institutional identities with our three interactional contexts:

- trainer-as-trainer (managerial and organizational) - expository
- trainer-as-teacher (discoursal) - exploratory
- trainer-as-colleague (interpersonal) - experiential

Expository contexts are in fact the most frequently encountered in my training classrooms and, as I have shown, they are typically the sequential gateway to the other two contexts. They establish the trainer's institutionally marked control of topic openings and closings and the two levels of sequential and sequence organization that structure the interaction order. This certainly foregrounds the trainer-as-trainer's managerial identity. And to a degree expository contexts are the places to transmit new information. Reflective models of teacher learning accept that experience alone is not enough data for reflection; it needs to be strengthened by external information sources. However, this kind of information, while necessary is not sufficient. It is no more reliable as a measure of learning than the input-output models of the language classroom questioned by Nunan (1987) and others, or for that matter behavioural explanations of language learning. Something else has to happen beneath the scaffolding.

The flexible, transformational qualities of expository contexts allow them to provide the sequential wherewithal for the deployment of the two other elements of being the trainer, the discoursal and the interpersonal, both crucial to reflective models of teacher learning. The key pedagogic question is of course, to what extent can or will trainers deploy their three key pedagogic identities in ways that will ensure an appropriate ecology of teacher learning in the training classroom? in extract **4.8** and the discussion of interlanguage, at one point the trainer talks of 'idiosyncratic dialects' as another term for interlanguage. Trainer talk is an idiosyncratic dialect and while I would maintain that the properties of trainer talk that I have identified are universal (as does Seedhouse for L2 interaction), the extent and manner of orientation to them by trainers and trainees will not be universally the same. I return to this when discussing pedagogic implications in Part 2 of this chapter.

The reflector identity lodged in the trainer-as-teacher's professional discourse and shaping of trainees is clearly central to the institutional goal of learning how to teach and the currently underlying paradigm of a social constructivist-reflective model which was discussed in chapter 2. But what I have suggested is that this needs a sequential scaffolding and a human touch (the right sort of atmosphere and receptivity discussed by Allwright and Bailey for language classrooms, 1991). The three elements of trainer identity are not easily separable or allocated to a one-to-one relationship with different interactional contexts.

Teacher training is a dialogue or conversation between trainers and trainees with the aim of helping teachers to develop a ' professional identity', which is a mix of knowledge, skills, theories-of-practice and the professional discourse to talk about them. This overarching enabling identity of the trainer involves the deployment of different elements of a trainer's professional identity: expert and knower, reflector, discourse developer, manager, colleague. These identities are sequentially displayed in the three interactional contexts I have described. Furthermore, I have tried to show how going beyond the default situational identity of teacher/trainer through detailed sequential and categorial analysis allows us to go beyond one dimensional models of teaching or training - giving (transmission) or getting (constructivism).

Sacks (1992, Part IV: 217) remarks on the notebooks of writers, poets and novelists and their 'elaborated studies of small, real objects... or extended character observations'. He suggests that it is the job of novelists and poets (out-of-the ordinary people) to make 'distinctive observations about the world and its persons', not an ordinary person. It is something that, in being ordinary, you don't do. The trainer has to combine the by no means easy work of being an ordinary teacher with the sorts of distinctive and extended observations about teaching and learning that are a part of their trainer-as-teacher identity and its main goal of enabling trainees themselves to succeed in developing this professional identity.

Part 2   Conclusions

3 Pedagogic Implications

Learning to teach is not just about what happens in the training classroom. Supervised teaching practice and the post observation feedback dialogue that accompanies it is another important institutional setting. However, the training classroom is a setting which also concerns itself with reflecting on experience, getting new information to inform practice and in turn provide the basis for further reflection. This reflective cycle frames the developing of theories-from-action and interaction that underly social constructivist models of teacher learning. Trainer talk is central in this process.

I have argued that trainer talk is constituted in the enactment of three main kinds of identity which make up the master institutional identity of **being a trainer**. This overarching pedagogic identity involves organizational, discoursal and relational elements which combine to constitute a trainer's methodology-in-interaction. In my view, the key question in discussing pedagogic implications is that it is the way in which these identities are drawn on, coordinated and interactionally enacted in a specific training classroom setting that constitute good teacher trainer practice.

This ecological approach to teacher training pedagogy is set firmly in a 'post method condition' (Kumaravadivelu, 1994, 2006; Holliday, 1994) where good teaching and training is not following a particular method or approach but being aware of the process options available and making the right strategic decisions in a defined pedagogic context.

Training pedagogy is emergent rather than imposed and depends on both trainer and trainees, upon training styles as well as learning styles and on what stage trainers and learners are at in their learning.   The three trainers who were the producers of my trainer talk had rather different styles, which were enacted in different combinations of being-the-trainer identities, with different consequences for the shape of participation structures.

For one trainer, the trainer-as-teacher and its discoursal basis was the most characteristic institutional identity on display. This led to a predominance of expository contexts but with frequent exploratory and experiential embeddings, which allocated trainees-as-teachers turn space to the trainees, with an accompanying willingness to see where things went. For another trainer their trainer-as-trainer managerial identity was to the fore and the demands of the syllabus an apparent influence. This again made for a predominance of expository contexts but with less space for exploratory elements. With the third trainer, trainer-as-trainer and trainer-as-teacher identities were more mixed so that while expository contexts were still the preferred sequential environment for the enactment of these identities, there were more exposed exploratory contexts and fewer embedded. With all three trainers, trainer-as-colleague was an identity threaded through their sessions, in embedded and exposed form.

Having said this, it would be wrong to attribute the differential distribution of identities to trainer style - their idiosyncratic dialects. The needs of a particular kind of training course, the kinds of trainees and the kind of session in a course may lead to variations in the trainer identity mix. The common thread is the locally managed, contingent and interactive nature of training. Training is an accomplishment through talk-in-interaction and a long way from delivering a package of knowledge or skills. We should not confuse the syllabus-as-plan with syllabus-as-process.

My study offers an important addition to the database for training the trainer courses, which often seem to be more concerned with covering rather than uncovering what it is to be a trainer. Paradoxically, this top-down applied science approach to training trainers embodies a now-discarded approach to training teachers. Trainers need to reflect on and articulate their experience as much as the teachers they train; data from training classrooms can provide an important source of input in the development of trainer theories-from-action.

4   Strengths and Limitations

There are a number of limitations to my study. In its reliance on one method and one kind of data it eschewed the triangulation of methods and kinds of data which may improve the reliability of one method and offer a 'truer' empirical picture. The absence of systematic observation and interviews is a possible drawback.

A second limitation relates to the database and the small number of 'cases' on which I am basing my findings. Sampling issues inevitably accompany CA based qualitative studies. While I noted that my database was relatively large in terms of recordings available for transcription and analysis, the number of sessions that were analysed and transcribed and provide the basis for my description of trainer talk is relatively small. Seedhouse's (2004: 84) database was made up of a number of different databases which insured a greater variety of data, measured by country, culture, learners and language background, proficiency and so on. This provides a broader basis for generalizations about the nature of L2 classroooms. It should be said, however, that much of Seedhouse's energies went into the assembling of his interactional data not transcribing it; this was in contrast to the time I spent on transcribing my small number of cases. Sample size arguably restricts generalizabillity to other training contexts. In this sense my study of institutional interaction is representative in its focus on a few sites (Perakyla, 2004: 297).

A third limitation which is related to the second is that my comparative method was confined to ordinary conversation and to a contrast with other forms of institutional interaction. I was not able to compare other CA studies of ELT teacher trainer talk or training classrooms.

Finally, the nature of teacher trainer talk meant that a complete reliance on CA's third turn proof procedure was not always possible and so it could be argued that I was in danger of doing what CA third turn proof and deviant case procedures are meant to guard against, and that is the substitution of the analyst's interpretation of institutionality for the relevance and procedural consequentiality demonstrated by participants (Schegloff, 1992a; 1992b).

I would maintain that the strengths of my study have a reflexive relationship with its weaknesses. Silverman (2000) has questioned the use of multiple methods to make better analytic sense. The whole picture they offer is, maintains Silverman, an illusion which 'speedily leads to scrappy research based on under-analysed data and an imprecise or theoretically indigestible research problem' . Better to go deep than wide, working within a theoretical perspective and choosing methods that will give you an account of structure and meaning from within that perspective (2000: 99).

The strength in depth of my detailed, often single case approach to sequential and categorial analysis, drawing on cases from a small range of sites, collected over an extended time period, makes for the sort of 'ethnography of situation' that characterises the work of Goffman and the best CA/IT, despite their very different databases and approaches to analysis. While next turn proofs may not always be available, the sequential grounding of interpretations in fine-grained sequential analysis, allied to my own virtual membership status can compensate.

In the absence of comparison with other training classrooms the depth and detail of the analysis in turn provides a stronger basis for the sort of reader authentication and legitimation I discussed in chapter 3. Sacks (1992) claimed that tearing apart any piece of spoken interaction allows us to see the machinery or technology of conversation. Perakyla's (2004) argument that generalizability in studies of institutional interaction is not (and cannot be) based on distributional realities of language use, but on its possibilities is founded on this central idea in CA. Practices may not be actualized in the same way in different settings, but they can be, if we accept the proposition that professionals (in this case English language teacher trainers) anywhere have the same machinery or set of interactional competencies available for use. Whether they do so is not so important as the fact that they <u>can </u>do so if they choose.

5   Future Research

Following on from my discussion of strengths and weaknesses, I feel that there are four main avenues for future research on training classroom interaction as a variety of institutional interaction.

1. Studies of other contexts of L2 trainer talk for comparative purposes and to have a better sense of the variables that are seemingly influential in differential actualizations of trainer talk and the identities that I have argued constitute it.
2. Studies of the training classroom equivalent of Seedhouse's task-oriented contexts to see how they relate to other training classroom contexts and contribute to the institutional goal of teacher learning.
3. Studies of particular aspects of teacher trainer talk - assessments, repair or formulations, for example.
4. Ethnographic case studies of teacher trainers, drawing on interviews, participant observation and audio or video recordings.

6 Final Comments

This descriptive study of teacher trainer talk has confirmed the primacy of context in studying any form of social interaction, perhaps most especially institutional interaction. But it has also underlined a crucial methodological maxim underlying many qualitative studies of face-to-face interaction. The context is not a given and should not be taken-for granted. It must be created by the interactants, whatever performances or texts might be prepared beforehand, whatever we might know or believe about the extra-situational context and its influence. In talking of the nature of lecture talk, Goffman says

> .....we can begin to learn about a basic feature of all face-to-face interactions, namely how the wider worlds of structures and positions is bled into these occasions. The predetermined text (and its implied authorial self) that the speaker brings to a podium is somewhat like other external matters that present themselves to a local situation..... In all these cases, a translation problem exists. Externally grounded properties whose shape and form have nothing to do with face-to-face interaction must be identified and mapped with such ingredients as are available to and in local settings. The external must be melded to the internal, coupled in some way, if only to be systematically disattended. (1981: 103)

Situations, and so institutions, have to be talked into being, they are not ready made texts, or scripts. This is so, even if they appear to be. Goffman talks of properties external to face-to-face interaction whch have nothing to do with it. This would seem wrong for institutional interaction. Surely we as analysts or participants should bring these properties with us into the talk. But Goffman's point, like CA's, is that the interaction order is a world of its own, both part of but apart from that other world, and needing to be talked into being, whether institutionally or conversationally.

Trainer talk and the identities that shape it has to be created and recreated in each instance, and this is an accomplishment on the part of both trainers and trainees. Goffman's suggestion that external, person properties (like trainer) have no importance in the interaction seem not to be applicable to institutional discourse. But who you are professionally or personally requires interactional work.   This is probably the most important part of a trainer's job and it involves all three of the interactional identities I have identified and described.

Appendix 1

ICELT Aims (2005: 2,3)

ICELT programmes are designed to enable candidates to:

1. extend their knowledge and awareness of those aspects of language which are relevant to their professional practice

2. extend their understanding of the context in which their learners are learning English, and of the principles underlying language learning and teaching

3. extend their familiarity with resources and materials for English Language teaching and develop their ability to use, evaluate and, where appropriate, adapt or create classroom materials

4. consolidate their planning and their practical teaching skills

5. identify learner needs, monitor and evaluate learner progress and develop awareness of different means of assessment

6. identify needs and opportunities to further their development as professionals

7. extend their knowledge and understanding of the language required for their professional role, and improve their ability to use English both generally and for classroom purposes.

DELTA Aims (1998: 2)

The DELTA is intended to offer candidates who have substantial experience of teaching English to adult speakers of other languages the opportunity to:

- acquire new insights into this area and a deeper understanding of the principles and practice of ELT to adults;

- examine their current practices and beliefs;

- apply the results of their learning and reflection to their current professional lives and to circumstances beyond their present and previous teaching experience.

Appendix 2 Transcript Conventions

?	rising intonation
.	falling intonation
,	continuing intonation
drink!	exclamatory tone
TEXT	syllable stress
Now	stressed word
(1.0)	timed pause
< >	spoken slowly
> <	spoken rapidly
:	lengthened syllable
-	word cutoff
=	latched talk
{ }	backchannel
[ ]	overlapping speech
//	a number of speakers talking at once
↓now↓	spoken softly
↑now↑	spoken loudly
hh	audible breathing
(( ))	paralinguistic behaviour
(xxxx)	unclear or unintelligible speech
(happy)	uncertain transcription

References

Alasuutari P (1995) *Researching Culture*. London: Sage.

Allwright R (1988) *Observation in the Language Classroom*. London: Longmans.

Allwright R (1984) ´Why don´t learners learn what teachers teach? - the interaction hypothesis´, in D Singleton and D Little (eds) *Language learning in formal and informal contexts*. IRAAL, 3-18.

Allwright R and K Bailey (1991) *Focus on the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Altheide D and J Johnson (1998) 'Criteria for Assessing Interpretive Validity in Qualitative Research' in N Denzin and Y Lincoln (eds*) Handbook of Qualitative Research,* 283-312. London: Sage.

Altrichter H, P Posch and B Somekh (1993) *Teachers Investigate their Work*. London: Routledge.

Antaki C (1994) *Explaining & Arguing:The Social Organization of Accounts*. London: Sage.

Antaki C (2000) 'Using Identity Ascription to Disqualify a Rival version of Events as "Interested"', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 33:155-177.

Antaki C and S Widdicombe (eds)(1998) *Identities in Talk*. London: Sage.

Antaki C, H Houtkoop-Steenstra & M Rapley (2000) '"Brilliant. Next question . . .": High-grade assessment sequences in the completion of interactional units', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *33*, 235–262.

Antaki C, R Barnes and I Leudar (2005) 'Diagnostic formulations in psychotherapy', *Discourse Studies*, 7: 627-647.

Antaki C, M Biazza, A Nissen and J Wagner (2008) 'Accounting for moral judgements in academic talk: the case of a conversation analysis data session', *Text and Talk*, 28: 1-30.

Arminen I (2000) 'On the context sensitivity of institutional interaction', *Discourse and Society,* 11: 435-458.

Arminen, I (2005) *Institutional Interaction*. Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing.

Aronsson K (1998) 'Identity-in-interaction and Social Choreography', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 31: 75-89.

Ashmore M & D Reed (2000) 'Innocence and nostalgia in conversation analysis: The dynamic relations of tape and transcript', http://qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/3-00/3-00ashmorereed-e.htm

Atkinson J M (1992) `Displaying neutrality: formal aspects of informal court proceedings', in P Drew and J Heritage (eds), *Talk at Work,* 199-211. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Atkinson P and M Hammersley (1995) *Ethnography.* London:Routledge.

Atkinson J and P Drew (1979) *Order in Court: The Organization of Verbal Interaction in Judicial Settings*. London: Macmillan.

Atkinson J and J Heritage (1984) *Structures of Social Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baker C (2004) 'Membership categorization and interview accounts', in D Silverman (ed) *Qualitative Research,* 162-176. London: Sage.

Barnes R (2007) 'Formulations and the facilitation of agreement in meetings talk', *Text and Talk*, 27: 273-296.

Bassey M (1999) *Case Study Research in Educational Settings*. Buckingham: Oxford University Press.

Basturkman H (2000) 'The organization of discussion in university settings', *Text*, 20: 249-269.

Beach W (1993) 'Trainsitional regularities for 'casual' "Okay" usages', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19: 325-352.

Beijaard D, P Mejier, N Verloop (2004) `Reconsidering research on teachers`professional identity,´, *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 20: 107-128.

Benwell B and E Stokoe (2002) 'Constructing discussion tasks in university tutorials: shifting dynamics and identities', *Discourse Studies*, 4:429-453

Benwell B and E Stokoe (2006) *Discourse and Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Berger P and T Luckmann (1966/1991) *The Social Construction of Reality*. London:
Penguin Books.

Bergmann J (1992) `Veiled morality: notes on discretion in psychiatry´. In P Drew and J Heritage (eds), *Talk at Work,* 137-162. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bickman L and D Rog (eds)(1997) *Handbook of Applied Social Science Research Methods*. London: Sage.

Billig J (1999) 'Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in Conversation Analysis', *Discourse and Society*, 10: 543-558.

Bird C (2005) 'How I Stopped Dreading and Learned to Love Transcription', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11:226-248.

Boden D (1994) *The Business of Talk: Organizations in Action*. Cambrdge: Polity Press.

Boden D (1995) 'Agendas and Arrangements: Everyday Negotiations in Meetings' in A Firth (ed), *The Discourse of Negotiation:Studies of Language in the Workplace,* 87-99. Oxford: Pergamon.

Boden D and D Zimmerman (1991) *Talk and Social Structure*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bolden G (2009) 'Implementing incipient actions: The discourse marker "so" in English conversation'*, Journal of Pragmatics* 41: 974–998.

Bolden G (2010) 'Articulating the unsaid' via and-prefaced formulations of others' talk' *Discourse Studies* 12: 5-32.

Borg S (1999a) 'Teachers' theories in grammar teaching', *English Language Teaching*
Journal, 53: 157-167.

Borg S (1999b) 'Studying teacher cognition in second language grammar teaching', *System,* 27: 19-31

Breen M (1985) ´The social context for language learning - a neglected situation?´, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7: 135-158.

Breen M, B Hird, M Milton, R Oliver and A Thwaite (2001) 'Making Sense of Language Teaching: Teachers´Principles and Classroom Practices', *Applied Linguistics*, 22:470-501.

Britten D (1985a) ´Teacher training in ELT: part 1´, *Language Teaching*, 18: 112-128.

Britten D (1985b) ´´Teacher training in ELT: Part 2´, *Language Teaching*, 18: 220-238.

Brown P and S Levinson (1987) *Politeness*. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.

Brumfit C and R Mitchell(eds)(1990) *Research in the Language Classroom*. ELT Documents, British Council.

Bucholtz M and K Hall (2005) 'Identity and interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach', *Discourse Studies*, 7: 585-614.

Brumfit C and K Johnson (eds) (1979) *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Butler C and A Weatherall (2006) '"No We're Not Playing Families": Membership Categorization in Children's Play', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 39: 441-470.

Buttny R (1998) 'Putting Prior Talk into ContexT: Reported Speech and the Reporting Context', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 31: 45-58.

Button G (1991) 'Conversation-in-a-series', in D Boden and D Zimmerman (eds) *Talk and Social Structure*, 251-276. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Button G (1992) `Answers as interactional products: two sequential practices used in job interviews´.In P Drew and J Heritage (eds), *Talk at Work,* 212-231. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Button G and N Casey (1984) 'Generating topic: the use of topic initial elicitors' in J Maxwell Atkinson and J Heritage (eds) *Structures of Social Action*, 167-190. Cambridge University Press.

Button G and N Casey (1988/89) 'Topic initiation: business at hand', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 22: 61-92

Button G and J Lee (1987) *Talk and Social Organisation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Calderhead J (1989) 'Reflective teaching and teacher education', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 5:43-51

Cameron L (1997) 'The task as a unit for teacher development'*, English Language Teaching Journal*, 51: 345-351.

Cazden C, V John and D Hymes (eds) (1972) *Functions of Language in the Classroom*. New York: Teacher´s College Press.

Cazden C (1986) `Classroom Discourse´ in M Wittrock (ed), *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, pp 432-463. London: Macmillans.   .

Chaudron C (1988) *Research in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge:CUP.

Cicourel A (1992) ' The interpenetration of communicative contexts: examples from medical encounters' in A Duranti and C Goodwin (eds) *Rethinking Context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University press. PAGES

Clayman S (1992) `Footing in the achievement of morality: the case of news interview discourse´. In P Drew and J Heritage (eds), *Talk at Work,* 163-198. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clayman S and D Maynard (1995) `Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis´, in P ten Have and G Psathas (eds**),** *Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*, 1-30. London: Sage.

Cohen L and L Mannion (1994) *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge.

Coates J and J Thornborrow (1999) 'Myths, lies and audiotapes: some thoughts on data transcripts' *Discourse & Society*, 10: 594-597

Cole P and J Morgan (1975) *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press.

Condon S (2001) 'Discourse ok revisited: Default organization in verbal interaction', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33: 491-513.

Cook-Gumperz J and L Messerman (1999) ' Local identities and institutional practices: Constructing the record of professional collaboration', in S Sarangi and C Roberts (eds), *Talk, Work and Institutional Order*, 145-182. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Coupland J (2000) *Small Talk*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Coupland N (2001) 'Sociolinguistic theory and social theory' in N Coupland, S Sarangi and C Candlin(eds), *Sociolinguistics and Social Theory*, 1-26. London: Longman/Pearson Education.

Coupland N, S Sarangi and C Candlin (2001) *Sociolinguistics and Social Theory*. London: Longmans.

Creese A (2008) 'Linguistic Ethnography', in K King and N Hornberger (eds), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, Vol 10: Research Methods in Language and Education, 229–241.

Cullen R (1998) ' Teacher talk and the classroom context', *English Language Teaching Journal*, 52: 179-187.

Cullen R (2002) 'Supportive teacher talk: the importance of the F-move',

Davis K (1995) 'Qualitative Theory and Methods in Applied Linguistics Research', *TESOL Quarterly*, 29:427-454.

Day D (2008) ' In a bigger messo context', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40:979-996.

De Fina J, D Schiffrin and M Bamburg (2006) *Discourse and Identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Delamont S (1983) *Interaction in the Classroom*. London: Methuen.

Denzin N and Y Lincoln (1998) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. New York: Sage.

Denzin N & Y Lincoln (2000) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. New York: Sage.

Doecke B (2004) `Professional identity and educational reform: confronting my habitual practices as a teacher educator`, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20: 203-215.

Doyle, W (1986) ´Classroom organization and management´, in M Wittrock (ed), *Handbook of research on teaching*. London: Macmillans,   pp 392-431.

Dressler R and R Kreuz (2000) 'Transcribing Oral Discourse: A Survey and a Model System', *Discourse Processes*, 29: 25-36.

Drew P (1997) 'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28:69-101.

Drew P (2003) 'Precision and Exaggeration in Interaction', *American Sociological Review*, 68: 917-938.

Drew P and J Heritage (eds)(1992) *Talk at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drew P & Heritage J (1992) `Analyzing talk at work: an introduction´, in P Drew and J Heritage (eds)(1992) *Talk at Work*, 3-65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drew P and M-L Sorjonen (1997) 'Institutional Dialogue'. In T van Dijk, ed, *Discourse studies: a multidisciplinary introduction*, 92-118. London: Sage.

Drew P, G Raymond, D Weinberg (eds)(2006) *Talk and Interaction in Social Research Methods*. London: Sage Publications.

Drummond K and R Hopper (1993a) 'Back Channels Revisited: Acknowledgement Tokens and Speakership Incipiency', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26:157-177.

Drummond K and R Hopper (1993b) 'Some Uses of Yeah', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26: 203-212.

Duff P (2001) 'The discursive co-construction of knowledge, identity, and difference: an ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream', in *Applied Linguistics*, 23:289-322.

Duranti A (1997) *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.

Duranti A (2005) 'On theories and models', *Discourse Studies,* 7: 409-427

Duranti A and C Goodwin (eds) (1992) *Rethinking Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dyer J and D Keller-Cohen (2000). 'The discursive construction of professional self through narratives of personal experience', *Discourse Studies*, 2: 283-321.

Edelsky C, K Smith and P Wolfe (2001) 'A Discourse on Academic Discourse' *, Linguistics and Education*, 13: 1-38.

Edge J (1988) 'Applying linguistics in English language teacher training for speakers of other languages', *English Language Teaching Journal*, 42: 9-13.

Edge J and K Richards (eds) (1993) *Teachers develop, teachers research*. London: Heinemann

Edge J and K Richards (1998) 'May I See Your Warrant, Please?: Justifying Outcomes in Qualitative Research', *Applied Linguistics*, 19:334-356.

Edwards D and N Mercer (1990) *Common Knowledge: The Development of*

Eisner E and A Peshkin(eds) (1990) *Qualitative inquiry in education: the continuing debate*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ellis D (1999) 'Research on Social Interaction and the Micro-Macro Issue', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 32:31-40.

Ellis R (1994) *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford:Oxford University Press.

Ellis R (1997) *Second language research and language teaching*. Oxford:Oxford University Press.

Erickson F (1996) 'Ethnographic microanalysis' in S Mackay and N Hornberger (eds), *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*,283-306. Cambridge Cambridge University Press.

Erickson F (2001) 'Co-membership and wiggle room:Some implications of the study of talk for social theory', in N Coupland, S Sarangi and C Candlin (eds) *Sociolinguistics and Social Theory Today*, 152-181. London: Pearson Education Ltd/Longman.

Fine G (1993) 'TEN LIES OF ETHNOGRAPHY: moral dilemmas of field research', *Journal of Comtemporary Ethnography*, 22:267-294.

Fine G and G Smith (eds)(2000) *Erving Goffman*.Two Volumes. London: Sage Publications.

Fitch K (1994) 'The Issue of Selection of Objects of Analysis in Ethnographies of Speaking', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 27: 51-93

Fitch K (1998) 'Text and context: a problematic distinction for ethnography', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 31:91-107.

Fitzgerald R and W Housley (2002) 'Identity, categorisation and sequential organisation: The sequential and categorial flow of identity in a radio phone-in', *Discourse and Society* 13: 579-602.

Foster M, J Lewis and L Onafowora (2003) 'Anthropology, Culture, and Research on Teaching and Learning: Applying What We Have Learned to Improve Practice', *Teachers College Record*, 105:261-277.

Fraser B (1999) ' What are Discourse Markers?', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31:931-952.

Freeman D (1989) ´Teacher training, development, and decision-making: A model of teaching and related strategies for teacher education´, *TESOL Quarterly*, 23: 27-45.

Freeman D (1991) ''To Make the tacit Explicit'': Teacher Education, Emerging Discourse, and Conceptions of Teaching', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 7: 439-454.

Freeman D (1993) 'Renaming experience/reconstructing practice: Developing new understanding of teaching', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 9: 485-497.

Freeman D (1998) *Doimg Teacher Research*. Mexico City: Heinle and Heinle.

Freeman D and J Richards (eds)(1996) *Teacher Learning in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gafaranga J and N Britten (2004) 'Formulations in general practice consultations', *Text*, 24: 147-170.

Gardner R (1997) 'The Conversation Object Mmm: A Weak and Variable Acknowledging Token', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 30: 131-156.

Gardner R (1998) 'Between Speaking and Listening: The Vocalisation of Understandings', *Applied Linguistics*, 19: 204-224.

Gardner R (2007) 'The right connections: Acknowledging epistemic progression in talk', *Language in Society*, 36: 319-341.

Garfinkel H (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Geertz C (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books

Geertz C (1983) *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.

Geertz C (1988) *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Gibson W, A Hall, P Callery (2006) 'Topicality and the structure of interactive talk in face-to-face seminar discussions: implications for research in distributed learning media', *British Educational Research Journal*, 32:77-94

Giles H, N Coupland and J Coupland (eds)(1991) *Contexts of Accomodation: Developments in Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gittlin A (2000) 'The Double Bind of Teacher Education', *Teaching Education*, 11: 25-30.

Goffman E (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everday Life*. London: Penguin Books.

Goffman E (1963) *Behavior in Public Places*. New York: The Free Press.

Goffman E (1967) *Interaction Ritual.* New York: Anchor Books.

Goffman E (1974) *Frame Analysis*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Goffman E (1981) *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goffman E (1983) `The Interaction Order´, *American Sociological Review*, 48:1-17.

Gomm R, M Hammersley and P Foster(eds)(2000) *Case Study Method*. London: Sage.

Goodwin C (1986) 'Audience diversity, participation and interpretation', *Text*, 6:283-316.

Goodwin M (1990) *He Said She Said: Talk as Social Organization among Black Children*. Indiana University Press.

Goodwin C & Goodwin M (1992) 'Assessments and the construction of context', in A Duranti & C. Goodwin (eds), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*,147-189. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Greatbatch D and R Dingwall (1998) ` Talk and Identity in Divorce Mediation`in C Antaki & S Widdicombe (eds) *Identities in Talk*. London: Sage.

Green J and C Dixon (1993) 'Talking Knowledge into Being: Discursive Practices in Classrooms' *Linguistics and Education*, 5: 231-239.

Green J and C Dixon (2001) 'Exploring differences in perspectives on microanalysis of classroom discourse', in *Applied Linguistics*, 23:393-406.

Green J, M Franquiz and C Dixon (1997) 'The Myth of the Objective Transcript: Transcribing as a Situated Act', *TESOL Quarterly*, 31: 172-176.

Grenfell M (1998) *Training Teachers in Practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Grice P (1975) 'Logic and Conversation', in P Cole and J Morgan (eds), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, 41-58. New York: Academic Press.

Guba E and Y Lincoln (1998) `Competing paradigms in qualitative research´ in N Denzin and Y Lincoln (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 195-220. London: Sage.

Gubrium J and J Holstein (1997) *The New Language of Qualitative Method*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gubrium J and J Holstein (2000) 'Analysing Interpretive Practice' in N Denzin and Y Lincoln(eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 487-508. London: Sage.

Gulich E (2003) 'Conversational techniques used in transferring knowledge between medical experts and non-experts', *Discourse Studies*, 5: 235-263.

Gumperz J (1999) `On interactional sociolinguistic method'. In S Sarangi and C Roberts (eds), *Talk, Work and Institutional Order*, 453-471. New York: Mouton Gruyter.

Gumperz J and D Hymes (eds) (1972) *Directions in Sociolinguistics.* New York:

Hak T (1999) '"Text" and "con-text": Talk bias in studies of health care work', in S Sarangi and C Roberts (eds), *Talk, Work and Institutional Order*, 428-451. New York: Mouton.

Hall C, S Sarangi and C Candlin (1999) 'The legitimation of the client and the profession: Identities and roles in social work discourse', in S Sarangi and C Roberts (eds), *Talk, Work and Institutional Order*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp293-322.

Halliday M (1985) *Introduction to Fuctional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hammersley M (1990) 'What's wrong with ethnography? The myth of theoretical description', *Sociology*, 24: 597-615.

Hammersley M (1992) *What's Wrong with Ethnography*? London: Routledge.

Hammersley M (1998) *Reading Ethnographic Research*. London: Longmans.

Hammersley M and P Atkinson (1995) *Ethnography*. London: Routledge.

Hamo M, S Blum-Kulka and G Hacohen (2004) 'From Observation to Transcription and Back: Theory, Practice, and Interpretation in the Analysis of Chidren's Naturally Occurring Discourse', *Resarch on Language and Social Interaction*, 37: 71-92.

Hansen A (2005) 'A Practical Task: Ethnicity as a Resource in Social Interaction', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 38: 63-104.

Hart C (1998) *Doing a Literature Review*. London: Sage.

ten Have P (1990) 'Methodological Issues in Conversation Analysis'. http://www2.fmg.uva.nl/emca/mica.htm

ten Have P (1991) `Talk and institution: a reconsideration of the "asymmetry" of doctor-patient interaction´in D Boden and D Zimmerman (eds) *Talk and social structure: studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*, 138-163. Cambridge: Polity Press.

ten Have (1997) 'In the presence of data: conversation analysis as empirical philosophy'. http://www2.fmg.uva.nl/emca/presence.htm.

ten Have P (1999) *Doing Conversation Analysis*. London: Sage.

ten Have (2004) *Understanding Qualitative Research and Ethnomethodology*. London: Sage.

He A W (1994) 'Witholding academic advice: Institutional context and discourse practice', *Discourse Processes*, 18: 297-316.

He A W (1995) 'Co-Constructing Institutional Identities: The Case of Student Counselees', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 28:213-231

Heap J (1995) `The Status of Claims in "Qualitative" Education Research´, in *Curriculum Inquiry*, 25: 271-289.

Heath SB (1983) *Ways with Words: Language, Life and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heller M (2001) 'Undoing the macro/micro dichotomy: Ideology and categorisation in a linguistic minority school' in N Coupland, S Sarangi and C Candlin(eds) *Sociolinguistics and Social Theory*, 212-234 London: Longmans/Pearson Education.

Hellerman J (2005) 'Syntactic and Prosodic Practices for Cohesion of Three-Part Sequences in Classroom Talk', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 38: 105-130.

Helm D, T Anderson, A Meehan and A Warfield Rawls (1989) *The Interactional Order: New Directions in The Study of Social Order*. New York: Irvington Publishers.

Heritage (1984) *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heritage J (1985) `Analysing news interviews: aspects of the production of talk for an "overhearing" audience´, in T van Dijk (ed), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Vol II: Discourse and Dialogue*, 95-119. New York:Academic Press.

Heritage J (1987) `Ethnomethodology´, in A Giddens and J Turner

Heritage J (1988) ' Explanations as accounts: a conversation analytic perspective', in C Antaki (ed) *Analysing everyday explanation: a casebook of methods*, 127-144. London: Sage.

Heritage J (2004) `Conversation analysis and institutional talk: analysing data´ in D Silverman (ed), *Qualitative research: theory, method and practice*, 222-245. London: Sage.

Heritage J (2002) 'The Limits of Questioning: Negative Interrogatives and Hostile Question Content', *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 1427–46.

Heritage J and D Greatbach (1991) `On the institutional character of institutional talk´. In D Boden and D Zimmerman (eds), *Talk and social structure: studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 93-137.

Heritage J and G Raymond (2005) 'The Terms of Agreement: Indexing Epistemic Authority and Subordination in Talk-in-Interaction', *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68:15-38.

Heritage, J and A Roth (1995) 'Grammar and Institution: Questions and Questioning in the Broadcast News Interview', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 28: 1–60.

Heritage J and S Sefi (1992) 'Dilemmas of advice: aspects of the delivery and reception of advice in interactions between health Visitors and first-time mothers' in P Drew and J Heritage (eds)*Talk at Work*, 359-417. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. and Sorjornen, M. (1994) 'Constituting and Maintaining Activities across Sequences: *And*-Prefacing as a Feature of Question Design', *Language in Society*, 23:1–29.

Hester S and P Eglin (1997) *Culture in action: studies in membership categorization analysis*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.

Hester S and D Francis (2000) `Ethnomethodology, conversation analysis, and `institutional talk´, in *Text*, 20: pp 391-413.

Hockly N (2000) `Modelling and `cognitive apprenticeship´in teacher training´, *English Language Teaching Journal*, 54: 118-225.

Holliday A (1994) *Appropriate Methodology and Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge university Press.

Holliday A (1999) 'Small Cultures', *Applied Linguistics*, 20: 237-264.

Holliday A (2002) *Doing and Writing Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

Holt E (2000) 'Reporting and reacting: Concurrent Responses to Reported Speech', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 33: 425-454.

Housley W & R Fitzgerald (2002) 'The reconsidered model of membership categorisation analysis', *Qualitative Research*, 2: 59-83.

Housley W and R Fitzgerald (2009) 'Membership catagorization, culture and norms in action', *Discourse and Society*, 20: 345-362.

Huberman AM, and M Miles (1998) 'Data Management and Analysis Methods' in N Denzin and Y Lincoln (eds*), Handbook of Qualitative Research*.179-210. New York: Sage.

Huddleston R (1984) *Introduction to the Grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press.

Hutchby I (1999) 'Beyond agnosticism?: Conversation Analysis and the Sociological Agenda', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 32:85-93.

Hutchby I and R Wooffitt (1998) *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hyland K and M Lo (2006) 'Examining interaction in the teaching practicum: issues of language, power and control', *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 14:163-186.

Hymes D (1972) 'Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life' in J Gumperz and D Hymes (eds) *Directions in Sociolinguistics*, 35-71 New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Hymes D (1974) *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jacobs G and S Slembrouck (2010) 'Notes on linguistic ethnography as a liminal activity', *Text and Talk*, 30: 235-244.

Jarvis J and M Robinson (1997) ' Analysing Educational Discourse: An Exploratory Study of Teacher Response and Support to Pupil Learning', *Applied Linguistics*, 18: 212-228.

Jefferson G (1972) ' Side Sequences' in D Sudnow (ed), *Studies in social interaction*, 294-338 New York: Free Press.

Jefferson G (1978) 'Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation' in J Schenkein (ed) *Studies in the Organisation of Conversational Interaction*, 219-248. New York: Academic Press.

Jefferson G (1985) 'An exercise in the transcription and analysis of laughter', in T van Dijk (ed) *Handbook of Disourse Analysis*, Vol III, 25-34. London: Academic Press.

Jefferson G (1989) 'Preliminary notes on a possible metric which provides for a "standard maximum" silence of approximately one second in conversation', in D Roger and P Bull (eds), *Conversation: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*, 166-196. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Jefferson G (1993) 'Caveat Speaker: Preliminary Notes on Recipient Topic Shift Implicature', *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 26:1-30.

Jefferson G (2002) 'Is "no" an acknowledgement token? Comparing American and British uses of (+)(-) tokens' *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34: 1345-1383.

Jefferson G and J Lee (1981) 'The Rejection of Advice: Managing the Problematic Convergence of a 'Troubles-telling' and a 'Service Encounter'', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 5:399-422.

Johnson K (1995) *Understanding Communication in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jones C (2001) ' Missing assessments: Lay and professional orientations in medical interviews', *Text*, 31: 115-150.

Jones R and J Thornborrow (2004) 'Floor, talk and the organization of classroom activities', *Language and Society,* 33: 399-423.

Kaiser K (2009) 'Protecting Respondent Confidentiality in Qualitative Research', *Qualitative Health Research*, 19: 1632- 1641.

Kent G (2000) ' Informed consent', in D Burton (ed) *Research Training for Social Scientists*, 81-87. London: Sage.

Koester A (2004) ' Relational sequences in workplace genres', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36: 1405-1428.

Korthagen F (2004) ' In search of the essence of a good teacher: towards a more holistic approach in teacher education', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20: 77–97.

Korthagen F, J Loughran and T Russell (2006) 'Developing fundamental principles for teacher education programs and practices', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22: 1020-1041

Koster B, M Brekelmans, F Korthagen, T Wubbels (2005) ' Quality requirements for teacher educators', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21: 157-176.

Krashen S (1982) *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Kumaravadivelu B (1994) 'The Post Method Condition: (E)merging Strategies for Second/Foreign Language Teaching', *TESOL Quarterly*, 28: 27-45

Kumaravadivelu B (2006) 'TESOL Methods: Changing Track, Challenging Trends', *TESOL Quarterly,* 40: 59-81.

Labov W (1972) *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Lapadat J and A Lindsay (1999) 'Transcription in Research and Practice: From Standardization of Technique to Interpretive Positioning', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 5: 64-86.

Laurillard D (2002) *Rethinking University Teaching*. London: Routledge.

Larrue J and A Trognon (1993) `Organization of turn-taking and mechanisms for turn-taking repairs in a chaired meeting´, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19:177-196.

Lazaraton A (1995) 'Qualitative research in applied linguistics: a progress report', *TESOL Quarterly*, 29:455-472.

LeCompte M and J Goetz (1982) 'Problems of reliability and validity in ethnographic research', *Review of Educational Research*, 52:31-60.

Lee J (1987) 'Prologue: Talking Organisation', in G Button and J Lee (eds) *Talk and Social Organisation*, 19-53. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Lee Y-A (2006) 'Respecifying display questions:Interactional resources for languageteaching', *TESOL Quarterly, 40:* 691–713.

Lee Y-A (2007) 'Third turn position in teacher talk: Contingency and the work of teaching', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39:1204-1230.

Lee Y-A (2008) 'Yes–No Questions in the Third-Turn Position: Pedagogical Discourse Processes', *Discourse Processes*, 45:237–262.

Lepper G (2000) *Categories in Text and Talk*. London: Sage.

Lerner G (1995) 'Turn Design and the Organization of Participation in Instructional Activities', *Discourse Processes*, 13: 111-131.

Lerner G and C Kitzinger (2007) Extraction and aggregation in the repair of individual and collective self-reference', *Discourse Studies*, 9: 526-557.

Levinson S (1983) Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levinson S (1992) `Activity Types and Language´. In P Drew and J Heritage (eds), *Talk at Work*, 66-100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levinson S (2005) 'Living with Manny's dangerous idea', *Discourse Studies*, 7:431-453.

van Lier L (1988) *The Classroom and the Language Learner*. London: Longmans.

van Lier (1994) 'Forks of hope: Pursuing understanding in different ways', *Applied Linguistics*, v15:328-346

van Lier (1996) *Interaction in the Language Curriculum*. London: Addison Wesley-Longman.

Lincoln Y and E Guba (1985) *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverley Hills, California: Sage.

Lindstrom A and A Mondada (2009) ' Assessments in Social Action: Introduction to the Special Issue', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 42: 299-308.

Lindstrom A and T Heinemann (2009) 'Good enough: Low-grade assessments in caregiving situations', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 42: 329-348.

Loughran J and A Berry (2005) 'Modelling by teacher educators', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21: 93-103.

Lubelska D, T Gilpin, A Gonzalez, S Mayorga and E Santillan (2000) `Training the trainers: developing skills in observing and giving feedback for teacher development´, *The Teacher Trainer*, 15: 15-19.

Lynch M (1993) *Scientific practice and ordinary action: ethnomethodology and social studies of science*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lynch M and D Bogen (1994) 'Harvey Sacks' Primitive Natural Science', *Theory, Culture and Society*, 11:65-104.

van Maanen J (1988) *Tales of the Field*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Macbeth D (2004) 'The relevance of repair for classroom correction', in *Language in Society*, 33:703-706.

Makitalo A (2003) 'Accounting practices as situated knowing: dilemmas and dynamics in institutional categorization' *Discourse Studies*, v5: 495-516.

Makitalo A and R Saljo (2002) 'Talk in institutional context and institutional context in talk: Categories as situated practices', *Text*, 22:57-82.

Markee N (2000) *Conversation Analysis*. London: Lawrence Earlbaum.

Maxwell R (1997) 'Designing a Qualitative Study' in L Bickman and D Rog (eds), *Handbook of Applied Social Science Research Methods*, 69-100. London: Sage.

Maynard, D (1988) 'Structure in Plea Bargaining', *Law & Society Review*, 22: 449-482.

Maynard D (1988) 'Language, Interaction, and Social Problems'*, Social Problems*, 35:311-334.

Maynard D (1992) 'On clinicians co-implicating recipients´perspective in the delivery of diagnostic news', in P Drew and J Heritage (eds), *Talk at Work*, 331-358. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp331-358.

Maynard D and D Zimmerman (1984) ' Topical talk, ritual and the social organization of relationship, *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 47:301-306.

McCarthy M (1991) *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy M (2003) Talking Back: '"Small" Interactional Response Tokens in Everyday Conversation', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 36:33-63

McGrath I (ed) (1997) *Training the trainers*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.

McGrath I (2006) 'Using insights from teachers' metaphors', *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 32: 303-317.

McHoul, A (1978) `The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom´, *Language in Society*, 7: 183-213.

McHoul A (1990) 'The organization of repair in classroom talk', *Language in Society*, 19: 349-377

McHoul A & M Rapley (2002) '"Should We Make a Start Then?":A Strange Case of (Delayed) Client-Initiated Psychological Assessment', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 35: 73-91.

McHoul A, M Rapley and C Antaki (2008) 'You gotta light? On the luxury of context for understanding talk-in-interaction', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40: 827-839.

Mehan H (1979) *Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom*. Harvard University Press.

Mehan H (1991) ' The School´s Work of Sorting Students'. In D Boden & D Zimmerman (eds), *Talk & Social Structure*, 71-90. London: Polity Press.

Miles M and M Huberman (1994) *Qualitative Data Analysis*. London: Sage.

Miller G (1994) 'Toward Ethnographies of Institutional Discourse', *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 23:280-306.

Mirivel J and K Tracy (2005) 'Premeeting Talk: An Organisationally Crucial Form of Talk, *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 38: 1–34.

Modaff J and V Modaff (2000) 'Technical Notes on Audio recording', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 33: 101-113.

Moerman M (1988) *Talking Culture*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Mori J (2003) 'The Construction of Interculturality: A Study of Initial Encounters Between Japanese and American Students', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 36: 143-184.

Morita N (2000) 'Discourse socialization through oral classroom activities in a TESL graduate program', *TESOL Quarterly*, 34: 279-310.

Muntigl P and L Zabala (2008) 'Expandable Responses: How Clients Get Prompted to Say More During Psychotherapy', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 41: 187-226.

Murray J and T Male (2005) 'Becoming a teacher educator: evidence from the field', *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 21:125-142.

Nassaji H and G Wells (2000) 'What´s the Use of 'Triadic Dialogue'?: An Investigation of Teacher-Student Interaction', *Applied Linguistics*, 21: 376-406.

Nespor J (2000) ' Anonymity and Place in Qualitative Inquiry', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 6:

Nguyen HT (2008) 'Sequence organization as a local and longitudinal achievement', *Text and Talk*, 28: 501-528.

Nofsinger R (1999) ` Normal research: digging up the data patch' , *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 32:103-109.

Nunan D (1987) 'Communicative Language Teaching: making it Work' *ELT Journal*, 41: 136-145.

Ochs E (1979) 'Transcription as Theory' in E Ochs and B Schieffelin (eds), *Developmental Pragmatics*, 43.72. New York: Academic Press.

Ochs E, E Schegloff, and S Thompson (eds) (1996) *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Perakyla A (2004) 'Reliability and Validity in Research Based on Tapes and Transcripts' in D Silverman (ed), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*, 283-304. London: Sage.

Philips, S (1972) `Participant Structures and Communicative Competence: Warm Springs Children in Community and Classroom´in C Cazden, V John and D Hymes (eds) *Functions of Language in the Classroom*, 370-394. New York: Columbia Teachers Press.

Pillet-Shore D (2003) 'Doing "OK": On the Multiple Metrics of an Assessment', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 36: 285-319.

Pomerantz A (1984) 'Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes', in J M Atkinson and J Heritage (eds), *Structures of Social Action,* 57-101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pomerantz A and B Fehr (1997) 'Conversation analysis: an approach to the study of social interaction as sense making practices', in T van Dijk (ed), *Discourse studies: a multidisciplinary introduction*, 64-91. London: Sage.

Psathas G (1999) 'Studying the Organization in Action: Membership Categorization and Interaction Analysis', *Human Studies*, 22: 139-162.

Punch M (1998) 'Politics and Ethics in Qualitative Research' in N Denzin and Y Lincoln (eds) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research*, 156-184. London: Sage.

Ramanathan V, CE Davies, M Schleppegrell (2001) 'A Naturalistic Inquiry Into the Cultures of Two Divergent MA-TESOL Programs: Implications for TESOL', *TESOL Quarterly*, 35:279-305.

Rampton B (2007) 'Neo-Hymesian linguistic ethnography in the UK', *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 11: 584–608.

Rampton B (2009) 'Dell Hymes' visions of enquiry', *Text and Talk*, 29: 359-269.

Rampton B, K Tusting & J Maybin, with R Barwell, A Creese & V. Lytra (2004) 'UK linguistics ethnography: A discussion paper'. http://www.ling-ethnog.org.uk.

Rampton B, C Roberts, C Leung, and R Harris (2002) 'Methodology in the Analysis of Classroom Discourse, in *Applied Linguistics*, 23: 373-392

Raymond G (2003) 'Grammar and Social Organization: Yes/No Interrogatives and the Structure of Responding', *American Sociological Review*, 68: 939-967.

Raymond G (2004) 'Prompting Action: The Stand-Alone "So" in ordinary Conversation', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 37:185-218.

Raymond G (2006) 'Questions at Work: Yes/No Interrogatives in Instititutional Contexts' in P Drew, G Raymonde and D Weinberg (eds) *Talk and Interaction in Social Research Methods*, 115-134. London: Sage.

Raymond G and J Heritage (2006) 'The epistemics of social relations: Owning grandchildren', *Language in Society*, 35: 677-705.

Richards J (2000) *Beyond Training*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards J and D Nunan (eds)(1990) *Second Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards K (2003) *Qualitative Inquiry in TESOL*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.

Richards K (2006) ''Being the Teacher': Identity and Classroom Conversation', *Applied Lingui*stics, 41: 51-77.

Richards K (2009) 'Case Study' in *Handbook of research in second language*

Richards K and P Seedhouse (eds)(2005) *Applying Conversation Analysis*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd.

Roberts C (1997) 'The Politics of Transcription' *TESOL Quarterly*, 31:167-176.

Roberts C (2001) ' 'Critical' Social Theory: Good to think with or something more?', in N Coupland, S Sarangi and C Candlin (eds), *Sociolinguistics & Social Theory*, 323-333. London: Longmans.

Roberts C (2006) 'Figures in a landscape: Some methodological issues in adult ESOL research', *Linguistics & Education*, 17: 6-23.

Roberts C and S Sarangi (1999) 'Hybridity in gatekeeping discourse: Issues of practical relevance for the researcher'. in S Sarangi and C Roberts (eds), *Talk, Work and Institutional Order*, 473-503. New York: Mouton.

Roberts J (1997) *Language Teacher Education*. London: Edward Arnold.

Robinson M & W McMillan (2006) `Who teaches the teachers? Identity, discourse and policy in teacher education`, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27: 327-336.

Roca-Cuberes C (2008) 'Membership categorization and professional insanity ascription', *Discourse Studies*,10:543-570

Sacks H (1972a) ' An initial investigation of the use of conversational data for doing sociology', in D Sudnow (ed) *Studies in social interaction*, 31-74. New York: Free Press.

Sacks H (1972b) ' On the analyzability of stories by children', in J Gumperz and D Hymes (eds) *Directions in Sociolinguistics*, 325-345. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Sacks H (1974) 'An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation', in R Bauman and J Sherzer (eds), *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*, 337-353. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks H (1984a) `Notes on methodology´in J Atkinson and J Heritage (eds) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, 21-27. Cambridge.

Sacks H (1984b) `On doing being ordinary´, in J Atkinson and J Heritage (eds) *Structures of Social Action: Studies of Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge:CUP, pp 413-429.

Sacks H (1987) 'On the Preferences for Agreement and Contiguity in Sequences in Conversation', in G Button and J Lee (eds), *Talk and Social Organisation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp53-69.

Sacks H (1992) *Lectures on Conversation*, 2 Volumes, ed by G Jefferson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Sacks H, E Schegloff and G Jefferson (1974) `A simplest sytematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation´, *Language*, 50: 696-735.

Sanders R (1999)'The Impossibility of a Culturally Contexted Conversation Analysis: On Simultaneous Distinct Types of Pragmatic Meaning', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 32:129-140

Sarangi S (1998) `Rethinking recontextualization in professional discourse studies: An epilogue´, *Text*, 18:301-318.

Sarangi S & C Candlin (2001) ''Motivational relevancies': Some methodological reflections on social theoretical and sociolinguistic practice', in N Coupland, S Sarangi and C Candlin (eds), *Sociolinguistics and Social Theory*, 350-388. London: Longmans.

Sarangi S and C Roberts (eds) (1999) *Talk, Work and Institutional Order*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Salisbury K (1998) ´Observation in the round´, *Teacher Trainer*, 12: 3-5.

Saville-Torike M (1982) *The Ethnography of Communication*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schegloff E (1968) 'Sequencing in Conversational Openings', in

Schegloff E (1982) 'Discourse as an interactional achievement: some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences', in D Tannen (ed) *Analysing Discourse: Talk and Text*, 71-93. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Schegloff E (1986) 'The routine as achievement', *Human Studies*, 9:111 151.

Schegloff, E (1987) `Between macro and micro: contexts and other connections´, in J Alexander, B Giesen, R Munch and N Smelser (eds), *The Micro-Macro Link*, 207-234. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schegloff E (1987) ' Analyzing Single Episodes of Interaction: An Exercise in Conversation Analysis', *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 50:101-114.

Schegloff E (1988) 'On an Actual Virtual Servo-Mechanism for Guessing Bad News: A Single Case Conjecture', *Social Problems*, 35: 442-457.

Schegloff E (1991) ' Reflections on Talk & Social Structure'. In D Boden & D Zimmerman (eds) *Talk as Social Structure*, 44-70. London: Polity Press.

Schegloff, E (1992a) `On talk and its institutional occasions´, in P Drew and J Heritage (eds), *Talk at Work*, 101-134. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E (1992b) `In another context´, in A Duranti and C Goodwin (eds), *Rethinking Context*, 191-227. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff E (1993) 'Reflection on quantification in the study of conversation', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26: 99-128.

Schegloff E (1995) 'Discourse as an Interactional Achievement III: The Omnirelevance of Action' in *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 28: 185-211.

Schegloff E (1996) 'Confirming allusions: towards and empirical account of action', *American Journal of Sociology*, 104: 161-216.

Schegloff E (1997) 'Whose Text? Whose Context?', *Discourse and Society*, 8: 165-187

Schegloff E (2000) 'When 'Others' Initiate Repair', *Applied Linguistics*, 21:205-243.

Schegloff (2001) 'A Tutorial on Membership Categorization', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39:462-482.

Schegloff E (2005) 'On integrity in enquiry...of the investigated not the investigator', *Discourse Studies*, 7: 455-480.

Schegloff E (2007) *Sequence Organization in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambrdge University Press.

Schegloff E (2009) 'Beginning to Respond: Well-Prefaced Responses to Wh-Questions', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 42: 91-115.

Schegloff E, G Jefferson and H Sacks (1977) 'The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation', *Language*, 53:361-382.

Schegloff E and H Sacks (1973) 'Opening up Closings', *Semiotica*, 8: 289-327.

Schenkein J (ed)(1978) *Studies in the Organisation of Conversational Interaction*. New York: Free Press

Schiffrin D (1994) *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwells.

Schofield J (1990) `Increasing the Generalizability of Qualitative Research', in E Eisner and A Peshkin (eds), *Qualitative inquiry in education: the continuing debate*. New York: Teacher´s College Press.

Schon D (1987) *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Scrivener J (2005) *Learning Teaching*. London: Macmillan.

Seale C (1999) *The Quality of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

Seedhouse P (2001) 'The Case of the Missing No: The Relationship between Pedagogy and Interaction', *Language Learning*, Vol 51, Supp 1: 347-385

Seedhouse P (2004) *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Seedhouse P (2005) ' Conversation Analysis as Research Methodology' in K Richards and P Seedhouse (eds), *Applying Conversation Analysis*, 251-266. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Silverman D (1998) *Harvey Sacks, Social Science and Conversation Analysis.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Silverman D (1999) 'Warriors or collaborators?: Reworking methodological controversies in the study of institutional interaction'. In S Sarangi & C Roberts (eds), *Talk, Work and Institutional Order*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp401-423.

Silverman D (2000) *Doing Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

Silverman D (2001) *Interpreting Qualitative Data*. London: Sage.

Silverman D (2004) *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice*. London: Sage.

Sinclair J and M Coulthard (1975) *Towards an Analysis of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith J (1993) *After the Demise of Empiricism: The Problem of Judging Social and Education Enquiry*. New York: Ablex Publishing.

Smith K (2005) 'Teacher educators' expertise: what do novice teachers and teacher educators say?', *Teaching & Teacher Education*, vol 21: 177-192.

Smith L (1988) 'Broadening the Base of Qualitative Case Study Methods in Education', in R Burgess (ed), *Studies in Qualitative Methodology*, Vol 1. London: JAI Press, pp 25-57.

Stake R (1998) 'Case Studies' in N Denzin and Y Lincoln (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Vol II: 86-109.

Steensig J and P Drew (2008) 'Introduction: Questioning and Affiliation/Disaffiliation in Interaction', *Discourse Studies* 10: 5–15.

Steensig J and T Larsen (2008) Affiliative and disaffiliative uses of you say x questions', *Discourse Studies*, 10: 113-132.

Stivers T and J Heritage (2001) 'Breaking the sequential mould: answering "more than the question" during medical history taking', *Text,* 21: 151-185.

Stokoe E (2009) 'Doing actions with identity categories: complaints and denials in neighbor disputes', *Text and Talk*, 29: 1-75.

Sudnow D (ed)(1972) *Studies in Social Interaction*. New York: Free Press.

Sutherland J (1999) 'The Grammar of the In-Group Code', *Applied Linguistic*s, v20: 179-202.

Taylor E (1989) Language and the Study of "Shared Cultural Knowledge", in D Helms, T Anderson, A Meehan and A Warfield Rawls(eds*) The Interactional Order*. New York: Irvington Publishers, pp215-230.

Taylor S (2001) 'Locating and Conducting Discourse Analysis Research', in M Wetherall, S Taylor and S Yates (eds), *Discourse as Data*, 5-48. London: Sage.

Taylor S (2001) 'Evaluating and Applying Discourse Analytic Research', in M Wetherall, S Taylor and S Yates (eds), *Discourse as Data*, 311-330. London: Sage.

Taylor T and D Cameron (1987) *Analysing Conversation*. London: Pergamon Press.

Thornborrow J (2002) *Power Talk: Language and Interaction in Institutional Discourse*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Tilley S (2003) '"Challenging" Research Practices: Turning a Critical Lens on the Work of Transcription', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 9: 750-772

Toolan, M (1989) 'Ruling out rules in the analysis of conversation', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 13:251-274.

Tracy K and J Robles (2009) 'Questions, questioning, and institutional practices: an introduction' , *Discourse Studies,* 11: 131-152

Trappes-Thomas H and I McGrath (eds)(1999) *Theory in Language Teacher Education*. London: Longmans.

Tsui A (2003) *Understanding Expertise in Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Turk M (2004) 'Using *And* in Conversational Interaction' *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 37: 219-250.

Ur P (1996) *A Course in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vásquez C (2004) '"Very carefully managed": advice and suggestions in post-observation meetings', *Linguistics and Education,* 15: 33-58.

Vazquez C (2007) 'Moral stance in the workplace narratives of novices', *Discourse Studies*, 9: 653-675.

Voutilainen L, A Perakyla and J Ruusuvuori (2010) ' Recognition and Interpretation: Responding to Emotional Experience in Psychotherapy', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43: 85-107.

Vygotsky L (1962) *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of technology.

Walford G (2005) 'Research ethical guidelines and anonymity', *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 28: 1, 83 — 93

Wallace, M (1991) *Training Foreign Language Teachers.*Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wallace M (1998) *Action Research for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Waring H Z (2002) 'Expressing noncomprehension in a US graduate seminar', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34:1711-1731.

Waring H Z (2003) ''Also' as a discourse marker: its use in disjunctive and disaffiliative environments', *Discourse Studies*, 5: 415-436.

Waite D (1992) 'Supervisors' Talk: Making Sense of Conferences from an Anthropological Linguistic Perspective. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 7: 349–371.

Waite D (1993) 'Teachers in Conference: A Qualitative Study of Teacher-Supervisor Face-to-Face Interactions', *American Educational Research Journal,* 30: 675–702.

Watson C (2006) ' Narratives of practice and the construction of identity in teaching', *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, 12:509-526

Watson R (1992) `Ethnomethodology, Conversation Analysis and Education: An Overview´, in *International Review of Education*, 38: 257-274.

Watson R (1997) 'Some general reflections on "categorization" and "sequence" in the analysis of conversation', in S Hester and P Eglin (eds) *Culture in action: studies in membership categorization analysis*, 49-76. Washington DC: University Press of America.

Watson R (2000) 'The character of "institutional talk": a response to Hester and Francis', *Text*, 20: 377–389.

Watson-Gegeo K (1988) ' Ethnography in ESL: Defining the Essentials', *TESOL Quarterly*, 22:575-592.

West C and D Zimmerman (1985) 'Gender, language and discourse', in T van Dijk (ed*), Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 103-124. London: Academic Press.

Wetherall M (1998) 'Positioning and interpretive repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue', *Discourse and Society*, 9: 431-456.

Wetherall M, S Taylor and S Yates(eds)(2001) *Discourse as Data*. London: Sage.

Wetherall M, S Taylor and S Yates (eds)(2001) *Discourse Theory & Practice*. London: Sage.

Wieder DL (1993) ' On the Compound Questions Raised by Attempts to Quantify Conversation Analysis´Phenomena, Part 2: The Issue of Incommensurability', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26:213-226.

Wieder DL (1999) 'Ethnomethodology, Conversation Analysis, Microanalysis, and the Ethnography of Speaking (EM-CA-MA-ES): Resonances and Basic Issues', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 32:163-171.

Wiles R, G Crow, S Heath, C Vikki (2008) 'The Management of Confidentiality and Anonymity in Social Research', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 11: 5, 417 — 428

Williams M (1999) 'Learning Teaching: A Social Constructivist Approach: Theory and Practice or Theory with Practice?', in H Trappes-Lomax and I McGrath (eds) *Theory in Language Teacher Education*, 11-20. HArlow, Essex: Pearson Education.

Willis D and J Willis (eds)(1995) Challenge and change in language teaching. London: Edward Arnold.

Wilson T (1991) 'Social Structure and the Sequential Organization of Interaction', in D Boden & D Zimmerman (eds), *Talk as Social Structure*, 22-43 London: Polity Press.

Wolcott H (1992) `Posturing in Qualitative Inquiry' , in D LeCompte and J Preissle (eds), *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education*, 4-52. New York: Academic Press.

Wong J (2000) 'The Token "Yeah" in Nonnative Speaker English Conversation', *Research in Language and Social Interaction'*, 33:39-67.

Woodward T (1991) *Models and Metaphors in Language Teacher Training*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woodward T (1992) *Ways of Training*. London: Longmans.

Wooffitt R (2001) 'Researching Psychic Practititioners: Conversation Analysis', in M Wetherall, S Taylor and S Yates (eds), *Discourse as Data*, 49-92. London: Sage.

Wooffitt R and S Allistone (2008) 'Participation, procedure and accountability: 'you said' speech markers in negotiating reports of ambiguous phenomena', *Discourse Studies,* 10:407-427.

Wortham S (2006) *Learning Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wowk M and A Carlin (2004) 'Depicting a Liminal Position in Ethnomethodology, Conversation Analysis and Membership Categorization Analysis: The Work of Rod Watson', *Human Studies*, 27: 69-89.

Yin R (1997) 'The Abridged Version of Case Study Research', in L Bickman and D Rog (eds) *Handbook of Applied Social Science Research Methods*, 229-259. London: Sage.

Zeichner K and D Liston (1985) 'Varieties of discourse in supervisory conferences', *Teaching and Teacher Education* 1: 155-174.

Zeungler J and J Mori (2002) 'Introduction to the Special Issue: Microanalyses of classroom discourse: a critical consideration of method', in *Applied Linguistics*, 23: 283-288.

Zimmerman D (1992) 'The interactional organisation of calls for emergency assistance', in P Drew and J Heritage (eds) *Talk at Work*, 418-469. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zimmerman D (1993) 'Acknowledgement Tokens and Speakership Incipiency Revisited', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26:179-194.

Zimmerman D (1998) `Identity, context and interaction´ in C Antaki and S Widdicombe (eds) *Identities in Talk*, 86-106. London: Sage.

Zimmerman D and D Boden (1991) `Structures-of-action´ in D Boden and D Zimmerman (eds), *Talk and social structure: studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*, 3-21. Cambridge: Polity Press.