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Introduction

Conversation analysis is one of the key methodological approaches to the study of talk-in-interaction. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson’s (1974) study of the organization of turn-taking in everyday interaction is one of the most remarkable achievements in CA. They described the kind of systematic procedures that participants were using to conduct turn transfer. The system they identified includes turn construction components and a set of procedures for turn allocation. The procedures for turn allocation are described as a series of “rules” in which speaker transfer is taken to be an accomplishment, achieved as a consequence of mutually coordinated speaker sensitivity to those procedures or conventions for effecting such change.

In the same way, there are “rules” or organizations for how to have conversations in classroom discourse – the kinds of replies that are appropriate, the points at which it is acceptable to interrupt, and the ways participants indicate attentiveness. One of the most familiar organizations of classroom interaction is a three-turn sequence, often referred to as IRE (Initiation-Response-Evaluation) (Mehan, 1979). The prototypical IRE begins with the teacher’s question followed by the student’s response in the second turn and ends with teacher evaluation of the student response (Lemke, 1990). The prior literature examines the role of the third turn in this sequential relation through the lens of functional categories such as offering evaluation, feedback or follow-up on the student’s second turn (Wells, 1993; Nassaji & Wells, 2000). However, Lee (2007) argues that the third turn produced by classroom teachers carry out far more local and contingent tasks than what is projected by “blanket terms such as ‘evaluation,’ ‘feedback,’ or ‘follow-up’” (Lee, 2007, p. 180).

This paper examines more cases of local contingencies embedded in the third turn focusing on the repeated patterns third turn position that we observed: (1) *okay* that projects reformulated, more specific or elaborated response, (2) *okay* and repetitions that co-construct list answers with students, and (3) *right*-prefaced reformulations that provide affirmative evaluation and concise reformulation of student response.

The data

Video recorded data of an International Teaching Assistants’ (ITA) English language preparation course at a major research university in the U.S. was used for the analysis. The data was collected without researchers’ involvement. A thirty-minute portion of the class was video-taped with three cameras that provided three different angles and audio focus of the same content. The class was a review session of a material on how to communicate with students through questions and answers. The review went on in the form of a quiz and there were total twelve questions provided by the teacher. Pre-game and post-game interaction was excluded from receiving focus. Twelve students and one teacher participated in the class and the class was teacher-dominated, following the typical IRE sequence.

Analytic framework and transcription procedures

This paper is situated in a conversation analytic framework for exploring classroom discourse and interaction. Conversation Analysis (CA) framework was started by Harvey Sacks and his associates including Garfinkel, Jefferson, and Schegloff (ten Have, 2004). Audio recordings were initially the enabling condition to practice CA, and later video recordings had a similar impact (ten Have, 2004). CA allows more detailed renderings of interactional activities than other approaches. Unlike other methodology, CA favors naturally occurring data, rather than experimental data, and focuses on discovering how humans interact, rather than why we interact (ten Have, 2004). The main focus of CA is to find patterns in talk and determine how these patterns are used to accomplish the task at hand (e.g., tell a story or ask a question).

An important distinction in CA is made between etic and emic viewpoints. Etic methodology studies behavior from an outside point of view, whereas emic methodology studies behavior from the inside (Pike, 1967 as cited in ten Have, 2004). With an etic viewpoint, conclusions can be formulated prior to analysis and applied afterwards to applicable cases, but with an emic viewpoint, conclusions are discovered during analysis. CA framework leans towards an emic perspective with the belief that researchers need to become a member of the group they are analyzing and that observations should be found while researching, not looked for.

CA framework has been used in various studies of classroom discourse. Repair has always been a sequence and action of focus in CA. Hall (2007) and Macbeth (2004) explore types of repairs done in a classroom setting and how these repairs, or corrections, differ from conversational talk outside of the classroom. Cekaite (2009) contributes to CA’s emic belief that researchers must enter the frame they are researching to become members with the notion of “linguaculture.” Koshik (2002) studies Designedly Incomplete Utterences (DIUs) in the classroom setting which explores teacher and student interaction. Lee (2007) and Macbeth (2004) both contribute research to IRE sequence in classroom discourse. Lee argues that the third turn in IRE sequence can have different functions than just Evaluation; Macbeth creates an additional turn, Student Correction (IREC), to the IRE sequence.

In deciding what to focus our research on, we watched the data without any preconceived notions, similar to Psathas’ “unmotivated looking” (as cited in ten Have, 2004, p. 120). This means to take an open-minded approach to the data: open to discovering phenomena rather than searching for phenomena which has already been found and described (ten Have, 2004). We first noticed IRE (Initiation-Response-Evaluation) sequence in the section of video we chose. Through our unmotivated looking, the third turn stood out and we decided to focus our attention on this turn in the IRE sequence. As mentioned previously in this paper, the third turn in IRE sequence can have many different functions. We noticed two patterns with the utterance “okay” and also the teacher’s use of the utterance “right” followed by a reformulation of the student Response. Although we had limited data, we noticed “okay” in third turn position functioning as a continuer in some situations and as a list constructor in others. With this limited data, we found several instances of the word “right” followed immediately by a reformulation of the student’s response in third turn of IRE sequence. Because we found a pattern and found this data interesting and significant, we chose to focus our attention on these three functions of the third turn in IRE sequence.

The data were transcribed following CA conventions as presented in ten Have (2004, pp. 215-216). We focused in particular on the teacher’s questions, student responses, and third turn position work. The data were transcribed to include details about the sequential organization of talk, speech delivery, and relevant nonverbal actions. (See the appendix for a full list of transcription conventions.) Transcription work was divided equally by questions from the game (i.e., each group member transcribed four quiz-game questions).

Transcript fragments

The analysis presented below is based on the following 12 fragments of data. Each fragment represents one review quiz question. Lines of interest are reproduced in our analysis with reference to the fragment from which they are taken.

**Fragment 1**

1 @ Question 1

2 @ Starts at 04:24 cam01

3

4 T: question number one.

5 (0.2)

6 WHAT(.)are the three types of questions that

7 teachers ask for thirty points.

8 (0.1)

9 the three types of questions that teachers ask (.)

10 for thirty points.

11 (.)

12 who can tell me.

13 (0.4) ((Smiles shaking her head))

14 C: ((mumbling noise))

15 T: LEI:. ((Pointing to student using left index finger

16 with a smile))

17 [((raising left hand with palm upward))

18 L: [yes there’re three (.) um [types of questions=

19 T: [((nods head))

20 L: =first rising question is to (.) uh (.) check (.)

21 the student’s underst↑anding.=

22 T: =okay:,=

23 L: =the ss the second one is a (.) to: (0.1) to check

24 the students’ l↑earning.

25 T: ok[ay:,

26 L: [the third one is to guide the student te:h (.)

27 to: (.) learn the knowledge.

28 T: ok↑ay I’ll say that’s close en↑ough=

29 =good j↑o:b.

**Fragment 2**

1 @ Question 2

2 @ Starts at 05:58 cam01

3

4 T: give me an example of a comprehension check

5 question.

6 (0.7)((T Smiles))

7 okay ((pointing to student)) AJ.

8 A: do you follow me?=

9 T: =do you follow me.

10 Good idea, good one.

**Fragment 3**

1 @ Question 3

2 @ Starts at 06:22 cam01

3

4 T: give me an example (.) o:f testing for student

5 knowledge.

6 (.)

7 you can use your own field.

8 [((pointing to student with pen))

9 S: [um (.) could you tell me the formula of the ( )

10 sss (.) similar like this=

11 T: =yes (.) that’s exactly right.

12 can you tell me the formula of something=

13 =so you are making sure they know what it is.

14 S2: ((talking to S))

15 T: good.

16 (.)

17 excellent.

**Fragment 4**

1 @ Question 4

2 @ Starts at 06:55 cam01

3

4 T: who can give me a example of guide(.)guiding

5 student learning.

6 a question to guide student learning=

7 =yes C.((Pointing to student))

8 C: tell me a difference between the ( ) dynamic

9 and ( ) dynamic=

10 T: =right and what kind (.) this question(.)that

11 you’ve just asked (.) is asking it what kind of a

12 questioning technique is it wha- which one is it

13 using.

14 C: uh (.) ask the paraph- paraphrasing the

15 (.)definition.=

16 T: =right. you’re paraphrasing definitions.

17 (.)

18 good job. ((Begins question 5))

**Fragment 5**

1 @ 7:42

2 @ Question 5

3 T: For twenty points, ↑whenever you call on a student.

4 you should have a purpose

5 right? Give two examples of purposes or reasons to

6 call on a student.

7 (.)

8 Zunny.

9 Z: The first (hhrr) ((cough)) The first try to- the

10 first one (.) asks uh try to involving class

11 T: Try to:

12 Z: involve participate in class

13 T: Okay, try to get them to participate in class, okay.

14 Z: and we can also do (.) bad things like talking

15 others and

16 T: \*h alright so it wasn’t necessarily in the reading

17 but right if they’re talking or

18 something you might want to pick on the person to

19 make- okay↓ that works as

20 well.

21 Twenty points good.

22 THERE WERE OTHER re(h)ason(h)s ((laughing voice))

23 in the text as well.

24 Some of them included things like making sure uh:

25 if you want to call on

26 somebody who is particularly knowledgeable so, they

27 can actually °answer the

28 question, and get a good answer, or, checking

29 student comprehension.°

**Fragment 6**

1 **@** Question 6

2 T: Good. For ten points. Ten points. How long should

3 you wait for students to answer a question? Jichow.

4 J: Three-five sections.

5 T: Three-five seconds, right. ((smiling voice))

6 Ten points for o:range.

7 Chatching ↑UP Alri:ght↓

**Fragment 7**

1 @ Question 7

2 T: Ten points (.) International teaching assistants at

3 the Utah state (.) °university° (.)

4 first thought what (.) about wait time? Before they

5 realized it actually made

6 students feel more comfortable. What did they think

7 about wait ↑time first? (.)

8 They changed their minds.

9 (4)

10 \*h:: this is a tough one I almost made it worth

11 more points.

12 (3)

13 The only people who cannot answer right now are

14 °Jichow and Sunny. Everybody else can answer.°

15 Z: Can you (.) say again the question?

16 T: Yes. the question i:s International teaching

17 assistantships at Utah state ↑university

18 what they- the:y where involved in a study (.) and

19 when they bega:n they had a

20 certain opinion about wait time but at the end of

21 the study they realized that wait

22 time actually makes American students feel °more

23 comfortable. (.) What was that

24 opinion?

25 (.)

26 Consider this an obscure fact. °

27 Z: Hey ( ) ((whispering to AJ))

28 T: °Blay can answer.° AH ↑See

29 C: um international TA in Utah ↑study who study the

30 tape that first thought that uh

31 we can’t was kind of keep the student waiting and

32 it was impolite however they

33 change the idea that if a teacher keep increasing

34 wait time can make a students more comfortable.

35 ((reading))

36 T: right. They thought ↑it was impolite. That the

37 ↑students ↑wouldn’t like↓ it. But

38 then decided that maybe the students were actually

39 more comfortable. (.) ‘kay ↑good. ((Begins question 8))

**Fragment 8**

1 **@** Question 8

2 T: \*hh for twenty points, °and this would bring you

3 guys to a tie.° for twenty points,

4 what are two things you can do to encou:rage

5 students to ask questions? What are

6 two things you can do: to ↑encourage students to

7 ask questions?

8 And I think See and Zunny, ↓no ↑See and Jichow, are

9 the only two that cannot answer now. AJ.

10 A: So you can be ↑humorous: kidding about topics

11 you’re talking about and you can

12 look around you know to watch those students see if

13 they feel some:thing uh they

14 feel hard to answer it then you can encourage to

15 answer. Ah they’re two ah

16 perpe( ) by saying something like ( ) or polite.

17 T: More polite[ly? Can you give me an example?]

18 Z: [should I add on?]

19 should I add on?

20 T: huh?

21 Z: add on (.) add on ((hand gesture showing “add on”))

22 T: ah ↑( )? I want a little bit more from you.

23 Z: extra po:ints:

24 T: no I’m not going to give you extra ↑points I might

25 give you twenty though if you

26 can give me the answer

27 Z: no. this my answers. Is a- is a-

28 T: extra points?

29 Z: alright

30 T: well that’s something that wasn’t in the reading.

31 Z: oh

32 T: right but, AJ can you kind of explain by adding

33 more: making it more formal: can

34 you give an example?

35 ((AJ nods))

36 (7)

37 A: yeah. you can say that since very difficult so why

38 thinking must have some ↑questions so

39 T: right. Good. °Uh you guys are the orange team.° Good

40 twenty points. So you can

41 use humor but you can ac↑knowledge that it’s a very

42 difficult ↑subject, (.) and

43 that you might need some ↑help. (.) You might also::

44 specifically ask questions:

45 about °topics. Like° do you ha:ve about what

46 dialogic teaching i:s.

47 °Right. That’s another thing you can do.°

**Fragment 9.**

1 @ Question 9

2 @ Starts at 13:13 cam01

3

4 T: you didn't understand your student's question.

5 (.)

6 what are three: thi:ngs you can do::=

7 =kio ((pointing to k))

8 (4.6) ((laughter))

9 K: first you uh you can (admit) that you that you (you) didn't

10 (understand) the question

11 (.)

12 and also you can repeat and check if the (.) if um the the

13 student's question.

14 (.)

15 like do you mean (what what) blah blah blah

16 T: okay:,

17 K: (sometimes) you can ask another question

18 t- to restate the the question

19 you didn't understand.

20 T: you can ask another question to restate th-

21 K: another student.

22 T: another stu:dent

23 right.

24 you can ask another student to restate (.) the question

25 very ↑good

26 (.)

27 purple team gets it

28 thirty points

**Fragment 10.**

1 @ Question 10

2 @ Starts at 14:20 cam01

3 T: for ↑ten points.

4 (2.5)

5 what is positive reinforcement.

6 (3.0)

7 yes. ((pointing to student))

8 S: ( )

9 T: no

10 ho sung

11 H: nice job

12 good try

13 T: okay:,

14 so what does that mean.

15 (1.0)

16 what is it.

17 those are good examples:

18 (1.0)

19 H: so (1.0) um (.) as (.) we (.) say (.) good job

20 maybe we can encourage (.) the student

21 T: right.=

22 =so it's encouragement

23 it's saying good things

24 instead of (.) YOU'RE WRONG ((mean teacher voice))

25 ri:ght,

26 goo::d

27 ten points to ↑or↓ange.

**Fragment 11.**

1 @ Question 11

2 @ Starts at 15:05

3 T: for ten points

4 (2.0)

5 for homework (.) you read a transcript

6 (2.5)

7 what cla:ss was that transcript from

8 (1.0)

9 sunn[y ]

10 S: [bi]ology

11 T: what was that?

12 S: biology.

13 T: biology.

14 right.

15 S: ( )

16 T: intro: to biology

**Fragment 12.**

1 @ Question 12

2 @ Starts at 15:27

3 T: for forty points

4 (4.0)

5 besi:des question: and answer:

6 what are four: ways: you can be dialogic

7 (.)

8 when you teach.

9 (1.5)

10 I saw See's hand first.

11 ?: ( )

12 T: ↑it was up ↑fi↓rst.

13 S: debate,

14 T: debate, ((index finger))

15 S: discussion,

16 T: discussion, ((index and middle fingers))

17 S: game,

18 T: game, ((index, middle, ring fingers))

19 S: student lab.

20 T: student lab. ((index, middle, ring, pinky fingers))

21 ↓that's correct. ((serious tone; laughter))

22 forty points to purple.

Preliminary analyses

*Third-turn position* okay *projects a ‘second attempt’ answer*

In our data, the teacher routinely evaluates correct answers positively with utterances including *okay*, *right*, *good*. However, like in most classrooms, students’ responses were not always wholly correct. In such cases, the teacher categorically provided opportunities for her students to reformulate their answers, which we have labeled as ‘second attempt’ answers. Example 1 illustrates this type of interaction:

**Example 1.** ((Fragment 10, ll. 3-20))

3 T: for ↑ten points.

4 (2.5)

5 what is positive reinforcement.

6 (3.0)

7 yes. ((pointing to student))

8 S: ( )

9 T: no

10 ho sung

11 H: nice job

12 good try

13 T: **okay:,**

14 so what does that mean.

15 (1.0)

16 what is it.

17 those are good examples:

18 (1.0)

19 H: so (1.0) um (.) as (.) we (.) say (.) good job

20 maybe we can encourage (.) the student

Here, the teacher poses her question (ll. 3-5) and, after a long pause, selects the next speaker (l. 7). S mistakenly begins to answer (l. 8) but the teacher corrects the student (l. 9) and re-selects H as the called on student. H provides two examples of positive reinforcement in response to the question (ll. 11-12). However, H’s examples are not sufficient for the teacher. In lines 13-17, she pursues her question, explicitly indicating that the preferred answer is a definition, not an example, of positive reinforcement. H then provides a definition or explanation (ll. 19-20). What is remarkable here is the teacher’s use of *okay* (l. 13) prior to her request for a more explicit definition of positive reinforcement. *Okay* is prosodically marked with a lengthened vowel [ei] and slightly rising, continuing intonation. Her following positive evaluation of the examples (l. 17) suggests that H is “on the right track” but has not yet answered the question. We argue that the use of *okay:,* in this teacher’s talk may project a second attempt answer, regardless of whether the teacher explicitly reformulates her question or not. We base our claim on the data in Example 2.

**Example 2.** ((Fragment 9, ll. 4-19))

4 T: you didn't understand your student's question.

5 (.)

6 what are three: thi:ngs you can do::=

7 =kio ((pointing to k))

8 (4.6) ((laughter))

9 K: first you uh you can (admit) that you that you (you) didn't

10 (understand) the question

11 (.)

12 and also you can repeat and check if the (.) if um the the

13 student's question.

14 (.)

15 like do you mean (what what) blah blah blah

16 T: **okay:,**

17 K: (sometimes) you can ask another question

18 t- to restate the the question

19 you didn't understand.

Whereas in Example 1 the teacher’s pursuit of the question was prefaced by *okay* and followed by an explicit request for a reformulated answer, here the *okay* in line 16 alone elicits a reformulated answer (17-19). Importantly, this *okay* is prosodically marked in the same way as the previous example: the vowel sound [ei] is lengthened and there is slightly rising, continuing intonation. This suggests that students in this class orient to this type of *okay* as a request for a reformulated or second attempt answer. Of course, an expanded data set would help us to confirm or disconfirm this hypothesis.

*Third-turn position co-constructs list answers*

Our second observation suggests that the third turn position helps to co-construct list answers. This is similar to our analysis of *okay* presented above, where *okay* signals to answering students that they are “on the right track” but need to provide a second attempt answer. Here, however, third turn position projects the next element in a list or multi-element answer. Example 3 illustrates this:

**Example 3.** ((Fragment 1, ll. 15-28))

15 T: LEI:. ((Pointing to student using left index finger

16 with a smile))

17 [((raising left hand with palm upward))

18 L: [yes there’re three (.) um [types of questions=

19 T: [**((nods head))**

20 L: =first rising question is to (.) uh (.) check (.)

21 the student’s underst↑anding.=

22 T: **=okay:,=**

23 L: =the ss the second one is a (.) to: (0.1) to check

24 the students’ l↑earning.

25 T: **ok[ay:,**

26 L: [the third one is to guide the student te:h (.)

27 to: (.) learn the knowledge.

28 T: **ok↑ay.** I’ll say that’s close en↑ough=

The question (see Fragment 1, 4-12) is about the three types of questions that teachers ask. L is called on by the teacher and initiates a pre-answer response (18). The teacher begins to nod her head up and down as if to say “okay” or “yes” as the pre-answer comes to a close. Then, as L begins her answer (20), the teacher responds to each element with *okay*. The first two *okay*s (22, 25) are prosodically the same as those shown in the preceding section: the vowel is lengthened and there is slightly rising intonation. However, instead of projecting a second attempt answer, these *okay*s project the next element of a list answer. Thus, there is evidence that this same practice accomplishes two similar yet distinct actions. The final *okay* (28) then differs prosodically. There is a sharp pitch rise on [kai] followed by final falling intonation. Here, *okay* signals the completion of the list, which is followed by the teacher’s positive evaluation of the co-constructed list answer (i.e., *I’ll say that’s close enough*).

Similarly, repetitions are used in third turn position to co-construct list answer, as in Example 4:

**Example 4.** ((Fragment 12, ll. 12-22))

12 T: ↑it was up ↑fi↓rst.

13 S: debate,

14 T: **debate,** ((index finger))

15 S: discussion,

16 T: **discussion,** ((index and middle fingers))

17 S: game,

18 T: **game,** ((index, middle, ring fingers))

19 S: student lab.

20 T: **student lab.** ((index, middle, ring, pinky fingers))

21 ↓that's correct. ((serious tone; laughter))

22 forty points to purple.

Here, there question (see Fragment 12, 5-8) is about four ways to be dialogic when teaching in addition to question-answer participation frameworks. The teacher calls on S to provide the answer. In this case, each element of the answer is a single word (13, 15, 17, 18). Interestingly, the teacher repeats not only the words uttered by S in his answer but also follows the intonation contour while simultaneously counting one to four with her fingers. In the first, second, and third repetitions, the intonation in continuing and slightly rising, whereas the last repetition, following the student’s answer, has final, falling intonation. We argue that these repetition simultaneously evaluate the answer-in-progress positively and project the next element in the list. After the final element is provided, both the student’s delivery of it and the teacher’s repetition with final falling intonation signal the end of the list, the completed answer.

Right*-prefaced reformulations evaluate answers and close the question sequence*

The final focus of our analysis in on the teacher’s *right*-prefaced reformulations of student answers in third turn position. These occur in Fragments 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10. Based on these examples, we argue that *right*-prefaced reformulations serve to evaluate correct answers positively and bring the question sequence to a close. Example 5 illustrates this:

**Example 5.** ((Fragment 4, ll. 4-18))

4 T: who can give me a example of guide (.) guiding

5 student learning.

6 a question to guide student learning=

7 =yes C.((Pointing to student))

8 C: tell me a difference between the ( ) dynamic

9 and ( ) dynamic=

10 T: =right and what kind (.) this question (.) that

11 you’ve just asked (.) is asking it what kind of a

12 questioning technique is it wha- which one is it

13 using.

14 C: uh (.) ask the paraph- paraphrasing the

15 (.)definition.=

16 T: =**right**. you’re paraphrasing definitions.

17 (.)

18 good job. ((Begins question 5))

Here, the question is about providing an example of guiding student learning. C provides an example question (8-9) that the teacher positively evaluates as being “on the right track” but further pursues the question by asking which technique it represents (10-13). Following C’s reformulation of the answer (14-15), the teacher utters her *right*-prefaced reformulation (16). This *right* signals the close of the question via its final falling intonation. The teacher’s reformulation of the answer is then followed by another evaluation (*good job*; 18). Then, the transition to question 5 begins. This pattern is also shown in Example 6:

**Example 6.** ((Fragment 7, ll. 29-39))

29 C: um international TA in Utah ↑study who study the

30 tape that first thought that uh

31 we can’t was kind of keep the student waiting and

32 it was impolite however they

33 change the idea that if a teacher keep increasing

34 wait time can make a students more comfortable.

35 ((reading))

36 T: **right.** They thought ↑it was impolite. That the

37 ↑students ↑wouldn’t ↓like it. But

38 then decided that maybe the students were actually

39 more comfortable. (.) kay ↑good. ((Begins question 8))

Following C’s answer (29-35), the teacher produces a *right-*prefaced reformulation (36-39). Here again, the *right*-prefaced reformulation is followed by a final evaluation (*kay good*; 39) before moving on to the next question. From these examples, we can say that third turn position *right*-prefaced reformulations following a completed, correct answer project the close of the question sequence and allow the teacher to move into a final evaluation to transition to the next action (e.g., asking the next question).

Concluding remarks

Our preliminary analyses illustrate the polyvalence of the third turn position beyond straightforward evaluations, which aligns with Lee’s (2007) study. We found that the third turn position can accomplish the following three actions:

1. Eliciting a reformulated “second attempt” answer;

2. Co-constructing a list answer;

3. Positively evaluating a complete, correct answer to close the question sequence.

In order to confirm or disconfirm these findings, an expanded corpus of data is needed. Ideally, this would include both review quiz games and other types of classroom interaction in order to explore how pervasive these actions are in a variety of interaction types. In addition, data from other classes with other teachers is needed to investigate whether the practices and actions described above are idiosyncratic or more widespread. Future research will also benefit from more specific focus on prosodic features of third turns that follow or contrast with student responses.
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Appendix: Transcription Conventions (see ten Have, 2004, pp. 215-216)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sequencing** | |
|  |  |
| [ | Onset of overlapping speech |
| ] | End of overlapping speech |
| = | Latching (i.e., no gap between utterances) |
|  |  |
| **Timed intervals** | |
|  |  |
| (.) | Micropause (less than 0.2 sec) |
| (2.0) | Timed pause (longer than 0.2 sec) |
|  |  |
| **Speech delivery** | |
|  |  |
| word | Underlined words (or parts of words) indicates stress |
| :: | Sound lengthening. Multiple colons indicate more prolongation |
| - | Abrupt cut off |
| . | Falling intonation |
| , | Slightly rising/continuing intonation |
| ? | Rising intonation (not necessarily a question) |
| ↑ | Markedly higher pitch relative to preceding talk |
| ↓ | Markedly lower pitch relative to preceding talk |
| WORD | Markedly loud sound relative to surrounding context |
| ºwordº | Markedly soft sound relative to surrounding context |
| h | Audible outbreath (multiple *h*s mean longer outbreath) |
| .h | Audible inbreath (multiple *h*s mean longer inbreath) |
| w(h)ord | Breathiness, as in laughter during speech |
| @ | Laughter. Each @ represents one beat (e.g., *ha ha ha* → @ @ @) |
|  |  |
| **Transciber’s doubts and comments** | |
|  |  |
| ( ) | Empty parentheses indicate inaudible speech |
| (word) | Unclear speech. For errors in French leading to unclear or indecipherable speech, the transcription is a phonetic approximation of what was uttered. |
| (( )) | Transcriber’s notes, comments, descriptions, etc. |

Individual reflections

*Sarah Pun*

After a semester of studying Conversation Analysis (CA), I feel that I have a strong grasp of the ideology behind it and even a firm grasp of transcribing methods. I like the CA view that phenomena found in analysis must be “discovered” rather than “searched for.” I think this basic, yet foundational, idea is the essence of CA and the reason it is extremely influential as a tool for research on interaction.

In this paper, we had to go about our analysis using CA methodology. At first, I was not sure that any phenomena would stand out, but after watching the data source, it was easy to focus on the game section of the video we selected simply because it is unique and interesting. After narrowing the data down a bit, we still had a daunting task ahead of choosing what to focus on; however, after transcribing my section, I did see some interesting patterns emerge. I was particularly interested in the third turn IRE sequence when the teacher responded, “Right” and reformulated the student Response.

Before we found this particular pattern, we first noticed a pattern of reformulations and repetitions in third turn position. We decided to look for all the excerpts where we found repetitions, but it turned out that there was not enough data to support any claims. During this process, however, we noticed the pattern of “right” followed by a reformulation of student response in third turn position. It is interesting how noticing one thing can lead to something different that was not noticed before, but I’m sure this is a common occurrence in the CA practice. This is an example of how trying to “discover” patterns rather than “search” for them was extremely beneficial for our analysis.

We also noticed the use of “okay” in the third turn position. It was interesting to find different “okay” utterances with differing intonations which had different functions from one another. We had some debates on whether certain “okay” utterances had the same function which was really interesting and insightful. To solve our debates, using CA methodology, we focused on what occurred *after* the “okay” in the next turn, rather than trying to assume what the speaker was trying to do by using “okay.” Another fundamental part of CA is to never assume what is going on in a participant’s head, and although this can be difficult to avoid, it is extremely essential to avoid multiple, subjective perspectives on the same phenomena.

After a semester of learning about CA, I feel confident that our paper and analysis follow the CA framework carefully. We were able to practice the two fundamental parts of CA I brought up here which solidified the CA framework for me and gave me a new perspective on CA as a tool for research on interaction. Through this experience, I was able to find for myself that CA is indeed an extremely useful tool for understanding interaction, especially in educational settings. For me, as a teacher, I know I will be able to use CA methodology in the future to examine my own classroom interaction to discover what is being done by the words I choose and whether or not it is the result I was wanting.

*Jiyun Kim*

The microanalysis of the data that our group conducted revealed the followings: (1) without detailed analysis of the interactional context and its relevance to the participant’s conduct, it is hard to assess analytic claims about the kind of work an utterance is doing and its significance in the unfolding interaction; (2) analytic process made me better understand the difference between CA and other theoretically oriented approaches such as critical discourse analysis: while critical discourse analysis tends to impose an interpretation of interaction which reflects the analysts’ theoretical orientations, and which in turn obscures analysis of what is actually relevant to the participants themselves, CA analysis is grounded in close description of participants’ activities, and which were demonstrably relevant to the participants themselves as they conducted those activities.

Next turn analysis in CA research is routinely used to ground claims about how a next speaker interpreted the action accomplished by a prior turn. In this sense a methodological procedure associated with CA is useful because it exposes the layers of meaning of an utterance. The majority of the prior literature on third turn position in classroom interaction has offered a general and global characterization of what teachers do relying on the functional categories of teacher evaluation and feedback. While the previous research provides us with a theoretical undertaking and helps us to shape our ways of understanding classroom interaction, it, at the same time, reveals its limit capture and reconstruct the complex realities of language use on the basis of a few abstract categories that have been established so far.

Lee (2007), in the same vein, points to what cannot be seen in such analytic undertakings. Introducing the approach that focuses on cases of interactional details that do not necessarily fit the previously suggested formal categories, he illustrates how the third turn position is particularly important since “its relevance and influence take shape across the contingencies generated by the students’ second turn, which itself is contingent upon the prior turn by the teacher. As a result the third turn position pulls into view the practical details of teaching that are contingent and ad hoc (ibid., p. 202).” The roles of the third position we found from our data aligns with Lee’s argument in that the teacher’s utterance *okay* with the same intonation contour plays difference roles of projecting reformulated response and con-constructing list answers with students in two different contexts. These categories cannot be explained by the formal categories of the third turn position in classroom discourse. This reveals that the analytic procedure of CA allows us to obtain a closer understanding of classroom teaching and learning as practical enactments of classroom instruction.

Further analysis of an expanded data set that consists of more instances of the same patterns is necessary in order to either confirm or disconfirm the previous argument made. More detailed transcription on intonation contours and prosodic features used in the third turn position is in need to specify the local contingencies that surround the teacher’s third turn and to reveal more range of the method of actions that the teacher displays.

*Rémi A. van Compernolle*

At the beginning of this project, I thought it would be relatively easy to identify, transcribe, and analyze some feature of interaction that would stand out in our data. The three of us talked about equally dividing up the work for efficiency, each of us working on a particular interactional feature. However, early on, it become apparent that each of us saw and heard different things, and even when we saw or heard the same thing, our interpretations and arguments were often different. This was particularly relevant for our analysis of *okay*. We spent a number of hours at different meetings trying to come to a consensus about what was happening in the data.

Although it was at times frustrating because we could not immediately come to a consensus about our analyses, it forced me to make clear and strong arguments based on the data rather than some impressionistic or more traditional discourse analytic understanding of words and utterances. In fact, the disagreements often led to new understandings of the data that none of us had previously argued for. In other words, it was through our disagreements that we came to a consensus, but that consensus often had little to do with the analyses we had done before meeting to discuss them.

The most specific example I can think of is again our disagreement about *okay*. We each had different takes on what it was doing: positive evaluation, continuation, projecting a second attempt answer, etc. This disagreement forced us to go back to the video data to listen carefully to the way *okay* was delivered in each of our fragments. This is how we found that the particular practice of *okay:,* (lengthened vowel + continuing, slightly rising intonation) was the *okay* we wanted to focus on. So our conclusion was not that any and all *okay* tokens evaluated, but that the particular prosodic features were key to their interpretations.

Overall, I think I have become relatively comfortable using CA to analyze interaction and to make claims about the interactions I analyze. I am also confident evaluating other research that is CA-based. This is a result of two things. First, this project, as well as the various in-class data analyses and discussions, have helped me to understand the CA perspective in greater depth. Second, I have also become more familiar with the discourse and jargon of CA research. In short, in addition to improving my analytic skills, I feel more comfortable talking about interaction in CA terms.