University of Alberta

Conversation Analysis:
A Study of Institutional Interaction and Gender
in a Russian Classroom

by

Carole Teresa Greene

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Slavic Linguistics

Modern Languages and Cultural Studies

©Carole Teresa Greene
Fall 2009
Edmonton, Alberta

Examining Committee

Alla Nedashkivska, Modern Languages and Cultural Studies

Tom M.S. Priestly, Modern Languages and Cultural Studies

Geneviève Maheux-Pelletier, Modern Languages and Cultural Studies

Waclaw Osadnik, Modern Languages and Cultural Studies

Olenka Bilash, Secondary Education

Ursula Doleschal, Institute of Slavonic Studies, Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt

Dedication

To my parents,
for their unconditional love
and never-ending support.

Let us be grateful to people who make us happy;
they are the charming gardeners who make our souls blossom.
~Marcel Proust

Abstract

This dissertation analysed the interactions between instructors and students in a language classroom in Russia. Using video-recorded data, instructor interviews, and student assessments from English classes at a private language school for children in the Urals region of Russia, a Conversation Analytic [CA] framework was employed to determine: how the talk (specifically turn-taking, adjacency pairs, and repairs) was sequentially organised; if and how the institutional setting constrained the talk; and if previously determined 'universal' structures of talk applied to this Russian academic discourse. This research also tested the hypotheses that the 'universal' structures of talk would apply regardless of gender, but would be used differently by the boys and girls, and by the instructors interacting with them. The relevance of the participants' institutional identities or gender to the interaction was also examined.

The analysis showed that the participants did orient to their institutional identities of instructor or student, and the institutional setting did constrain the organisation of talk. The instructors' responses to the interviews and 'student assessment' questionnaires showed that they generally had positive attitudes toward girls and mixed attitudes toward boys. While the underlying sequences, the universal 'rules' of interaction, applied to interactions with both boys and girls, *how* (and *how frequently*) the sequences were used did vary by gender (i.e., typically 'male' and 'female' speech styles). Also, some of the organisation of

talk showed that the instructors did orient to the students' genders in the classroom.

This research is significant as the first CA study of the sequential organisation of talk in an institutional setting in Russia. In general, this research contributes to the CA findings on the organisation of talk in different languages, cultures, and settings; specifically, it provides the first point of comparison of Russian classroom interactions, from a CA perspective, with the large corpus of data already collected in classrooms in the Western tradition of education. Finally, this research is significant as it provides a thorough microanalysis of the relativity of gender-specific verbal behaviour; the analysis also shows how the instructors behave verbally, and in this way produce gender-specific communication styles.

Acknowledgement

List of Tables

List of Excerpts

1 Introduction

1.1 Overview of Dissertation

This dissertation analyses the interactions between instructors and students in a language classroom in Russia. Using video-recorded data, instructor interviews, and student assessments from English classes at a private language school for children in the Urals region of Russia, a Conversation Analytic [CA] framework is employed to determine: how the talk (specifically turn-taking, adjacency pairs, and repairs) is sequentially organised; if and how the institutional setting constrains the talk; and if previously determined 'universal' structures of talk apply to this Russian academic discourse. This research also tests the hypotheses that the 'universal' structures of talk apply regardless of gender, but are used differently by the boys and girls, and by the instructors interacting with them. The relevance of the participants' institutional identities (here, instructor or student) or gender to the interaction is also examined.

The major focuses of this dissertation were selected because of researcher interest in the so-called 'universal' findings of CA, especially for institutional interactions, and in the ever-growing field of Russian gender linguistics. The analysis of the institutional interaction in chapter 4 employs an applied CA framework, while the analysis of gender differences (in language use *and* in attitudes) in chapter 5 employs a blended framework of applied CA and the triangulation of other data sources (interviews and questionnaires). The research questions were derived from personal experience in Russian and Canadian classrooms, and in Russia in general, and were refined by common descriptions in the literature (e.g., Silverman 1998; Ten Have 2000; Sauntson 2007; Schleef 2008). Specifically, literature that has been influential in CA and/or gender linguistics was used to inform this research; the studies reviewed in chapter 2 were selected to provide a comparison of various approaches to institutional interactions and/or gender linguistics.

This research is significant as it is, to my knowledge, the first CA study of the sequential organisation of talk in an institutional setting in Russia. In general, this research contributes to the CA findings on the organisation of talk in different languages, cultures, and settings; specifically, it provides the first point of comparison of Russian classroom interactions, from a CA perspective, with the large corpus of data already collected in classrooms in the Western tradition of education. This research is also significant as the recordings of Russian classroom interactions are very difficult to obtain and are therefore valuable in their own right; for example, the large corpus of Russian spoken language that has been collected since the 1960s by the Russian Language Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Moscow does not comprise any classroom interactions. Finally, this research is significant as it provides a thorough microanalysis of the relativity of gender-specific verbal behaviour; the analysis also shows how the instructors behave verbally, and in this way produce gender-specific communication styles.

1.1.1 Research Questions

The research questions posed comprise the following.

1) How is *turn-taking* in the classroom organised? Is it constrained by the institutional nature of the setting, and if so, how? How do the participants deal with pauses and overlaps (disturbances in the turn-taking system)? How is speaker change[1] organised?

2) How is the interaction *sequentially organised*? Is the institutional nature of the setting relevant to the organisation of talk? How are adjacency pairs[2], such as question and answer pairs, initiated and accomplished?

3) How are *repairs*[3] of interactional difficulties organised? How are they initiated and accomplished, and by whom, the instructor or student?

4) What are the instructors' *gender perspectives*? Are there any differences in

---

[1] For a discussion of speaker change, see section 4.1.1 on turn-taking theory.
[2] See section 4.2.1 on adjacency pairs and the sequential organization of talk.
[3] See section 4.3.1 on repair organization.

how (and how frequently) the 'universal' structures of turn-taking, sequences, and repairs are used in the classroom - first, by boys and girls; and second, by the instructors interacting with boys as compared with girls?

1.1.2 Preliminary Hypotheses

The preliminary hypotheses come under three headings: discourse behaviour; attitudes to gender differences on the part of the instructors; and gender differences in language use.

The following *discourse behaviour* was hypothesised. The basic hypotheses were that 1) the participants would orient to their institutional identities, and 2) the talk-in-interaction would be constrained by the institutional setting; in particular, such constraints would be seen in the organisation of turn-taking, sequences and repairs, as well as in the overall structure of the classroom interaction. 2a) Specifically, the instructors would have control of the turn-taking system, and would most often select next speaker. 2b) The instructors would also control the overall structure of the interaction, and would indicate this control by orienting to the lesson plan. 2c) The instructors would most often initiate repairs; if 'repairables' such as pauses or interruptions occurred, the instructors would resume, or regain, management of the turn. These hypotheses regarding the organisation of talk were developed in light of findings of other CA studies of talk, especially in institutional settings (e.g., Drew and Heritage 1992; Schegloff 1992; Koshik 2000).

Turning to gender similarities and/or differences, the following *instructor 'gender perspectives'* were hypothesised. The instructors would claim that 3) girls study better and are better language learners than boys. Also, they would claim that 4) girls are better behaved than boys, while boys interrupt and misbehave more, requiring more control. Consequently, the instructors would claim that 4a) they scold boys and tell them to be quiet more often and, 4b) they praise the boys more

often than girls, as good behaviour and/or language achievement would be 'expected' from the girls (and less so from the boys). The hypotheses on gender perspectives were based on personal experience in Russia, especially in Russian classrooms, both as a student and an instructor;

Gender differences in actual language use were also hypothesised. On the one hand, 5) the 'universal' structures of turn-taking, sequences, and repairs would apply regardless of gender. On the other hand, 6) how, and how frequently, the structures would be used by the classroom participants would vary by gender. For example, 6a) the boys would speak out of turn more than the girls, while the girls would wait to be named next speaker by the instructor before speaking; and 6b) question - answer sequences with boys would require more repairs, and more translation from English to Russian, while the girls would answer more questions correctly than the boys. These hypotheses on gender differences in language use were established by applying the 'universal' structures of CA to personal experiences in the Russian classroom.

1.1.3 Outline of Dissertation

After the current section, 1.1, which summarises the dissertation overall, its hypotheses, and its structure, in section 1.2 the institutionality of interaction as compared to so-called *ordinary conversation* is discussed. In section 1.3 several approaches to the study of institutional interaction are outlined, such as sociolinguistics and discourse analysis, while focusing on Conversation Analysis.[4] In chapter 2 related literature is reviewed, including studies on medical discourse, emergency services discourse, and academic discourse. In section 3.1 the methodology used for data collection, the choice of subjects, and the transcription conventions are outlined. In section 3.2 the theoretical framework employed to analyse the institutional interaction, informed by the CA perspective, is described. In 3.3 I discuss the theoretical framework of CA and its application in the study of

---

[4] See Appendix C for a list of abbreviations.

institutional interaction. In sections 4.1 through 4.3 the primary data are analysed employing the CA framework, including sections on turn-taking, sequence organisation, and repairs. In section 4.4 the previous analysis sections are tied together in a discussion of the results. In sections 5.1 through 5.3 the instructors' gender perspectives are outlined. In section 5.4 the primary data are further analysed from a CA perspective to determine if there are any gender differences in the application of turn-taking, sequence organisation, or repairs. In section 5.5 the results of gender analysis are summarised with a further discussion of the instructors' gender perspectives. In 6.1 the results are briefly summarised, and the dissertation is concluded in 6.2 with suggestions for future research.

1.2 Institutional Interaction

> When people visit the doctor, appear as witnesses in court, hold meetings at their workplaces, negotiate business deals, call railway stations for information, as faculty meet their students in office hours, or as counsellors or clients participate in AIDS counselling sessions, they are talking, communicating and interacting in institutional 'contexts'. They are using language to conduct the kinds of affairs in which we are all engaged when dealing with the variety of organizations we encounter in our daily lives, either as professional members of those organizations, or as their clients (customers, students, patients and the like).
>
> (Drew and Sorjonen 1997: 92)

As humans talk, communicate and interact in institutional contexts on a daily basis, the questions to be asked are the following. Do the institutional contexts of those interactions affect the language use of the participants (whether they are professional or clients), that is, can we show a relationship between the institutionality of a context and the language used in that context? If so, how is the language use affected? Can we find systematic characteristics of 'institutional

talk' that differ from those of ordinary conversation? These are but a few of the questions that face the researcher of institutional discourse.

1.2.1 The Institutionality of Interaction

To begin our discussion, we must first outline a few basic concepts of institutional discourse. Drew and Sorjonen (1997) are cautious in noting that there are no fixed boundaries between institutional talk and ordinary conversation, thereby making it difficult to precisely "delimit the scope of the field of Institutional Dialogue" (Ibid: 92). "The institutionality of dialogue is constituted by participants through their orientation to relevant institutional roles and identities, and the particular responsibilities and duties associated with those roles; and through their management of institutionally relevant tasks and activities" (Ibid: 94). In other words, "interaction is institutional insofar as participants' institutional or professional identities are somehow made relevant to the work activities in which they are engaged" (Drew and Heritage 1992: 3-4). What we find, then, is that the institutionality of the context must be shown to be relevant to the interaction for the *participants* and not just the analyst. "Analyzing institutional dialogue involves investigating how their orientation to and engagement in their institutional roles and identities is manifest in the details of participants' language, and their use of language to pursue institutional goals" (Drew and Sorjonen 1997: 94).

The researcher cannot label an interaction 'institutional' simply because it takes place in a formal institutional setting. While institutional interactions do frequently occur within a designated physical setting (e.g., hospital, courtroom, school), they are by no means restricted to such settings (Drew and Sorjonen 1997: 92; Drew and Heritage 1992: 3). It is only in those settings where the participants orient to institutional roles and identities that we can consider the talk 'institutional' (Drew and Sorjonen 1997: 92). Therefore, other locations can become an institutional setting, if only temporarily. For example, a conversation

between a doctor and patient in a clinical setting may not be work-related and therefore classified as 'ordinary conversation'. On the other hand, a health care worker may visit a new mother in a private home to discuss the health of a newborn baby, a setting that can be considered institutional for this interaction. "The institutionality of talk is not determined by its occurrence in a particular physical setting" (Ibid: 92).

1.2.2 Ordinary Conversation vs. Institutional Interaction

The most prevalent object of study in the conversation analytic tradition is usually referred to as talk-in-interaction, encompassing both ordinary conversation and institutional interaction. "Talk-in-interaction is the principal means through which lay persons pursue various practical goals and the central medium through which the daily working activities of many professional and organizational representatives are conducted. We will use the term 'institutional interaction' to refer to talk of this kind" (Drew and Heritage 1992: 3). Drew and Heritage propose the following.

1) Institutional interaction involves an orientation by at least one of the participants to some core goal, task or identity (or set of them) conventionally associated with the institution in question. In short, institutional talk is normally informed by *goal orientations* of a relatively restricted conventional form.

2) Institutional interaction may often involve *special and particular constraints* on what one or both of the participants will treat as allowable contributions to the business at hand.

3) Institutional talk may be associated with *inferential framework* and procedures that are particular to specific institutional contexts.

(Ibid: 22)

To study institutional interaction, we must also consider what is termed ordinary conversation [OC]. "The analysis of the communicative texture of institutional

interaction depends on the distinction between ordinary talk and institutional occasions, so that we can single out the institutional relevancies in contrast to the expectancies prevailing in ordinary, everyday interaction" (Arminen 2000: 441). Institutional interaction differs from what is considered everyday, ordinary conversation. While OC is considered 'casual', 'normal', and not constrained by predetermined turn sizes or content (Ibid: 442), institutional interaction may often be constrained by the participants as they orient to the goal or task of the institution (Drew and Heritage 1992: 22). This allows us to distinguish institutional talk through its observable contrast to 'prototypical forms of everyday talk" (Arminen 2000: 442). Institutional interaction is a more constrained speech exchange system than ordinary conversation.

1.2.3 Gender and Institutional Interaction

Early feminist linguists like Robin Lakoff attempted to characterise and make generalisations about men's and women's stereotypical speech, the women's marked by powerlessness, while other linguists such as Deborah Tannen looked to describe the differences in terms of style and not power. Such treatments of gender were 'global' and "assumed that women's and men's language are necessarily different" (Mills 2003). In recent years the study of gender and language has undergone a shift in the concept of gender.

> Recent research on language and gender has moved
> away from global analyses treating women and men
> as homogeneous groups and has acknowledged the
> diversity of male and female speech styles in more
> localized investigations of gender.
>
> (Schleef 2008: 515)

Third Wave feminist linguistic studies "focus on the way that participants in conversation bring about their gendered identity, thus seeing gendering as a process" (Mills 2003). As Ehrlich indicates, "gender is not a set of permanent traits residing in an individual but rather a property of behaviours and practices that become symbolically associated with cultural constructs of femininity and

masculinity" (2007: 453). Sauntson notes the criticisms of binary conceptions of gender in current language and gender research, and therefore she tries to avoid generalisations or arguments for "all-encompassing gender differences;" however she emphasises that "it is important to bear in mind Coates's (1997: 126) important point that 'it is clear that women and men share linguistic and interactional resources, but that they choose to draw on these differentially'" (Sauntson 2007: 306).

Also, interactants are not 'unitary' subjects, for example not just *girls* or *boys*, but rather they have identities and relationships that are constantly shifting; "thus, speakers may potentially adopt multiple positions or multiple voices that interact with their conscious and unconscious desires, pleasures and tensions, as well as changes of discursive context and social relationship" (Baxter 2002: 829-830). According to Grenoble,

> Speaker's sex is one of a number of sociolinguistic variables which affect speech; other such variables, relevant for both speaker and addressee, include age, ethnicity, level of education, occupation, regional dialect, socio-economic class, social status and the speech setting (e.g. formal versus informal, etc.) (1999: 114)

Sara Mills states that institutional and contextual constraints clearly determine "the type and form of identity and linguistic routines which an individual considers possible within an interaction" (2003[5]). In the study of gender and institutional interaction, therefore, a speaker may orient to a gender identity and use a 'male' or 'female' speech style, but the speech style is still constrained by the institutional nature of the interaction.

---

[5] Retrieved January 25, 2009, from
http://extra.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/open/2003/001/mills2003001-03.html

1.3 The Study of Institutional Interaction

According to Drew and Sorjonen, the study of institutional talk "has emerged as a distinctive field of research during the past 20 years from developments in a number of cognate disciplines and perspectives, notably in *sociolinguistics*, *discourse analysis*, *ethnography of speaking*, *microethnography of face-to-face interaction*, and *conversation analysis*" (1997: 94, their italics). Systemic functional linguistics can also be added to this list.[6] Below I outline the contributions that these disciplines and perspectives have made to the development of the study of institutional talk.

1.3.1 Sociolinguistics and Institutional Interaction

Sociolinguistic studies that focus on language variation traditionally treat social variables such as age, class, ethnicity, gender, geographical region, and kinship (Drew and Heritage 1992: 7). Such studies of naturally occurring language have shown that the relevance of speaker attributes depends upon the setting, such as a business negotiation or a classroom, and on the task at hand (Ibid). New studies, then, in the past few decades have also turned to language variation associated with the "social situation of use, somewhat independently of other (speaker-related) sources of variation" (Drew and Sorjonen 1997: 95). In interactive variational sociolinguistics we find not the traditional focus on speaker characteristics as an explanation of language variation, but a focus on the situational accomplishment of social identity (Ibid). Key in this approach is the treatment of speaker identities not as givens, but as being interactionally produced in the institutional contexts of modern bureaucratic society (Ibid).

---

[6] Another approach to the study of institutional interaction, Critical Discourse Analysis [CDA], focuses on the relationship between language and power. "CDA may be defined as fundamentally concerned with analysing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language" (Wodak 2001: 2). Given the 'power' relationship inherent in classroom interactions, CDA would potentially be valuable for the study of such interactions.

1.3.2 Discourse Analysis and Institutional Interaction

Of all the approaches to institutional talk outlined here, discourse analysis is the approach built most directly on the notion of speech act in the analysis of spoken interaction, as developed by the Birmingham discourse analysis group through the examination of classroom and medical interactions (Drew and Sorjonen: 95; Drew and Heritage: 13). The Birmingham group described the standardised sequences in interaction that are characteristically found in such institutional settings, resulting in a more "dialogic approach" to the study of institutional talk (Drew and Sorjonen: 95). However, the Birmingham approach is criticised for obscuring social relations as well as extending the general models from classroom interactions to "other institutional domains, such as doctor-patient interaction, but without serious attention being given to how these various settings are differentiated" (Drew and Heritage: 15). In more general terms of discourse analysis, much of the research being carried out is applied, although applied discourse analysis [ADA] is not an established field in and of itself (Gunarsson 1997: 285). Language is a key tool in many professional settings, for both experts and lay people, and as such "the focus within ADA is thus on language and communication in real-life situations, and the goal is to analyse, understand or solve problems relating to practical action in real-life contexts" (Ibid). One such applied approach, discursive psychology, focuses on language use in everyday settings, including institutional interactions, to study how interactants pragmatically construct objects such as attitudes and emotions through conversation (Tuffin and Howard 2001: 196; editorial).

1.3.3 Ethnographic Approaches and Institutional Interaction

Within the *ethnography of speaking* in anthropology, studies have consolidated key ideas of how cultural contextualization contributes to the understanding of language use, and the relationship between language and the sociocultural order in general (Drew and Heritage 1992: 9). In other words, the meaning and action of an utterance is firmly rooted in its sociocultural context (Ibid: 7). Researchers

emphasise that membership in a speech community forms part of the speaker's identity (Drew and Sorjonen: 95).

> In this perspective, the analysis of communicative meanings requires a description and understanding of such sociocultural features as speakers' social identities; their past history and other biographical details; the states of knowledge and expectations, manifest in their talk, that they bring to speech events; and the rights, duties, and other responsibilities which are attached to participants' roles or positions in particular institutional events.
>
> (Ibid)

Microethnographic studies of face-to-face interaction in institutional settings have a similar emphasis as the ethnography of speaking. Studies have attempted to show how the ethnographic details of an institutional interaction, such as the sociocultural context and the participants' inherent knowledge as members of speech communities, are shown in, and consequential for, the organisation of the verbal and non-verbal actions being accomplished (Drew and Sorjonen: 95-96).

1.3.4 Systemic Functional Linguistics and Institutional Interaction

Systemic functional linguistics [SFL] is a social semiotic approach to the study of language (He 1993: 23). The focus is on context and text to understand the meaning of the language, and therefore critique any inequality and engender social change (He 1993: 22-23; Slembrouck 2005: 621-622). At the core of SFL is an interest in 'grammaticalized' phenomena,[7] with grammar considered by Halliday and Matthiessen (1994) as the motivating force of the linguistic system and further (2004) as the repository of the "meaning-making resources of a language" (references from Simon-Vandenbergen and Steiner 2005: 574). The study of language in society, particularly in institutional settings, is seen as highly

---

[7] Simon-Vandenbergen and Steiner refer to 'grammaticalization' on the syntagmatic axis as processes such as syntacticization and morphologization, and on the systemic axis in terms of what such processes mean for the underlying systems (Simon-Vandenberger and Steiner 2005: 574-575).

socially relevant, and SFL studies attempt to understand the ways in which "social realities are constructed and maintained in institutional interaction and elsewhere" (Slembrouck 2005: 631).

Many SFL studies have focused on classroom settings, in particular looking at second language acquisition as meaning-making. Developed by Halliday and those researchers he has inspired, SFL provides concepts and processes that integrate cultural content and language, which is "at the heart of truly content-based language teaching and learning" (Byrnes 2009: 1).

> SFL models of language involve a trinocular conception of meaning as comprising ideational resources for naturalizing reality, interpersonal resources for negotiating social relations, and textual resources for managing information flow; these generalized orientations to meaning are referred to as metafunctions. In addition, Halliday's trinocular perspective on meaning is projected onto social context. (Martin 2009: 11)

Halliday considers that the theory of SFL "is functional in the sense that it is designed to account for how the language is **used**. Every text - that is, everything that is said or written, unfolds in some context of use. ... A functional grammar is essentially a 'natural' grammar, in the sense that everything in it can be explained, ultimately, by reference to how language is used" (Halliday 1994: xiii; his emphasis; quoted in Colombi 2009: 42). An SFL "perspective of language education proposes that the explicit description of language functions allows for a conscious understanding of the linguistic repertoire that can then be deployed productively in various contexts, according to the different intentions and purposes of the users" (Colombi 2009: 42). Because of this, SFL has been considered "particularly well suited to contemporary concerns of L2 education" (Byrnes 2009: 2).

1.3.5 Conversation Analysis and Institutional Interaction

Lastly we turn to what is probably the most prevalent approach to the study of institutional talk, conversation analysis [CA].[8] CA has its own assumptions, methodology, and 'way of theorizing' (Schiffrin 1994: 232). Although CA has roots in sociology, its aim (unlike other branches of this science) is to discover how members of a society produce a sense of social order through language, rather than to analyse social order itself, as "conversation is a source of much of our sense of social order, e.g. it produces many of the typifications underlying our notions of a social role" (Cicourel 1972, quoted in Schiffrin 1994: 232). The four main concerns of CA are: 1) the problem of social order, 2) how language both creates and is created by social context, 3) human knowledge, and 4) the belief that no detail of an interaction can be neglected a priori as unimportant (Ibid). The focus of CA is on the sequential organisation of talk. While some approaches begin the analysis from the treatment of cultural or social identity and others from linguistic variables, CA "begins from a consideration of the interactional accomplishment of particular social activities...These activities are embodied in specific social actions and sequences of social actions" (Drew and Heritage 1992: 17). According to Drew and Sorjonen, the "recognition of the key importance of investigating the characteristic sequential dynamics of dialogue in particular institutional settings has been, perhaps, one of the most significant developments in the field of institutional dialogue" (Drew and Sorjonen: 96).

The origins of CA go back to the late 1960s when the sociologist Harvey Sacks investigated calls made to a suicide prevention center and recordings of group psychotherapy sessions (Drew and Heritage 1992: 60).

> Subsequent studies have developed that interest in unraveling how the participants, in and through the ways in which they construct their turns and sequences of turns, display their orientation to particular institutional identities, and thereby

---

[8] See chapter 3 for a more thorough review of CA's methodology and theoretical stance.

> manage the practical tasks associated with any given institutional setting.
>
> (Drew and Sorjonen 1997: 96)

Drew and Heritage published *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings* in 1992, a volume containing studies from a wide variety of institutional contexts, but all based in the research tradition of CA (Drew and Heritage 1992: 4). These studies "focus on conduct that is in various ways shaped or constrained by the participants' orientations to social institutions either as their representatives or, in various senses, as their 'clients'" (Ibid: 5). Participants' orientations have traditionally been researched through such means as questionnaires, interviews, ethnographic observation, and self-reports (Ibid). The studies included in the Drew and Heritage volume, on the other hand, "attempt to gain access to institutional processes and the outlooks that inform them by analyzing audio and video records of specific occupational interactions" (Ibid). The objective of these studies is to "describe how particular institutions are enacted and lived through as accountable patterns of meaning, inference, and actions" (Ibid).

"CA represents a consistent effort to develop an empirical analysis of the nature of context" (Ibid: 17). CA data analysis involves the "analytic integration of what linguists would term the 'illocutionary' dimension of a current utterance with the 'perlocutionary' dimension of its prior," thereby focusing on 'sequences of activity' that are larger than the individual sentence or utterance (Ibid: 18). Conversation analysts focus on conversation due to a distrust of idealisations as the basis for social science. (Schiffrin 1994: 234). Sacks argued against such idealisations because they "produce concepts that have only a vague and indeterminate relationship with a specific set of events" (Ibid: 234). He wanted to analyse the details of actual events in a formal manner, in a way that anyone else could also examine the results to see whether his analysis was correct (Ibid: 234-235). For this reason he chose to study tape-recorded conversations as they provide data that can be repeatedly analysed by multiple analysts. These goals and beliefs continue to play an important role in CA.

15

CA research focuses on the details of recorded conversations that occur naturally, that is, without researcher prompting (Drew and Heritage 1992: 235). By using recorded data, the analyst can repeatedly inspect the data to "enhance analytic treatments ranging from the interpretive to basic forms of quantification" (Ibid: 5). The impetus of such research is to connect linguistic structure with social context, and not just the social attributes of speakers, such as age, class, ethnicity or gender, and to do so in natural social settings. (Ibid: 7). Analysts are interested in actual pieces of language use, including all kinds of conversations as they take place in real life (Mey 1993: 195). These recorded conversations are transcribed in such a way as to reproduce what is said without indicating any "presuppositions about what might be important for either participants or analysts themselves" (Schiffrin 1994: 235). By doing so, the focus remains on specific events of the conversation rather than on generalizations about what participants may or may not know (Schiffrin 1994). Both linguistic and paralinguistic features (e.g., sound quality, pauses, gaps, restarts, etc.) are included in the transcriptions[9] (Pomerantz and Fehr 1997: 65). The methods of transcribing conversations in the CA framework are elaborate. As Jacob Mey notes, making such transcriptions is not a trivial task as conversation analysts want to get *everything* down on paper (1993: 195).

The CA view of interaction is structural, focusing on the sequences of utterances in talk. CA searches for recurrent patterns and forms of organisation in large corpora of talk, through a close, detailed analysis of the talk. Many aspects of such organisation are studied: opening and closing talk, turn-taking, repair, topic management, information receipt, and showing agreement and disagreement (Schiffrin 1994: 239).

> Since the sense of order that emerges is publicly
> displayed through ongoing activity one can examine
> the details of that activity for evidence of its
> underlying order and structure - searching not just
> for evidence that some aspect of conversation "can"

---

[9] See Appendix B for a list of transcription conventions in Conversation Analysis.

be viewed in a certain way, but that it is viewed that way by participants themselves. (Levinson 1983: 318-319, quoted in Schiffrin 1994: 239)

Context also plays a large role in the analysis of conversation. In fact, every utterance is treated as doubly contextual - as *context-shaped* and *context-renewing* (Schiffrin 1994: 235). "Each utterance in a sequence is shaped by a prior context (at the very least, and most typically, the immediately prior utterance) and provides a context for a next utterance (again, for a very next utterance)" (Ibid). Proponents of CA strongly argue that although each utterance is assumed to have contextual relevance, this relevance should not be treated as constant. Specific contextual features are also not presupposed as being relevant for the interaction. Therefore, CA transcripts do not focus on social relations or "social context" (e.g., the social identities of the participants, the setting, personal attributes, etc.) that other approaches treat as being *a priori* relevant (Ibid). Conversation analysts intentionally ignore what other approaches treat as static features of the social world, such as the occupation of a participant, in order to avoid premature generalizations and idealizations (Ibid).

> Social identity (setting, and so on) is viewed instead as a category of social life and conduct that is subject to locally situated interpretive activity: the relevance of a social identity can be no more presumed to hold across different times and places than can the relevance of a one second pause. (Ibid)

The relevance of contextual features must be grounded in the text under analysis; the empirical conduct of the speakers is the central resource that the analyst must use to develop the analysis. Therefore, CA theorising is data-driven, as the data are the exclusive foundation for hypotheses (Mey 1993: 195).

Emanuel Schegloff elaborates CA's position on avoiding presuppositions when determining the relevance of contextual features. Characterizations of the participants should be based on aspects of the interaction that are "demonstrably relevant" to the participants (Schegloff 1992: 109). There are many ways to

characterise social interactants; for example, a doctor can also be characterised by age, gender, religion, and so on, as well as by more transient characteristics (to use Schegloff's example, "the one who just tipped over the glass of water on the table") (Schiffrin 1994: 235-236). Any one of these characteristics may be relevant for the interactants at any point in the interaction, and can be considered relevant for the analysis only if they can be shown to be relevant to the participant at that particular moment. "Participants' institutional identities can be viewed, not as exogenous and determining variables, but as accomplished in interaction" (Drew and Sorjonen 1997: 97). The problem lies in

> showing from the details of the talk or other conduct in the materials that we are analyzing that those aspects of the scene are what the parties are oriented to. For that is to show how the parties are embodying for one another the relevancies of the interaction and are thereby producing the social structure." (Schegloff 1992: 110)

Recently, however, feminist linguists have been examining what they consider to be methodological issues in the study of language and gender using a CA approach (Stokoe and Smithson 2001: 217). As indicated above, Schegloff argues that sociological variables such as gender, age, or class should only be considered from the participant's perspective and not imposed on the analysis by the researcher (Schegloff 1997: 166; Speer 2002: 785). Feminist researchers have accused CA in this matter of "methodological and political conservatism: it does not look at the 'bigger picture' (e.g. patriarchy and the oppression of women in society), and describes, rather than challenges, how people understand gender roles" (Speer 2002: 786).

> While we propose CA is a useful tool for making claims about the relevance of gender in conversational interaction, and that such claims are grounded in speakers' orientations, we suggest that culture and common-sense knowledge, of both members and analysts, are largely unacknowledged and unexplicated resources in CA.
>
> (Stokoe and Smithson 2001: 217)

Also, feminists point to Garfinkel's 1967 claim that gender is 'omnirelevant' in everyday life, viewed as a "routine ongoing accomplishment of interaction" (Weatherall 2002: 768; also see Speer 2002: 799-800). Weatherall states that "for conversation analysts it is not defensible to use a category, even one that is arguably omnirelevant, to describe and understand interactions (see Schegloff, 1997)" (Weatherall 2002: 768). Speer, however, emphasises that, "conversation analysts note that gender need not be explicitly mentioned or indexed for it to be oriented to (Schegloff, 1997: 182)" (Speer 2002: 799).

> Being limited, as an analyst, to the overtly displayed concerns of the participants is not to say that gender is not omnirelevant. What it does mean is that it is incumbent on the researcher to show *how* and *that* gender as omnirelevant is produced and oriented to. Some ground has been made towards demonstrating the existence of omnirelevant devices for casting people in particular ways during an interaction.
> (Weatherall 2002: 768; her italics)

Speer suggests that CA can be used to contribute to feminism, challenging feminists to develop an "analytically grounded approach to reflexivity and the interaction between researcher and researched" (Ibid: 799). She argues that CA need not be politically or methodologically conservative; "rather, since it encourages us to explore the local, turn-by-turn constitution of participants' practices, it provides an analytically sophisticated and tractable grounding *for* politics" (Ibid).

CA is also used to study different kinds of interactions. A comparative analysis of ordinary conversation ('non-institutional' interactions) and institutional discourse shows that OC serves as a benchmark for institutional talk; according to Drew and Sorjonen, institutional forms of interaction show systematic variations and restrictions on activities (1997: 110). For example, sequential patterns in institutional talk differ from patterns found in OC (Ibid: 110).

> Participants in institutional encounters employ linguistic and interactional resources which they possess as part of their linguistic and cultural

> competences: they use these resources, and the
> practices associated with them, in talk-in-interaction
> generally (that is, in non-institutional as well as
> institutional talk). Hence many of the linguistic
> practices which one may observe in institutional
> settings may not be exclusive to such settings.
>
> (Ibid: 110-111)

Therefore it is necessary to show that a certain linguistic practice is "specifically and specially characteristic of talk in a given (institutional) setting" or that it has a "characteristic use when deployed in a given setting" (Ibid: 111). "This Schegloff (1992) refers to as the aim of demonstrating that the context of talk (that it is in a hospital, a school, etc.) is *procedurally relevant*, that is it has special consequences for the details of the language through which participants conduct their interactions in such contexts" (Ibid). Researchers need to demonstrate "not merely that dialogue happens to occur in a certain institutional setting, but that through various details of their language use, participants orient to their respective institutional identities, roles and tasks in that setting, that is that participants' institutional identities and roles are *procedurally relevant* for their talk" (Ibid). Schegloff calls this concept 'procedural consequentiality' (Schegloff 1992: 110).

> Even if we can show by analysis of the details of
> the interaction that some characterization of the
> context or the setting in which the talk is going on
> (such as "in the hospital") is relevant for the parties,
> that they are oriented to the setting so characterized,
> there remains another problem, and that is to show
> how the context or the setting (the local social
> structure), *in that aspect*, is procedurally
> consequential to the talk. (Ibid: 111)

Therefore, the researcher's knowledge of the institution at hand is vital to ensure a complete and detailed analysis. "In institutional contexts, in particular, the disclosure of the context-sensitive meanings of the activities may depend on access to participants' knowledge or organisational particulars without which the analysis may remain insufficient as far as the task is to decipher participants' competencies (or their lack of them) in doing the institutional tasks" (Arminen

2000: 437). In other words, the analyst may not necessarily have sufficient knowledge about the institution under investigation (e.g., expert knowledge, organisational procedures) to determine what relevance the activities hold for the participants themselves; such knowledge may be 'taken-for-granted' but not known to outsiders (Ibid: 438). Arminen cautions that in such instances, the analysis may remain superficial if the analyst is "unable to trace the relevant features the parties are oriented to in the setting" (Ibid). The task for the analyst, therefore, is to show that the institutional context is not only relevant to the participants, but also that there is a direct procedural connection between that institutional context and the language used. Such analyses will give validity to the results of studies of institutional talk.

CA began as a method to "discover our ordinary, everyday procedures for constructing a sense of social and personal reality" (Schiffrin 1994: 409). CA treats language as context-shaped and context-renewing, that is, that language is shaped by context and also shapes context. Conversation analysts do not focus on all aspects of context, but rather on those that are empirically-warranted in the actual text; all findings must be grounded in what the participants actually said and did (Schiffrin 1994). Because of this methodological rigour, CA offers close, detailed analyses of language use.

2 Review of Literature

Current research of institutional talk "continues to extend our knowledge about the linguistic and interactional practices characteristically associated with what might be regarded as 'core' institutional settings, in so far as they are some of the 'crucial sites' of modern social life" (Drew and Sorjonen 1997: 111). Such settings include classrooms, courtrooms, social welfare agencies, emergency services, media, business organisations, and medical consultations (Drew and Sorjonen 1997: 111; Hester and Francis 2001: 207).

The developments in the field of institutional talk outlined in Section 1.3 have centered around three principal foci:

> 1) The expansion of the sociolinguistic notion of 'context' to include the sensitivity of language to a variety of social situations, including institutional settings;
>
> 2) The emergence of analytic frameworks that recognize the nature of language as action and which handle the dynamic features of social action and interaction;
>
> 3) Methodologically, the analysis of audio and video recordings of naturally occurring interactions in specific institutional and occupational settings.
>
> (Drew and Sorjonen 1997: 96)

Therefore the field of institutional talk is "beginning to coalesce around a cumulative body of knowledge concerning (a) participants' orientations to their institutional roles and identities, (b) participants' management of institutionally relevant activities, and (c) comparative dimensions of language and interactions" (Ibid: 97).

In this section the focus turns to recent studies of institutional interaction. The studies included here come from a variety of sources, primarily the journals *Text* and *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, and from the database

22

Dissertation Abstracts International. This is not a comprehensive selection of research on institutional interaction; rather these studies make up a relevant selection of very recent research that is interesting and informative. It is necessary to consider research carried out in various institutional settings in order to find possible similarities and differences in their theoretical frameworks, methodological strategies, and results.

2.1 Medical Discourse

Institutional talk related to medical issues can occur in many different contexts. Studies have focused on doctor-patient interactions, health care worker home visits and pharmacy consultations, among others.

Mark Landa, in his 2000 dissertation *An Analysis of Discourse Strategies in Pharmacy Consultations: Novices and Experts, L1 and L2*, focuses on structural features of pharmacy consultations and on the linguistic and social knowledge required of pharmacists in the United States (Landa 2000). He poses four questions: 1) What discourse strategies do pharmacists use in understanding and responding to clients' concerns about medication? 2) What do performance evaluations of novice pharmacists reveal about the effectiveness of their strategies? 3) How are current pharmacy guidelines put into operation in consultation discourse? 4) How do pharmacists with different levels of experience, performance ratings and native languages compare in their handling of clients' concerns?

His methodological approach is one of discourse analysis from a sociolinguistic perspective, concerned with both discourse structures and strategies. In line with traditional studies of institutional talk, Landa uses videotaped recordings of the pharmacy consultations of novices (native and non-native speakers) and experienced pharmacists (native and non-native speakers). These recordings were

then transcribed and analysed based on Gumperz' approach to interpersonal communication.[10] Landa also carried out playback interviews with the participants, during which they reflected on their strategies, strengths and difficulties.

His results show that the consultations have a shared underlying structure, including predictable sequences, when dealing with client concerns. The experienced pharmacists and the more highly-rated novices had these discourse strategies in common: 1) soliciting clients' concerns in the context of ongoing talk about medication problems; 2) providing elaborated responses to the concerns; 3) including references to the physician during consultation; and 4) encouraging clients to contribute to the discourse throughout the consultation (Ibid). The novices tended not to employ these strategies and omitted some of the required parts of the consultation. In terms of contributing to further research in the field of institutional talk, Landa emphasises the point that contextual details (e.g., language, experience) need to be considered in analyses for "complete, substantial investigations of professional consultations" (Ibid). Recalling Schegloff's warnings about relevance, researchers must also show that such contextual details have consequences for the language use under investigation.

In the article "Reshaping Lives: Constitutive Identity Work in Geriatric Medical Consultations", Nikolas Coupland and Justine Coupland "present a discourse analysis of socially supportive interactions in a UK geriatric medical context" (1998: 159). The focus of their study lies in "3 overlapping sets of discourse processes": 1) how doctors are concerned to resist and renegotiate patients' ideological values of aging and health interactively; 2) the collaborative negotiation of depression and the construction of positivity; and 3) patients being helped to acclimatise to new health constraints and to cope with associated life

---

[10] This approach views "language as a socially and culturally constructed symbol system that is used in ways that reflect macro-level social meanings (e.g. group identity, status differences) and create micro-level social meanings (i.e., what one is saying and doing at a moment in time)" (Schiffrin 1998: 102).

transitions (Ibid: 159).

Their data consist of "a small subset of a large corpus", including audiotaped recordings of outpatient clinic consultations involving elderly patients ranging from 62 to 97 years old and doctors of varying ages and experience (Ibid: 163). This outpatient clinic is located at a hospital in the UK. Coupland and Coupland approach their analysis from a discourse analytic perspective, using an "empirical, text-based approach" (Ibid: 159). They focus on "some recurrent patterns through which age is oriented to, projected and managed in everyday talk, and how what we might call 'age values' are embedded in these texts" (Ibid: 159). Specifically, they "examine geriatric medical consultations as a site of identity work, where age and age-related health are actively renegotiated by doctors, elderly patients and sometimes third-parties (often family members who fulfil caring roles)" (Ibid: 160). Their results show that these interactions "enact a particularly intense set of renegotiative processes, where patients' life narratives come up for review and potential realignment" (Ibid: 159). However, Coupland and Coupland do not show how the institutionality of the setting can affect these processes.

In the article "Risk Discourse: Recontextualization of Numerical Values in Clinical Practice", Viveka Adelsward and Lisbeth Sachs (1998: 191) focus on the following questions: 1) How are epidemiological and genetic risk calculations, usually formulated as mathematically expressed probabilities of risk, communicated in clinical interaction between physicians and lay people? 2) How are such calculations of risks recontextualised and interpreted in the clinical encounter and into the lifeworld of the individual? Their rationale is that "through advances in medical technology, more and more people are being defined as at risk for various diseases" (1998: 191).

The discourse data analysed come from two different sets, both from "larger empirical projects dealing with health care in Sweden" (Ibid: 194). The first consists of interactions between a nurse and male patients participating in a

voluntary health survey about blood cholesterol levels. The second set is "based on 33 interactions taken from a consultation service for genetic assessment of risk of hereditary cancer" (Ibid: 94). The consultation service is limited to those persons "who are believed to be, or believed themselves to be, at risk and have been referred to the clinic" (Ibid: 194). The researchers also carried out post-interviews to discuss the patients' reactions to their clinic visits. The data were analysed from a discourse analytic perspective.

The results "show that both patient groups had difficulties in interpreting decontextualized numbers and percentages" of risk factors (Ibid: 191).

> The interpretation of numerical risk information in connection with clinical medicine is dependent on whether the potential patients believe that the risk attached to a certain number is relevant to them and on whether they feel that they are in a position to influence their future health. We can also see that risks are talked about and interpreted in different ways according to whether they are regarded as externally imposed or self-inflicted. (Ibid: 207)

This study, as with the one discussed just above, seems to have some limitations in its discussion. The conceptual framework applied is described in very general terms as discourse analytic. It is unclear exactly which theoretical framework is informing the analysis. Moreover, despite being carried out in institutional settings, no mention is made on how the institutionality of the context may or may not have affected the discourse. It is unclear whether these researchers are disregarding the institutional nature of the settings. If they are, then it is unclear what affect the institutional context may have had on the talk. If in fact the institutionality of the setting has no relevance for the talk, then this fact must also be made clear. These medical consultations are not held in everyday settings where ordinary conversation would be expected, but rather in clinical settings. Surely this fact bears mentioning, and especially whether or not the settings influenced the interactions.

In the study "Dilemmas of Advice: Aspects of the Delivery and Reception of Advice in Interactions Between Health Visitors and First-Time Mothers" (1992), Heritage and Sefi analyse advice-giving sequences in home visits between British health visitors [HV] and first-time mothers using a conversation analytic framework. HVs are qualified nurses in the U.K. community nursing programme who, as part of their duties, are obliged to visit the homes of new mothers, and as such provide advice and support (Heritage and Sefi 1992: 359). The researchers are interested in how advice giving is initiated "with a particular focus on how the parties arrive at the point where advice giving is begun," and how it is accepted or resisted (Ibid: 360).

The data are taken from a large corpus of audio-taped recordings of health visits in central England; the HVs recorded their first six visits to a range of mothers, including both first-time and repeat mothers (Ibid 1992: 360). Included in this study are interactional data from initial visits to first-time mothers, usually when the baby is about ten days old. The results showed that overwhelmingly the advice was initiated by the HV and not the mother. When advice is initiated by the mother, she tries to avoid the appearance of incompetence often by requesting "confirmation of a proposed course of action" and by doing so orients to the role of advice recipient (Ibid: 388). When initiated by the HV, the need for advice, and the mother's role as recipient, are not as clearly established (Ibid: 388-389). Heritage and Sefi summarise the steps of advice-giving as follows, noting that there are variations of the sequences that do not include steps three and/or four (Ibid: 379):

Step 1	HV:	initial inquiry.
Step 2	M:	problem-indicative response.
Step 3	HV:	focusing inquiry into the problem.
Step 4	M:	responsive detailing.
Step 5	HV:	advice giving.

Heritage and Sefi also outline three main ways in which advice may be received:

1) marked acknowledgement that conveys acceptance; 2) unmarked acknowledgement that does not overtly accept the advice or acknowledge it as informative; and 3) assertions of knowledge or competence that resist the advice by indicating it is redundant (Ibid: 391). Most frequently the mothers use unmarked acknowledgements that show receipt of the talk but not "its character *as advice*" (Ibid: 409, their emphasis). Heritage and Sefi note that in many cases the unmarked acknowledgements were "followed by more overt expressions of resistance to advice giving that challenged its relevance or informativeness to advisees" (Ibid). The HVs are pessimistic about the first-time mothers' competences and knowledge, and highly value their own expertise (Ibid: 411-412). They were found to initiate and deliver advice in a predominantly unilateral way, doing little to accommodate their advice giving to the needs of the individual mothers (Ibid: 409-410). By orienting to their institutional roles as community health nurses, as expert providers of advice and support, the HVs constrain the interactions through the advice giving sequences they most often initiate.

In the article "The Straightforwardness of Advice: Advice-Giving in Interaction Between Swedish District Nurses and Patients", Vesa Leppanen aims "to explicate recurrent features of advice-giving in interactions between Swedish district nurses and patients" and compare the findings with Heritage and Sefi's (1992, see above) results (Leppanen 1998: 210). "With the increased division of labor in society, advice-giving has become an integrated part of the work of experts who meet laypersons in a number of settings" (Ibid: 209). Differences in advice-giving

> can be related to the different contexts to which the interactants in the two settings are oriented when they give and respond to advice. Therefore, the study of advice should both carefully explicate the details of the production of advice and show how these details are systematic products of the interactants' orientations to specific features of the institutions. (Ibid: 210)

Leppanen addresses the following questions in her research. 1) When is advice-

giving initiated? 2) How can the sequential positions, in which advice-giving is initiated, be described and understood? 3) What is advice about? 4) How is advice-giving constructed, with words and body movements? 5) How do patients respond to advice?

The data used in this study were collected for a study of social interaction between nurses and patients, and were made up of video recorded meetings between nurses and patients (Ibid: 213). In nearly all of the interactions analysed, testing and treatment were the primary reasons for the meetings; "thus, the studied situations were not ones in which the nurses met their patients with the specific purpose of giving advice" (Ibid: 213). The results show that "nurses' advice regularly consists of three components: (a) a part that *proposes a course of action*, (b) a set of characteristic *body movements*, and (c) an *account* that supports the proposed course of action" (Ibid: 223). Leppanen compares her findings with Heritage and Sefi's study, outlining the basic differences between these two settings and the participants involved. She determines that the roles and identities of both the institutional professionals and the laypersons affect the advice sequences found in the two sets of data, although both types of interaction take place in medically-related institutional settings. This finding reminds us to be cautious in not assuming that all medical contexts will affect language use in similar ways. We must also determine how the participants orient themselves to the institutional setting, as well as consider the speaker characteristics that are relevant for that particular interaction (e.g., old or young, first-time mother or experienced patient, sick or healthy).

The final article on medical interactions to be discussed here is John Heritage and Anna Lindstrom's "Motherhood, Medicine, and Morality: Scenes From a Medical Encounter" (1998). They "examine some moments in the course of informal medical encounters in which motherhood and medicine collide and intertwine" (Ibid: 397). In the article they

sketch some aspects of the talk that takes place between first-time mothers and British community nurses ("health visitors" or "HV") during the course of the nurses' visits to the mothers' homes. We first focus on data from the first of these visits that normally take place about 10 days after the birth of the baby...Subsequently, we look in more depth at some moments in which the morally problematic nature of certain experiences and emotions is more explicitly taken up and dealt with in these encounters. (Ibid: 398)

The data for this study are from the same corpus from which Heritage and Sefi (1992) draw their data, and from which Leppanen (1998) draws data for her comparative analysis. As noted above, the corpus is made up of "self-administered audiotape recordings by HVs in a large industrial city in central England" (Heritage and Lindstrom 1998: 399). Dozens of visits were recorded by HVs with both first-time and other new mothers, although the data examined for this article were restricted to initial visits to first-time mothers by several different HVs, as well as a longitudinal analysis of six visits between one mother and her HV (Ibid: 399-400). The data are analysed using a conversation analytic approach to discourse.

Evidence shows that "during these first visits mothers primarily orient to their HVs as 'baby experts' - persons with particular expertise on the health and treatment of babies - rather than as 'befrienders' with whom they can share problems or troubles that are not directly connected with problems of baby management" (Ibid: 401). It is also important to note that HVs "characteristically comport themselves as 'baby experts' during these visits" (Ibid: 401). The mothers also show that they "see their knowledge, competence, and vigilance in baby care as an object of evaluation and, moreover, by a person with officially accredited competences to judge their conduct" (Ibid: 401).

Such findings illustrate Schegloff's concept of relevance, that it is necessary to show how the participants' orient themselves to the institutionally relevant roles

and identities involved in the interactions, such as being expert or novice baby caregivers. In instances, however, where the HV shares her experiences as a mother herself to offer advice or comfort a first-time mother, "the technical or medical idiom that has informed the women's interaction thus far falls away, and...the feelings associated with mothering assume a greater importance" (Ibid: 434). Hence there is a shift from the institutional nature of the setting (HV-mother) as relevant to the interaction to a non-institutional interaction involving two mothers. This study shows that "there is not necessarily a hard and fast distinction to be made between ordinary conversation and institutional talk in all instances of interactional events, nor even at all points in a single interactional event" (Drew and Heritage 1992: 21).

Considering this discussion of these six recent contributions to the study of institutional discourse in a medical setting, there are a few general questions that can be raised. First, few of the articles clearly define or delimit the theoretical frameworks and/or methodological approaches taken to analyse the data. When CA is not mentioned as a specific framework, the term "discourse analysis" is sometimes used; as this term means many different things to different scholars, it is not clear which approach exactly has been taken - whether conversation analytic, sociolinguistic, ethnographic, etc. All of the studies focus on language in institutional settings, but not all of them (e.g., Coupland and Coupland, Adelsward and Sachs) discuss how the institutional setting, roles or identities may have affected the discourse. In such cases, this institutional context therefore seems to be portrayed as an insignificant factor, whether or not it is in fact relevant. The other researchers considered here make explicit mention of the institutional nature of the contexts, as well as the relevance of this context for the interaction in question.

2.2 Emergency Services Discourse

In this section are discussed three studies of interactions in 'emergency services' settings - those involving the police and 911 calls.

The first study, "Interactional Trouble in Emergency Service Requests: A Problem of Frames" by Karen Tracy, analyses calls to 911 that request emergency help. Information from such calls is forwarded to dispatchers of various emergency services: police, fire, or paramedics (1997: 315). As Tracy notes, "although emergency calls routinely may be managed well, this is not always the case. Calls can become interactionally tense affairs with irritation and even anger expressed by one or both parties" (Ibid: 315).

The aim of Tracy's article is to outline interactional troubles that take place between citizens and 911 operators (Ibid: 316). She claims that "many of the routine interactional difficulties...can be traced to a set of differing expectations that the parties bring to interaction" (Ibid: 316). In other words, "citizens and calltakers bring closely related but distinctive interactional frames to their exchanges" (Ibid: 316). The interactional problems tend to stem from the idea that the citizens and the calltakers orient themselves to different institutional goals; "citizens...frequently bring a 'customer service' frame to the exchange, whereas emergency calltakers assume...a 'public service' frame" (Ibid: 316).

The data analysed in this article came from a large corpus of telephone calls made to 911 and a "non-emergency" police line. The calls occurred over a 10-month period and involve many different 911 operators (Ibid: 320). The call center is located in a major city in the U.S., and dispatches police, fire, and paramedic services; calltakers are civilians working for the police department (Ibid: 321). Fifty calls from this data set were transcribed for analysis. Data are also taken from 1) field notes from observation and informal talk with calltakers and "observation in other areas of emergency-related work (police, fire, and paramedic dispatching; calltaker training; ride-along with police and ambulance

services; observations of four other emergency centers)", 2) semistructured interviews with calltakers, and 3) the center's training and procedure manuals (Ibid: 322).

To analyse the data, Tracy uses "action-implicative discourse analysis...an approach that blends ethnographic methods and discourse analysis for the purpose of pursuing a practical theory agenda" (Ibid: 322). Such analyses typically "characterize the problems of a practice," "identify the conversational techniques that constitute or manage the problems," and "describe participants' situated beliefs about how actors ought to behave" (Ibid: 322-323).

Tracy finds that the 'public service' vs. 'customer service' orientations do not cause problems for the vast majority of calls. When the frame differences do matter, though, interactional trouble occurs. This trouble takes places 1) when a police call originates from a location outside the geographic boundaries, 2) when organizational resources are already pressed and the caller's difficulty is not a high priority one, or 3) when the call involves asking callers for certain types of information" (Ibid: 338). She suggests that such communication could be improved by citizens having different expectations and calltakers recognising and managing such "frame mismatches" (Ibid: 338). Conversation strategies of, e.g. politeness or sympathy, however, often take more time than being blunt, and 911 calls are necessarily kept as brief as possible (Ibid: 339).

The next study included here, "Reduction and Specialization in Emergency and Directory Assistance Calls," Michele A. Wakin and Don H. Zimmerman "explore how openings in 2 types of service calls, emergency calls and directory assistance calls, differ both generally and locally from ordinary and mundane telephone calls" (1999: 409). They focus on service call openings to describe "local features of the calls that delineate their institutional agenda, an agenda requiring different sequential trajectories than those found in ordinary calls" (Ibid: 409).

The aim of this CA study is to make a comparative analysis of institutionalised and ordinary telephone conversations. They measure service calls "against ordinary calls to address how the basic processes of telephone conversation are adapted to focused and specialized projects emerging from the institutionalization of seeking and providing help" (Ibid: 410). Wakin and Zimmerman use ordinary calls "either as a comparison or a point of divergence" for the analysis of service call openings (Ibid: 414).

Their data consist of two types of service calls: emergency (911) and directory assistance (411). They use transcriptions of recorded calls made in the U.S. (Ibid: 409). They note that directory assistance operators are paid employees, and 911 operators are civilians who not only obtain the necessary information but also transfer calls to other dispatchers (e.g., police, ambulance) as necessary (Ibid: 413). Their findings show that call types differ "through the deletion, preemption, or repositioning of components of the 'canonical' opening sequence that characterises ordinary calls. Such modifications are based on participants' orientation to particular tasks and the facilitating social arrangements supporting them" (Ibid: 431). Call features "delineate their institutional agenda" (Ibid: 431); mundane greetings and identifications are deleted in order to proceed directly to the immediate point of the service call. They also find that directory assistance calls reduce openings the most severely. Such calls have one purpose only, to obtain a phone listing, while emergency calls can be made for any number of reasons; therefore, directory assistance calls can jump right to the query "what city please" (among other variants) (Ibid: 432).

Wakin and Zimmerman conclude that

> the practices that make up the activities of daily life in society, both mundane and momentous, are not arbitrary, however they might vary by circumstance. Observed variations are themselves systematic, situationally sensitive means of addressing the interactional issues that attend any given activity

involving the concerted efforts of participants.

<div align="center">(Ibid: 433)</div>

Their study is strongly rooted in the traditions of the institutional talk program. They show how institutional talk varies systematically from OC in call openings, depending on the goals of the interaction. In service calls such as those discussed in their article, callers and calltakers alike must immediately orient to the goal of the call, therefore showing constraints of the institutional nature of the interaction.

The final study included in this section is a dissertation called Reifying and Defying Sisterhood in Discourse: Communities of Practice at Work at an All-Female Police Station and a Feminist Crisis Intervention Center in Brazil by Ana Cristina Ostermann (2000). The goal of her study is "to complicate [sic; explicate?] the relationship between language and gender by examining the way women in two institutional settings talk" (Ibid). These two settings include 1) an all-female police station (a "working class" organisation) and 2) a crisis intervention center (a "grass-roots" organisation) in Brazil.

Ostermann's data consist of first-time encounters between victims and professionals in each institutional setting. She investigates the discursive practices of the officers at the police station and the feminists at the crisis intervention center. The theoretical framework applied in her analysis is conversation analytic, concerned with the overall structural organisations of the talk. Her results show that the police officers do not waver from their institutional identities throughout the encounters, their discourse consisting of fixed structures only. The feminists on the other hand shift from institutional talk to ordinary conversation during the encounters, their orientation to the institutionality of the context enacted only at certain points. She uses turn management, pronoun use, and politeness strategies to support her claims. Although Ostermann claims that her findings suggest that "gender does not predict interactional patterns; instead these interactions are best understood as reflecting the gendered communities of practice from which the professionals are drawn," her study focuses on women's language only. Therefore

it is unclear where she draws her conclusions on gender predictions.

The three studies discussed in this section focus on interactions that occur primarily in emergency service settings. The institutionality of the contexts is clearly represented in the discussions. Due to the 'emergency' nature of such interactions, research on the effect their institutional intensity has on interaction would prove interesting. Perhaps such intensities can be analysed across institutional settings, for example when a doctor has to notify family members of a relative's death, or when a teacher has to deal with an extremely troubled child.

2.3 Academic Discourse

This last section of the literature review comprises studies of institutional discourse in academic settings, including studies at both the school and the university level.

In the 2000 dissertation entitled Practices of Pedagogy in ESL Writing Conferences: A Conversation Analytic Study of Turns and Sequences that Assist Student Revision, Irene Koshik carries out a study of teacher elicitation turns that assist student revision during one-on-one tutoring sessions on writing for ESL post-secondary students (2000). The aim of the study is to provide a detailed description of practices through which the pedagogy is being accomplished, and of the ways in which practices of ordinary talk have been adapted to meet specific pedagogical goals.

Koshik investigates several types of "known-answer" teacher turns that assist student performance. One such turn type includes a "reverse polarity question" [RPQ], which is a "grammatically affirmative yes/no question which, in describable contexts, reverses its polarity from affirmative to negative by conveying an implied negative assertion which shows what is problematic about a

portion of student text and, in the process, points to a possible remedy" (Ibid) The second turn type discussed is the "Designedly Incomplete Utterance" [DIU], a turn design used to elicit self-correction. A DIU is an incomplete utterance designed to be continued by the student.

Koshik carries out an extensive turn-by-turn analysis of the data through which she explicates fragments of talk containing the relevant question sequences, showing how "each question is related to the other utterances in its sequence, and what both the sequence and the individual question are being used to do" (Ibid: 29-30). Her analysis is based in the conversation analytic framework, and includes interactions between ESL teachers and students in writing conferences at the post-secondary level. Her results show that the traditional category of "known answer" teacher turns "is more complex than previous research has led us to believe" (Ibid). She finds that the DIU is a "variation on a basic design adapted from conversational repair" (Ibid). Her results fall in line with basic theoretical concepts of institutional discourse in that they relate pedagogical discourse (as a form of institutional talk) to everyday conversation, thereby showing the systematic differences between the two. According to Hester and Francis, ordinary conversation serves as the 'bedrock' of sequential organisational characteristics, while other speech systems modify this basic system of OC; institutional talk is a more 'constrained' way of talking than OC and much that is open ordering in OC is 'prestructured' in institutional talk (1999: 392).

> The basic assumption of the institutional talk program is that the concepts and methods of conversation analysis can be extended beyond the study of ordinary conversation to the investigation of various forms of 'institutional talk' in order to show that such interaction differs from ordinary conversation *in systematic ways*. (Ibid: 392)

As Koshik shows, the teachers apply everyday speech strategies to pedagogical purposes in institutional settings, such as teacher-student writing conferences.

The next study to be discussed here is by Kristina Love, entitled "The Construction of Moral Subjectiveness in Talk Around Text in Secondary English" (2000). Love states that, "it is through the everyday, institutional forms of classroom talk that teachers and students act and enact their cultural being" (Ibid). Therefore, "the talk that occurs in secondary English classrooms provides a valuable site for the examination of how particular cultural beings are enacted in particular contexts" (Ibid). The focus of this study is to show that "in oral discussions about their responses to texts, students are apprenticed into selected ways of valuing and reasoning from text, learning ethical stances at the same time as they learn literate skills" (Ibid).

Love analyses the interaction between students and teachers in two different grade 10 English classes in Australia. The classes are both involved in "whole-class text response discussion" (WCTRD) of the same short story; in other words, after reading the story the teachers have engaged the students in an open discussion about what they have read. Love applies a microsemantic analysis, using systemic functional linguistics "to identify the precise ways in which each group of students' moral subjectivities are constructed" (Ibid). She finds evidence that, "despite differences in the social contexts of each class and despite differences in each teacher's pedagogy, the discourse of the WCTRD operates in each case to develop shared moral positions" (Ibid).

Perhaps in this institutional setting the discussions are not so much constrained by certain aspects of the varying pedagogy (itself institutional by nature), but rather by the students' orientation to the institutional role of open discussions in a classroom setting. Further studies need to be undertaken in order to establish possible systematic hierarchies that are at play in different classroom settings, for example, to determine if the task at hand or the teacher's pedagogical style have more relevance for the interactions. This area could prove fruitful for further discussion, as studies can be undertaken considering many factors: culture, gender, age, task, etc. Perhaps it will be found that some of these factors are

continually more relevant or consequential for talk in the classroom.

The next study is slightly different from those above as it focuses on an interaction involving only one student in particular. In "Who is Cindy? Aspects of Identity Work in a Teacher-Parent-Pupil Talk at a Special School", Viveka Adelsward and Claes Nilholm present a "case study of one teacher-parent-pupil (TPP) conference" (2000: 545). Cindy is a student with Down syndrome, and the aim of this study is to show "how people with verbal communication problems manage discursive practices that largely rely on the ability to verbally negotiate identity" (Ibid: 545).

The focus of this study is on "identity work, i.e., how identities are negotiated and invoked as part of the interactional process." (Ibid: 547).

> We suggest that participant roles, rather than being identities as such, provide means for negotiating identity... In some types of institutional talk, identity has become the very topic of talk. One could say that there are special communicative genres in modern Western society that are specially designed for talking about and constructing people's identities; these genres include therapeutic sessions, job counseling, and teacher-parent-pupil conferences. We can thus see the explicit goal of such conferences as doing identity work. i.e., as a case of institutionalized identity work.
>
> (Ibid: 547-458)

Adelsward and Nilholm posed these three research questions: 1) How is the talk about identity managed? 2) How is Cindy's identity demonstrated in the interaction? 3) In what ways do the institutional aspects of the talk influence identity management? (Ibid: 550) To analyse the discourse of this TPP talk, the researchers apply concepts from ethnomethodology and conversation analysis, "especially those studies from this field that demonstrate an attention to the details of authentic interaction while taking contextual features into account in the analysis" (Ibid: 550). Their "understanding of the notion of identity is influenced

by recent work in discursive psychology claiming that social identities are not properties of persons, but achieved in interaction, requiring negotiation as well as consolidation" (Ibid: 550).

The results showed that

> Cindy's identity is described and talked about in terms of predefined aspects codified in a written agenda. All participants oriented themselves towards some sort of cultural model of this ideal identity that does not have to be discursively justified. Cindy's identity is not only talked about, but also demonstrated and enacted in interaction. Her self-presentation is mediated by her mother.
>
> (Ibid: 545)

Cindy's assets and shortcomings are presented by the teacher and the assistant, who are "performing a kind of identity work that could best be described as a 'character contest'" (Ibid: 551). In such identity work, the teacher uses forms that "could be seen as a way of invoking an institutional over a personal identity" (Ibid: 553). In general, the teacher's "lexical choice and the choice of delivery is oriented toward the institutional context of the talk" (Ibid: 554). In conclusion, Adelsward and Nilholm find that identity work is being done at different levels at the TPP talk. "Not only do the mother and teacher interactively assist Cindy in presenting and demonstrating her individual identity. Other relationships - mother-daughter, teacher-pupil, and teacher-parent - are also displayed" (Ibid: 564).

This study not only directly addresses the issue of the institutionality of the interaction, but also does so in such a way that is mindful of Schegloff's warning of relevance and procedural consequentiality. Throughout the TPP talk, the participants orient themselves to institutional identities and goals, especially in terms of the teacher-pupil and teacher-parent relationships. Therefore, those institutional relationships were relevant for the participants in the interaction under discussion.

The article "Collaborative Construction of Task Activity: Coordinating Multiple Resources in a High School Physics Lab" by Cecilia E. Ford examines the interaction among three high school students working on a physics laboratory task (1999: 369). "Through the close analysis of the social construction of task, on a moment-to-moment basis, this study draws attention to the highly complex, yet taken-for-granted practices that are integral to thinking and acting in the context of laboratory activities" (Ibid: 370). In the laboratory task, Ford sets out to show that 1) reading, both privately or aloud, and reference to formulations are tightly tied to action structure; 2) that multiple resources, both immediate and generic, are deployed in constructing and maintaining the 'jointness' of the activity; and 3) that there is special work required of students in order to maintain their task focus and to display deference to the authority of the instructor (Ibid: 370).

Ford's data "come from a physics course videotaped in the Spring of 1997 as part of a longitudinal study of socialization into subject matter courses at a high school in a major U.S. urban center" (Ibid: 371). She focuses on one segment of the recordings, looking specifically at "the students' skills at managing and manipulating physical objects, written materials, social roles, and their ongoing and orderly construction of a shared task. Also included is the interaction between those students and their instructor" (Ibid: 371).

To analyse the data, Ford primarily uses conversation analysis, repeatedly viewing and analyzing the video recordings made from two cameras. She interprets both "hearable and visible" actions (Ibid: 371-372). Her analysis is also informed by prior work in ethnomethodology and interactional sociolinguistics that have "shed light on the discourse patterns characteristic of educational activities" (Ibid: 371). She finds that the students' "reading, linguistic reference, and other verbal and nonverbal actions are produced in a tightly interwoven manner. They use routine and expectable task-based talk to orient and guide their activities, thus making use of an accumulated understanding of the components of the shared order of science laboratory setting" (Ibid: 399).

This is in effect a two-fold institutional setting: a science laboratory set in a high school classroom. For this reason the institutionality of the context seems to be conflicting: the students are immersed in a scientific task and are interacting in this setting; the teacher, on the other hand, tries to interact with them as in a pedagogical context.

> Observing Delia, Edith and Kira has also offered us a perspective on the work of maintaining the jointness of a group laboratory activity while also dealing effectively with the authority of the instructor, a privileged interlocutor. (Ibid: 399-400)

In fact, "teacher intervention is potentially misplaced and not guaranteed to be relevant to any current internal focus of a group; the teacher moves quickly from group to group, and does not always recognize which part of the shared task a particular group is in fact working on" (Ibid: 400).

Ford shows that the girls defer to the teacher when he intervenes, but quickly re-establish the group's internal structure when he leaves; they also treat the teacher's talk as privileged but "resist allowing the teacher's talk to take them too far afield from the point in the task that is their internally constructed focus" (Ibid: 400). The students also "display individual identities and values" when relating to the teacher's talk (Ibid: 400). Such contrasts "underscore the potential for variation in interactional strategies that girls may employ" (Ibid: 400). Ford calls for more studies of "variation in girls' talk in educational contexts" (Ibid: 400). This study was interesting as it compared and contrasted interactions within a twofold institutional context. Ford also made explicit the effects of the institutional nature of the context and showed how the context affected behaviours during the interaction.

The next study to be discussed here is, "The Organization of Discussion in University Settings" by Helen Basturkmen. She investigates "the sequential patterns of talk in discussion in university classes using the construct of exchange structure. (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, 1992; Coulthard and Brazil 1992)"

(Basturkmen 2000: 249). This is the approach developed by the Birmingham discourse analysis group, as discussed in Section 1.3.2. Basturkmen examines "structures extending the basic IRF (initiation, response, follow-up) pattern" established in the exchange structure system.

The data were compiled through video recordings of "naturally occurring seminar and discussion classes from the Masters in Business program at Aston University, UK" (Ibid: 253). The number of words totalled around 30,000. The video recordings had been made for students in a distance learning program, and included 18 texts from three different types of discussion: discussion followed by a presentation made by an external expert, discussion followed by student presentations, and tutorial discussion classes. Basturkmen transcribed the texts and applied the exchange system approach to analyse them. Although "investigation has shown that much of discussion talk can be characterized as two-part routines of initiation and response, i.e., question and answer ... a prevalent pattern is noticeable in this study, comprising a four-part sequence which includes a third-part follow-on move" (Ibid: 267). Basturkmen suggests "modifications to the exchange structure approach ... to help account for specific patterns found in discussion in a university setting" (Ibid: 268).

What is most important about this study is not necessarily the specific findings on question-answer exchanges or the application of a certain theoretical framework, but the reminder that each institutional setting varies by nature and therefore needs to be reexamined with each study. The Birmingham discourse analysis approach was developed for school-level classroom studies, while in this instance it was applied to a university-level setting. While the school and university settings are both considered "academic," the interactional sequences were found to differ; it is important to remember, then, that previous findings should not be applied mechanistically to new data, but rather they should be used as a starting point for analysis and discussion.

Next I turn to gender linguistic studies of academic discourse. In Helen Sauntson's study, "Girls' and Boys' Use of Acknowledging Moves in Pupil Group Classroom Discussions," she examines the "use of acknowledging moves in the single-sex group discussions of 12-13-year-old girls and boys in their Design and Technology lessons," employing a structural-functional discourse analytic perspective (Sauntson 2007: 304). Acknowledging moves are "a feature of discourse that perform the function of providing feedback to another speaker's utterance" (Ibid); for example, to reformulate or protest what another speaker has said (see below for further types of acknowledging moves).

Sauntson notes that "much current work in language and gender emphasises that it is impossible to generalise about the behaviour of women/girls and men/boys and criticizes work that present a binary conception of gender" (Ibid: 306). As noted in section 1.2.3, she emphasises that she does not wish to make any generalisations based on her evidence or argue for "all-encompassing gender differences" (Ibid).

Sauntson's data were collected through once or twice weekly recordings over a two-year period at an urban co-educational comprehensive school in Birmingham, UK (Ibid: 308). Lessons were observed and pupils' conversations in group tasks were audio-recorded; the groups included all girls, all boys, and mixed sex groups. She found that the girls in the study "use proportionally more acknowledging moves than the boys" (Ibid: 312). The acknowledging move types included *receive*, *react*, *reformulate*, *endorse*, *protest*, or *repeat* (Ibid: 314).

The girls most often used *receive*, *react*, or *repeat* feedback, while the use of *protest* was low. The boys, however, used *protest* almost half the time, while *receive* and *react* were used for most of the remaining examples (Ibid: 314-315). These findings suggest that, "the girls' discourse is strongly oriented towards achieving consensus rather than disagreement. Whereas *protest* is confrontational, *receive* and *react* are generally supportive in that they offer positive endorsement

of a preceding utterance" (Ibid: 315). Sauntson's analysis suggested that the girls tended to use acknowledging moves to collaborate and achieve consensus within the group, while the boys tended to use the moves to negotiate status and hierarchy; these gender differences were tied to specific linguistic features (Ibid: 322). In this study, Sauntson clearly demonstrates that "boys and girls have access to the same linguistic resources in their group discussions but choose to draw on them differently" (Ibid: 306).

In her study, "Expressions of Gender: An Analysis of Pupils' Gendered Discourse Styles in Small Group Classroom Discussions," Julia Davies uses a discourse analytic technique to examine learning through talk-related activities and the ways in which pupils orient to gender (2003: 115). Davies recorded 14-year-old students in speaking and listening activities in English lessons, in both single and mixed sex groupings, at comprehensive schools in the north of England; however, the data for this article were taken from the single sex groups (Ibid: 117). She examined whether "discussions fulfilled the tasks set and whether there was variation according to gender" (Ibid). The analysis showed that

1) Girls demonstrated and cemented their social loyalties via discussion work, challenging neither their membership of 'female culture' nor the work process, referred to as *polyphony* (Coates, 1996);

2) Boys' demonstrations of their social loyalties severely challenge the work process and inhibit learning (referred to as *cacophony*);

3) Boys' use of sexist language and stereotypes is rarely challenged by other boys – potentially harming themselves as well as girls;

4) Boys tend to invoke the use of emblems from popular culture in order to avoid self-revelation.
(Ibid: 118; her italics)

As in Sauntson's study, Davies was careful to avoid over-generalisations or designations of "a linguistic feature as 'typical' of one gender and mak[ing] brash conclusions regarding their signification. Although patterns were sought, the use

of an intransigent framework was avoided." (Ibid: 117-118)

In the article, "Talking About Gender: The Conversational Construction of Gender Categories in Academic Discourse," Elizabeth Stokoe examined the "nature of academic discourse, paying particular attention to the construction of gender categories within students' conversations" (1998: 217). Rather than define gender differences in language or characterise men's and women's styles of interaction, Stokoe explored "ways in which participants themselves talk about gender" (Ibid).

To collect the data, Stokoe videotaped seminar sessions of Education and Psychology students at a higher education college in the UK (Ibid: 220). For the analysis she used a discursive conversation analytic approach. The following research questions were asked: 1) Did the students orient to gender as a participant's category and, if so, how did they treat it? 2) Did the occasioning of gender affect the task execution in any way? Might it limit the students' perceptions and exploration of relevant issues? (Ibid: 221)

Stokoe found that the students oriented to gender on some occasions as a result of the task, and on other occasions more spontaneously (Ibid).

> For example, gender was occasioned as the relevant thing about a certain aspect of the students' discourse. It was also occasioned as a contrastive category such that characterizations of men and women could be made. Further, gender stereotypes were invoked to support or contest arguments.
> (Ibid: 236-237)

Stokoe's study contributed to the "critical shift towards a social constructionist framework for research...investigat[ing] participants' own understandings of gender categories" (Ibid: 237).

In her study "'Teacher Talk' in the Russian and American Classroom: Dominance

and Cultural Framing," Margaret Mills examined educational discourse in Russian and American English entry-level classrooms to identify the regulation of instructional discourse used with young native speaker (NS) students; next she compared and contrasted teacher talk in NS and non-native speaker (NNS) classrooms to determine which *instructional chains*[11] are "language-specific and which may be applied successfully and understood more 'universally' across linguistic boundaries" (1999c: 132-133).

Mills collected and transcribed natural (ethnographic) data for the study: audio-recordings of instruction in American primary school classrooms (including Kindergarten, grades 4 and 6) and comparable classrooms in Moscow, and NS-taught Russian language classes for American students at universities in the U.S. and in Russia on exchange (Ibid: 133-135). In a pragmatic analysis of the data, she set out to compare the teaching strategies used in the various educational settings, specifically the teachers' use of directives through indirect or direct methods (Ibid: 134-135). Although Mills did not employ a Conversation Analytic approach as in this dissertation, she did stress the importance of viewing speech acts *sequentially*, i.e., through their "continuous negotiation" (Ibid: 135-136), a key feature of CA research.

Mills emphasised that the focus on female classroom instructors allowed the research to avoid the argument about women's speech being 'powerless' and more 'polite' than men's speech; "in fact, in examining this predominantly female genre of instructional discourse, we are presented with the more complex issues of how instructors balance the powerful speech acts and strategies comprising chains of classroom directives, while adhering to the strong universal notions of "nurturing" traditionally associated with women's language use in contact with young children" (Ibid: 132). In the educational setting, the teacher (the speaker, or S) and the student (the hearer, or H) have an "inherently *unequal* status" as speech

---

[11] Mills identifies instructional chains as series of directives used by teachers in the classroom; e.g., a *declarative + imperative + declarative* such as "When *you* finish, *raise your* hand, and *I'll* pick them up." (Mills 1999c: 144; her italics)

participants (Ibid: 136; her italics).

Mills found that Imperative directives such as "Tak vot, ty vstan'!" (*So, here now, you - stand up!*) are frequently employed by the Russian teachers to regulate the discourse (Ibid: 139-140). However, the directive form most frequently used in the English data was the Hearer Declarative, as exemplified by "Sam - you need to finish up now," which "carries a much lower degree of FTA[12] while still allowing S a clear, unambiguous route for ... issuing the directive" (Ibid: 139). The Russian instructors also used joint directives such as "Davajte zakončim!" (*Let's finish up!*) more than a quarter of the time, although the inclusion of the teacher in a directive is "never perceived as allowing H a 'choice' or the option of non-compliance" (Ibid: 141-142). There was an English preference for requesting through interrogative forms not seen in the Russia data, for example "Susie, can you tell us what today's date is?" (Ibid: 142-143). Mills stated that "the most plausible explanation for its absence in the Russian sets of instructional data stem from the fact that the indirect interrogative form might allow H an 'out' if s/he chooses not to comply." (Ibid: 142). Mills concluded that

> in comparison with the shared knowledge sets and metapragmatic information stored by typical American students from their U.S. classroom experience, the Russian university instructors in our study were, in fact, significantly more "direct" in their selection of linguistic forms to regulate classroom discourse with their American students.
>
> (Ibid)

However, the perceived 'dominant' voice of the female Russian teachers was influenced in varying degrees by "universally-accepted notions of women's 'nurturing' speech behavior;" this influence was affected not only by the individuality of the teacher but also by the "underlying cultural expectations encoded in the classroom 'script.'" (Ibid: 149).

---

[12] A Face-Threatening-Act

Unlike the studies of medical interactions, all of the studies on academic discourse outlined here clearly define and delimit the methodological approaches used to analyse the data. The authors of the first five studies discussed in this section explicitly discuss the institutionality of the contexts and its effect on the interactions at hand. Although the institutionality of each setting does not dominate any of the discussions (as it need not necessarily do), its importance is nevertheless discussed. The authors of the final four studies investigate gender (as relevant to the participants) and language in academic settings, and do so without making 'global' claims of gender differences.

2.4 Studies of Institutional Interaction and this Dissertation

As in all of the studies discussed in the literature review, the core data for this dissertation are comprised of recordings of authentic interactions in institutional settings. As well, many of the reviewed studies were carried out using a conversation analytic framework similar to this research, although some applied CA in complementarity to other (e.g., ethnographic) approaches. Still others were informed by discourse analysis, systemic functional linguistics, and sociolinguistics. Supplementary data, such as field notes and interviews, were also sometimes included in the analyses. For this research, supplementary data were also collected and used to inform the gender analysis in chapter 5 (but not for the analysis in chapter 4). Despite differences in approach, all of the studies, including this one, focus on interactions between participants of different institutional identities, such as nurse-patient, 911 operator-civilian caller, and teacher-student, or genders, such as single sex or mixed sex groups.

This dissertation will contribute to the studies of institutional interaction, in this case in an academic setting, that deal specifically with a Russian linguistic and social setting. To my knowledge only one study, by Margaret Mills (1999c; see above), has been published thus far that provides an analysis of teacher discourse

in classrooms in Russia; one other study, by Meskill and Anthony (2005), provides an analysis of online teaching strategies in a first-year Russian language classroom in the U.S.

This dissertation will also contribute to studies of language and gender in Russia. The study of Slavic gender linguistics has "only recently become a research focus for Russian and Western Slavic linguists."(Mills 1999b: vii). In 1993 a chapter on Russian gender linguistics by E.A. Zemskaja, M.V. Kitajgorodskaja and N.N. Rozanova was published by the Russian Language Institute of the Academy of Sciences (Zemskaja et al. 1993) (Mills 1999b: vii). Zemskaja had also been involved in the collection and analysis of "naturally occuring spoken Russian" since the early 1970s, contributing to studies of the codified literary language and colloquial Russian, the 'second literary language;' for example, Zemskaja (1973) and Zemskaja (1983) (Mills 1999b: viii). Russian gender studies have also been published in Austria and Germany, such as the collections of papers in van Leeuwen-Turnovcová et al. (2002) and in van Leeuwen- Turnovcová et al. (2003).

Igor' Sharonov contributed to Mills' book (1999) with a chapter titled "Speaker, gender, and the choice of 'communicatives' in contemporary Russian." He noted that "communicatives are immediately connected with the speaker and express both communicative intentions as well as indications of the speaker's mental and psychological state" (Sharonov 1999: 155). Sharonov found that there were instances of "male- or female-preferential tendencies" in the choice of communicatives; for example, the expression of indignation or dissatisfaction "Fi!" was used predominantly by women, the injerjection "Oj!" was used much more frequently by women and children, while the interjection "Ba!" was typically used by men (Ibid: 157-158). He also showed that male speakers sometimes used "female" communicatives such as "meždu nami, devočkami" (just between us, girls) to "turn the conversation to a more intimate level" (Ibid: 159). Key in his conclusion was that these tendencies of usage are not restricted: a

speaker can elect "to emply a communicative favored by the opposite sex" (Ibid: 162).

Lenore Grenoble contributed to Mills' book (1999) with a chapter titled "Gender and conversational management in Russian." She focused on "the exchange structure of conversation, or specifically how turn-transition points are negotiated between male and female speakers in Russian through an analysis of recorded spontaneous and elicited conversations" (Grenoble 1999: 113). She indicated that Russian women have a tendency to be "interactive conversationalists;" they use various methods such as tag questions and minimal responses either to involve the listener or to signal that they are listening (Ibid). She also indicated that men have a tendency to interrupt and overlap more frequently, and use "turn-taking strategies to manipulate the exchange structure and gain control of the floor" (Ibid: 114). She concluded that her findings supported the hypothesis that "women are more interactive conversationalists than men" (Ibid: 127).

Olga Yokoyama also contributed to Mills (1999) with a chapter titled "Gender linguistic analysis of Russian children's literature" (Yokoyama 1999b). She noted that recent research suggests that "most gender linguistic distinctions are learned, and not biological" (Ibid: 57). On this basis, Yokoyama studied "gender-specific language models that children might internalize ast they develop gender identification in a given culture" (Ibid). To do so, she examined several books for pre-school age readers (Ibid: 58). Yokoyama found gender-specific features, including four that had been described in Zemskaja et al. (1993), were represented in nursery-level books (Yokoyama 1999b: 63). For example, diminutives were used more frequently by female characters (Ibid: 63-64); boys were associated with boats, fishing, and military drums, etc., while girls were associated with booties, clothes, teddy bears, and rabbits, etc. (Ibid: 66-67); and the "nature of the girls' interaction with the world [was] rather passive, especially when compared with that of the boys" (Ibid: 66). In an upper-level pre-school text, Yokoyama noted that

> it is striking that the boys' names are built on individualizing intellectual, professional, social or personality-based qualities of the bearers, thereby attributing to each an unmistakable identity. Girls' names, on the other hand, are for the most part simply "cute": no particular individuality is discernible between, say, Daisy and Chamomile."
>
> (Ibid: 69)

Yokoyama concluded that gender-specific linguistic models are pervasive in pre-school age materials, and they "reveal remarkably traditional forms of male-female verbal behavior" (Ibid: 76-66). These studies illustrate that, as Margaret Mills notes, "gender linguistics has clearly begun to provide a wealth of new data, methodologies, and preliminary findings to scholars in the broader fields of Slavic linguistic, cultural, and literary studies" (1999b: vii).

To sum up, the results of this research will come from a fine-grained conversation analysis of the organisation of talk in the Russian classroom, and will provide the first point of comparison of Russian classroom interaction with the organisation of classroom interaction in other cultures and languages. The analysis will show (if and) how the interactants orient to institutional identities, here of instructor or student, which some reviewed studies fail to do. Also, the analysis will show if there are any gender differences in how the classroom interaction is organised. To my knowledge no other conversation analytic studies have been carried out on data collected in Russian institutional settings,[13] although researchers around the world have been studying discourse in a wide variety of institutional settings in other cultures.

---

[13] However, one CA study of Russian 'ordinary conversation' (Bolden 2004) has been published.

3 Methodology and Theoretical Framework

3.1 Methodology

The general design of my study included the four phases typical of CA research projects: recordings of natural interaction, transcriptions of the recordings, analysis of selected episodes, and reporting of the research (Ten Have 2000: 48).

3.1.1 Data Collection

To carry out this research, I spent four months at a private language school in the Urals region of Russia where I worked as an instructor of English. The school is dedicated to teaching English as a Second Language.[14] The students attend three times per week and pay monthly fees for the lessons. The town in which the school is located is quite poor; not many parents can afford to send their students so the classes are relatively small (four to ten students). Some of the students seem to love language-learning and display a keen desire to study English; others seem to be attending classes at their parents' insistence. To get into the nearest university as a state-funded student, they often must pass an English exam that is very competitive. For many young men specifically, attending university is the only way to avoid serving in the army. Therefore there are various motivations for these students to learn English. For the remainder of their education they attend local public schools.

The instructors of English as a Second Language were recruited as participants to allow access to videotape their lessons. Due to the limited number of classes available for the students in the target age range, this research was limited to six different classes. Five lessons for each class were videotaped, for a total of thirty recorded lessons. Each lesson lasted approximately 45 to 50 minutes.

---

[14] When the students enroll, they take a placement test to determine their level of English. The students can progress from first-year (beginner) through fifth-year (advanced) English classes at the school.

The goal of recording the lessons was to "catch 'natural interaction' as fully and faithfully as is practically possible," i.e., the interaction was not provoked or co-produced by the researcher (Ten Have 2000: 48). (As follows from the Observer's Paradox (Labov 1972), it is impossible to determine how the interaction might have been affected by my presence in the classroom.) The video camera was set up in the back corner of the room in order to focus on the instructor, and also to be less obtrusive to the students in the classroom. While visual aspects of interaction do not have the same degree of "neat turn-by-turn organization" that talk does, and while video cameras create a more obvious presence than audio recorders do,

> video recording provides a wealth of contextual information that may be extremely helpful in the analysis of interactional talk-as-such, especially in complex settings with more than a few speakers, like meetings of various sorts. (Ten Have 2000: 53)

They provide more visual information about the interactions (such as direction of gaze, body language, meaningful silences), as well as the layout of the classroom (such as seating arrangements). By videotaping the lessons, I was able to enrich my transcriptions with better identification of speakers, direction of the instructor's gaze, and descriptions of physical movement around the classroom and writing on the blackboard. To capture as much visual conduct as possible, it would have been ideal to have another camera facing the students. However, due to limited funding, and to make the recording less obtrusive for the participants, one video camera was used to record the interactions.

The basic requirement for carrying out CA research is recordings of talk-in-interaction, the "core data"; beyond that, the collection of other data[15] for analysis is a widely debated topic for CA, both from within the discipline and from outside (Ten Have 2000: 53). According to Ten Have, there is no fixed answer to this question; the use of additional data depends on the researcher's 'theoretical-

---

[15] Ten Have cites other common data sources in the social sciences, such as interview data and field notes (2000: 53-54).

methodological' outlook and the kinds of activities studied (Ibid: 60). For "pure CA," the analysis is based on the recorded talk and in most cases additional information is not required. (Ibid: 58). For "applied CA,"[16] background information may be needed if it helps the researcher understand what is going on (e.g., a bureaucratic form used during an interaction that may inform a questioning strategy) (Ibid: 59).

Primary 'core' recorded data as well as supplementary data on the participants of the study (such as copies of the students' public school report cards) were collected. The instructors also filled out forms answering questions about each student, such as their levels of physical and emotional maturity, and personality characteristics. The instructors were interviewed to gather information about their backgrounds and pedagogical training. A log of what occurred during the lessons was kept, and this was used to help select the lessons to transcribe. The initial analysis of CA structures in chapter 4 was based on the primary data alone. For the gender analysis in chapter 5, I employed a triangulation approach to analyse the various primary and supplementary data sources; the student questionnaires, interview data, and the primary data were all used in order to carry out a contrastive analysis (e.g., language use vs. interviews vs. questionnaires).

I had a strong member-level understanding of the interactions to inform the analysis; i.e., based on my experiences in classrooms in Russia I could interpret the interactions from an interactant's perspective (Ten Have 2000: 59-60). The classroom situation was also relatively routine and standardised, and it was not necessary to collect additional information on specific institutional procedures and protocols (Ibid: 58). Methodologically and theoretically, I support the use of ethnographically acquired knowledge to contribute to the researcher's ability to analyse the recorded data (Ibid: 66).

---

[16] A further discussion of pure and applied CA follows in section 3.2.

3.1.2 Subjects

The school had three instructors[17] of English, all of whom were female, and each of them participated in the study.[18] They are identified here as ST, BM, and PN. ST taught one of the classes, which will be identified as ST:1a. BM taught two of the classes, BM:2a and BM:2b. PN taught three of the classes, PN:3a, PN:3b, and PN:3c. Reference to the specific lessons will be indicated by numbers and letters; for example, the third recorded lesson for PN:3b will be PN:3b:3.

The instructors' language teaching methodologies were generally similar, although the delivery of the lessons varied somewhat according to the individual instructor. Much of the classroom interaction was based on the instructors' talk: to review covered material, to introduce new material, and to evaluate student turns (often in short question-answer sequences). In fact, the instructors mostly used questions and answers to engage the learners in talk. The instructors also used textbook exercises to guide the interactions, and held more "traditional" dictations and tests to gauge the students' progress. Students were graded according to their achievements, and were assigned homework (e.g., copying out vocabulary lists) on a regular basis. Despite these similarities, it was noticeable that 1) PN viewed her role as one of a more informal, caring, nurturing facilitator, 2) BM viewed her role as a formal pedagogue and strict disciplinarian, and 3) ST, who had herself been taught by PN, was trying to emulate PN's warm instructional style although with less confidence.

The students in the participant classes were mostly ten to twelve years old, although a few were thirteen and fourteen years old.[19] The students are identified using pseudonyms, never by their actual names. When the speaker is not

---

[17] The three teachers who participated in the study are identified here as "instructors" as only two of them had been trained and certified as teachers.

[18] The large majority of instructors in Russia are female; therefore the inclusion of female instructors only in this study is not out of line with the current pedagogical state in Russia.

[19] There were 6 ten-year-olds, 11 eleven-year-olds, 15 twelve-year-olds, 5 thirteen-year-olds, and 2 fourteen-year-olds in the study. One student's age was not provided, although he appeared to be approximately twelve years old.

identifiable, they are labelled as *girl* or *boy* not to make pre-judgements about gender being significant in the interaction, but rather as a simple naming mechanism since the use of past tense verbs in Russian distinguishes between male and female gender anyway; gender is identified as significant to the analysis only where the participants show it to be relevant at that moment.

All of the students attended local public schools as well as lessons at the private language school. All participants received an oral explanation of the study, after which both instructors and students filled out voluntary consent forms in order to participate in the study.[20] The forms outlined the purpose of the research and the time commitment required to participate; they also indicated that the participants would be video-recorded, the recordings would be used for research purposes, and the research findings would be published in part or in whole. The participants were also informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequence. All identifying details of the participants and school have been changed in the transcription of the data to protect the participants' anonymity. Also, as the researcher named on the form, I am the only person who has seen the videotaped lessons.

3.1.3 Transcription

Transcription is central to CA as it "captures the data" for analysis (Ten Have 2000: 6). The recorded lessons were transcribed using the symbols outlined in Paul Ten Have's *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide* (Ten Have 1999: 213-214) and in George Psathas' *Conversation Analysis: The Study of Talk in Interaction* (1995: 71-78). This system of transcription symbols was mostly developed by Gail Jefferson "to capture those phenomena relevant to the organization of conversation" (Ibid: 71). Jefferson was Harvey Sacks' 'data recovery technician,' but according to Ten Have later become "one of the most

---

[20] See Appendix D for the Russian and English versions of the Ethics Informed Consent Form.

important contributors to CA in her own right" (2000: 7). The CA transcription symbols distinguish such aspects of interaction as sequencing (overlaps, simultaneous or latched utterances), timed intervals both within and between utterances, characteristics of speech production (intonation, emphasis, pitch, cut-offs, volume), aspiration (audible inhalations and exhalations), verbal descriptions (e.g., coughs, laughs), and presentation conventions (numbered lines, ellipses, etc.) (Psathas 1995: 71-78). Using this system, the analyst can "visualize on paper the timeline of the interactional stream, and…place each participant's contribution in relation to those of others" (Ten Have 2000: 33). A timed interval - a pause - is given significance in the analysis when it is clear that the interactants themselves are orienting to it as potentially troublesome, i.e. the absence of an expected turn or action. In other words, what should happen next has been deemed by the interactant(s) as not having taken place. There is no general rule as to how long a pause must be before it can be seen as a troublesome turn; again, what is significant is how the interactant(s) interpret the pause as shown in the following turns. Because of CA's focus on the sequential analysis of interaction, the theory that what an utterance actually means depends on its position in relation to other utterances, Jefferson's system is highly suited to the task. That being said, it must be noted that transcripts are "unavoidably incomplete;"

> The purpose of a CA transcription is to make *what* was said and *how* it was said available for analytic consideration, at first for the analyst who does the transcribing, and later for others, colleagues and audiences. Transcribing recordings gives the analyst a 'feel' for what has been recorded.
>
> <div align="right">(Ten Have 2000: 33; his italics)</div>

For my research, not all of the distinctions identified by the symbols are relevant to the research questions at hand. However, I transcribed the data using as many distinctions as possible for two reasons: 1) to be able to investigate other research questions that were not part of the original proposal, but which may become of interest during analysis; and 2) to facilitate the use of the corpus by other researchers who may want to pose research questions of their own in future

research.

The linguistic transliteration used for transcription of the data was system III as laid out in the University of Alberta *Transliteration from Russian* for "scholarly studies in linguistics" (see Appendix A).

3.2 Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework employed for this research belongs mostly within the applied CA framework. Whereas pure CA is the study of interaction in its own right, applied CA is the study of how "interactions with an institutional purpose…are organized *as* institutional interactions" (Ten Have 2000: 162). This is not to say that pure and applied CA are divided by the study of 'ordinary conversation' and 'institutional interaction' respectively; pure CA is the study of any talk-in-interaction, whatever its context (Ibid). Within applied CA, there can be two different focuses: 1) the organisation of interaction in an institutional setting (turn-taking, distribution of speaking rights, etc.), and 2) "the specific institutional activities, the specific interactional situation, its local, interactional requirements, and especially the ways in which the interactants show their orientations to these situations and requirements" (Ibid: 8). My research falls within the first focus of applied CA above; I attempt to determine how the institutional nature of the classroom situation affects the organisation of the talk-in-interaction.

3.2.1 Sequential Organisation of Talk

To carry out the task defined above, I analyse the data in terms of the organisation of talk in the classroom, focusing on such aspects as turn-taking, sequence, and

repairs.[21] The sequential organisation of talk is key, as David Silverman notes, because

> when we speak we do far more complicated things than simply confirming assertions and / or emptying out the contents of our minds. Instead, it seems that what we say will be heard in terms of its position in this particular conversational 'space' – after a previous turn and in the light of a possible next turn.
>
> (1998: 8)

Therefore, speakers with member-level competency (i.e., those who have the language competence of a member of the speech community) are aware of the implications of their utterances. "By saying what we do, positioned in a particular place, we thus make available to our hearer(s) a particular *reading* of what we mean" (Ibid: 6). For this research the rules that inform such knowledge are investigated; it is important to note, however, that interactional behaviour "is *not* rule-governed but rule-guided. In this sense, you can do what you like but you will be held accountable for the implications of your actions" (Ibid: 35; his italics). What the interactants in a classroom say can be shown to reflect, at least at specific times, that they are orienting to the institutional setting, to the rules of interaction in the classroom. However, at some points in the interaction the institutional nature of the setting is not relevant and the interactants talk using rules of 'ordinary conversation.'

3.2.2 Context

While some critics claim that CA is mechanical and ignores context, context in actuality plays an integral part in CA analysis (Silverman 1998: 163). Interaction is never context-free; it is "always 'situated' – it always comes out of, and is part of, some real sets of circumstances of its participants" (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974: 699; quoted in Silverman 1998: 163). The location, the time, and

---

[21] Turn-taking is discussed in further detail in section 4.1.1, sequence organization in section 4.2.1, and repairs in section 4.3.1.

the identities of the participants, while "undoubtedly relevant to speakers," are only identified as significant in my analysis when it is clear that such contextual factors are demonstrably relevant to the participants themselves (Silverman 1998: 163). In other words, this concept of *relevance* demands that I demonstrate that the participants are currently oriented to the descriptions being used (Ibid: 164). In terms of other background information supplementing the core data, as I indicate above I agree with its usefulness when it enables the analyst to interpret the interaction with member-level competency.

In my analysis the demands of *procedural consequentiality* must also be met.

> How does the fact that the talk is being conducted in some setting (e.g. the hospital) issue in any consequence for the shape, form, trajectory, content or character of the interaction that the parties conduct? And what is the mechanism by which the context-so-understood has determinate consequences for the talk? (Schegloff 1992: 111)

To demonstrate the institutionality of the interactions recorded for this research, it must be shown not only that the interaction occurred in a classroom, but also that the classroom setting constrained or affected the talk in some way. Silverman highlights two key points for the analysis of institutionality:

> 1) The turn-taking system for conversation is 'the basic form of speech-exchange system' [Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974: 730). As such, it is to be treated as the baseline for *any* interaction.
>
> 2) Institutionality arises through how the parties adapt or modify this system.
> (Silverman 1998: 165-166; his italics)

Drew and Heritage (1992) identified three dimensions through which talk can be institutional: 1) being goal-oriented to meet institutional functions, 2) being constrained by what can be done (e.g. in a courtroom), and 3) being "associated with particular ways of reasoning or inferencing" (Silverman 1998: 166-167). We

find these three institutional dimensions in formal classroom settings. The interaction can have abstract goals such as the imparting of knowledge to the students, and the successful uptake of this knowledge. There are also specific goals such as completing an exercise, reviewing a lesson, and so on. The interaction will be constrained, for example, in terms of who can speak, when they can speak, and about what. The instructor is the disciplinarian in the interaction, and has more control over the talk than any particular interactant would have in a non-institutional 'everyday' conversation. These examples are all associated with particular ways of reasoning about education and learning, that the instructor has the knowledge and the control, the way it *should be* in a formal classroom setting with children.

3.2.3 Data Selection

In CA studies, the selection of data for analysis is unencumbered by weighty theoretical and methodological choices.

> The nice message for novice researchers is that, in a sense, they will find evidence of social order wherever they look. As Sacks puts it: 'given the possibility that there is overwhelming order, it would be extremely hard *not* to find it, no matter how and where we looked' [Sacks 1984: 23]
>
> (Silverman 1998: 59)

In other words, no matter what naturally-occurring interaction is studied, the data are utilisable for CA research. Some CA researchers begin with a collection of data that they systematically analyse; other researchers look for moments of special interest, such as examples of contrasting usage, to analyse (Ten Have 2000: 40). For this research, in essence, these two approaches were combined. A corpus of data was built by recording and transcribing interactions in an institutional setting, here lessons in a language school. For the transcription, a log of the lessons recorded was consulted in order to choose those that had been noted at the time as being especially interesting. Finally the data of all transcribed

lessons was analysed, looking closely at sequential organisation, turn-taking, and repairs. The process of selecting excerpts to be included in chapter 4 was mostly based on the "noticing" of certain features. I scanned through the transcripts and chose instances that were representative of the aspect of interaction under discussion, and that were also from a variety of instructors and classes. For chapter 5, however, the entire transcripts were analysed for gender differences,[22] and the excerpts included here were selected as representational of those differences.

3.2.4 Gender

Binary conceptions of gender have been a contentious issue in recent studies of language and gender; as Sauntson notes, researchers emphasise that it is impossible to generalise behaviours based on a dichotomy of women/girls and men/boys (Sauntson 2007: 306). Research, therefore, has shifted focus from 'global' to 'localised' analyses of male and female speech styles (Schleef 2008: 515). For this research I perform a localised analysis of the data. I discuss the participating instructors' gender perspectives to determine if *they* 'pre-categorise' boys and girls in terms of their abilities and classroom behaviours, perspectives which would potentially inform their linguistic choices. I also analyse the primary language data, specifically looking at how (and how frequently) the instructors and students use the 'universal' structures of talk available to them, to determine if there are gender differences for these participants in this context. I also attempt to show how gender is relevant to the participants, whether implicitly or explicitly.

Therefore, the aim of this analysis is to show whether or not gender-based differences are "achieved at a micro-level, by making reference to specific linguistic features" (Sauntson 2007: 322); in other words, any 'local' gender

---

[22] With the exception of the gender analysis of incorrect question - answer sequences, for which only the excerpts already analysed in section 4 were chosen.

differences in the turn-by-turn organisation of talk are discovered through a detailed CA analysis. However, the results are *not* overgeneralised as 'typical' of one gender in general and claims are not made as to the 'global' significance of any gender-based differences (Davies 2003: 117; Sauntson 2007: 322).

3.3 Discussion of CA Methodology

In this section I discuss the advantages and disadvantages of the CA methodology. As noted in the introduction, CA has arguably been the most prevalent approach in the study of institutional discourse. Principally due to the work carried out in Conversation Analysis, one of the most significant developments in the field of institutional talk has been the recognition of the key importance of sequential characteristics in particular institutional settings (Drew and Sorjonen 1997: 96). In fact, the development of CA itself has never exclusively focused on ordinary conversation, as data from institutional contexts have also been important in pioneering work in CA (e.g., Gail Jefferson's group therapy data, Emanuel Schegloff's work on calls to a police department) (Drew and Heritage 1992: 60). Drew and Heritage, who published a volume of institutional studies that had all been carried out in the conversation analytic framework (1992), claim "there is nothing about the perspective and techniques associated with the sequential analysis of ordinary conversation which is inimical to the analysis of institutional talk" (Ibid: 4).

One of the main assumptions in CA is that ordinary conversation serves as the benchmark against which other more formal or 'institutional' types of talk are recognised and experienced (Drew and Heritage 1992:19). "The analysis of the communicative texture of institutional interaction depends on the distinction between ordinary talk and institutional occasions, so that we can single out the institutional relevancies in contrast to the expectancies prevailing in ordinary, everyday interaction" (Arminen 2000: 441). Explicit with this view is that

institutional interaction will vary from ordinary conversation. Although CA claims to lack the presuppositions it finds so disdainful in sociology, Michael Billig finds the treatment of ordinary conversation as the 'bedrock' for other forms of talk to carry sociological presumptions of its own. Ordinary conversation is implicitly depicted as a world of equality and participation while institutional talk, marked by restrictions, is a world of inequality (1999: 552). Therefore, Billig concludes that CA's foundational rhetoric is based on a social presupposition. This argument may be circular, however, as rigorous CA studies of interactional data have repeatedly shown differences between ordinary conversation and institutional talk, and so such rhetoric in CA could also be seen to be based on data and not any presuppositions. The solution then is for each analyst to look at their data with a fresh eye and not mechanically apply concepts of 'ordinary conversation' versus 'institutional talk.'

Hester and Francis question the analysis of the formal properties of talk alone as a method for determining the institutional nature of an interaction (2000: 394). CA claims that institutional talk is comprised of distinctive sequential structures, and that 1) such sequential forms are institutionally specific adaptations of the turn-taking organisation of ordinary conversation, and 2) the distinctive forms of the turn-taking organisation are constitutive of the recognizable "institutionality" of the conduct (Ibid: 401-402). However, distinctive "institutional" sequences are found in ordinary conversation as well. For example, Maynard found that 'bad news delivery' in ordinary conversation has the same three-part sequential structure as it does in clinical environments (Ibid: 403). The asymmetry of participation noted in interviews is also not limited to institutional talk alone. Such asymmetry is also found in storytelling in ordinary conversation, "especially those occasions in which one participant tells an *invited story* at the behest of another" (Ibid; their italics). Hester and Francis conclude, "if the formal structures identified in institutional talk studies are not distinctive, they alone cannot provide for the recognizable production of 'institutional talk'" (Ibid).

> Whilst a focus on sequential ordering alone has produced the achievements of conversation analysis, such a focus will not allow the 'institutional' analysts to adequately explicate the in situ social organization of 'institutional' talk and activities. (Ibid: 408)

Hence we find a potential problem at the very heart of the conversation analytic approach to institutional discourse. Studying sequences of conversation to understand characteristics of talk is a justifiable and valid claim of conversation analysis, which is not disputed by Hester and Francis. I would also argue, however, that studying sequences of conversation *can* determine the institutionality of talk when they are analysed in terms of Drew and Heritage's 'three dimensions' (see below). The analyst can determine if the sequences with similar structures are *ordinary* (e.g., bad news delivery in everyday life, a story) or *institutional* (bad news delivery in a clinical setting, an interview). The three dimensions as noted in section 3.2.2 are: 1) being goal-oriented to meet institutional functions, 2) being constrained by what can be done (e.g. in a courtroom), and 3) being associated with institutional ways of reasoning. Therefore, what the sequence is trying to do, what action it is serving, is key. If the sequence under question is seen to meet one of these dimensions, then it can be considered institutional. If the sequence does not meet any of these dimensions, if its actions do not serve institutional goals, then it can be considered ordinary conversation.

Next we turn to CA's treatment of data, both as collected and as transcribed for analysis. There are four main reasons why conversation analysts prefer to work from recordings of conduct, all of which contribute to the reliability and validity of the findings.

1) Certain features of the details of actions in interaction are not recoverable in any other way.

2) A recording makes it possible to play and replay the interaction, which is important both for transcribing and for developing an analysis.

66

3) A recording makes it possible to check a particular analysis against the materials, in all their detail, that were used to produce the analysis.

4) A recording makes it possible to return to an interaction with new analytic interests.

(Pomerantz and Fehr 1997: 70)

By working with tapes and transcripts, the researcher avoids the problems of working with potentially inaccurate field notes and limited public access to the data (Perakyla 1997: 203, quoted in Hak 1999: 443). CA also prefers the use of video recordings, allowing for the most complete review of both verbal and visual conduct (Pomerantz and Fehr 1997: 70). There are, however, some (perhaps unavoidable) methodological pitfalls to the use of recorded data. The presence of the researcher and/or the recording device may affect the conduct of those under observation (the Observer's Paradox) (Ibid). Tony Hak also cautions for the need for "inclusiveness of data." He suggests that the analyst should tape more rather than less, tape many successive encounters, tape with multiple cameras, and should collect documents that are used by the participants during the observed interactions (Hak 1999: 443-444). Such extra data help make sense of the taped interactions. While these suggestions are methodologically sound, they lead to potential difficulties in the study of institutional discourse. Sarangi and Roberts warn that observing the everyday, behind-the-scenes practices in institutional settings may be much more threatening for those working there than observing them in the more formal, 'frontstage' encounters (Sarangi and Roberts 1999a: 23). The participants may question the motive of the outside researcher in wanting to observe them. The researcher will need to address issues of ethics, confidentiality, and the degree of the observer effect that she is bound to have on the naturally-occurring events being observed (Ibid: 19). For example, collecting documents used during the taping may be extremely difficult, considering the confidentiality needs of certain institutions (e.g., police departments, law offices). Therefore, the choice of data sites is crucial. Despite the issues involved with taping interactions, the benefits outweigh the disadvantages of using recorded data.

The transcription method used in CA, as noted above, attempts to get everything down on paper. Because of this desire to capture all aspects involved in carrying on a conversation, this technique differs from the classical transcription techniques of linguistics (Mey 1993: 216). For example, laughter is included in CA transcriptions. Although not usually considered a linguistic phenomenon, laughter often plays an extremely important role in conversation (Ibid). Such transcription practices are beneficial for the study of any conversation, whether institutional or not, as they capture *all* aspects of the talk; at that point it is the job of the analyst to determine which of those aspects are more relevant for the participants than others, and what role they play in the interaction.[23]

CA's approach to context and the concept of relevance is a rich source for debate for the study of institutional interaction. One the one hand, Schegloff developed his concept of relevance to ensure that the institutionality of talk can be translated into empirically warranted findings (Drew and Heritage 1992: 20). "Given that mere 'factual correctness' cannot motivate the analytic use of one particular description over another, the analyst is faced with the task of finding some other warrant for some specific description of the parties" (Ibid). In other words, the analyst needs to show which aspects of the context are demonstrably relevant to the participants themselves, and do so with empirical observations (Ibid). For institutional talk, this means that the analyst needs to show that the participants' actions are oriented to specifically institutional roles and identities (Ibid). This is not an easy task, however, and not all CA studies will achieve this degree of relevance. The difficulty of showing the relevance of contextual features is made trickier by CA's elaborate and complex analysis of context. As each utterance is context-shaped and context-renewing, CA researchers cannot take context for granted or treat it as pre-determined and independent of the participants' activities (Ibid: 21). "'Context' and identity have to be treated as inherently locally

---

[23] CA transcripts have, of course, been criticised by linguists for orthographically representing phonetic details such as rapid speech, voicing and so on. This criticism does not directly affect the study of institutional discourse; rather it is in ideological disagreement between two approaches to discourse.

produced, incrementally developed, and, by extension, transformable at any moment" (Ibid). Therefore, the demonstration of institutionality needs to be shown turn-by-turn. Showing this detailed, turn-by-turn orientation to the institutionality of the interaction is a difficult task, but by doing so the analyst ensures a thorough analysis of the data in its context-shaped and context-renewing position.

Although CA's approach to context is clearly articulated and defined while other approaches work with unstated, loose definitions, perhaps it is too limiting. Jacob Mey states that the social aspects of context have no place to fit in CA's framework, a weakness of the approach. Focused only on the portion of text that more or less immediately surrounds a sentence, CA is a "minimalist approach, which allows only so much hypothesising as is strictly required to explain the phenomena at hand" (Mey 1993: 185). Sarangi and Roberts, discussing context in mediation studies, see CA's treatment of context in a different light. "Turn-by-turn sequential analysis of institutional talk may be seen as lacking in a discussion of the wider context surrounding mediation practices in a given sociopolitical setting" but they feel this is what is regarded as the strength of conversation analytic work, ignoring wider context presuppositions unless they are demonstrably relevant in the text (1999a: 45). Through focusing on a close analysis of the talk at hand, the minute details actually reveal the greater social order to which the participants are orienting; CA is not the minimalist approach that Mey claims it to be.

The final aspect of conversation analytic studies to be considered here is the role of the analyst. As noted above, the analyst may not necessarily have sufficient knowledge about the institution under investigation to determine what relevance the activities hold for the participants themselves. What analysts find interesting or noticeable also depends on their own knowledge, expectations, and interests; however, drawing upon these resources is necessary to develop analyses (Pomerantz and Fehr 1997: 71). The analyst must simply be aware that their

interpretation is only one alternative among many. Schegloff claims that, "most students of interactional data readily acquire an intuitive sense of the particular social identities or attributes (e.g. gender, ethnicity, status, occupational role, power, etc.) which the parties treat as significant in the course of their interaction" (quoted in Drew and Heritage 1992: 20). While there are methodological and theoretical debates involved in applying CA to the study of institutional discourse, as discussed above, CA remains the most appropriate framework for that study in the opinion of many researchers. For these researchers, myself included, the advantages outweigh the disadvantages; we must simply be aware of the shortcomings of CA.

4 Analysis of Data: Applied CA

In this chapter, I present the results of my analysis. There are three main sections: turn-taking, sequential organisation, and repair organisation. As part of the analysis I will also address the institutionality of the interactions. I introduce each section with specific CA theory on the concepts, which will be compared to the findings in the analysis sections.

4.1 Turn-taking

4.1.1 Theory

As noted in section 3.2.2, Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) indicate that the turn-taking system for conversation is the basic form of speech-exchange system. As such, "'turn-taking' as an organised activity is one of the core ideas of the CA enterprise" (Ten Have 2000: 111). Sacks described some of the general features of turn-taking throughout his lectures (1992).

> As Sacks has observed, the basic fact about 'conversation' is that, overwhelmingly, there is one and only one person speaking at a time, while speaker change recurs with minimal gap and minimal overlap. This 'fact' is seen as a continuous achievement of the parties to the conversation, which they accomplish on a turn-by-turn basis, or, more precisely, at any 'transition relevance place', at the end of any 'turn constructional unit' (TCU).
>
> (Ten Have 2000: 111)

Interactants display, or listen for, features of conversation that indicate that the current speaker's turn is coming to an end and speaker change can occur (Sacks 1992: 33; as referred to in Silverman 1998: 104). Sometimes the end of a turn can be obvious, for example a question, but listeners can also inspect pauses to determine if they are:

1) A pause within a turn (the current speaker's pause);

2) A pause between turns (a possible turn-transition point);

3) 'Their pause' (because they have been nominated as next speaker)

(Silverman 1998: 104)

The selection of next speaker can occur in various ways: the current speaker can select the next speaker; the current speaker can select a next action, for example ask a question and therefore require an answer from a next speaker; or the next speaker can self-select him- or herself (Ibid: 104-105). These three ways speaker change can occur are also sequentially ordered. "(2) only applies if (1) does not occur. And (3) can happen only if (1) and (2) are absent." (Ibid: 105). This system repeats itself at every possible completion point, making the turn-taking system locally and interactionally managed by the interactants (Ten Have 2000: 111). I note again that these rules of interaction are guidelines for interactional behaviour, not hard and fast laws of conversation.[24]

When there are glitches in speaker change, such as an overlap of speech, "the rule is that the first speaker is allowed to continue" (Ibid: 104). In a traditional classroom setting, however, the rules of speaker change are more constrained; for example, "when a teacher has asked a question, students simply raise their hands and the teacher selects one of them to be the next speaker" (Ibid). The teacher can also simply select the next speaker without any indication on the student's part that they want to answer the question.

---

[24] See section 4.4.1 for an illustration of the typical sequences of turn transition (i.e., speaker change) in the classroom.

4.1.2 Analysis

The first segment for analysis is from the beginning of a lesson taught by PN. There are eight students in attendance, and the topic of this excerpt is how to ask, and respond to, the question "how are you?" The method of interaction is primarily question - answer sequences led by the instructor.

Excerpt 1. PN.3b.3

1	PN:	Please sit down. (0.5) Rebjat, každyj urok my s vami načinaem s
		Please sit down. (0.5) Children, every lesson we begin with the
2		voprosom kak dela, kak poživaeš'. (.) Da ved'? Uh davajte
		question how are things, how are you. (.) Right? Uh let's
3		vspomnim kak po anglijski možno zadat' ètot vopros, kak dela?,
		recall how in English you can pose the question, how are things?,
4		kak požyvaeš', Sue.
		how are you? Sue. ((Svetlana))
5	Svetlana:	How are the things?
6	PN:	How are the things možno. Boris, eščë kak možno?
		How are the things is possible. Boris, how else can you answer?
7	Boris:	How are you?
8	PN:	How are you:, možno. Elena?
		How are you;, yes. Elena?
9	Elena:	How are you doing?
10	PN:	How are you doing. I na vse vot èti voprosy my možem otvetit' (.)
		How are you doing. And to all these questions we can answer (.)
11		okay, kak eščë možno otvetit' esli vsë xorošo?
		okay, how else can we answer if everything is good?
12		((several students speak at once))
13	Boris:	Thank you, fine.
14	PN:	Fine?,
15		((several students speak at once))
16	Svetlana:	All right
17	Boris:	All right, I am fine
18	PN:	Fine, èto odno i to že okay. Fine, eščë kakie slova vy znaete?
		Fine, that's the same as okay. Fine, what other words do you know?
19		((several students speak at once))
20		((PN waves hand to stop the students))
21		Esli <u>vsë xorošo:</u>, esli vsë xorošo.
		If <u>everything is good</u>;, if everything is good
22	Svetlana:	All right
23	PN:	Alri:ght. Xorošo, eščë čto?
		Alri:ght. Good, what else?
24		(0.5)

25	PN:	[Okay,] all right, (.) [fine]
26	Sergej:	[so so] [so so]
27	PN:	Èto esli vsë xorošo, ja govorju, vsë xorošo.
		That's if everything is good, I'm saying, if everything is good.
28		(1.0)
29	PN:	[[Možno]]
		[[It is possible]]
30	Ivan:	[[I am]] bad
31	PN:	M- net, esli vsë xorošo. (.)
		M- no, if everything is good. (.)
32		((listing the answers already given))
33		Okay, all right, fine, (.)
34		možno skazat' very well, da? očen' xorošo. Very well. A esli ne očen'
		you can say very well, right? Very well. Very well. And if things aren't
35		dela idut, Serëža?
		going very well, Serëža? ((Sergej))
36	Ivan:	Very bad=
37	Sergej:	=so-so
38	PN:	So-so, all right. (.) Esli ploxo dela idut ((looks at Ivan)) [Ivan?]
		So-so, all right. (.) If things are going badly [Ivan?]
39	Ivan:	[Bad]
40	Sergej:	Bad
41	PN:	Bad.
42	Igor':	Bad
43	PN:	Nu čto, davajte my sejčas uh drug drugu zadadim vot ètot vopros. Uh
		Well then, now let's pose this question to each other. Uh
44		požalujsta, vy možete upotrebljat' ljuboj vopros kak vam nravitsja, ili
		please, you can use any form of the question that you like, either
45		how are you?, ili how are the things?, ili how are you doing. Ljuboj
		how are you?, or how are the things?, or how are you doing. Any
46		vopros.
		question.
47		(0.5)
48		((Irina raises her hand))
49		Well Irina, how are you doing?

PN starts the class with a review of asking how someone is, both the possible questions and answers.[25] If we recall the turn-taking rules of one-speaker at a time, no gaps, and no overlaps, in this short segment we see instances of speaker selection, several gaps, and three overlaps. I will go through each in detail below to exemplify the transcriptions and conventions used.

---

[25] For convenience, and to avoid confusion with the Russian "a" (meaning "and"), tokens such as the schwa in line 2 are transcribed as "uh," rather than given in Russian transliteration.

PN calls the class to order by telling the students to sit down (line 1). In this way she indicates she is orienting to the institutional context of the classroom. One of the main goals, the function, of a school is to impart subject matter knowledge from the instructor to the students. In traditional classrooms as this, students sit at their desks and the instructor at the front of the room has control of the turn-taking system, especially at the beginning of the lesson. (Depending on the activity, however, the instructor can choose to give up this control while maintaining the right to reclaim it at any time.) PN's utterance here is a command, using the imperative. Despite the use of *please*, the students do not have a choice whether to sit down or not. In ordinary conversation, on the other hand, a speaker might say "please have a seat" as an invitation, or offer of comfort, to the recipient. In such a case, even if the speaker used the same phrase "please sit down," it is not a command; the recipient could refuse such an invitation.

There is a 0.5 second pause after PN has told the students to sit down (line 1). This can be seen as a pause belonging to PN. Again, in a classroom setting the instructor has control of the first turn and until they indicate a change in speaker selection, they have the floor. In an informal setting, any speaker could self-select during such a pause - to offer an acceptance or refusal to the suggestion to sit down. Because none of the students self-select as next speaker during this gap, and by sitting down, they are also showing their orientations to the classroom setting. This acceptance allows PN to begin the lesson with a review.

In later lines (24, 28, 47) the pauses belong to the students. In line 23, as current speaker, PN has selected the next action: by asking a question she requires an answer from a next speaker. Here she has posed a question to the entire class, asking for more ways to answer "well" to the question "how are you?" She does not select the required next speaker, therefore giving the students the opportunity to self-select. In line 24, there is a 0.5 second pause that belongs to the students collectively; none of them self-selects even though PN has nominated someone to do so (thereby signalling a required speaker change).

In lines 25 and 26, however, we see an overlap between PN (25), listing the answers already given, and Sergej (26), self-selecting to answer the question from PN's previous turn in line 23. There are several actions occurring in these overlapping turns. PN is resuming her turn because no one had self-selected in the 0.5 second gap. She lists the previous answers so that the students are reminded of what has been said, and therefore is seen as encouraging them to provide new responses. Listing the responses is more than just encouragement, however; PN is again requiring an answer, the next action, to her question posed in line 23. As an instructor in a classroom setting, she can repeatedly require an answer until she gets one. Sergej overlaps her turn twice by providing the answer "so so" in line 26. With the overlaps, Sergej is in effect showing his institutional orientation as well. He is not trying to overlap PN's talk, but rather he is showing his understanding that PN, as instructor, requires an answer of the students. When none of his classmates self-selects for the required answer, Sergej sees the pause as 'theirs' and answers, resulting in the first overlap. PN continues her turn; as instructor she exercises her control of turn-taking. There is a small pause in the list, at which point Sergej provides his answer again, resulting in the second overlap.

In line 27 PN acknowledges Sergej's answer but indicates that it is wrong by emphasising she is looking for answers that mean "well." Again, PN is requiring an answer to her question from line 23. In line 28 there is a 1.0 second pause, again the students', as none of them self-selects. PN waits longer this time before selecting herself as next speaker, in this case not to require an answer of the students but to provide one for them in its absence, by starting to say "you can say" (literally "it is possible"). In line 30 we see that Ivan overlaps with PN. Similar to Sergej, he recognises that a student is required to provide an answer to the instructor's question, and answers "I am bad." In this overlap, PN stops and allows Ivan to finish his utterance. Although as instructor she can retain control of the overlapped turn, here she allows the action (an answer) that she has been requiring over multiple turns to take precedence.

Lastly, I turn to other examples of speaker selection from this short excerpt. At the beginning of the excerpt, also the beginning of the class, the turn-taking is controlled by the instructor's speaker selection. PN is establishing that she has this control before she allows any self-selection. When she starts reviewing possible ways to ask "how are you?" PN directs her questions to specific students: to Svetlana (here addressed as Sue[26]) in line 4, Boris in line 6, and Elena in line 8. The students also show orientation to PN's control of turns. Those addressed take turns, and those not addressed do not speak. In line 11, however, PN asks the entire class (by not selecting next speaker) for possible answers to the various "how are you?" questions, and several students speak at once in overlapping turns (12). In line 13, when the class is quiet again, Boris self-selects and provides the answer "thank you, fine." In line 14, PN repeats Boris' answer "fine" with a continuing intonation, indicating she requires other answers and a student should self-select as next speaker. In line 15, several students again speak at once. Svetlana self-selects in the next line and says "All right." The turn-taking continues, and in line 19 several students again overlap each other's turns. To regain control, PN waves her hand to stop the students and in a louder tone indicates she only wants answers that mean, "everything is well." (By this utterance I believe that students are likely calling out all possible answers, for example "bad," in their overlapped turns.)

In lines 34 and 35 PN changes the line of questioning to ask for answers that mean "not very well." As we saw above, Sergej had provided the wrong answer "so so" in line 26. Because his answer would be correct in this context, PN resumes control of speaker selection (not used since line 8), and poses the question to him (35). In line 36, however, Ivan ignores PN's speaker selection and self-selects. Sergej latches on to the end of Ivan's utterance and takes control of the turn he rightfully owns. In line 38 PN acknowledges the correctness of Sergej's turn and only then selects Ivan as next speaker, first by gaze and then

---

[26] The instructors sometimes use English names in place of the students' Russian names, here Sue for Svetlana; in such instances the name is not transliterated as Russian but is given with the standard English spelling.

verbally. Ivan correctly interprets the gaze directed at him as speaker selection, and his turn overlaps with PN's verbal selection of him as next speaker.

After they have reviewed the "how are you?" questions and answers, PN states that the students will now practice by posing them to one another in any form of the question (43 to 46). In line 47 there is a 1.0 second pause. This pause belongs to the students as PN is waiting for a volunteer to self-select; if she had wanted to start off the questioning with a specific speaker, PN would have selected one. Irina raises her hand to indicate her willingness to answer (48), and PN poses the first question to her[27]: "Well Irina, how are you doing?" (49). In line 48 Irina has shown she is oriented to the classroom setting by raising her hand rather than speaking. In ordinary conversation, speakers do not usually raise their hands to indicate they will answer a question.

In this short excerpt I have closely analysed many examples of the turn-taking system at work: gaps, speaker selection, and overlaps. I have also shown how at various points in the excerpt the participants are oriented to the institutional nature of the classroom setting. See section 4.4 for a general discussion. In the following excerpt I turn to an example from one of BM's lessons.

Excerpt 2 (BM.2b.2)
In this excerpt from one of BM's lessons, there are nine students present. BM has just told the class to open their textbooks for an oral exercise. The topic of the current lesson is dates and holidays, and the students have been practicing ordinal numbers and months. This textbook exercise entails correctly matching two columns, one of dates and one of holidays, to create a sentence. When selected by the instructor, each student produces a sentence from the exercise. I begin here

---

[27] It is common for PN to pose the initial question in round-the-room questioning practice in her lessons.

Excerpt 2. BM.2b.2

1	BM:	Well, let's start. Načinaem my po levoj kolonke, da?, (.) to est' snačala
		Well, let's start. We begin with the left column, yes?, (.) that is first you
2		iz levoj kolonke čitaem, potom uže iz pravoj?, (0.3) Tak podbiraetsja.
		read from the left column, and then from the right?, (0.3) That's how
		it is selected.
3		Ponjatno?
		Understood?
4		((Anatolij raises hand.))
5		To est' načinaem s daty. Anthony begin please.
		That is we start with the date. Anthony ((Anatolij)) begin please.
6	Anatolij:	The first of January (0.3) is (0.3) Christmas in Russia.
7	BM:	<u>No:::!</u> ((animatedly, as if he has made a huge mistake))
8		No:, you are wrong. Denis.
9	Denis:	Ah, the first of January is the new year.
10	BM:	((looks at Anatolij))
11		<u>The new year!</u> Pervoe janvarja èto že novyj god.
		<u>The new year!</u> The first of January is New Year's.
12		Well, (0.5) ((wags finger))
13		prazdniki- bud' prazdnikami vnimatel'nee Tolja.
		holidays- be more careful about holidays Tolja. ((Anatolij))
14		Lika dal'še.
		Lika ((Anželika)) next.
15		*(1.0)*
16	Anželika:	The twenty fifth of December is (1.0)
17	Denis:	((whispers)) °°Christmas°°
18	BM:	Christmas?,
19	Anželika:	Christmas
20	Denis:	((whispers)) °°( )°°
21	BM:	PERESTAN'!
		STOP!
22		(2.0) ((looks at Denis to make sure he is being quiet))
23	Anželika:	Christmas (1.5) in England.
24	BM:	Yes. Well?,
25		(0.5) ((looks around))
26		uh, (.) Tanja? ((Tat'jana))
27	Tat'jana:	M, (.) the first of May is um, (1.0) the (3.0) the w- (.) the walk's day
28	BM:	<u>workers'</u>
29	Tat'jana:	workers' day.
30	BM:	The workers' day. <u>Walk</u>, èto guljat', a <u>worker</u>?, (.) rabočij. (0.3)
		The workers' day. <u>Walk</u>, that's to walk, a <u>worker</u>?, (.) a worker (0.3)
31		Well, Toni?, ((Antonina))
32		(2.0)
33	Antonina:	The first (of June) (2.0)
34		((BM nods))
35	BM:	Eščë raz. (Toni) <u>Ju:ne</u> da?, mesjac èto u nas.
		One more time. (Toni) <u>Ju:ne</u> yes?, that's a month we have.
36	Antonina:	The first of (0.5)
37	BM:	<u>of [June,</u>

38	Antonina:	[of June is (0.3) the children's deh.
39	BM:	<u>day:</u>.
40	Antonina:	day.
41	BM:	The children's day. Egor?
42		(0.4)
43	Egor:	Th[e
44	BM:	[Kak čitaetsja èto slovo?
		[How is this word pronounced?
45	Egor:	The first of September is the (.) first day (0.3) of school.
46	BM:	Of school. Yes. (0.1) Olja? ((Ol'ga))
47	Ol'ga:	The first
48	BM:	Th- č<u>to::</u>?
		Th- <u>wha::t</u>?
49	Ol'ga:	The (0.5) seven? ith
50	BM:	<u>The seventh</u>
51	Ol'ga:	of my-
52		(0.5) ((BM grimaces))
53	Ol'ga:	January (1.0) the-
54	BM:	<u>is</u>
55		(1.0)
56	Ol'ga:	is?
57	BM:	is propuščennyj prosto, <u>is:</u>? čto,
		is is simply missing, <u>is:</u>? what,
58		(0.5)
59		OLJA!
60	Ol'ga:	is (2.0)
61	Tat'jana:	( )
62	BM:	((to Tat'jana)) Ty za neë učiš'sja? čto li?, (0.3) ili za sebja! (4.0)
		((to Tat'jana)) Are you studying for her or something? (0.3) Or for yourself! (4.0)
63		((to Ol'ga)) <u>Christ</u>mas.
64	Ol'ga:	Christmas in (0.5) Russia.

with some analysis of the institutionality of the interaction before turning to the turn-taking system. In lines 1 through 3, BM indicates she is orienting to her institutional identity as instructor, here by explaining the exercise to the students. As noted above, the goal of the lesson is reviewing and practicing dates and holidays, and by initiating this exercise BM is orienting to that goal (and also to the greater goal of learning). The use of the textbook, as a traditional institutional working aid, by instructor and students shows an orientation to the classroom task. BM is also asserting her control of the overall structure of the lesson, the organisation of the interaction according to lesson plan, by calling on the students to open their books to this page at this time (just prior to this excerpt), and then to

do the exercise. In line 4 Anatolij raises his hand, indicating he would like to go first for the exercise, and by doing so he acknowledges BM's role as instructor and his own as student.

Throughout the excerpt BM orients to the goals of language learning, as instructor imparting knowledge to the students. On several occasions she corrects student pronunciation, for example "worker" not "walk" (28) and "day" not "deh" (39).[28] In line 35 BM tells Antonina to repeat herself, emphasising the proper pronunciation of June, and over several turns (33-41) works with Antonina until she has correctly pronounced all of the words in "The first of June is the children's day." Antonina's repetitions in lines 36, 38 and 40 all indicate her institutional orientation: as a student of this class her goal is to learn to speak English, and so when the instructor corrects her to help her achieve this goal, she acts on the corrections. In line 44 BM again refers to pronunciation. When it is Egor's turn to read the next example from the textbook exercise, BM asks him how one of the words is pronounced. She is not asking him because she herself does not know the answer, but to confirm that he knows the correct pronunciation. As the instructor she is evaluating the students' abilities in English. Another example of evaluation is found in lines 7 and 8 and 10 through 13. BM animatedly and bluntly tells Anatolij he is wrong (7-8) when he says "The first of January is Christmas in Russia" (6). After Denis has correctly responded that January first is New Year's (9), BM addresses Anatolij again (10-13) emphasising the correct answer and telling him to learn the holidays better (literally "be more careful/attentive").

In other parts of the excerpt we see BM addressing improper classroom behaviour from the students. What can be done in a traditional Russian classroom setting is constrained, and by addressing the improper behaviour BM is orienting to her role

---

[28] The students produce the correct pronunciation in next turn, here in lines 29 and 40 respectively. These student repairs, as in other instances throughout this study, may be seen simultaneously as "echoes." Echoes may also occur when another student repeats the answer provided by a classmate, or by the instructor.

as instructor, and therefore disciplinarian. Instructors are at times required to be disciplinarians to maintain order, to give each student the chance to learn on their own. In line 17 Denis whispers the correct answer to Anželika when she pauses in her turn, and then he whispers something inaudible in line 20 when she has yet to complete her answer. In line 21 BM shouts at Denis to stop whispering, and looks at him for 2.0 seconds to make sure he is done interfering (22). Denis is reprimanded for self-selecting as next speaker while it is another student's turn; speaking out of turn is not allowed in the classroom. Denis, for his part, was rebelling against this classroom rule, and therefore the institutional nature of the setting, by interrupting twice. After he has been shouted at, however, he does not speak out of turn again; by being silent he indicates his new orientation to his role as student. In lines 46 through 64, BM and Ol'ga are taking turns to negotiate the correct sentence for Ol'ga's turn; here "The seventh of January is Christmas in Russia." There are difficulties because Ol'ga has forgotten the need for the verb "is" and does not understand (53) even when prompted by BM (54-56). BM explains that the "is" is missing (57), and after a 2.0 second pause (60) when Ol'ga's deskmate Tat'jana is quietly trying to help her (not audible on the tape), BM reprimands Tat'jana. In line 62 BM orients to the classroom goal of each student learning English by asking if Tat'jana is learning for Ol'ga or for herself.

Next I look more closely at the organisation of turn-taking in this excerpt. As they work through the textbook exercise, BM almost wholly controls the selection of next speaker. In line 3, BM asks the students if the instructions for the exercise are understood. With this utterance she is indicating that the explanation is finished and, unless there is a problem of understanding, the exercise can begin. None of the students says there is a problem, and Anatolij raises his hand (4) to self-select as next speaker (and first for the exercise). BM initially ignores his self-selection and repeats part of the instructions, "that is we start with the date," and only then says, "Anthony ((Anatolij)) begin please" (5). What is she doing with these two short utterances? By resuming her turn and repeating the instructions, instructions which none of the students had indicated they did not

understand, she is asserting that she has control of the turn-taking and therefore does not initially accept Anatolij's attempt to self-select. Only after she has reasserted this control does she ask Anatolij to begin the exercise.

Other than Anatolij raising his hand to self-select in line 4, all other students are called on by name for their turn to participate in the exercise. None of them raises a hand or asks any questions. Denis (8), Anželika (14), Tat'jana (26), Antonina (31), Egor (41), and Ol'ga (46) all wait until BM has selected them as next speaker. The general pattern of the exercise is as follows: once BM has selected a student as next speaker, the two of them take turns until a correct answer has been produced, and at that point BM selects the next speaker. There are, of course, exceptions to the pattern. In lines 10 through 13, upon Denis' successful turn completion, BM addresses her next turn to Anatolij to emphasise his previous mistake. In line 17 and 20, Denis self-selects without being called upon, and inserts his turn in the middle of an interactional sequence between BM and Anželika. BM does not tolerate this breaking of the rule (21). The final exception occurs when BM addresses Tat'jana (62) for assisting Ol'ga, who has had difficulties correctly creating a sentence. Even with the exceptions, BM is in control of the turn-taking. She chooses which student can speak next, and when Denis speaks out of turn she makes it very clear that this behaviour is unacceptable.

There are several pauses throughout the excerpt. In line 6 we see two pauses that belong to Anatolij[29]: "The first of January (0.3) is (0.3) Christmas in Russia." The pauses, at 0.3 seconds, are mid-sentence and not long enough for other speakers to identify as possible turn-transition points, and therefore no one self-selects. The pauses within the turn can be seen as time Anatolij takes to choose the correct next part, first contemplating the verb and second the holiday. In line 16 Anželika

---

[29] A pause can be seen to "belong" to the person in whose turn it occurs. For example, if the instructor names a student as next speaker, an ensuing pause is seen as "belonging" to the named student. However, the analyst must consider how the participants themselves treat the pause in order to confirm to whom it belongs.

has a similar "current speaker's pause" when she pauses for 1.0 second halfway through her sentence. BM as instructor does not self-select here to provide help to Anželika; it is at this point, however, that Denis whispers the correct answer to Anželika (17). He has interpreted her pause, longer than Anatolij's, as a turn-transition point because of her apparent inability to finish the sentence. In line 27, Tat'jana has similar problems constructing her sentence with a 1.0 second pause and a 3.0 second pause. BM treats the pauses as Tat'jana's and again does not self-select to provide instruction; she gives Tat'jana a chance to say the whole sentence by herself. Perhaps because Denis was reprimanded for speaking out of turn, none of the students interjects during Tat'jana's pauses; BM has made it very clear that the students should treat such pauses as belonging to the current speaker.

BM, however, *can* claim speaking rights during a current speaker's pause, as she is the one in control of speaker selection in the classroom. BM selects Antonina as next speaker (31) and there is a 2.0 second pause (32); this pause, even before she begins to speak in line 33, belongs to Antonina as the nominated next speaker. In line 34 Antonina pauses for another 2.0 seconds without completing her sentence. Both pauses, one before even speaking, indicate Antonina's uncertainty in what to say during her turn. BM recognises this and self-selects (35), telling Antonina to repeat and giving her background information on June being a month. Antonina starts over, pausing again for 0.5 seconds (36). In lines 37 and 38, BM and Antonina overlap. BM interprets Antonina's 0.5 second pause as continued difficulty, and prompts her with the next words (37). Because Antonina overlaps her after BM has only said "of," I believe she saw the 0.5-second pause as her own and was preparing to continue her turn (38). In line 38 Antonina pauses for 0.3 seconds before completing the sentence; this pause was not long enough for BM to interpret as difficulty.

In line 41 BM calls on Egor to speak. There is a 0.4 second pause belonging to Egor as nominated next speaker (42). In line 43 Egor starts to speak only to be cut

off by an overlap from BM (44), who is asking him if he knows how to pronounce the word in the textbook. BM interprets Egor's pause as difficulty, possibly because of the difficulties with Antonina's turns just prior (32-40), as she had previously let much longer student-owned pauses take place without assisting. Egor acknowledges BM's right as instructor to overlap his talk; when she overlaps him in line 44, he immediately stops speaking (43) and she finishes her turn before he resumes his in line 45. In this turn Egor shows that the pause in line 42 was not one of difficulty, rather just a short pause before beginning his turn, as he quite readily puts together the entire sentence. The initial pause caused a minor problem in their interaction, an overlap, but both speakers negotiated to achieve the goal of these turns, here the production of a correct sentence from the exercise.

Finally I look closely at the interaction between BM and Ol'ga (46-60, 63-64). Ol'ga has difficulties putting together her sentence, which should be: "The seventh of January is Christmas in Russia." In line 47 Ol'ga begins by saying "the first," and BM immediately interjects to indicate Ol'ga is very wrong: "Th-wha::t?" (48). Ol'ga attempts a correction in line 49. The 0.5 second pause is hers within the turn, indicating uncertainty, as does the intonation of "seven? ith" rather than "seventh." In line 50 BM again claims a turn by emphasising the correct pronunciation of "seventh." In line 51 Ol'ga decides to continue her sentence from "of January" to avoid the problem word "seventh," but mistakenly says "of my-." Ol'ga cuts her pronunciation of "my" short, acknowledging it is a mistake, at which point BM grimaces and there is a 0.5 second pause (52). BM, by not taking a turn, shows the pause belongs to Ol'ga; Ol'ga, on the other hand, is pausing to see if BM will take a turn to correct her, showing that she thinks the pause belongs to BM. When BM does not take the turn, Ol'ga continues. By doing so, Ol'ga is acquiescing to BM's power of turn-taking in the classroom: it was Ol'ga's turn and she realised she had made a mistake; she paused to allow BM a chance to correct her; when BM did not claim a turn to do so, Ol'ga resumed her own interrupted turn.

After resuming her turn Ol'ga pauses again, this time for 1.0 second (53). This pause belongs to Ol'ga. She had correctly pronounced January and there is no need for a correction from BM. The pause reveals Ol'ga's uncertainty, as confirmed by her next utterance "the-". Knowing it is a mistake she again cuts herself short. In line 54 BM takes a turn to correct Ol'ga, who has left the verb "is" out of her sentence. There is another 1.0 second pause (55) that again belongs to Ol'ga. BM does not continue her turn and, having provided the correction, has nominated Ol'ga as next speaker, in this case by expecting her to repeat the correction. In line 56 Ol'ga repeats "is" with a question intonation, again revealing her uncertainty. This question leads BM to explain more fully that Ol'ga had omitted the verb "is" (57). BM encourages Ol'ga to continue her sentence with *what* the seventh of January is (57). There is another pause owned by Ol'ga, this time 0.5 seconds (58), as BM is waiting for her to continue. In line 59 BM gets exasperated and loudly calls Ol'ga's name, directly nominating her as the appropriate next speaker. By doing so, BM is indicating that Ol'ga cannot ignore the instructor's nomination as next speaker, whether by name or not. Ol'ga repeats the "is" and pauses again, this time for 2.0 seconds (60), at which point her deskmate Tat'jana tries to help her (61). As already discussed above, BM chastises Tat'jana (62) and in line 63 again addresses Ol'ga. To assist Ol'ga, she provides the next word, and Ol'ga completes the sentence (64). It is interesting to note that both times BM chastised students for speaking out of turn, Denis in line 21 and Tat'jana in line 62, she owned two large pauses afterward, 2.0 and 4.0 seconds respectively. Neither student responded, silently accepting her disciplinary utterances. BM did not continue until she was sure of their compliance.

This analysis shows that the instructor maintains the constraints of the turn-taking system in the classroom. Both BM and the students orient to the institutional context in this excerpt. BM controls the nomination of next speakers, and disciplines students who speak out of turn. She interrupts student turns to correct them. When overlapped she does not stop but completes her turn. She uses

disciplinary pauses as signs of power. She also claims a right to speak during a current speaker's pause. Now I turn to an excerpt from one of ST's lessons.

Excerpt 3 (ST.1b.3)

There are seven students in class for this lesson. Prior to this excerpt, ST has been reviewing verbs such as *swimming*, *running*, *speaking*, and *jumping* with the class. Each student has a stuffed animal with which they have been acting out the actions of the verbs. For the exercise in this excerpt, ST has indicated that each student will have a turn to introduce their stuffed animal, and tell the class the animal's name, how old it is, where it lives, and what it is able to do. This excerpt is comprised of the students' storytelling turns, and begins with Andrej, who is standing at the front to introduce his animal. As we have seen in the previous two excerpts, the instructor exerts authority over the turn-taking in the classroom. This holds true for ST as well, although perhaps more subtly than in BM's case. Throughout the exercise ST selects the next "storyteller" to talk about his animal, the story giving the student the right to take a longer turn. Andrej is selected first by ST (prior to this excerpt), followed by Marina (24), Aleksej (62) and Nataša (75).[30] In Marina's case she puts up her hand to self-select (23), but waits until ST acknowledges her selection before going up to the blackboard to speak (25). By putting her hand up and waiting for permission to be next speaker, Marina is orienting to the institutional nature of the classroom.

There are certain elements that ST has explained they must include in the story, noted above. When a student has difficulties with his story, ST has the right to self-select to provide assistance or correct the student. Within the students' larger 'story turns,' then, we see insertion sequences initiated by ST. In line 1, Andrej hesitates before starting. He says "uhh," pauses for 0.5 seconds, then says "I" with a question intonation and pauses for another 0.5 seconds. Both pauses belong to him as the current speaker who has clearly not finished his turn: he has not told

---

[30] Continuing beyond this excerpt, the remaining students are each called upon by ST in turn to tell their stories.

Excerpt 3. ST.1b.3

1	Andrej:	Uhh (0.5) I?, (0.5)
2	ST:	°Hello:,°
3	Andrej:	Hello: (1.5) I am (0.5) a han
4	ST:	°hare°
5	Andrej:	hare. (0.5) My name (0.5) is (3.0) Marina(hhh)
6		((Marina giggles))
7		((Andrej rocks back and forth))
8	ST:	((to Andrej)) °( )°
9		((gestures to Andrej to stand still))
10	Andrej:	I am (.) twelve. (1.5) mm (1.5) uh (0.5) I can?,
11	ST:	°(glagol)°
		°(verb)°
12		(5.0)
13	Andrej:	I live (0.5) in the- (1.0) in the (2.0) garden
14	ST:	Okay?,
15	Andrej:	Uh (1.0) I c- (0.5) I can (1.5) si- sit, (1.0) I can (0.5) s::ing,
16	ST:	Mhm,
17	Andrej:	Uh (0.5) I can (3.0) jo-
18	ST:	jump
19	Andrej:	jump, (.) I can (2.0) dance. (2.0) I can (2.0) hm (8.0) Nu vsë.
		jump, (.) I can (2.0) dance. (2.0) I can (2.0) hm (8.0) Well that's all.
20	ST:	((smiles))
21		Vsë, bol'še ne [pomniš'?]
		That's all, you don't remember [any more?]
22	Andrej:	[Goodbye]
23		((Marina waves her hand in the air))
24	ST:	hhh go(hh)dbye. Marina.
25		(7.0) ((Marina goes to the board))
26	Marina:	Hello, I am a dog. My name is (3.0)
27		((Jurij makes banging noises))
28	Marina:	Katie=
29	ST:	=Jura. ((Jurij)) ((uses strict tone of voice))
30		(5.0)
31		((Marina looks to ST))
32		((ST nods for Marina to continue))
33	Marina:	I am (2.0) two. (1.5) I lives in th- I live in the house
34	ST:	°Jura uspokojsja°
		°Jura calm down°
35	Marina:	I can, (1.0) I can (1.0) sing. (2.0) I (0.5) I can (4.0) pin.
36	ST:	°speak°
37		(0.5)
38	ST:	°razgovarivat'?°
		°speak?°
39	Marina:	((furrows brow)) Mh (4.0) °begat'°
		* Mh (4.0) °run°*
40	ST:	°run°=
41	Aleksej:	=run

42	Marina:	Ah. I (0.5) can run. (0.5) I can speak. I can (0.5) s- skin.
43		[I-]
44	ST:	[Net] net, čto skazala?=
		[No] no, what did you say?=
45	Marina:	=skip
46	ST:	skip
47	Marina:	I can
48		(3.0)
49	ST:	((to Andrej)) °°( )°°
50	Marina:	count. ((looks at ST))
51	ST:	((gestures for Andrej to cross his arms on his desk))
52	Marina:	count.
53		(4.0)
54	ST:	((to Andrej)) °°( )°° ((turns to Marina))
55	ST:	Mhm.
56		(4.0)
57	Marina:	I can sit?, (4.0) ((smiles at ST)) I (1.5) I can jump.
58	ST:	°Vsë?°
		°That's all?°
59		((Marina nods))
60	ST:	°Goodbye°
61		((Marina returns to her seat))
62	ST:	Very well, thank you Marina. (0.5) Alex, ((Aleksej)) you are
63		welcome.
64		(6.0) ((Aleksej goes to the board))
65	Aleksej:	Hello, I am a mouse. (1.0) My name (.) is, (1.5) My name is Nina. Um
66		I am (.) m two. (3.0) I live in the house. I (1.0) I can (4.0)
67	ST:	Mhm?,
68	Aleksej:	I can (1.0) uh jump. I can (3.0) I can run. I can (1.0) count. (0.5) I can
69		speag.
70	ST:	°speak°
71	Aleksej:	I can s:: [sit]
72	ST:	[sit]
73	Aleksej:	I can sing. (3.0) Goodbye.
74	ST:	Goodbye, °thank you Alex.°
75		Nataša.

his story with all required elements (or even finished a sentence). The intonation and pauses show his uncertainty at what to say. ST self-selects to help him, telling him to begin with "hello" (2). In line 3 Andrej again shows hesitation with two pauses, 1.5 and 0.5 seconds. Although ST could claim another turn during Andrej's pauses to help him, it is not until he makes a mistake that she interjects (4). ST orients to her role as instructor not only by claiming a turn in the middle of Andrej's, but also by correcting him in that turn. Andrej, in turn, orients to his role as student by accepting her interruption and correctly repeating "hare" (5).

There are multiple instances throughout the 'story turns' where there are lengthy student-owned pauses (lines 5, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 26, 33, 35, 39, 42, 56, 57, 64, 65, 68 and 72) and ST does *not* self-select. For example, in line 19 Andrej says, "jump, (.) I can (2.0) dance. (2.0) I can (2.0) hm (8.0) Well that's all."[31] An 8.0 second 'current speaker' pause is quite lengthy, and even though there are three other 2.0-second pauses in the same turn, ST allows Andrej to retain ownership of the current turn. We see a similar example for Aleksej in lines 68-69: "I can (1.0) uh jump. I can (3.0) I can run. I can (1.0) count. (0.5) I can speag." All four pauses belong to Aleksej as current speaker, and ST does not interrupt. In line 67, however, ST does take a turn by saying "Mhm?," after a 4.0 second pause owned by Aleksej (66). This is a response token to indicate that Aleksej should continue his turn, rather than ST claiming a turn for herself.

Although ST does not self-select during many of the student-owned pauses, there are several other instances where she claims a turn when a student has made a mistake. As instructor she is orienting to the goal of language learning when she corrects student mistakes. In line 70, following Aleksej's mispronunciation of "speak" as "speag" (69), ST corrects him. In line 71 Aleksej resumes his interrupted turn. He does not repeat the corrected word, perhaps because he did not hear ST's turn as a correction (or does not acknowledge it), or he simply chooses to resume his 'story turn' without repeating it.

In line 17 Andrej begins to say "jump" but cuts himself short. His mispronounced and half-said word indicates to ST that he does not know how to pronounce the word correctly. She provides him with the correction (18), and, as he did above in line 5, he repeats the correct pronunciation before continuing his story (19). In line 42 Marina pauses several times, but only when she says "skin" does ST claim a turn to indicate she has made a mistake (44). We see a short overlap between ST

---

[31] When both Russian and English words occur on the same numbered line in the transcripts, the English words are repeated on the translation line; providing the translation from Russian plus any repetition of English words ensures a correct representation of *what* was said, and *how*.

and Marina in lines 43 and 44. Marina is continuing her 'story turn' (43) when ST interrupts with, "No no, what did you say?" (44). As instructor, ST has the greater right to speak and so Marina cuts her turn short. In line 45 Marina repairs her mistake, which ST repeats (46) to indicate she is correct. This negotiation of the overlap shows that both interactants are orienting to their roles as instructor and student. The instructor can interrupt to correct the student. When the instructor speaks, the students listen.

In line 35 Marina makes a similar mistake with the word "pin": "I can, (1.0) I can (1.0) sing. (2.0) I (0.5) I can (4.0) pin." ST self-selects and provides Marina with the corrected word "speak" (36). There is a 0.5 second pause belonging to Marina (37), as ST has nominated her as next speaker in order to resume her 'story turn' and fix her mistake. Marina's correction is absent, i.e., she does not take up her turn, which leads ST to ask if "to speak" was the verb Marina had been trying to use when she said "pin" (38). In line 39 Marina says "mh," acknowledging ST's question and showing her understanding that it is her turn to speak. After a 4.0 second pause she tells ST she wants to say "begat'" (to run). ST provides the English word "run" (40), which is latched onto by Aleksej also providing the correct translation "run" (41). In line 42 Marina indicates she accepts the correction and continues her story: "Ah. I (0.5) can run." Aleksej speaking out of turn in line 41 is not chastised; he simply latched onto ST's turn rather than overlap her or take her turn.

ST however, does address improper behaviour from other students. In line 26 Marina begins the story about her stuffed dog: "Hello, I am a dog. My name is (3.0)". The pause belongs to Marina as she has not finished her turn, but Jurij makes banging noises (27). In line 28 Marina resumes her turn, showing that the pause did indeed belong to her, by providing her dog's name "Katie." ST latches onto Marina's turn to chastise Jurij, calling his name in a strict tone and with a

falling stop (29).[32] ST is orienting to the constraints of the classroom interaction. While one student is rightfully taking a turn, other students cannot cause distractions. ST as instructor enforces this institutional 'rule' by chastising Jurij. There is a 5.0 second pause that belongs to ST (30), during which she waits to see if Jurij is complying and being quiet. She owns the turn and could discipline him further if he were to disobey. He is silent, and Marina looks to ST (31) for permission to continue. In line 32 ST nods to Marina, confirming her selection for next turn. Jurij (not on tape) is still being disruptive, as ST interrupts Marina's storytelling turn again to tell him to calm down (34). ST does not chastise him further, and so I infer that he is behaving properly.

In line 48 there is a 3.0 second pause that belongs to Marina, who is mid-turn, mid-sentence. Even though the pause belongs to Marina, ST self-selects to whisper to Andrej (49). In line 50 Marina self-selects to complete her turn, and turns to ST to confirm that her turn uptake was accepted. ST however, is looking at Andrej and gesturing for him to cross his arms on his desk and sit quietly (51). Marina repeats her turn uptake (52), and pauses for 4.0 seconds (53). As she has tried to claim her turn twice, Marina now waits for the instructor's selection of next speaker. ST once more whispers to Andrej and then turns to Marina (54). Turning to Marina signifies that she can now resume her 'story turn' and in line 55 ST provides a token "mhm" to strengthen Marina's nomination as next speaker. There is a 4.0 second pause (56) that belongs to Marina, as nominated by ST. Marina may be pausing to confirm she can continue uninterrupted, without distractions from Andrej and admonitions from ST, or she may be pausing to think about what to say next.

In this excerpt we have seen that ST maintains the turn-taking system. She selects the next speaker. She claims turns for herself during the current speaker's storytelling turn to correct mistakes, provide assistance, or admonish other

---

[32] A falling stop occurs when the speaker's intonation decreases throughout the utterance. In English, for example, falling intonation is commonly found in statements. In CA transcriptions the falling stop is identified by the use of a period.

students who are misbehaving. Both she and the students orient to the institutional nature of the setting. Students raise their hands to volunteer as next 'storyteller.' Within their storytelling turns, they wait for verbal or non-verbal nomination from ST to continue after ST has inserted a turn. ST also disciplines the students for distracting from the learning task at hand. Now that I have analysed excerpts from each of the three instructor's lessons, I return to another excerpt from one of PN's classes.

Excerpt 4 (PN.3c.2)

In this second excerpt from one of PN's lessons, the class has been learning how to say the time in English. There are four students in attendance. After a grammar lesson on asking for and giving the time, PN brings out a cardboard clock with moveable hands to question the students on various times. In this excerpt, she has asked for a volunteer to come to the front of the room and ask the class what time it is. The volunteer will then lead the interaction with question - answer sequences.

Throughout the excerpt PN orients to her role as instructor in the classroom setting. She has authority over the overall organisation of the lesson, and as such she establishes which interactional exercises should take place and when. Through organising the structure of the interaction, the lesson, PN orients to the greater goals of the class: teaching the students to speak English and, more specifically here, to tell the time. Having finished the grammar instruction, in this excerpt she tells the class that they will now be practicing the questions and answers. The students are also willing interactants to achieve the goals set by PN. In line 4 Valentin raises his hand to volunteer to lead the practice session. He shows that he understands that PN has the authority to organise the interaction, and also that he must raise his hand and wait for PN's acceptance of his self-selection. PN recognises Valentin's selection, "Well Valja, you're welcome" (5). There is a 1.0 second pause during which he does not get up to go to the front of the class, even though PN has nominated him (6). As PN has indicated the

Excerpt 4. PN.3c.2

1	PN:	All right, very well, thank you. Now who would like to come up to the
2		blackboard, (0.3) take this clock and ask the question, <u>what time is it</u>
3		<u>now</u>?
4		((Valentin raises hand.))
5	PN:	Well Valja, ((Valentin)) you're welcome.
6		(1.0)
7		Valja, tol'ko my tebja prosim stojat' kak to s boku čtoby <u>mne </u>bylo vidno.
		Valja,we're just asking you to stand kind of to the side so that <u>I</u> can see.
8		Please take the clock.
9		(4.0) ((Valentin goes to front of class and takes clock.))
10	PN:	Mhm?,
11	Valentin:	(8.0) ((changes the time))
12		What time is it now? ((shows class))
13		(2.0)
14	PN:	Valja I c-
15		((Valentin shows the clock to PN))
16		oh all right. Ask someone, <možno ( ) imja, da?, zadat', čtoby ponjatno
		oh all right. Ask someone, <you can ( ) name, right?, ask, so that it's clear
17		bylo komu vopros.>
		to whom the question ((was addressed)).>
18	Valentin:	Kolja, ((Nikolaj)) what time is it now?
19	PN:	<u>Ja ne vižu</u>, nado vot tak deržat'
		<u>I can't see</u>, you need to hold it like this
20	PN:	((indicates holding clock right in front of chest))
21		kak ja, ja ved' xorošo deržala, vsem bylo vidno da ved'?
		like I did, I held it well didn't I, everyone could see it right?
22		((looks to other students))
23	Nikolaj:	It's five minutes past three.
24	PN:	All right?,
25		(2.0) ((Valentin changes clock))
26	PN:	Mhm?,
27		(9.0)
28	Valentin:	Valerija, what time is it now?
29		(2.0)
30	Valerija:	It's ten minutes?, (2.0)
31	PN:	Mhm,
32		(0.5)
33	PN:	Ah, show it to me please.
34		(0.5)
35		<u>Ten minutes?</u>,
36	Valerija:	Past?, (.) four.
37	PN:	All right?,
38	Valentin:	Kak ten. Eleven!
		What ten. Eleven!
39		((shows clock to PN))
40	PN:	Well,
41		((students laugh, Valerija laughs indignantly))

42	PN:	let it be ten. Pust' budet tak, <u>ploxo vidno</u>. (0.5) Pust' budet desjat'.
		let it be ten. Let it be that way, <u>it's hard to see.</u> (0.5) Let it be ten.
43		(3.0)
44	Valentin:	( ) ((Valentin mutters to himself))
45	PN:	Okay?,
46		(4.0)
47	Valentin:	Julie, ((Julija)) what time is it now?
48	Julija:	It's a quarter past five.
49		(7.0) ((Valentin changes clock))
50	Valentin:	Kolja, what?, (2.0) ((Valentin changes clock again.)) What time is it
51		now?
52	Nikolaj:	It's half past (0.3) eight.
53		(11.0) ((Valentin changes clock))
54	Valentin:	Valerija, what time is it now?
55		(5.0)
56	Valerija:	It's (2.0) half
57	PN:	°Net, po-moemu dvadcat' pjat'.°
		°*No, I think it's twenty five.*°
58		(2.0)
59	Valerija:	It's thirty five?,
60	PN:	Oni- (.) sčitaetsja v obratnom porjadke, <u>do</u> nastuplenija
		They- (.) It's counted in reverse, <u>to</u> the top of the hour
61	Valerija:	Hhh it's twenty five?, minutes (0.5) to? (1.0) ten.
62		(2.0)
63	PN:	All right?, ((nods)) thank you?
64		(6.0) ((Valentin changes clock))
65	Valentin:	Julie, ((Julija)) what time is it now?
66	Julija:	It's a quarter to, (.) twelve.
67		(2.0)
68	PN:	Oka:y,
69		(3.0) ((Valentin changes clock))
70	Valentin:	Kolja, what time is it now.
71	Nikolaj:	It's twelve (1.0) °sharp.° (0.5) Uh, twe- twelve o'clock?,
72	PN:	All right, ((to Valentin)) well thank you. That will do.
73		((Valentin returns clock))
74		Thank you very much, (.) you may take your seat.

volunteer would come up to the blackboard to ask his questions (1-3), and Valentin's response is absent, this pause belongs to Valentin. In line 7, PN provides more information to clarify the required next action, asking him to stand to the front and side so that the clock will be visible to everyone in the class. She then asks him to take the clock. PN is not only telling him where to stand and inviting him to take the clock, she is letting him know that the appropriate next action has not occurred. As instructor, not only can she select the next speaker, she can also enforce the required actions of the students.

For this exercise, PN turns some control of the turn-taking system over to Valentin. When Valentin first addresses the class with the question "What time is it now?" (12), PN tells him to use the students' names so that they know who should answer (16-17). In this ways she establishes for Valentin and his classmates the constraints of the classroom interaction, that turn-taking is managed through next speaker nominations made by the instructor (or by the person given that authority by the instructor). Valentin takes on a pseudo-instructor role as he changes the time on the clock and poses the question to individual students over several turns (lines 18, 28, 47, 50, 54, 65, and 70). The students accept his selection of next speaker and answer when called upon, in deference to Valentin's authority as granted by PN (23, 30, 48, 52, 56, 66, and 71). Valentin asks each student what time it is at least twice, and after Nikolaj has had a third turn (71), PN ends the exercise and tells Valentin to take his seat (72, 74). With these utterances, PN is removing Valentin's authority of the turn-taking system.

Despite Valentin's control of next speaker selection, however, PN retains her authority of the overarching turn-taking in this excerpt. She self-selects at any time, either to correct an answer, to offer an evaluation of one, or to assert authority over Valentin's actions. When Valentin poses the first question to Nikolaj (18), PN self-selects to tell Valentin that she cannot see the clock and he needs to hold it so that it is visible to everyone (19-21). She compares it to how she held the clock, as instructor, and how he, as pseudo-instructor, should do the same. Throughout the turn-taking, PN also self-selects to correct students when they make a mistake. In line 56, Valerija answers that "It's (2.0) half" and PN interrupts to tell her, "No, I think it's twenty five [to]" (57). Valerija had paused for 5.0 seconds once nominated as next speaker (55), and again for 2.0 seconds during her turn, but it is not until she makes a mistake that PN claims a turn to help her. After the correction, there is a 2.0 second pause (58) that again belongs to Valerija, as she is nominated to correct her answer using PN's additional information. Valerija continues with "It's thirty five?," (59), and PN again

interrupts to explain that this time should be counted *to* the hour (60). Valerija produces the correct time in line 61, and PN appraises her answer (63).

Valentin is able to select the next speaker, but it remains the instructor's role to evaluate their turns. She can self-select at any point to do so. There are several instances throughout the turn-taking where PN indicates that the students' answers are correct with short turns such as "All right?," (24, 37, 63, and 72) and "Mhm," (31). Each evaluation has a continuing intonation. Not only is she confirming their answers with these short utterances, she is also indicating to Valentin that he may continue the questioning and select the next speaker. Valentin does not offer assessments of the students' answers, except in line 38 when he corrects Valerija's and PN's assessment of the time. Valerija responds that it is ten minutes past four (30, 36), which PN indicates is "all right" (37). Valentin, rather than continuing his questioning of the next selected student, says "What ten. Eleven!" The students laugh, Valerija indignantly, showing that they feel he has done something outside the allowable - by saying PN and Valerija are wrong - and therefore distance themselves from his turn. In line 42 PN clarifies that Valentin is not allowed to make such evaluations, that her word is final: "Let it be ten." There is a 3.0 second pause that belongs to Valentin (43), where the expected next action is for him to acknowledge PN's 'ruling' or continue his questioning. In line 44 Valentin takes up his turn, but rather than accepting PN's statement, even indirectly by continuing, he mutters something inaudible to himself. PN says "Okay?," (45) to enforce his continuation, which he obeys (47).

We also find other examples of PN using one-word utterances with continuing intonation as tokens to indicate the next turn belongs to the student (10, 26, and 31). When Valentin has first taken the clock from PN, she says "mhm?," (10), which indicates it is his turn to begin when ready. Valentin takes up this turn (12) after a pause to change the time on the clock (11). After Valentin has posed the question to Nikolaj (18), and PN has appraised Nikolaj's response (24), there is a 2.0 second pause owned by Valentin (25), who is changing the time on the clock

for the next question. In line 26, PN says "mhm?," to let him know, again, that it is his turn to begin when ready. In this way she establishes the interactional pattern for Valentin: he selects the next speaker, the next speaker answers, PN evaluates the answer (possibly inserting sequences to help the student provide the correct answer), and the pattern repeats. After a 9.0 second pause (27), he takes this turn to question Valerija (28). Valerija pauses for 2.0 seconds before starting to answer (29), and another 2.0 seconds halfway through her answer (30). At this point PN uses a token "mhm," to encourage her turn continuation. There is a pause of 0.5 seconds (32) belonging to Valerija, who is not only halfway through her answer but has already received encouragement from PN to continue. In line 33, however, PN claims a turn to ask Valentin to show her the clock. As Valerija is having difficulties answering, PN needs to see the clock in order to provide Valerija with assistance to finish her turn, which PN does in line 35.

There are several lengthy pauses during which Valentin is setting the time on the clock in preparation for the next speaker (lines 11, 25 and 27, 46, 49, 53, 64 and 69). He owns these pauses as the next turns are reserved for him to pose the question. In line 13 we see a 2.0 second pause owned by his classmates. Valentin has asked the question "What time is it now?" (12) but no one is willing to self-select. PN self-selects first to indicate she cannot see the clock (14) and then to explain the 'rules of interaction' to Valentin, and by proxy the class. He will address the students directly and they will respond (16-17).

In this excerpt we saw an example of some turn-taking authority transferred to a student, while the instructor retained control of the system as a whole. PN allowed Valentin to question the students in turn, only claiming a turn herself to assess the answer or provide help, all the while indicating to Valentin when he could continue with his speaker selection (mostly by using tokens with continuing intonation). There were no overlaps in this excerpt, despite the presence of five potential speakers. We see, therefore, that the speakers were negotiating the turn-taking according to rules of classroom interaction: students speak when

nominated by the instructor, or through the instructor's authority.

Excerpt 5 (BM.2a.2)

This excerpt is taken from the beginning of one of BM's lessons. There are three students present initially, and a fourth arrives mid-excerpt. The interaction is primarily comprised of instructor-directed questions - answers about the date and the weather. BM has already told the class that they will be reviewing the latest grammar section on ordinal numbers, and then learning vocabulary for the theme 'birthday presents.' At the start of this excerpt BM orients to the structured lesson at hand (1-2): "we begin our lesson as usual? (0.5) That is with the class monitor's account." By doing so, she is also letting the students know they are expected to orient to the lesson as well. She uses "we" to show that they are working together to achieve the common goals of the lesson: learning the grammar and vocabulary.

BM also asks which student is the classroom monitor that day (2), and Nadežda responds that she is (3). Nadežda's role for this lesson then is pupil and monitor. As monitor she has the right to specific turns in interaction with BM, such as reporting who is absent and answering initial questions about the date (lines 2 through 14, seen in more detail below).

When BM asks for a report on who is absent, she is orienting to the educational 'reasoning' that attendance is important to the goal of learning, and therefore should be checked. This pattern of instructor-monitor questioning is present in all of BM's lessons. By following this routine, BM is again highlighting the institutional context of the interaction.

Later in the excerpt BM and Kirill both show their orientation to classroom routines, as guided by BM's 'rules' of proper interactional conduct. In line 47, Kirill enters the classroom late and waits by the door, not taking a turn until given that right by BM. Elizaveta and BM continue their question-answer interaction (48-57), and only once it is complete does BM acknowledge Kirill (57). By

Excerpt 5. BM.2a.2

1	BM:	Tak (1.0) uh načnëm my urok naš kak obyčno? (0.5) To est' s (otčetom)
		So (1.0) uh we begin our lesson as usual? (0.5) That is with the class
2		dežurnogo. Who is on duty today?
		monitor's (account). Who is on duty today?
3	Nadežda:	I am
4	BM:	Well Hope, ((Nadežda)) who is absent?
5	Nadežda:	Carl ((Kirill)) is absent.
6	BM:	That's right. What is the date today?
7	Nadežda:	Today is the
8	BM:	Udarenije (.) vnimatel'no.
		Pay attention (.) to the stress.
9	Nadežda:	The eigh<u>teenth</u> [of No]vember=
10	BM:	[mhm]
11	BM:	=That's right, the eigh<u>teenth</u> of November. V porjadkovykh čislitel'nykh
		=That's right, the eigh<u>teenth</u> of November. In ordinal numbers
12		vsegda udarenije padaet na? (.) <u>tee:n,</u> na ètot suffiks vsegda takoe
		the stress always falls on (.) <u>tee:n,</u> it's always that way with this
13		imeetsja. And what is the day today?
		suffix. And what is the day today?
14	Nadežda:	Today is Monday.
15	BM:	Yes, today is Monday. Laura, ((Larisa)) (.) what is the weather like today?
16	Larisa:	The weather is not windy, (0.5) sno:wy, and not nasty.
17	BM:	Mmhm. Well, <u>not</u> snowy, or <u>i:s</u> snowy?
18	Larisa:	<u>Is</u> snowy.
19	BM:	Mm, the weather is snowy.
20		(1.0) ((looks out window))
21		Well that's right. (.) Well (0.5) Liza, ((Elizaveta)) what <u>season</u> is it now?
22		(2.0)
23	Elizaveta:	It is (.) autumn.
24	BM:	It is autumn. Is it <u>la:te</u> or <u>ea:rly</u> autumn?
25		(1.0)
26		Čto značit late?
		What does late mean?
27		(0.5)
28		Kogda my opazdyvaem, my ot- <my govorim> <u>I'm late</u>. Ja?
		When we are late, we ex- <we say> <u>I'm late</u>. I?
29		(0.5)
30		opozdal. Značit late autumn, to kakaja? ((looks at class))
		am late. So that means late autumn is what? ((looks at class)
31	students:	Pozdnjaja=
		Late=
32	BM:	=Pozdnjaja osen', a naoborot early autumn?
		=Late autumn, and the opposite early autumn?
33	students:	Ranjaja=
		Early=
34	BM:	=Ranjaja. Well Liza, (.) is it late or early autumn?
		=Early. Well Liza, (.) is it late or early autumn?
35		(2.0)

36	Elizaveta:	Autumn is=
37	BM:	=l- ((shakes head)) <u>Is it</u> da? v voprose bylo, v otvete budet?
		=l- ((shakes head)) <u>Is it</u> was in the question right?, in the answer will be?
38	Elizaveta:	It is late
39		(1.5) ((BM indicates with hand there is more))
40		autu[mn]
41	BM:	[au:]tumn, yes. It is late autumn. Do you like the weather today
42		Liza?
43		(1.0)
44	Elizaveta:	No (.) I don't like the weather today.
45	BM:	What weather do you like?
46	Elizaveta:	I like
47		(2.0) ((Kirill enters and waits at the door))
48		the weather is
49	BM:	I like (.) kakuju pogodu
		I like (.) what kind of weather
50		(2.0)
51		Snačala prilagatel'noe a potom slovo pogoda. I like?=
		First the adjective and then the word weather. I like?=
52	Elizaveta:	=Hot?,
53	BM:	Mmhm,
54	Elizaveta:	Not nasty (.) and not windy.
55	BM:	W:ea[ther
56	Elizaveta:	[Weather
57	BM:	Mmhm, thank you, Carl? ((Kirill))
58	Kirill:	I am sorry I am late. May I come in?
59	BM:	Mm, <u>good morning</u> first of all.
60	Kirill:	Good morning=
61	BM:	=Come in please …* Well Laura, ((Larisa)) (.) and what month is it now?
62	Larisa:	Mm=
63	BM:	=What month is it now?
64		(2.0)
65	Larisa:	Uh (0.5) the month uh
66	BM:	What month <u>is it</u> now?
67	Larisa:	<u>It is</u> November.
68	BM:	It is November, that's right. Well? (.) Okay tak, Laura, ((Larisa)) go to the
69		blackboard please. (0.5) Well, sejčas tebe budet zadanie ( ),
		blackboard please. (0.5) Well, now you will have the task ( ),
70		zatranskribirovat' ( ).
		to transcribe ( ).

* This ellipsis represents speech during which Kirill is reprimanded for being late.

addressing him by name and using a question intonation, she nominates him as next speaker to excuse his tardiness. Kirill shows his understanding of classroom rules by apologising and asking to join the lesson (58): "I am sorry I am late. May I come in?" In line 59, BM indicates he has missed one of the appropriate

sequences, a greeting. Only once Kirill has said good morning (60) does BM allow him to come in (61). I have omitted part of this sequence, as shown by the ellipsis, during which BM admonishes him for being late and tells him to sit. In line 61 she returns to the questioning sequence that Kirill has interrupted with his late arrival.

BM determines next speaker selection throughout this excerpt. As we have seen, the initial question-answer sequence is always between BM and the class monitor. In line 2 when BM asks who is on duty, she is asking who has the right to be selected for this sequence, in this case Nadežda. After getting the report on absences (5), BM asks Nadežda what the date is (6). Nadežda takes up her turn in line 7, but is interrupted halfway through by BM reminding her to pay attention to the stress (8). This interruption shows BM's orientation to the role of instructor. Not only does she self-select to interrupt a student's turn, she does so to draw attention to the pronunciation. Nadežda completes her turn, correctly pronouncing "eighteenth" (9). BM overlaps Nadežda's turn midway to acknowledge the proper stress with a token "mhm" (10). Once the turn is complete BM latches on to Nadežda's final word and again acknowledges that Nadežda is right (11). As instructor, BM inserts a sequence here to provide the entire class with a review of the correct stress in ordinal numbers (11-13). In line 13 she resumes the instructor-monitor sequence with Nadežda: "And what is the day today?" By using "and," she indicates this question is a follow-up to the previous one addressed to Nadežda (5). Nadežda understands that it is her rightful turn and responds (14). BM assesses the response as correct and then closes the instructor-monitor sequence by opening the turn-taking to other students (15).

BM is not opening the floor to self-selection, rather she is opening the interaction to include other students *when nominated by her*. In line 15 she nominates Larisa as next speaker when she asks her what the weather is like. Larisa responds that "the weather is not windy, (0.5) sno:wy, and not nasty." (16). The continuing intonation prior to the 0.5 second pause shows Larisa's turn is not completed yet,

and BM does not interrupt. After the completed turn, BM says "mmhm." with a stopping intonation (17). In this case the "mmhm" is not a response token to indicate Larisa should continue, but rather it shows BM is claiming her turn. It is not clear from Larisa's turn if it *is* or *is not* snowy outside, and BM questions which meaning she intended (17). Larisa corrects herself (18) and BM repeats: "mm, the weather is snowy." (19). In line 20, the 1.0 second pause is owned by BM, who has yet to evaluate the correctness of Larisa's answer. She turns and looks out the window to confirm the weather, and only then tells Larisa that she is right (21).

BM selects Elizaveta as the next interactant. She asks her what season it is (21), and there is a 2.0 second pause that belongs to Elizaveta as nominated next speaker (22). Elizaveta provides the required action, an answer to BM's question (23). BM appraises the answer as correct by repeating Elizaveta's statement: "It is autumn." (24). BM takes this opportunity to check her vocabulary by asking a second question: "Is it la:te or ea:rly autumn?" There is a 1.0 second pause that belongs to Elizaveta, who is required to provide an answer to BM's follow-up question (25). BM identifies the problem as one of vocabulary, and asks Elizaveta what "late" means (26). There is a 0.5 second pause that again belongs to Elizaveta (27). Because of the continued difficulty, BM takes up her turn after a shorter pause to insert a question sequence that will help Elizaveta understand what "late" and "early" mean. In lines 28 and 29, BM explains: "When we are late, we ex-… <we say> I'm late. I?" BM is indirectly comparing the verb "opazdyvat'" (to be late), which the students know, to the adjective she is looking for, with the same root, "pozdnjaja" (late). There is another 0.5 second pause (29) during which Elizaveta does not take up the utterance BM has started for her in line 28: "I?". BM completes the sentence "I am late" and asks the whole class, as indicated by gaze, a specific question: "So that means late autumn is what?" (30) Several students answer at once, providing the correct Russian translation of the adjective "late" (31). BM latches on to their response, repeating it with the noun "autumn," and asks what "early autumn" means (32). Several students again

answer at once (33). BM latches her response to theirs, repeating the correct answer (34). The sequence of latched turns in lines 31 through 34 is very quick as compared to the slower negotiation of the meaning of "early" and "late" in lines 24 through 30, when BM is having difficulties eliciting a response from Elizaveta. The latched responses show that BM is working through the word meanings quickly to return to the question at hand.

Once this negotiation is completed, BM poses the problematic question to Elizaveta again: "Well Liza, (.) is it late or early autumn?" (34) BM is requiring the turn that was absent in response to her question in line 24. By questioning Elizaveta again, she is not only demanding the missing turn, but also as instructor she is checking the comprehension of the adjectives "early" and "late." There is a 2.0 second pause (35) that belongs to Elizaveta, as nominated for next turn yet again by BM. In line 36 Elizaveta starts her turn with "Autumn is" and BM immediately latches on to provide her with help (37). However, BM stops herself short and shakes her head; it is possible that she was providing the word "late" but stopped once she realised Elizaveta's construction was incorrect. BM provides her with a hint about using "it is" (37). Elizaveta understands the hint and says "It is late" (38). In line 39 there is a 1.5 second pause that Elizaveta believes belongs to BM, who has yet to evaluate her response. BM gestures with her hands that there is more, and therefore Elizaveta's turn is not over. In line 40 Elizaveta completes her turn to meet BM's requirements. BM overlaps the end of Elizaveta's response to wrap up the question-answer sequence (41), perhaps impatient with the time it took to negotiate the turn (or just keen to wrap it up).

For the next question, BM again selects Elizaveta as next speaker: "Do you like the weather today Liza?" (41-42). This question is not directly related to the question Elizaveta has just answered about the season (24 and 34), but it more closely resembles a follow-up to the question addressed to Larisa in line 15 ("What is the weather like today?") Therefore the question can be seen as a new nomination of Elizaveta for next turn. She pauses for 1.0 second (43) before

answering that she does not like the weather (44). BM extends the interaction, questioning what kind of weather Elizaveta does like (45). Elizaveta starts to answer "I like" (46), but pauses when Kirill enters the room. This 2.0 second pause (47) belongs to Elizaveta, although she does not realise it immediately. When Kirill does not speak (as noted above, he awaits his turn to do so), and BM does not address him yet, Elizaveta resumes her turn. When she begins to answer this time, however, she uses the wrong construction: "the weather is" (48). BM interrupts her (49) to remind her of the correct construction. As instructor, BM can claim a turn at any point, and often does so to correct student turns. There is another 2.0 second pause (50) during which Elizaveta does not take up her nominated turn. In line 51, BM expands on the hint, explaining that there should be an adjective followed by the word "weather." She also starts the construction for Elizaveta: "I like?=" Elizaveta latches on the started construction and says "Hot?," (52). BM uses the response token "Mmhm," with a continuing intonation to indicate that Elizaveta is correct, but that her turn is not complete yet (53). Elizaveta treats this continuation token as a requirement to add more adjectives to the kind of weather she likes: "Not nasty (.) and not windy." (54). She has forgotten to say "weather," which BM provides (55). The "w" in BM's turn is prolonged, and Elizaveta takes up the correction quickly enough to overlap BM (56). BM thanks Elizaveta upon her turn completion (57), and at this point turns to Kirill (as discussed above).

Last in this excerpt BM nominates Larisa as next speaker for the final sequence of questions-answers. In line 61 BM asks Larisa what month it is now. Larisa uses the token "mm" which indicates she is thinking about the response (62), at which point BM latches on to repeat the question (63). There is a 2.0 second pause that belongs to Larisa as expected next speaker (64). She hesitates, but takes up her nominated turn with "uh" after which she pauses again for 0.5 seconds (65). BM does not interrupt to help her, so she resumes her turn with "the month uh". This construction is incorrect and the second "uh" emphasises that Larisa does not know how to answer correctly. BM claims a turn to pose the question again, using

stress to hint at the proper construction of the answer (66): "What month <u>is it</u> now?" Larisa answers correctly (67) and BM calls her to the board to begin the next classroom exercise. With this BM closes the question-answer interaction with Larisa, but also the overall exercise of dates and weather with all of the students.

In this excerpt the instructors and students orient to their institutional roles. BM as instructor selects the next speaker, and the students carry out the actions required by her, sometimes requiring negotiation to achieve the correct form. This negotiation with the instructor is an integral aspect of the classroom interaction, as the goal of learning is facilitated by the instructor's instruction and corrections. There are several latches but few overlaps, pointing to the skilful negotiation of turn-taking by the interactants in the classroom. The students do not speak unless directly addressed by BM. We also find several student-owned pauses after which BM claims a turn, or inserts sequences of interaction, to achieve completion of the required student turns. The students do not speak unless addressed, and when addressed they must complete their turns.

Excerpt 6 (ST.1b.2)
In this final excerpt of turn-taking analysis, there are six students in attendance. This excerpt shows one exercise of many for which the students are divided into two teams, and the teams are competing for points. Team 1 is made up of Andrej, Marina and Natal'ja. Team 2 comprises Aleksej, Aleksandra and Nina. In the previous exercise the students had taken turns drawing sentence models on the board. The models are made up of squares, triangles, circles, and punctuation, the shapes representing nouns, verbs, and prepositional phrases. For this exercise, they must now make sentences according to the various models. The sentences are created using the vocabulary they have learned in class so far, such as where someone lives and the size of his or her house. Finally, whoever has drawn each model has a reserved right to speak when that model comes up in the interaction.

Excerpt 6. ST.1b.2

1	ST:	Tak. (1.0) Da. (1.0) To u kogo model'ku narisoval tot i dolžen s- skazat' *So. (1.0). Yes. (1.0) So whoever drew the model has to g- give*
2		mne, pervuju model' u nas Drew risoval? *me [an example], the first model was drawn by Drew? ((Andrej))*
3	(girl):	Da *Yes*
4		((several students speak at once))
5	Andrej:	Pervuju? *The first one?*
6	ST:	Pervuju vot u tebja kvadrat, treugol'nik, i kružoček. (Kakoj-to primer) *The first look you have a square, triangle, and circle. (What kind of*
7		možno postavit' po takoj modeli? Pomniš'? (.) Vy možete pomogat' *example) can you make from this model? Do you remember? (.) You can*
8		drug drugu. *help each other.*
9	Marina:	Nu ( ) dim- ((frustrated, covers face with fist)) *But ( ) dim-*
10		((Aleksej, Aleksandra, Nina - team #2 - waving hands in air))
11	ST:	Zabyli? *Have you forgotten?*
12	Andrej:	Sčas. (.) Čto-to skažu. (5.0) *Just a sec. (.) I'll say something. (5.0)*
13	ST:	Skaži *Say it*
14	Andrej:	I (.) I ha- (.) I ha? (.) a house da? *I (.) I ha- (.) I ha? (.) a house yes?*
15	Marina:	Net *No*
16	ST:	Net, ne ( ) *No, not ( )*
17		((Aleksej and Aleksandra waving hands, Aleksandra squeaking))
18	Marina:	I- (.)
19	Natalja:	((whispering loudly)) I live
20	Andrej:	I lis?
21	ST:	I <u>live</u>
22	Andrej:	Ah. (.) I live in the (.) h- house.
23	ST:	Okay, s nebol'šoj ošibkoj. Alex. *Okay, with a small mistake. Alex. ((Aleksej))*
24	Aleksej:	I live in the zoo.
25	ST:	In the zoo. Okay vtoraja model'ka Marina. *In the zoo. Okay the second model Marina.*
26	Marina:	The house is good.
27	ST:	((looks at models on board)) <u>Vtora:ja model'</u> *<u> The se:cond model</u>*
28	Marina:	Ah. (6.0) I k- have a mother.
29	ST:	I have a mother right. Your turn Saša. ((Aleksandra))
30	Aleksandra:	I have a sister.

31	ST:	Okay tret'ja model' načinaem s vami (ili vy slyšite ved')
		Okay the third model we begin with you (or you can hear right)
32	Nina:	I live in (.) I live in the house.
33	ST:	It's wrong.
34	Aleksej:	Net.
		No.
35		((Andrej puts hand in air, makes excited noises))
36	ST:	Tixo Drew. hh spokojnee. hhh
		Quiet Drew. ((Andrej)) hh calm down. hhh
37		((Andrej continues to wave hand excitedly, but quietly))
38		U tebja tam (kvadrat S) stoit uhh značok bukva S
		You have a (square S) standing uhhh a symbol with the letter S
39		(3.0)
40	Aleksej:	<u>He</u>
41		(2.0) ((looks at ST, ST nods))
42		<u>He</u>
43	Nina:	He lives in the house
44	ST:	He lives in the house=Drew. U vas Nataša risoval (etu) model'ku.
		He lives in the house=Drew. ((Andrej)) Nataša ((Natalja)) drew this
		model for your team.
45		Nataša. ((ST clarifies that the next turn rightfully is Natalja's, not Andrej's))
46	Natalja:	He lives (1.5) in (0.5) the garden.
47	ST:	In the garden=Okay, četvërtuju model' Alex ty risoval?=
		In the garden=Okay, the fourth model you drew Alex?=
48	Aleksej:	=Da:: (3.0) The- (.) The house (.) is big
		=Ye::s (3.0) The- (.) The house (.) is big
49	ST:	The house is big=Drew?,= ((Andrej))
50	Marina:	=ºDavajº
		=ºGo onº
51		((pushes Andrej to stand up))
52		(1.0)
53		ºThe houseº
54	Andrej:	Ty čë?
		What's with you?
55	Marina:	º<u>Da</u>º
		º<u>Yes</u>º
56	Andrej:	Dik- (možno?)
		But- (it's possible?)
57	ST:	Da
		Yes
58		(10.0) ((other students waving hands, grunting))
59	Andrej:	It is?
60	ST:	(Možno) ((nods))
		(Possible)
61	Andrej:	It is ºtwelveº
62	ST:	Čto?
		What?
63	Andrej:	It is twelve.
64	Marina:	<u>Ne:t</u>!
		<u>No:</u>!

65	ST:	Net. (Postavil) nepravil'no.
		No. (You put it together) incorrectly.
66	Marina:	Da ty čë
		No way
67	Andrej:	Da ty čë. Vsë xorošo.
		No way. It's all correct.
68	Marina:	( )
69	ST:	Net četvërtaja model' ( ) Da èto vsë pravil'no. (.) Okay (.) kto u vas
		No the fourth model ( ) Yes it's all correct. (.) Okay (.) who drew
70		risoval?
		this one?
71	Aleksandra:	((raises hand)) Is the house small?
72	ST:	Mmhmm.
73		(2.0)
74		Marina, tvoja model'ka?
		Marina, is ((it)) your model?
75	Marina:	Is the house high?
76	ST:	Is the house high?
77		((Andrej waves hand))
78		Okay (sledujuščij)
		Okay (next)
79	Andrej:	The house-
80	Marina:	[[is
81	Natalja:	[[is
82	Andrej:	Is the house-
83	Marina:	°Dik ty čë!° ((angry whisper))
		°*What's with you!*°
84	ST:	Mari:na ((admonishes her and smiles))
85	Andrej:	The house is not (.) good
86	ST:	The house is not good. Otri- mmm (.) otricatel'noe predloženije.
		The house is not good. Neg- mmm (.) a negative sentence.
87	Nina:	The house is not big.
88	ST:	The house is not big. (.) Model'ki narisovali vse pravil'no da?
		The house is not big. (.) All the models were drawn correctly, right?

In this lesson ST orients to the plan she, as instructor, has created for the classroom interaction; she has authority over its organisation. The exercises lead from one into the next, and so by introducing this exercise at this point, she is structuring the interaction according to the lesson plan. In ST's previous turn (not shown here) she tells the students that for this exercise they must create sentences based on the models. The excerpt begins with her explanation that whoever drew each model in the previous exercise will now create a sentence based on it (1-2). With this explanation she is informing the students that the turn-taking will be based on a specific order and not open to self-selection. She will not choose next

speaker at random, but will choose the order of team turns, and will enforce the order of turn-taking based on the models.

Throughout the interaction ST orients to her role as instructor. In lines 6-7, she clarifies which model Andrej's sentence should be based on, and with the question "What kind of example can you make from this model?" she is not only encouraging him to take his nominated turn, but also repeating the instructions to ensure he understands them. As instructor, she helps the students negotiate their turns by providing instructions, assistance, and corrections. Throughout the excerpt we find several examples where ST evaluates the students' sentences. If the sentence is correct, she often simply repeats the student's turn in part or in whole (lines 25, 29, 44, 47, 49, 76, 86 and 88). For example, in line 24 Aleksej creates the sentence "I live in the zoo." and ST repeats "In the zoo." before selecting the appropriate next speaker from the other team (25). In line 86, she repeats Andrej's correct sentence "The house is not good." and confirms that the model requires a negative sentence. ST achieves several actions with the repetition: evaluates the sentence as correct; reviews the structure for the entire class; and indicates to the next speaker that the current turn is completed.

If the sentence is incorrect, ST tells the student that he is wrong (16, 27, 33, and 65). Because this exercise is a competition for points, she does not always provide assistance but simply evaluates the answer and allows the teams to negotiate the correct answer themselves. In line 65 ST tells Andrej that he created his sentence incorrectly. In another example, ST does not directly say Marina's sentence is wrong; she repeats part of her previous turn (25) with a stressed intonation to let Marina know she is incorrect: "the se:cond model"(27). In line 33, ST tells Nina that her sentence "I live in the house." (32) is incorrect: "It's wrong." Nina's teammate Aleksej also tells her it is wrong (34). In line 38 ST intervenes to provide assistance to Nina, who has not taken up her turn to correct the sentence:

"You have a (square S) standing uhhh a symbol with the letter S."[33] There is a 3.0 second pause owned by Nina (39), who again does not take up her turn. Aleksej stresses the subject "he" (40) and looks to ST, who nods to tell him he is correct (2.0). Aleksej repeats "he" again (42), and Nina completes her sentence correctly: "He lives in the house" (43).

ST also provides assistance when a student is struggling with his or her answer. Andrej has the first turn, and has already received prompting from ST on what is expected (lines 6-7, discussed above). In line 11 ST asks him if he has forgotten how to create a sentence based on the symbols. She is not just asking if he has indeed forgotten, but reinforcing his nomination as next speaker; whether or not he can create a sentence, Andrej must take the next turn. He is not ready to create his sentence, but in line 12 shows he understands he must say something: "Just a sec. (.) I'll say something." There is a 5.0 second pause that belongs to him (12), which ST interrupts to enforce his turn again: "Say it" (13). In line 14 finally takes up his turn, first nominated in line 2: "I (.) ha- (.) I ha?> (.) a house yes?" As discussed above, this sentence is incorrect and ST evaluates it as such (16). Andrej's teammates both take turns to provide assistance (18, 19) to help him repair his sentence, and in line 20 he hesitates: "I lis?" ST corrects him (21), and he creates the sentence: "I live in the (.) h- house." (22). ST assesses his turn as correct with a small mistake (23). As we have seen, ST evaluates the students' turns, which are sometimes negotiated over several turns with assistance from ST and teammates. ST as instructor maintains this pattern. When a student creates a correct sentence, their turn is over. When the sentence is wrong, the student's 'overall' turn is not over until the mistake is corrected.

As noted above, ST does not choose the next speaker at random, but rather according to the order of models drawn on the board. The decision to select next speaker this way is still hers, however, and as such she maintains control over the

---

[33] Based on the correct answer, it seems that the square with S represents a third-person subject.

turn-taking organisation of the exercise. ST moderates the order of 'team turns' for the various sentence models, starting with the order 'Team 1-Team 2' (2, 23, 25, and 29). After two turns by each team, she switches the order to 'Team 2-Team 1' (31, 44, 47, and 49). She explains the switch so that Team 2 is not always listening to the correct answer by Team 1 before answering themselves (31). Up to this point, Team 1 has taken several turns to negotiate each correct answer, while Team 2 has answered correctly in one turn. In contrast, after the switch the first Team 2 sentence takes several turns to be produced correctly. In line 69, ST reverts to the 'Team 1-Team 2' order (78). In line 87, Nina interprets the pattern set by ST and assumes her turn as next speaker from Team 2, having been the one who drew the last model on the board.

ST also enforces the nomination of next speaker according to the models they had drawn. In lines 35 and 37, Andrej is excitedly waving his hand to be selected as next speaker. When it comes to Andrej's team's turn, ST latches his name to her previous utterance (44), therefore not allowing him a chance to self-select. ST then explains that Natal'ja drew this model and therefore she is next speaker (44-45). In line 47 she again latches her repetition of the correct answer with her question confirming that Aleksej is the next speaker. These latches in two successive turns by ST (44, 47) reinforce the order of turns according to who has drawn which models. In lines 69-70, ST asks who drew the next model to determine whose turn it should be. Aleksandra raises her hand to indicate the right to speak is hers (71). In line 74 ST confirms that Marina drew the next model. Finally, in line 77 Andrej waves his hand to indicate it is his turn, which ST acknowledges (78).

In lines 7-8, ST tells the class that they can help each other for this exercise. Students may self-select during a teammate's turn to assist him, but the overall turn itself belongs to the nominated speaker until the correct answer is achieved. There are several instances when teammates self-select to provide assistance, or evaluate, each other's sentences in order to produce the correct sentence (15, 18,

19, 34, 40, 42, 53, 55, 64, 68, 80, 81, and 83). For example, in lines 18 and 19, Marina and Natal'ja provide Andrej with the first parts of his sentence. Members of the other team are waving their hands to claim a turn (17), and by prompting Andrej with the start of his sentence, Marina and Natal'ja are encouraging him to take his rightful turn. In lines 49 through 60, we see a lengthy interaction between ST, Andrej and Marina. Marina pressures Andrej to take his turn and provides him with the start of an example sentence (50-53). Andrej does not trust that Marina is providing him with the correct structure (54, 56) until ST confirms it is possible (57). There is a 10.0 second pause that belongs to Andrej (58) during which other students try to claim a turn by waving hands in the air, but ST does not acknowledge their claims. In line 59 Andrej begins his sentence construction. When he completes his sentence (63), both Marina (64, 66, and 68) and ST (65) assess his answer as incorrect. Andrej however argues that he is indeed correct (67) and ST checks the model and changes her assessment (69): "Yes it's all correct." We see here that Marina self-selected multiple times for this sentence alone, trying to provide assistance to Andrej.

It is interesting to note that the students only speak during their own, or a teammate's, turn and not during the opposing team's turns. We have seen that the students self-select to assess a teammate's turn or provide assistance, as allowed for by ST. While they would likely not be willing to assist the other team, it is plausible they would want to point out when their opponents are wrong. Either the students respect the ordering of 'team turns' established by ST and self-select only during a teammate's turn, or they want their opponents to be wrong and therefore do not want to point out mistakes and inadvertently help them. Perhaps it is a bit of both. The students do raise their hands during difficulties in opponent's turns (10, 17, 35, 37, and 58); they do not speak out of turn (here the team's turn), but indicate to ST that they would like her to nominate them as next speaker. ST does not select any of these students outside of their team's turns. In fact she tells Andrej to calm down (36) when he is trying to get selected as next speaker (35, 37). On the other hand, the only time the students do raise their hands

is when an opponent is having a hard time answering correctly. They recognise there is a problem but do not speak out of turn (which would potentially help the other team).

To conclude, in this excerpt the students are competing on two teams and ST has opened up the turn-taking to allow teammates to assist each other. As instructor, however, she maintains overall control of the turn-taking, selecting the order of 'team turns' and enforcing the individual students' rights to speak about the models they had drawn. While teammates self-select to assess and assist each other's utterances, when it is the other team's 'turn' they do not speak out of turn. They may raise their hands during these other team's turns, but they are not nominated to speak by ST. Despite the competitive and somewhat open nature of this exercise, there is only one short overlap (80-81) when Marina and Natal'ja self-select at the same time to assist Andrej. There are also few pauses throughout this excerpt, mostly student-owned when thinking about their sentence creation. We see, therefore, that the interactants in the classroom are successfully negotiating the 'rules' of talk: one speaker at a time, no gaps, no overlaps. The instructor sets out and maintains the constraints on what can be done in this particular exercise, and the students abide by them. In section 4.2 I turn to the sequential organisation of the classroom interaction, specifically Adjacency Pairs such as question-answer and greeting-greeting.

4.2 Sequence Organisation

4.2.1 Theory
 "A second core idea of CA is that utterances in interactional talk are *sequentially organised*. The idea of 'sequence' refers to the common experience that 'one thing can lead to another'" (Ten Have 2000: 113). For the analysis of sequence

organisation, the main concept involves adjacency pairs [APs[34]], although a sequence

> quite often includes more than just two-pair parts. In many cases, an item in 'third position' is added to the two utterances in AP format, as an acknowledgement or evaluation by the first speaker of the item produced in second position. (Ibid)

APs, according to Schegloff and Sacks (1973: 295-6), "consist of sequences which properly have the following features: (1) two utterance length, (2) adjacent positioning of component utterances, (3) different speakers producing each utterance" (in Ten Have 2000: 20). Some examples of adjacency pairs are question-answer, invitation-acceptance/refusal, greeting-greeting, the first pair part always going before the other (Silverman 1998: 105)). The first pair part constrains what the next speaker *should* do; if the expected second pair part is not done, it will be seen as absent (Ibid). "Adjacency pairs can now be seen as a powerful way of recognizing a relationship between a current utterance and a prior and a next utterance" (Ibid).

Some adjacency pairs act as a *pre-sequence* (Ten Have 2000: 114). They prepare for the next pair(s), which are part of the *core sequence* (Ibid). "So you can have pairs that have implications for what can follow. They can be designed to check whether a certain condition for a possible next action exists, and they are conventionally heard to be doing just that" (Ibid). Some examples of pre-sequences are pre-invitations, pre-requests, and pre-announcements; we also find pre-sequences that indicate that the ordinary turn-taking system will be temporarily lifted, such as for a joke or a story (Ibid).

> Sequences…are *patterns* of subsequent actions, where the 'subsequentiality' is not an arbitrary occurrence, but the realization of locally constituted projections, rights, and obligations.
> (Ten Have 2000: 114-115; his italics)

---

[34] See the list of abbreviations in Appendix C.

In most types of adjacency pairs (other than greeting-greeting) it is not unusual for sequences to be inserted before the second pair part is produced, known as *sequence expansion* (Ten Have 2000: 114). For example, when speaker A asks speaker B to go to a movie, speaker B can ask questions as well to get details such as time and place before providing an answer to the initial invitation (Silverman 1992: 106). After the second speaker provides the recognizable answer, the person who asked the initial question has, according to Sacks, 'a reserved right to speak' (Sacks 1992: 264; referred to in Silverman 1998: 108). "Since this right *can* be used to ask a further question, we can have an indefinitely long chain of the form: Q-A-Q-A-Q etc." (Ibid). In this example, a pre-invitation could be something like, "Have you heard about X's new movie Y?"[35]

In the classroom, instructors often organise instructional sequences using 'questions with known answers;' that is, "teachers routinely know the answers to their questions, and … this is understood by everyone else in the room, whether those others know the answers or not" (MacBeth 2004: 704). Two 'known answer' teacher turns are the RPQ [reverse polarity question] and the DIU [designedly incomplete utterance] (Koshik 2000). An example of a RPQ[36] is given in line 2 below, designed to draw the student's attention to the repairable in their turn in line 1:

1) student: Her eyes is blue.
2) teacher: Do we say her eyes *is* blue?
3) student: Her eyes are blue.

An example of a DIU[37] is given in line 3, designed to elicit the correct response from the student (absent in line 2):

1) teacher: What is the frog's name?
2) student: It (pause)
3) teacher: The frog's name is
4) student: The frog's name is Fred.

---

[35] See section 4.4.2 for an illustration of the typical sequences of adjacency pairs in the classroom.
[36] See Excerpt 24 for an example of a RPQ in the data.
[37] See Excerpt 22 for an example of a DIU in the data.

4.2.2 Analysis

For the analysis of sequential organisation, I look at some longer excerpts, as in the previous section, as well as many shorter examples of adjacency pairs. To begin, I look at greeting pairs in the classroom.

4.2.2.1 Greeting - Greeting

In her lessons PN regularly calls the class to order by having the students stand up, exchange greetings, and then sit down. This pattern indicates for the students that the time for 'before class' chatting is over and the institutional setting is established (at least for this moment). Excerpts 7 through 9 are all taken from the start of PN's lessons.

Excerpt 7. PN.3a.2

```
1   PN:         Let's begin our lesson. (.) Well if you are ready? (.) please stand up.
2               (4.0) ((students stand up))
3               Well?, (.) good morning.
4   students:   Good morning.
5   PN:         I am glad to see you.
6   students:   We are glad to see you too.
7   PN:         Please sit down.
8               (0.5) ((students sit down))
9               Rebjata my s vami urok načinaem …
                Children we begin our lesson …
```

In this short excerpt from the beginning of PN's lesson with class 3a, we have a pre-sequence as well as a core sequence of chained pairs. The *pre-sequence,* in lines 1 and 2, prepares the conditions for the greeting-greeting pairs to follow. In line 1 PN tells the class the lesson is starting and asks the students to stand up. In line 2 they comply and rise from their seats. Once this pre-sequence is completed, PN greets the students: "Well?, (.) good morning." (3). Her greeting is the first part of the two pair parts. As noted above, the first pair part constrains what the next speaker should do. In the classroom setting, when the instructor greets the students they must carry out the required action of the second pair part and return

the greeting. In ordinary conversation, on the other hand, the recipient of the greeting may refuse to return the greeting for any host of reasons. (Not *all* students must greet her in the second pair part, of course, but at least one of them must respond so that the reply is not seen as absent; it would be difficult for the instructor to watch all students at once to ensure that every one of them had greeted her.) In line 4, then, we see the required second pair part. The students respond to her greeting in chorus: "Good morning." This response not only fulfils the second action of the pair, but also shows the students' acknowledgement of PN's right as instructor to initiate a greeting pair at this time.

In lines 5 and 6 we see a chained second greeting pair. PN, as instructor *and* as initiator of the first pair greeting, has a reserved right to speak. She claims this right and in line 5 says: "I am glad to see you." Again the students are required to respond with a second pair part, which they do in line 6: "We are glad to see you too." These chained greeting pairs (3-6) make up the core sequence. In line 7 PN again has a reserved right to speak, but rather than chaining another greeting pair, she signifies that the core sequence has ended by asking the students to sit down. By sitting down (8), the students acknowledge that the greeting pair sequence is completed. However, the instructor telling the students to sit down serves not only as a close to the greeting sequence, but also acts as a pre-sequence to prepare the conditions for the next interaction - here the beginning of the teaching component of the lesson (9).

Excerpt 8 (PN.3b.3)
In this excerpt from PN's lesson with class 3b, we see a similar pattern of sequences as the one in excerpt 7. Again, PN is calling the class to order. The students are standing, PN asks one of them to close the door (1). In line 2 PN draws their attention to the start of the lesson: "Well, (.) the door is closed and let's start our English lesson." She is orienting to the educational goal of learning English, and calling on the students to do so as well, i.e., let *us* start the lesson. Lines 1 and 2 also act as a pre-sequence, preparing interactional conditions in the

Excerpt 8. PN.3b.3

1	PN:	Please, uh (.) close the door. (1.0) Thank you. (1.0)
2		Well, (.) the door is closed and let's start our English lesson.
3		Good afternoon.
4	students:	Good afternoon.
5	PN:	I am glad to see you.
6	students:	I am glad to see you, too.
7	PN:	Please sit down.
8		(0.5) ((students sit down))
9		Rebjat, každyj urok my s vami načinaem …
		Children, every lesson we begin with …

classroom for the greeting pair to follow. In line 3 PN initiates a two pair part greeting, telling the students "Good afternoon." The students take up the required second pair part and return the greeting (4). In lines 5 and 6 we see another chained second greeting pair. PN, who has the reserved right to speak, ties a second greeting pair to the first (5): "I am glad to see you." The students take up the second pair part again and respond to PN's greeting (6). The two pairs of greetings in lines 3 through 6 form the core sequence here. In line 7 PN tells the students to sit down, ending the greeting sequence of the lesson. The students obey and sit down (8). As in excerpt 7, the instructor telling the students to sit down closes the greeting sequences and sets the conditions for the first part of the lesson plan (9).

Excerpt 9. PN.3c.2

1	PN:	All right, well let's start with our exam.
2		Hello.
3	students:	Hello
4	PN:	I am glad to see you
5	students:	I am glad to see you, too
6	PN:	All right, please sit down.
7		((students sit down))
8		I tak my obyčno každyj urok načinaem …
		And so we usually start each lesson …

In this third excerpt from the start of PN's lessons, here from class PN.3c, the pattern is the same as in the previous two excerpts. The pre-sequence is shorter in this example as the students are already standing and the door is closed; PN

simply needs to tell the class the lesson is starting. In line 1, PN sets the conditions for the greeting pair by telling the class, "All right, well let's start with our exam." Again she uses the construction "let us" to orient the students to the beginning of the lesson. In line 2, PN greets the students with the first pair part of a greeting pair: "Hello." In line 3 the students return the greeting "hello," therefore taking up the necessary second pair part. It is interesting to note that in all three excerpts, the students return the same greeting that PN used with them, either "good morning," "good afternoon," or here, simply "hello." For the students, not only must they respond to the instructor's greeting, but their choice of greeting in the second pair part seems to be closely tied to her choice as well. In line 4 PN chains a second greeting pair, telling the students she is glad to see them. The students return the same greeting in line 5: "I am glad to see you, too." In this excerpt the core sequence can be seen in line 2 through 5. PN indicates that this core sequence is completed in line 6 when she asks the students to sit down, which they do (7). Again, by closing the sequence PN prepares to open the next one, the lesson itself (8).

In all three excerpts from PN's lessons, we saw the same structure: pre-sequence, chained pairs of greetings, and closing (pre-sequence for next action). Now I turn to two excerpts, 10 and 11, from ST's class to analyse the greetings at the start of her lessons.

Excerpt 10 (ST.1b.2)
The pattern in excerpt 10 is also the same as that found in PN's lessons. The students stand by their desks, ST calls the class to order, they exchange greetings, and the students take their seats. We see a pre-sequence over several turns, chained greeting pairs, and a closing/pre-sequence for next action. As before, it is the instructor establishing the sequences of actions, and through them the institutional context of the interaction. The pre-sequence in this excerpt can be found in lines 1 through 6. ST asks the students if they are ready to begin (1), and various students respond that they are (2-3). Lines 1 through 3 of the pre-sequence

Excerpt 10. ST.1b.2

1	ST:	Gotovy?=
		Ready?=
2	students:	=<u>Yes</u>
3	students:	Yes
4	ST:	°( )°
5		Let's start davajte načněm.
		Let's start let's begin.
6		(0.5)
7		Good afternoon
8	students:	Good afternoon.
9	ST:	I am glad to see you
10	students:	I am glad to see you too
11	ST:	Thank you sit down please
12		(1.0) ((students sit down))
13		How are you Nataša

are in fact a question-answer adjacency pair with one first pair part, the question, and two second pair parts, the students' responses. By asking the question, ST is requiring the next action, an answer, and the students must respond. In line 4 ST says something inaudible, and then says, "Let's start let's begin." (5). As PN did, ST also uses the "let us" construction to include the students in the orientation to the beginning of the lesson. ST pauses (6), ensuring the conditions for the next sequence have been met: the students are quiet and attentive.

In line 7 ST greets the students: "Good afternoon." Her first pair part is taken up by the students, who return the greeting and fulfil the requirements of the second pair part (8). As PN did, ST also chains a second greeting pair in line 9: "I am glad to see you." In line 10, the students again return her greeting in their second pair part: "I am glad to see you too." The core sequence of greeting pairs is then seen in lines 7 through 10. In line 11, ST closes the greeting sequence by asking the students to sit down. They do so (12) and the pre-conditions for the next sequence are set. In line 13, ST begins the lesson with practice question-answer pairs.

Excerpt 11. ST.1b.3

1	ST:	Are you ready? Gotovy?
		Are you ready? Ready?
2	students:	Yes
3	ST:	Okay,
4		hello.
5	students:	Hello
6	ST:	I am glad to see you
7	students:	I am glad to see you too
8	ST:	Thank you,
9		sit down please.
10		(1.0) ((students sit down))
11		How are you Ol'ga?

In excerpt 11, also from ST's class, the pattern is the same. There is a pre-sequence (1-3), which itself is a question-answer adjacency pair. There are two chained greeting pairs (4-8). Lastly, there is a closing of this action, also pre-sequence for next action (9-10). The students are standing by their desks when ST asks them if they are ready (1); the students respond that they are (2). In line 3 we see an item in third position relative to the question-answer adjacency pair. ST says "okay," acknowledging the item produced in second position.

ST then says "hello" to the students, the first pair part of the greeting (4). The students, as in the other examples, return the greeting in line 5. ST chains a second greeting pair in line 6, telling the students she is glad to see them; this greeting is returned in line 7: "I am glad to see you too." For both greeting pairs, the students have produced the required second pair parts. In line 8 we see another 'third position' item, here relative to the greeting pair in lines 6 and 7. ST is thanking the students for their greeting in second position (7). At this point she asks the students to sit down (9) and they obey (10). Lines 9 and 10 signify the end of the greeting pairs and prepare the students for the next sequence. In line 11, she does so, introducing a question-answer portion of the lesson. Next I turn to three excerpts from the beginning of BM's lessons, 12 through 14, to see if the greeting pattern is the same for her classroom interactions.

Excerpt 12. BM.2a.2

```
1   BM:          Good morning?,
2   students:    Good morning
3   BM:          Sit down please.
4                (0.5) ((students sit down))
5                Let's start our lesson, …
```

In this excerpt from a lesson with class BM.2a, there is no pre-sequence. BM is standing at the front of the class, and her silence prior to speaking (not shown here) appears to suffice as the pre-sequence, drawing the students' attention to her desire to speak. In line 1 BM greets the students with "good morning." In line 2 the students produce the required second pair part and return the greeting. As with the other classes, the students return the same greeting as used by the instructor. BM does not chain a second greeting pair, and so lines 1 and 2 alone form the core sequence. In line 3 she closes the greeting sequence and asks the students to sit down. They show their acceptance of the end of the sequence by taking their seats, allowing BM to begin the next sequence, the content of the lesson. (5)

Excerpt 13. BM.2b.1

```
1   BM:          Well sit down please.
2                (1.5)  ((students sit down))
3                Let's start our lesson. mhm …
```

Excerpt 14. BM.2b.2

```
1   BM:          Požalujsta?, (.)
                 Please?, (.)
2                Let's start our lesson=<Davajte načněm naš urok.> …
                 Let's start our lesson=<let's begin our lesson,>…
```

In excerpts 13 and 14, both from lessons with class BM.2b, BM does not greet the students. We see pre-sequences that take place before the start of the lesson content. In excerpt 13, BM asks the students to sit down (1) to set the conditions for the next interactional sequence, the starting of the lesson (3). In excerpt 14, BM says "please" with a questioning-continuing intonation to indicate she is

ready to speak (1). This is a pre-sequence that leads into the next sequence, the start of the lesson (2).

When there is a greeting pair at the beginning of a lesson, all instructors follow the same pattern: pre-sequence, core sequence (one or two greeting pairs), and closing, which also acts as a pre-sequence for the next action. The instructor has the right to start the lesson whenever and however she wants. The students in each example orient to the instructor's right to do so, by obeying the commands to stand up and sit down, and by producing the appropriate second pair parts when required. If the students had not stood up or sat down, had not returned any greetings, or had carried on other talk, the instructor would have called on their inappropriate behaviour and enforced the proper conditions for the greetings (and start of the lessons).

4.2.2.2 Invitation - Acceptance / Refusal

In the next section I look at 'invitation - acceptance / refusal' adjacency pairs in the classroom. These will not be 'traditional' invitations to social events, for example, but rather invitations for the students to come to the blackboard or do other such actions that they would otherwise not be allowed to do independently of the instructor's permission. As students, they also do not have the right to turn down an invitation by the instructor without a valid justification, so the second pair part is usually constrained to 'acceptance' only. Such invitations, therefore, are 'command invitations,' i.e., invitations constrained by the institutional setting. I look at the invitations' structure (how they are accepted, difficulties, expansion sequences, etc.) and compare them to each other.

Excerpt 15 (BM.2a.2)
In this excerpt, BM has asked Larisa to go to the blackboard to transcribe phonetically the words (specifically, names of months) that BM will write for her.

Excerpt 15. BM.2a.2

```
1   BM:            (.) Okay tak, Laura, go to the blackboard please.
                   (.) Okay so, Laura, ((Larisa)) go to the blackboard please.
2                  (0.5) ((Larisa goes to the front of the class)
3                  Well, sejčas tebe budet zadanie (  ), zatranskribirovat' (  ).
                   Well, now you will have the task (  ),to transcribe (        ).
4   Larisa:        Oh:
5                  ((reacts as if the task is very difficult, stands at the board))
6   BM:            Well ja èti tebe napišu, ty požalujsta napiši mne transkriptsiju
                   Well I will write these for you, you write the transcription for me please
7                  (28.0) ((BM writes words on the board))
8                  Well požalujsta (  ).
                   Well please (  ).
9                  (((Larisa begins transcribing))
```

There are four students in class, and BM has been posing questions about the weather and months of the year. In line 1 BM invites Larisa to go to the board, the first pair part of the invitation. Larisa has no choice but to accept; if she were to refuse, it would likely lead to some form of explanatory or disciplinary expansion sequence. (One can imagine the instructor's reaction if Larisa had questioned the invitation with "Why?") In line 2 Larisa gets up from her desk to go to the board, a silent second pair part showing her acceptance of the invitation. As initiator of the adjacency pair, BM has a reserved right to speak and in line 3 inserts a sequence to explain Larisa's task. In line 4 responds with "Oh:," indicating she is not pleased with her task, although this is not a refusal. In line 6 BM completes the inserted sequence, giving more precise instructions to Larisa. After writing the words on the board (7), BM again exercises her reserved right to speak and chains a second invitation to the first: "Well please (   )" (8). In line 9, Larisa begins transcribing, by her actions showing her acceptance of the invitation. The two chained invitations (1-2 and 8-9), with an expansion sequence inserted in lines 3 through 7, are negotiated by BM and Larisa to produce the desired affect: Larisa is at the board transcribing words which will later be used in a classroom exercise.

The next three excerpts, 16 through 18, are taken from exercises in PN's classes in which the students have each brought in a picture to form collages on the

board. They take turns describing their pictures, and the other students try to figure out which picture is theirs. When a student has a guess, PN invites them to the blackboard to point out the picture.

Excerpt 16. PN.3b.3

1	PN:	Okay, (0.5) who is this? (.) Kto èto? Any ideas? Čto, kto to dogadalsja?
		Okay, (0.5) who is this? (.) Who is this? Any ideas? What, has someone guessed?
2	Svetlana:	Mhm
3	PN:	Well Sue, ((Svetlana)) please come up to the blackboard=
4		idi k doske i možno ukazat'.
		go to the board and you can point ((it)) out.
5		(3.0) ((Svetlana goes to the board and points to a picture))

In this excerpt PN asks if anyone has guessed (1), and Svetlana indicates she has (2). Lines 1 and 2 serve as a pre-invitation. In line 1 PN is checking to see if the conditions for the possible next action, being invited to the blackboard, have been met: the student must have a guess in order to do so. Svetlana confirms that the conditions are met (2), and in lines 3-4 PN invites her to the board to make her guess. Svetlana accepts the invitation as the second pair part, in this case by doing rather than saying. She goes to the front of the room and points at a picture. This sequence, then, is made up of a pre-invitation (1-2), and invitation (3-5).

Excerpt 17. PN.3b.3

| 1 | PN: | All right. Well Boris, have you got any idea? |
| 2 | | (2.0) ((Boris goes to the board)) |

This excerpt is taken from the same lesson as excerpt 16, during the same exercise of guessing which picture the student is describing. It is from the very next 'picture – guess' discourse unit. Svetlana, who had guessed correctly in excerpt 16, is now the one describing a photo. In line 1, PN asks Boris if he has a guess, the same pre-invitation we saw in excerpt 16. This is the first pair part of a question-answer pair to determine if he has a guess, and therefore if he can be invited to the board. Rather than producing the second pair part of the pre-

invitation, Boris jumps right to the second pair part of the invitation (2) and goes to the board to make his guess. He interprets PN's first turn here according to the sequential organisation of the 'pre-invitation / invitation' of the prior excerpt, and sees the pre-invitation as performing the action of an invitation.

Excerpt 18. PN.3b.3

```
1   PN:         Irina, have you got any ideas who it is?
2               (1.0)
3   Irina:      I think ((stands up to go to the board))
4   PN:         Mhm,
5               (3.0)  ((Irina goes to the board))
```

This excerpt is from the same exercise as the previous two were. In line 1, PN asks Irina if she has a guess. This first pair part of a question-answer pair is part of the pre-sequence, again determining if the student has a guess before being invited to the board. After a pause (2), Irina says, "I think," and stands up to go to the board (3). As Boris did, she interprets the pre-invitation question as an invitation itself, so her utterance and action in line 3 is her acceptance, the second pair part of the invitation. In line 4 PN says, "Mhm," an utterance in third position relative to the invitation sequence in lines 1 and 3: PN is acknowledging Irina's acceptance of the invitation. In both excerpts 17 and 18, PN does not chastise the students for treating the pre-invitation as an invitation, and so she is seen to treat her pre-invitation question as an invitation as well.

In these three excerpts from the same exercise, we find the same core invitation sequence. In excerpt 16, there is a pre-invitation (1-2) before the invitation (3-5), the core sequence. In excerpts 17 and 18, the pre-invitation does the action of the invitation, and therefore the question of the pre-invitation first pair part combined with the acceptance of the invitation second pair part form an invitation - acceptance sequence. In all cases the students accept the instructor's invitation to go to the board and make a guess.

Excerpts 19 through 21 are taken from one of ST's lessons. There are seven

students in class, and they are taking turns telling stories about their stuffed animal's abilities from the front of the classroom. They do not return to their seats unless invited to do so by ST.

Excerpt 19. ST.1b.3

```
1    Jurij:      I can (1.0) dance (0.3) I can (0.5) count
2                I can (.) fly (1.0)
3                I can (11.0)
4                ((looks at ST))
5    ST:         Vsë, bol'še ne pomniš'?
                 That's all, you don't remember any more?
6                ((Jurij shakes his head))
7    ST:         Okay, thank you sit down please.
8                ((Jurij returns to his seat))
```

In lines 1-2, Jurij is telling his story about what his dog can and cannot do, such as dance, count and fly. In line 3 there is a lengthy 11.0 second pause owned by Jurij, who has half-completed the sentence "I can." In line 4 he looks at ST, which, along with the lengthy pause, she interprets as difficulty continuing his story. In line 5 she asks Jurij if he can remember anything else, to which he indicates no (6). This question-answer pair acts as a pre-invitation. ST is checking if the conditions for the next action, being invited to sit down, have been met: the student must have completed their stories. Because the conditions are met, she asks Jurij to sit down (7). The second part of the invitation, the acceptance, is non-verbally produced when Jurij takes his seat (8). Again, we see a pre-invitation (5-6) and an invitation sequence (7-8).

Excerpt 20 (ST.1b.3)

In this excerpt, Nina has been telling a story about her stuffed animal, as seen in line 1: "I can jump." In line 2 ST uses the token "Mhm?" to indicate Nina is correct and should continue. After a 7.0 second pause (3), ST asks if Nina can remember any other verbs. ST's question is part of the pre-invitation, confirming that Nina is finished before she can be invited to sit down. In line 4, Nina shakes her head to confirm that she is finished, which acts as the second pair part answer

Excerpt 20. ST.1b.3

```
1   Nina:        I can jump
2   ST:          Mhm?,
3                (7.0)
4                Eščë pomniš' kakie to dejstvija?
                 Do you remember any other actions?
5                ((Nina shakes her head))
6   ST:          Thank you, sit down please.
7                (0.5) ((Nina sits down))
```

of the pre-invitation. The conditions for the possible next sequence are met, and in line 6 ST invites Nina to take her seat. In line 7, ST accepts the invitation by returning to her seat. In this excerpt, therefore, we find both a pre-invitation (4-5) and an invitation sequence (6-7).

Excerpt 21. ST.1b.3

```
1   Marina:      I can jump.
2   ST:          °Vsë?°
                 That's all?
3                ((Marina nods))
4   ST:          °Goodbye°
5                (0.5) ((Marina returns to her seat))
```

In this excerpt Marina is telling her story about the stuffed animal, in line 1 saying, "I can jump." In line 2 ST initiates the pre-invitation sequence, asking if that is all. Marina confirms by nodding her head that she is done her 'story turn' (3). This nod is the second pair part of the question-answer pair forming the pre-invitation. At this point ST is able to carry out the next action of inviting Marina to sit down. If Marina had indicated she was not finished yet, the invitation would not have taken place in the next sequence. In line 4 ST tells Marina "Goodbye." This is a closing greeting that here acts as an invitation to sit down, as shown by Marina's action in line 6. Marina does not say goodbye in return, which would be the expected second pair part of a greeting - greeting pair; however, because she sits down, we see that the interactants treat this sequence in lines 5-6 as an invitation for Marina to return to her seat.

For all three examples from this exercise, excerpts 19, 20, and 21, we see a pre-invitation sequence followed by an invitation sequence. In each case the instructor initiates both sequences. In all of the pre-invitations from this classroom exercise (four student excerpts not given here), the students always produce the same second pair part, acknowledging that they are finished and therefore the conditions for the next possible action are met. Their 'story turns' vary greatly in length, so it seems that the instructor's question about being finished indicates to them that their turns should be complete. The students also all produce the required second pair part of the invitations, that is they all returned to their seats. In fact, in all of the excerpts in this section, the students accept the instructor's invitation to carry out an action. Sometimes we see a pre-invitation, sometimes just the invitation itself, but this invitation is always accepted.

In the next section I will look at the organisational structure of question-answer adjacency pairs, including pre-sequences, sequence expansions, and the chaining of pairs.

4.2.2.3 Question - Answer

Excerpt 22 (PN.3a.2)
In this longer excerpt from lesson PN.3a.2, PN starts the lesson after the initial classroom greetings (shown in excerpt 7). PN is reviewing the possible variants for asking, and responding to, "how are you?" in English with the seven students in class.

In lines 1 and 2 we find a pre-sequence that prepares the students for the coming sequences. PN reminds the class that they usually begin their lessons with "how are you?" questions. Once she has drawn attention to their knowledge of such questions and answers, she asks, "which questions do we know, how in English

Excerpt 22. PN.3a.2

1	PN:	Rebjata my s vami urok načinaem (.) obyčno, s voprosom
		Children we begin our lesson (.) usually, with the question
2		kak dela da? kak požyvaeš',
		how are things right? how are you doing,
3		kakie my s vami voprosy znaem, kak možno po anglijski zadat' ètot
		which questions do we know, how in English can you pose
4		vopros. (.)
		this question. (.)
5		Kto pomnit.
		Who remembers.
6		(0.5)
7		(Vot) samyj lëgkij kotoryj s [pervogo klassa] učite.
		(Well) it's the easiest question that from [first grade] you learn.
8	Anton:	[ºHow are youº]
9	PN:	How?
10	Anton:	How are you
11	PN:	How are you (.)
12		Eščë kak možno zadat' ètot vopros
		How else can you pose this question
13	girl:	How are you doing
14	PN:	How are you <u>doing</u>?,
15		a eščë kak možno?
		and how else is ((it)) possible?
16		(2.0)
17		Vy sami govorili nedavno da? ètot novyj variant voprosa (.)
		You used it yourselves recently right? this new variant of the question (.)
18		Zabyli?
		Have you forgotten?
19		(0.5)
20		Ja vam napomnju (.) How are the things? (.) Da? How are the things?
		I will remind you (.) How are the things? (.) Yes? How are the things?
21		Well? please repeat after me. How are the things.
22	students:	How are the things.=
23	PN:	=Okay.
24		Kak my otvečaem na èti voprosy, kak to po raznomu? ili my
		How do we answer these questions, in different ways? Or do we
25	PN:	odinakovo otvečaem na voprosy na èti
		answer these questions the same way
26	students:	( )
27	Evgenija:	ºodinakovoº
		The same way
28	PN:	Odinakovo da?
		The same right?
29		to est' možno skazat' (.) okay? čto na vopros how are you?
		that is you can say (.) okay? To the question how are you?
30		možno otvetit' okay, čto na vopros how are you doing?
		you can answer okay, to the question how are you doing?

31		možno otvetit' okay da? i how are the things (.) okay? my govorim.
		you can answer okay right? and how are the things (.)okay? we say.
32		Čto eščë možno skazat' okay?
		What else can you say okay?
33		(2.0)
34		Kakie eščë slova možno skazat'? kotorye perevodjatsja kak xorošo,
		What other words can you say? that translate as well,
35		dela u menja v porjadke
		things are in order with me
36		(2.5)
37		Well okay, good
38	Anastasija:	[Great
39	student:	[Fine
40	PN:	Great, fine, da?
		Great, fine, right?
41		All right možno skazat'.
		You can say all right.
42		Esli dela ne (očen') čto my govorim?
		If things aren't (very), what do we say?
43	students:	So so
44	PN:	So so?,
45		a esli sovsem ploxo
		and if they are really bad
46	Vadim:	Bad=
47	Anastasija:	=Bad
48	PN:	Bad. (.)
49		All right (.) no:w let's uh (.) find out how are you.=
50		Davajte vyjasnim kak u vas dela.
		Let's find out how things are with you.
51		Well Tamara how are the things
52	Tamara:	°Fine°
53	PN:	((nods)) All right
54	Tamara:	Annie, ((Anastasija)) how are-? (1.5)
55	PN:	The things
56	Tamara:	How are the things
57	PN:	Mmhm?
58	Anastasija:	(Thank you) so so.
59		Mary ((Marija)) how are the things?
60	Marija:	Thank you fine. Evgenija (1.0)
61	Marija:	how are the things?
62	Evgenija:	Thank you fine=
63		Vadik ((Vadim)) how are the things?
64	Vadim:	Uh I'm okay thank you.
65		Anton how are (.) how are the things?
67	Anton:	I am fine thank you=
68		Polina Nikolaevna ((PN)) how are the things?
69	PN:	Fine thank you.
70		Well (.) now please tell me who is on duty today.

can you pose this question?" (3-4) These two questions form the first pair part of the question - answer pair. Before the students can produce an appropriate second pair part, PN inserts the question "who remembers." (5). This question, however, does not require a second pair part as its primary action is to indicate that the next speaker may self-select; a student does not need to answer "I remember," but rather should raise their hand or simply self-select to provide an answer to the first question.

None of them does self-select, however, and there is a 0.5 second pause (6). In line 7 PN inserts a sequence expansion to prompt the required and still absent second pair part to her question from lines 3-4. Anton overlaps her (8) to provide this second pair part: "°How are you°." He speaks very quietly, which diminishes the interruptive effect of his overlap while still letting the instructor know that he has produced the appropriate second pair part. PN completes her turn and then in line 9 addresses Anton: "How?" This is not a new question requiring an answer, but rather a DIU; PN leaves the question incomplete to nominate Anton as next speaker and therefore to have him repeat his answer. Lines 5 through 9, then, are a sequence expansion initiated and controlled by PN to help achieve the correct answer. Anton takes up this selection and repeats his answer (10); this turn is the second pair part 'answer' to the question posed in lines 3-4. PN repeats the correct answer (11), an item in third position by which she evaluates the second pair part as correct.

PN has a reserved right to speak, both as instructor and as initial questioner, which she claims here to chain another question - answer sequence. In line 12 she asks, "How else can you pose this question?" One of the girls provides the answer, "How are you doing" (13). Again PN repeats the correct answer (14), the 'third position' item used to acknowledge a correct second pair part of an adjacency pair.

In line 15, PN chains another question: "And how else is possible?" There is a 2.0

133

second pause belonging to the students (16) as none of them produces the required second pair part. To negotiate this difficulty, PN inserts a sequence (17-18): "You used it yourselves recently right? this new variant of the question. Have you forgotten?" The purpose of this sequence is to provoke an answer by hinting that they had recently learned this variant. The question in this sequence expansion, "have you forgotten?," does not necessarily require a second pair part answer itself; it also acts as an open invitation to self-select and provide the still absent answer to the question from line 15. There is another pause (19) belonging to the students, as no one self-selects to provide an answer to either question (15 or 18). Their collective silence acts as a "yes" answer to the question from line 18. At their failure to answer, PN produces the required answer to the question from line 15: "I will remind you (.) How are the things? (.) Yes? How are the things?"[38] By telling the students "I will remind you," she is indicating that *she* is providing the second pair part that *they* were required to produce.

PN inserts another sequence at this point to have the students repeat the correct question after her (21-23). By doing so, she is orienting to her role as facilitator of learning, as instructor. She reviews the new question (21), checks student pronunciation and grammar through repetition (22), and assesses their performance (23).

Now that PN has reviewed the questions with the students, she turns to the possible answers. She asks if the question variants have different possible answers, or if the same answers can be used for all of the questions (24-25). Several students speak at once and it is not possible to distinguish who has said what (26). Evgenija self-selects and produces the correct answer (27). In third position relative to the first pair part (24-25) and the second pair part (27), PN assesses Evgenija's answer as correct (28): "the same right?" At this point she inserts another sequence that shows her institutional orientation. In lines 29

---

[38] Instances such as "how are the things?" where a instructor produces incorrect English, or a student repeats a instructor's incorrect English, are ignored as beside the point for this analysis.

through 31, she explicitly states that "okay" is an appropriate answer for all of the "how are you?" questions, and in this way she also reviews the various constructions they know.

After inserting a sequence, PN chains another question - answer pair when she asks, "What else can say okay?" (32). There is a 2.0 second pause where the required answer is absent (33), and PN rephrases her question: "What other words can you say? that translate as well, things are in order with me" (34-35). She is asking for multiple second pair parts to her question, as she is looking for the *words* they know that mean "well." Again there is a student pause (36). Because PN has not received an answer to her question yet, she produces the second pair part answer herself in line 37; she lists some of the possible answers, "okay" and "good." This turn prompts the student to produce other second pair parts themselves, which Anastasija and another unidentified student do in lines 38 and 39, when they overlap their respective answers, "great" and "fine." As instructor, PN takes another turn, the 'third position' unit, to assess their answers as correct (40). She lists another possible response, "all right," to add to the student answers (41).

After they have negotiated the list of responses that mean "doing well," PN chains another question - answer sequence in line 42: "And if things aren't (very   ), what do we say?" Several students speak at once and provide the appropriate second pair part (43): "So so." We see another 'third position' unit here as PN repeats the answer, indicating it is correct (44). She immediately chains another question (45), asking for how to answer "really bad." Vadim and Anastasija answer one after another, latching their responses (46-47). PN repeats their answer in third position, showing it is correct (48).

So far in this excerpt, we have seen a pre-sequence that prepared the students for the question - answer sequences to come (1-2). In lines 3 through 48, we found the general chained structure of *question - answer - third position unit* (here the

135

instructor's assessment of the answer). If there are difficulties in receiving the second pair part, the instructor inserts a sequence to help negotiate the answer, sometimes providing it herself. The instructor also inserts instructional sequences at any point as explanation or for review. For the last portion of the excerpt, the structure is modified.

In lines 49-50 we see a pre-sequence where PN prepares the students for a change in the interaction: "All right (.) no:w let's uh (.) find out how are you.=let's find out how things are with you." In PN's lessons the students regularly practice taking turns asking each other how they are, and PN is orienting the students to a known exercise. As instructor, PN always starts and ends this cycle of questioning. In line 51, she asks Tamara how things are. Tamara produces an appropriate second pair part, and in third position PN nods and lets her know that she is correct (53). Usually the speaker who asked the initial question has the reserved right to speak and therefore continue questioning, but this sequence is based on specific exercise rules set by PN. As answerer, Tamara is *required* to produce the first pair part of a chained question - answer sequence, and direct it to a classmate. Tamara does so (54), but hesitates for 1.5 seconds. PN as instructor has the right to insert a sequence, which she does here to assist Tamara (55). Tamara repeats the entire question to Anastasija (56), and PN inserts an assessment sequence here - before Anastasija's required second pair part. Anastasija replies to Tamara's question (58), and now as answerer she is the *required* questioner for the next chained question - answer sequence. Marija, Evgenija, Vadim and Anton continue these chained adjacency pairs without difficulty (60-68), and Anton as last student answerer poses the question to PN. In line 69 PN produces her second pair part, and the exercise of chained questions - answers is completed. We see here that institutional constraints set by the instructor modified the question - answer sequences of this exercise: the instructor initiated the chain after a pre-sequence; the answerers were required to perpetuate the chain; and the chain involved every student before finishing with the instructor. To close this interactional sequence, PN asks an unrelated question,

which also acts as a pre-sequence for the next sequence.

Excerpt 23. ST.1b.2

1	ST:	How are you Nataša ((Natalja))
2	Natalja:	Okay
3	ST:	How are you Nina=
4	Nina:	=Okay
5	ST:	How are you Saša ((Aleksandra))
6	Aleksandra:	Okay
7	ST:	How are you Marina
8	Marina:	So so
9	ST:	So so? (.)
10		How are you Alex ((Aleksej))
11	Aleksej:	[[Okay]
12	Andrej:	[[So-so]
13	ST:	((laughs)) hehh
14		How are you Drew ((Andrej))
15	Andrej:	So so
16	ST:	So so so:
17		(1.0)
18		Let me think (.) uh Alex is a monitor=Alex u nas starosta (.)
		Let me think (.) uh Alex ((Aleksej)) is a monitor=Alex is our monitor (.)
19		uh Alex please tell me who is on duty today=kto segodnja dežurit
		uh Alex please tell me who is on duty today=who is on duty today
20	Aleksej:	Saša ((Aleksandra)) on duty today
21	ST:	Saša is da ved'? on duty
		Saša is on duty right?
22	Aleksej:	is °on duty today°
23	ST:	Saša (.) uh please tell me is anybody absent=kto to otsutsvuet?
		Saša (.) uh please tell me is anybody absent=is someone absent?
24	Aleksandra:	Yes (0.5) Is anybo- (1.5)
25	ST:	Jura? ((Jurij))
26	Aleksandra:	Jura [[hhh
27	ST:	[[is absent
28	Aleksandra:	is absent
29	ST:	Okay (.) xorošo i požalujsta napomni nam vaše domašnee zadanee na
		Okay (.) good and please remind us what was your homework for
30		segodnjašnij urok
		today's lesson

Excerpt 23 is taken from the start of ST's class. ST has just led the initial greetings (as seen in excerpt 10), and begins the lesson as usual with warm-up questions posed to the six students in attendance. Sitting down after the greetings acts as a pre-sequence as it prepares the classroom conditions for this routine question session. The instructor always initiates the warm-up, which itself, along

with the greeting pairs, acts as a pre-sequence preparing the students for the entire lesson.

As in excerpt 22 from PN's lesson, we find multiple chained question - answer pairs. In line 1, ST poses the first question to Natal'ja: "How are you Nataša." Natal'ja produces an appropriate second pair part to answer the question (2). In this sequence, however, we do not see a 'third position' utterance made by the instructor. The student is not required to chain the next question either. In line 3 ST takes her reserved right to speak as initial questioner (and instructor) and poses the question to Nina, who in turn answers (4). The chain continues with Aleksandra and Marina, *instructor question - student answer*, in lines 5 through 8. In line 9, however, we do see a unit in third position when ST repeats what Marina says, acknowledging her second pair part: "So so?" Next ST resumes the chain and asks Aleksej how he is doing (10). In lines 11 and 12 both Aleksej and Andrej overlap each other, providing the second pair part that should have been produced by Aleksej only. ST laughs at this mistake in the turn-taking sequence (13), and addresses the next question to Andrej (14). By doing so, she accepts Aleksej's answer as valid in that position (11), and Andrej's as invalid (12) and therefore in need of being repeated. Andrej repeats his answer (15), accepting that his initial answer was produced out of turn.

In next turn, ST produces an utterance that acts partly as a 'third position' utterance and as a pre-sequence for the next sequence (16): "So so so:." *"So so"* repeats Andrej's answer and evaluates it as a correct second pair part; the third lengthened *"so:"* indicates that the next interactional sequence will be different from the chained "how are you" questions - answers in lines 1 through 15. In fact, the pre-sequence for the next interaction is formed by this *"so:"* in line 16 through line 20. ST pauses for 1.0 second while considering the next sequence (17), then states, "Let me think (.) Alex is a monitor=Alex is our monitor" (18). Her questioning of the monitor is another classroom routine, so this utterance tells the students which question - answer sequence to expect next. In line 19 ST asks

Aleksej who is on duty, and he answers that Aleksandra is (20). This informative question is part of the pre-sequence because it leads into the core sequence of question - answer pairs; ST cannot question the monitor without knowing who it is.

Before the core sequence, ST inserts a sequence (21) to correct Aleksej's grammar: "Saša is on duty right?" Her correction gives Aleksej the right to take a turn to repeat the correct answer, which he does (22). ST reserves the right to speak and addresses the next question to Aleksandra, the monitor (23): "Saša (.) uh please tell me is anybody absent=is someone absent?" Aleksandra produces part of the required second pair part, but makes a mistake when she repeats part of ST's question (24): "Yes (0.5) Is anybo- (1.5)." Realising she has made a mistake, she cuts herself short and pauses. In line 25, ST inserts a sequence expansion to help Aleksandra produce a correct answer. She says "Jura" with a questioning intonation; this utterance is not a question, but rather the correct answer provided in the form of a direct hint. Aleksandra accepts the hint and starts her answer again (26), and ST overlaps her outward breaths with the rest of the answer (27). Aleksandra repeats the last portion of the answer, thereby completing her second pair part (24, 26, and 28). ST evaluates this answer in third position (29): "Okay (.) good." Then she closes this 'monitor' question - answer sequence by requiring a different sequence from the monitor: a reminder of the homework for this lesson.

In this excerpt we found the general organisation of the structure to be *question - answer - (third position)*. The third position utterance, as usual, was not mandatory but was used at the will of the questioner, here the instructor. We saw a pre-sequence in lines 16-18, preparing the students for a change in the interactional sequences. The instructor also inserted sequence expansions to correct student mistakes, in 21-22 and 25-27. The excerpt was closed with a pre-sequence leading into the next interaction.

Excerpt 24. BM.2b.1

1	BM:	Uh:, who is on duty today?
2		(0.5)
3		M?
4		(1.5)
5		Who is on [duty-]
6	Anželika:	[I am]
7	BM:	I am. (.)
8		Anželika, who is absent?
9	Anželika:	Anna and Pëtr are absent=
10	BM:	=<u>Anthony</u>. ((Anatolij))
11	Anželika:	oj, (.) Anthony.
12	BM:	and Anthony?,
13	Anželika:	are absent.
14	BM:	are absent, that's right.
15		What is the date today?
16	Anželika:	Today is the (1.0)
17	BM:	thir<u>teenth</u>
18	Anželika:	thirteenth of November.
19	BM:	And what is the day today?
20		(2.0)
21	Anželika:	Today is Wednesday
22	BM:	Yes that's right, today is Wednesday, thank you. …
23		Tak, what is the weather like today?
		So, what is the weather like today?
24		(0.5)
25		Tonja? ((Antonina))
26	Antonina:	The weather is not hot=
27	BM:	=A začem [( )]? The weather [is]
		=And why [( )]? The weather [is]
28	Antonina:	[Ah-] [The] weather is not hot
29	BM:	Is not hot,
30		well, so what is, (0.5) what is it like?
31		(1.0)
32		It is?,
33		(2.0)
34	Antonina:	It is (1.0)
35	BM:	Pasmurnaja, da?, (.) vetrennaja, xolodnaja=
		Overcast, right?, (.) windy, cold=
36	Antonina:	=(col) (1.5)
37	BM:	Pasmurnaja
		Overcast
38		(0.5)
39		<u>na:sty</u>=
40	Antonina:	=it is nasty °and col-° and cool.
41	BM:	Mhm, it is nasty and cool thank you.
42		Egor, is it windy?
43	Egor:	Yes, it is windy.

44	BM:	It is windy.
45		Lisa, ((Lidija)) do you like the weather today?
46		(1.5)
47	Lidija:	Uh: (.) no, it is not-
48	BM:	<u>Do you like</u> čto značit?
		<u>Do you like</u> means what?
49		(1.5)
50	Lidija:	(°Vy ljubite°)
		(°Do you like°)
51	BM:	Ye:s,
52		nu vot pro sebja otvečaj,
		so *then answer about yourself,*
53		<u>do you like</u> the weather today?
54	Lidija:	No, (.) uh, (0.5) it is
55	BM:	<u>You</u>! (.) <u>Ty pro sebja govoriš'</u>, pri čëm zdes' it, <u>Lida</u>. ((Lidija))
		<u>You</u>! (.) <u>You are speaking about yourself</u>, why have "it" here, <u>Lida</u>
56		(0.5)
57		Ty govoriš' <u>pro sebja</u>.
		You're speaking <u>about yourself</u>,
58		(0.5)
59		Da? Kogda my govorim o sebe kakoe my slovo ispol'zuem?
		Right? When we speak about ourselves what word do we use?
60		(2.0)
61		<u>Ty: ljubiš'</u>?
		<u>Do you: like</u>?
62		kak ty otvetiš'?,
		how do you answer?,
63	Lidija:	Ja
		I
64	BM:	<u>Ja:</u> ne ljublju, gde u tebja slovo ja, (.) pri čëm zdes' it,
		<u>I:</u> don't like, where do you have the word I, (.) why have "it" here,
65		<u>it</u> èto razve ja?
		does <u>it</u> really mean I?
66		(1.5)
67	Lidija:	No, I like?,
68	BM:	Ty govoriš' ja <u>ne</u> ljublju, <u>No: I</u>?,
		You're saying I <u>don't</u> like, <u>No: I</u>?,
69	Lidija:	don't like (0.5) the weather today=
70	BM:	=You don't like the weather today. (.)
71		Olja, ((Ol'ga)) do you like autumn?
72	Ol'ga:	Yes, (.) I like (0.5) I- (0.5) do
73	BM:	Yes, I do.
74		Do you like winter? (3.0)
75	Ol'ga:	Ye- (.) Yes I do.
76	BM:	Yes I do, thank you.
77		Denis, do you like <u>late</u> autumn?
78		Well, kogda vy opozdali, vy govorite <u>I am late</u>, da?, ja opozdal.
		Well, when you are late, you say <u>I am late</u>, right?, I am late.
79		Čto takoe budet late autumn?
		What will late autumn be?

80	Denis:	Pozdnjaja osen'=
		Late autumn=
81	BM:	=Pozdnjaja da?, ne opozdavšaja konečno, a pozdnjaja.
		=Late yes?, not tardy of course, but late.
82		Do you like late autumn?
83	Denis:	No, I don't like late autumn.
84	BM:	What is your favourite season?
85	Denis:	My favourite season (.) is (1.0) winter.
86	BM:	Winter.
87		Do you like snow?
88	Denis:	Yes I like snow.
89	BM:	Mhm. Thank you.
90		Tanja, ((Tat'jana)) do you like summer?
91	Tat'jana:	Yes I like summer.
92	BM:	Why?
93	Tat'jana:	I like summer (.) because hm ((clears throat)) I don't (0.5) uh- I don't
94		go (0.5) to school.
95	BM:	Mhm.
96		Do you like the weather in summer?
97	Tat'jana:	Yes I like the weather in summer.
98	BM:	Mm thank you. Xorošo. (0.5)
		Mm thank you. Good. (0.5)
99		Tak, teper'. (.) Now please open your books
		Okay, now. (.) Now please open your books.

BM begins the lengthy chain of questions - answers in line 1: "Uh:, who is on duty today?" This question is part of the pre-sequence that will allow BM to lead into the core sequence. Because the classroom monitor is the 'reserved' answerer for the initial *core sequence* questions, BM poses this question in order to determine who the rightful answerer is. There is a 0.5 second pause (2) during which no one self-selects to identify the monitor. BM reminds the students that there is an unanswered question, an absent second pair part, with her token utterance "M?" (3). There is another pause (4), after which BM repeats her question to try to provoke the required second pair part (5).

Anželika overlaps BM's repeated question to produce the answer that she is on duty for the lesson (6). Again we see that a student prioritises the production of an absent instructor-required answer higher than the 'rule' not to interrupt the instructor. BM cuts her question short (5) after this overlap as she recognises the required second pair part has been produced. In line 7 BM repeats Anželika's

answer, a 'third position' utterance acknowledging the second pair part while also repeating the correct structure for the entire class. Lines 1 through 7, then, form the pre-sequence, which set the conditions for BM to begin the core sequence of questions - answers.

She does so in line 8: "Anželika, who is absent?" Anželika responds that Anna and Pëtr are absent (9). BM is quick to latch onto Anželika's answer to correct her; there is no Pëtr in this class, it is Anthony who is absent (10). Anželika repairs her answer (11): "oj, (.) Anthony. ((Anatolij))." BM, however, does not consider the second pair part acceptable and says, "and Anthony?," using a DIU with a questioning-continuing intonation to convey the answer is not complete (12), prompting Anželika to finish the answer (13). BM's turns in lines 10 and 12 are sequence expansions inserted to guide Anželika to a correct answer (negotiated in lines 9, 11 and 13). In line 14, we find the 'third position' item relative to the first and second pair parts; BM repeats part of Anželika's answer and tells her it is correct.

Throughout the core sequence as questioner (and the classroom interaction in general as instructor), BM has a reserved right to speak at any time. She takes up this right by chaining a second question, posed again to the monitor (15). She asks Anželika what the date is, and Anželika in turn starts to produce the answer (16). She pauses without completing the second pair part, and BM inserts an utterance to prompt the rest of the answer (17). This insertion helps Anželika complete the second pair part (18). BM does not say anything in third position, but immediately chains another question (19). After a pause (20), Anželika answers (21), and this time BM does produce an utterance in third position. She evaluates the answer as correct and thanks Anželika (22). BM, therefore, wraps up the instructor - monitor sequence of questions - answers and opens the questioning to other students.

In line 23 BM says, "So, what is the weather like today?" There is a brief pause (24) after which BM selects Antonina as required answerer. Antonina responds

with, "The weather is not hot" (26). BM latches on to her answer and asks a question that is only partially audible, "And why (   )?" (27). Antonina has overlapped and distorted the last item of BM's question when she says, "Ah-." (Based on context, it is likely that the distorted item might be "not," as Antonina has created a sentence about what the weather is *not*, not what it *is*.) With her overlap, Antonina is attempting to claim her turn, but cuts it short when it is clear BM has not finished hers. BM continues, "The weather is," repeating part of Antonina's answer from line 26. She does so to prompt Antonina to continue. (If the question in line 27 was indeed "And why 'not'?", then here BM is providing the start of a positive sentence for Antonina.) Antonina again overlaps BM and repeats her initial answer (28): "The weather is not hot." In line 29, BM repeats the last portion of Antonina's answer, indicating the second pair part is grammatically correct. In line 30, though, BM clarifies the question to get a positive construction: "well, so what is, (0.5) what is it like?" There is a pause (31), and BM provides Antonina with the start of the answer: "It is?," with a questioning-continuing intonation, another example of an instructor DIU to elicit the appropriate answer (32). There is a long pause (33), after which Antonina takes up the answer, repeating BM: "It is" (34). She pauses again, and at this point BM inserts another sequence to assist Antonina. In lines 35 through 39, BM negotiates appropriate vocabulary with Antonina until, in line 40, Antonina produces the answer that BM was initially looking for in line 23 (and clarified in line 30): "it is nasty °and col-° and cool." BM assesses her answer as correct (41), her evaluation in third position relative to the second pair part answer: "Mhm, it is nasty and cool thank you."

To summarise this lengthy question - answer sequence, we saw the initial question (23), then Antonina's nomination as required answerer (25), who in turn produces an answer (26). BM inserts a sequence expansion in line 27 to prompt the desired second pair part, i.e., a positive construction, but this fails and Antonina produces the same answer (28). BM concedes (29) but chains another variant of the question to ensure the next answer is positive (30). There are some

difficulties in lines 31 through 34, during which Antonina cannot say what the weather *is* like. In lines 35 through 39, BM inserts a sequence to provide vocabulary assistance, which Antonina takes up to produce her positive answer (40); BM wraps up this lengthy sequence with a third position item in line 41.

BM chains another question but selects a different student, Egor, to be answerer (42). Egor answers (43), and BM acknowledges the answer by repeating it (44). These turns form a succinct *question - answer - third position acknowledgement* sequence. In line 45, BM chains another question, here addressed to Lidija: "Lisa, ((Lidija)) do you like the weather today?" After a pause (46), Lidija begins her response (47), but is interrupted by BM (48). Lidija is not answering the question posed to her, and BM interrupts to insert a corrective (and instructional) sequence, which will last from line 48 through 67.

The sequence expansion begins with a question - answer pair. BM asks Lidija what does "do you like" mean in Russian (48). After a pause (49), she responds quietly with, "do you like" (49), the appropriate second pair part. We see BM's 'third position' item that evaluates the answer as correct (51), followed by an instructional utterance: "so then answer for yourself," (52). In line 53 BM repeats the initial question from 45, emphasising the "do you like" construction they had just covered (48-50). Despite this, Lidija begins her answer with the same mistake she had made in line 47 (54). BM interrupts her and says, "You! (.) Speak about yourself, why have 'it' here, Lida. ((Lidija)) (0.5) You're speaking about yourself," (55-56). The question "why have 'it' here" is not meant to require a literal answer, but rather embedded here with other utterances it serves to instruct Lidija on her mistake; it is an item in the form of a question but with the action of a correction. In this regard its function is the same as that of the RPQ, which conveys to the student what is wrong with their turn and therefore facilitates a possible repair. There is a pause (58) and Lidija does not take up her turn to correct her answer, even though she has been specifically reprimanded for using "it." BM takes another turn to instruct Lidija on her mistake, asking, "Right?

When we speak about ourselves what word do we use?" (59) This question does require an answer, which is seen to be absent in the 2.0 second pause in line 60. BM emphasises the first part of the initial question, this time in Russian, "<u>do: you like?</u>", to overcome possible comprehension difficulties (61), and asks Lidija how she answers this question (62). Lidija finally produces the second pair part to the first pair part question in line 59: "I" (63). BM acknowledges the answer by emphasising the "I", and expands the sequence to include further instructional comments: "<u>I:</u> don't like, where do you have the word I, (.) why have "it" here, does <u>it</u> really mean I?" (64-65). Again, these are not literal questions requiring direct answers, but rather correctional devices used in similar fashion as a RPQ to make Lidija produce the correct answer to the initial question. After a pause (66), Lidija starts her answer with the correct subject "I" but makes a mistake by omitting "do not" (67). BM claims a turn to identify this mistake by employing a DIU (68), and in line 69 Lidija produces the long-awaited second pair part to the question from line 45. BM confirms her answer (70), thereby wrapping up the question - answer sequence with Lidija (lines 45 through 70).

In lines 71 through 76, we see short *question - answer - third position acknowledgement* sequences. BM chains two questions addressed to Ol'ga, who produces correct second pair parts without the need for sequence expansions initiated by the instructor. In line 77 BM addresses the next chained question to Denis (77) and we see an instructional sequence inserted by BM (78-81). Before giving Denis a chance to answer, BM provides information to help him understand what "late autumn" means (78), and then checks his comprehension with a question (79). Denis correctly answers this inserted question (80), which BM assesses as correct while providing further information on the meaning of "late" in this instance (81). After this sequence expansion, BM repeats her initial question for Denis (82). He responds properly (83), and BM chains a second question addressed to him (84). Denis again produces a correct answer (85), and in this case we see an acknowledgement in third position when BM repeats part of his answer (86). She chains a third question for Denis (87), and he again answers

correctly (88). We see a final item in this question - answer sequence; BM accepts his answer, "Mhm." and thanks Denis (89), thereby wrapping up the question - answer sequence involving him.

We see a similar question - answer sequence with Tat'jana. In line 90, BM asks her a question, which she answers (91). She chains another question (92), answered again by Tat'jana (93-94), followed by a third position acknowledgement (95). BM chains a third and final question (96), followed by Tat'jana's answer (97) and then the instructor's acknowledgement (98). In line 99, BM closes this entire *question - answer* sequence by making a pre-sequence statement that will prepare conditions for the next exercise: "Okay, now. (.) Now please open your books."

Throughout these excerpts, we have seen profound orderliness of the question - answer sequences. The instructor usually poses the questions, the 'first pair parts,' unless the exercise dictates otherwise. The students are required to produce the answers, the second pair parts. If they are unable to, the instructor inserts sequence expansions to correct or assist them. The instructor also has the right to insert an instructional sequence at any time to provide subject matter information to the students. And finally, the instructor often uses an utterance in third position to acknowledge and/or assess the 'second pair part' answer produced by the student.

Excerpt 25 (PN.3b.3)
In this shorter excerpt, PN has handed back workbooks to the eight students with their marks from the latest vocabulary dictation. Ivan was not even given a failing grade[39] on his dictation because he had done so poorly. In this exchange, he and PN discuss the situation. In line 1 we see a first pair part question posed by PN to

---

[39] The Russian grading system uses a 5-point scale: '5' = excellent, '4' = good, '3' = satisfactory, and '2' = unsatisfactory/fail. A grade of '1' is rare (and sometimes unofficial); when used it represents a "complete failing." Retrieved January 24, 2009, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russian_Grading_System_(Russian_GPA).

Excerpt 25. PN.3b.3

1	PN:	Ne propisal doma slova?
		You didn't copy out the words at home?
2		No po čestnomu.
		Well be honest.
3		(1.0)
4	Ivan:	Kakie?
		Which ones?
5	PN:	Vot slova kotorye nado bylo učit', časti tela.
		Well the words that you had to learn at home, body parts.
6		Propisyval doma?
		Did you copy them out at home?
7	Ivan:	Net
		No
8	PN:	↓Počemu:?
		↓*Why:?*
9		(1.0)
10		Bylo že domašnee zadanie na vyxodnye,
		It was homework for the weekend,
11		prigotovit'sja k slovarnomu diktantu ja skazala.
		to prepare to the vocabulary dictation I said.
12	Ivan:	Gde vy [za-]
		Where did you [gi-]
13	PN:	[Voz']mite tetrad' dlja analiza, (.)
		[*Take*] *your workbook for analysis, (.)*
14		každoe slovo tri stročki propišite.
		copy every word out three times.
15		Vse ved' vsë èto sdelali.
		Everyone did all of it after all.
16		(0.5)
17		I vidiš' u vsex rezul'taty xorošie.
		And you see that they all received good marks.

Ivan to determine the source of his poor performance: "You didn't copy out the words at home?" Before Ivan has a chance to answer with the required second pair part, PN inserts a turn to specify her expectations for an honest answer (2). After a 1.0 second pause (3), Ivan claims his turn (4). However, instead of answering the first question, he inserts a question - answer sequence himself to clarify "Which *[words should he have copied out at home*]?" PN answers his question (5), and then repeats the initial question (1). Now that Ivan has procured the necessary information to allow him to provide the appropriate second pair part, he answers "no" (7). In lines 1 through 7, then we see the sequence **Q1, I1** - **Q2** - **A2, Q1** - A1 (instructor's turns in bold), where a question - answer pair is

inserted within another question - answer pair.[40] There are several examples of question - answer insertion sequences within other question - answer pairs in the data shown above; however, this is the first example in which the student inserts their own the question - answer sequence in the instructor's question - answer pair. In line 8 PN chains a second question to find out why he did not do the homework. There is a 1.0 second pause owned by Ivan who does not produce any second pair part. PN inserts an explanatory sequence (10-11): "It was homework for the weekend, to prepare for the vocabulary dictation I said." Rather than answering the question from line 8, Ivan begins his own question (12) that seems to show he doubts the validity of PN's statement in lines 10-11. PN interrupts and does not allow him to finish his question, repeating the homework assignment (13-14). She continues the expansion to further quash any doubts he may have had: "Everyone else did all of it after all. (0.5) And you see that they all received good marks." (15-17). In this portion, PN is the instructor and is aware of what she has assigned for homework; a student does not have the right to doubt her authority (although they may question her for informative purposes).

Excerpt 26. BM.2b.2

1	Anželika:	(napisat') tol'ko mesjac?
		(write) only the month?
2	BM:	Lika. (0.5) Mesjac u nas v tabličke napisan. Da ved'? (0.3)
		Lika.((Anželika)) (0.5) The month is written in the table. Right? (0.3)
3		I ty naprotiv mesjac eščë raz budeš' mesjac pisat'?
		And across from the month you're going to write month another time?
4		(0.5) ((Anželika looks at her page))
5		Ton- <Lika.>
6		(0.5) ((Anželika looks up at BM))
7		Naprotiv mesjac eščë raz budeš' mesjac pisat'?
		Across from the month another time you're going to write the month?
8	Anželika:	Čislo:!
		The da:te!

In this excerpt from lesson BM.2b.2, the nine students are entering birthdays into tables of "classmates" and "months." They are asking each other in English what their birthdays are. Anželika did not prepare her table at home and must do so in

---

[40] Question 1, Insertion 1 - Question 2 - Answer 2, Question 1 (repeated) - Answer 1.

class, and here asks BM a question as to how to do so. In line 1 Anželika asks BM if she should write the month only. Rather than answer her directly, BM inserts a sequence expansion (2-7) to force Anželika to answer her own question. Line 2 can be seen as a pre-sequence within the sequence expansion, as BM is pointing out relevant information that will help Anželika answer BM's inserted question in line 3. BM uses a RPQ to convey to Anželika what the correct answer is: "And across from month you're going to write *month* another time?" (italics mine). There is a short pause (4) during which Anželika looks at her desk and does not attempt an answer to BM's question in line 3. BM calls her name, mistakenly at first, but corrects herself (5); she is calling Anželika on the still absent answer. After another short pause (6), BM repeats the question, again a RPQ to help the student identify the correct answer (7). Anželika animatedly produces the answer to her own question from line 1 (8). She does not explicitly answer BM's question (3, 7), but by producing the appropriate answer to her question she is acknowledging that the answer to BM's question is "no." As instructor, BM has inserted a sequence to guide the student to the correct answer herself.

Excerpt 27. ST.1b.2

1	ST:	Vsem ponjatno kak èto zadanee nužno vypolnjat'?
		Everyone understands how to do this assignment?
2		[[To est'] vybiraem sebe kogo-nibud' da? iz obitatelej [fermy]
		[*That is] we each choose somebody right? who lives on a [farm]*
3	Aleksej:	[[Two:-] [Kak tam-]
		[*Two:-] [How do you-]*
4	ST:	i dolžny budem opisat' ego pri pomošči vsex slov kotorye my
		and we will have to describe him with the help of all the words that we
5		[znaem]
		[*know*]
6	Aleksej:	[Svetlana] Timofeevna (.) Dve koški? Èto kak, two cats?
		[Svelana] Timofeevna (.) Two cats? That's what, two cats?
7	ST:	Ne:t (pro odnu)
		No: (about one)

This excerpt is taken from the beginning of one of ST's lessons, where six students are present. ST has just explained the next classroom exercise, which involves the students taking turns to describe animals. Here she is explaining the

instructions to the class, and Aleksej overlaps her several times to try to ask a question.

In line 1, ST asks if the assignment is clear to everyone. This question does not require a second pair part unless the answer is "no"; an absent reply would indicate that everyone understands the assignment. However, before giving the students a chance to respond, ST inserts a sequence to explain the assignment again (perhaps in case a student is too shy to answer that they do not understand): "That is we each choose somebody right? who lives on a farm and we will have to describe him with the help of all the words that we know" (2, 4, 5). During this sequence expansion, Aleksej attempts to claim a turn three times and overlaps ST's talk each time (3, 6). The first overlap occurs at the beginning of line 2. Aleksej likely interpreted the end of ST's question (1) as a possible turn transition point, and rather than use this transition point to produce an answer to her question, he tries to claim the turn for a question of his own (3). Later in line three he tries again to ask his question, overlapping ST when there has been no possible turn-transition point; ST is still mid-sentence. She finishes her explanation (4-5), and Aleksej overlaps the last word of her turn when he addresses her directly (6). Rather than simply try to strong-arm a turn, this time he uses the full form of instructor address to ask ST a question: "Svetlana Timofeevna (.) Dve koški? That's what, two cats?" There has been no answer to ST's initial question (1), but after the instructional sequence (2, 4, and 5), and Aleksej's attempted interruptions (3), Aleksej produces the entire first pair part question in line 6. In line 7, somewhat garbled, ST produces a second pair part relative to Aleksej's question: "No: (about   one   ). Aleksej is correct that "dve koški" means "two cats," so it seems that ST is not answering his specific question but telling him to speak about only *one* cat during the exercise. As instructor, she has the right not to answer his question but to take the opportunity to clarify the instructions for the exercise.

Excerpt 28. PN.3a.2

1	PN:	Rebjata eščë možno znaete čto
		Children you know what we can also do
2		(davaj) čtoby my ne terjalis' v dogadkax,
		(let's) so that we don't get lost in guesses,
3		uh, otkuda ètot čelovek, (.) da? naprimer iz Rossii, …
		uh, say where the person is from, (.) okay? for example from Russia, ...
4		(ne zabyvajte) skazat' v načale otkuda on, a to my budem
		(don't forget) to say at the start where he is from, otherwise we will
5		dumat' neizvestno na kogo.
		think who knows about whom.
6	Anastasija:	A možno skazat' I have a photo of a film star?
		And can we say I have a photo of a film star?
7	PN:	Možno, možno tak načat' rasskaz. All right, …
		You can, you can start your story that way. All right, ...

Prior to this excerpt, PN has explained to the class that they will each take a turn describing a famous person, using the adjectives and body part nouns they have learned, and the rest of the class will guess whom they are describing. She has already informed them that they should say what the profession of the famous person is. In lines 1 through 5, PN extends her instructions to have the students also tell where the person is from in order to narrow down the guessing process (some of the instructions are omitted in line 3). Once she has completed the instructions, Anastasija asks a question to clarify how she can begin her story (6): "And can we say I have a photo of a film star?" Even though Anastasija was not named by PN as next speaker, she is orienting to her role as student by self-selecting to ask this question: she is requesting further information in order to ensure she fulfils the instructor's assignment correctly. In line 7, we see PN's second pair part answering Anastasija's question. Immediately after (not shown here), PN continues her instructions telling the students to raise their hands when they have a guess. Anastasija does not produce a third pair part that acknowledges, let alone assesses, the instructor's answer.

Excerpt 29. PN.3a.2

1	Marija:	She is (.) singer and (.) film star.
2	PN:	Mhmm.
3	Marija:	°Kak Argentina tak?°
		°*How do I say Argentina?*°
4		(1.0)
5	PN:	Oh: Argentina, (0.5)
6		I don't know.
7		<Ja ne uverena v proiznošenii po anglijski=
		<*I'm not sure about the pronunciation in English=*
8		=davajte togda èto skažem po russki čtoby ošibki u tebja ne bylo.>
		=*let's then say it in Russian so you don't have a mistake.*>
9		Značit <u>ona iz</u>?,
		That means <u>she is from</u>?,

This excerpt is from the same exercise as the previous excerpt. Marija is telling the story about her famous person. She starts off as instructed by telling the class what the person's profession is (1). In line 2 we see a response token from PN, encouraging Marija to continue her story. Marija is uncertain how to pronounce "Argentina," and so in line 3 she quietly asks PN how to say it in English. It is Marija's rightful turn here to continue her story sequence, but because she is unable to continue without language help from PN, she uses this opportunity to insert a question - answer sequence. There is a 1.0 second pause that belongs to the instructor, who is the rightful answerer of the question. In line 5 PN takes up her turn to acknowledge the question, and pauses again briefly. She tells Marija that she does not know the answer (6); as instructor she is expected to have the answers to student questions, and so she inserts a sequence to explain that she does not know how to pronounce it herself and offers a solution to Marija (7-8). PN's second pair part, then, is not the answer Marija requested, but an answer nonetheless. In line 9 PN uses a DIU to encourage Marija to continue her story. Marija does not have a chance to claim a third position turn, as questioner, to acknowledge PN's second pair part. If the questioner - answerer roles were reversed, the instructor could question why the student did not have an answer, if they should be expected to have one, or the instructor could help the student negotiate the correct answer.

Excerpt 30. BM.2a.2

1	Larisa:	A kak budet videokamera?
		And how do you say videocamera?
2		(3.0)
3	BM:	Well, a videocamera tak ved' i budet? Da? A videocamera.
		Well a videocamera is how you say it? Right? A videocamera.
4	Larisa:	A videocamera. (2.0)

Before this short excerpt, the four students are quietly asking each other what their birthdays are and what presents they would like to receive, practicing their knowledge of dates and gifts. This is a communicative exercise, and BM only takes a turn when she hears a mistake or to enforce the 'English only' rule for the questions - answers. In line 1, however, Larisa poses a question to BM in Russian: "And how do you say videocamera?" Again, the student can self-select to ask a question that will allow them to carry out the exercise properly, and also to provide for a learning opportunity. There is a 3.0 second pause (2) during which BM's answer can be seen as absent. In line 3, however, BM takes up her turn to produce the appropriate second pair part. In this case we do see a student 'third position' utterance when Larisa repeats the answer (4); she is acknowledging the instructor's answer and practicing the pronunciation.

Excerpt 31. ST.1b.2

1	ST:	Marina davaj načněm s toboj=let's start with you (.)
		Marina let's begin with you=let's start with you (.)
2		Oh (0.5) budem k doske ( )
		Oh (0.5) We'll () to the board
3		(1.0)
4		Okay?
5		(0.5)
6	Marina:	°S knižkoj?°
		°With the book?°
7	ST:	°Možno bez knižki, možno s knižkoj° (.)
		°You can without the book, you can with the book°
8		Okay go to the blackboard please

Prior to this excerpt, ST has instructed the students that they will be describing farm animals (also seen in excerpt 27). In line 1, ST nominates Marina to be the first 'storyteller.' She provides further instructions that the storytellers will go to

the front of the room for their turns (2). There is a pause (3) during which Marina does not take up the expected action of going to the blackboard. In line 4 ST says, "Okay?" to encourage Marina to do so. After another pause (5), Marina quietly asks if she can take her book with her (6). ST answers that it is up to the students, they can take the book or not (7). ST then repeats the instructions for Marina to go to the board (8). As seen above, the instructor allows a self-selected student question to clarify what or how something must be done, but immediately after resumes the task at hand. Marina does not have the opportunity to insert an item in third position to acknowledge or comment on the instructor's second pair part.

Excerpt 32. ST.1b.2

1	ST:	Povtorit' projdennyj material (1.0) za poslednye pjat' urokov.
		Review all covered material (1.0) from the last five lessons.
2		(5.0) ((students are copying out the assignment))
3	Marina:	A (kontrol'naja) budet?
		And will there be (a test)?
4		((ST shakes head))
5		(3.0) ((students finish copying))
6	ST:	Zadanie vtoroe (0.5)
		Second assignment (0.5)
7		Èto urok pjatnadcatoe (.) na stranice dvenadcat'.
		It's exercise fifteen (.) on page 12.

In this excerpt ST is telling the class what homework is assigned for the next lesson, and one of the six students present asks a clarifying question. In line 1 ST tells the class to review the material from the previous five lessons, and there is a pause during which the students copy down the assignment (2). In line 3 Marina self-selects to ask a question about a test on the covered material. ST's second pair part is simply a shake of her head to answer "no" (4). The question - answer sequence is complete, and after the students finish copying down the first task (5), ST resumes the homework assignment (7). Again, Marina as student questioner does not take a turn in third position to comment on the instructor's answer.

Throughout the eight transcribed lessons, there are very few student questions, other than those required in instructor-led exercises. When the students do self-select to pose questions, it is to clarify instructions or ask for information about

something they do not know and therefore better fulfil the task at hand. Sometimes the instructor provides an answer in second position, sometimes she inserts a sequence to help the students determine the answer themselves. We only saw one item in third position when the student was the questioner, when Larisa repeated BM's answer in excerpt 29. She was not assessing the instructor's answer as correct, as the case would be if the roles were reversed, but as a student was practicing the pronunciation. Next, in section 4.3, I analyse the organisation of repairs in the classroom interaction.

4.3 Repair Organisation

4.3.1 Theory

Repairs are "organized ways of dealing with various kinds of *trouble* in the interaction's progress, such as problems of (mis)hearing or understanding" (Ten Have 2000: 116; his italics). The term *repair* is used for the correction of any problem of this kind. The second speaker can show that they misheard or did not understand a turn by using a *next turn repair initiator* such as "huh?" or "what?" immediately after the problematic turn (Ten Have 2000: 116; Silverman 1998: 122). If a repair is not requested in a next position, the speaker can assume that they were heard and understood (Silverman 1998: 122).

Any utterance can be a *repairable*, that is, a trouble source. (Ten Have 2000: 116). The initiation of the repair can be *self-initiated*, initiated by the speaker, or *other-initiated* (Ibid). The same holds true for the repair itself. It can be done either by the speaker or by others, *self-repair* and *other-repair* respectively (Ibid) A repair does not necessarily take place immediately after the problematic turn; it can occur in later turns if the original speaker recognises that the recipient has misunderstood something and therefore initiates a self-repair (Ibid). Repairs also occur in circumstances other than misunderstandings:

> For instance, where more than one party is speaking
> at a time, a speaker may stop speaking before a
> normally possible completion point of a turn.
> Again, when turn transfer does not occur at the
> appropriate place, the current speaker may repair
> the failure of the sequence by speaking again.
> Finally, where repairs by other than the current
> speaker are required…the next speaker typically
> waits until the completion of a turn.
>
> (Silverman 1998: 122)

As we see here, turn-taking and repair organisation are closely interwoven, with the turn-taking system's "allocation of rights…respected even when a repair is found necessary" (Ibid). In the classroom, the instructors also employ "known answer" teacher turns, such as DIUs and RPQs (see 4.2.1 above), to initiate and facilitate student repairs.[41]

4.3.2 Analysis

Excerpt 33. PN.3c.2

```
1   PN:         Kolja ((Nikolaj)) who is on duty today?
2   Nikolaj:    Julie ((Julija)) [is on duty today
3   Valentin:                    [I'm sorry I am late, may I come in
4   PN:         Yes you may but you are a:lways late.
5               Nu sit down, prjamo opazdyvaem.
                Well sit down, we're really late.
6               [Well-]
7   Valentin:   [Ja] segodnja na (   ) byl
                [I] was at (   ) today
8   PN:         Okay.
9               Well, Kolja. Excuse my interrupting you,
10              who is on duty today.
11  Nikolaj:    Julie ((Julija)) is on duty today.
```

In this excerpt, PN has started the usual beginning-of-lesson questions, which she directs to individual students. There are initially three students in attendance, although a fourth arrives soon after the start of this excerpt.

---

[41] See section 4.4.4 for an illustration of the typical sequences of repairs in the classroom, including a 'core' instructor-initiated repair sequence.

PN begins by asking Nikolaj who is on duty today (1). In line 2 Nikolaj answers that Julie is on duty (2), but the repairable occurs when Valentin overlaps Nikolaj by apologising for being late and asking to come in (3). Because of the overlap, it is possible that Nikolaj's expected answer is not heard properly by the instructor and/or the other students. Normally speakers repair overlaps by one speaker stopping and allowing the other, usually the first speaker, to continue without overlap. Here, however, both boys complete their turns at the same time. Nikolaj is the selected next speaker, answering the instructor's question, and as such does not give up his turn to Valentin. Valentin interrupts one word into Nikolaj's turn, and also completes his turn. Even though Nikolaj is the rightful speaker, PN addresses Valentin's question first (4-5): "yes you may but you are a:lways late. Well sit down, we're really late." In line 6, PN says, "well" turning back to Nikolaj. However, she is cut off when Valentin interrupts her, the second instance of trouble (7). PN was already speaking and, as instructor, she maintains the turn-taking system; however, she stops herself shorts and listens to Valentin's excuse for being late. This repair of the overlap, then, can be considered a self-initiated self-repair by PN.

After Valentin's turn completion, PN says, "okay," which indicates the end of the interruption sequence with him (8). In lines 9-10, she turns to Nikolaj again and says, "Well, Kolja. Excuse my interrupting you, who is on duty today." Even though it was Valentin who interrupted Nikolaj (3), PN did address Valentin rather than him in the following turn (4-5). By apologising, she is acknowledging that he was the rightful speaker and that his turn may not have been heard properly. Next PN repeats the question to Nikolaj (10), allowing him to repeat (repair) his interrupted (and therefore possibly misheard) answer (11). It is possible PN did not hear his answer the first time because of the overlap, or she heard it and is allowing the question-answer sequence to occur uninterrupted. This repair then was other-initiated, by PN, and self-repaired, by Nikolaj.

Excerpt 34. PN.3b.3

```
1   Ivan:        He- (1.0) hair is dark and short.
2   PN:          All right,
3   Ivan:        And think
4   PN:          Okay,
5                (1.0)
6                Thin or thick, sorry?
7   Ivan:        Thick
8   PN:          Okay
```

In this excerpt Ivan is describing a photograph for the class, practicing new adjectives and body part terminology. There are eight students present, although only Ivan and PN interact here. In line 1 Ivan says, "He- (1.0) hair is dark and short." He has mispronounced "her" and as instructor, PN could interrupt to correct him during his 1.0-second pause, or wait to use a *next turn repair initiator*. In the language classroom, where the institutional goal is to teach the correct use of the subject language, the instructor often initiates repairs of incorrect student pronunciation. (One can imagine that such a repair initiation could be seen as rude, or at least blunt, in everyday ordinary conversation.) A student mistake is a repairable utterance in the classroom. However, in next turn PN does not initiate a repair, rather she says, "all right," to encourage him to continue (2). Ivan does so by saying, "and think" (3). PN again encourages him to continue (4), and there is a 1.0-second pause that belongs to Ivan as nominated next speaker and current 'storyteller.' In line 6, however, PN realises that Ivan's utterance in line 3 is troublesome; she is not sure if he meant to say "thin or thick," and asks him to clarify (6). She does so in a manner similar to that of a RPQ by asking a question to convey what is wrong with the student's previous turn, in this case the pronunciation. This turn is not, however, a "known answer" turn, as it is unclear which word Ivan meant to use. Ivan corrects the troublesome utterance by saying "thick" (7), and PN acknowledges the repair (8). This repair, as the previous one in excerpt 33 (line 11), is other-initiated by the instructor and self-repaired by the student.

Excerpt 35. PN.3a.2

1	Vadim:	His (1.0) eyes (1.0) are colour (5.0)
2		°kak golubye?°
		°how do you say blue?°
3	PN:	Sorry?=
4	Vadim:	=°golubye°
		=°blue°
5	PN:	Blue. [His] eyes are blue.
6	Vadim:	[°blue°]
7	Vadim:	Blue
8	PN:	Mmhm

This excerpt is from a different class than excerpt 34, but the exercise is the same: the student is describing a person in a photograph to practice using adjectives and body part nouns. Vadim has been describing the person's hair, and in this sequence he is talking about the eyes. There are six students present, but again, only the student and PN interact here.

In line 1 Vadim says, "His (1.0) eyes (1.0) are colour (5.0)." He has made a grammatical mistake in this line, leaving out the definite article before "colour," and he has paused for 5.0 seconds indicating a vocabulary problem. In line 2 Vadim self-initiates an other-repair when he asks the instructor how to say "blue" in English. Vadim's request for a repair is itself a troublesome utterance as he speaks quietly and PN does not hear him. In line 3 she says, "Sorry?," to indicate she has not heard him properly. In response to this, Vadim self-repairs (4) by repeating part of his question more loudly, an other-initiated self-repair. Now that PN understands his utterance, she can provide the correct answer to Vadim's request for repair from line 2 (5): "Blue. His eyes are blue." This turn also subtly provides a repair to his grammatical issue from line 1, using the construction "his eyes are blue" rather than "his eyes are the colour blue."[42] However, we see another troublesome utterance here when Vadim overlaps PN's speech (lines 5-6). Vadim interprets the first part of the turn as a complete short answer, and therefore overlaps PN when he repeats the repair. He initiates another self-repair when PN has finished her turn by repeating the repair a second time (7). In line 8

---

[42] The construction 'his eyes are blue' is the one taught in class.

PN says, "mmhm" to indicate that the repair sequence is complete. In this short excerpt there are several troublesome utterances and we see self-initiated other-repairs (2 and 5), self-initiated self-repairs (7), and other-initiated self-repairs (3 and 4). In fact, repair initiators can become repairable items themselves (2).

Excerpt 36. ST.1b.2

1	ST:	Teper' vy.
		Now it's your turn.
2	Aleksej (2):	°uh° (2.0)
3	ST:	°davajte poživee°
		°*A little more lively*°
4		(5.0)
5		Ne vspomnili,
		You don't remember,
6		a vy možete nazyvat'? ((points to team 1))
		and can you name something?
7	Aleksej (2):	Dinozavr
		Dinosaur
8	ST:	Net
		No
9	ST:	Davajte s bukvom s bukvoj (.) D
		Give me words with the lette with the letter (.) D
10	Aleksej (2):	Dog
11	Marina (1):	bylo
		it *was ((already given))*
12	ST:	bylo uže
		it *was already ((given))*
13		(0.5)
14		samoe pervoe slovo bylo
		it was the very first word
15		(4.0)
16	Andrej (1):	A house?
17	ST:	A D netu
		There's no D
18	Andrej (1):	°bak- (0.5) bak-°
19	ST:	hhh (čto ty govoriš'?) hhh
		hhh (what are you saying?) hhh
20	Aleksej (2):	°bad°
21		(2.0)
22		A bad?
		And bad?
23	ST:	Bad bylo.
		Bad was already ((given))

In this excerpt from ST's class, the six students are divided into two teams (team numbers are indicated next to their names in the excerpt). They are competing to

name as many vocabulary items with specific letters in them as possible, in this case the letter D. In line 1 ST nominates Team 2 as next speaker. Aleksej says, "uh" to take up the team's turn (2), but then pauses for 2.0 seconds. When no one on the team provides a word, ST tells them to be more lively (3). She is, in fact, attempting to initiate a repair; other than Aleksej's token "uh," there has been no turn transition as required and ST as current speaker speaks again to provoke a response. There is a longer pause (4), after which ST says, "You don't remember," (5). Team 2 has failed to repair the absent turn. Then ST attempts to initiate another repair (6) by nominating Team 1 for next turn: "and can you name something?"

Aleksej from Team 2 self-selects as next speaker, even though ST has nominated Team 1. He suggests the Russian word for dinosaur (7), but ST rejects it (8); she is asking for English words from their vocabulary lists. By rejecting Aleksej's answer, she is initiating an other-repair and requiring the submission of a different word. She inserts a sequence to remind the class she is looking for words with the letter D (9). Aleksej attempts a repair by suggesting the word "dog" (10). Marina, Aleksej's competitor, assesses his answer as invalid (11); she does so not to assist him in a repair, but to deny his team a point. ST uses a similar construction, but as instructor she is attempting to initiate a repair by telling him that "dog" has already been used. Aleksej, however, does not take up the repair. After a pause (13), ST further explains her rejection of "dog" as the very first word given (14). There is a 4.0 second pause (15) after which Andrej from Team 1 self-selects and suggests the word "house" (16). Again, ST attempts to initiate a repair when she says, "there's no D" (17). Andrej takes up ST's initiator and attempts to self-repair with a correct word (18). His answer is nonsensical, and ST laughs, asking him what he is trying to say (19). This is another repair initiator, and Aleksej self-selects to repair competitor Andrej's answer (20). He speaks quietly and ST does not acknowledge his repair. After a 2.0 second pause (21) he self-initiates a repair by asking about "bad" (22). In line 23, ST again rejects his answer because "bad" has already been used.

162

In this excerpt the instructor and students are negotiating the repair sequences. As instructor and therefore moderator of this exercise, ST initiates the repairs and evaluates their validity. There are several attempts at repair initiations, although not all of them are taken up; some of the repairs are also rejected as incorrect. In the next four excerpts, 37 through 40, the interaction is limited to the instructor and one student, in each case the instructor initiating a student's self-repair.

Excerpt 37. BM.2b.1

1	BM:	Lisa? ((Lidija))
2	Lidija:	I wouldn (.) like uh=
3	BM:	=ne ponjala <u>would</u> ili <u>wouldn't</u>? vsë taki
		=I didn't understand <u>would</u> or <u>wouldn't</u>? after all
4	Lidija:	°would (0.5) would°
5	BM:	Tak <u>utverditel'noe</u> ili <u>otricatel'noe</u> ( ) delaeš' predloženie?
		So are you making an affirmative or a negative ( ) sentence?
6		(0.5)
7		<u>Would like</u> ili <u>wouldn't like</u>?
		<u>Would like</u> or <u>wouldn't like</u>?
8	Lidija:	would
9	BM:	<u>would</u> utverditel'noe, (.)
		<u>would</u> affirmative, (.)
10		well značit čëtko proiznosim čtoby u nas vsë ponjatno.
		well that means we articulate properly so that everything is clear.
11	Lidija:	I would like, (.) uh, to have a (.) birthday today
12	BM:	I would <u>like</u>, èto ( ) intonacionnoe udarenie togda, I would <u>like</u>.
		I would <u>like</u>, it's ( ) intonational stress then, I would <u>like</u>.
13	Lidija:	I would <u>like</u>
14	BM:	Mhm.

Prior to the start of excerpt 37, BM has been asking the students individually what they would and would not like (to be, to do, to have, etc.) In this excerpt, BM nominates Lidija as next speaker (1). Lidija takes up her turn and begins to answer: "I wouldn (.) like uh" (2). BM latches on to the "uh," interrupting to initiate a self-repair by Lidija (3). She does not understand if Lidija "would" or "would not" like something. Usually a repair initiator occurs at the next turn, but as instructor BM can interrupt to initiate a repair at any point in a student's turn. In line 4, Lidija takes up the initiator and repairs her pronunciation, repeating "would" twice. Lidija's repair is itself a troublesome utterance as she speaks quietly and BM does not hear her properly. BM initiates the repair another time,

asking if Lidija is making an affirmative or a negative sentence (5). There is a 0.5 second pause during which Lidija does not attempt a repair (6) and so BM rewords the question: "Would like or wouldn't like?" (7). BM is conveying that pronunciation is the cause of the repairable utterance here. Lidija repeats her repair from line 4: "would" (8). In line 9 BM acknowledges the repair and indicates it is an affirmative construction. She inserts an instructional sequence calling on Lidija to articulate her words more clearly (10) and therefore avoid further pronunciation problems. Lidija completes her sentence with the proper form of "would" (11): "I would like, (.) uh, to have a (.) birthday today." BM initiates another repair in line 12 by correcting her intonation. Lidija repeats "I would like" with the required intonation (13), and BM responds with a token "Mhm." to accept the repair (14).

In this excerpt, BM as instructor initiates the student self-repairs and enforces their proper production. She also interrupts the student mid-turn to initiate the first repair rather than waiting for the turn completion point. When Lidija fails to take up a repair turn, BM repeats the initiator to manage Lidija's turn uptake and therefore repair her pronunciation.

Excerpt 38 (BM.2a.2)

In this excerpt, BM is asking Elizaveta to translate a birthday poem from English to Russian. Just prior to this excerpt, BM has read the line that includes the construction "we would like to say," and in line 1 she calls on Elizaveta to say what it means. After a pause (2), BM resumes her talk to repair the absent speaker change; the required turn transition has not taken place. BM restates the question for her (3): "I would like, we would l- like, what is it?" The question is troublesome for Elizaveta who again does not speak (4). To repair this second lack of turn transition, BM speaks again to tell Elizaveta that she should know this

164

Excerpt 38. BM.2a.2

1	BM:	Čto èto značit Liza?
		What does it mean Liza?((Elizaveta))
2		(1.0)
3		<u>I</u> would like, <u>we</u> would l- like, čto èto takoe?
		<u>I</u> would like, <u>we</u> would l- like, what is it?
4		(3.0)
5		Well, (.) my že znaem èto vyraženie
		Well, (.) we know this expression
6	Elizaveta:	ºMyº
		º*We*º
7	BM:	My?
		We?
8	Elizaveta:	ºxotimº
		º*want*º
9	BM:	Xo- <u>xotim</u> ili xoteli <u>by</u>?
		Wa- <u>want</u> or <u>would</u> like?
10		(1.0) ((grimaces, knocks on desk))
11		Nu Liza smelee, bystree, [ne spim.]
		Well Liza braver, faster, [we're not sleeping.]
12	Elizaveta:	[xoteli by]
		[would like]
13		(0.5)
14	BM:	<u>Bystree, nu perevodi</u>.
		Faster, well translate.
15		(3.0)
16		<u>Nu vsju stročku požalujsta skaži</u> vmesto kak polučilos'.
		<u>*Well say the whole line please*</u> *instead of what you just produced.*
17		(2.0)
18	Elizaveta:	Segodnja
		Today
19	BM:	<u>I poèto[mu segodnja]</u>
		<u>*And so [today]*</u>
20	Elizaveta:	[I poètomu] segodnja my xoteli by
		[And so] today we would like
21	BM:	<u>To say</u>, bystree Liza.
		<u>*To say*</u>*, faster Liza.*
22		(2.0)
23		<u>To sa:y</u>.
24		(0.5) ((uses fingers to show words coming out of her mouth))
25		<u>To sa:y</u>.
26		(1.0) ((again uses fingers to show words coming out of her mouth))
27		<u>To: sa::y</u>!
28		(2.0) ((uses fingers to indicate moving lips))
29	Elizaveta:	º(vot- (.) ne zn-)º
		º*(well- (.) I don't kn-)*º
30	BM:	<u>Sa:y</u>! <u>Sa:y</u>! <u>Sa:y</u>! <u>Say</u>! <u>Say</u>!
31		((uses both hands beside her mouth to show movement))
32		<u>You say</u>, <u>I am saying now</u>,

33	BM:	(1.0)
34		Čto takoe ((points in her mouth))
		What is it
35		<u>say</u>? <u>say</u>, <u>Liza:</u>! [<u>say</u>.
36	Elizaveta:	[skazat'
		[to say
37	BM:	<u>Skaza:t'</u>. <u>Nu kak eščё pokazyvat'</u>, ja ne znaju. ((exasperated))
		<u>To say. Well how else can I show that</u>, I don't know.
38		(1.0) Well (0.5) Liza, eščё raz, (.) kak polučaetsja stročka
		(1.0) Well (0.5) Liza, one more time, (.) what is the whole line
39		(1.0)
40	Elizaveta:	°Poètomu segodnja my xoteli by s- s- [skazat']°
		°And so today we'd like to s- s- [say]°
41	BM:	[Skazat'.] (.)
		[To say.] (.)
42		From all of <u>u:s</u> to <u>you</u>: ((gestures with arms to indicate 'us' and 'you'))
43		(2.0)
44		From all of <u>u:s</u>, ((gestures with arms again to indicate 'us'))
45		vot from Carl, ((points to everyone individually))
		Well from Carl, ((Kirill))
46		[from] Nadja, ((Nadežda)) from (.) Laura, ((Larisa)) (.) from me to <u>you</u>.
47	Elizaveta:	[mhm]
48	Elizaveta:	Ot nas tebe.
		From us to you.
49	BM:	Ot vsex nas?, (.) tebe. (0.5) Čto by my xoteli skazat'?
		From all of us?, (.) to you. (0.5) What would we like to say?
50		(2.0)
51	Elizaveta:	°S dnёm°=
		°Happy°=
52	BM:	=S dnёm?,
		=<u>Happy?,</u>
53	Elizaveta:	°S dnёm ro[ždenija°
		°Happy bir[thday°
54	BM:	[S dnёm roždenija
		[Happy birthday
.		
.		
.		
55	BM:	Nu ( ) Liza perevela=well koe kak.
		Well ( ) Liza translated it=well after a fashion.

expression (5). Elizaveta takes up her turn in line 6, with the beginning of the answer: "we." BM employs a DIU, repeating Elizaveta's turn with a question intonation to encourage her to continue (7), which Elizaveta does in line 8: "want." She has made a mistake in her translation, however, and BM initiates a self-repair with a question - answer sequence (9): "Wa- <u>want</u> or <u>would</u> like?" Similar to the function of a RPQ, this question identifies the problem to the

student, here the verb tense of the translation. Again Elizaveta does not take up her turn, and BM knocks on the desk to get her attention (10). To repair the lack of speaker transition, BM speaks again and tells Elizaveta to hurry up (11). Elizaveta overlaps the end of BM's turn to produce the repaired answer (12): "would like."

BM does not acknowledge Elizaveta's repair and after a pause (13) she again tells Elizaveta to hurry up and translate (14). It is possible that BM did not hear Elizaveta's repair in line 12 during the overlap, and so BM's turn in line 14 would be seen as another repair of absent speaker transition. There is a longer pause (15) and BM expands on her instructions (16): "well say the whole line please instead of what you just produced." BM's turn in line 14 was vague and so these more specific instructions can also be seen as a self-initiated self-repair to achieve the desired action, a full translation of the sentence.

BM's repair is successful as, after another pause (17), Elizaveta starts the translation in line 18. However, she again makes a mistake and BM interrupts and corrects her (19): "And so today." She does not use a next turn repair initiator but rather immediately initiates an other-repair, using a DIU to encourage the correct translation. Elizaveta overlaps BM halfway through her repair to repeat it and continue the translation: "And so today we would like" (20). BM self-selects to provide the next English words from the poem: "To say, faster Liza." (21). Elizaveta does not take up her nominated turn and after a pause (22), BM repairs this absence and speaks again: "To sa:y" (23). She also wiggles her fingers in front of mouth to indicate words, and after this pause (24) she repeats the words again: "To sa:y" (25). There is another pause during which BM again wiggles her fingers to mimic words coming out of her mouth (26). She speaks again very emphatically: "To: sa::y!" (27). BM's turns in lines 21, 23, 25 and 27 are repairs for the lack of speaker transition, and, with the finger gestures, they also act as attempted initiators of self-repairs for Elizaveta to continue her translation.

After another pause during which BM continues to wiggle her fingers (28), Elizaveta attempts to initiate an other-repair for the translation when she begins to say she does not know the answer (29). BM interrupts her: "Sa:y! Sa:y! Sa:y! Say! Say!" while using both her hands beside her mouth to indicate movement (30-31). She continues in line 32, saying, "You say, I am saying now,". BM is again attempting to initiate a self-repair to have Elizaveta translate "to say" while ignoring Elizaveta's request for an other-repair in line 29. BM's attempted initiation of a self-repair by Elizaveta fails again as Elizaveta remains silent. After another pause (33), BM speaks to repair the lack of speaker change (turn uptake) and again attempts to initiate Elizaveta's self-repair with a question - answer sequence (34-35): "What is it ((points in her mouth)) say? say, Liza:! say." In line 36 Elizaveta finally self-repairs and continues her translation: "to say." She overlaps the end of BM's turn when she does so, but it seems that she is responding to BM using her name in a direct and emphatic speaker nomination just prior to the overlap. In 'third position' relative to the *repair initiation - repair* BM assesses Elizaveta's repair (37): "To say. Well how else can I show that, I don't know." BM is exasperated at the difficulties in achieving Elizaveta's self-repair. BM asks her to say the entire line one more time (39), and after a pause Elizaveta does so: "And so today we'd like to s- s- say" (40). She hesitates on the pronunciation of "to say" and BM initiates an other-repair (41) that overlaps Elizaveta's production of the word.

In line 42 BM provides Elizaveta with the next words from the poem to be translated: "From all of u:s to you:" which she accompanies with gestures to indicate "us the class" and "you Elizaveta" (42). After another pause (43), BM resumes her turn to repair the lack of speaker transition and also to attempt to initiate a self-repair for Elizaveta's lack of translation (44). BM repeats part of the line and again gestures with her arms to indicate "us the class." She continues this attempted repair initiator in lines 45-46 by naming the classmates and pointing at them, the people who comprise "us." In line 47 Elizaveta overlaps part of BM's turn to indicate she understands, but stops and BM continues. Once BM has

completed her turn, Elizaveta produces the self-repair, the missing translation (48): "From us to you." In line 49 there is another 'third position' item relative to the repair initiator - repair; BM repeats the translation and slightly repairs it: "From all of us?, (.) to you." Rather than providing the next words in English for translation, BM continues her turn by asking Elizaveta what it is the poem states they would like to say. After a pause (50), Elizaveta begins the second pair part, the answer to BM's question: "Happy" (51). BM latches on to the answer and repeats it as another DIU, indicating it is correct and encouraging Elizaveta to continue (52). Elizaveta takes up her turn and says the full answer: "Happy birthday" (53). BM overlaps her midway through her turn to repeat the answer, thereby assessing it as correct. Some utterances have been omitted here where BM and Elizaveta repeat "happy birthday." In line 55, BM makes a comment on Elizaveta muddling through the translation.

There are multiple initiators and repairs in this segment through which BM and Elizaveta negotiate the correct translation of the poem. They are almost entirely instructor-initiated self-repairs. BM self-repairs when speaker transition does not occur; these self-repairs also act as attempted *other-initiators* to encourage Elizaveta to self-repair her translation difficulties. Elizaveta, then, self-repairs when she fixes these translation difficulties. Only one repair initiator is done by Elizaveta when she attempts to self-initiate an other-repair to be done by the instructor, which the instructor ignores.

For the next excerpts, I will look closely at repairs from segments already analysed in sections 4.1.1 and 4.2.1. Repairs are accomplished through turn-taking and the sequential organisation of talk, and therefore they are closely tied to speaker turns and sequences (e.g., question - answer pairs).

Excerpt 39. ST.1b.2

1	ST:	Vsem ponjatno kak èto zadanee nužno vypolnjat'?
		Everyone understands how to do this assignment?
2		[[To est'] vybiraem sebe kogo-nibud' da? iz obitatelej [fermy]
		[*[That is] we each choose somebody right? who lives on a [farm]*
3	Aleksej:	[[Two:-] [Kak tam-]
		[*[Two:-] [How do you-]*
4	ST:	i dolžny budem opisat' ego pri pomošči vsex slov kotorye my
		and we will have to describe him with the help of all the words that we
5		[znaem]
		[*know*]
6	Aleksej:	[Svetlana] Timofeevna (.) Dve koški? Èto kak, two cats?
		[*Svelana] Timofeevna (.) Two cats? That's what, two cats?*
7	ST:	Ne:t (pro odnu)
		No: (about one)

This excerpt was previously discussed in excerpt 27 in 4.2.2. There are several overlaps, repairables, in which the student Aleksej attempts to claim a turn while the instructor is speaking. In line 3, he overlaps ST at a possible turn transition point, that is, after ST has asked a question (1). In overlaps, one of the speakers usually self-initiates a self-repair and stops speaking. This is the case here as Aleksej stops short when he realises the instructor is continuing her turn. He attempts another self-selection (3) while ST is still speaking; again the instructor continues and the student repairs the overlap. Aleksej attempts a third self-selection (6) that overlaps the end of ST's instructions for the exercise (5). In this case ST repairs the overlap and Aleksej continues, although it is likely she repairs this overlap because she has finished her turn and not because Aleksej has a greater right to speak.

Excerpt 40. BM.2b.2

1	BM:	Egor?
2		(0.5)
3	Egor:	Th[e
4	BM:	[Kak čitaetsja èto slovo?
		[*How is this word pronounced?*
5	Egor:	The first of September is the (.) first day (0.3) of school.

This sequence was already discussed as part of the larger excerpt 2 in 4.1.1. In line 1 BM calls upon Egor to read the next sentence from the textbook. There is a

0.5 second pause (2) and Egor begins his turn (3). BM overlaps Egor after he has only managed to pronounce "th" and he stops. Again the student self-repairs during an overlap with the instructor; only once she has completed her turn does he continue his interrupted answer.

In excerpts 41 and 42, the instructors interact with the class as a whole. They repair absent turns that occur because no student knows the answer (or wants to self-select to answer).

Excerpt 41. PN.3a.2

1	PN:	a ešče kak možno?
		and how else is possible?
2		(2.0)
3		Vy sami govorili nedavno da? ètot novyj variant voprosa (.)
		You used it yourselves recently right? this new variant of the question (.)
4		Zabyli?
		Have you forgotten?
5		(0.5)
6		Ja vam napomnju (.) How are the things? (.) Da? How are the things?
		I will remind you (.) How are the things? (.) Yes? How are the things?
7		Well? please repeat after me. How are the things.
8	students:	How are the things.

This example is taken from excerpt 22 in 4.2.1. PN is asking the students for various ways to ask "how are you?" (1). None of the students takes up a turn at this transition point (2) and so PN repairs the lack of turn uptake (e.g., the lack of an answer) by the students and speaks again (3). In doing so, she is also repairing her initial question in line 1, which may have been misheard and/or misunderstood by the students; repairing her own question also initiates a student self-repair of the absent answer. She asks if the students have forgotten (4) and again there is no turn uptake (5). PN again repairs the absent turn transition by resuming her talk (6-7): "I will remind you (.) How are the things? (.) Yes? How are the things? Well? please repeat after me. How are the things." By providing them with the answer to her own question from line 1, she is also repairing their knowledge of "how are you" questions. In line 8 the students repeat the correct

answer. In this short excerpt we see two examples of instructor self-initiated self-repairs when the students do not speak as required at turn transition points.

Excerpt 42. BM.2a.2

1	BM:	It is autumn. Is it <u>la:te</u> or <u>ea:rly</u> autumn?
2		(1.0)
3		Čto značit late?
		What does late mean?
4		(0.5)
5		Kogda my opazdyvaem, my ot- <my govorim> <u>I'm late</u>. Ja?
		When we are late, we ex- <we say> I'm late. I?
6		(0.5)
7		opozdal. Značit late autumn, to kakaja? ((looks at class))
		am late. So that means late autumn is what?
8	students:	Pozdnjaja=
		Late=

This portion was taken from excerpt 5 in 4.1.1. BM asks the class if it is late or early autumn (1). There is a 1.0 second pause during which no student self-selects (2); therefore, the appropriate turn transition is absent. BM resumes her talk in line 3, asking a question to determine if the lack of student uptake in line 2 was due to comprehension problems. There is another absent turn transition (4) and BM provides more specific vocabulary information to help the students with the meaning of "late" (5). In line 6 we see a third absent turn transition and again BM resumes her turn, posing another question to the class (7). Several students respond in line 8; the absent turn uptake and vocabulary difficulties have been repaired.

Excerpt 43 (ST.1b.2)

This example is taken from excerpt 6 in 4.1.1. Andrej has been called upon to create a sentence based on the grammatical model he had drawn on the board in the previous exercise. There are six students in attendance at this lesson. In line 1 he initiates an other-repair, asking the instructor to confirm that he should do the first model. ST answers him and provides further information on the exercise (2-4). Andrej does not take his turn and in line 7 ST asks if he has forgotten. Andrej

Excerpt 43. ST.1b. 2

1	Andrej:	Pervuju?
		The first one?
2	ST:	Pervuju vot u tebja kvadrat, treugol'nik, i kružoček. (Kakoj-to primer)
3		*The first look you have a square, triangle, and circle. (What kind of*
		možno postavit' po takoj modeli? Pomniš'? (.) Vy možete pomogat'
		example) can you make from this model? Do you remember? (.) You
4		drug drugu.
		can help each other.
5	Marina:	Nu ( ) dim- ((frustrated, covers face with fist))
		But ( ) dim-
6		((Aleksej, Aleksandra, Nina - team #2 - waving hands in air))
7	ST:	Zabyli?
		Have you forgotten?
8	Andrej:	Sčas. (.) Čto-to skažu. (5.0)
		Just a sec. (.) I'll say something. (5.0)
9	ST:	Skaži
		Say it
10	Andrej:	I (.) I ha- (.) I ha? (.) a house da?

does not answer the question directly, nor does he create his sentence for the exercise; he does however acknowledge it is his rightful turn (8). He pauses for 5.0 seconds and as his 'exercise turn' is still absent, ST initiates another repair by telling him to say something (9). In line 10 Andrej self-repairs and produces an answer. In this excerpt there is an other-repair initiated by the student, as well as other-repairs initiated by the instructor to repair the students' absent turns.

Excerpt 44. BM.2a.2

1	BM:	What weather do you like?
2	Elizaveta:	I like
3		(2.0) ((Kirill enters and waits at the door))
4		the weather is
5	BM:	I like (.) kakuju pogodu
		I like (.) what kind of weather
6		(2.0)
7		Snačala prilagatel'noe a potom slovo pogoda. I like?=
		First the adjective and then the word weather. I like?=
8	Elizaveta:	=Hot?,
9	BM:	Mmhm,
10	Elizaveta:	Not nasty (.) and not windy.
11	BM:	W:ea[ther
12	Elizaveta:	[Weather

In this segment taken from excerpt 5 in 4.1.1, BM is interacting with a student during the typical question – answer period at the beginning of the lesson. There are three students in attendance, and a fourth who arrives during the excerpt.

BM starts by asking Elizaveta what kind of weather she likes (1). Elizaveta begins her answer correctly (2), when there is a 2.0 second pause and Kirill enters the room (3). Elizaveta resumes her answer, but this time incorrectly: "the weather is" (4). BM does not use a next turn repair initiator, but rather interrupts Elizaveta's turn to (other-)initiate a self-repair: "I like (.) what kind of weather" (5). This turn is a modified DIU. BM repeats Elizaveta's original attempted answer from line 2, to indicate it is the correct form as compared to her attempted answer in line 4; however, BM adds instructional information to the DIU to further clarify what the answer should be: "what kind of weather." Elizaveta does not take up this initiator to repair her mistake and there is another 2.0 second pause (6). The turn transition, then, is absent and BM speaks again to repair its absence: "First the adjective and then the word weather. I like?" (7) This repair also serves as an initiator to help Elizaveta self-repair her mistake from line 4, and includes instructional information followed by a DIU. Elizaveta resumes her answer with an adjective (8), and in lines 9 through 12 she and BM negotiate turns to complete her answer.

Excerpt 45. ST.1b.2

1	Andrej:	It is twelve.
2	Marina:	<u>Ne:t!</u>
		<u>*No:!*</u>
3	ST:	Net. (Postavil) nepravil'no.
		No. (You put it together) incorrectly.
4	Marina:	Da ty čë
		No way
5	Andrej:	Da ty čë. Vsë xorošo.
		No way. It's all correct.
6	Marina:	( )
7	ST:	Net četvërtaja model' ( ) Da èto vsë pravil'no. (.)
		No the fourth model ( ) Yes it's all correct.

This excerpt is taken from the longer excerpt 6 in 4.1.1. There are six students present, and they are taking turns creating sentences based on grammatical models drawn on the board. Here it is Andrej's turn to do so, and he creates the sentence "it is twelve" based on the model (1). His teammate Marina other-initiates a self-repair when she tells him he is wrong (2). ST also tells him he is wrong (3), another other-initiator for Andrej to self-repair his mistake. Marina expresses her indignation at his wrong answer (4), but Andrej does not accept that his sentence is incorrect and counters both Marina's and the instructor's repair initiators (5). Marina says something inaudible (6), and in line 7 ST concedes that Andrej is correct and her call for a self-repair was not necessary. Although the repair-initiator of his sentence in line 1 was not necessary (his turn was correct) and the repair was therefore not completed, Andrej's turn in line 5 did initiate a repair of the general misunderstanding in this excerpt; ST repaired this misunderstanding with her last turn by acceding that his answer in line 1 had been correct.

Excerpt 46. ST.1b.3

1	Marina:	Ah. I (0.5) can run. (0.5) I can speak. I can (0.5) s- skin.
2		[I-]
3	ST:	[Net] net, čto skazala?=
		[*No] no, what did you say?=*
4	Marina:	=skip
5	ST:	skip

In this final excerpt, also seen in excerpt 3 in 4.1.1, a student is telling a story about her stuffed animal in order to practice verbs of motion. There are seven students in class, and they are taking turns to tell their stories. Here it is Marina's turn. In line 1 she makes a mistake when she says "skin." She continues her story (2), but is overlapped by ST who interrupts to initiate a self-repair (3). Marina as student repairs the overlap by stopping her talk, and ST completes her repair initiator asking Marina what she had said. In line 4, Marina takes up the appropriate turn and self-repairs her pronunciation of "skip." In line 5 ST repeats the repair, a third position acknowledgement of it.

Throughout these excerpts, there are examples of both self- and other-initiated repairs, and the repairs themselves are either self- or other-repairs. Most often the repair initiation is done by the instructor. The instructor does not need to use a next turn repair initiator but can interrupt the student to correct a mistake at any time, and therefore ensure proper language use (and learning) in the classroom. The instructors often insist on the students self-repairing their mistakes. When there are student difficulties in repairing, the instructor sometimes assists them to self-repair, or other-repairs the mistake. When student turn transitions are absent, i.e., the students do not take up their nominated turns, the instructor resumes speaking to other-repair the absence.

4.4 Results of Applied CA Analysis

The *discourse behaviour* hypotheses are presented in 1.1.2 above. We can now conclude that, as noted in hypothesis 1, the interactants did orient to their institutional identities as instructors and students. The negotiation and management of institutional identities by the participants is key in the study of institutional interactions; such relevance was also demonstrated in several of the reviewed studies in section 2, including notably all of the CA studies.[43] The basic hypothesis 2 was that the organisation of turn-taking, sequences and repairs was constrained by the institutional setting; this was confirmed. The first specific hypothesis 2a was also confirmed: the instructors did control the turn-taking system, and most often selected next speaker. Speaker selection was only opened up to students in specific exercises. The instructors also controlled the overall structure of the interaction, as hypothesised in 2b. Finally, hypothesis 2c that the instructors most often initiated repairs was also confirmed. Specifically, when student pauses occurred mid-turn, the instructors often resumed their turns to initiate a repair of the difficulty. Also, when turn transitions did not take place as

---

[43] See Heritage and Sefi (1992), Leppanen (1998), Heritage and Lindstrom (1998), Tracy (1997), Wakin and Zimmerman (1999), Ostermann (2001), Koshik (2000), Adelsward and Nilholm (2000), Ford (1999), and Basturkmen (2000).

directed by the instructors, they again resumed their turns to elicit the appropriate speaker change. Lastly, when there were overlaps or student interruptions, the instructors most often regained, or maintained, control of the turn. The results are discussed in further detail in the following sections.

4.4.1 Summary of Turn-taking

As noted above, turn-taking is the basic form of the speech-exchange system for which there are general rules guiding interaction: one speaker at a time with minimal gaps and minimal overlaps. Interactants display, and listen for, possible turn transition points at which speaker change can occur. This speaker change can take place through the nomination of next speaker by the current speaker, or through self-selection. When speaker change does not occur smoothly, i.e., there is an overlap of speech, the first speaker usually continues.

Classroom interaction is a constrained form of this 'ordinary conversation.' As seen in this data set, the instructor maintains the turn-taking system. They decide, for the most part, who can speak and when. Through instructor maintenance of this classroom turn-taking, and student adherence to it, both the instructor and students are orienting to the institutional setting. The goal of the interaction is to learn the subject at hand, in this case the English language. Therefore, the 'institutional' reasoning is that the instructor speaks at will to impart their knowledge and maintain classroom discipline, and the students only speak when allowed (either when nominated by the instructor or during an exercise as directed by the instructor). There are, of course, missteps in this system, but when they occur the instructor regains control through some display of authority. The instructor also orients to their role as instructor by organising the overall structure of the interaction according to the lesson plan. By doing so, they also orient to the curriculum and therefore the greater institutional function of teaching and learning.

Speaker selection in the classroom is constrained by the instructors. The instructor controls the first turn at the beginning of the lesson, and the floor remains theirs until they allows for speaker change. The instructors often nominate next speaker by name. When a question is addressed to the class as a whole, the students sometimes raise their hands to self-select (and wait for acknowledgment from the instructor), or they simply speak. If none of the students accepts this open nomination, the instructor either addresses an individual student or resumes her talk. When a student self-selects out of turn, they can be disciplined or ignored. The instructor can also self-select at any point to insert sequence expansions, for instructional purposes. In some exercises, the instructor transfers turn-taking authority to a student who can ask questions and nominate next speaker. However, the instructor retains control of the system as a whole and can claim a turn at any time.

Pauses can belong to the current speaker in mid-turn, to all interactants at possible turn transition points, or to the nominated next speaker before beginning a turn. In the data there are several examples of lengthy pauses owned by the students, either mid-turn or when nominated as next speaker. The instructor chooses how to interpret such pauses, as current speaker's pause or as a turn transition point. For example, the instructor can give the student time to think and continue their turn. The instructor may also produce a response token such as "mhm" with a continuing intonation to encourage the student to continue their turn. If the instructor assesses the pause as student difficulty, they can claim a turn to provide assistance and therefore facilitate the resumption of the student's turn. Some of these claimed turns are DIUs [designedly incomplete utterances], also found in Koshik (2000).[44] The instructor begins an utterance for the student, eliciting the student's turn resumption. There are also instructor-owned pauses that occur during lengthier instructional turns, for example. The students do not self-select during obvious instructor-owned pauses.

---

[44] See section 2.3 for a discussion of Koshik's study of pedagogical discourse in university-level academic ESL classrooms

When overlaps occur between the instructor and students, the instructor has the right to continue speaking. They can choose to stop, however, and allow the student to continue. When students overlap each other, sometimes calling out answers at the same time, the instructor has the authority to intervene and re-establish the 'one-speaker at a time' rule. If one of the overlapped speakers is the rightful turn holder, the instructor disciplines the student who has interrupted.

Therefore, the instructor controls turn transitions in the classroom, i.e., who can speak when and about what. These transitions are often accomplished by the naming of next speaker. However, even when the instructor has named the next speaker, they have the right to reclaim a turn at any point in the interaction. The core sequence of turn taking involving the nomination of next speaker selection can be shown as

1) instructor turn: names next speaker
2) student turn: named student takes up nominated turn

The instructor can also name the next action. The core sequence of turn taking involving the nomination of next action can be shown as

1) instructor turn: names next action; e.g., asks open question to class
2) student turn: any student provides the required action; e.g., raises hand or calls out answer

When repairables occur in turn taking, for example a turn uptake or an answer is absent, the instructor (or more rarely the student) can initiate a repair. See section 4.4.4 for a detailed discussion of repair sequences.

4.4.2 Summary of Sequence Organisation

Another core idea in CA is that utterances are sequentially organised and their position relative to other utterances is key in determining what action is being done. The main concept in sequence organisation is adjacency pairs. Such pairs

are two utterances long, *first* and *second pair parts*, and are produced adjacently by different speakers. There may also occur an item in third position, an assessment of the second pair part produced by the first speaker. The first pair part constrains what the next speaker should do; if this expectation is not met, the required second pair part will be noticeably absent. This relationship, then, is very powerful. Adjacency pairs can also act as pre-sequences to prepare conditions for the next pair, or chained pairs, which form the core sequence. Sequence expansions can also be inserted into adjacency pairs to request or provide further information in order to enable the production of the second pair part. The adjacency pairs analysed in this dissertation include greeting - greeting, invitation - acceptance / refusal, and question - answer.

As in several of the studies reviewed in section 2, common underlying structures were found in the interactional data.[45] At the beginning of the lessons, the instructors usually initiate a greeting sequence with the students.[46] In most examples, the greeting is preceded by a pre-sequence where the instructor establishes the conditions for the sequence to follow. She asks the students to stand up or simply tells them the lesson is beginning. Once these conditions are met, the instructor greets the students with "hello" or "good morning," for example. The students always return the same greeting given to them. The instructor often chains a second greeting, such as "I am glad to see you," which is also returned by the students. The students never produce the first pair part of the greeting, only the second pair part. The two 'chained greetings' form the core sequence. The greeting sequence is then closed by the instructor's next turn, such as asking them to sit down or discussing the lesson plan (also a pre-sequence for next action). Such patterns establish the institutional nature of the interaction, i.e., the lesson has begun and pre-class chatting is over. The structure then is pre-sequence (optional) - greeting sequence(s) - closing (pre-sequence for next action).

---

[45] Landa 2000, Coupland and Coupland 1998, Heritage and Sefi 1992, Lepannen 1998, Wakin and Zimmerman 1999, Ostermann 2001, Koshik 2000, and Basturkmen 2000.
[46] Only in BM.2b.1 and BM.2b.2 did BM not initiate a greeting sequence with the class.

Invitations in the classroom are not traditional social invitations, but rather invitations for students to come to the board or carry out actions they would otherwise not be allowed to do. As students they are not allowed to disobey a instructor and therefore must usually produce an *acceptance* second pair part. These invitations can be seen then as *command* invitations. For this dissertation the structure of such invitations was the point of interest.

When invited to do something by the instructor, the second pair part is often non-verbal; the student simply carries out the action required of them, such as going to the board or transcribing words. To have the student carry out all of the required actions, the instructor can chain together multiple invitations, breaking down the task into smaller parts. In some cases a pre-invitation is initiated by the instructor to confirm that the student has the right information in order to carry out the core task. When there is a pattern of invitations established during an exercise, the students interpret the pre-invitation as the core invitation itself and produce the core sequence second pair part. In all invitations sequences in this data, the student accepted the invitation.

Question - answer sequences are a large part of classroom interactions; the typical language lesson at this school is interactive. Instructors ask questions to check comprehension, to review, to practice. Students ask questions to clarify, to ask permission to do something. When the instructor asks a question, either of a particular student or the entire class, an answer is required. If the question is open-ended, any student can self-select to produce the answer. When a nominated student does not answer and the second pair part can be seen as absent, the instructor sometimes inserts a sequence expansion to help them negotiate the correct answer. The expansion can include question - answer sequences itself, or can simply be instructional information. These expansion questions can be RPQs [reverse polarity questions], reversing an affirmative question to a negative one to convey to the student what is wrong with their answer, a type of question also

found in teacher-student interactions in Koshik's (2000) research.[47] The instructors also employ other question sequences that are not in fact questions, but rather instructional sequences that function similarly to the RPQ by conveying to the student what is wrong with their turn and therefore initiating a possible repair. The expansion continues until that point when the student has produced a satisfactory answer. When an open-ended question is not answered, the instructor again inserts sequences to elicit the required answer. Again, these inserted sequences can also be DIUs. There were also examples of students prioritising a instructor-required answer higher than the non-interruption of the instructor, and so they overlapped the instructor's talk to produce the absent answers.

The instructor, as questioner, has a reserved right to speak and can therefore chain multiple questions. As instructor, they can also interrupt any sequence to claim a turn. In some exercises the instructor initiates a question - answer sequence, whereby the answerer must pose the next question to another student, until the final student answerer must question the instructor. Only in specific exercises such as this are students allowed to question each other. When a student poses a question to the instructor, the instructor is not obligated to answer directly. The instructor's second pair part can be another question, or an informative utterance, to help the student answer their own question. Students self-select and ask questions after a instructor has given instructions for an exercise but before the instructor has nominated first speaker. This seems to be a point when self-selected student questions are expected and therefore not disciplined. The instructor also sometimes ignores a student's questions, and the student is not in a position to require the production of a instructor's answer. There are very few examples in the data of student-produced questions, usually only posed to clarify instructions or ask for information.

In this data there are also examples of pre-sequences, such as when the instructor asks who is the daily monitor. The instructor does so to determine which student

---

[47] See section 2.3.

has the right to be answerer for the routine 'monitor' questions. Such informative questions allow the questioner to lead into the core sequence of questions. We also see examples of third position items in the question - answer sequences when the instructor assesses the student's answer for correctness or acknowledges its production. Therefore, the question - answer sequence found in these data can be shown as pre-sequence (optional), core sequence of question(s) - answer(s) (with possible sequence expansion when answer is absent), and third position acknowledgement/assessment.

Therefore, the underlying sequences of adjacency pairs can be shown as

1) instructor turn: pre-sequence first pair part; e.g., question

2) student turn: pre-sequence second pair part; e.g., answer

3) instructor turn: core sequence first pair part; e.g., question

4) student turn: core sequence second pair part; e.g., answer.

5) instructor turn: item in 'third position'; e.g., assessment of answer.

where steps 1 and 2 are optional to determine if the correct conditions exist for the core sequence(s) to take place. Steps 3 and 4 can be chained multiple times. Step 5 is also optional, although the instructors in this study often did assess the student's second pair part (except for in greeting-greeting pairs).

The underlying sequences of adjacency pairs when a repairable occurs can be shown as

1) instructor turn: core sequence first pair part; e.g., question

2) student turn: core sequence second pair part with repairable; e.g. answer with lexical mistake

3) instructor turn: sequence expansion / repair initiator; e.g., RPQ to draw attention to incorrect choice of word

4) student turn: core sequence second pair part;
   e.g., correct answer to question from line 1

5) instructor turn: item in 'third position';
   e.g., assessment of answer.

When a repairable occurs in the sequence, the instructor or student can insert a sequence expansion to initiate a repair (although this is most often done by the instructor). The sequence expansion (shown here in step 3) can involve chained question - answer pairs before the correct second pair part is produced (shown here in step 4).

4.4.3 Summary of Repair Organisation

Repairs are ways in which interactants fix communication trouble such as misunderstandings or mishearing. Repairs are very tightly bound in turn-taking and the sequential organisation of talk, and so throughout the analysis there are examples of repairs in each section. Through subsequent turns the initial speaker can determine that what they said was properly interpreted. In following turns the recipient of a problem utterance can also clarify what was said. In the classroom, the instructor uses questions to check understanding and students uses questions to clarify information, as noted above.

Any utterance can be a problem source for the talk, a *repairable*. The speaker can self-initiate a repair when it is clear that the recipient did not understand. The recipient can other-initiate a repair to fix the trouble source. The actual repair itself can be done by the initial speaker, a self-repair, or by another interactant, an other-repair. In these data there are examples of self- and other-initiated repairs. The repairs themselves are also either self- or other-repairs.

The instructor, whose role it is to impart language knowledge to the students and assess learning performance, most often initiates repairs in the classroom. They do not need to wait for a next turn to initiate a repair, but rather can claim a turn at

any time to correct a student's mistake. Most often the instructor interrupts when a mistake is made, and only sometimes waits for the next turn. They often insist on the students self-repairing their mistakes, sometimes eliciting this self-repair through the use of a DIU or a RPQ. Therefore, the repairs are usually other-initiated self-repairs. Koshik (2000) found similar uses of DIUs and RPQs to repair problematic language use. When the students are unable to self-repair, or are displaying difficulties doing so, the instructor sometimes inserts a sequence to facilitate the self-repair. More rarely the instructor other-repairs the student's mistake. When the repairable is an overlap, one speaker stops speaking to self-repair, usually the student.

As noted above, the absence of a turn transition is a cause for trouble. The instructor can nominate an individual student as next speaker or address the entire class, but when speaker change does not take place there is a repairable turn transition. Absent student turns are most often seen in question - answer sequences. The student does not know the answer, perhaps did not understand the question, and therefore does not take their nominated turn to answer. The instructor repairs this absence by resuming their turn. They often use this continuation to provide further information and therefore encourage the production of the missing turn or answer.

Most of the repairs in these data occur when the instructor is interacting with an individual student; many of the repairs are quickly and easily accomplished, although there are a few instances of lengthy repair interactions between instructor and student. Interruptions often involve a third student not currently participating in the instructor-student interaction, or at times a student simply interrupting a instructor's turn, but such repairs are quickly negotiated. Repairs directed at the entire class occur when no one self-selects to respond to a instructor question, i.e., the turn transition is absent. In such instances, the repair can take several inserted instructor turns before it is negotiated. However, the structure of repairs does not vary whether the repair is directed at one student or

the entire class; it varies according to what it is that requires fixing.

4.4.4 Interaction of Turn-taking, Sequences and Repairs

From the data analysed here, it is clear how closely tied turn-taking, sequence organisation, and repairs are in their interaction. Turn-taking is the foundation of the speech-exchange system without which there would be no interaction; the organisation of sequences and the repair of troublesome utterances are all accomplished through turns taken by the interactants. In the classroom the instructor maintains the turn-taking system to control the interaction and, as such, guide the learning process. Therefore, not only is turn-taking the basis of interaction, it is also an important means through which to achieve institutional goals. This control of turn-taking, then, is key in the classroom setting.

Sequences, most notably question - answer adjacency pairs, are also highly relevant to classroom interaction and therefore institutional goals. The instructors use questions to check comprehension, to have students practice correct answers, to facilitate student self-repairs, and so on. Students ask questions, for example, to clarify instructions, to learn new words, to ask permission to do something. Again, any sequential organisation is achieved through turn-taking by the participants. Both turn-taking and sequential organisation, therefore, are important for classroom interaction, although turn-taking perhaps more so as the basic speech-exchange system and, as such, the instructor's means of guiding the interaction.

Repairs are also closely tied to the turn-taking system. Repairs in the classroom address turns, including sequences, that have not proceeded as they should have; they are also initiated in view of institutional goals, here the learning of English. More specifically, repairs in the classroom are initiated and accomplished to fix a variety of interactional troubles: absent turns, overlapping turns, misheard utterances, mispronunciation and other mistakes (e.g., lexical or grammatical). As

previously noted, the repairs in these data are more frequently other-initiated self-repairs where the instructor other-initiates student self-repairs. This finding falls in line with other research of classroom interactions (McHoul 1990; Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain 2003). In Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2003), the data was collected in a content-based university seminar for advanced learners of German, in which approximately two-thirds of the repairs were found to be initiated by the instructor. Although Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain did not outline a core turn-by-turn sequence of instructor-initiated repairs, and despite the differences in culture, education context, age and language abilities of the students in their study as compared to the participants in this research, their excerpts of data can be seen to have the same underlying core repair sequences as outlined below in this section. In Liebscher and O'Cain, however, there are many more student-initiated repairs than are found here, likely due to language abilities of the students and the more open nature of the interaction, namely a university seminar.

Occurring most often in these data are repairs to fix *absent turns* when a student has been nominated by the instructor as next speaker; such absent turns are often also *absent second pair parts* of question - answer adjacency pairs. It is through posing a question to a particular student that the instructor is selecting the next speaker *and* the action their utterance should do, in this case provide an answer. The cause of absent turns, including answers, can most often be seen as the result of student uncertainty and/or limited language knowledge: not understanding the question, not knowing the answer, or perhaps being too shy or scared to take a turn. When the answer, usually the entire student's turn, is absent, the instructor initiates a repair. The core repair structure for missing turns, including absent sequence pair parts, is often the following:

> Repair Sequence 1[48]
>
> 1) instructor turn: nomination of next speaker;
>   e.g., question
>
> 2) *student turn: absent answer[49]*

---

[48] For an example of repair sequence 1, see excerpt 38 in 4.3.2.

3) instructor turn: repair of turn[50] / repair initiator;
e.g., informative utterance

4) student turn: self-repair of absent answer

Step 3 is a instructor-initiated other-repair of the absent turn, such as an informative utterance or the restatement of a problematic question, which by design also acts as a repair initiator to elicit the appropriate student turn in step 4. Steps 2 and 3 can be repeated several times before the student repairs the absent second pair part in step 4.

As mentioned above, step 3 can be a question that can lead to inserted sequence expansions, for example a student answer to a clarifying question, before the student's self-repair is achieved. In this case the sequence is expanded with steps 4 and 5:

Repair Sequence 2[51]

1) instructor turn: nomination of next speaker;
e.g., question (Q1)

2) *student turn: absent answer (A1)*

3) instructor turn: repair of turn / repair initiator;
e.g., clarifying question (Q2)

4) student turn: turn uptake; e.g., answer to
clarifying question (A2)

5) instructor turn: repair initiator; e.g., repetition of
Q1

6) student turn: self-repair of absent A1

If the student does not know the answer to the repair-initiating question in step 3,

---

[49] The italics are used in these repair structures to emphasise that an expected turn is absent.

[50] In line 3 the instructor in effect repairs two trouble sources: 1) the lack of student turn uptake and 2) the potential mishearing or misunderstanding of the instructor's turn in line 1. This two-fold repair also serves to initiate a repair of the absent answer, by encouraging the student to provide the absent turn. Turn 3 in repair sequence 2 can also be seen to carry out the same actions.

[51] For an example of repair sequence 2, see excerpt 5 in 4.1.2 (partially seen in excerpt 42 in 4.3.2).

this as well can lead to an absent student turn and further repair initiation, and the sequences repeat. There does not seem to be a difference in how easily or quickly the repair of an absent turn is accomplished depending on whether it is a problematic sequence (e.g., absent answer) or simply a nominated student turn not taken up.[52] In both cases, the instructor interacts with the student until the appropriate turn is taken.

When the student turn is taken up in its proper position but the turn itself includes a mistake (e.g., grammar or pronunciation), the core structure of the repair is similar:

> Repair Sequence 3[53]
>
> 1) instructor turn: nomination of next speaker
> 2) student turn: trouble source; e.g., grammatical error
> 3) instructor turn: repair initiator; e.g., assessment of mistake
> 4) student turn: self-repair of error

The instructor will take a turn, again step 3, to provide more information or ask another question to help elicit the corrected turn; this can also lead to expanded sequences until the mistake is repaired (not shown here). In some instances, however, the instructor other-repairs the mistake in step 3, often when the mistake is one of pronunciation, and the student usually repeats the correction in step 4 (although this is not always the case). This other-repair in step 3 then also acts as a repair initiator to elicit the repeated self-repair from the student in step 4:

> Repair Sequence 4[54]
>
> 1) instructor turn: nomination of next speaker

---

[52] From classroom observation and subsequent analysis of the data, it seems extremely likely that factors affecting repair difficulties could include student language ability, student shyness or fear in the classroom, the usefulness of the instructor's sequence expansion, etc. Such factors are not studied here.
[53] For an example of repair sequence 3, see excerpt 44 in 4.3.2.
[54] For an example of repair sequence 4, see excerpt 2 in 4.1.2.

2) student turn: trouble source; e.g., pronunciation
   error

3) instructor turn: other-repair / initiator of self-
   repair

4) student turn: turn uptake; e.g., self-repair

If step 4 does not occur, step 3 can still be seen as a repair initiator for future student self-repair, i.e., correct pronunciation of the problem word. There are also examples in the data combining repairs for both absent turns and mistakes. For example, the instructor asks a question; the student turn is absent; the instructor takes a turn to elicit an answer; the elicited answer is incorrect; the instructor takes another turn to facilitate the repair; and so on until the mistake is corrected.

The repair structure when the instructor does not hear a student's turn is similar:

Repair Sequence 5[55]

1) instructor turn: nomination of next speaker

2) student turn: °quiet turn uptake°

3) instructor turn: repair initiator, e.g. "Sorry?"

4) student turn: self-repair; e.g., louder repetition
   of (2)

In this case the repairs are easily accomplished without sequence expansions or further interactional difficulties.

The repair of instructor - student overlaps is also simple, usually:

Repair Sequence 6[56]

1) [instructor turn

2) [student turn

3a) instructor turn: turn continuation / student self-
    repair (i.e., student stops speaking)

or

---

[55] For an example of repair sequence 5, see excerpt 35 in 4.3.2.
[56] For an example of repair sequence 6, see excerpt 39 in 4.3.2.

3b) student turn: turn continuation / instructor self-
repair (i.e., instructor stops speaking)

When the repairable, i.e., the overlap occurs, the instructor has the reserved right to speak. The instructor can continue and the student stops speaking (3a), or the instructor can stop and allow the student to speak (3b). If the instructor continues their turn, the student's stop can be seen as a self-repair of the overlap. If the instructor stops and allows the student to continue, the instructor is self-repairing the overlap. In both instances, the continuation and self-repair occur simultaneously. Overlaps are repaired immediately in current turn. There are also examples of students overlapping each other, at which point the instructor asserts authority or acknowledges the rightful speaker, regaining control of the turn-taking.

When a student has language difficulty while taking a turn, for example they cannot remember a vocabulary item, they can initiate a question - answer sequence to repair language knowledge. The structure is as follows:

Repair Sequence 7[57]

1) student turn: 'language difficulty' repairable

2) student turn: other-repair initiator; e.g., question

3) instructor turn: other-repair; e.g., answer

The instructor may answer the student's question directly (other-repair), as shown above in step 3, or may choose to facilitate the student's production of a self-repair. In this case, the repair structure then follows the core instructor-initiated repair structure, with possible sequence expansions between steps 3 and 4 (e.g. further repairables, repair initiators, question - answer sequences):

Repair Sequence 8[58]

1) student turn: 'language difficulty' repairable

2) student turn: other-repair initiator; e.g., question

---

[57] For an example of repair sequence 7, see excerpt 35 in 4.3.2.
[58] For an example of repair sequence 8, see excerpt 26 in 4.2.2.

3) instructor turn: self-repair initiator; e.g., informative utterance

4) student turn: self-repair

Therefore, the core instructor-initiated repair structure in the classroom, for absent turns (including absent answers), student mistakes (pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar), and mishearing, can be shown as:

Core Instructor-Initiated Repair Sequence

1) instructor turn: nomination of next speaker or next action

2) student turn: repairable

3) instructor turn: repair initiator

4) student turn: self-repair

Again, steps 2 and 3 can be repeated many times, and step 3 can also lead to further sequence expansions not shown here, such as clarifying question - answer sequences, before step 4 is achieved. Again, instructor-initiated student self-repairs are the most common repairs found in the data. The instructor determines whether or not a student turn is a repairable, and the most frequent repairable in these data is the absent student turn. Whether it is a problem in the turn-taking system (excluding overlaps), a problem in sequential organisation (also a problem in turn-taking), or a language mistake, the underlying structure is the same. Repairs of pronunciation mistakes and overlaps are most easily accomplished, while repairs of absent turns or of grammatical or lexical mistakes can vary in length and difficulty, perhaps according to factors not studied here such as the student's ability or the instructor's proficiency at facilitation.

Turn-taking is the foundation of classroom interaction. Sequential organisation, including adjacency pairs, is accomplished through turn-taking; the first pair part dictates what the second pair part *should* be. Repairs fix turns that are problematic in some way, and do so in a structured fashion. A student turn may not be taken up and therefore be seen to be absent; an absent turn may itself be an absent

answer (second pair part) to a instructor's question (first pair part); it may be taken up in the wrong position (overlap); it may be too quiet; it may be produced incorrectly (grammatical or lexical mistake). Whatever the case, it is clear that turns, sequences, and repairs are inherently intertwined.

Such organisation of talk in the classroom is significant in this research as a means of understanding how the interactants talk the institution into being (Heritage 1984). In other words, through the skilful management of the turn-taking system, the perception of the sequential relationships of utterances, the ability to recognise and repair troublesome talk, and especially through the simultaneous and on-going accomplishment of all three as a means to achieve institutional goals, the instructors and students are creating the social order of the institution. The instructors orient to their roles as pedagogues / facilitators / disciplinarians and the students to their roles as learners, and as such they construct the classroom interaction, the purpose of which is to meet the goals of the institution.

Although much CA research has been carried out on interactions in institutional settings, and although pedagogical discourse has been the focus of much research in a variety of other analytic frameworks, very little research applying (or being informed by) CA methodology has been done on classroom discourse to date (e.g., McHoul 1978 and 1990, Lerner 1995, Koshik 2000, Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain 2003). It is difficult, therefore, to compare the findings of this research to studies of classroom interaction in different cultures and languages, and for a similar age group. In fact, to my knowledge there is not one study to which this research can be directly compared. However, in more general terms, the findings here have shown that the turn-taking system in the classroom does indeed vary from turn-taking in ordinary conversation, as has also been found in previous CA studies of institutional interaction (e.g., McHoul 1978). Specifically, the classroom interaction follows the general 'ordinary conversation' *rules* of one speaker at a time, no gaps, and no overlaps, but this turn-taking system is

constrained by the instructor.

As in other studies of institutional interaction, the findings here have also shown that question – answer sequences are dominant in classroom interactions (Drew and Heritage 1992; Koshik 2000; MacBeth 2004; Pontefract and Hardman 2005).[59] When examining the question – answer sequences in section 4 above, it is clear how the Birmingham group was able to outline the three-part *initiation – response – evaluation* (IRE) sequence in academic discourse.[60] Boyd and Rubin (2002: 499) note that up to 70% of teacher-student interactions include teacher initiation, student response, and teacher evaluation. Such patterns in interaction allow the teacher to control the interaction and do most of the talking (van Lier 1984; Cazden 1988; Gutierrez 1994; Hall and Walsh 2002), which is also true of the interactions analysed in this research. The sequences outlined in section 4 often have these three elements, but they are not always simple *first pair part – second pair part – 'third position' item* sequences. There are several examples in these data of three-part sequences that have been expanded with inserted question – answer pairs, repairs (see next paragraph for further discussion), and/or instructional utterances. Lastly, the use of "known-answer" sequences is found throughout these data, similar to findings in other studies of classroom discourse (Koshik 2000; MacBeth 2004). "The question with known answer is a deeply familiar and pervasive way of organizing instructional sequences in classrooms, and it delivers the last word, and sequence closure, to the teacher." (MacBeth 2004: 704)

The findings discussed here also have similarities to other studies of classroom repairs, notably the dominance of teacher-initiated student repairs (McHoul 1990; Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain 2003). The sequences of repairs outlined in this research can be seen to include the three-part repair outlined in Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2003: 376): *repairable, repair initiation,* and *outcome* (i.e., the

---

[59] Pontefract and Hardman (2005: 91) also note that *teacher explanation* comprises the bulk of the remaining portion of classroom interactions.
[60] See section 1.3.2 for a discussion of the Birmingham group.

success or failure of the repair). Similarly, other researchers have outlined what MacBeth calls an IREC sequence: *initiation – reply – evaluation – correction* (e.g., McHoul 1990). This sequence also coincides with the core instructor-initiated repair sequence outlined above in this section:

1) instructor turn: nomination of next speaker or next action

2) student turn: repairable

3) instructor turn: repair initiator

4) student turn: self-repair

5 Analysis of Data: Gender and Applied CA

In section 5 I summarise the gender attitudes of the instructors, informing further analysis of the language used to determine if there are any gender differences discernible from a CA perspective. To understand the instructors' gender attitudes, I analyse interview responses, as well as assessments of the individual students in the classes. The collection of these secondary data took place after all lessons had been recorded, to avoid drawing the instructors' attention to research questions of interest and thereby minimise possible influence on their language use in the classroom

5.1 Interviews

All three instructors (PN, BM and ST) participated in a videotaped interview. Ten questions were posed regarding the instructors' attitudes and behaviours toward girls and boys in the classroom:[61]

1) Who do you think studies better, girls or boys?
2) Who are better second language learners, girls or boys?
3) For whom do you translate from English to Russian more often, girls or boys?
4) To whom do you pose more questions in class, girls or boys?
5) Who behaves better in class, girls or boys?
6) Who needs more control in the classroom, girls or boys?
7) Who interrupts you more often, girls or boys?
8) Whom do you tell to be quiet more often, girls or boys?
9) Whom do you praise more often in class, girls or boys?
10) Whom do you scold more often in class, girls or boys?

---

[61] See Appendix E for a complete list of the interview questions.

The instructors were not instructed that they were constrained by the binary 'boy-girl' split in their responses, and were therefore able to provide alternate answers if desired. I outline the instructors' responses for each question, after which I summarise their gender attitudes as gleaned from the interviews.

Who do you think studies better, girls or boys?

To this question PN responded that girls studied better 90% of the time because they were more assiduous, patient and thorough. She noted that if boys enjoyed learning and found the subject matter interesting, then they too would be successful in their studies; these boys made up the 10% difference. BM responded that in general, girls studied better than boys. She indicated that there were boys who were very capable, and there were girls who were very hardworking. Because of their hard work, the girls achieved greater results than the "lazy boys" who were capable. BM added that there were few boys who studied very poorly. ST answered that it depended on the individual student; if they wanted to learn and found it interesting, they would do well. She also expressed some hesitation that she was not entirely sure, adding that some boys were very hardworking and capable while some girls were "the opposite."

Who are better second language learners, girls or boys?

PN answered that girls are better language learners because they liked studying languages more; it was in their nature. She explained that in pre-Revolutionary Russia girls were expected to study music and learn foreign languages in order to be introduced to society, which influenced girls' interests even today. She noted that girls who studied both music and second languages achieved greater results in language learning. BM responded that being a better second language learner did not depend on gender, but rather on individual abilities. A student could study hard for two years and not progress, while another student who showed up to class infrequently and did not try could somehow learn more and speak better. ST answered that she thought boys and girls were equal second language learners, but she was not sure.

For whom do you translate from English to Russian more often, girls or boys?

PN answered that she translated from English to Russian more often for boys, as the girls had larger vocabularies and therefore understood more than the boys. BM responded that it depended on how certain she was that the students understood what she had said; she always translated new material. ST indicated that she translated for whomever needed it if she saw that someone did not understand, but then qualified her response by adding that in general she tended to translate everything.

To whom do you pose more questions in class, girls or boys?

This question addresses the instructors' question-asking behaviour. PN indicated that she asked questions equally of all students, independent of factors such as language ability or gender. BM responded that it depended on how well the students understood the material or if they had missed any classes; she would more frequently question those students who did not understand, but she would always ask a strong student first as an example for the others. ST stated that she tried to pose questions equally to boys and girls, but sometimes she questioned the boys more to keep them from being distracted.

Who behaves better in class, girls or boys?

This question elicited the answer "girls" from all three instructors. PN responded that girls behaved better 90% of the time. She noted that it depended on temperament as some girls were full of energy and could not sit still, but such behaviour is boy-like. BM said girls behaved better undoubtedly (*odnoznačno*), adding that even girls who studied poorly would sit quietly and calmly, and would admit that they do not know anything. ST responded that girls were more obedient, and whispered and interrupted less, while boys were restless and it was very difficult to "re-educate" (*perevospitat'*) them to behave better.

Who needs more control in the classroom, girls or boys?

Again, all three instructors indicated boys require more control. PN responded

that boys required greater control because they were more easily distracted, which she called a physiological characteristic, making it difficult to keep their attention. Because of this, boys required constant supervision and control. She noted that in some cases their parents were forcing the boys to attend language school, while they had other interests like sports and computer games. BM answered that girls in general required less control and did their homework responsibly. She added that boy-girl pairs working together in class needed to be monitored and controlled because they were shy with each other and did not cooperate well, while two girls working together would help each other and get the work done. ST also answered that boys required more control. She collected their classroom journals (*dnevniki*) at the end of each class to give them marks for behaviour, and to direct their attention to "normal behaviour." If nothing was done to control the boys, she noted it would be a "nightmare" (*košmar*).

Who interrupts you more often, girls or boys?

All three instructors answered that boys do. PN indicated that boys were more active and energetic and always had questions, while girls had more self-control. BM had nothing to add to her answer, while ST stated that boys were completely disobedient and often interrupted her; she noted that she was trying to break them of this habit.

Whom do you tell to be quiet more often, girls or boys?

PN stated that she did not have this problem, because if the lesson plan were interesting, the students would not have time to chat. BM responded that she had to tell boys to be quiet more often because they tended to speak out of turn more frequently. She added that just because a student yelled out an answer before the others had a chance to respond, that it did not mean that the student knew more. If a student had a bona fide question, however, she indicated she would never tell him to be quiet. ST also answered that she had to tell boys to be quiet more often because of their habit of interrupting, yelling out in class, and talking out of turn.

Whom do you praise more often in class, girls or boys?

PN stated that she praised any student when deserved, although she especially liked to praise weaker students when they were making progress. BM responded that she praised hardworking students more, because hard work was more important than abilities in reaching learning goals. (It is interesting to note that in previous questions, BM described girls as hardworking who achieve greater results.) ST answered that she tried to praise students equally. Even if a student did not answer a question very well, she would praise them if they answered well for their abilities.

Whom do you scold more often in class, girls or boys?

PN responded that she scolded whoever deserved it, because "both boys and girls can be lazy." BM also responded that she scolded lazy students. The school was private and parents often paid for lessons even if they could not afford them, in order to help their child's development; therefore, if the child did not work hard, BM scolded them so that they understood what they were being given. ST answered that she scolded boys more for misbehaving or not doing their homework, and to teach them that such behaviour was inappropriate.

Next I summarise the answers provided by each instructor. Based on her responses in the interview, PN appeared to have a positive attitude towards girls in the classroom and a more negative one towards boys. She believed that girls studied better, were better language learners, and behaved better in class; boys, on the other hand, needed more control, interrupted more, and required more Russian-English translations because of their smaller vocabularies and therefore more limited understanding.

PN believed that she posed questions equally to boys and girls, and also that she praised and scolded those who deserved it, independent of gender. (If you consider her answers that boys misbehave and interrupt more, then it would seem likely that she scolds boys more.) PN also stated that she never had to tell a

student to be quiet because she had interesting lesson plans that kept the students occupied. However, as already noted, she stated that boys interrupted her and were easily distracted, requiring much control, which would seem to indicate that her lesson plans did not always keep the students occupied. It is possible that PN answered these questions about her own classroom behaviour (asking questions, praising/scolding, telling a student to be quiet) more in terms of how she would *like to* teach rather than how she *actually* taught.

BM also seemed to have a more positive attitude towards girls and a more negative one towards boys, although her attitudes were less clear-cut at times. She believed that girls studied and behaved better, and did their homework more responsibly, while boys required more control, interrupted more, and needed to be quieted more frequently. However, in qualifying her responses, we got further insights into BM's attitudes. She stated that there were very hardworking girls and very capable but lazy boys; this qualification implied a belief that boys were naturally more talented students but their laziness held them back, while perhaps less talented girls would have to work hard to achieve results.

When BM answered that girls behave better, she added that even girls who were poor students would sit quietly and admit that they did not know anything. It is difficult to determine if this was a positive or a negative statement about girls. It could be interpreted as positive if BM believed that knowing one's limitations is a strength, or as negative in the sense that *at least 'low achieving' girls know their place*. It could also be seen as a negative statement about boys who would not admit if they "knew nothing" but still acted as if they knew everything.

BM believed that being a better second language learner depended on individual abilities and not gender; some students who worked hard did not progress while others who did very little work seemed to learn more and speak better. However, BM contradicted this answer in her response to the question about praise, where she stated that hard work was more important than abilities in reaching learning

goals. She also stated that she praised students who deserved it, regardless of gender. As she believed that girls were harder workers, her response implied that girls achieved greater results in learning second languages and therefore deserved and received more praise.

BM believed that she treated boys and girls equally when it came to asking questions in class, translating from English to Russian, and scolding. She scolded "lazy students;" as she believed girls were harder workers and did their homework more responsibly, it is likely that she would scold boys more frequently.

In general, BM's attitude towards girls was positive as she viewed them as hardworking, well-behaved and responsible students, qualities which were rewarded by greater language learning results and therefore deserving of praise. Her attitude towards boys was more negative, although perhaps less so than was immediately obvious. She viewed the boys as misbehaving and requiring more control than the girls, but as capable of doing well in their studies if they put their minds to it.

ST, despite some uncertainty, also seemed to view the girls in a positive light and the boys in a more negative one. She believed that being a better student depended on the individual; if they wanted to learn and found it interesting, they would do well. She also states that boys and girls were equal second language learners. However she qualified both of these responses by stating that she was not sure of her answers. She also noted that some boys were very hardworking and capable while some girls were the opposite. (This statement is interesting as it could imply that she believes most girls are hardworking and capable while most boys are not. She did not make such a claim, however, and so her comment seems out of place.)

For the majority of ST's remaining responses, the boys were depicted negatively and the girls positively. Girls behaved well by being obedient, and not whispering

or interrupting, while boys misbehaved in many ways: being restless, interrupting, talking out of turn, yelling, not doing their homework. The boys needed more control and got marks for "behaviour" at the end of each class; in fact, ST called the boys "extremely disobedient." Because of such behaviour, the boys were scolded more than the girls, and were more often told to be quiet. ST tried to teach the boys normal behaviour and break them of their bad habits (e.g., interrupting). ST tried to pose questions equally to boys and girls, but sometimes she questioned the boys more just to keep their attention. That being said, she praised students equally as deserved, and translated for whomever needed it.

Based on their interviews, the instructors did claim to 'pre-categorise' students according to gender, at least in some categories (e.g., of abilities, behaviours), implying that gender was indeed relevant to them in the classroom.[62] In general, all three instructors' attitudes were more positive about the girls and more negative about the boys. PN and BM believed that girls were better students, while ST believed, with no degree of certainty, that they were equal as students. PN felt that girls were innately better second language learners, while BM and ST did not differentiate between girls and boys. PN translated more for boys, who understood less due to smaller vocabularies, while BM and ST translated equally depending on student comprehension. All three indicated that they posed questions to students equally, except in those cases where ST posed more questions to boys to try and keep their attention. They all agreed that girls behaved better, that boys required more control in class, and that boys interrupted more. PN claimed never to have to tell students to be quiet, although this seems somewhat unlikely as she also claimed that boys misbehaved and interrupted her. Both BM and ST told boys to be quiet more often, again for misbehaving in the classroom. All three instructors praised students equally when deserved, although BM linked praise to hard work, which she had attributed more to girls. Finally,

---

[62] It is possible that the instructors claimed to pre-categorise the students in part due to design of the questions. However, they had the choice not to provide an answer of "boys" or "girls," and each instructor answered approximately half of the questions without using the binary boy/girl distinction.

PN scolded students equally as required, although it seems likely that by their worse behaviour the boys deserved more scoldings. BM scolded lazy students, which she had attributed more to boys. ST scolded boys more for misbehaving and not doing their homework. These interview responses give insight into the instructors' gender perspectives, which will be discussed further in section 5.3. In section 5.5 the gender perspectives will then be compared with the turn-by-turn analysis of the primary data, to determine what the instructors' gender perspectives *really* are.

5.2 Questionnaires

The instructors filled out questionnaires about each student, rating them on a 7-point scale for emotional maturity, physical maturity, intelligence, self-confidence, degree of responsibility (arrives on time, does homework, prepares for lessons), sociability, behaviour (obedient, does not disturb other students during class), calmness, and politeness. For maturity, the instructors were asked to choose the point on the scale that best described the student relative to other students of the same age. For the remaining categories on character and abilities, they were asked to choose the point which best described the student. The 7-point scale also included written descriptions for each point within each category.[63] The descriptions, 1 being negative and 7 positive, were:

> 1 - extremely
> 2 - very
> 3 - somewhat
> 4 - average; neither/nor
> 5 - somewhat
> 6 - very
> 7 - extremely

---

[63] See Appendix F for the Russian and English versions of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire also included information such as the student's age and grade[64] (in regular school), the number of years they have been students at the language school, the current year's mark, and the previous year's final mark at the language school.[65] Of a total 39 students about whom questionnaires were completed, PN has 20 students, BM has 12, and ST has 7.[66] 23 of the students are girls and 16 are boys.

In this section, I discuss the average ratings of all students in the study, of all the girls and of all the boys, of each instructor's students, and finally of each instructor's girls and boys.[67] This discussion is not intended to provide analyses on a statistical basis, but rather to give further insights into the instructors' gender attitudes towards their current students, which will then be compared with their interview responses. Therefore, these findings are useful and relevant in determining which differences the instructors *claim* exist (and can be used in triangulation with other data sources), rather than providing a statistically significant analysis.

All Students

There were forty students in the study in total. The average age of all students was 11.64 years, and the grade in regular school was 5.9. The students had spent an average of 2.32 years studying at the language school. The average current year's mark was 3.87 (out of 5), and the previous year's final mark was 3.41.

Table 1. Average questionnaire ratings of all students

Emotional Maturity	Physical Maturity	Intelligence	Self-confidence	Respons ibility	Behaviour	Calmness	Politeness
4.41	4.36	4.64	4.54	4.69	5.08	5.13	4.95

---

[64] The Russian grading system is described in Excerpt 25.
[65] The students are marked according to their homework, dictations, short answer tests, and classroom participation.
[66] BM refused to fill out a questionnaire about one difficult student that she had removed from the school partway through the data collection.
[67] See Appendix G for a chart of all the average ratings.

As Table 1 illustrates, the average rating of the emotional maturity of all students was between *average for age* and *somewhat mature*. Physical maturity was rated slightly lower, but also between *average for age* and *somewhat mature*.

Turning to aspects of the students' abilities and characters in Table 1, the intelligence of all students was scored between *average* and *somewhat smart*. Self-confidence was rated between *neither insecure nor confident* and *somewhat confident*.

The degree of the students' responsibility in Table 1 averaged *between neither irresponsible nor responsible* and *somewhat responsible*. Behaviour was rated slightly above *behaves somewhat well*. Calmness was rated even higher at *somewhat calm*. Finally, the students' politeness was rated just below *somewhat polite*. Overall, the average ratings of all students came in predominantly at average to slightly above average.

All Girls, All Boys

There were 23 girls and 17 boys in the study. The respective averages for the two groups were as follows. The overall ages were 11.61 and 11.69; the time spent studying at the language school, 2.33 and 2.31 years; the grades for the current year, 4.04 and 3.63; and grades for the previous year, 3.57 and 3.63.

Table 2. Average questionnaire ratings of all girls

Emotional Maturity	Physical Maturity	Intelligence	Self-confidence	Responsibility	Behaviour	Calmness	Politeness
4.52	4.61	4.61	4.35	4.91	5.65	5.48	5.22

Table 3. Average questionnaire ratings of all boys

Emotional Maturity	Physical Maturity	Intelligence	Self-confidence	Responsibility	Behaviour	Calmness	Politeness
4.25	4.00	4.69	4.81	4.38	4.25	4.63	4.56

As shown in Tables 2 and 3, the emotional maturity of the girls was rated halfway between the points *average for age* and *somewhat mature*. The boys were rated slightly lower. For physical maturity, the girls also scored approximately halfway between *average for age* and *somewhat mature*, while the boys were again lower.

The average intelligence of all girls was scored between *average* and *somewhat smart* in Table 2 while the boys ranked slightly higher in Table 3. Of note is the fact that the girls had higher marks on average but the boys were rated as more intelligent. The boys were also rated as more confident, just below *somewhat confident*, with the girls rated closer to *neither insecure nor confident*.

In Tables 2 and 3, the girls were rated as more responsible at *somewhat responsible*, while the boys scored *neither irresponsible nor responsible*. Girls scored more than a point higher regarding behaviour with an average rating between *behaves somewhat well* and *behaves very well*. The boys were rated *neither behaves well nor misbehaves*. The girls also scored almost a point higher for calmness halfway between *somewhat calm* and *very calm*. The boys were ranked between *neither restless nor calm* and *somewhat calm*. Finally, the girls also scored higher for politeness at *somewhat polite*, while the boys were rated between *neither rude nor polite* and *somewhat polite*. Next I break the ratings down by instructor and gender, after which I compare the instructors' ratings to the overall average.

PN's Girls and Boys
There were 10 girls and 10 boys in PN's classes. The respective averages for the two groups were as follows. The overall ages were 11.3 and 11.6; the time spent studying at the language school, 3.1 and 2.8 years; the grades for the current year, 4 and 3.5; and grades for the previous year, 4.3 and 3.7.

Table 4. Average questionnaire ratings of PN's girls

Emotional Maturity	Physical Maturity	Intelligence	Self-confidence	Responsibility	Behaviour	Calmness	Politeness
5.00	5.30	4.80	4.80	5.30	5.90	5.80	5.30

Table 5. Average questionnaire ratings of PN's boys

Emotional Maturity	Physical Maturity	Intelligence	Self-confidence	Responsibility	Behaviour	Calmness	Politeness
4.50	3.80	4.70	4.80	4.40	4.60	4.80	4.60

Tables 4 and 5 show that the girls were rated more emotionally mature than the boys, the girls at *somewhat mature* and the boys between *somewhat mature* and *average for age*. Girls were rated higher for physical maturity at slightly above *somewhat mature*. The boys scored slightly below *average for age*.

PN rated the girls' and boys' intelligence on average as *somewhat smart* in Tables 4 and 5 respectively, with the girls scoring slightly higher. The girls and boys had the same ratings for self-confidence at *somewhat confident*.

Turning to the behaviour-related categories in Tables 4 and 5, PN rated the girls above *somewhat responsible* for responsibility. The boys scored between *neither irresponsible nor responsible* and *somewhat responsible*. The girls also scored much higher for behaviour, slightly below *behaves very well*, while the boys had a score between *neither behaves well nor misbehaves* and *behaves somewhat well*. The girls' calmness was rated slightly below *very calm*, while the boys were rated slightly below *somewhat calm*. PN also rated the girls higher for politeness, above *somewhat polite*. The boys were rated between *neither rude nor polite* and *somewhat polite*.

BM's Girls and Boys
There were 9 girls and 4 boys in BM's classes (although a questionnaire was not

submitted for Denis). The respective averages for the two groups were as follows. The overall ages were 12.22 and 12.33; the time spent studying at the language school, 2.06 and 2 years; the grades for the current year, 3.89 and 3.67; and grades for the previous year, 4.67 and 4.33.

Table 6. Average questionnaire ratings of BM's girls

Emotional Maturity	Physical Maturity	Intelligence	Self-confidence	Responsibility	Behaviour	Calmness	Politeness
4.00	3.89	4.33	4.11	4.67	5.33	5.11	5.33

Table 7. Average questionnaire ratings of BM's boys

Emotional Maturity	Physical Maturity	Intelligence	Self-confidence	Responsibility	Behaviour	Calmness	Politeness
4.00	4.00	4.67	4.67	3.67	4.67	5.33	5.00

As illustrated in Tables 6 and 7, BM rated the emotional maturity of the boys and girls equally at *average for age*. Physically she rated the girls' maturity slightly below *average for age*, while the boys were again rated *average for age*. She scored the boys slightly higher than the girls for intelligence, although both were scored between *average for age* and *somewhat smart*. The boys were also rated more self-confident than the girls, although both scores fell between *neither insecure nor confident* and *somewhat confident*.

In terms of behaviour, Tables 6 and 7 show that the girls were rated a point higher for responsibility (below *somewhat responsible*) than the boys (below *neither irresponsible nor responsible*). BM also rated the girls higher for behaviour, scoring them above *behaves somewhat well*. The boys scored below *behaves somewhat well*. BM rated the boys as calmer than the girls, although both were rated slightly above *somewhat calm*. The girls, however, were rated as more polite than the boys; the girls were rated above *somewhat polite*, while the boys were rated *somewhat polite*.

ST's Girls and Boys

There were 4 girls and 3 boys in ST's class. The respective averages for the two groups were as follows. The overall ages were 11 and 11.33; the time spent studying at the language school for both was 1 year; the grades for the current year, 4.5 and 4; they had no previous year's marks.

Table 8. Average questionnaire ratings of ST's girls

Emotional Maturity	Physical Maturity	Intelligence	Self-confidence	Respons ibility	Behaviour	Calmness	Politeness
4.50	4.50	4.75	3.75	4.50	5.80	5.50	4.75

Table 9. Average questionnaire ratings of ST's boys

Emotional Maturity	Physical Maturity	Intelligence	Self-confidence	Respons ibility	Behaviour	Calmness	Politeness
3.67	4.67	4.67	5.00	5.00	2.67	3.33	4.00

Tables 8 and 9 show that ST rated the girls' emotional maturity between *average for age* and *somewhat mature*. The boys scored *below average*. Physically, however, the boys were rated higher for maturity with a score falling below *somewhat mature*. The girls had a physical maturity rating halfway between *average for age* and *somewhat mature*.

ST rated the girls' intelligence slightly below *somewhat smart*, in Table 8. The boys scored slightly lower between *average* and *somewhat smart*, in Table 9. The boys, however, were rated much higher for confidence with an average score of *somewhat confident*; the girls scored slightly below *neither insecure nor confident*.

As illustrated in Tables 8 and 9, ST rated the boys as more responsible than the girls. The boys were rated *somewhat responsible*, while the girls were rated between *neither irresponsible nor responsible* and *somewhat responsible*.

However, the girls rated much higher for behaviour with a score slightly below *behaves very well*. The boys scored below *behaves somewhat poorly*. The girls were also calmer, rated between *somewhat calm* and *very calm*, while the boys were rated above *somewhat restless*. Finally, for politeness the girls rated below *somewhat polite*, and the boys rated *neither rude nor polite*.

Next I summarise the instructors' attitudes toward the students in their classes, as illustrated by the questionnaire ratings. PN had a positive attitude toward the girls in her class, rating them above the *neutral/average* point,[68] in all of the categories on the questionnaire, as shown in Table 4. The girls were rated from *somewhat* to *very* above neutral/average for emotional and physical maturity, responsibility, behaviour, calmness, and politeness. They were rated *somewhat* above neutral/average for intelligence and self-confidence.

PN's attitude towards the boys was slightly less positive, falling between *neutral* and *somewhat* positive. As illustrated in Table 5, the boys were rated higher than neutral in seven of the eight categories on the questionnaire: emotional maturity, intelligence, self-confidence, responsibility, behaviour, calmness and politeness. Only for physical maturity did they score below average for age. This rating likely does not reflect a less positive attitude to the boys than the girls, but rather the fact that most girls start to mature physically at a younger age than boys do.

The girls in PN's classes were slightly younger than the boys by 0.3 of a year, yet they received a higher rating for emotional maturity. Therefore, PN seemed to have a more positive attitude about the girls' emotional maturity than the boys'. The girls also scored higher in all categories related to classroom behaviour: responsibility, behaviour, calmness and politeness. However, even though the boys had lower marks for both the previous and current years, they were rated as having equal intelligence as the girls. PN viewed the boys and girls as having

---

[68] The term *neutral* is used here for the point 4s on the scale that are described as "neither/nor."

equal levels of self-confidence. Based on these questionnaires, as illustrated in Tables 4 and 5, it seems that PN had a positive attitude towards the girls, and a neutral/slightly positive attitude towards the boys.

BM's attitude to the girls in her classes also appeared to be positive. As shown in Table 6, they received ratings between *neutral/average* and *somewhat* positive for emotional maturity, intelligence, self-confidence, responsibility, behaviour, calmness and politeness. Girls were rated *somewhat* positive or higher in three of the four behaviour-related categories; only physical maturity was below average.

BM's attitude about the boys also appeared to be somewhat positive, seen in Table 7, although less so than about the girls. The boys were rated between *neutral/average* and above *somewhat* positive for emotional and physical maturity, intelligence, self-confidence, behaviour, calmness and politeness. Only for the category of responsibility did the boys score below neutral. As noted above, BM refused to fill out a questionnaire about a "hooligan" boy whom she had permanently removed from her class during the primary data collection (he participated in just two of the recorded lessons). There were many examples in those two lessons of BM angrily scolding him for misbehaving. If she had filled out a questionnaire about him, the average results for the boys here would almost certainly have been slightly lower.

It is interesting to note that BM rated the emotional maturity of the boys and girls equally, even though she rated the responsibility, behaviour and politeness of the boys lower than the girls. She also rated the boys as calmer than the girls, even though they behaved worse. Finally, even though the girls had higher marks during the current year, she rated the boys as more intelligent. It seems that BM's attitudes to boys and girls, as given in Tables 6 and 7, were complex, although still slightly more positive to the girls.

ST had a positive attitude towards the girls in her class. She rated them closer to

somewhat positive for emotional and physical maturity, intelligence, responsibility and politeness, as outlined in Table 8. For calmness and behaviour, she rated them between *somewhat* and *very* good. Only for self-confidence did the girls have a slightly negative score.

ST had a mixed attitude towards the boys, ranging from somewhat negative to somewhat positive. As seen in Table 9, she rated the boys negatively for emotional maturity, behaviour and calmness with scores between *very* to *somewhat* bad. They had a neutral score for politeness, and scores slightly below *somewhat* positive for physical maturity and intelligence. Only for self-confidence and responsibility did they score *somewhat* positively.

In general, ST's attitude seemed to be more positive towards the girls than the boys, as shown in Tables 8 and 9. She was somewhat positive to the boys except when it came to their behaviour. She rated their intelligence similarly with the girls somewhat higher, but less confident than the boys. She also rated the boys as more responsible, which seems out of line with her much worse assessment of their behaviour.

All three instructors had positive attitudes towards the girls, which were all more positive than their attitudes towards the boys. PN had a neutral/slightly positive attitude to the boys. BM was slightly less positive about the boys, although her attitudes seem to have been more complex. ST was slightly positive about the boys in some aspects (e.g., intelligence, self-confidence), and negative in others (e.g., emotional maturity, behaviour). Overall, the average ratings of all girls ranged from slightly above *neutral/average* to *somewhat* and even *very* good. The boys were rated slightly less positively with overall scores from *neutral/average* to slightly below *somewhat* good.

5.3 Gender Perspectives

In this section I analyse and compare the results of both the interviews and questionnaires together, in order to summarise the instructors' gender perspectives about boys and girls in the classroom.

According to her interview and questionnaires, PN's attitude to girls in the classroom, and to the specific girls in her current classes, was positive. She believed that girls studied better, were better language learners, and behaved better than boys did. The girls in her class were rated slightly higher for intelligence, and also had higher marks than the boys. The girls also had more positive ratings (*somewhat* to *very* above average) for emotional maturity and all categories related to classroom behaviour (responsibility, behaviour, calmness, politeness), as illustrated in Tables 4 (girls) and 5 (boys).

PN's attitude to boys was slightly more mixed, ranging from slightly negative to slightly positive. She believed that boys were worse at studying and learning second languages, required more Russian-English translations, behaved worse, needed more control, and interrupted more. Her assessment of the boys in her classes in Table 5 was slightly more positive (*neutral* to *somewhat* positive). Despite her interview claim that boys were easily distracted and required constant supervision and control, she rated the boys as slightly above *neutral/average* in terms of responsibility, behaviour, calmness and politeness. Also, she rated the boys and girls in her classes of equal intelligence in the questionnaires, while in the interview she rated girls as better students and language learners in general. In both the interview and questionnaires, her attitude to the boys was less positive than it was to the girls.

BM's attitude toward girls was also generally positive in both the interview and questionnaires. She believed that girls studied better, were hardworking and more responsible at doing their homework, and behaved better than boys. Those who

worked hard deserved her praise, therefore it would follow that she believed girls deserved more praise. As seen in Table 6, she rated the girls in her classes as being above *neutral/average* for emotional maturity, intelligence, self-confidence, responsibility, calmness and politeness. The girls had their highest ratings in the behaviour-related categories, scoring *somewhat* better than neutral and higher.

BM's attitude to the boys was slightly more mixed. In the interview it was somewhat negative. She believed that boys studied and behaved worse, required more control, interrupted more, and needed to be quieted more frequently than girls do. However, BM also stated that some boys were capable of achieving results if they put their minds to it, and that few boys studied very poorly. In the questionnaires (see Table 7), BM's assessment was slightly more positive, although still less so than in regards to the girls. The boys scored between *neutral* and slightly better for emotional maturity, behaviour, calmness and politeness. Her interview responses and student assessments were not necessarily contradictory; for example, a boy behaving worse than a girl could still be behaving *somewhat well* on the 7-point scale. In general, her attitude to boys could be described as slightly negative/neutral.

ST believed that studying well or being a better language learner depended on the individual, although she added that she was not sure of these answers. Her attitude about the girls was mostly positive in both the interview and questionnaires. She viewed girls as obedient and well behaved. In line with this belief, she assessed the girls in her class between *average* and *somewhat* above average in maturity, intelligence, responsibility and politeness, and between *somewhat* above average and *very* good for calmness and behaviour (see Table 8).

ST's attitude about the boys was slightly more negative. In the interview, she stated that boys misbehaved, were restless, talked out of turn, and needed to be taught appropriate behaviour. She also stated that they need to be controlled more, were told to be quiet more often, and were scolded more often than girls were.

Her ratings of the boys in the questionnaires (see Table 9) ranged from slightly negative to slightly positive, but still less positive than the ratings of the girls. She rated the boys negatively for emotional maturity and behaviour, neutrally for politeness, and slightly positive for intelligence and responsibility. In general, ST had a negative attitude about boys' behaviour, and a fairly neutral/slightly positive attitude about their language abilities and intelligence. Based on the interviews and the questionnaires, all three instructors had positive attitudes about girls in the classroom, while their attitudes about the boys were more mixed, ranging from slightly negative (e.g., behaviour) to slightly positive (e.g., intelligence), depending on the category.

5.4 Gender and Applied CA

In this section I undertake a localised gender analysis, the aim of which is to show *if*, and if so *how*, the boys and girls use different speech styles in the classroom. Specifically, I carry out a qualitative analysis of turn-taking, sequences and repairs to determine if there are any differences in how some of the 'universal' underlying structures identified by CA are used in the classroom by the boys and girls, and by the instructors interacting with them. As a result, any differences can be considered as 'male' and 'female' speech styles for these interactants in this setting.

For turn-taking, I analyse directed or 'named' *next speaker selection* by the instructor, which in the classroom is most often accomplished through sequences of question - answer pairs. I also look at *student self-selections*, e.g., speaking out of turn or raising a hand, including the instructors' responses to (i.e., repairs of) out-of-turn talk.

For sequences, I analyse absent or incorrect *second pair parts*[69] in question - answer pairs, their repair (including the use of *insertion sequences*), and the use of *third position assessments*. In contrast, I also analyse question - answer sequences with correct *second pair parts*, and again the instructors' use of *third position assessments* (e.g., acknowledgement or praise).

Repairs are analysed throughout this section as they are inherently tied to turn-taking and sequences in the classroom.

5.4.1 Turn-taking and Repairs

For the analysis of turn-taking, I first look at *next speaker selection* when directed by the instructor at specific students by name, or in a few instances by gaze at a specific student,[70] giving that student the right to speak in the next turn. (However, as noted throughout the analysis above, the instructor retains the right to claim turns at talk at any time.) Not included here are exercises in which *next speaker selection* is determined by whoever answered the previous question correctly, or those instances when a student has raised their hand to self-select.[71] Finally, the naming of next speaker does not account for the overall length of the student's turn in sequences with the instructor; this aspect of student turns will be addressed later.

To analyse the *next speaker selection* of boys and girls, the ratio of *girls to boys* in each lesson is compared to the ratio of *'girl' to 'boy' next speaker selections* that occur. Such a comparison determines who, proportionately, is selected next speaker more often, girls or boys.

---

[69] For example, answers with grammatical, lexical or pronunciation mistakes, or any other difficulties with comprehension/production.

[70] Such instances are usually confirmed when the student at whom the gaze is directed takes up the required next turn.

[71] Due to the angle of the videocamera in the classrooms, not all events of students raising their hands to self-select are caught on tape. It is likely, therefore, that some of the *next speaker selections* discussed here are in fact student self-selections. However, from direct observation in the lessons, it was clear that the raising of hands was not very common.

In lesson PN.3a.2, there are four girls and two boys in attendance, a ratio of 2:1. Over the course of seven exercises[72] during which PN uses *next speaker selection* by name, girls are selected 51 times and the boys 22 times, a ratio of 2.6:1. The girls are proportionately selected as next speaker somewhat more often than the boys are. Other patterns in the speaker selection are discernible. In all seven exercises, PN begins by selecting a girl as first speaker. In four of the seven exercises she first selects the four girls in a row before selecting any of the boys, while in the remaining three exercises the boys were selected as next speaker in second or third position. In all seven exercises, there is a 'cluster' pattern of direct speaker selection of girls and boys, often with three or even four selections of one gender in a row. [73] The seating arrangements of the students in the various classes were not in such clusters.

There are four girls and four boys in lesson PN.3b.3, a 1:1 ratio. Over the course of five exercises, one of which was very lengthy with 28 separate *next speaker selections* by name, the girls were selected 35 times and the boys 40 times, a ratio of 1:1.14. In this lesson, the boys were directly selected as next speaker slightly more often than the girls were. In three of the five exercises, PN first selected a girl as next speaker. In the first three exercises, we again find a 'cluster' pattern with very few 'single' selections of boys or girls in between. In the last two exercises, however, despite a few clusters, the speaker selection mostly alternates girl-boy-girl and so on.

In PN.3c.2, PN's third and final lesson discussed here, there are two girls and two boys present, an equal ratio. Throughout the lesson, girls are directly selected as next speaker 21 times and the boys 19, an almost equal ratio of 1.11:1. Again, three out of the five exercises begin with girls selected first. The three longer

---

[72] *Exercises* are defined here as unique portions of the lesson as identified by instructions and/or topics.

[73] A 'cluster' pattern is defined here as groupings, or *clusters*, of two or more speaker selections of the same gender in a row, alternating with groupings of the opposite gender (e.g., girl-girl-boy-boy-girl-girl-girl).

exercises have many girl-boy clusters in the order of speaker selection, and the other two shorter exercises are entirely ordered by single repeating girl-boy selections. It is interesting to note that when one of the boys is given the authority to question his classmates in this lesson, he repeats a girl-girl-boy order of speaker selection throughout his questioning.

Overall, PN selects next speaker fairly evenly among girls and boys. Her average ratio of girls to boys is 1.25:1 and next speaker selection of girls to boys is 1.4:1, giving the girls a slight lead in speaker selection. Of 17 total exercises, 13 begin with speaker selection of a girl. In 13 of the 17, we also predominantly see clusters of girl-boy selections, and in the remaining four we see mostly single alternations of girls-boys; in all exercises there is some pattern of alternation between the genders, which does not appear to be random.

Turning to lesson BM.2a.2, there are three girls and one boy in attendance. BM selects next speaker by name on 69 occasions: 52 for girls and 17 for boys, giving a ratio of 3.06:1 that is almost identical to the ratio of girls to boys in class. Of four exercises, two start with the selection of a girl and two with the selection of a boy. The order of speaker selection throughout the exercises is made up of many groupings of girls (mostly twice or three times in a row) and individual selections of the boy in between. This pattern seems likely in a class of three girls and one boy if the instructor were trying to select all students equally and by turn. There are also several larger clusters of 'girl' selections, up to eight in a row.

BM has five girls and two boys in lesson BM.2b.1, a ratio of 2.5:1. She selects a girl as next speaker on 49 occasions and a boy on 21 occasions for a girl to boy ratio of 2.33:1. In this lesson, therefore, the boys are selected as next speaker slightly more frequently than the girls, according to the ratios. Of the six exercises, four have a girl selected as first *next speaker* and two have a boy. In all six, we again find lengthy groupings of girl *speaker selections* in a row, again up to eight at a time. Four of the six also have groupings of boy selections, mostly

two but up to four in a row; therefore, in four of the six exercises we see alternating clusters of girls and boys. In the remaining two exercises, one is mostly made up of repeating single girl-boy speaker selections, and one is all girls.

In lesson BM.2b.2, there are six girls and three boys present, a ratio of 2:1. BM selects next speaker by name 66 times, 44 for girls and 22 for boys, also a ratio of 2:1. According to these ratios, the boys and girls are equally selected as next speaker. In four of the six exercises, a girl is nominated as first speaker. All six exercises are made up almost entirely of alternating girl and boy clusters of threes and twos respectively, although towards the end of the lesson we see more single boy selections between clusters.

On average, BM also selects next speaker fairly evenly among girls and boys. She has a ratio of 2.33:1 girls to boys in class, and a named *next speaker selection* ratio of 2.42:1 girls to boys; therefore, the girls are only slightly more frequently named next speaker than the boys are. Of 16 exercises, ten have a girl named as first speaker. All 16 exercises have clusters of 'girl' next speaker selections, while only ten have clusters of 'boy' selections. This number is lower largely because only one boy was in lesson BM.2a.2, and BM did not select him as next speaker more than once at a time. Again, in all exercises there seems to be a cluster pattern of alternation between the genders for *next speaker selection*, often in twos or threes but up to eight in a row at times.

In ST.1b.2, there are 4 girls and two boys in class, a 2:1 ratio. ST names girls as next speaker 26 times and boys 17 times, a ratio of 1.53:1 girls to boys. Comparing these two ratios, the boys are 1.31 times more likely to be selected as next speaker than the girls are. In five of the seven exercises, girls are selected first as next speaker. Four of the exercises have a pattern of girl and boy groupings, mostly fours and threes respectively, two of them are entirely made up of repeating single girl-boy selections, and one is entirely made up of girls. In the

four exercises with girl and boy groupings, ST's pattern is one of selecting all girls and then all boys (or vice versa) individually.

In the last class, ST.1b.3, four girls and three boys are present, a ratio of 1.33:1. ST selects a girl as next speaker 22 times, and a boy 17 times. This ratio of 1.3:1 is almost equal to the girl-boy ratio in the class. Unlike all previous classes, the boys are selected first in the majority of exercises as next speaker, here in four of six. Four of the seven exercises had groupings of 'boy' selections, while three of the seven had groupings of girls. One exercise was entirely made up of alternating individual boy-girl selections, while one exercise was all girls.

The overall ratio of girls to boys in these two lessons was 1.6:1, while the *next speaker selection* of girls to boys was 1.41:1. The boys, therefore, had an edge in being selected next speaker 1.13 times more often than the girls according to ratios. The girls were nominated next speaker first in seven of 13 exercises, almost equal with the boys. Eight of the exercises had cluster patterns of girls and boys being selected next speaker (often in groups of twos, threes and fours), three exercises had alternating single girl-boy patterns, and two had all girl selections.

All three instructors fairly equally selected boys and girls as next speaker by name, according to a comparison of the ratio of *girls to boys* to the ratio of *'girl' to 'boy' next speaker selections*. However, some very noticeable patterns of these selections emerged throughout the lessons of all three instructors. Girls were most often selected as first speakers in the exercises, although least often by ST. The instructors most often selected next speakers in clusters of girls and of boys (mostly in threes and fours), and sometimes alternated their selections in single girl-boy (or boy-girl) patterns. In a few instances, only girls were selected throughout an entire exercise.

The patterns do not appear to be completely random as the clusters are fairly consistent throughout the lessons. Rather, they indicate that the instructors are

conscious of the students' genders and orient to them through the turn-taking system, as exemplified by the use of named *next speaker selection* in the classroom. The students are selected fairly equally between the boys and girls, while still being selected in 'gender clusters.' Therefore, as named *next speaker selection* accounts for much of the turn-taking system here, gender is indeed implicitly relevant to the instructors throughout the lessons.

Again, it is overwhelmingly clear that the instructor has the right to name the next speaker throughout the lesson, thereby restricting the turn-taking system. The adherence to such control in this setting shows that the participants are orienting to their institutional identities of instructor or student. By contrast in everyday talk, the next speaker in a group of interlocutors is not "named" nearly as frequently, especially not by one person in particular; people would likely find such practice quite rude. In everyday talk, speaker self-selection accounts for the majority of speaker change.

Next I turn to *student self-selections*, as well as the instructors' responses to them. Students may self-select by 1) calling out an answer when the instructor has posed an open question to the entire class, 2) speaking out of turn (i.e., without being named by the instructor), or 3) putting their hand up to identify their desire to be next speaker. Only the latter two types of self-selection are analysed in this section; questions - answers will be analysed more fully in the following discussion on sequential organisation.

Excerpt 47. PN.3a.2

```
1   PN:         Okay?, (.) well? (.) how many fingers?
2               (0.5)
3               [Ta]mara, how many fingers?
4   Vadim:      [Te-]
5   Tamara:     °Ten°
6   PN:         Ten fingers, all right, thank you.
```

In the lesson PN.3a.2, there is just one example of a student self-selecting out of

turn, shown above in excerpt 47. The class has just listened to a song about the number of body parts. PN asks the class "how many fingers" did the song character have (1). There is a 0.5 second student-owned pause during which no one answers (2). To repair the pause, PN resumes her turn to name a specific student, in this case Tamara (3), and Vadim overlaps the start of PN's speaker selection (4). Vadim, recognising the student-owned pause in line 2, is self-selecting to take a turn in what he has interpreted as an open question; however, he cuts himself short when he realises that PN has resumed her turn. His talk out of turn was inadvertent and immediately self-repaired, allowing Tamara and PN to complete the question - answer sequence. Because Vadim self-repaired, PN did not need to initiate a repair.

In this lesson there are several 'open' exercises during which PN poses questions to the entire class and various students call out answers; in such exercises, however, the students have the right to self-select after a question is posed and as such are not speaking out of turn. During the remainder of the lesson, the students claim turns when named next speaker by PN.

Although initially surprising that there is just one example of a student talking "out of turn" in this lesson, albeit inadvertently, it is clear that the participants orient to their roles as instructor or student, recognising the rights system for *turns at talk* in the classroom. To take turns, the students either self-select during open exercises or are selected next speaker by the instructor.[74] The only instance of self-selection out of turn was done by a boy, which in and of itself does not provide any insight into self-selections by boys and girls, or the instructors' reactions to them. A comparison of many examples is required to determine if there are any gender-related trends in student self-selections.

Turning to PN.3b.3, there are many examples of student self-selections, either by

---

[74] As noted above, there are 73 instances of *named next speaker selection* in lesson PN.3a.2.

speaking out of turn or by raising their hands. There are several excerpts that include self-selections, of which approximately two third involve boys and one third involve girls. Only a few of these excerpts involve hand-raising (or some other token) to indicate the student's desire to self-select. PN's reaction varies from ignoring the out-of-turn talk to acknowledging it, for example, if required for the negotiation of meaning.

Excerpt 48. PN.3b.3

1	PN:	A esli ne očen' dela idut, Serëža?
		And if things aren't going very well, Serëža? ((Sergej))
2	Ivan:	Very bad=
3	Sergej:	=so-so
4	PN:	So-so, all right. (.) Esli ploxo dela idut ((looks at Ivan)) [Ivan?]
		So-so, all right. (.) If things are going badly [Ivan?]
5	Ivan:	[Bad]
6	Sergej:	Bad
7	PN:	Bad.
8	Igor':	Bad
9	PN:	Nu čto, davajte my sejčas uh drug drugu zadadim vot ètot vopros.
		Well then, now let's pose this question to each other.

In excerpt 48, PN is asking the class how to ask, and respond to, the question "how are you?" (also seen in the larger excerpt 1). There are three examples of student self- selection resulting in *out of turn* talk (lines 2, 6, and 8), all done by boys. In line 1, PN names Sergej as next speaker with a direct question. Ivan self-selects to respond out of turn, providing an incorrect answer to PN's question (2). Sergej latches onto Ivan's turn to claim his own rightful turn and provide the required answer (3). PN assesses Sergej's turn as correct before acknowledging Ivan's self-selection (4). Here she poses the question to which Ivan's earlier answer would have been correct, identifying Ivan as next speaker first by gaze and then by name. PN is requiring him to reproduce his out-of-turn talk from line 2 but now during his rightful turn. Ivan repeats his turn (5), overlapping PN's selection of him by name (4).

In line 6, however, Sergej now self-selects to repeat Ivan's answer; this talk is out of turn because Ivan has finished his question - answer sequence with PN, and as

questioner (and instructor), PN has the right to claim the next turn. PN repeats the answer, assessing Ivan's turn as correct (7). At this point, Igor' also self-selects to repeat the same answer (8). Again, his talk is out of turn because PN has closed the question-answer-assessment sequence with Ivan and retains the right to the next turn. PN does not acknowledge Igor's self-selection but rather claims her rightful turn to continue with the lesson.

Student self-selections in the language class when out of turn do not necessarily require repairs. Here PN does not acknowledge these instances of talk when they occur. The self-selections in lines 6 and 8, being one word only, do not interfere with the turns at talk and therefore can be ignored. The students are simply repeating the correct answer, turns that would not be unexpected in a language classroom. Only in line 4 does PN other-initiate a repair for Ivan's self-selection (and incorrect answer), giving him a chance to speak after Sergej has finished his turn as *named next speaker*. By doing so, PN lets Ivan know that it was not his turn to speak in line 2, while also indicating the proper question to his answer from line 2.

In lesson PN.3b.2 the same student Igor' self-selects and speaks out of turn on five different occasions. In excerpt 49 below, he is nominated next speaker by PN (1), and takes up his rightful turn to respond to her question (2). In line 3, we see a token in third position where PN assesses Igor's response as correct. However, Igor' self-selects out of turn (4), overlapping PN's repetition of his answer. His turn is not clear on the recording, but he also points to PN's desk while speaking. PN continues her turn in line 5, but again Igor' self-selects to overlap her (6). He is referring to the badge that the monitor gets during each lesson. PN acknowledges Igor's second attempt at self-selecting, asking him to repeat his turn (7). He again indicates he is referring to the monitor's badge (8), to which PN responds that he missed his chance to get his badge and therefore must do without it for this lesson (9 and 10). In 11, PN returns to the chaining of question-answer pairs, calling on Elena to answer the next question.

Excerpt 49. PN.3b.3

```
1   PN:          Igor', what date is it today?
2   Igor':       Today is (.) the (1.0) twentieth of November
3   PN:          Right you are, [today is the-]
4   Igor':                      [(        )] ((points to PN's desk))
5   PN:          (.) twentieth of [November.]
6   Igor':                        [badžik]
                                  [badge]
7   PN:          Čto čto?=
                 What what?=
8   Igor:        =Badžik
                 =Badge
9   PN:          Badžik nužno podxodit' brat' (  ) samomu.
                 You need to pick up the badge (  ) yourself.
10               Ne vzjal, značit segodnja bez badžika. ((smiles))
                 You didn't take it, so today you are without the badge.
11               All right, (.) well, and what temperature is it today, Elena?
```

Although Igor' has initially been nominated to take a turn, once he answers PN's question his right to speak is over, unless PN selects him to take another turn. Igor' uses the opportunity of his prior speaker nomination to self-select and ask about the badge, overlapping the instructor's turn. PN continues her turn without stopping, and again is overlapped by Igor'. Her third position assessment of his answer appears to be complete, and it is at this point that PN acknowledges Igor's interruption. She explains that Igor' cannot have his badge today and continues by selecting the next student speaker. Igor's turns in lines 4 and 6 are *out of turn* not only because he self-selected and interrupted the instructor, but also because he changed the topic set by the instructor. He did not self-select to clarify his understanding of the lesson, but rather to address an issue that was not relevant. Because he overlaps PN twice and points at her desk, she selects him as next speaker to determine what the issue is. Once the issue has been addressed, she resumes the question-answer chaining by selecting Elena as next speaker.

On four other occasions not shown here, Igor' self-selects without being named by the instructor. Depending on the relevance of the self-selection, PN either ignores Igor' or addresses him to determine the issue. In one instance, PN has instructed the students to let her know what marks they received in their workbooks for the dictation. Igor' self-selects to indicate that he has received the

wrong workbook. His turn is relevant to the lesson and as such is not *out of turn*, but rather is a simple student self-selection. Because it is relevant, PN acknowledges Igor's turn to address the issue. In the remaining three instances, however, PN ignores Igor's self-selections as his talk is out of turn. In the first, Igor' speaks out of turn, commenting to Ivan about their classmates' dictation marks. In doing so he overlaps Svetlana's rightful turn, as she is currently answering a question from PN. Svetlana continues her turn despite the overlap, and PN acknowledges her answer while ignoring Igor'. In the second, Igor' again speaks out of turn to swear at Ivan. PN is in the middle of a chained question-answer sequence with Boris, and Igor's turn overlaps Boris'. Again, PN acknowledges Boris' turn while ignoring Igor'. Finally, Igor' makes crude noises during a question-answer sequence between PN and Ekaterina. Again, PN ignores his out-of-turn talk. In the next excerpt, we see an example of self-selection by one of the girls, Irina.

Excerpt 50. PN.3b.3

1	PN:	Igor', no tebe čto mogu skazat'. Ty ne učil.
		Igor', well what can I say to you. You didn't study.
2		Vot vyučila Irina, u neё pjat'. Sveta vyučila s Elenoj, tože pjat'.
		Irina learned it, she got a five. Sveta and Elena learned it, also five.
3		(2.0)
4	Irina:	Četyre u nix.
		They got fours.
5	PN:	Nu ved' tam četyre, <u>nu xorošo</u>, vidno čto ljudi staralis' i učili.
		Well then fours, <u>well good</u>, it's obvious that people tried and learned.

PN has made note of the students' dictation marks with the class, and in excerpt 50 is making a point to Igor' that those students who studied for the dictation earned better grades (lines 1-2), with five being the highest. In line 3 there is a 2.0 second pause that seems to be owned by PN. Although she has addressed Igor' in her turn at talk, she has not named him as next speaker, and so this pause appears to emphasise the point she is making to him. However, if Igor' were to self-select during the pause to explain his dictation mark, his talk would be relevant to the discussion at hand and therefore not out-of-turn.

In line 4, however, Irina self-selects to point out that Sveta and Elena got marks of four and not five. As indicated by PN in line 2, Irina herself received a five, so here she is clarifying her highest standing in the marks. PN acknowledges Irina's self-selection but downplays the relevance of the turn, again emphasising her initial point that those who studied had better results (line 5). Irina has taken advantage of the pause to make a comment about PN's talk. As she does not overlap PN or interrupt another classmate, and as she was speaking about the current context of student marks, PN chose to use Irina's turn as an opportunity to re-emphasise her point from lines 1-2.

Next we turn to examples of hand-raising (or other tokens) used to indicate the student's desire to speak next. As noted above, there are only a few such examples in lesson PN.3b.3. In one excerpt, the entire class is engaged in an exercise in which whoever guesses the correct answer must raise their hand, and several boys and girls are waving their hands at the same time. PN allows the current student leading the exercise to finish her turn, at which point PN names one of the other girls to take a turn and provide her guess. In two other excerpts PN has opened a question to the entire class, at which point a girl indicates that she would like to self-select, either by raising her hand or using a token "mhm."[75] PN then names that girl as next speaker, and the girl takes her rightful turn. Finally, in the only example of one boy raising his hand, the boy also tries to speak but overlaps a fellow student's turn. This excerpt is also from the 'guessing' exercise above and he is trying to be the first student to guess. As he has not been named by PN to provide his guess, and as he overlaps another, PN quietly tells him to wait a minute. When the current turn is complete, PN then names the boy to take his desired turn.

In PN.3b.3, most of the out-of-turn talk was done by Igor', and as such it is difficult to say if there are trends in such boy or girl self-selections. However, in

---

[75] The 'mhm' was used here as a response to PN's question, "has anyone guessed the answer?"

most instances of girl self-selections here, the girls raise their hands and wait to be named by PN. PN usually ignores out-of-turn talk, except when relevant to the discussion (e.g., to comprehension), or when the student makes multiple attempts to interrupt and self-select. The class of PN.3b has one of the largest groups of students in the study; despite this, the occurrences of out-of-turn talk are minimal.

Excerpt 51. PN.3c.2

1	PN:	èti slova budut vstrečat'sja v vašem teste, poètomu vy k- vy
		these words will be on your test, therefore you w- you
2		snova s ètimi slovami stolknëtes'.
		will come across these words again.
3	Valerija:	Možno proxodit'?
		Can I come up?
4	PN:	Da, konečno, esli est' kakie to voprosy.
		Yes, of course, if there are some questions.
5		((Valerija approaches PN's desk to ask a question about her dictation))

In lesson PN.3c.2, other than during open question-answer exercises, there is only one example of a girl self-selecting to take a turn. PN has been discussing the students' dictations with the class. At the start of excerpt 51 she warns the class that they will have the same words on a test (1-2). Valerija self-selects to ask if she can approach PN's desk (3), and PN indicates that she can if she has relevant questions (4). Valerija goes to the desk (5) to ask about something PN has written in her dictation workbook (not shown here). As such, Valerija's self-selection in line 2 was indeed relevant to the task at hand, and therefore was not 'out-of-turn.'

The remaining twelve examples of out-of-turn talk and raised hands in lesson PN.3c.2 involve the same boy, Valentin. In seven excerpts he raises his hand to self-select, while in five others he simply claims a turn. He raises his hand to answer PN's questions when opened to the class, to clarify instructions or negotiate language meaning, and to go to the front of the class and change the time on an example clock. In one instance PN ignores his raised hand, which he keeps waving until she asks him what his question is. When speaking out of turn, he interrupts and/or overlaps other speakers (including PN) to ask questions or make statements that are not relevant to the current turn. PN does not ignore

Valentin when he speaks out of turn, but rather deals with his turn before resuming the lesson. In the one instance she does ignore him, he persists in speaking until she is forced to acknowledge his turn. In lesson PN.3b.3, PN ignores Igor's out-of-turn talk, so it is likely that Valentin's persistence is well known to PN and she therefore deals with it immediately in most cases.

Most of the student self-selections[76] in PN's lessons are done by two boys, Igor' and Valentin. PN mostly ignores Igor's out-of-turn talk, while she acknowledges Valentin's; Igor's attempts can be categorised as misbehaviour, while Valentin's, although not always relevant, are attempts to be involved in the lesson. Also, Igor's out-of-turn talk is usually short, while Valentin persists until he is acknowledged by the instructor. When the girls self-select, they almost always raise their hands and wait to be named next speaker. When they simply claim a turn, their talk is relevant to the current discussion.

Next I look at student self-selection in BM's lessons. In BM.2b.1, there are only a few examples of student self-selection; most of the lesson is controlled by BM's naming of next speaker. When the students (boys and girls) do claim turns on a few occasions without being named by BM, it is usually to ask a clarifying question that is relevant to the current exercise, and they do not interrupt or overlap anyone else's turns. Because these claimed turns are relevant, BM acknowledges them and provides the appropriate information in the next turn. Only in two instances did students speak out of turn in BM.2b.1, both boys. In one example, Denis provides the answer to a question directed at another student, and BM simply repeats his answer for the other student to repeat.

---

[76] As noted above, these self-selections include raised hands (or similar tokens) or out-of-turn talk.

Excerpt 52. BM.2b.1

1	BM:	Mhm, Denis.
2	Denis:	I=
3	Egor:	=I- I would like
4	BM:	((to Egor)) °Po odnomu°
		°*One at a time*°
5	Denis:	to visit Britain
6	BM:	to visit Britain, Lika ((Anželika))?

For this exercise in excerpt 52, the students are required to create a sentence beginning with, "I would like." BM names Denis as next speaker (1), and he begins his turn (2). Egor, however, latches onto Denis' rightful turn (3) and begins to create an "I would like" sentence (3), causing Denis to pause. BM tells Egor that they should answer one at a time (4), and Denis finishes his sentence (5). It is interesting to note that, after repeating Denis' correct answer, BM names Anželika as next speaker, not Egor; it is possible that she is making a point to Egor that the students can only answer when named.

In BM.2b.2 there are many examples of out-of-turn talk. All of these examples involve boys, and the overwhelming majority involves Denis. In the secondary data collected BM has identified Denis as a "troublemaker" and as noted above, refused to fill out a student questionnaire about him. When Denis speaks out of turn during this lesson, BM almost always stops what she is saying, or interrupts another student, to tell him to be quiet. For example, she shouts at him, asks sarcastically if she was speaking to him, bangs her hand on the desk, or tells him his commentary is not needed by anyone.

Excerpt 53 (BM.2b.2)

In line 1, Lidija is answering a question after being named next speaker by BM. BM clarifies that the correct answer is a "definite article," not just an "article" (2), but is overlapped by Denis, whose voice is heard on tape but whose words are not decipherable (3). There is a two-second pause owned by BM as she looks

Excerpt 53. BM.2b.2

1	Lidija:	°artikl'°
		°*article*°
2	BM:	<u>Opre-delë</u>:nnogo artiklja, [da?
		De-fini:te article, [da?
3	Denis:	[( )]
4	BM:	(2.0) ((looks furiously at Denis))
5		((speaks with controlled voice)) °Ne vyskakivaj. °
		°*Don't jump in.* °
6		NE VYSKAKIVAJ.
		DON'T JUMP IN.
7		((shakes head and looks disgusted))

furiously at Denis (4), after which she quietly and in a controlled voice tells him not to jump in (5). BM then shouts at Denis, repeating her command not to jump in (6), after which she shakes her head as if she is disgusted (7). This excerpt is indicative of BM's responses to Denis when he speaks out of turn. Only on two occasions does she ignore Denis' out-of-turn talk when he speaks during another student's turn (usually to provide the correct answer). Approximately three-quarters through the lesson when Denis starts humming, BM goes to his desk and asks for his class journal to write a reprimand; it has previously been arranged that Denis' parents check regularly to see BM's comments about his behaviour in class. She tells him that she is writing a note that he should not come back to class. For the remainder of the class, Denis does not speak out of turn and only speaks when named by BM.[77]

Another boy, Egor, speaks out of turn once during the lesson. Egor answers BM's question even though Anželika has been named to answer the question. BM repeats Anželika's name with emphasis and indicates to Egor that she is not speaking to him. Another boy, Anatolij, raises his hand twice during the lesson when BM is naming next speaker during question-answer exercises. In one instance she ignores his repeated hand waving and calls on girls instead, but in the other instance she selects him as next speaker.

---

[77] BM speaks with Denis' parents after this lesson, after which he is removed permanently from the class.

Turning to the last of BM's lessons, BM.2a.2, is a remarkably controlled class when it comes to student self-selections. This level of control is possibly due to the class size; there are only four students, three girls and one boy, in the class. When Kirill arrives late to the lesson, he waits by the door and only speaks when named by BM, at which point he apologises for his tardiness and requests permission to join the lesson. The major part of the lesson is directed questions-answers where BM names the next speaker, often for chains of questions-answers. When BM is asking open questions to the entire class and students are calling out answers, there are very few instances of overlaps, indicating a high level of awareness of turn-taking. In fact there is only one instance of out-of-turn talk, by the only boy Kirill.

Excerpt 54. BM.2a.2

1	BM:	An umbrella. ((mimes holding an umbrella))
2		Novoe slovo. (.) Look at me please. (2.0)
		A new word. (.) Look at me please. (2.0)
3		<u>Look at me</u> please. (0.5)
4		An umbrella.
5	Nadežda:	Zo[ntik
		Um[brella
6	Kirill:	[zont=
		[umbrella=
7	BM:	=Zontik, yes? an umbrella. Zontik.
		=Umbrella, yes? an umbrella. Umbrella.

In this excerpt, BM is trying to help Nadežda translate a new word, "umbrella," from English to Russian by having Nadežda look at her actions (lines 1-4). In line 5, Nadežda realises the answer and provides the Russian translation "zontik." Kirill overlaps Nadežda halfway through her answer to provide the word as well (6), having judged Nadežda's required answer to be absent. BM then repeats the correct answer for the class (7). Kirill's monosyllabic turn is not disruptive to the turn-taking system as Nadežda has already provided the required answer, and as such BM ignores his speaking out of turn. As indicated above, this is the only example of out-of-turn talk in the entire lesson.

In BM's lessons, all out-of-turn talk is done by boys. In BM.2b.1 and BM.2a.2 there are very few examples of such talk, in fact there are only three instances. In BM.2b.2 there are many examples, mostly by Denis, although when his out-of-turn talk is excluded we are left with only one instance. Only two instances of hand-raising, also by a boy, are seen in the recordings. In one case BM ignores him, in the other she names him next speaker. Finally, the students rarely self-select to ask clarifying questions (i.e., questions relevant to the lesson).

Apart from Denis, BM has remarkable control of the turn-taking system in her classroom, indicating that the participants are orienting to their roles as instructor or student. BM as instructor has the right to speak at any time and controls the selection of next speaker. The students speak when named, or when clarification (e.g., of instructions or language comprehension) is required. Such clarifications are acknowledged by BM, as they are necessary in order to achieve the learning goals of the language classroom. It is interesting to note that there are fewer examples of hand-raising in BM's classes (only two instances by one boy) than in PN's classes; BM's students are less likely to indicate a desire to self-select through hand-raising.

Finally we look at student self-selections in ST's lessons. The lessons are riddled with examples of out-of-turn talk and hand-raising by both boys and girls, far too many to be discussed in detail here. The majority of out-of-turn talk and hand-raising takes place in lesson ST.1b.2, during which the students are divided in teams and are competing for points, although there are also many examples in lesson ST.1b.3. During the games the girls and boys call out answers to help their teammates, criticise the other team's turns, and wave their hands wildly to get ST's attention (e.g., when they know an answer but it is the other team's turn).[78] Outside of the games when a student is taking a rightful turn, however, the

---

[78] The rules of turn taking are modified by the instructor for the games. A student may self-select to help a student produce the correct answer (and therefore get a point for their team), while they are not "allowed" to self-select during the opposing team's turn. When they do the latter, their talk can be seen as out of turn.

integrity of the turn-taking system is much more intact. The students usually respect the named speaker's right to talk, and mostly do not overlap each other or ST. ST ignores most out-of-turn talk, although she acknowledges self-selections when the students have relevant questions. She also acknowledges raised hands during the games, but only after she has given the current team sufficient time to answer.

Of interest is that most out-of-turn talk is done by one boy and one girl, Aleksej and Marina, who appear to be in competition to dominate the class. Other boys and girls speak out of turn as well, notably Natal'ja and Andrej, but nowhere near to the extent that Aleksej and Marina do. Aleksej and Marina interrupt each other, criticise and/or correct each other's (and other students') turns, argue and protest, and often overlap ST to prove that they know the answer first or have more information to add. Only on a few occasions does ST tell them to be quiet or take turns in order. They also ask many clarifying questions during the game in ST.1b.2 to make sure they understand the *rules of engagement*, so to speak; if one breaks the rule, the other is sure to point it out. In ST.1b.3 where much of the lesson is based on open questions-answers, Aleksej and Marina again dominate the student self-selections to provide answers.

Excerpt 55 (ST.1b.2)

In this excerpt the students are on teams, competing to provide as many English words with the letter B as possible. Aleksej says "football" (1), but ST tells him that word was already used (2). In line 3 Marina says something indecipherable. ST asks if there are any more words with the letter B (4), to which Nina responds with the word "brother (5). In line 6 Aleksej overlaps Nina's turn with an emphatic statement that the letter B *can* be in the middle of the word (presumably in response to Marina's turn in line 3). In line 7 ST acknowledges Nina's response as correct, at which point Aleksej repeats Nina's answer twice (8). As part of a team-based game, ST makes no effort to control turns among the students, leading to self-selections and overlaps.

Excerpt 55. ST.1b.2

1	Aleksej:	Football.
2	ST:	Football bylo.
		We already had football.
3	Marina:	( )
4	ST:	Vse slova so- s bukvoj B?
		Are those all the words w- with the letter B?
5	Nina:	[[Brother
6	Aleksej:	[[MOŽNO čto-by oni v seredine=
		[[*It CAN be that they're in the middle=*
7	ST:	=Right, brother.
8	Aleksej:	Ba- brother. Brother.
9	Marina:	V seredine?
		In the middle?
10	ST:	Možno
		It can be
11	Marina:	((in protest)) DIK-=
		BUT-=
12	ST:	((irritated))
13		=SLOVA S BUKVOJ B. Ja že ne skazala bukva B
		=*WORDS WITH THE LETTER B. I didn't say the letter B*
14		v načale predloženija ili v konce. Prosto s bukvoj B.
		at the beginning of the sentence or the end. Simply with the letter B.

In line 9 Marina self-selects to question ST as to the validity of Aleksej's claim, and ST also assures her that "in the middle" is allowed (10). Marina begins to protest (11), but ST cuts her short in irritation to restate loudly that the instructions did not specify in which position the letter B must be found. This is the only instance in ST's lessons where ST raises her voice, and is also the only time she chastises the often self-selecting Marina.[79] In this short excerpt we see a typical exchange of self-selected turns between Aleksej and Marina, arguing over who is right, overlapping other students, and questioning ST to settle any disputes (even protesting ST's decision). Next I turn to other examples of Aleksej's and Marina's dominant turn-taking behaviour.

---

[79] Throughout ST's recorded lessons, it is patently obvious that Marina is the "teacher's pet" and can usually "do no wrong."

Excerpt 56. ST.1b.2

1   ST: [[To est'] vybiraem sebe kogo-nibud' da? iz obitatelej [fermy]
                   [*[That is] we each choose somebody right? who lives on a [farm]*

2   Aleksej: [[Two:-]   [Kak tam-]
                   [*[Two:-]*   [*How do you-]*

3   ST: i dolžny budem opisat' ego pri pomošči vsex slov kotorye my
                   and we will have to describe him with the help of all the words that we

4   [znaem]
                   [*know*]

5   Aleksej: [Svetlana] Timofeevna (.) Dve koški? Èto kak, two cats?
                   [*Svelana] Timofeevna (.) Two cats? That's what, two cats?*

6   ST: Ne:t (pro odnu   )
                   No: (about   one   )

This example (previously seen in excerpt 27) shows Aleksej's persistence in overlapping ST's turns to ask a question. He overlaps ST three times (lines 2 and 5), finally resorting to addressing her by name and patronymic to get her attention, before she stops her rightful turn as instructor and current speaker (4), and he is able to ask his question (5).

Excerpt 57. ST.1b.3

1   Marina: I can, (1.0) I can (1.0) sing. (2.0) I (0.5) I can (4.0) pin.
2   ST: °speak°
3   (0.5)
4   ST: °razgovarivat'?°
                   °speak?°
5   Marina: ((furrows brow)) Mh (4.0) °begat'°
                                      Mh (4.0) °run°
6   ST: °run°=
7   Aleksej: =run
8   Marina: Ah. I (0.5) can run. (0.5) I can speak. I can (0.5) s- skin.

In this example (from excerpt 3), it is Marina's turn to tell a story about what her stuffed animal can do. She makes a mistake with the word "pin" (1), which ST attempts to correct (2, 4). Marina clarifies what she was trying to say (5), and ST provides the correct translation (6), but in line 7 we see Aleksej latch onto ST's turn to provide the correct answer as well.

Excerpt 58. ST.1b.2

1	Andrej:	It is ºtwelveº
2	ST:	Čto?
		What?
3	Andrej:	It is twelve.
4	Marina:	<u>Ne:t!</u>
		<u>*No:!*</u>
5	ST:	Net. (Postavil) nepravil'no.
		No. (You put it together) incorrectly.
6	Marina:	Da ty čë
		No way
7	Andrej:	Da ty čë. Vsë xorošo.
		No way. It's all correct.
8	Marina:	( )
9	ST:	Net četvërtaja model' ( ) Da èto vsë pravil'no.
		No the fourth model ( ) Yes it's all correct.

This excerpt, already seen in the larger excerpt 6, is also part of the team game competition. It begins with Andrej creating a sentence based on a grammatical model (1). ST does not hear his answer and asks him to repeat it (2), which he does in line 3. Marina self-selects to tell her teammate Andrej, quite emphatically, that his answer is wrong (4). In the classroom the evaluation of student turns is the instructor's role, but as this is a game Marina does not hesitate to point out when a turn is wrong. This indicates that she is orienting more to a role as competitor than student, wanting her team to get all the points possible.

ST agrees with Marina's assessment, indicating that Andrej put the sentence together incorrectly (5). Marina claims another turn to further express her indignation at her teammate for costing the team a point. Andrej challenges both Marina's and ST's assessment of his turn as incorrect (7), to which Marina responds something indecipherable (8). ST re-evaluates Andrej's answer and agrees that he is correct (9).

The greater amount of out-of-turn talk in ST's lessons, as compared to PN's and BM's, is likely explained by many factors. ST is a fairly new, young instructor at the school who does not have any pedagogical training, and in general has a very quiet and unassuming demeanour. She rarely calls order to the class during the

lesson, and only admonishes out-of-turn talk on a few instances when a student becomes too agitated or loud. Also, the children in her class are younger than in any other class in the study.

This is also the only class where we see girls speaking out of turn so much; the previous classes analysed had only an instance or two of out-of-turn talk by girls at most. In fact, in class ST.1b the girls speak out of turn about as often as the boys do (although most of such talk is done by Marina and Aleksej). As this is a younger class, it would be interesting to determine through further research if confidence levels of boys and girls in the 9 to 10 age range are more similar than in boys and girls even a year or two older, and whether or not such confidence levels are a factor in the frequency of self-selecting in the language classroom.[80]

In PN's and BM's classes, we see that the students usually wait until named by the instructor to speak, and only infrequently self-select out of turn to speak in class. Instances of hand-raising, which indicate a student's desire to self-select, are minimal.[81] Most of the out-of-turn talk can be attributed to one boy in each class, although some classes have only one or two instances of such talk. Four of the five top self-selectors are boys in different classes (Igor', Valentin, Denis and Aleksej); Marina is the only girl to make the list. In ST's class, we see that the students (both boys and girls) speak out of turn more frequently, especially during games portions of the class. Such behaviour in games would not be unexpected, although it is interesting that this is the only class in which the girls speak out of turn about as much as the boys do. Most hand-raising in ST's class also occurs during the games, as the students are keen to answer and win points for their teams. In general, however, the boys self-select and speak out-of-turn much more

---

[80] In the questionnaires ST rated the girls' self-confidence much lower than the boys' on average (see Tables 8 and 9); to pursue the question of confidence levels in different age ranges as a factor in *student self-selections* would require further data and assessments of those confidence levels.

[81] As noted previously, due to the position of the videocamera in the classroom not all students are visible on the recordings. However, of the many students who are visible, very few raise their hands.

frequently than the girls do.[82] This finding indicates that gender is implicitly relevant to many of the boys and girls. It is clear that they use the turn-taking system, specifically self-selections, differently. However, these 'male' and 'female' styles are not rules that the students *must* follow, as Marina exemplifies; she uses the 'male' style of self-selections as frequently as some of the boys do. Also, the boys who do *not* self-select are using the 'female' style of waiting to be selected by the instructor, perhaps because of the importance they ascribe to the institutional constraints.

By waiting to speak until named by the instructor, the children are indeed orienting to their institutional identities as students. By controlling self-selection (and therefore turn-taking) in the classroom, the instructors are also orienting to their identities – instructors are expected to control the classroom environment in order to achieve the learning goals of the class. ST takes least control of her class, which indicates that perhaps she does not identify herself as a full-fledged teacher; she is a law student with no pedagogical training.

When student self-selections resulting in interruptions and/or overlaps do occur, the instructors repair this lapse in the turn-taking system only some of the time.[83] When the out-of-turn talk is not disruptive (e.g., one word, quietly spoken), the instructors usually ignore it; it would be more disruptive to the lesson to repair the turn-taking mistake.[84] In other circumstances, the instructors acknowledge the student self-selections in order to repair the interruption or problem in comprehension. When a self-selected student turn is relevant to the learning goals of the classroom, the instructors will often address the student in order to

---

[82] The "frequency" of self-selections is given here as a proportional comparison of the number of instances in which the boys and girls self-select and speak out of turn.

[83] Overall, there are not many overlaps throughout the lessons. The few that do occur are mostly during 'open turn' exercises or instructor questioning: when students answer at the same time; after a student-owned pause when the instructor reclaims her turn; when negotiating meaning together in a instructor-student repair sequence; or when a student is a named speaker and is in sequential talk with the instructor.

[84] As we saw in BM's lessons, when Denis spoke out of turn, even when he was quiet and not disruptive, he was usually chastised by the instructor.

negotiate meaning and/or clarify instructions; by doing so, the instructors are indicating that such relevant talk can be less "out-of-turn" and therefore self-selections can be attempted. The instructor is orienting to their role as language facilitator and the student to their role as learner, and together they work towards the common goals of the classroom through the turn-taking system. When out-of-turn talk is disruptive and/or persistent, the instructors again acknowledge it, whether by addressing a question or chastising a student for speaking out of turn. In some cases the instructor will remind the student the rules of turn-taking, for example speaking "one at a time." Again, such acknowledgement restores order to the classroom turn-taking system, allowing the instructor to return to the lesson.

5.4.2 Sequences and Repairs

Next I turn to *question - answer adjacency pairs* to determine if there are any gender-related trends in instructor-student sequence organisation. I look at absent or incorrect *second pair parts* in question - answer pairs, as well as their repair (including *insertion sequences*), and the instructors' use of *third position acknowledgements* in the sequences. I also look at correct question - answer pairs that require no repair, and again the instructors use of *third position acknowledgements*.[85] Gender trends in 'named' next speaker selection by the instructor were analysed in the previous section on turn-taking. As question - answer pairs account for the majority of classroom talk in this study,[86] those trends are also generally applicable to the discussion of sequences here.

Beginning with PN's lessons, there are few instances of absent or incorrect second pair parts. In the next excerpt, already discussed in detail in excerpt 1, PN is asking open questions to the class for vocabulary items that can be used to answer the general question, "How are you?" (1). In line 2 there is a pause that

---

[85] To answer these questions, those excerpts already discussed above are analysed from a CA gender perspective.
[86] As noted above, other research has also shown that question – answer pairs account for the majority of classroom discourse.

Excerpt 59. PN.3b.3

```
1   PN:        Alri:ght. Xorošo, eščë čto?
               Alri:ght. Good, what else?
2              (0.5)
3              [Okay,] all right, (.) [fine]
4   Sergej:    [so so]              [so so]
5   PN:        Èto esli vsë xorošo, ja govorju, vsë xorošo.
               That's if everything is good, I'm saying, if everything is good.
6              (1.0)
7   PN:        [[Možno]]
               [[It is possible]]
8   Ivan:      [[I am]] bad
9   PN:        M- net, esli vsë xorošo. (.)
               M- no, if everything is good. (.)
10             ((listing the answers already given))
11             Okay, all right, fine, (.)
12             možno skazat' very well, da? očen' xorošo. Very well. A esli ne očen'
               you can say very well, right? Very well. Very well. And if things aren't
13             dela idut, Serëža?
               going very well, Serëža? ((Sergej))
14  Ivan:      Very bad=
15  Sergej:    =so-so
16  PN:        So-so, all right. (.) Esli ploxo dela idut ((looks at Ivan)) [Ivan?]
               So-so, all right. (.) If things are going badly [Ivan?]
17  Ivan:                                                                   [Bad]
18  Sergej:    Bad
19  PN:        Bad.
```

belongs to the students as none of them has provided an answer to PN's question. PN resumes her talk in line 3, an item in *third position* assessing the second pair part as absent. This turn, therefore, is also an attempt to other-initiate a student self-repair: PN tries to help the students in the production of the missing second pair part by listing those answers already given.[87] In line 4 Sergej self-repairs the absent student turn.

There are several examples of boys making lexical mistakes (lines 4, 8, and 14). In lines 5 and 9, PN uses *third position* assessments of the boys' turns as wrong, which again also act as attempted other-initiations of self-repairs. After the

---

[87] By doing so, PN not only initiates a student self-repair of the missing answer, but also repairs
the absence of turn uptake.

assessment in line 9, PN lists the answers already given (11) and provides the problematic second pair part (12). In response to the new question directed at Sergej (12-13), Ivan self-selects and provides a wrong answer (14). PN first acknowledges Sergej's answer by assessing it as correct, then asks the question that correctly matches Ivan's prior turn (15). PN's question in line 15 not only acts as a first pair part question requiring a second pair part answer, but also as an item in third position evaluating Ivan's previous answer as incorrect. Ivan self-repairs by providing the same answer but for the appropriate question (17). In line 19, PN produces another item in third position, assessing Ivan's turn as correct.

Excerpt 60. PN.3c.2

1	Valentin:	Valerija, what time is it now?
2		(5.0)
3	Valerija:	It's (2.0) half
4	PN:	°Net, po-moemu dvadcat' pjat'.°
		°*No, I think it's twenty five.*°
5		(2.0)
6	Valerija:	It's thirty five?,
7	PN:	Oni- (.) sčitaetsja v obratnom porjadke, <u>do</u> nastuplenija
		They- (.) It's counted in reverse, <u>to the top of the hour</u>
8	Valerija:	Hhh it's twenty five?, minutes (0.5) to? (1.0) ten.
9		(2.0)
10	PN:	All right?, ((nods)) thank you?

In excerpt 60 (taken from excerpt 4), Valentin is asking the class what time it is according to his cardboard clock. In line 1, he addresses the question to Valerija. After a lengthy pause (2), Valerija takes up her turn to provide the answer, again pausing mid-turn before resuming (3). Although PN did not ask the initial question, as instructor she has the right to assess the students' answers, and so in line 4 we see a third position item assessing Valerija's turn as incorrect. By doing so, PN also initiates Valerija's self-repair. In line 6, Valerija attempts to provide the correct answer to Valentin's question, as prompted by the instructor, thereby orienting to her role as student. PN again claims a turn to provide further information required for Valerija to produce the right answer (7), by which she also assesses Valerija's turn in line 6 as incorrect. In line 8, Valerija attempts for a

third time to produce the answer to Valentin's question. In third position, it is the instructor, not the student questioner, who assesses this answer to be correct (10). Valerija's second pair parts and PN's third position assessments, which also act as other-initiators of Valerija's self-repairs, are chained until Valerija produces the right answer.

Excerpt 61. PN.3b.3

```
1   Ivan:      He- (1.0) hair is dark and short.
2   PN:        All right,
3   Ivan:      And think
4   PN:        Okay,
5              (1.0)
6              Thin or thick, sorry?
7   Ivan:      Thick
8   PN:        Okay
```

Prior to this example from excerpt 34, PN has asked Ivan to describe a person in a photograph. As such, Ivan's 'second pair part' is several turns long in order to satisfy the requirements of the question. In this excerpt Ivan describes the person's hair, making a pronunciation mistake (1). In third position PN evaluates Ivan's turn as correct, using a continuing intonation to prompt more descriptions (2). Ivan continues in line 3, but makes a lexical or pronunciation mistake by describing the hair as "think." PN again assesses this turn as correct, encouraging him to continue (4), but after a pause (5) she inserts a clarification question (6). This question acts as an initiator of a self-repair, requiring Ivan to produce the correct answer "thick" (7). In third position relative to this inserted question - answer pair, PN accepts the repaired turn.

Excerpt 62 (PN.3a.2)

In this excerpt (already seen in excerpt 35), Vadim makes a grammatical mistake while describing a person's eye colour, after which he has a lengthy pause mid turn (1). PN does not claim a turn to assess the grammatical mistake or repair the vocabulary difficulty. Instead, it is Vadim who resumes his turn by inserting a vocabulary question to initiate an 'other repair' by the instructor (2). PN does not

Excerpt 62. PN.3a.2

```
1   Vadim:          His (1.0) eyes (1.0) are colour (5.0)
2                   °kak golubye?°
                    °how do you say blue?°
3   PN:             Sorry?=
4   Vadim:          =°golubye°
                    =°blue°
5   PN:             Blue. [His] eyes are blue.
6   Vadim:              [°blue°]
7   Vadim:          Blue
8   PN:             Mmhm
```

provide the answer but indicates that she has not heard him properly (3), and Vadim again specifies the vocabulary problem he is having (4). In line 5 PN provides the answer to Vadim's inserted question from line 2, and repeats the grammatically correct answer that Vadim should have given in line 1. This repetition can therefore be seen as a third item assessment of his initial turn. Vadim repeats the new vocabulary word (6,7), and PN uses a token "Mmhm" to indicate that he should continue his turn (8).

In PN's lessons overall, there are not many examples of incorrect second pairs parts in question - answer sequences. Of those that do occur, most are simple lexical mistakes made by boys. To repair them, PN mostly uses items in third position to indicate that there is a mistake (as well as the source of the mistake), and these items sometimes also act as initiators of student self-repairs. PN rarely uses insertion sequences of question - answer pairs to negotiate the repair of incorrect answers, usually when the mistake is grammatical in nature. There are no examples of lengthy or difficult insertion sequences required to do so.

In the lessons there are also examples of absent student turns in question - answer sequences open to the entire class. In such cases, PN resumes her talk to repair the absence of turn uptake, while also attempting to initiate student self-repairs of the missing second pair part. In question - answer pairs directed at named students, there are no instances of absent turn uptake. However, there are instances of student pauses mid turn. The girls make mid turn pauses more frequently than the

boys do. To repair the paused turns, PN sometimes claims a turn to encourage the student to continue (e.g., uses a token "mhm" or repeats the student's answer so far with a continuing intonation). If there is a need for grammatical and/or lexical help from the instructor, PN will insert a sequence to help negotiate the difficulty. Although the boys make more mistakes while the girls pause mid turn more frequently in PN's lessons, further research would be required to determine the causes of such differences: are the girls more afraid to be wrong, and therefore pause for help rather than make a mistake? Are they less confident than boys at this age?

Turning to BM's lessons, there are many instances of incorrect, and few instances of absent, second pair parts in question – answer pairs. Excerpt 63 was already analysed in detail in the larger excerpt 2. BM is asking students to create sentences based on a textbook exercise on dates and holidays, and in the order prescribed by the textbook. In this short excerpt there are several examples of absent or incorrect second pair parts, here the "holiday" sentence to be created.

Excerpt 63 (BM.2b.2)
BM names Tat'jana to create the first sentence in this excerpt, which acts as the first pair part in the question – answer sequence (1). Tat'jana produces the answer in line 2 but makes a pronunciation mistake. In line 3, in third position, BM assesses the answer as incorrect by emphasising the proper pronunciation. In repairing Tat'jana's answer, BM orients to her institutional identity. As instructor she can assess second pair parts for correctness; in 'everyday' talk it is likely that people would consider a correction of their pronunciation to be rude (or at the very least surprising). Tat'jana accepts BM's third position assessment by repeating the correct pronunciation, and thereby orienting to her identity as student (4). In line 5 BM inserts a sequence expansion to explain the source of the pronunciation mistake and clarify vocabulary.

Excerpt 63. BM.2b.2

1	BM:	uh, (.) Tanja? ((Tat'jana))
2	Tat'jana:	M, (.) the first of May is um, (1.0) the (3.0) the w- (.) the walk's day
3	BM:	<u>workers'</u>
4	Tat'jana:	workers' day.
	BM:	The workers' day. <u>Walk</u>, èto guljat', a <u>worker</u>?, (.) rabočij. (0.3)
5		*The workers' day. <u>Walk</u>, eto guljat', a <u>worker</u>?, (.) a worker (0.3)*
6		Well, Toni?, ((Antonina))
7		(2.0)
8	Antonina:	The first (of June) (2.0)
9		((BM nods))
10	BM:	Eščë raz. (Toni) <u>Ju:ne</u> da?, mesjac èto u nas.
		One more time. (Toni) <u>Ju:ne</u> yes?, that's a month we have.
11	Antonina:	The first of (0.5)
12	BM:	of [June,
13	Antonina:	[of June is (0.3) the children's deh.
14	BM:	<u>day:</u>.
15	Antonina:	day.
16	BM:	The children's day. Egor?
17		(0.4)
18	Egor:	Th[e
19	BM:	[Kak čitaetsja èto slovo?
		[How is this word pronounced?
20	Egor:	The first of September is the (.) first day (0.3) of school.
21	BM:	Of school. Yes. (0.1) Olja? ((Ol'ga))
22	Ol'ga:	The first
23	BM:	Th- <u>čto::</u>?
		Th- <u>wha::t</u>?
24	Ol'ga:	The (0.5) seven? ith
25	BM:	<u>The seventh</u>
26	Ol'ga:	of my-
27		(0.5) ((BM grimaces))
28	Ol'ga:	January (1.0) the-
29	BM:	<u>is</u>
30		(1.0)
31	Ol'ga:	is?
32	BM:	is propuščennyj prosto, <u>is:</u>? čto,
		is is simply missing, <u>is:</u>? what,
33		(0.5)
34		OLJA!
35	Ol'ga:	is (2.0)
36	Tat'jana:	( )
37	BM:	((to Tat'jana)) Ty za neë učiš'sja? čto li?, (0.3) ili za sebja! (4.0)
		((to Tat'jana)) Are you studying for her or something? (0.3) Or for yourself! (4.0)
38		((to Ol'ga)) <u>Christ</u>mas.
39	Ol'ga:	Christmas in (0.5) Russia.

BM selects Antonina as next 'answerer' in line 6. Antonina begins to answer but pauses mid turn (8). To repair the student-owned pause, BM inserts a sequence expansion to check Antonina's comprehension of the vocabulary item "June" (10). Antonina makes a second attempt at answering (11), but after a short pause BM again claims a turn to emphasise the correct pronunciation, pre-empting any pronunciation mistake (12). Antonina then completes the required answer (13). In line 14, BM uses an item in third position to assess and repair Antonina's incorrect pronunciation of "day." Antonina repeats the correct pronunciation, now having completed her second pair part over several turns (15). BM uses another item in third position, this time repeating the final portion of Antonina's corrected answer (16).

Next BM selects Egor to answer the question, i.e., to create the appropriate sentence (16). He begins to answer (18) but is immediately overlapped by BM inserting a sequence expansion (19). BM asks a question to check Egor's knowledge of a word; it seems likely that she is pre-empting a pronunciation mistake of the word "first," as Egor has pronounced "the" correctly. In line 20, Egor produces the correct sentence, with correct pronunciation, which acts as the second pair part to the original question (to create a sentence) and to the inserted question (how is the word pronounced). BM assesses his answer as correct (21).

The final example in this excerpt involves Ol'ga. She is asked by BM to create the next sentence (21). Ol'ga begins with a mistake, starting with the date from the previous sentence, "the first" (22). As instructor BM has the right to claim a turn, and she expands the question - answer sequence by emphatically asking, "th-wha::t?" (23). This turn is a third position assessment of Ol'ga's answer, indicating that the answer is wrong, and therefore the assessment also acts as an initiator of a self-repair. Ol'ga attempts the required answer again but makes a pronunciation mistake (24). BM immediately claims another turn to stop Ol'ga and emphasise the correct pronunciation (25). Again this third position assessment expands the sequence to initiate Ol'ga's self-repair. Ol'ga does not

self-repair but continues with the production of the required answer (26). She makes another mistake saying, "of my-" but stops herself short. It is not clear what she was attempting to say here (e.g., May or my). During a brief pause BM grimaces at her to indicate she is wrong, rather than claiming a turn to assess the mistake (27). The grimace acts as a repair initiator as Ol'ga resumes her answer correctly, but now she makes a grammar mistake by leaving out the verb "is" (28). BM cuts Ol'ga's turn short to assess this mistake; she expands the sequence with an other-repair, providing the missing verb (29). After a pause, Ol'ga expands the sequence with a question to clarify BM's repair (31). BM answers with grammatical information about the missing verb "to be" (32). There is a short pause after which BM calls Ol'ga's name loudly and emphatically (34). This use of Ol'ga's name indicates that Ol'ga is the named next speaker whose turn is absent. Tat'jana, Ol'ga's desk mate, whispers something to help Ol'ga (36). BM chastises Tat'jana for helping Ol'ga with her answer. In doing so, BM orients to her identity as instructor; she is the disciplinarian when the 'rules' of classroom turn-taking are not followed, but she is also the facilitator whose goal is to make sure all students learn the subject matter. In line 38, BM provides Ol'ga with the next missing word in her answer, again indicating it is her turn to complete the answer. In line 39 Ol'ga finishes her sentence, the required second pair part that was negotiated over several turns and with various mistakes. BM does not assess the completed turn in third position, although this absence of repair (or repair initiator) indicates that there are no further mistakes.

Throughout this short excerpt of question - answer pairs there are several examples of student mistakes, mostly pronunciation, all made by girls. BM uses items in third position to assess the mistakes, thereby expanding the sequences to make or initiate repairs. She often claims a turn immediately to deal with the language difficulty, rather than waiting for the student to complete the entire answer; in some cases she pre-empts any mistakes by claiming a turn to address potential difficulties (e.g., the sequence expansion during Egor's turn). This practice of assessing mistakes immediately can lead to multiple chains of

'questions - answers - third position assessments'[88] until the answer is correct.

Excerpt 64. BM.2b.1

1	BM:	Lisa, ((Lidija)) do you like the weather today?
2		(1.5)
3	Lidija:	Uh: (.) no, it is not-
4	BM:	<u>Do you like</u> čto značit?
		<u>Do you like</u> means what?
5		(1.5)
6	Lidija:	(°Vy ljubite°)
		(°Do you like°)
7	BM:	Ye:s,
8		nu vot pro sebja otvečaj,
		so *then answer about yourself,*
9		<u>do you like</u> the weather today?
10	Lidija:	No, (.) uh, (0.5) it is
11	BM:	You! (.) <u>Ty pro sebja govoriš'</u>, pri čëm zdes' it, <u>Lida</u>. ((Lidija))
		You! (.) <u>You are speaking about yourself</u>, why have "it" here, <u>Lida</u>
12		(0.5)
13		Ty govoriš' <u>pro sebja</u>.
		You're speaking <u>about yourself</u>,
14		(0.5)
15		Da? Kogda my govorim o sebe kakoe my slovo ispol'zuem?
		Right? When we speak about ourselves what word do we use?
16		(2.0)
17		<u>Ty: ljubiš'</u>?
		<u>Do you like</u>?
18		kak ty otvetiš'?,
		how do you answer?,
19	Lidija:	Ja
		I
20	BM:	<u>Ja:</u> ne ljublju, gde u tebja slovo ja, (.) pri čëm zdes' it,
		<u>I:</u> don't like, where do you have the word I, (.) why have "it" here,
21		<u>it</u> èto razve ja?
		does <u>it</u> really mean I?
22		(1.5)
23	Lidija:	No, I like?,
24	BM:	Ty govoriš' ja <u>ne</u> ljublju, <u>No: I</u>?,
		You're saying I <u>don't</u> like, <u>No: I?</u>,
25	Lidija:	don't like (0.5) the weather today=
26	BM:	=You don't like the weather today. (.)

In this excerpt (taken from excerpt 24), there are multiple chains of 'questions -

---

[88] When the answer is incorrect, these third position assessments act as repairs or repair initiators.

answers - third position assessments' between BM and Lidija, another girl in the class BM.2b. In line 1 BM begins by asking Lidija if she likes the weather today. After a pause, Lidija starts her answer using the wrong sentence structure, "no, it is not-" (3). BM cuts her short to claim a turn: "<u>Do you like</u> means what?" (4). This turn is a third position assessment of Lidija's answer as wrong, but as a second question to Lidija it also acts as a repair initiator in a sequence expansion.

Lidija answers the second question (6), and BM assesses her turn to be correct (7). Next BM expands the sequence to provide further instructions to aid Lidija's repair of the incorrect initial answer (8). Lidija, however, begins her answer with the same mistake as before (10). BM stops Lidija before she can complete the answer (11). BM assesses the attempted answer as wrong again by emphatically indicating that Lidija should be answering from a first and not a third person perspective. This third position assessment also acts as a repair initiator, but Lidija does not take up her turn to repair the answer. After a short pause BM resumes her turn, repairing the absent turn uptake while also attempting again to initiate Lidija's self-repair of the grammar mistake (13). She tells Lidija again that she should be speaking about *herself*.

Lidija still does not take up her turn. BM resumes her turn again, this time to insert a question - answer sequence addressing the grammar issue (15). BM asks Lidija what word is used when we speak about *ourselves*. Lidija does not produce the required answer; her turn uptake is again absent. After a 2.0 second pause (16) BM rephrases the question to ask Lidija how to answer the question "do you like?" in Russian (17-18). In line 19 Lidija produces the answer to the inserted question. BM assesses the answer as correct by emphasising the first person pronoun in the construction "I do not like" (20). She further expands the sequence to explain the source of the grammar difficulties and initiate Lidija's repair (20-21). In line 23 Lidija begins the repaired answer with the correct pronoun but makes another grammar mistake, leaving out the word "don't." BM cuts Lidija's turn short immediately to assess the mistake and initiate a self-repair (24). Lidija

finally produces a mistake-free answer to the question from line 1 (25). In third position BM repeats the answer, thereby assessing it as correct (26).

There are several mistakes here made by one of the girls, Lidija. As in the previous excerpt BM uses items in third position to assess the mistakes immediately after they occur, cutting Lidija's turns short. In doing so, BM expands the sequences to make or initiate repairs. When Lidija does not take up her turn as required to produce the repairs, BM resumes her turn in further attempts at repair initiators. As a result, we again find multiple chains of 'questions - answers - third position assessments.'

Excerpt 65 (BM.2a.2)

The next excerpt was discussed in detail as excerpt 38. In line 1 BM asks Elizaveta to translate into Russian a line from a birthday poem that includes the construction "we would like to say." Elizaveta does not take up her nominated turn, and after a pause BM resumes her turn (3). She expands the question - answer sequence by asking another question that clarifies the answer Elizaveta should provide. The rephrased question acts as a repair of the absent turn uptake, and as a repair initiator for the missing translation. Again Elizaveta does not take up her turn and the question - answer sequence remains incomplete (4). BM resumes her turn, again expanding the sequence, to let Elizaveta know that she should know how to translate the expression (5). Elizaveta begins to produce the answer by translating the pronoun "we" in a very quiet voice (6). It is likely that Elizaveta's whisper-like talk indicates a lack of confidence in her answer. BM inserts another sequence expansion repeating the pronoun with a questioning intonation; this repetition assesses Elizaveta's turn as correct while indicating that she should continue (7). Elizaveta translates the next word of the answer, again very quietly, but makes a mistake in the verb tense (8). BM inserts another question in the sequence to emphasise this mistake; this question acts as a third position assessment to initiate a student self-repair (9).

Excerpt 65. BM.2a.2

1	BM:	Čto èto značit Liza?
		What does it mean Liza?((Elizaveta))
2		(1.0)
3		I would like, <u>we</u> would l- like, čto èto takoe?
		I would like, we would l- like, what is it?
4		(3.0)
5		Well, (.) my že znaem èto vyraženie
		Well, (.) we know this expression
6	Elizaveta:	°My°
		°We°
7	BM:	My?
		We?
8	Elizaveta:	°xotim°
		°want°
9	BM:	Xo- <u>xotim</u> ili xoteli <u>by</u>?
		Wa- <u>want</u> or <u>would</u> like?
10		(1.0) ((grimaces, knocks on desk))
11		Nu Liza smelee, bystree, [ne spim.]
		Well Liza braver, faster, [we're not sleeping.]
12	Elizaveta:	[xoteli by]
		[would like]
13		(0.5)
14	BM:	<u>Bystree, nu perevodi</u>.
		Faster, well translate.
15		(3.0)
16		<u>Nu vsju stročku požalujsta skaži</u> vmesto kak polučilos'.
		<u>Well say the whole line please</u> instead of what you just produced.
17		(2.0)
18	Elizaveta:	Segodnja
		Today
19	BM:	<u>I poèto[mu segodnja]</u>
		<u>And so [today]</u>
20	Elizaveta:	[I poètomu] segodnja my xoteli by
		[And so] today we would like
21	BM:	<u>To say</u>, bystree Liza.
		<u>To say</u>, faster Liza.
22		(2.0)
23		<u>To sa:y</u>.
24		(0.5) ((uses fingers to show words coming out of her mouth))
25		<u>To sa:y</u>.
26		(1.0) ((again uses fingers to show words coming out of her mouth))
27		<u>To: sa::y</u>!
28		(2.0) ((uses fingers to indicate moving lips))
29	Elizaveta:	°(vot- (.) ne zn-)°
		°(well- (.) I don't kn-)°
30	BM:	<u>Sa:y</u>! <u>Sa:y</u>! <u>Sa:y</u>! <u>Say</u>! <u>Say</u>!
31		((uses both hands beside her mouth to show movement))

32	BM:	<u>You say</u>, <u>I am saying now</u>,
33		(1.0)
34		Čto takoe ((points in her mouth))
		What is it
35		<u>say</u>? <u>say</u>, <u>Liza:</u>! [<u>say</u>.
36	Elizaveta:	[skazat'
		[to say
37	BM:	<u>Skaza:t'</u>. <u>Nu kak eščë pokazyvat'</u>, ja ne znaju. ((exasperated))
		To say. Well how else can I show that, I don't know.
38		(1.0) Well (0.5) Liza, eščë raz, (.) kak polučaetsja stročka
		(1.0) Well (0.5) Liza, one more time, (.) what is the whole line
39		(1.0)
40	Elizaveta:	°Poètomu segodnja my xoteli by s- s- [skazat']°
		°*And so today we'd like to s- s- [say]*°
41	BM:	[Skazat'.] (.)
		[To say.] (.)
42		From all of <u>u:s</u> to <u>you</u>: ((gestures with arms to indicate 'us' and 'you'))
43		(2.0)
44		From all of <u>u:s</u>, ((gestures with arms again to indicate 'us'))
45		vot from Carl, ((points to everyone individually))
		Well from Carl, ((Kirill))
46		[from] Nadja, ((Nadežda)) from (.) Laura, ((Larisa)) (.) from me to <u>you</u>.
47	Elizaveta:	[mhm]
48	Elizaveta:	Ot nas tebe.
		From us to you.
49	BM:	Ot vsex nas?, (.) tebe. (0.5) Čto by my xoteli skazat'?
		From all of us?, (.) to you. (0.5) What would we like to say?
50		(2.0)
51	Elizaveta:	°S dnëm°=
		°*Happy*°=
52	BM:	=<u>S dnëm</u>?,
		=*Happy?,*
53	Elizaveta:	°S dnëm ro[ždenija°
		°*Happy bir[thday*°
54	BM:	[S dnëm roždenija
		[Happy birthday

Elizaveta does not take up her turn to repair the mistake. BM grimaces at her, knocks on the desk to get Elizaveta's attention, then claims another turn to tell Elizaveta to answer more bravely and quickly (10-11). This expansion repairs the absent turn uptake while indicating to Elizaveta that she must fix her mistake as required by the inserted question in line 9. Elizaveta continues with her translation, correcting the mistake in verb tense (12). She pauses again (13), and BM expands the sequence again to tell her to translate more quickly (14). Elizaveta does not resume her turn (15).

In line 16 BM claims another turn to tell Elizaveta to repeat the whole translated line (including the portion prior to this excerpt, "and so today"). This turn acts as a first pair part *question* that requires a second pair part *answer*. Elizaveta starts to translate the whole sentence again (18). BM cuts her short to correct her translation using an item in third position (19). Elizaveta repeats the correction and continues with the translation (20). From lines 21 through 28, there are multiple chains of sequence expansions from BM trying to get Elizaveta to translate "to say," and absent turn uptake (i.e., absent answers) from Elizaveta. BM becomes quite loud and animated in her attempts to provoke the answer.

Elizaveta expands the sequence herself in line 29, indicating to BM that she does not know the answer. BM, however, cuts her short to repeat the English word "say" many times loudly and emphatically (30-32). Elizaveta still does not know the answer and as such her turn is again absent in line 33. BM claims another turn to ask what "say" means, pointing in her mouth (34-35). She also calls Elizaveta's name to emphasise that her turn is missing. BM repairs the absent turn, while again attempting to initiate a student self-repair of the missing translation.

Elizaveta produces the missing answer in line 36. BM responds with a third position assessment, repeating the correct translation, and further expands the sequence by stating that she does not know how else one can show the translation of "to say" into Russian (37). Not satisfied with the answer negotiated over many turns, BM again asks Elizaveta to repeat the entire sentence (39). Elizaveta does so without mistake in line 40, and BM repeats the correct translation of "to say" as a third position assessment of the answer (41).

Next BM chains another question - answer sequence with Elizaveta, asking her to continue with the translation of the next line in the poem (42). Elizaveta does not take up her turn (43), and BM expands the sequence to provide information to help Elizaveta with the answer (44-46). Elizaveta produces the required answer (48), which BM slightly modifies in her third position assessment (49). In line 49

BM chains another question, asking Elizaveta what the next line in the poem is, "what would we like to say?" After a pause Elizaveta answers the latest question (51), but is cut short by BM latching on to her turn (52). BM repeats Elizaveta correct answer thus far, a sequence expansion that acts as a third position assessment. Elizaveta finishes her translation of "happy birthday," thereby completing the required second pair part answer (53). BM repeats the answer in third position, accepting it as correct (54).

Although these excerpts were also analysed in detail in previous sections, they are included here to further illustrate how BM handles absent and incorrect second pair parts in question - answer pairs, as well as how she uses insertion sequences and/or third position assessments to make or initiate repairs. The incorrect answers have a variety of trouble sources: pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar mistakes. Many of the question - answer sequences that require repairs are long and difficult to negotiate, with multiple sequence expansions from BM. If an expansion does not succeed in initiating a repair, she will often keep repeating the turn more loudly and angrily, sometime banging on her desk or using gestures. BM inserts sequence expansions even in short question - answer sequences that are easily resolved, and in some instances inserts expansions to pre-empt possible mistakes.

Unlike the examples of out-of-turn talk in BM's lessons, mostly done by boys, *all* of the lengthy and difficult question - answer sequences involve girls. There are more girls than boys in BM's classes, but it is meaningful that *none* of the boys are involved in the lengthy question - answer 'repair sequences.' When the boys make mistakes, BM's responses are usually as simple as "no you are wrong."[89] Also, all of the examples of absent turns involve the girls. In the interview BM

---

[89] As the sample for incorrect answers was taken from those excerpts already analysed in the dissertation, there are no examples of such sequences given here. However, in the transcripts there are many examples of boys making mistakes that elicit the 'no you are wrong' response from BM. There are no examples of lengthy, difficult 'repair sequences' with the boys.

claimed that girls study better and work harder than boys; therefore, it is possible that she is harder on the girls for making mistakes, and/or that the girls are less confident around BM's intimidating (and perhaps sometimes mean) behaviour in the classroom.[90] It is also possible that BM pays more attention to the girls and dismisses the boys' mistakes because she believes the girls can learn from their mistakes and the boys cannot. Such analysis is beyond the scope of this research, but is included here as a future research question.

ST's lessons are the last to be discussed in terms of gender differences in question - answer sequences. There are many examples of incorrect answers, a mix of pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar mistakes. There are also many examples of lengthy student-owned pauses, and some of absent answers.

Excerpt 66 (ST.1b.2)

In excerpt 66 (taken from excerpt 6), the students are on teams creating sentences based on the grammatical models drawn on the board. The question or first pair part is given in the instructions: "what kind of sentence can you make from this model?" Whoever drew the model in the previous exercise is the designated answerer. Prior to this excerpt ST clarified that Andrej drew the first model, and therefore is the first answerer. In lines 1 through 3, she explains the instructions, i.e., asks the question. She also indicates that the students are allowed to help each other, thereby lifting some of the constraints of classroom interaction; the students can now help each other answer the instructor's question. In line 4, Marina expresses frustration, possibly because the students can help each other; as already seen above, she is extremely competitive in these games. Members of the opposing team wave their hands in the air to answer, but they are not acknowledged by ST as it is not their team's turn (5). Instead, as Andrej has not

---

[90] She also claimed in the interview that the boys interrupt more and require more control. As seen in the data above, she is hard on the boys, especially Denis, for speaking out-of-turn.

Excerpt 66. ST.1b.2

1	ST:	Pervuju vot u tebja kvadrat, treugol'nik, i kružoček. (Kakoj-to primer)
		The first look you have a square, triangle, and circle. (What kind of
2		možno postavit' po takoj modeli? Pomniš'? (.) Vy možete pomogat'
		example) can you make from this model? Do you remember? (.) You can
3		drug drugu.
		help each other.
4	Marina:	Nu ( ) dim- ((frustrated, covers face with fist))
		But ( ) dim-
5		((Aleksej, Aleksandra, Nina - team #2 - waving hands in air))
6	ST:	Zabyli?
		Have you forgotten?
7	Andrej:	Sčas. (.) Čto-to skažu. (5.0)
		Just a sec. (.) I'll say something. (5.0)
8	ST:	Skaži
		Say it
9	Andrej:	I (.) I ha- (.) I ha? (.) a house da?
		I (.) I ha- (.) I ha? (.) a house yes?
10	Marina:	Net
		No
11	ST:	Net, ne ( )
		No, not ( )
12		((Aleksej and Aleksandra waving hands, Aleksandra squeaking))
13	Marina:	I- (.)
14	Natalja:	((whispering loudly)) I live
15	Andrej:	I lis?
16	ST:	I <u>live</u>
17	Andrej:	Ah. (.) I live in the (.) h- house.
18	ST:	Okay, s nebol'šoj ošibkoj. Alex.
		Okay, with a small mistake. Alex. ((Aleksej))
	.	
	.	
	.	
19	ST:	Okay tret'ja model' načinaem s vami (ili vy slyšite ved')
		Okay the third model we begin with you (or you can hear right)
20	Nina:	I live in (.) I live in the house.
21	ST:	It's wrong.
22	Aleksej:	Net.
		No.
23		((Andrej puts hand in air, makes excited noises))
24	ST:	Tixo Drew. hh spokojnee. hhh
		Quiet Drew. ((Andrej)) hh calm down. hhh
25		((Andrej continues to wave hand excitedly, but quietly))
26		U tebja tam (kvadrat S) stoit uhh značok bukva S
		You have a (square S) standing uhhh a symbol with the letter S
27		(3.0)
28	Aleksej:	<u>He</u>
29		(2.0) ((looks at ST, ST nods))
30		<u>He</u>

31	Nina:	He lives in the house
32	ST:	He lives in the house
		He lives in the house

taken up his turn to answer, ST inserts a question to clarify if Andrej has forgotten what sentence can be made (6). This question is in third position to Andrej's absent answer, and also acts as a repair initiator.

Andrej takes up his absent turn *not* to provide the missing answer to the first question from lines 1-2, but to answer the inserted question from line 6 (7). This turn repairs his absent turn uptake, but does not repair the missing answer. Because the answer remains absent, ST inserts a sequence expansion (another repair initiator), telling Andrej to "say it" (8). Andrej self-repairs, answering the initial question (9). He has made a mistake however, based on the grammatical model, and also mispronounced the verb "have." Because the students are allowed to help each other answer, Marina self-selects to produce a third position assessment of his answer as incorrect (10). Normally only the instructor is allowed to assess answers, but the 'rules' have been relaxed for the game. ST also produces an assessment of Andrej's turn as incorrect; this item acts as a repair initiator for Andrej to fix his mistake (11).

The opposing team is again waving their hands in the air in order to claim a turn, but ST still ignores their attempts to self-select (12). Marina self-selects to produce the first part of Andrej's answer, the subject pronoun (13), after which Natal'ja also self-selects to provide the subject pronoun and verb (14). Both turns act as a repair initiator. Andrej resumes his turn to correct his initial answer but makes a pronunciation mistake; his questioning intonation indicates his uncertainty (15). ST inserts a sequence to repair the mistake, emphasising the proper pronunciation (16). In line 17, Andrej resumes his answer with the correct pronunciation and finally completes the answer required from lines 1-2. In third position, ST assesses his answer as correct, but as this is a game for points, notes that his turn had a small mistake (18).

After other turns not included here (represented by the ellipsis), ST poses the same question to Nina (19). She must create a sentence based on her model drawn on the board. She produces the required second pair part, but has made a grammatical mistake (20). ST assesses her answer as wrong in line 21, a third position assessment that also acts as a repair initiator. Her teammate Aleksej also assesses her answer as incorrect (22). In line 23 Andrej, from the opposing team, raises his hand in excitement at Nina's mistake; as seen above, the opposing teams attempt to profit point-wise from an absent or incorrect answer. Unlike above, however, ST inserts a sequence to acknowledge Andrej's attempt, but she does so to tell him to be quiet and calm (24). Andrej continues to wave his hand but quietly (25). In line 26, ST inserts another sequence expansion to provide Nina with information about her grammatical model, and therefore attempt to initiate a repair. After a pause, Aleksej also attempts to initiate Nina's repair by providing her with the correct subject pronoun (28). Aleksej pauses to look at ST for an assessment of his turn, which she provides by nodding (29). Aleksej repeats the subject pronoun, the source of Nina's mistake (30). Nina takes up ST's and Aleksej's repair initiators to repair her mistake and produce the correct answer (31). In third position ST repeats her answer, thereby assessing it as correct (32).

Excerpt 67. ST.1b.3

1	Nina:	I can jump
2	ST:	Mhm?,
3		(7.0)
4		Eščë pomniš' kakie to dejstvija?
		Do you remember any other actions?
5		((Nina shakes her head))
6	ST:	Thank you, sit down please.

This excerpt, already discussed in excerpt 20, is from the end of Nina's 'storytelling' turn. She has been standing at the front of the class answering the question, "what can your stuffed animal do?" This exercise is designed for the students to practice verbs of action, and as such the *second pair part* (i.e., the story of what the animal can do) is lengthy. Here Nina provides the sentence, "I can jump" as part of her answer (1). ST inserts a token "Mhm?," that assesses

Nina's sentence as correct while encouraging her to continue (2). There is a lengthy 7.0 second pause that belongs to Nina, the continuation of her answer being absent (3). ST expands the sequence by asking a clarifying question, "Do you remember any other actions?" (4). This turn also acts to repair Nina's absent turn uptake. Nina shakes her head to answer the inserted question (5), and in line 6 ST uses a third position assessment to indicate that there are no mistakes to be repaired and Nina's answer is complete.

Excerpt 68. ST.1b.2

1	ST:	uh Alex please tell me who is on duty today=kto segodnja dežurit
		uh Alex please tell me who is on duty today=who is on duty today
2	Aleksej:	Saša ((Aleksandra)) on duty today
3	ST:	Saša <u>is</u> da ved'? on duty
		Saša <u>is</u> on duty right?
4	Aleksej:	<u>is</u> °on duty today°
5	ST:	Saša (.) uh please tell me is anybody absent=kto to otsutsvuet?
		Saša (.) uh please tell me is anybody absent=is someone absent?
6	Aleksandra:	Yes (0.5) Is anybo- (1.5)
7	ST:	Jura? ((Jurij))
8	Aleksandra:	Jura [[hhh
9	ST:	[[is absent
10	Aleksandra:	is absent
11	ST:	Okay (.) xorošo
		Okay (.) good

This last excerpt on incorrect or absent second pair parts was discussed in the larger excerpt 23. ST begins by asking Aleksej which student is on duty today (1). She asks in English but latches the Russian translation onto the question; by doing so she attempts to pre-empt any comprehension difficulties and therefore potential mistakes. Aleksej provides the required answer that Aleksandra is monitor, but makes a grammatical mistake by omitting the verb "to be" (2). In third position, ST assesses his answer as containing a mistake, emphasising that he has omitted the word "is" (3). This item also acts as a repair of Aleksej's answer. Aleksej repeats the corrected answer in line 4.

Next ST addresses the monitor's question to Aleksandra, asking her if anybody is absent from the lesson, again latching the Russian translation onto the question.

(5). Aleksandra begins to answer but makes a mistake by using the syntax structure of the question, "is anybo-" before stopping short (6). Aleksandra pauses for 1.5 seconds, unsure how to fix her mistake. ST uses an item in third position to initiate a repair of the syntax error, providing Aleksandra with the name of the missing student (and the start of the answer) (7). Aleksandra begins to repair her mistake (8). ST overlaps Aleksandra's audible exhale to provide the remainder of the correct answer (9), which Aleksandra repeats (10). Although in line 7 ST just initiated Aleksandra's repair, in line 9 she completes the repair herself, providing the answer that Aleksandra should have produced in line 6. In line 11, ST uses an item in third position to assess that Aleksandra has correctly answered the question.

Of all three instructors, ST's lessons again have the greatest mix of boys and girls involved in the analysed sequences, in this case absent or incorrect *second pair parts*. Most examples of the mistakes were made in the games and storytelling turns, and were roughly equal for the boys and girls. ST sometimes expanded the sequences to initiate repairs or assess mistakes in both the games and 'stories,' as did the students during the games to help their teammates; there were no examples of lengthy, difficult insertion sequences. The mistakes were mostly pronunciation, vocabulary or grammar mistakes. There were also many pauses, some lengthy, especially in the storytelling turns, but few student answers were entirely absent. ST often inserted sequence expansions items to initiate repairs of the lengthy pauses, encouraging the students to continue. Again, both boys and girls 'owned' the lengthy pauses and/or had absent answers about the same amount.

To summarise the analysis of absent or incorrect second pair parts in question - answer sequences, PN had relatively few examples of mistakes. They were mostly lexical and made by boys. PN used items in third position to acknowledge the mistakes and sometimes assessed the source of it; these items could also act as initiators of student self-repairs. She rarely used inserted question - answer pairs

to negotiate the repair of the mistake, and usually did so only when it was grammatical. Absent second pair parts occurred only when PN was asking open questions to the entire class; when students were named answerers, there were no examples of absent turns. There were, however, examples of mid-turn pauses, which were made more frequently by the girls. PN inserted sequences to help negotiate the difficulty. There were no examples of lengthy and/or difficult insertion sequences in PN's lessons. The low instance of mistakes and the relative ease in repairing mistakes is possibly explained by the fact that PN's classes were at the third year level at the private school, and as such had received the most English language training; however, the level of English being studied was also more advanced. There were not enough examples of girls' mistakes to analyse PN's responses to incorrect answers for any potential gender differences. Without a comparison, no claim can be made as to the relevance of the student's gender to PN for incorrect question - answer sequences.

BM's lessons had many examples of incorrect second pair parts, again pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar mistakes. BM used items in third position to assess the mistakes and initiate repairs. Many of the sequences with mistakes required long and difficult negotiations of the repairs through sequence expansions from BM. She also inserted sequence expansions when there were mistakes that were easily resolved, and sometimes expanded sequences to pre-empt possible mistakes. *All* of the lengthy and difficult 'repair sequences' involved girls. None of the boys were involved in these lengthy, expanded sequences; when the boys made mistakes, BM often simply told them that they were wrong. Therefore, BM's response to mistakes varied according to the gender of the student, implying that gender was relevant to her throughout incorrect question - answer sequences. Also, all of the absent turns involved girls. BM's students were in second-year English at the school, lower than PN's classes, although it seems that BM held her students to a higher degree of correctness.

ST's lessons, with the youngest students in the lowest level of English, had a

fairly equal mix of boys and girls making mistakes and/or having absent answers. As in BM's lessons, the mistakes were a mix of pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar errors. ST used items in third position and/or sequence expansions to initiate repairs or assess the mistakes, although none of the expanded sequences were difficult to negotiate. The boys and girls also paused frequently but few answers were entirely absent; ST again used sequence expansions to initiate repairs of the pauses. ST responded to incorrect answers of boys and girls in a similar fashion, and therefore gender was implicitly *not* relevant to her when the students made mistakes.

The gender trends in the repair of absent or incorrect answers, therefore, seem to vary by instructor. In PN's lessons the boys made the most mistakes and there were no examples of absent answers; in BM's lessons the girls made the most mistakes and were responsible for all of the absent turns; in ST's lessons the girls and boys made mistakes and were responsible for absent answers fairly equally. While there seem to be gender differences at play, the trends are different for each instructor (although still similar across each instructor's different classes). Further research would be required to determine what other factors affect the language use, although it seems likely that the instructors' pedagogical approach to mistakes and their repair, and their gender perspectives on male and female students, play a role.

To compare with these findings, question - answer sequences that require no repairs (i.e., that have no absent or incorrect second pair parts) are analysed here to determine how the instructors use third position items to acknowledge and/or praise the correct answers. The structure of such sequences is the following:

1) instructor turn: question
2) student turn: correct answer
3) instructor turn: item in third position

The item in third position can include a repetition of the answer and/or assessment words (e.g., "good" or "okay"). The assessment words tell the answerer that their

turn is accepted and/or praised as correct, while the repetition emphasises the correct answer (e.g., the grammar, vocabulary, and/or pronunciation) for the entire class. However, a repetition alone is also an assessment that the answer is correct. The structures of these third position items are discussed in detail here.

Sometimes the instructors add a "thank you" to the end of the third position item. This is not a traditional expression of appreciation for having done something; the student does not have a choice but to answer the instructor's question. As determined by where and when the instructors use it, a "thank you" indicates that the question - answer sequence(s) with the current student are closed and another student will be asked next, or that the current exercise is finished. As such, the "thank you" also acts as a pre-sequence for the next question or next exercise.

Starting with PN's lessons, the most frequent structure of her items in third position is *repetition of answer + correct assessment.*

Excerpt 69. PN.3a.2

1	PN:	Well Jane ((Evgenija)), please answer, what day is it today
2	Evgenija:	Today it's (.) uh (0.5) <u>Wednes</u>day
3	PN:	Wednesday. Right you are.

PN begins by asking Evgenija what day it is (1), to which Evgenija provides the correct answer that it is Wednesday (2). In third position, PN repeats the answer and assesses it with one of her most frequent assessment phrases, "right you are."

Excerpt 70. PN.3b.3

1	PN:	Very well, Ivan, uh please tell me, is anybody absent today?
2	Ivan:	No (0.5) all are present
3	PN:	All are present. All right, thank you.
4		Well guys, let's have a talk as usual.

In this excerpt PN asks Ivan, the classroom monitor that day, if anybody is absent (1). He replies correctly that all students are present (2). In third position, PN repeats his answer that, "all are present," and uses another frequent assessment

word, "all right" (3). PN closes her item in third position by saying "thank you," which indicates that the current exercise is complete. This close also acts as a pre-sequence to introduce the new task, which PN does in line 4.

Also commonly used is the reverse structure *correct assessment + repetition of answer*. Rarely PN adds a "yes?" or "da?" to the repetition of the answer here. This "yes" emphasises the 'correct' assessment of the answer, while the question intonation indicates that the class has already learned this grammar construction/vocabulary item.

Excerpt 71. PN.3c.2

1	PN:	All right, well? (0.3) What time is it now, (.) Julie? ((Julija))
2	Julija:	Ah, it's (1.5) five minutes past two.
3	PN:	Right you are, pjat' minut (0.5) tret'ego.
		Right you are, five minutes (0.5) past two.

Here PN asks Julija what time it is (1), to which Julija responds that it is five minutes past two (2). In third position PN firsts assesses the answer as correct, again with "right you are," before she repeats the correct answer translated into Russian (3). By translating, PN is emphasising the correct meaning of Julija's answer for the entire class.

Excerpt 72. PN.3a.2

1	PN:	pjat' minut vos'mogo, kak sleduet po anglijski nazyvat' èto vremja,
		five minutes past seven, how do we call this time in English,
2		kto možet byt' pomnit?
		who will perhaps recall?
3	Anton:	It's five minutes
4	PN:	Pravil'no. It's five minutes.
		Correct. It's five minutes.

Just prior to this excerpt PN has been asking the students to tell the time when the clock is on the hour "sharp," but here turns to telling time with the second hand "moving." She uses a cardboard clock to change the time to five minutes past eight o'clock, and asks if anyone remembers how to answer in English (1-2).

Anton answers that the minute hand is at five minutes (3). He does not need to add "past seven" as the focus here is on the minute hand. In line 4, PN assesses his answer as "pravil'no" (correct) and repeats his answer.

Sometimes PN's third position response to a correct answer is simply a *correct assessment*.

Excerpt 73. PN.3c.3

1	PN:	Valja ((Valentin)), what time is it now?
2		(1.5)
3	Konstantin:	It's uh twenty minutes (0.5) uh (1.0) to (2.5) ten.
4	PN:	Right you are.

In excerpt 73 PN asks Valentin what the time is (1). After a pause (2), he produces a correct answer (3). Even though he has several pauses within his answer as well, PN does not claim a turn to repair the pause; he has not made any mistakes and PN gives him time to put together the correct answer. In line 4 she assesses his turn, "right you are."

Excerpt 74. PN.3a.2

1	PN:	Davajte my s vami vspomnim prilagatel'nye s pomošč'ju kotoryx
		Let's recall together the adjectives with which
2		vy možete opisat' vnešnost' čeloveka.
		you can describe a person's appearance.
	.	
	.	
	.	
3	PN:	Annie. ((Anastasija))
4	Anastasija:	Fair.
5	PN:	Very well.

This excerpt begins with PN giving instructions to the class to recall adjectives that can be used to describe a person's appearance (1-2). The vertical ellipsis represents sequences in which PN asks students one by one to provide an adjective, and in line 3 she names Anastasija as next answerer. Anastasija answers with the appropriate adjective "fair" (4), and in line 5 PN simply assesses her

answer as "very well."

Lastly, and least frequently, PN uses the following structure: *correct assessment + correct assessment*.

Excerpt 75. PN.3c.3

1	PN:	Is Alsou your favourite singer?
2	Julija:	No, Alsou is uh not my favourite singer
3	PN:	All right, very well, thank you.
4		Can you tell me, can I keep the pictures?

Here the students have been describing famous people in photographs. As a follow-up question, PN asks Julija if the Russian artist Alsou is her favourite singer (1). Julija produces a complete, grammatically correct answer in line 2. In third position, PN uses two 'assessment' phrases, "all right" and "very well," to indicate that the answer was correct, and closes the item with "thank you" (3). Again, this "thank you" indicates to the class that the current exercise is over; it is not an expression of appreciation to Julija for a correct answer. In line 4, PN asks if she can keep the pictures the students brought in, confirming that the exercise is complete.

Excerpt 76. PN.3b.3

1	PN:	Katja, ((Ekaterina)), what's the weather like today?
		.
		.
		.
2	PN:	Boris?
3	Boris:	The (.) weather is windy.
4	PN:	Okay, very well.

In excerpt 76, PN is asking some of the students in turn what the weather is like (1). In line 2 she names Boris as next speaker to describe the weather. He answers that it is windy (3), which PN assesses as correct in third position, "okay, very well" (4).

There are slight differences in how (and how often) these structures are used with boys and girls in the classroom. In PN's classes there are ten girls and ten boys overall, but there are roughly 1.5 times greater occurrence of correct question - answer sequences with the girls. This higher occurrence could be the result of any combination of factors. For example, the instructors could ask the girls easier questions than the boys (which does not appear to be the case in this study), the girls in PN's classes could be stronger language students than the boys (or at least understand the current subject matter better), the girls answer 'open' questions more frequently (and do so when they are confident in their answer), and/or PN asks the girls a greater number of questions overall. As noted above in the section on named *next speaker selection*, PN selects next speaker fairly evenly among girls and boys; as the majority of the classroom interaction is question - answer pairs, and most of these questions are directed at named students, PN's questioning practices are also fairly evenly spread among girls and boys. Based on researcher observation in the classroom, it is likely that PN's girls are slightly stronger language learners than the boys, at least for the current level being taught, and also that the girls usually answer the 'open' questions when they have a degree of confidence in the answer.[91]

PN's most frequent 'correct' assessments are *right you are, all right, okay,* and the token *mhm*, which she uses with both girls and boys. Only sometimes does she use the phrase *very well*, most of which are to assess the girls' answers. On a few occasions she uses the Russian assessments *pravil'no* (correct) and *možno (*it is possible), but only with boys. A few times she also uses *yes?* or *da?* after a repetition, and does so with girls and boys. In all of the lessons, only once does she use the praise *molodec* (roughly "well done!" or "excellent") to assess a student's answer - a girl's. PN sometimes adds *thank you* to the end of the third position assessment, indicating that the current exercise or lengthy instructor-

---

[91] It is likely that other factors contribute to the greater occurrence of correct answer sequences by girls than boys, but such a discussion is beyond the scope of this research. The focus here is on *how* the sequences are used by the instructors and male/female students, and not necessarily *why*.

student sequence is finished; however, on one occasion she says *thank you very much* to a girl in assessment of her correct answer. Of note, the potential assessment words *xorošo* or *good* are also only used by PN to indicate the end of the current exercise or the end of a chain of question - answer sequences involving one student; they are not used to assess a student's answer as being done well.

Because the girls answer more questions correctly, there are more instances of third position assessments involving girls. However, PN's assessments of correct answers are often similar for girls and boys, mostly neutral phrases such as *right you are* and *okay*. Most often the assessments are in English, but the few occasions of assessments in Russian mostly involve boys, with the notable exception of *molodec* (excellent"). This praise, as well as the more positive assessments *very well* and *thank you very much*, almost entirely involve girls.

Turning to BM, her third position items were most frequently a simple *repetition of answer*. She also sometimes inserts a sequence with instructional information to reinforce a grammar, vocabulary or pronunciation point in the correct answer.

Excerpt 77. BM.2a.2

1	BM:	Liza ((Elizaveta)), what <u>season</u> is it now?
2		(2.0)
3	Elizaveta:	It is (.) autumn.
4	BM:	It is autumn.

BM asks Elizaveta what season it is now (1). After a pause (2), Elizaveta provides the correct answer, "it is (.) autumn" (3). In line 4, BM repeats the correct answer. This repetition accepts Elizaveta's answer as being problem-free while emphasising the correct structure, meaning, and pronunciation to the entire class.

Excerpt 78 (BM.2b.2)
In line 1 BM asks an open question to the class, "what is late autumn ((in

Excerpt 78. BM.2b.2

1	BM:	Čto takoe budet late autumn?
		What is late autumn ((in Russian))?
2	Denis:	Pozdnjaja osen'=
		Late autumn=
3	BM:	=Pozdnjaja da?,
		=late yes?,
4		ne opozdavšaja, konečno, a pozdnjaja.
		not tardy, of course, but late.

Russian))?" Denis self-selects to provide the correct translation, "pozdnjaja osen'" (2). BM latches on to his answer immediately to repeat it, followed by "da?" (yes?) (3). BM is not asking the students to assess the answer by saying "yes" as well, but is emphasising that "late" is a vocabulary item that they should know. In line 4, BM inserts an instructional sequence to further emphasise the correct meaning of "late," and therefore the correctness of Denis' answer.

BM also commonly used the structure *repetition of answer + correct assessment* when assessing students' correct answers.

Excerpt 79. BM.2a.2

1	BM:	Hope? ((Nadežda))
2	Nadežda:	The first of (May) is (0.5) the (1.0) workers' day.
3	BM:	Workers' day yes.

Here BM is asking the students one by one to create a sentence based on a textbook exercise, matching dates in the first column to the relevant holiday in the second. Here BM asks Nadežda to take her turn (1). In line 2, Nadežda creates the sentence, "the first of (May) is (0.5) the (1.) workers' day." BM repeats the correct match from the second column, the "workers' day," and says "yes" to indicate that it is correct (3).

Excerpt 80. BM.2b.1

1	BM:	Yes?,
2	Antonina:	September=
3	BM:	=September, that's right.
		=September, that's right.
4		Xorošo. (0.5)
		Good. (0.5)
5		Now, exercise seventeen.

This question - answer sequence in excerpt 80 is from a larger chain of sequences with Antonina, whom BM has asked to list the months of the year in alphabetical order. In line 1 BM says, "yes?," which acts as a third position assessment for Antonina's previous correct answer, "October," but also as a question for her to continue and provide the next answer. Antonina names the month of September (2). BM latches on to her answer to repeat it and then assess it as correct, "that's right" (3). In line 4 BM says, "xorošo" (good); this is not an assessment of Antonina's answer but an indication that the exercise is finished. BM then confirms the close of the exercise by introducing the next one, exercise seventeen in the textbook (5).

Sometimes the structure was reversed as *correct assessment + repetition of answer*.

Excerpt 81. BM.2b.2

1	BM:	Porjadkovoe čislitel'noe vsegda s čem upotrebljaetsja?'
		Ordinal numbers are always used with what?
.		
.		
.		
2	BM:	Antonina.
3	Antonina:	Porjadkovye čislitel'nye upotreljajutsja s artiklem the.
		Ordinal numbers are always used with the article the.
4	BM:	Da, s opredelënnym artiklem, da?
		Yes, with the <u>definite</u> article, yes?

In excerpt 81, BM has asked an open question to the class to find out with what ordinal numbers are always used (1). In the portion represented by the vertical

ellipsis, several students speak at once to answer the question; BM tells them that they cannot just self-select, but must raise a hand to be acknowledged by the instructor. In line 2, BM selects Antonina as next answerer. Antonina answers correctly by stating that ordinal numbers are always used with the article "the" (3). In line 4, BM assesses the answer as correct with the word *yes*, and inserts an instructional sequence to emphasise that *the* is the definite article; the *yes?* at the end of her third position assessment emphasises that the students should already know this.

Excerpt 82. BM.2a.2

1	BM:	The workers' day, Carl. ((Kirill))
2	Kirill:	Den' rabočix?
		Workers' day?
3	BM:	Da, den' trudjaščixjsa.
		Yes, the workers' day.

Here BM asks Kirill to translate the holiday "the workers' day" into Russian (1). In line 2 he provides the correct translation, "den' rabočix" (day of the workers/labourers). In third position BM assesses his answer as correct with "yes," but repeats his answer with a variant Russian translation, "den' trudjaščixjsa" (day of the working persons).

Lastly, and rarely, BM uses the following structure: *repetition of answer + translation of answer (into Russian)*. In fact, she uses this structure just twice when assessing a correct answer: once for a girl and once for a boy. For the boy she also adds a *correct assessment* to the end of the item. The translation into Russian achieves a similar purpose as the other insertion sequences with 'extra' instructional information; it repeats the correct answer in its Russian translation to ensure the entire class understands the meaning.

Excerpt 83. BM.2b.2

1 BM: Lida, ((Lidija)) požalujsta.
                Lida, please.
2 Lidija: The chi- (.) the children's day.
3 BM: The children's day.
                The children's day.
4   Den' rebenka, da ved'?, den' zaščity detej my nazyvali (tot) prazdnik.
                *Day of the child, after all?, Day of the protection of children we
                called that holiday.*

In this exercise in excerpt 83, the students must identify the holiday by the date given in the textbook. In line 1 BM names Lidija as next answerer for the date June 1st. After a slight hesitation Lidija provides the correct holiday, the children's day (2). BM repeats the correct answer in English (3). However, in line 4 she inserts an instructional sequence to translate the answer into Russian; she provides a more literal translation, "day of the child," as well as the former official Russian name of the holiday, the "day of the protection of children."

Excerpt 84. BM.2b.2

1 BM: Denis.
2 Denis: The New Year.
3 BM: The New Year. Novyj god, yes, that's right.
                The New Year. New years, yes, that's right.

From the same exercise as excerpt 83, BM names Denis as next answerer (1). Denis provides the correct holiday to match January 1st, the New Year (2). In line 3, BM repeats his correct answer, translates it into Russian, and also assesses his answer as correct by adding, "yes, that's right."

Again there are slight gender differences in how these structures are used in BM's classroom. In BM's two classes there are nine girls and four boys in total, although one of the classes, BM.2b, is represented twice in the recorded and transcribed lessons.[92] There are more than twice as many girls, but on average the girls again have an approximately 1.3 times greater occurrence of correct question

---

[92] The class BM.2b has six girls and three boys.

- answer sequences per student. Again, this higher occurrence is likely the result of multiple factors. Like PN, BM selects next speaker fairly evenly among girls and boys, so it is not likely that she is simply asking the girls a greater number of questions overall. BM does not ask many 'open' questions that would allow for boys or girls to answer more frequently. Again based on researcher observation, it seems most likely that the girls in BM's classes are slightly stronger language learners than the boys, at least for the current level. As noted above, BM considers girls to be better students and seems to be harder on them: the girls answers questions correctly more frequently, but also have tougher responses from BM when they do make a mistake. The boys answer correctly slightly less frequently, but do not have lengthy and difficult repair sequences with BM when they do mistakes; instead, they get assessments like "no you are wrong."

Many of the third position items are simply a repetition of the correct answer, but when BM does use a 'correct assessment' phrase, she almost always uses one of the following: *yes*, *that's right*, *da?*, or the token *mhm*. All of these phrases are used with both girls and boys, although BM uses *yes* and *that's right* more frequently with the girls, and *da?* with the boys.[93] On one occasion BM assesses a boy's answer with *konečno* (of course), and on another she assesses a girl's answer with *pravil'no* (correct). All of these assessments of correct answers are neutral. In contrast to her negative assessments of incorrect answers, BM does not use positive or praiseful phrases such as *molodec* (excellent) or *very good* when assessing correct answers. BM rarely adds *thank you* to the end of the third position assessment, and only does so to indicate that the current exercise has finished. As with PN, *xorošo* or *good* are used to indicate the end of the current exercise, or the end of a chain of question - answer sequences involving one student, and not to indicate that the student had done well.

Overall, there are more instances of 'correct' third position assessments involving girls, and they are often simply a repetition of the correct answer. BM uses the

---

[93] The *da?* follows a repetition of the answer.

same neutral 'correct assessment' phrases for both boys and girls, although with slightly different frequencies. Most often they are in English. In general, BM is quite scrupulous in her use of assessment words, and does not praise boys or girls for correct answers.

In ST's lessons, the most frequent structure of her items in third position is *repetition of answer + correct assessment.* On only a few occasions does she add a "thank you" to the end of her third position assessment, and almost all of them with girls.

Excerpt 85. ST.1b.2

1	ST:	Togda kak ( ) vyražaemsja?
		Then how do we say ( )?
2	Natal'ja:	I like (.) the fish
3	ST:	I like the fish. Okay, thank you.
4		Nina poprobueš'?
		Nina will you try?

Natal'ja has been telling a story about a fish. When she finishes, ST asks her how to say something (1). A portion of the question is inaudible, but judging by the answer it is likely a variant of, "how do we say I like something?" In line 2, Natal'ja answers the question with the English construction, "I like (.) the fish." ST repeats Natal'ja's answer and indicates that it is correct by saying, "okay." ST closes Natal'ja's lengthy 'storytelling' turn by saying thank you, which also acts as a pre-sequence for ST to ask Nina if she would like to try next (4).

Excerpt 86. ST.1b.3

1	ST:	Alex ((Aleksej))
2	Aleksej:	Big.
3	ST:	Big. Okay.

This excerpt is taken from a game where the students must provide words that have the letter "B" in them. ST names Aleksej as first answerer (1). He provides the word "big" (2). In third position, ST repeats the answer and assesses it as

correct by saying, "okay" (3).

ST also commonly uses a simple *repetition of answer* to assess the student's turn as correct, which also emphasises the correct structure (or pronunciation, vocabulary, etc.) for the entire class.

Excerpt 87. ST.1b.3

1	ST:	I can run.
2	students:	Ja umeju begat'.
		I can run.
3	ST:	Ja umeju begat'.
		I can run.

In this exercise in excerpt 87, ST asks the class to translate the English sentence into Russian. This excerpt begins with the sentence, "I can run" (1). Multiple students provide the correct translation in Russian, "ja umeju begat'" (2). In third position, ST repeats the answer, and therefore accepts it as correct.

Excerpt 88. ST.1b.2

1	ST:	Marina, tvoja model'ka.
		Marina, your model.
2	Marina:	Is the house high?
3	ST:	Is the house high?

As part of a game already discussed in detail above, the students must create a sentence based on the grammatical model each had drawn on the board. Here ST indicates that it is Marina's turn to answer the question (1). Marina creates a sentence (2), which ST assesses as correct by repeating it (3).

Sometimes ST's third position response is composed solely of *correct assessment*, or *correct assessment + correct assessment*.

Excerpt 89. ST.1b.2

1	ST:	Your turn Saša. ((Aleksandra))
2	Aleksandra:	I have a sister.
3	ST:	Okay

This excerpt is from the same game, and in line 1 ST names Aleksandra as next 'answerer.' Aleksandra produces the sentence, "I have a sister" (2), which ST acknowledges with the assessment word "okay" (3).

Excerpt 90. ST.1b.3

1	ST:	Marina, čto ty umeeš' delat'?
		Marina, what can you do?
2	Marina:	I can sing, I can sit, I can dance, I can run, I can speak, I can jump, I can swim, I can s:peak, I can count.
3	ST:	Okay, molodec.
		Okay, excellent.

In excerpt 90 ST asks Marina what she can do; this exercise not only provides practice using verbs of action but also allows ST to check the student's knowledge. Marina produces a lengthy answer with eight verbs, although "I can speak" is repeated twice (2). In line 3 ST uses two assessment words to praise Marina's correct answer, "okay, excellent."

Lastly, and rarely, ST repeats the correct answer in both Russian and English. She only does so when the exercise is based on the translation of words and/or phrases from one language into the other. By repeating the question and answer (e.g., the English phrase and Russian translation, or vice versa), ST emphasises the correct translation for the entire class.

Excerpt 91. ST.1b.3

1	ST:	I can speak.
		.
		.
		.
2	Marina:	Ja umeju govorit'.
		I can speak.
3	ST:	Yes. I can <u>speak</u>, ja umeju razgovarivat', ja umeju r- govorit'.
		Yes. I can <u>speak</u>, I can talk, I can t- speak.

In excerpt 91, from the same task as excerpt 87, ST has provided an English sentence for the students to translate into Russian (1). The vertical ellipsis represents omitted turns not relevant to the question - answer sequence with Marina. In line 2 Marina self-selects to answer the open question, providing the correct translation, "ja umeju govorit'." In third position, ST assesses Marina's answer as correct with the assessment word "yes." She also repeats the original English sentence (i.e., the question) then translates it into Russian, providing two variants, including the one Marina had used.

As in PN's and BM's classes, there are differences in the use of these 'third position' items with the girls and boys. ST has four girls and three boys in her class, which is her only class in this study. Per student on average, the girls produce correct answers almost 1.9 times more than the boys. ST names next speaker fairly equally between girls and boys in both regular question - answer sequences and the games played. However, the girls in this class are more likely to self-select than the girls in the other instructors' classes, especially in open question sequences; they are possibly more confident and willing to speak out than the older girls, leading to a greater number of 'open' answers given. Also, the girls in ST's class all seem to be fairly strong language students for the current level being taught, while only two of the boys, Aleksej and Andrej, are fairly strong. Although the discussion here is limited to gender differences as revealed through the actual language use, the interplay of other factors such as the students' ages and confidence levels are also likely a factor in differences in their language use.

When ST uses 'correct' assessment words, she most frequently uses the neutral *okay* or the token *mhm*, and does so with both boys and girls. Sometimes she uses *right*, mostly with girls, and *da* (yes) with boys and girls. Unlike PN and BM, ST uses *xorošo* as an assessment word several times, more frequently with girls. Twice she uses *xorošo* in combination with *molodec* (excellent), which is itself used three times in total to highly praise a student's correct answer, twice for girls

and once for a boy. Like the other instructors, ST also uses *xorošo* or *thank you* as an indicator that the current task has ended. Although there are almost twice as many examples of girls answering questions correctly (and therefore receiving third position assessments), ST's third position assessments are similar for boys and girls. She mostly uses neutral phrases in English, but the higher praise of *xorošo* and *molodec* are also used, albeit with a slightly higher frequency for the girls. The assessment *right*, slightly more positive than *okay* or *mhm*, is also used more frequently with girls.

In all of the variant structures of *items in third position*, PN always uses 'correct' assessment words and usually repeats the correct answer. BM almost always repeats the correct answer and only sometimes uses assessment words. ST often repeats the answer and often uses assessment words, but sometimes does just one or the other, not both.

Overall, the most common structures of the third position assessments were:

1) *repetition of answer + correct assessment*
2) *repetition of answer*
3) *correct assessment + repetition of answer*

Rarely did the instructors translate from one language into the other in the assessments of correct answers.

In all three instructors' classes there are slight gender differences in how, and how frequently, correct question - answer sequences take place. On average per student, the girls have a greater occurrence of correct question - answer sequences than the boys. Although the assessment structures used by the instructors were similar for both boys and girls, the assessment *words* they used sometimes varied. While PN mostly used neutral phrases with both boys and girls, she sometimes used positive assessments with the girls; in fact, the only use of the high praise *molodec* (excellent) was with a girl. PN also used Russian neutral assessments

such as *pravil'no (correct)* and *možno* (it is possible), but only with boys. BM mostly repeats the correct answer and as such has fewer examples of assessment words. When she does use them, they are often neutral phrases. Although she uses them with both boys and girls, she uses *yes* and *that's right* more frequently with girls, and *da?* with boys. BM does not use positive or praiseful words such as *molodec* or *very good*. ST uses neutral assessments with both boys and girls (e.g., *okay*, *mhm*), although the slightly more positive *right* is used mostly with girls, and the neutral *da* with boys. ST also uses positive and/or praiseful assessments like *xorošo* and *molodec* slightly more frequently with girls. The use of different assessment words again shows how gender is implicitly relevant to the instructors, in this case in the third position assessment of correct answers. Although the instructors mostly use neutral phrases, there are some differences in which neutral phrases are used with the boys and which with the girls. Also, PN and ST use more positive and praiseful phrases more frequently with girls.

The underlying sequence of 'question - answer - third position assessment' is the same for all three instructors when used with boys and girls. The structure of the third position assessment, whether it includes a repetition of the answer and/or assessment words, mostly varies according to instructor;[94] the instructors use the structures with both boys and girls. However, the gender differences arise in how and how frequently the correct question - answer sequences are used. There is a greater occurrence of correct answers produced by girls than boys on average, and therefore a greater number of correct assessments of girls' turns. The words that make up the instructors' third position assessments also vary somewhat according to the gender of the student answerer. Although neutral phrases are commonly used with both boys and girls, the more positive assessments are more frequently used with girls.

---

[94] This is perhaps a reflection of different pedagogical approaches or instructor personalities.

5.5 Results of Gender and Applied CA Analysis

As presented in 1.1.2 above, there were two kinds of hypotheses relating to gender: two relating to the *instructors' gender perspectives/attitudes*, and two relating to *gender differences in language use*. For the instructors' gender perspectives, it was hypothesised that the instructors would claim that:

> 3) girls study better and are better language learners than boys;

> 4) girls are better behaved than boys, while boys interrupt and misbehave more, requiring more control.

Specifically, the instructors would claim that:

> 4a) they scold boys and tell them to be quiet more often;

> 4b) they praise the boys more often than the girls, as good behaviour and/or language achievement would be 'expected' from the girls (and less so from the boys).

For the gender differences in language use, it was hypothesised that:

> 5) the 'universal' structures of turn-taking, sequences, and repairs would apply regardless of gender;

> 6) how, and how frequently, the structures would be used by the classroom participants would vary by gender.

Specifically, it was hypothesised that:

> 6a) the boys would speak out of turn more than the girls, while the girls would wait to be named next speaker by the instructor before speaking;

> 6b) question - answer sequences with boys would require more repairs, and more translation from English to Russian, while the girls would answer more questions correctly than the boys.

As hypothesised, the following instructors' gender perspectives were found to be

true, or generally true. Hypothesis 3 was generally confirmed: two of the three instructors claimed that girls studied better than boys do, while the third felt they were probably equal; one instructor also claimed that girls were better language learners, one claimed that it depended on how the student's abilities, and one stated that boys and girls were equal. The instructors' perspectives about student behaviour (and their own responses), as outlined in hypothesis 4, were generally confirmed. All three instructors claimed that girls behaved better than boys, and that boys interrupted and misbehaved more, requiring more control. Also, two of the three instructors claimed that boys were told to be quiet more often because they spoke out of turn more frequently; the third instructor claimed that she never had to tell a student to be quiet. On the other hand, some of the specific hypotheses, 4a and 4b, were found to be less true. For hypothesis 4a, only one instructor claimed that she scolded boys more often; the other two believed they scolded whoever deserved it. Contrary to hypothesis 4b, all three instructors claimed that they praised whoever deserved it, and not boys more frequently. Observations of instructor-student interaction generally bore out these claims.

With respect to *gender differences in language use*, hypothesis 5 was confirmed; the 'universal' structures applied regardless of gender. On the other hand, hypothesis 6, was also confirmed; there were gender differences in how those structures were used. The following gender-specific differences in hypotheses 6a and 6b were confirmed as follows. As indicated in 6a, the boys did self-select and speak out of turn more than the girls, while the girls most often waited to be named next speaker by the instructor before speaking. Hypothesis 6b on question - answer sequences (boys' answers require more repairs, girls answer more questions correctly) was found to be not entirely true; the findings were more complicated than these dichotomies indicated. In the following sections the results of this gender analysis are summarised in greater detail.

5.5.1 Summary of Interviews

Both PN and BM believed that in general girls studied better than boys, and that boys were capable of studying well if they were interested or hardworking. ST, on the other hand, believed that the quality of study depended on the individual student, that is, whether or not they wanted to learn. PN believed that it was in girls' natures to be better second language learners than boys, BM believed that language learning depended on the learner's abilities, while ST believed that boys and girls were equal second language learners. All three instructors believed that girls behaved better in class than the boys, and that boys interrupted more and required more control in the classroom. PN claimed that she praised students when deserved, BM praised hardworking students more than capable students, and ST tried to praise students equally. PN also claimed that she scolded whoever deserved it, BM scolded lazy students, while ST scolded boys more for misbehaving. These pre-categorisations of boys and girls by the instructors implied that student gender was relevant to them in the classroom.

5.5.2 Summary of Questionnaires

In this section the instructors' average ratings for all girls and all boys in the study are summarised.

All girls

The average age of all girls in the study was 11.61 years. Their mark for the current year of study was 4.04. Their emotional and physical maturity was rated between *average for age* and *somewhat mature*. Their intelligence was also scored between *average* and *somewhat smart*. Their self-confidence was rated slightly above *neither insecure nor confident*. The girls were rated as *somewhat responsible*. Their behaviour was rated between *behaves somewhat well* and *behaves very well*. Their calmness was rated as between *somewhat calm* and *very calm*, and politeness as *somewhat polite*.

All boys

The average age of all boys was 11.69 years. Their mark for the current year was 3.63. Their emotional maturity was rated slightly above average for age, and physical maturity as average for age. The boys' intelligence was ranked between average and somewhat smart. Their self-confidence was rated as somewhat self-confident. They were rated as neither responsible nor irresponsible and neither behaves well nor misbehaves. Their calmness was scored as neither restless nor calm, and their politeness between neither rude nor polite and somewhat polite.

5.5.3 Summary of Applied CA Analysis

In the next two sections the results of the Applied CA gender analysis are summarised for turn-taking (named *next speaker selections*, student *self-selections*, repairs) and sequences (correct and incorrect question - answer pairs, repairs).

5.5.3.1 Turn-taking and Repairs

The turn-taking system was analysed to determine if there are any gender differences in *next speaker selection* when directed by the instructor, either by name or by gaze. All three instructors selected girls and boys as 'named next speaker' fairly equally when the ratios of *girls to boys* and *'girl' to 'boy' next speaker selections* are compared proportionately.

There are, however, discernible patterns in the selection of next speaker throughout all of the lessons. The instructors most often selected girls as first speakers in exercises. They also most often selected next speakers in clusters of girls and boys, mostly in threes and fours. Sometimes the instructors had alternating girl-boy or boy-girl patterns of speaker selection, and rarely there were 'all girl' selections in an exercise. As noted above, the patterns do not appear to

be completely random. The clusters are fairly consistent, which indicates that the instructors were orienting to the students' genders through the turn-taking system; the students were selected fairly equally between girls and boys, but were being selected in 'gender clusters.' Gender, therefore, was implicitly relevant for the instructors, as illustrated through this aspect of the turn-taking system.

Student self-selections and the instructors' responses to them were also analysed from a gender perspective. Students self-selected by answering an 'open' question, by speaking out of turn, or by raising a hand to indicate their desire to be next speaker. Only the latter two types of self-selection were analysed in the section on turn-taking, as question - answer sequences were analysed in the following section on sequences.

The students in PN's and BM's classes usually waited to speak until named by the instructor. There were only infrequent examples of out-of-turn talk and few captured examples of hand-raising. When out-of-turn talk did occur, it was most often done by one boy in each class. In ST's classes, both boys and girls spoke out of turn more frequently, especially during the games; most of the examples of hand-raising also occurred during the games. ST's class was the only one where the girls spoke out of turn about as much as the boys do. In general for all classes, the boys self-select and speak out-of-turn much more frequently than the girls; these differences can be seen as typically 'male' and 'female' speech styles for these students in this context (although as noted above, the students can choose to use either style).

Only sometimes did the instructors repair student self-selections that had resulted in interruptions and/or overlaps. When the out-of-turn talk was not disruptive, e.g., when one word in length or very quiet, it was usually ignored. On other occasions the instructors acknowledged the self-selections in order to repair the interruption or problem in comprehension. Self-selected turns can be relevant to the goals of the language classroom, and in such cases the instructors often

addressed the student to negotiate meaning; therefore, *relevant* self-selections are less 'out-of-turn.' The instructors also acknowledged self-selections when they were disruptive or persistent, sometimes just to remind the student about the appropriate 'one at a time' turn-taking system.

5.5.3.2 Sequences and Repairs

Question - answer adjacency pairs were analysed to determine if there were any gender-related trends in instructor-student sequence organisation. Included in the analysis were absent or incorrect *second pair parts* in question - answer pairs and their repair, and the instructors' use of *third position acknowledgements* in the sequences. Also included were correct question - answer pairs, again including the instructors' use of *third position acknowledgements*.

PN's lessons had relatively few examples of incorrect answers, most of which were vocabulary mistakes made by boys. PN uses items in third position to assess the mistakes, and these items can also act as initiators for student self-repairs. She rarely uses inserted question - answer sequences to negotiate a repair, but when she does so it is usually for a grammatical mistake. There are no absent second pair parts when PN has named a student as answerer, although some answers are absent during open questioning to the entire class. In such cases PN resumes her turn to repair the absent answer/turn uptake and also to attempt to initiate a student self-repair. The students sometimes have mid turn pauses during their answers, more frequently in the girls' turns; PN expands the sequence to address the difficulty in such cases, although there are no examples of lengthy or difficult insertion sequences in PN's lessons.

BM's lessons, on the other hand, have many examples of incorrect answers in question - answer sequences; the incorrect answers involve pronunciation, vocabulary and/or grammar mistakes. BM uses items in third position to assess

the mistakes and initiate repairs. Many of the incorrect question - answer pairs are long and difficult, requiring multiple sequence expansions to negotiate the repair. BM also inserts sequences for simple mistakes in short question - answer sequences, and sometimes inserts them simply to pre-empt possible mistakes. The difficult repair sequences all involve girls, during which BM sometimes gets very loud and angry. When the boys make mistakes, BM often simply tells them that they are wrong. All of the absent answers also involve girls.

In ST's lessons the boys and girls fairly equally have incorrect answers, usually due to pronunciation, vocabulary or grammar mistakes. ST uses items in third position to assess the mistakes and/or initiate student self-repairs. The students pause frequently during answers, although few answers are entirely absent; both boys and girls 'owned' the pauses and had absent answers roughly the same amount. ST also uses sequence expansions to initiate repairs of mistakes or pauses, although none of the expanded sequences are lengthy or difficult.

There are gender trends discernible in these absent or incorrect question - answer sequences and their repair. These trends seem to vary by instructor, indicating that individual instructor differences (e.g., in pedagogical approaches), and not just the students' genders, are a factor. Mistakes are mostly made by boys in PN's lessons, by girls (with difficult repair sequences) and to a lesser extent boys (with simple repair sequences) in BM's lessons, and by boys and girls fairly equally in ST's lessons. The mistakes are mostly vocabulary in PN's lessons, while in BM's and ST's lessons they are vocabulary, pronunciation and/or grammar mistakes. Girls are responsible for all of the absent answers in BM's lessons, while boys and girls are about equally responsible for absent answers in ST's lessons; PN's lessons had no examples of absent answers. There were not enough mistakes made by girls in PN's lessons to compare her third position assessments for gender differences. Gender was implicitly relevant to BM, however, as her responses to mistakes did vary according to the gender of the student. Gender was implicitly *not* relevant to ST for incorrect question - answer sequences, as she responded to

288

boys' and girls' mistakes in similar ways.

Correct question - answer pairs (i.e., those that required no repairs) were also analysed to determine how frequently the girls and boys answered correctly, as well as how the instructors used items in third position to assess their correct answers. These items included assessment words, which tell the student that their answer is accepted as correct, and/or a repetition of the correct answer, which emphasises the correct answer for the class: these are referred to below as "third position assessments." The instructors also sometimes added a "thank you" to the end of the item, which indicated that the current exercise, or current student's question - answer sequence(s), were closed; *xorošo* (good) was also used as an indicator that the current task had ended

In PN's lessons the girls had, proportionately, a 1.5 times greater occurrence of correct question - answer sequences than the boys, and therefore there were more instances of third position assessments involving girls. It is likely that PN's girls were slightly stronger language learners than the boys, at least for the current language level taught; it is also likely that the girls answered the 'open' questions when they had a degree of confidence in the answer. The structures of PN's third position assessments, from most to least frequently used, were the following:

1) *repetition of answer + correct assessment*
2) *correct assessment + repetition of answer*
3) *correct assessment*
4) *correct assessment + correct assessment*

The first two structures made up the majority of PN's third position assessments. Her 'correct assessment' words were often similar for girls and boys, mostly neutral phrases such as *right you are* and *okay*. The assessments were mostly in English. The few assessments in Russian mostly involved boys with the notable exception of the praise *molodec* (excellent) which, along with the more positive assessments *very well* and *thank you very much*, were used almost entirely with

girls.

In BM's lessons the girls had, proportionately, a 1.3 times greater occurrence of correct question - answer sequences than the boys. Again, it seems most likely that the girls in BM's classes were slightly stronger language learners than the boys, at least for the level taught. BM's third position assessments had the following structures, again from most to least frequent:

1) *repetition of answer*
2) *repetition of answer + correct assessment*
3) *correct assessment + repetition of answer*
4) *repetition of answer + translation of answer (into Russian)*

BM mostly just repeated the answer, as shown in the first structure, although she sometimes inserted sequences with instructional information to reinforce the correct answer. When she does use 'correct assessment' words, she almost always used the same neutral phrases *yes, that's right*, or *da?* (yes?) for both boys and girls, although she uses *yes* and *that's right* more frequently with girls, and *da?* more frequently with boys. She did not use positive or praiseful phrases for either boys or girls in her third position assessments.

In ST's lessons the girls had, proportionately, a 1.9 times greater occurrence of correct question - answer sequences than the boys. The girls in ST's class were all fairly strong language students for the current level being taught, while only two of the three boys were fairly strong. ST's third position assessments had the following structures, from most to least frequently used:

1) *repetition of answer + correct assessment*
2) *repetition of answer*
3) *correct assessment* (or *correct assessment* + correct *assessment*)
4) *repetition of answer + translation*

The first two structures were most often used. When ST used 'correct' assessment words, they were most often neutral phrases used with both boys and girls, e.g., *okay* or *right*, although there were some slight differences in the frequency of use between them. ST also used higher praise like *xorošo* and *molodec* (excellent) on a few occasions, slightly more frequently with girls; unlike the other two instructors, ST used the more positive *xorošo* (good) as an assessment word and not just as an indicator that the current task had ended.

The underlying sequence of '*question - answer - third position assessment*' applied in all cases, whether the student involved was a girl or boy. The structure of the third position assessment itself, whether it included a repetition of the answer and/or 'correct assessment' words, mostly varied according to instructor; the instructors each used their own common structures with both boys and girls. However, there *were* gender differences in the frequency of correct question - answer sequences, and in the 'correct assessment' words used in the third position assessments. There was a greater occurrence of correct answers produced by girls than boys on average, and therefore a greater number of correct assessments of girls' turns. Also, although neutral phrases were commonly used with both boys and girls (although with some difference in choice of neutral phrases), the more positive assessments were more frequently used with girls; these differences in the 'correct assessment' words used imply that gender was at least somewhat relevant to the instructors when assessing correct answers.

5.5.4 Discussion of Gender Perspectives

To begin, I discuss the relevance of gender to the participants, after which I compare the instructors' gender perspectives to the results of the Applied CA gender analysis. All three instructors 'pre-categorised' students according to gender in various aspects of ability and behaviour, implying that gender in the classroom was relevant to them. Gender was also implicitly, and at times explicitly, relevant to the participants at various times throughout the interactions.

It was implicitly relevant to the instructors as illustrated by the 'gender cluster' patterns of naming next speaker. Self-selections were shown to be a 'male' speech style, while waiting to be named next speaker was a 'female' speech style; the students could choose either style, however, as shown by Marina who frequently self-selected and those boys who always waited to be named next speaker. The students' choices showed that they were either accepting or rejecting a speech style associated with one gender. Gender was also sometimes implicitly relevant to the instructors in question - answer sequences. For incorrect answers, BM's responses varied according to the gender of the student, although ST's responses were similar for both boys and girls. There were not enough examples of girls' mistakes in PN's classes for a gender comparison of her responses. For correct answers, the instructors mostly used neutral phrases in their third position assessments, although the actual phrases used varied somewhat by gender of the student; also, PN and ST used positive phrases more frequently with girls.

Explicit references to gender were also made in the interaction. In BM.2a.2 (excerpt 92 below), the class was discussing various holidays that are associated with women or men in Russia. BM addressed her question about Women's Day to the girls. She pointed at herself and me, saying we were 'women,' and pointed at the girls, saying they were 'girls.' The ellipsis represents further negotiation of the proper Russian translation of Women's Day. Not once did BM even look at Kirill until line 23, after which she asks him when Victory Day[95] is, a holiday especially in honour of Veterans (traditionally men in the Soviet Union and now Russia). While gender can simply be a topic of study in the classroom and not relevant to the actual interaction, here BM has addressed *only* the girls while discussing "Women's Day." This is, therefore, an important instance of the relevance of gender.

---

[95] The Victory Day holiday celebrates the defeat of Germany in World War II and honours those who took part in the war.

Excerpt 92. BM.2a.2

1	BM:	when do we have uh Women's Day?
2		(1.0)
3		((addresses the girls)) Čto značit Women's Day?
		What does Women's Day mean?
4		One woman, I am a woman ((holds up a finger, points to self))
5		You are girls, ((points to girls))
6		I am a woman ((points to self))
7		Carole is a woman ((points))
8		Many <u>women</u>.
9		(0.5)
10		Čto èto značit?
		What does it mean?
11		(2.0)
12		<u>I am a woman</u> ((points to self))
13		and Carole is a <u>woman</u>. ((points))
14		(0.5)
15		<u>You are</u> girls ((points to girls))
16		(2.0)
17		Čto èto značit? <u>Vy</u> kto?
		What does it mean? <u>You</u> are who?
18	Elizaveta:	Devočki
		Girls
19	BM:	Devočki. A Carole i ja, kak nas nužno nazyvat', esli my po starše?
		Girls. And Carole and I, what do you call us if we are older?
20	Larisa:	[[Ženščiny
		[[Women
21	Nadezda:	[[Ženščiny
		[[Women
22	BM:	Ženščiny da?
		Women yes?
	.	
	.	
	.	
23		((looks at Kirill for first time since line 3)
24	BM:	Kirill (.) and when do we have (.) Victory's Date? ((Victory Day))

There were also implicit and explicit references to gender in PN's classes. For the exercise in PN.3a.2 where the students were required to bring in photographs of people to describe, the girls all brought photographs of women and the boys brought photographs of men. Also, PN divided the students into teams of girls and boys to sing alternating verses of a song. In ST's lessons, there were also moments when ST and/or the students were explicitly orienting to gender. ST referred to the girls as "devočki" (girls) on a few occasions. ST also discussed a

known story about Miss Chatter, the Miss referring explicitly to a woman. Also in ST's class, the students asked for vocabulary help in the English translations of "devočka" (girl), "mal'čik" (boy), "mužčina" (man), and "ženščina" (woman). Gender was relevant at many points in the classroom interaction, and also relevant in the instructors' attitudes to students, whether implicitly or explicitly. Whether or not gender was 'omnirelevant' here is debatable, but it certainly was frequently relevant to the participants in the interaction.

The instructors' gender perspectives, as derived from the interviews and questionnaires, were discussed in section 5.3; they are summarised here. PN's attitude to girls, both those in her current classes and in the classroom in general, was positive. She claimed that girls were better students and language learners, and she rated their intelligence slightly higher than the boys. She also claimed that girls behaved better than boys, and rated them as more responsible, calmer, more polite, and more emotionally and physically mature than the boys. PN's attitude to the boys was slightly more mixed, ranging from slightly negative (e.g., behaviour) to somewhat positive (e.g., intelligence). She believed that boys only studied well if they were interested in the subject matter. She also claimed that boys required more control and interrupted more in the classroom, requiring constant supervision.

BM's attitude toward the girls in the study, and girls in the classroom, was also generally positive. She believed that girls studied well, were hardworking and well behaved, and she rated them as slightly calmer, more polite, and more responsible than the boys. BM's attitude to the boys was slightly mixed, ranging from slightly negative (e.g., behaviour, laziness) to somewhat positive (e.g., intelligence). She believed that boys could be capable but were hindered by laziness. She claimed that boys interrupted more and required more control.

ST's attitude toward the girls, both in the study and in the classroom in general, was mostly positive. Although she claimed that boys and girls were equal students

and language learners, she rated the girls' intelligence slightly higher than the boys'. She believed that girls behaved very well, and rated them as more polite and emotionally mature than the boys. ST's attitude to the boys was slightly more negative. She responded negatively to all of the behaviour-related questions: boys behaved poorly, were 'completely disobedient,' and required more control.

In general, all three instructors had positive attitudes about girls in the classroom, and mixed attitudes about boys, ranging from slightly negative (e.g., behaviour) to slightly positive (e.g., intelligence) depending on the category. Next their gender perspectives are compared with the results of the Applied CA gender analysis from section 5.4, to determine if the data confirm or contradict each other. The result will be greater insight into the instructors' real gender perspectives.

As seen in the analysis of the primary data, all three instructors selected girls and boys as next speaker fairly equally when a proportionate comparison was done. PN and ST both claimed in the interviews that they posed questions to boys and girls equally, or at least try to; BM claimed that she asked strong students first and then questioned the weaker students more. As the majority of the classroom discourse was based on question - answer sequences with named *next speaker selection* done by the instructor, the instructors did in fact pose questions to boys and girls fairly equally (although not necessarily to all individual students equally). However, the instructors *did* orient to the students' genders through the turn-taking system. They selected next speaker in 'gender' clusters, mostly in threes and fours, but sometimes in boy-girl (or girl-boy) alternating patterns and on a few occasions in 'all girl' clusters. Also, girls were usually selected as first speakers in exercises. These patterns were fairly consistent throughout all the lessons, again implying that gender was relevant to the instructors when they were naming next speaker.

Looking at *student self-selections* and out-of-turn talk, the students usually waited to speak only when named by the instructor. In PN's and BM's classes boys were

responsible for most out-of-turn talk when it did occur, while in ST's class both girls and boys spoke out-of-turn; overall the boys self-selected to speak out of turn much more than the girls did. Self-selecting, then, can be seen as a 'male' speech style in these classes, while waiting to be named next speaker can be seen as a 'female' speech style. In the interviews, all three instructors claimed that boys interrupt and speak out of turn more. The only discrepancy between the primary CA data and the instructors' claims was in ST's class, with boys and girls speaking out of turn about the same amount. Marina was responsible for most of the girls' out-of-turn talk in ST's class, and she can be seen as using a 'male' style of speech.

Turning to the analysis of question - answer sequences, PN's lessons had relatively few examples of incorrect answers, most of which were vocabulary mistakes made by boys. No second pair parts were entirely absent when a student was named next speaker, although there were examples of mid turn pauses, which were mostly done by girls. The girls also had a 1.5 times greater occurrence of correct answers than the boys did. When PN assessed the correct answers, she mostly used neutral assessment words, although the occasions of more positive assessments were almost entirely involved girls. PN believed that girls studied better and were better language learners; although the fact that the boys made more mistakes and the girls answered more questions correctly is not sufficient evidence to confirm these beliefs irrefutably, it does support them.

BM's lessons had many examples of vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar mistakes made by boys and girls. *All* of the lengthy and difficult expanded question - answer sequences involved girls, during which BM sometimes got very loud and angry. In contrast, when the boys made mistakes they were often simply told that they were wrong. All of the absent answers involved girls, likely explained by BM's intimidating approach to the repair of girls' mistakes. The girls also had a 1.3 times greater occurrence of correct answers. When BM assessed correct answers, she used neutral words for both boys and girls. She

believed that girls studied better than boys because they were harder working, and it seemed she was harder on them when they did make mistakes. She believed that boys were capable but lazy, perhaps expecting that they would make mistakes as a result, and therefore was easier on them. Her beliefs, therefore, seemed to influence her language behaviour in the classroom.

ST's lessons also had many examples of vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar mistakes made by both boys and girls. Few answers were entirely absent, and mid turn pauses were also 'owned' by boys and girls. The girls had a 1.9 times greater occurrence of correct answers than the boys did. ST's third position assessment were usually neutral for boys and girls, although the instances of positive or praiseful assessment words were used more frequently with girls. ST believed, with some degree of uncertainty, that boys and girls studied and learned languages equally well. While mistakes in her class were made roughly equally by boys and girls, correct answers were given almost twice as frequently by girls. With this in mind, and considering that the girls in her class had higher marks than the boys on average, it is possible that ST gave what she considered egalitarian answers in the interviews about who studies and learns languages better.

To sum up, PN claimed that she had a positive gender attitude toward girls, which was generally supported by the Applied CA gender analysis of the primary data (e.g., the girls' language behaviours and PN's responses to them). PN oriented to the students' genders in the turn-taking system, although she named next speaker fairly equally between the genders. The girls usually did not self-select to speak out of turn. They made very few mistakes in her lessons, and answered questions correctly proportionately more frequently than the boys did. Also, PN's assessments of the girls' correct answers were often neutral but sometimes positive. PN claimed that she had a 'mixed' gender attitude toward boys, ranging from slightly negative to slightly positive, which was also generally supported by the analysis of the primary data. For example, the boys spoke out of turn and

answered questions incorrectly more frequently than the girls (slightly negative), but in general they spoke only when named and made few mistakes (slightly positive).

BM also claimed that she had a positive gender attitude toward girls, which was somewhat supported by the analysis of the primary data. Like PN, she oriented to the students' genders in the turn-taking system while naming next speaker fairly equally between the genders. The girls did not speak out of turn. They answered questions correctly proportionately more frequently than the boys did, although when they did BM was not positive or praiseful in her assessments. Also, when the girls made mistakes BM was frequently very hard on them, perhaps because she expected them to work harder (and therefore do better). She claimed to have a somewhat negative/somewhat positive attitude toward boys, depending on the category. Again, the analysis of the primary data somewhat supported this claim. The boys did speak out of turn more frequently than the girls. She was easier on them when they made mistakes, which they did more often than the girls, but again she did not use positive assessments when they answered correctly.

ST claimed her gender attitude toward girls was mostly positive (sometimes neutral), which was supported by the analysis of the primary data. She oriented to the students' genders in the turn-taking system, naming next speaker fairly equally between the genders. The girls usually spoke only when named next speaker. The girls made mistakes roughly as frequently as the boys did, but they answered questions correctly almost twice as much. ST's claimed attitude toward boys was slightly more negative (sometimes neutral). The boys spoke out of turn more frequently than the girls did, apart from Marina who had a tendency to use a 'male' speech style when it came to self-selections. The boys made about the same amount of mistakes as the girls did, but had about half the occurrence of correct answers. For both boys and girls ST used neutral assessments of correct answers, while slightly positive assessments were used only with girls.

6 Conclusion

The focus of this dissertation has been the analysis of classroom interaction using a Conversation Analytic framework. The data are comprised of transcripts from video recorded lessons at a language school for children in the Urals region of Russia. The Applied CA analysis included three main features of the interaction: the turn-taking system, the sequential organisation of talk, and repairs; these aspects of the discourse were also discussed in terms of possible constraints from the institutional nature of the setting. The gender analysis included a discussion of the instructors' gender perspectives as derived from secondary data sources, and from further Applied CA analysis of the classroom interaction.

In the next section I briefly summarise the findings presented in this dissertation, discuss the application of the CA methodology to the study of classroom interaction, and conclude with suggestions for future research.

6.1 Summary of Results

In this research I set out to produce a detailed turn-by-turn analysis of the data that shows the institutionality of the interaction. I also analysed the instructors' interviews and 'student assessment' questionnaires to determine the instructors' gender perspectives; this showed that they generally had positive attitudes toward girls, and mixed attitudes toward boys. Further turn-by-turn analysis showed that while the underlying sequences, the universal 'rules' of interaction, applied to interactions with both boys and girls, *how* (and *how frequently*) the sequences were used did vary by gender (i.e., typically 'male' and 'female' speech styles). Also, some of the organisation of talk showed that the instructors did orient to the students' genders in the classroom.

This detailed turn-by-turn analysis was time-consuming and some aspects of it were challenging. The CA transcription of the lessons was painstakingly slow,

and was impeded by not having a second videocamera trained on the students, which would have provided extra visual clues about the interaction. The turn-by-turn analysis of data as context-shaped and context-renewing was also not uncomplicated. To carry out such an analysis required a continually spiralling examination of the data, which for each utterance involved scrutinising what had occurred in previous turns, determining how the speakers had interpreted those turns themselves and therefore what action they were trying to accomplish in the current turn, examining how the turn was interpreted and acted upon by other interactants in later turns, and finally, to check this analysis, looking at how the speakers themselves treated the interactants' interpretations of their turns, such as correcting a misinterpretation in a following turn. In some turns it was more readily apparent what the interactants were accomplishing; however, in the more complicated instances the spiral examination of a single turn could produce competing interpretations, each of which required further examination in order to be accepted or rejected.

It was extremely difficult to find any teaching facility (and instructors) that would consider even the idea of allowing a foreigner to videotape its classes in order to carry out this research. The region in which the research was conducted had been a closed military zone in Soviet times, and therefore no foreigners had been allowed to travel there without special dispensation. Therefore, I was the first foreigner most of the local people had ever met, and I was at the same time a curiosity and a source of suspicion.

This research is the first ever study of classroom interaction in Russia, and in fact the first study of institutional interaction in its entirety in Russia, from a Conversation Analytic standpoint.[96] The analysis of turn-taking in a Russian classroom showed that the underlying *rules* or guidelines of interaction are the same as those found in studies of other languages: one speaker at a time, no gaps,

---

[96] As noted above, Bolden (2004) has published a CA study of Russian 'ordinary conversation.'

no overlaps. Discipline plays an obvious role in this kind of language-teaching methodology. Presumably, if the instructor does not have control of the class and therefore of the turn-taking system, there will be more instances of 'broken rules,' e.g., more overlaps and more repairs as a result of behavioural lapses. The sequences in the data, such as greetings or questions - answers, also have the same structures as found in other languages, and repairs are achieved through similar fashions. Therefore the organisation of talk in this data can be seen to follow potentially universal underlying *rules*.

Next I briefly summarise the findings from chapter 4. The *discourse behaviour* hypothesised in section 1.1.2 was confirmed as follows. 1) Both instructors and students oriented to their institutional roles; and 2) the institutional setting constrained the organisation of interaction in these data, including turn-taking, sequences and repairs; both were confirmed. In section 4.1 on turn-taking, it was shown that the instructors maintained the constraints on the turn-taking system, confirming hypothesis 2a. The interactional *rules* of 'one speaker at a time, no gaps, no overlaps,' were skilfully negotiated throughout much of the data, any difficulties most often addressed through some form of instructor intervention; such difficulties included interruptions, overlaps, absent turns, and lengthy pauses, etc. (also discussed in section 4.3 on repair organisation). The instructors always had a reserved right to speak, and could claim turns at any point in the interaction, even if this 'broke' the rule of no overlapping. Also as hypothesised in 2a, most frequently next speakers were selected by the instructors. As per hypothesis 2b, it was determined that the instructors also controlled the overall structure of the interaction. Also discussed in section 4.3, Hypothesis 2c, indicating that the instructors most often initiated repairs, was also confirmed; the repairs were most often actualised by the students, i.e., they were *other-initiated self-repairs*. A core sequence of instructor-initiated student self-repairs was determined. The instructors determined which utterances were repairables, including those that could be seen as absent, and also whether or not the student self-repairs had been successful. Also as per 2c, when a student overlapped the

instructor, the instructor most often regained, or maintained, control of the turn to repair the overlap.

Adjacency pairs were analysed in section 4.2 on sequence organisation. Common underlying structures were determined for adjacency pair sequences such as greeting - greeting, invitation - acceptance / refusal, and question - answer. Core greeting sequences were preceded by pre-sequences that set conditions for the following (chained) greeting pair(s). The core sequence was usually closed with a pre-sequence indicating the next action to be undertaken. "Command" invitations from the instructors had to be accepted by the students; the second pair parts, the acceptance, were often non-verbal, the required actions simply carried out by the students. Invitation - acceptance pairs were sometimes chained to break down a larger task into smaller invitations, to ensure proper *acceptance* through the students' actions. Students also interpreted pre-invitations as core invitations once a pattern had been established, and immediately produced the second pair parts of the implied invitations.

Question - answer sequences traditionally comprise a large part of classroom discourse, and so if the turn-taking system is considered more important as the *foundation* of the interaction, further research would be required to determine whether question - answer sequences could possibly be more important for the process of language learning. No matter the outcome of such a study, question - answer sequences are still achieved through the skilful negotiation of turn-taking.

Question - answer pairs were found throughout the data, forming a large portion of the classroom interaction. When posed by an instructor, the first pair part *question* required a second pair part *answer*; when these second pair parts were absent, the instructors initiated repairs, sometimes inserting lengthy sequence expansions, to help the students negotiate the correct answers. The instructors had the right to chain multiple question - answer pairs. In the rare instances when the question was posed by a student, the instructor's second pair part was not

mandatory; the question could be ignored or treated as a repairable, and in such cases the instructor would initiate a student self-repair. Some question - answer pairs were also preceded by pre-sequences, themselves questions and answers, to prepare for the core sequence question(s). Key in the question - answer sequence were the items in third position, where the instructors acknowledged the students' answers, assessed their correctness, and if necessary, initiated repairs.

As discussed in section 4.4 on the results of the Applied CA analysis, the turn-taking system, the organisation of sequences, and the initiation and progression of repairs are accomplished simultaneously and continuously in classroom interaction; it is impossible to extricate sequences and repairs from turn-taking. Through managing talk, adhering to institutional constraints on the interaction, and demonstrating their orientations to institutional identities and goals, the interactants are creating the social order of the institution.

Despite the fact that the results here are what I expected them to be,[97] and also as they are what most language instructors probably experience in any country and teaching any language if they use a similar language-teaching methodology, this research is nevertheless a valuable contribution to the growing corpus of CA data. It reinforces the results of CA based on data from other studies of language classrooms, for example Koshik's study of the teaching of ESL writing skills to international students at an American university (Koshik 2000). As in Koshik's CA study, the instructors in this study used "known-answer" teacher turns, specifically the RPQ and the DIU, to assist student performance; these findings reinforce the potential 'universality' of Koshik's results in other languages (and cultures), levels of education, institution type, and teaching methodologies. As well, it reinforces the findings of other CA classroom studies in general, such as McHoul's 1978 study of high-school classroom interactions (McHoul 1978). In all of the CA studies of classroom interaction that I found, the researchers focused

---

[97] See the preliminary hypotheses as outlined in section 1.1.2 and the discussion of results in sections 4.4 and 5.4.

on interaction in the Western tradition of education (e.g., McHoul 1978 and 1990; Koshik 2000; Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain 2003). Where comparable, the data provided in those studies can be seen to fit the various sequences outlined here, despite the differences, for example, in the ages of participants, language ability, classroom settings (e.g., school vs. university level), and culture, or in the different focuses of the studies, such as pedagogical consequences of discourse choices in the classroom (e.g., Koshik 2000) as compared to the institutionality of interaction, as discussed here.

Next I summarise the gender results from chapter 5. The hypotheses relating to the *instructors' gender perspectives,* outlined in 1.1.2 and discussed in 5.5, can be summarised as follows. Hypothesis 3 was generally confirmed, as two of the three instructors claimed that girls were better students, while the third claimed that girls and boys were equal; however, only one teacher claimed that girls were better language learners. Hypothesis 4 was also generally confirmed: all three instructors claimed that girls behaved better than boys, although only two claimed that boys were told to be quiet more often. In contrast, the specific hypotheses 4a and 4b were found to be less true: only one instructor claimed to scold boys more often (4a), while all three claimed to praise whoever deserved it (4b).

The instructors' gender perspectives, based on the interviews and questionnaires, were analysed in sections 5.1 through 5.3. PN's gender attitude toward girls in the classroom in general, and the girls in her current classes, was positive. She rated the girls from *somewhat* to *very* above average in the questionnaire categories, and in the interviews indicated that girls were better students and language learners than boys. She also believed that girls behaved better and were more mature and responsible than boys. Her attitude toward boys, those in her classes and in general, was more mixed. Although she rated the boys in her classes from neutral to *somewhat* positive, she believed that boys studied well only if they found the subject interesting. She also believed that they misbehaved, requiring constant supervision and control.

BM's attitude toward girls was generally positive. She rated the girls in her classes from neutral to *somewhat* positive in the questionnaires. She believed that girls were harder working and could therefore achieve greater results. She also believed that they behaved better, and were more emotionally mature and responsible than boys. Her attitude toward boys was mixed. Her interview responses about boys in general were somewhat negative; she believed that boys could be capable but were lazy, misbehaved and required more control. She rated the boys in her classes from slightly negative to slightly positive. On average she rated them slightly more intelligent than the girls, more self-confident and physically mature, but also as behaving worse and being less responsible.

ST's attitude toward girls was also mostly positive. She rated the girls in her class from *neutral/somewhat* to *very* positive in all of the questionnaire categories except self-confidence. She believed the girls behaved very well and were more emotionally mature and polite. In contrast, her attitude toward boys was slightly negative. In both the interviews and questionnaires she indicated that boys misbehaved and required control, even receiving marks for behaviour; she believed it would be a "nightmare" if boys were not tightly controlled. However, she believed that boys and girls studied and learned languages equally well; therefore her attitudes were neutral/egalitarian about boys' and girls' learning abilities, positive about girls' behaviour, and negative about boys' behaviour.

The hypotheses relating to the *gender differences in language use*, also outlined in 1.1.2 and discussed in 5.5, were confirmed as follows. The 'universal' structures of turn-taking, sequences and repairs were found to apply regardless of gender, as predicted in hypothesis 5. On the other hand, as per hypothesis 6, there were indeed gender differences in how, and how frequently, those structures were used. The boys spoke out of turn more frequently than the girls, who in turn most often waited to be selected as next speaker by the instructor, as hypothesised in 6a. However, hypothesis 6b on question - answer sequences (boys requiring more repairs; girls answering more questions correctly) was not entirely confirmed; the

findings were more complex than a binary distinction can illustrate.

The primary data, the classroom interaction, was analysed from an Applied CA perspective in section 5.4. All three instructors selected boys and girls fairly equally as 'named' next speaker. However, the instructors did orient to the students' genders in their patterns of naming. The students were mostly named in 'gender' clusters of threes and fours, although sometimes just in girl-boy or boy-girl alternations. Girls were also usually selected first in exercises. These patterns were fairly consistent throughout all the lessons of all the instructors. Boys were responsible for most out-of-turn talk, self-selecting much more than the girls did; however, in ST's lessons both boys and girls (especially Marina) spoke out of turn fairly equally.

In PN's lessons there were few examples of incorrect answers, although most of the mistakes were made by boys, and there were no examples of absent answers (when a student had been named). Also, the girls answered questions correctly with a 1.5 times greater occurrence than the boys. When PN used 'correct assessment' words in third position assessments, they were mostly neutral, although almost all of the examples of more positive words involved girls.

BM's lessons had many examples of mistakes made by boys and girls. However, all of the lengthy and difficult 'repair' sequence expansions involved girls. Boys were often simply told they were wrong. All of the absent answers involved girls as well. The girls had a 1.3 times greater occurrence of correct answers, although BM used neutral 'assessment' words for both boys and girls.

ST's lessons also had many examples of mistakes made by boys and girls. Boys and girls were both responsible for absent answers and mid turn pauses as well. In contrast, the girls had a 1.9 times greater occurrence of correct answers. ST's 'assessment' words were usually neutral, although the examples of positive or praiseful words were used more frequently with girls.

Gender was also found to be frequently relevant to the participants. In the interviews the instructors all pre-categorised students according to gender. Gender was shown to be relevant to the instructors through the turn-taking system, specifically the naming of next speaker. The boys self-selected and spoke out of turn more often than the girls did, indicating 'male' and 'female' speech styles in self-selections. Gender was also shown to be relevant to the instructors, in varying degrees, as shown through their third position assessments of correct and incorrect question - answer sequences. Explicit references to gender were also made in the lessons, for example dividing the class into teams of boys and girls, or using the boys and girls to differentiate gender-related vocabulary.

These results contribute to the corpus of recent language and gender studies that focus on the 'local' analyses of linguistic features that can index gender, while "acknowledging the diversity of male and female speech styles" (Schleef 2008: 515). As other researchers have also shown (e.g., Saunston 2007; Davies 2005), specific linguistic features in this study are used in different ways and/or with different frequency by boys and girls; the instructors also draw on specific linguistic features differently in relation to boys and girls. These results also contribute specifically to the growing corpus of language and gender studies that use a conversation analytic approach to investigate male and female speech styles through the turn-by-turn organisation of talk; the challenge in such studies is to show how gender is relevant, whether explicitly or implicitly, to the participants (e.g., Speer 2002; Weatherall 2002). Lastly, the results especially contribute to the study of Russian gender linguistics (e.g., Sharonov 1999; Grenoble 1999), and particularly the study of Russian gender linguistics in an academic setting (e.g. Mills 1999c). As Sharonov noted in his study, "although there is no clearly differentiated women's and men's language (or even jargon) evidenced in contemporary spoken Russian, this study of Russian communicatives has helped to isolate *preferential tendencies* of usage by female and male speakers" (Sharonov 1999: 163; his italics). This dissertation also isolated preferential tendencies of usage by female and male speakers.

6.2 Implications of this Research

As the first CA study of classroom interaction in Russia, this research not only reinforces the results of previous CA studies, but also provides a foundation for the future elaboration of universally-favoured language classroom interactional strategies. Research has shown that teacher talk dominates classroom interaction, mostly through question - answer sequences and instructional talk, although such a teacher-dominated interactional strategy is not necessarily the most effective method of interaction for student learning. A greater detailed understanding of classroom interactions (including the role of gender and/or 'male' and 'female' speech styles in those interactions), as provided by the growing corpus of CA research, along with further studies on the effect of teachers' interactional practices on student learning, would only contribute to pedagogical training.

A logical next step in the research reported here would be to compare and contrast the *universals* of classroom interactions with the *universals* of interactions in other institutional settings, and again to analyse those universals from a gender perspective to determine whether their use varies according to the genders of the interactants. Such comparative research would only increase the validity of the claims of universal guidelines underlying the organisation of institutional interaction, and would also contribute to the findings of CA as a whole.

I suggest that further data of classroom interactions be collected to compare and/or contrast the findings of this research. To determine whether 1) Russian classroom interaction in general follows the same underlying guidelines as those found here, and/or 2) the 'male' and 'female' speech styles (including how the instructors' verbal behaviour produces gender-specific communication styles) outlined in this study can be found (or not) in other classrooms, the same research questions used in this study should be utilised with data collected in a variety of educational settings in Russia:

1) Various language-learning facilities, e.g., typical state-run schools, lyceums, special English schools, private language schools, technical institutes, universities.

2) Differing student ages and stages of language-learning. Some schools start language-teaching in primary grades, and presumably in large cities younger children can be sent to private nurseries or kindergartens in the target language. Some languages are mostly, if not only, available at the university level, such as Turkish or Japanese.

3) Instructor gender. This study only engaged female instructors; gender relations may look different with a male instructor.

4) Different regions. Large cosmopolitan cities have more native speakers of target languages, foreign businesses, greater access to foreign language materials, and instructors who have learned the target language with at least some native-speaker contact, while small provincial towns and villages do not have as much, if any, of the above language-learning materials or accesses.

5) Different languages, e.g., French and German classes in Russia.

Conducting research in settings that combine a variety of such factors would lend weight to the potentially universal 'rules' of interaction outlined in this research, which, as noted previously, was carried out in private language school for children. Most of the children who participated in the study were 10-12 years old and had already started learning English in public school classes, although some had studied German instead, depending on the local public school they attended. The language school officially offered English, German and French language training, although there was no demand for learning German or French, let alone an instructor available to teach either language. The location was a small provincial town that had no amenities, simply apartment blocks, peasant houses, and a factory. Without travelling to a large city, there was no chance to watch English language movies or read English language books, let alone speak with a

native speaker. The three instructors had learned their English in school and two received pedagogical training at regional universities (the third having had no pedagogical training); only one of them had ever spoken English with a native speaker prior to my arrival at the school. Some degree of similarity in teaching methodologies across the country may well have been inherited from the Soviet period, although the quality of language-teaching may be expected to vary greatly.

If similar organisational structures and sequences can be found across diverse educational settings in Russian, and if the use of those structures and sequences vary according to student gender (and perhaps instructor gender) in similar ways as in this study, then the conclusions reached in this research can be seen as valid for Russian classroom interaction. I also suggest that research be carried out in classroom settings outside Russia, and in different languages, to contribute to the existing body of research in this area, and further support the findings for universal structures. As well, it would be of interest to carry out comparative research in classrooms guided by other teaching methodologies, such as classes in which computers play a large role in language learning, or classes where the language learning is communicative rather than grammar- and translation-based. It would also be of interest to analyse classroom interactions from a CDA perspective, given the inherent 'power' relationship that exists between instructor and students. Finally, I propose posing other research questions to the data collected here, such as how code-switching[98] between Russian (L1) and the target language English (L2) is used in the classroom, especially for the initiation and progression of repairs. There are many avenues of interest in which to further develop the results of this dissertation.

---

[98] Code-switching is the alternation between two languages in the course of an interaction by speakers who have knowledge of both languages.

310

Bibliography

Adelsward, V., & Nilholm, C. (2000). Who is Cindy? Aspects of identity work in a teacher-parent-pupil talk at a special school. *Text, 20*(4), 545-568.

Adelsward, V., & Sachs, L. (1998). Risk discourse: Recontextualization of numerical values in clinical practice. *Text, 18*(2), 191-210.

Arminen, I. (2000). On the context sensitivity of institutional interaction. *Discourse & Society, 11*(4), 435-458.

Atkinson, J. M., & Drew, P. (1979). *Order in Court: The Organization of Verbal Interaction in Judicial settings.* . London: MacMillan.

Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Auer, P. (1995). Context and contextualization. In J. Verschueren, J.-O. Ostman & J. Blommaert (Eds.), *Handbook of Pragmatics* (pp. 1-19). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Basturkmen, H. (2000). The organization of discussion in university settings. *Text, 20*(3), 259-270.

Batters, J. (1986). Do boys really think languages are just girl-talk? *Modern Languages, 67*(2), 75-79.

Baxter, J. (2002). Competing discourses in the classroom: A Post-structuralist Discourse Analysis of girls' and boys' speech in public contexts. *Discourse & Society, 13*(6), 827-842.

Billig, M. (1999). Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in Conversation Analysis. *Discourse & Society, 10*, 543-558.

Blommaert, J. (1997). Whose background? Comments on a discourse-analytic reconstruction of the Warsaw Uprising. *Pragmatics, 7*(1), 69-81.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1997). Discourse Pragmatics. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies - A multidisciplinary introduction - Vol. 2: Discourse as Social Interaction* (pp. 38-63). Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications.

Bolden, G. (2004). The quote and beyond: defining boundaries of reported speech in conversation Russian. *Journal of Pragmatics, 36*, 1071-1118.

Boyd, M. P., & Rubin, D. L. (2002). Elaborated student talk in an elementary ESoL classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English, 36*(4), 495-530.

Byrnes, H. (2009). Systemic-functional reflections on instructed foreign language acquisition as meaning-making: An introduction. *Linguistics and Education, 20*, 1-9.

Cameron, D. (1997). Theoretical Debates in Feminist Linguistics: Questions of Sex and Gender. In R. Wodak (Ed.), *Gender and Discourse* (pp. 21-36). Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications.

Cameron, D. (2005). Relativity and its discontents: Language, gender, and pragmatics. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 2*(3), 321-334.

Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning.* London: Heinmann Educational Books.

Chilton, P., & Schaffner, C. (1997). Discourse and Politics. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies - A multidisciplinary introduction - Vol. 2: Discourse as Social Interaction* (pp. 206-230). Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications.

Christensen, J. L. (1999). A gender linguistic analysis of Mrozek's *Tango*. In M. Mills (Ed.), *Slavic Gender Linguistics* (pp. 39-56). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Cicourel, A. (1972). Basic and normative rules in the negotiation of status and rule. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction* (pp. 229-258). New York: Free Press.

Coates, J. (1986a). *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Sex Differences in Language*. New York: Longman.

Coates, J. (1986b). Language and sex. In *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Sex Differences in Language* (pp. 3-53). New York: Longman.

Coates, J. (1986c). Sex differences in communicative competence. In *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Sex Differences in Language* (pp. 96-118). New York: Longman.

Coates, J. (1986d). The acquisition of sex-differentiated language. In *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Sex Differences in Language* (pp. 121-134). New York: Longman.

Coates, J. (1986e). The social consequences of linguistic sex differences. In *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Sex Differences in Language* (pp. 151-162). New York: Longman.

Coates, J. (1986f). The historical background (II) - Anthropologists and Dialectologists. In *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Sex Differences in Language*. New York: Longman.

Coates, J. (1996). *Women Talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Coates, J. (1997). Women's friendship, women's talk. In R. Wodak (Ed.), *Gender and Discourse* (pp. 245-262). London: Sage Publications.

Coates, J. (1998). Gossip Revisited: Language in All-Female Groups. In J. Cheshire & P. Trudgill (Eds.), *The Sociolinguistics Reader Volume 2: Gender and Discourse*. London: Arnold.

Colombi, M. C. (2009). A systemic functional approach to teaching Spanish for heritage speakers in the United States. *Linguistics and Education, 20*, 39-40.

Colvocoresses, H. L. (1977). Spanish for law enforcement and correctional personnel. *Foreign Language Annals, 10*, 312-313.

Connor-Linton, J. (1999). Competing communicative styles and cross-talk: A multi-feature analysis. *Language in Society, 28*(1), 25-56.

Cook-Gumperz, J., & Szymanski, M. (2001). Classroom "Families": Cooperating or Competing - Girls' and Boys' Interactional Styles in a Bilingual Classroom. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 34*(1), 107-130.

Coulthard, M., & Ashby, M. (1975). Talking with the Doctor. *Journal of Communication, 23*(3), 240-247.

Coupland, N., & Coupland, J. (1998). Reshaping lives: Constitutive identity work in geriatric medical consultations. *Text, 18*(2), 159-190.

Davies, J. (2003). Expressions of gender: an anaysis of pupils' rendered discourse styles in small group classroom discussions. *Discourse & Society, 14*(2), 115-132.

Davies, J. (2005). '*We know what we're talking about, don't we?*' An examination of girls' classroom-based learning allegiances. *Linguistics & Education, 15*, 199-216.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing Talk at Work: An Introduction. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings* (pp. 3-65). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P., & Sorjonen, M.-L. (1997). Institutional Dialogue. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies - A multidisciplinary introduction - Vol. 2: Discourse as Social Interaction* (pp. 92-118). Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications.

Du Bois, J. W., Schuetze-Coburn, S., Cumming, S., & Paolino, D. (1993). Outline of discourse transcription. In J. A. Edwards & M. D. Lampert (Eds.), *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research* (pp. 45-89). Hillsdale (NJ): Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (1992). Think practically and look locally: Language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 21*, 461-490.

Edwards, J. A. (1993). Principles and contrasting systems of discourse transcription. In J. A. Edwards & M. D. Lampert (Eds.), *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research* (pp. 3-31). Hillsdale (NJ): Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Edwards, J. A., & Lampert, M. D. (Eds.). (1993). *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research*. Hillsdale (NJ): Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ehrlich, S. (2002). Legal institutions, nonspeaking recipiency and participants' orientations. *Discourse & Society, 13*(6), 731-747.

Ehrlich, S. (2007). Legal discourse and the cultural intelligibility of gendered meanings. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 11*(4), 452-477.

Evaldsson, A.-C. (2005). Staging insults and mobilizing categorizations in a multiethnic peer group. *Discourse & Society, 16*(6), 763-786.

Fitzpatrick, M. A., Mulac, A., & Dindia, K. (1995). Gender-preferential language use in spouse and stranger interaction. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 14*, 18-39.

Flowerdew, J. (1999). Face in cross-cultural political discourse. *Text, 19*(1), 3-23.

Ford, C. E. (1999). Collaborative Construction of Task Activity: Coordinating Multiple Resources in a High School Physics Lab. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 32*(4), 369-408.

Gal, S. (1989). Between speech and silence: The problematics of research on language and gender. *IPrA Papers in Pragmatics, 3*(1), 1-38.

Galasinski, D. (1997). The making of history: some remarks on politician's presentation of historical events. *Pragmatics, 7*(1), 55-69.

Galasinski, D. (1997). Background and discourse analysis: A Response to Jan Blommaert. *Pragmatics, 7*(1), 83-97.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Sage.

Goddard, C., & Wierzbicka, A. (1997). Discourse and Culture. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies - A multidisciplinary introduction - Vol. 2: Discourse as Social Interaction* (pp. 231-257). Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications.

Goodwin, M. (2002). Building power assymetries in girls' interaction. *Discourse & Society, 13*(6), 715-730.

Green, J. L., & Dixon, C. N. (2002). Exploring differences in perspectives on microanalysis of classroom discourse: contributions and concerns: Response article. *Applied Linguistics, 23*(3), 393-406.

Grenoble, L. A. (1999). Gender and conversational management in Russian. In M. Mills (Ed.), *Slavic Gender Linguistics* (pp. 113-130). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Gumperz, J. J., & Berenz, N. (1993). Transcribing conversational exchanges. In J. A. Edwards & M. D. Lampert (Eds.), *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research* (pp. 91-121). Hillsdale (NJ): Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gunnarsson, B.-L. (1997). Applied Discourse Analysis. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies - A multidisciplinary introduction - Vol. 2: Discourse as Social Interaction* (pp. 285-312). Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications.

Gutierrez, K. (1994). How talk, context, and script shape contexts for learning: A cross-case comparison of journal sharing. *Linguistics and Education, 5*(335-365).

Hak, T. (1999). 'Text' and 'con-text': Talk bias in studies of health care work. In S. Sarangi & C. Roberts (Eds.), *Talk, Work and Institutional Order. Discourse in Medical, Mediation and Management Settings.* (pp. 427-452). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hall, J. K., & Walsh, M. (2002). Teacher-student interaction and language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22*, 186-203.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). London: Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (1999). *Construing Experience Through Meaning. A Language-Based Approach to Cognition.* London: Cassell.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (third ed.). London: Arnold.

He, W. (1993). *Reconstructing institutions through talk: A discourse study of academic counseling encounters.* University of California, Los Angeles.

Heath, C. (1986). *Body Movement and Speech in Medical Interaction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hellerman, J. (2004). The sequential and prosodic co-construction of a 'quiz game' activity in classroom talk. *Journal of Pragmatics, 37*, 919-944.

Heritage, J. (1985). Analyzing News Interviews: Aspects of the Production of Talk for an Overhearing Audience. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Vol. 3* (pp. 95-117). London: Sage Publications.

Heritage, J., & Atkinson, J. M. (1984). Introduction. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 1-15). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J., & Lindstrom, A. (1998). Motherhood, medicine, and morality: Scenes from a medical encounter. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 31*(3&4), 397-438.

Heritage, J., & Sefi, S. (1992). Dilemmas of advice: aspects of the delivery and reception of advice in interactions between Health Visitors and first-time mothers. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings* (pp. 359-417). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hester, S., & Francis, D. (2000). Ethnomethodology, conversation analysis, and institutional talk. *Text, 20*(3), 391-413.

Hester, S., & Francis, D. (2000). Analyzing 'institutional talk': A reply to Watson. *Text, 20*(3), 373-375.

Hester, S., & Francis, D. (2001). Is institutional talk a phenomenon? Reflections on ethnomethodology and applied conversation analysis. In A. McHoul & M. Rapley (Eds.), *How to Analyse Talk in Institutional Settings: A Casebook of Methods* (pp. 206-218). New York: Continuum.

Holmes, J., & Marra, M. (2004). Relational practice in the workplace: Women's talk or gendered discourse? *Language in Society, 33*, 377-398.

Holmes, J., Stubbe, M., & Vine, B. (1999). Constructing professional identity: 'Doing power' in policy units. In S. Sarangi & C. Roberts (Eds.), *Talk, Work and Institutional Order. Discourse in Medical, Mediation and Management Settings.* (pp. 351-388). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hornberger. (1988). Misehaviour, punishment and put-down: Stress for Quechua children in school. *Language & Education, 2*(4), 239-253.

Iedema, R., & Wodak, R. (1999). Introduction: organizational discourses and practices. *Discourse & Society, 10*(1), 5-19.

Ilie, C. (2001). Semi-institutional discourse: The case of talk shows. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*, 209-254.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an Introduction. In G. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-23). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jefferson, G. (2004). A note on laughter in 'male-female' interaction. *Discourse & Society, 6*(1), 117-133.

Jones, R., & Thornborrow, J. (2004). Floors, talk and the organizaiton of classroom activites. *Language in Society, 33*, 399-423.

Jule, A. (2002). Speaking their sex: A study of gender and linguistic space in an ESL classroom. *TESL Canada Journal, 19*(2), 37-51.

Kim, S. H. O., & Elder, C. (2005). Language choices and pedagogic functions in the foreign language classroom: a cross-linguistic functional analysis of teacher talk. *Language Teaching Research, 9*(4), 355-380.

Koshik, I. (2000). *Practices of pedagogy in ESL writing conferences: A conversation analytic study of turns and sequences that assist student revision.* University of California, Los Angeles.

Kress, G. (1989). History and language: towards a social account of linguistic change. *Journal of Pragmatics, 13*, 445-466.

Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city: studies in the Black English Vernacular.* Philadelphie: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lakoff, R. (1977). Language and sexual identity. *Semiotica, 19*, 119-130.

Lakoff, R. (1999). Language and Woman's Place. In C. Roman, S. Juhasz & C. Miller (Eds.), *The Women and Language Debate: A Sourcebook* (pp. 280-291). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Lampert, M. D., & Ervin-Tripp, S. M. (1993). Structured coding for the study of language and social interaction. In J. A. Edwards & M. D. Lampert (Eds.), *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research* (pp. 169-206). Hillsdale (NJ): Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Landa, M. H. (2000). *An analysis of discourse strategies in pharmacy consultations: Novices and experts, L1 and L2.* University of Minnesota.

Leppanen, V. (1998). The straightforwardness of advice: Advice-giving in interactiono between Swedish district nurses and patients. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 31*(2), 209-240.

Lerner, G. (1995). Turn design and the organization of participation in instructional activities. *Discourse Processes, 19*, 111-131.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Liebscher, G., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2003). Conversational repair as a role-defining mechanism in classroom interaction. *The Modern Language Journal, 87*(3), 375-390.

Linell, P., Gustavsson, L., & Juvonen, P. (1988). Interactional dominance in dyadic communication: A presentation of initiative-response analysis. *Linguistics, 26*, 415-442.

LiWei. (2002). 'What do you want me to say?' On the Conversation Analysis approach to bilingual interaction. *Language in Society, 31*, 159-180.

Love, K. (2000). The construction of moral subjectiveness in talk around text in secondary English. *Linguistics & Education, 11*(3), 213-249.

Lundman, R. J. (Ed.). (1980). *Police Behavior: A Sociological Perspective.* New York: Oxford University Press.

MacBeth, D. (2004). The relevance of repair for classroom correction. *Language in Society, 33*, 703-736.

Martin, J. R. (2009). Genre and language learning: A social semiotic perspective. *Linguistics and Education, 20*, 10-21.

Matoesian, G. (1999). Intertextuality, affect, and ideology in legal discourse. *Text, 19*(1), 73-109.

Maynard, D. W. (1984). *Inside Plea Bargaining: The Language of Negotiations*. New York: Plenum Press.

McCormick, K. R. E., & Visano, L. A. (Eds.). (1992). *Understanding Policing*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

McElhinny, B. S. (1995). Challenging Hegemonic Masculinities: Female and Male Police Officers Handling Domestic Violence. In K. Hall & M. Bucholtz (Eds.), *Gender Articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self*. New York: Routledge.

McElhinny, B. S. (2003). Fearful, forceful agents of the law: Ideologies about language and gender in police officers' narratives about the use of physical force. *Pragmatics, 13*(1), 253-284.

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*(3), 349-378.

McHoul, A., & Rapley, M. (Eds.). (2001). *How to Analyse Talk in Institutional Settings: A Casebook of Methods*. New York: Continuum.

McVittie, J. (2004). Discourse communities, student selves and learning. *Language & Education, 18*(6), 488-503.

Menz, F., & Al-Roubaie, A. (2008). Interruptions, status and gender in medical interiews: the harder you brake, the longer it takes. *Discourse & Society, 19*(5), 645-666.

Meskill, C., & Anthony, N. (2005). Foreign Language Learning with CMC: Forms of Online Instructional Discourse in a Hybrid Russian Class. *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics, 33*(1), 89-105.

Mey, J. (1993). *Pragmatics: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Mills, M. (Ed.). (1999a). *Slavic Gender Linguistics*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Mills, M. (1999b). Background and Introduction. In M. Mills (Ed.), *Slavic Gender Linguistics* (pp. vii-xviii). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Mills, M. (1999c). "Teacher talk" in the Russian and American Classroom: Dominance and Cultural Framing. In M. Mills (Ed.), *Slavic Gender Linguistics* (pp. 131-152). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Mills, S. (2003). Third wave feminist linguistics and the analysis of sexism. http://www.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/open/2003/001/mills2003001-01.html

Mondada, L., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2004). Second language acquisition as situated practice: task accomplishment in the French second language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(4), 501-518.

Mori, J. (2002). Talk design, plan, and development of talk-in-interaction: An analysis of a small group activity in a Japanese language classroom. *Applied Linguistics, 23*(3), 323-347.

Mumby, D. K., & Clair, R. P. (1997). Organizational Discourse. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies - A multidisciplinary introduction - Vol. 2: Discourse as Social Interaction* (pp. 181-205). Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications.

Nerlich, B., & Clarke, D. D. (2001). Ambiguities we live by: Towards a pragmatics of polysemy. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*, 1-20.

Olsher, D. A. (2003). *Collaborative Group Work in Second and Foreign Language Classrooms: Talk, Embodiment, and Sequential Organization.* University of California, Los Angeles.

Ostermann, A. C. (2001). *Reifying and Defying Sisterhood in Discourse: Communities of Practice at Work at an All-Female Police Station and a Feminist Crisis Intervention Center in Brazil.* University of Michigan.

Ostermann, A. C. (2003). Communities of practice at work: gender facework and the power of habitus at an all-female police station and a feminist crisis intervention center in Brazil. *Discourse & Society, 14*(4), 473-505.

Peterson, S., & Calovini, T. (2004). Social ideologies in grade eight students' conversation and narrative writing. *Linguistics & Education, 15*, 121-139.

Pomerantz, A., & Fehr, B. J. (1997). Conversation Analysis: An approach to the study of social action as sense making practices. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies - A multidisciplinary introduction - Vol. 2: Discourse as Social Interaction* (pp. 64-91). Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications.

Pontefract, C., & Hardman, F. (2005). The discourse of classroom interaction in Kenyan primary schools. *Comparative Education, 41*(1), 87-106.

Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation Analysis: The Study of Talk-in-Interaction* (Vol. 35). Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications.

Rampton, B., Roberts, C., Leung, C., & Harris, R. (2002). Methodology in the analysis of classroom discourse: Response article. *Applied Linguistics, 23*(3), 373-392.

Rendle-Short. (2005). Managing the transitions between talk and silence in the academic monologue. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 38*(2), 179-218.

Sacks, H. (1984). On doing "being ordinary". In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 413-429). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1984). Notes on methodology. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 21-27). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1992). Lectures on Conversation (1962-1972), Vols. 1 & 2. In G. Jefferson (Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, H., Jefferson, G., & Schegloff, E. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language, 50*(4), 696-735.

Sarangi, S., & Roberts, C. (Eds.). (1999a). *Talk, Work and Institutional Order. Discourse in Medical, Mediation and Management Settings.* New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sarangi, S., & Roberts, C. (1999b). The dynamics of interactional and institutional orders in work-related settings. In S. Sarangi & C. Roberts (Eds.), *Talk, Work and Institutional Order. Discourse in Medical, Mediation and Management Settings.* (pp. 64-91). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sarangi, S., & Roberts, C. (1999c). Introduction: Revisiting different analytic frameworks. In S. Sarangi & C. Roberts (Eds.), *Talk, Work and Institutional Order. Discourse in Medical, Mediation and Management Settings.* (pp. 389-400). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sauntson, H. (2007). Girls' and Boys' Use of Acknowledging Moves in Pupil Group Classroom Discussions. *Language and Education, 21*(4), 304-327.

Schegloff, E. (1984). On some questions and ambiguities in conversation. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 28-52). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. (1992). On Talk and Its Institutional Occasions. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings* (pp. 101-136). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. (1997). Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse & Society, 8*(2), 165-187.

Schegloff, E. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis* (Vol. 1). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica, 8*, 289-327.
Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schleef, E. (2008). Gender and academic discourse: Global restrictions and local possibilities. *Language in Society, 37*, 515-538.

Sharonov, I. (1999). Speaker, gender, and the choice of 'communicatives' in contemporary Russian. In M. Mills (Ed.), *Slavic Gender Linguistics* (pp. 153-163). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Shoaps, R. (1999). The many voices of Rush Limbaugh: the use of transposition in construction a rhetoric of common sense. *Text, 19*(3), 399-437.

Silverman, D. (1998). *Harvey Sacks: Social Science and Conversation Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Simkins-Bullock, J. A., & Wildman, B. G. (1991). *Sex Roles, 24*, 149-160.

Simon-Vandenbergen, A.-M., & Steiner, E. (2005). Functional approaches to discourse: Perspectives, interactions and recent developments. *Language Sciences, 27*(573-584).

Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Slembrouck, S. (2005). Discourse, critique and ethnography: Class-oriented coding in accounts of child protection. *Language Sciences, 27*, 619-650.

Sommers, L. (2002). Women's ways of talking in teacher-directed and student-directed peer response groups. *Linguistics & Education, 4*(1), 1-35.

Speer, S. (2002). What can conversation analysis contribute to feminist methodology? Putting reflexivity into practice. *Discourse & Society, 13*(6), 783-803.

Speer, S. (2002). Sexist talk: Gender categories, participants' orientations and irony. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 6*(3), 347-377.

Stokoe, E. (1998). Talking about gender: the conversational construction of gender categories in academic discourse. *Discourse & Society, 9*(2), 217-240.

Stokoe, E., & Smithson, J. (2001). Making gender relevant: conversation analysis and gender categories in interaction. *Discourse & Society, 12*(2), 217-244.

Stokoe, E., & Weatherall, A. (2002). Guest Editorial: Gender, language, conversation analysis and feminism. *Discourse & Society, 13*(6), 707-713.

Sunderland, J. (1998). Girls being quiet: A problem for foreign language classrooms? *Language Teaching Research, 2*(1), 48-82.

Sunderland, J. (2000). New understandings of gender and language classroom research: Texts, teacher talk and student talk. *Language Teaching Research, 4*(2), 149-173.

Sunderland, J. (2005). Review article. *Positioning Gender in Discourse: a Feminist Methodology*, by Judith Baxter. *Linguistics & Education, 15*(295-301).

Sunderland, J., Cowley, M., Rahim, F. A., Leontzakou, C., & Shattuck, J. (2001). From bias "in the text" to "teacher talk around the text": an exploration of teacher discourse and gendered foreign language textbook texts. *Linguistics & Education, 11*(3), 251-286.

Swales, J. M. (1998). Textography: Towards a contextualization of written academic discourse. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 31*(1), 109-121.

Tanaka, H., & Fukushima, M. (2002). Gender orientations to outward appearance in Japanese conversation: a study in grammar and interaction. *Discourse & Society, 13*(6), 749-765.

Tannen, D. (1994). *Gender and Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, D. (1994). The Relativity of Linguistic Strategies: Rethinking Power and Solidarity in Gender and Dominance. In *Gender and Discourse* (pp. 19-52). New York: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, D. (1994). Interpreting Interruption in Conversation. In *Gender and Discourse* (pp. 53-83). New York: Oxford University Press.

Ten Have, P. (2000). *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide*. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications.

Ten Have, P. (2001). Applied conversation analysis. In A. McHoul & M. Rapley (Eds.), *How to Analyse Talk in Institutional Settings: A Casebook of Methods* (pp. 3-11). New York: Continuum.

Thonus, T. (1999). Dominance in academic writing tutorials: gender, language proficiency, and the offering of suggestions. *Discourse & Society, 10*(2), 225-248.

Tracy, K. (1997). Interactional trouble in emergency service requests: A problem of frames. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 30*(4), 315-343.

Tuffin, K., & Howard, C. (2001). Demystifying discourse analysis: theory, method and practice. In A. McHoul & M. Rapley (Eds.), *How to Analyse Talk in Institutional Settings: A Casebook of Methods* (pp. 196-205). New York: Continuum.

van Dijk, T. (Ed.). (1997a). *Discourse Studies - A multidisciplinary introduction - Vol. 1: Discourse as Structure and Process*. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications.

van Dijk, T. (Ed.). (1997b). *Discourse Studies - A multidisciplinary introduction - Vol. 2: Discourse as Social Interaction*. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications.

van Dijk, T. (1997c). Discourse as interaction in society. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies - A multidisciplinary introduction - Vol. 2: Discourse as Social Interaction* (pp. 1-37). Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications.

van Dijk, T., Ting-Toomey, S., Smitherman, G., & Troutman, D. (1997). Discourse, ethnicity, culture and racism. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies - A multidisciplinary introduction - Vol. 2: Discourse as Social Interaction* (pp. 144-180). Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications.

van Leeuwen-Turnovcová, J., Wullenweber, K., Doleschal, U., & Schindler, F. (Eds.). (2002) *Gender-Forschung in der Slawistik. Beiträge der Konferenz Gender - Sprache - Kommunikation - Kultur, 28. April bis 1. Mai 2001, Institut für Slawistik Friedrich Schiller-Universität Jena*. Vienna: Wiener Slawisticher Almanach.

van Leeuwen-Turnovcová, J. & Röhrborn, U. (Eds.). (2003). *Beiträge des Gender-Blocks zum XIII. Internationalen Slavistenkongress in Ljubljana, 15.-21. August 2003*. Munich: Sagner.

van Lier, L. A. W. (1984). Discourse analysis and classroom research: a methodological perspective. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 49*, 111-133.

Verschueren, J. (1999). Whose discipline? Some critical reflections on linguistic pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*, 869-879.

Verschueren, J. (2001). Predicaments of criticism. *Critique of Anthropology, 21*(1), 59-81.

Wakin, M. A., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1999). Reduction and specialization in emergency and directory assistance calls. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 32*(4), 409-437.

Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research, 6*(1), 3-23.

Watson, R. (2000). The character of 'institutional talk': A response to Hester and Francis. *Text, 20*(3), 377-389.

Weatherall, A. (2002). Towards understanding gender and talk-in-interaction. *Discourse & Society, 13*(6), 767-781.

West, C. (2002). Peeling an onion: a critical comment on 'Competing discourses'. *Discourse & Society, 13*(6), 843-851.

West, C., Lazar, M. M., & Kramarae, C. (1997). Gender in discourse. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies: A multidisciplinary introduction - Vol. 2: Discourse as Social Interaction* (pp. 119-143). Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications.

Wharton, S. (2005). Invisible females, incapable males: gender reconstruction in a children's reading scheme. *Language & Education, 19*(3), 238-251.

Widdowson, H. G. (1995). Discourse analysis: a critical view. *Language and Literature, 4.*

Wodak, R. (1986). *Language Behavior in Therapy Groups*. Los Angeles: UCLA Press.

Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about - a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 1-13). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Wolfe, J. (2000). Gender, Ethnicity, and Classroom Discourse: Communication Patterns of Hispanic and White Students in Networked Classrooms. *Written Communication, 17*(4), 491-519.

Yokoyama, O. T. (1999a). Russian genderlects and referential expressions. *Language in Society, 28*, 401-429.

Yokoyama, O. T. (1999b). Gender linguistic analysis of Russian children's literature. In M. Mills (Ed.), *Slavic Gender Linguistics* (pp. 57-84). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Zemskaja, E.A. (Ed.). (1973). *Russkaja razgovornaja reč*. Moscow: Nauka.

Zemskaja, E.A. (Ed.). (1983). *Russkaja razgovornaja reč'. Fonetika, morfologija, leksika, žest'*. Moscow: Nauka.

Zemskaja, E.A., Kitajgorodskaja, M.V. & Rozanova, N.N (1993). Osobennosti mužskoj i ženskoj reči. In E.A. Zemskaja & D. Šmelev (Eds.). *Russkij jazyk v ego funkcionirovanii: Kommunikativno-pragmati*českij aspekt (pp. 90-157). Moscow: Nauka.

Zuengler, J., & Mori, J. (2002). Microanalysis of Classroom Discourse: A Critical Consideration of Method. *Applied Linguistics, 23*(3), 283-288.

Appendix A Transliteration from Russian

Common to all systems of transliteration:

а	б	в	г	д	з	и	к	л	м	н	о	п	р	с	т	у	ф
a	b	v	g*	d	z	i	k	l	m	n	o	p	r	s	t	u	f

Vowels:

е	ё	ы	э	ю	я
e	ë	y	è	ju	ja

Consonants:

ж	й	х	ц	ч	ш	щ
ž	j	x	c	č	š	šč

Hard and soft signs:

ь	ъ
´	´´

* Never 'v,' so: синего always *sinego*.

Appendix B Transcription Conventions[99]

Sequencing

[[	Utterances starting up simultaneously are linked together with double left-hand brackets
[	A single left bracket indicates the point of overlap onset
]	A single right bracket indicates the point at which an utterance or utterance-part stops overlapping
=	Equal signs, one at the end of one line and one at the beginning of a next, indicate no 'gap' between the two lines. ('latching')

Timed Intervals

(1.0)	Numbers in parentheses indicated elapsed time in silence by tenth of seconds
(.)	A dot in parentheses indicates a tiny 'gap' within or between utterances
(gap)	An untimed pause occurring between turns
(pause)	An untimed pause occurring within a speaker's turn

Characteristics of speech production

word	Underscoring indicates some form of stress, via pitch and/or amplitude (alternate method: use of *italics*)
::	Colons indicates prolongation of the immediately prior sound. Multiple colons indicate a more prolonged sound.
-	A dash indicates a cut-off
.,?	Punctuation marks are used to indicate characteristics of speech production, especially intonation; they are not referring to grammatical units

---

[99] Ten Have 2000: 213-214; Psathas 1995: 70-78.

.   A period indicates a stopping fall in tone

,   A comma indicates a continuing intonation, like when you are reading items from a list

?   A question mark indicates a rising intonation

?,   The combined question mark/comma indicates a stronger rise than a comma but weaker than a question mark

          The absence of an utterance-final marker indicates an 'indeterminate' contour

↑↓   Arrows indicate marked shifts into higher or lower pitch in the utterance-part immediately following the arrow

!   An exclamation point indicates an animated tone

WORD   Upper case indicates especially loud sounds relative to the surrounding talk

°   Utterances or utterance-parts bracketed by degree signs are relatively quieter than the surrounding talk

< >   Right/left carets bracketing an utterance or utterance-part indicate speeding up

°hhh   A dot-prefixed row of **h**s indicates an inbreath. Without the dot, the **h**s indicate an outbreath

w(h)ord   A parenthesized h, or a row of **h**s within a word, indicates breathiness, as in laughter, crying, etc.

Transcriber's doubts and comments

( )   Empty parentheses indicate the transcriber's inability to hear what was said. The length of the parenthesized space indicates the length of the untranscribed talk. In the speaker designation column, the empty parentheses indicate inability to identify a speaker

(word)   Parenthesized words are especially dubious hearings or speaker identifications

(( ))   Double parentheses contain transcriber's descriptions rather than, or in addition to, transcriptions

…   Horizontal ellipses indicate that an utterance is partially reported, that is,   parts of the same speaker's utterances are omitted

.

.

.   Vertical ellipses indicate that intervening turns at talk have been omitted

1.   Line numbering done for convenience or reference, not a measure of timing or numbers of turns or utterances. Silences between talk may also receive line numbers.

Appendix C List of Abbreviations

ADA	Applied Discourse Analysis
AP	Adjacency Pair
CA	Conversation Analysis
CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
DIU	Designedly Incomplete Utterance
FTA	Face-Threatening-Act
H	Hearer
HV	Health Visitors (UK)
IRE	Initiation - Response - Evaluation turn sequence
NS	Native Speaker
NNS	Non-Native Speaker
RPQ	Reverse Polarity Question
S	Speaker
SFL	Systemic Functional Linguistics
TCU	Turn Constructional Unit

Appendix D Ethics Informed Consent Form

Осведомительная анкета о согласии

Название проекта: Общение на уроках в русской школе

Исследователь: Кэрол Грин
номер телефона: *xxx-xxx-xxxx*
Руководители: Доктор Том Пристли
номер телефона: *xxx-xxx-xxxx*
       Доктор Алла Недашкивска
       xxx-xxx-xxxx

Цель исследования: Цель этого исследования определить какой язык используют учителя с учениками на уроках в русской школе.

Количество времени, необходимое для участия в исследовании:
для учеников: Чтобы участвовать в исследовании, необходимо пять обычных уроков, которые должны сниматься на видеокамеру.
для учителей: Чтобы участвовать в исследовании, необходимо по пять обычных уроков с каждой группой, которые должны сниматься на видеокамеру.

Добровольное участие: Участие в этом исследовании строго добровольно. Участники имеют право отказаться от исследования в любое время без последствий.

Собранные данные: Данные собраны для этого исследования будут сняты, переписаны и анализированы исследователем.

Разрешение на публикацию:
       Подписывая эту анкету, участник даёт разрешение на публикацию материалов частично или полностью. Информация, определяющая личность участника, никогда не будет опубликована.

Своим согласием, я подтверждаю участие в этом проекте.
Я получил(а) копию этой осведомительной анкеты о согласии.
Ф.И.О. участника: _____
(для учителей) количество групп: 1   2   3
Подпись участника: _____
Дата: _____
Подпись исследователя: _____
Дата: _____

<u>**Informed Consent Form**</u>

Name of project:	Interaction in the classrooms of a Russian school
Researcher:	Carole Greene
telephone number:	*xxx-xxx-xxxx*
Supervisors:	Dr. Tom Priestly
telephone number:	*xxx-xxx-xxxx*
	Dr. Alla Nedashkivska
	xxx-xxx-xxxx
Purpose of the study:	The purpose of this study is to determine how language is used by teachers and students in lessons at a Russian school.

Amount of time required for participation in this study:

for students:	Five regular lessons, recorded by videocamera, are required to participate in this study.
for teachers:	Five regular lessons of each class, recorded by videocamera, are required to participate in this study.
Voluntary participation:	Participation in this study is strictly voluntary. Participants have the right to withdraw from this study at any time without consequence.
Collected information:	The information collected for this study will be recorded, transcribed, and analysed by the researcher.
Permission to publish:	By signing this form, the participant gives consent for the materials collected to be published in part or in whole. No information that identifies the participant will ever be published.

By signing this form, I consent to participate in this project.
I have received a copy of this Informed Consent Form.
Full name of participant: _____
(for teachers) number of classes: 1   2   3
Signature of participant: _____
Date: _____
Signature of researcher: _____
Date: _____

Appendix E Interview Questions

1.   Скажите ваши фамилию, имя и отчество.
     Please state your surname, name and patronymic.

2.   Скажите вашу дату рождения.
     State your date of birth.

3.   Скажите ваше место рождения.
     State your place of birth.

4.   Где вы выросли?
     Where did you grow up?

5.   В какой средней школе вы учились?
     In which high school did you study?

6.   Сколько лет вы учились после окончания средней школы?
     How many years of post-secondary education do you have?

7.   В каком институте или университете вы учились?
     In which institute or university did you study?

8.   На кого вы закончили?
     With which profession did you graduate?

9.   Где вы работали после окончания?
     Where did you work after you graduated?

10. Сколько лет вы уже работаете учителем в этой школе?
     How many years have you already worked in this school?

11. Опишите ваш педагогический подход или методику.
     Describe your pedagogical approach and methodology?

12. Как описали бы главные цели учителя на уроке?
     How would you describe the main goals of a teacher in a lesson?

13. Как вы думаете, кто лучше учится, девочки или мальчики?
     Who do you think are better students, girls or boys?

14. Кто более приспособлен к изучению второго языка, второго после русского, девочки или мальчики?
Who are better second language learners, girls or boys?

15. Кто ведёт себя лучше на уроке, девочки или мальчики?
Who behaves better in class, girls or boys?

16. Кого нужно больше контролировать на уроке, девочки или мальчики?
Who needs more control in class, girls or boys?

17. Кто чаще перебивает вас, девочки или мальчики?
Who interrupts you more, girls or boys?

18. Как вы реагируете, когда вас перебивают на уроке?
How do you react when you are interrupted in class?

19. Как вы обрашаетесь к ученикам, ласковыми или полными именами?
How do you address the students, with diminutives or full names?

20. Как вы думаете, кому вы чаще задаёте вопросы, девочкам или мальчикам?
What do you think, do you pose questions more frequently to girls or boys?

21. Кого вы чаще хвалите, девочек или мальчиков?
Whom do you praise more, girls or boys?

22. Кого вы чаще ругаете, девочек или мальчиков?
Whom do you scold more, girls or boys?

23. Кого вы чаще заставляете замолчать, девочек или мальчиков?
Whom do you tell more frequently to be quiet, girls or boys?

24. Кому вы чаще переводите английские предложения на русские, девочкам или мальчикам, если не понятно?
For whom do you more frequently translate English sentences into Russian, girls or boys, if they do not understand?

25. Есть ли у вас обычно любимый ученик?
Do you have a favourite student / teacher's pet?

Appendix F Questionnaire

<u>Анкета о характеристиках ученика</u>

1. Данные

Ф.И.О. ученика: _____

дата рождения (день/месяц/год): _____

в какой группе учится в школе иностранных языков (ШИЯ): _____

сколько лет учится в ШИЯ (включая текущий год): _____

оценка получена за первую четверть текущего года в ШИЯ: _____

оценка получена за предыдущий год (если учился в ШИЯ): _____

в какой государственной школе учится: _____

в каком классе: _____

2. Зрелость - Обведите кружком цифру, которая лучше всего описывает уровень зрелости ученика, относительно к другим ученикам в возрасте от 10 до 12 лет.

Эмоциональная зрелость ученика:

совсем незрелый	очень незрелый	немного незрелый	средний для возраста	немного зрелый	очень зрелый	совсем зрелый
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Физическая зрелость ученика:

совсем незрелый	очень незрелый	немного незрелый	средний для возраста	немного зрелый	очень зрелый	совсем зрелый
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. Характер ученика - Обведите кружком цифру, которая лучше всего описывает характер ученика.

Умственные способности:

совсем неумный	очень неумный	немного неумный	средний по уму	немного умный	очень умный	совсем умный
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Уверенность в себе:

совсем неуверен-ный в себе	очень неуверен-ный в себе	немного неуверен-ный в себе	ни неуверен-ный, ни уверенный в себе	немного уверенный в себе	очень уверенный в себе	совсем уверенный в себе
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Обязательность: (приходит вовремя, делает домашние задания, готовится к урокам)

совсем необязат-ельный	очень необязат-ельный	немного необязат-ельный	ни необязат-ельный, ни обязатель-ный	немного обязат-ельный	очень обязат-ельный	совсем обязат-ельный
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Общительность:

совсем стеснит-ельный	очень стеснит-ельный	немного стеснит-ельный	ни стеснит-ельный, ни общитель-ный	немного общитель-ный	очень общитель-ный	совсем общитель-ный
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Поведение: (послушный, не мешает другим ученикам на уроках)

ведет себя совсем плохо	ведет себя очень плохо	ведет себя немного плохо	ведет себя ни плохо, ни хорошо	ведет себя немного хорошо	ведет себя очень хорошо	ведет себя совсем хорошо
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Спокойность:

совсем неспокой-ный	очень неспокой-ный	немного неспокой-ный	ни неспокой-ный, ни спокойный	немного спокойный	очень спокойный	совсем спокойный
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Вежливость:

совсем грубый	очень грубый	немного грубый	ни грубый, ни вежливый	немного вежливый	очень вежливый	совсем вежливый
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4. Если вы считаете, что у этого ученика есть особенности характера, опишите их здесь.

_____

_____

5. Существуют (или существовали) проблемы в отношениях с этим учеником? Какие? Опишите их.

_____

_____

Questionnaire of Student Characteristics

1. Personal Information

Full name: _____
Date of birth (day/month/year): _____
Group of study at the school of foreign languages (SFL): _____
Years of study at SFL (including current year): _____
Grade received for first quarter of current year at SFL: _____
Grade received for previous year (if studied at SFL): _____
Studies at which government school: _____
In which class: _____

2. Maturity - Circle the number on the scale that best describes the level of maturity of the student, relative to other students 10 to 12 years old.

Emotional maturity:

extremely immature	*very immature*	*somewhat immature*	*average for age*	*somewhat mature*	*very mature*	*extremely mature*
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Physical maturity:

extremely immature	*very immature*	*somewhat immature*	*average for age*	*somewhat mature*	*very mature*	*extremely mature*
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. Character - Circle the number on the scale that best describes the student's character.

Intelligence:

extremely unintelligent	*very unintelligent*	*somewhat unintelligent*	*average intelligence*	*somewhat intelligent*	*very intelligent*	*extremely intelligent*
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Self-confidence:

extremely insecure	*very insecure*	*somewhat insecure*	*neither insecure nor confident*	*somewhat confident*	*very confident*	*extremely confident*
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Responsibility: (arrives on time, does homework, prepares for lessons)

extremely irrespons-ible	*very irrespons-ible*	*somewhat irrespons-ible*	*neither irrespons-ible nor responsible*	*somewhat responsible*	*very responsible*	*extremely responsible*
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Sociability:

extremely shy	very shy	somewhat shy	neither shy nor sociable	somewhat sociable	very sociable	extremely sociable
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Behaviour: (obedient, does not disturb other students in class)

behaves extremely poorly	behaves very poorly	behaves somewhat poorly	behaves neither poorly nor well	behaves somewhat well	behaves very well	behaves extremely well
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Calmness:

extremely restless	very restless	somewhat restless	neither restless nor calm	somewhat calm	very calm	extremely calm
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Politeness:

extremely rude	very rude	somewhat rude	neither rude nor polite	somewhat polite	very polite	extremely polite
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4. If you believe that this student has any distinctive characteristics, describe them here.

_____

_____

_____

5. Are there (or have there been) any problems relating to this student? What kind? Describe them.

_____

_____

_____

Appendix G Summary of Questionnaire Results

All students (PN, BM, ST):

	Emotional Maturity	Physical Maturity	Intelligence	Self-confidence	Responsibility	Behaviour	Calmness	Politeness
All	4.41	4.36	4.64	4.54	4.69	5.08	5.13	4.95
Girls	4.52	4.61	4.61	4.35	4.91	5.65	5.48	5.22
Boys	4.25	4.00	4.69	4.81	4.38	4.25	4.63	4.56

PN's students:

	Emotional Maturity	Physical Maturity	Intelligence	Self-confidence	Responsibility	Behaviour	Calmness	Politeness
All	4.75	4.55	4.75	4.80	4.85	5.25	5.30	4.95
Girls	5.00	5.30	4.80	4.80	5.30	5.90	5.80	5.30
Boys	4.50	3.80	4.70	4.80	4.40	4.60	4.80	4.60

BM's students:

	Emotional Maturity	Physical Maturity	Intelligence	Self-confidence	Responsibility	Behaviour	Calmness	Politeness
All	4.00	3.92	4.42	4.25	4.42	5.17	5.17	5.25
Girls	4.00	3.89	4.33	4.11	4.67	5.33	5.11	5.33
Boys	4.00	4.00	4.67	4.67	3.67	4.67	5.33	5.00

ST's students:

	Emotional Maturity	Physical Maturity	Intelligence	Self-confidence	Responsibility	Behaviour	Calmness	Politeness
All	4.14	4.57	4.71	4.29	4.71	4.43	4.57	4.43
Girls	4.50	4.50	4.75	3.75	4.50	5.80	5.50	4.75
Boys	3.67	4.67	4.67	5.00	5.00	2.67	3.33	4.00