THE UNIVERSITY
OF BIRMINGHAM

Department of English

Centre for English Language Studies

MA TEFL/TESL / Translation Studies, Open Distance Learning

Name	Sarah L. Jones
Country where registered	S. Korea
Dissertation title	INVESTIGATING THE F-MOVE IN TEACHER TALK: A SOUTH KOREAN STUDY ON TEACHERS' BELIEFS AND CLASSROOM PRACTICES
Submission date	2011.03.13
Submission	(1) First submission
Name of supervisor	John Adamson

DECLARATION

I declare:

   a) that this submission is my own work;
   b) that this is written in my own words; and
   c) that all quotations from published or unpublished work are acknowledged with quotation marks and references to the work in question.
   d) that this dissertation consists of approximately 12,714 (insert no.) words, excluding footnotes, references, figures, tables appendices & long quotations.

Name: Sarah L. Jones

Date: 2011.03.13

INVESTIGATING THE F-MOVE IN TEACHER TALK: A SOUTH KOREAN STUDY ON TEACHERS' BELIEFS AND CLASSROOM PRACTICES

by

Sarah Lindsay Jones

A dissertation submitted to
The School of Humanities of the University of Birmingham
in part fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign or Second Language (TEFL / TESOL)

Supervisor: John Adamson

This dissertation consists of approximately 12,714 words

Centre for English Language Studies
Department of English
University of Birmingham
Edgbaston
Birmingham B15 2TT
English

March 2011

ABSTRACT

Investigation into the relationship between what teachers say, intend, and do can help improve overall teacher effectiveness. Reviews of teacher belief systems and classroom discourse helped base this study on the relationship between beliefs and class practices. This small-scale study of three native-English speaking conversation teachers at a Korean university consisted of a triangulated methodology integrating a teachers' beliefs survey, classroom observations, and a retrospective interview. Analyzing the follow-up move in whole-class discourse using a modified version of the Sinclair and Coulthard IRF model, discoursal and evaluative teaching strategies were examined to determine if inferences could be made regarding teachers' beliefs and classroom behaviors. Aside from a few inconsistencies, it was found that these teachers' educational beliefs were manifested in their class actions in the observed and analyzed portions of their classes. Unanticipated study problems and limitations in discourse analysis were acknowledged and recommendations for further research made. Additional studies of how teachers use teacher talk in their follow-up move could further support the findings in this study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study would not have been possible without the support, participation, and feedback from a group of people I am deeply indebted to. First, I would like to thank the participants for allowing me to question, observe, and interview them. I want to express my sincere thanks to my dissertation supervisor John Adamson for his prompt and informative feedback. Without his insight and guidance this paper would not have reached its full potential. I am indebted to my tutor Andrew White who nurtured and encouraged my academic growth throughout the entire program. I would especially like to thank my professional colleagues for their support throughout this process. I am truly grateful to my husband for his patience and dedication to parenthood since the arrival of our son during the middle of my dissertation. Lastly, I would like to thank my parents and in-laws for being my first and constant supporters in all my projects.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF EXCERPTS

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Every language teacher holds beliefs about language learning and language teaching. Beliefs, "attitudes consistently applied to an activity," contribute to the choices and decisions made in a classroom (Eisenhart et al., 1988: 54). Though the basis of these beliefs varies among teachers, recognizing beliefs and their influence can help teachers better understand their classroom practices. Thus the relationship between teachers' beliefs and classroom practices becomes vital to educational research. These sentiments are widely shared by Fenstermacher (1979, cited in Pajares, 1992: 307); Johnson (1994); Karavas-Doukas (1996); and Pajares (1992). Investigation into what teachers say, intend, and actually do in their classrooms can help improve overall teacher effectiveness (Borg, 2003; Pajares, 1992). A classroom has a particular framework which allows a teacher to be in control of the discourse through their use of language (Johnson, 1995, cited in Walsh, 2002: 5). One aspect of teacher talk is the follow-up move (F-move) which typically occurs after a student contribution. It is the choice of the F-move that determines how a discourse is developed (Nassaji and Wells, 2000).

The purpose of this study is to analyze the teacher F-move in whole-class discourse to determine if any inferences can be drawn regarding teachers' educational beliefs. This is a small-scale study consisting of three native-English speaking teachers at a South Korean university in their mandatory freshmen conversation classes. To analyze these classroom practices, a modified version of the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, 1992) framework was applied, as well as Cullen's (2002) discoursal and evaluative F-moves. Though this type of study has been conducted previously, little attention has been given to conversation courses or the follow-up move. To strengthen any inferences made, a multi-methods approach will be used involving a teachers' belief survey, classroom observations, and semi-structured retrospective interviews.

The study begins with Chapter 2 addressing the term "beliefs," the role of teachers' beliefs and classroom practices, and sources of teachers' beliefs. Chapter 2 also reviews classroom discourse, using discourse analysis as a means to investigate classroom practices, while acknowledging some limitations of discourse analysis. Chapter 3 presents the project

participants as well as the triangulated methodology used to design this study, with study limitations mentioned at the end of this chapter. The results are presented, analyzed, and discussed in Chapter 4, focusing on each individual participant. The final chapter summarizes the findings and concludes the study. The teachers' beliefs survey and class transcriptions can be found in the Appendices.

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section, two topics will be addressed. First, a review of teachers' beliefs will cover terminology, contexts, and foundations of beliefs. Though Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theories are a significant source of teachers' beliefs, they will only be discussed as they occur in the methodology and findings of this study (See Chapters 3 and 4). Therefore, the purpose of this literature review is not to review SLA theories. Section 2.2 will discuss components of spoken discourse as a method for examining classroom interactions.

2.1 Beliefs

Beliefs are dynamic in nature and often associated with values, attitudes, and knowledge. Pajares explains the complexity of a belief system:

> *When clusters of beliefs are organized around...[a] situation and predisposed to action, this holistic organization becomes an attitude. Beliefs may also become values, which house the evaluative, comparative, and judgmental functions of beliefs and replace predisposition with an imperative to action. Beliefs, attitudes, and values form an individual's belief system.* (1992: 314)

Beliefs are often associated with knowledge but Pajares distinguishes between these terms, claiming that the former are based on evaluation and judgment while knowledge is based on objective fact (Ibid.). Nespor (1987) argues that beliefs are "more influential than knowledge in determining how individuals organize and define tasks and problems and are stronger predictors of behavior" (cited in Parajes, 1992: 311). Also, beliefs incorporate knowledge but are part of a broader dynamic (Rokeach, 1968, cited in Pajares, 1992: 314). Borg (2003) refers to "teacher cognition," as what teachers know, believe, and think. For Borg, teacher cognition is shaped by schooling, professional coursework, contextual factors, and classroom practice including classroom teaching (Ibid.: 82).

Borg (Ibid.) highlights other related terminology often paralleled with beliefs and gives a thorough review of prominent work in language teacher cognition research. His paper

provides evidence that studies have predominantly focused on teacher instruction in literacy, reading, and grammar classes as well as beliefs before, during, and after teacher training. Little research has been conducted on conversation courses.

Educational beliefs of teachers and their classroom behavior will be addressed in 2.1.1, followed by a discussion of the foundations of these beliefs in 2.1.2.

2.1.1 Teachers' Beliefs and the Classroom

The link between teachers' beliefs and classroom practices has been widely studied by Altan (1997); Borg (2003); Brown (2009); Chui (2009); Johnson (1992); Karavas-Doukas (1996); Tardy and Snyder (2004); and Walsh (2002). For an Asian perspective see: Choi (2000); Yook (2010)-- Korea; Chui (2009)-- Taiwan; and Sato and Kleinsasser (2004)-- Japan. Particularly relevant to this study on teachers' beliefs in Korea, Yook (2010) conducted an extensive analysis of thirteen empirical studies on native-Korean EFL teachers' beliefs, teacher education, and reforms. He summarized that these studies showed that "Korean EFL teachers' beliefs tend to be teacher-centered, text-based, and grammar-oriented" and that these beliefs are resistant to change (Ibid.: 53).

Several case studies on the congruence between teachers' beliefs and classroom practices have found gaps. McDonald and Walker (1975) claim there is a gap "between what people think they are doing, what they say they are doing...and what in fact they are doing" (cited in Powell, 1999: 4). Cohen and Fass (2001) questioned teachers and students on oral language instruction to discover that teachers believed their classrooms more student-centered and communicative than they proved to be. Karavas-Doukas (1996) also investigated the communicative approach and found a lack of awareness towards teachers' attitudes created a discrepancy between beliefs and classroom practice. Powell (1999) used self-observation as a less evasive method for determining teacher beliefs and though this method saved time, he found little reflection of teachers' beliefs in their practices.

Another such gap is a lack of contextual understanding. Farrell and Lim (2005) investigated grammar teaching and determined that context placed a major restriction on beliefs and

classroom practice. Burns (1996) explains that social and institutional contexts must be taken into account in these types of studies (cited in Borg, 2003: 94; See Johnson, 1992). A study in a Japanese high school English department discovered the significance of context, or teaching culture, in understanding teachers' beliefs and their work (Sato and Kleinsasser, 2004). This study investigated school culture to identify how teachers classified their teaching situation. Specifically, a learning-impoverished school has teachers that work in isolation, are uncertain about their instruction, and feel their learning has stopped. In contrast, learning-enriched schools have teachers that support continual collaboration and on-going learning to better their classes. Borg (2003) agrees that practices are shaped by institution and classroom contexts. External factors such as school policy, curriculum requirements, colleagues, and resource availability can hinder teachers' beliefs from becoming reflected in their practices (Ibid.).

Yook (2010) examined numerous studies on ESL/EFL teachers' beliefs and class practices, concluding that despite inconsistencies between what teachers say they believe and what they actually do in the language classroom, a significant degree of interaction could be found. Johnson (1992) used a multi-dimensional approach involving a theory profile, lesson plan analysis, and belief inventory to investigate non-native speakers of English during their literacy instruction to identify a relationship between teachers' beliefs and classroom practices. Johnson discovered that her dynamic technique strengthened her inferences about the relationship between beliefs and teaching methodologies (Ibid.). Yook (2010) concurs that triangulation is necessary to ensure sufficient qualitative methodology needed for sound inferences. Borg (2003) claims a lack of triangulation could undercut the validity of any findings. Munby (1982) not only believes congruence can exist between teachers' beliefs and teachers' classroom decisions, but that any lack of relationship is a result of a poor study model or instruments (cited in Pajares, 1992: 326). He feels all decisions are influenced by a belief and the challenge is to match these behaviors and decisions with the correct cause (Ibid.).

Not only is there a "school culture," or context which each teacher works within, there is also a "culture of teaching" which effects teachers' decision making in their own situation.

Richards and Lockhart claim:

> *Teachers' belief systems are founded on the goals, values, and beliefs teachers hold in relation to the content and process of teaching, and their understanding of the systems in which they work and their roles within it. These beliefs and values serve as the background to much of the teachers' decision making and action, and hence constitute what has been termed the 'culture of teaching.'* (1996: 30)

This "culture" is reflected within the context of teachers work environments, including the beliefs and knowledge surrounding the interactions between teachers and their work (Altan, 1997; Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986, cited in Richards and Lockhart, 1996: 30). The following section will discuss sources of teachers' beliefs.

2.1.2 Sources of Teachers' Beliefs

Richards and Lockhart (1996) argue that teachers' belief systems come from a variety of sources: personal experience as a language learner, teaching experience, preferred practice, personality factors, educationally based or research-based principles, and principles originated from an approach or method. Sato and Kleinsasser (2004) expand this to include initial teaching experiences involving trial and error, socialization within the work environment, and external learning opportunities. The complexity and importance given to these sources vary depending on the individual (Pajares, 1992). Each of these components deserves brief mention.

Teachers' prior experiences as learners mold their educational beliefs. Teaching is one of the few professions in which novices have already partaken in numerous hours of observation and evaluation of professional teachers (Borg, 2004). This "apprenticeship of observation" phenomenon creates pre-service teachers' preconceptions of classroom teaching behaviors (Lortie, 1975 cited in Borg, 2004: 274). Teachers remembering their own experience as language learners can influence their beliefs about effective classroom practice. However, this observation provides only a partial view of the behaviors necessary in teaching. By imitating these established procedures for teaching, student-teachers could fail to develop their own teaching beliefs (Johnson, 1994). The apprenticeship of observation allows for a powerful

understanding of teaching by helping pre-service teachers recognize and form their own beliefs. Richardson (2003) examined the relationship in teacher cognition, classroom action, and ways of creating changes in both, for in-service and pre-service teachers. According to her, classroom strategies and actions are influenced by beliefs and beliefs are an important aspect in the education of teacher candidates (Ibid.).

Established practice leads to a social negotiation of what works within a teaching context. Borg (2004) points out the value of a socially negotiated educational belief system. The environments and processes involved in the sociocultural school environment shape teacher learning and beliefs (Freeman and Johnson, 1998). Teachers' beliefs develop in this contextual framework as they experience what works effectively. Pajares (1992) asserts that classroom behaviors are a result of beliefs being filtered by experience. Trial and error, as well as established teaching styles within an institution, influence these beliefs. Educational beliefs, being constructed by experiences in the classroom as learner and teacher, as well as the teaching context in which teachers work, are organic and often challenged. This learning process is lifelong (Freeman and Johnson, 1998).

Personality, and personal preferences toward one teaching style or particular activity, become a foundation for teachers' educational beliefs (Richards and Lockhart, 1996). An outgoing teacher may believe in more active participation, such as whole-class surveys. A quieter teacher believes more in pairwork. Some teachers use their spontaneity to change their lesson plans during class, while others may prefer to follow the lesson as given in the book.

Teachers' beliefs may be influenced by educational theories or established teaching methods (Richard and Lockhart, 1996). Though Pajares (1992) states that beliefs formed early in life are resistant to change regardless of educational knowledge, teachers that have studied teaching/learning principles or have an understanding of certain teaching approaches may incorporate these methods into their educational beliefs. SLA theories may influence a teacher's classroom approach regardless of teacher awareness of the distinction between such theories (See 3.2.1). Brown (2001) states that as each teaching situation or classroom varies, an integrated, eclectic approach to teaching, often occurs. Teachers' beliefs, then, are partially eclectic. Though they may believe more strongly in one approach, they may not use only one

finite method to practice these beliefs in the classroom (Ibid.).

2.2 Method of Research

Woods (1996, cited in Borg, 2003: 87) sees beliefs as being analogous to assumptions and knowledge, which he terms "BAK," and hence, they are a vital component to teaching practice. The difficulty in empirically investigating educational beliefs has been recognized by Altan (1997), Pajares (1992), and Yang (2000). Yang (2000) states beliefs tend to be implicit, while Altan (1997) labels beliefs as subjective and therefore, difficult to study. This lack of objectivity and specificity justifies making inferences about what people say, intend, and do (Rokeach, 1968, cited in Pajares, 1992: 314). Pajares (1992) cautions that informative research in this area must involve belief inferences and assessments, that contain a focus on teachers' actions and intentions, as evidence of their beliefs. The challenge is to assess these inferences as accurately as possible.

With knowledge of this research challenge, this study used classroom discourse as a means to investigate teachers' classroom practices. A brief overview of classroom discourse (2.2.1), discourse analysis (2.2.2), and its limitations (2.2.3) will be covered in the following sections before describing the methodology employed in this study.

2.2.1 Classroom Discourse

In any discourse, the function of language is evaluated in terms of its participants, roles, and settings (McCarthy, 1991). As a type of institutional discourse, classroom discourse is founded on normal conversation exchanges with similar characteristics of interactive choice and interdependency of contributions (Walsh, 2002). This discourse differs from other settings as the teacher dominates and alters these aspects of the language to organize lessons, maintain discipline, and teach certain subject matter (Sinclair and Brazil, 1982). Language exchange in the classroom usually follows a repeated "triadic dialogue" (Lemke, 1985, cited in Wells, 1993: 29) of the teacher asking a question, students responding, and the teacher commenting on the student's contribution (Nunan, 1999). The follow-up move (F-move) distinguishes classroom talk strongly from other forms of discourse (Cullen, 2002). This move is atypical in

real-world conversations, while in classrooms it can occur at any point during an exchange (Nunan, 1999; Willis, 1992). Thus, this Initiation-Response-Feedback structure is not usually found in natural discourse (Jones, 2009). Known as the IRF structure in British schools, its American equivalent is IRE, Initiation-Response-Evaluation (Mehan, 1979, cited in Nassaji and Wells 2000: 379).

Another distinct component of classroom discourse, aside from the F-move, is teacher talk. Teacher talk is the way in which teachers modify speech to be understood by their learners (Richards and Lockhart, 1996). Teacher talk has distinct features according to its formal or functional purpose (Ma Xiaoyan, 2006). Formal features of teacher talk refer to changing pronunciation, speaking speed, repeating statements, or other such modifications that might alter conversational speech in an effort to provide more "comprehensible input" to learners (Krashen, 1985, cited in Richards and Lockhart, 1996: 184). Functional features involve language the teacher uses to manage and organize class, such as the type of questions asked, the quantity and quality of teacher talk, interactional modifications, and teachers' feedback (Ma Xiaoyan, 2006). Shim (nd) has investigated teacher talk as strategies in the Korean classroom.

Authentic or genuine communication, according to Thornbury (1996), involves asking referential questions, giving feedback on content, providing sufficient wait time between questions and responses, and encouraging student-initiated interaction. Cullen (1998: 179) argues that "good" teacher talk does not equate to "little" teacher talk, but rather the awareness and regard a teacher has for the aspects of communicative classroom interaction mentioned above by Thornbury. The quantity of teacher talk has been criticized for its imbalance with quality (Walsh, 2002). Features considered non-communicative would include excessive use of display questions, form-focused feedback, repeating students' responses, and predictable IRF/IRE structures. However, Cullen (1998) argues that these non-communicative features are relevant and significant in a classroom context.

In a natural setting, one asks a question they do not know the answer to, known as a reference question. Most classroom questions asked by the teacher are known-response, or display questions (Cullen, 2002; Walsh, 2002). The purpose of this question type is to check student

progress, yet is criticized as being meaningless to interactions other than classroom or parent-child exchanges (Seedhouse, 1996). The classroom setting also alters turn-taking and intonation (McCarthy, 1991). Some characteristics of conversation, such as equality among participants and spontaneity, are absent in a classroom setting (Cook, 1989). While in natural conversation turn-taking is initiated by both speakers, in a classroom, learners expect the teacher to lead the conversation and tell them what to do. Learners place the teacher in the more dominating role and this is further exemplified by intonation.

These issues highlight some conflicts that arise when trying to bring a more communicative approach into a classroom setting. Breen and Candlin (1980, cited in Cullen, 1998: 182) take an opposing position, claiming that the social environment of a classroom has its own unique activities and conventions. The classroom should be seen as communicative in its own context. Regardless of the non-authenticity of recreating conversational discourse, the institutional classroom setting is still valued as a place for learning English (Seedhouse, 1996).

2.2.2 Discourse Analysis

A look at form and function of written or spoken discourse is known as discourse analysis. Two analysts who gave structure to teacher-student discourse are J. Sinclair and M. Coulthard (1975, 1992). Adapting Halliday's original hierarchical grammar rank scale concept, they created a descriptive two-party classroom model of discourse: lesson, transaction, exchange, move, and act (1961, cited in Brazil, 1995: 34). As adaptions were later made on this scale, the lesson rank was eliminated (Coulthard, 1985). A brief explanation of the act, move, and exchange levels of the IRF model will now be given.

The smallest unit of classroom discourse is the individual act which is realized by a single word or a clause (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, 1992). Twenty-two acts were originally proposed but later minimized to seventeen, each with distinct discourse functions (Coulthard, 1985). When teachers ask a known-response question, they usually follow-up with an evaluation utterance. Francis and Hunston (1992) acknowledge that each new set of data requires adjustments to the act level, and provide their own thirty-two act labels. When

researchers analyze the F-move as not only being evaluative, but conversational (Francis and Hunston, 1992) or discoursal (Cullen, 2002; Jarvis and Robinson, 1997), the pedagogic function becomes more varied (Cullen, 2002; Jarvis and Robinson, 1997; Nassaji and Wells, 2000).

As moves combine to form exchanges, they are comprised of acts. The IRF/IRE moves already mentioned comprise one exchange. The feedback move was later functionally re-named a follow-up move (F-move) and, for consistency, will be labeled so in this paper (Coulthard and Brazil, 1992; Sinclair and Brazil, 1982). Exchanges are structures expressed in terms of moves. As teachers use language to get things accomplished, their exchanges may be classified as teaching or organizational. Organizational exchanges frame and focus transitions within a lesson as a teacher changes the direction of the discourse (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1992). Teaching exchanges are subdivided into free and bound exchanges with a bound exchange being fixed to the initiation of the preceding exchange (Malouf, 1995). Nominations, prompts, or clues are acts that are usually associated with bound teaching exchanges. A typical classroom exchange is illustrated in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 2.1:	**Typical Classroom Exchange**	
T:	Okay. Um, what do you have to do if you are going to go on a trip somewhere? What do you have to do if you have to go overseas?	**I**
S1:	I have to pack.	**R**
T :	**You have to pack. Okay.**	**F**

In Excerpt 2.1 the teacher is reviewing some vocabulary and rules from a previous lesson by discussing travel (See Excerpt 4.7). In a classroom, as a teacher usually gives some form of feedback to students' contributions, significance is placed on the F-move in the overall function of the exchange. Richards and Lockhart (1996) discuss content and form feedback. Strategies for content feedback include acknowledging a correct answer, indicating an incorrect answer, praising, modifying, repeating, summarizing and criticizing an answer (Ibid.). Form feedback is usually associated with the accuracy of students' contributions.

Nassaji and Wells (2000) caution that discourse can only be interpreted in relation to the purpose of the activity as a whole. According to Mercer (1995), analysis of talk must consider

that all conversations have a history and a future, taking place between particular people in a specific time and place. In Excerpt 2.1 the teacher is commenting on the content of the student's contribution and giving a discoursal F-move, rather than an evaluative one. A discoursal follow-up is typically found with reference questions and used when a teacher incorporates student contributions into the flow of discourse (Cullen, 2002; Jarvis and Robinson, 1997). An evaluative F-move would be what Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) originally termed feedback, where the teacher's comment focuses on the form of an utterance by deeming it acceptable or not. Cullen (2002) categorizes F-moves based on the strategy used: reformulation, elaboration, comment, or repetition. The first three strategies are discoursal F-moves and repetition is both a discoursal and an evaluative strategy.

2.2.3 Benefits and Limitations of Discourse Analysis

Since the groundwork laid by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, 1992), further discussion of the advantages and limitations of the IRF model has occurred. The IRF model has become significant and commonplace in labeling classroom discourse, as it is often a repetitive triadic sequence found in a traditionally teacher-centered classroom. This triadic sequence has been applied to classrooms for a variety of purposes: Cullen (2002); Jarvis and Robinson (1997); Nunn (2001); White (2003); Noor et al. (2010); and Yu (2009). However these and other applications of the IRF model have encountered problems with coding, function labeling, and deficiencies which they have attempted to remedy.

Seedhouse (1996, 2004) argues that recreating "genuine" communication in an institutional classroom setting is unrealistic but still supports a more conversational analysis (CA) approach to classroom discourse. Cullen (1998) disagrees with Seedhouse and redefines aspects of teacher talk in a classroom context to be pedagogic and therefore, communicative. The IRF sequence minimizes learner involvement and restricts learning opportunities as it denies students opportunities to ask questions, nominate topics, or negotiate meaning (Cullen, 2002). As teachers strive to have more communicative classes, the traditional IRF model may fail to meet analysts' needs (Thornbury, 1996). In Yu's study, the majority of IRF exchanges were teacher-initiated and hence, less communicative (2009). Moreover, she had difficulty

adhering to the IRF model, finding exchanges longer or shorter than the model (Ibid.). Unlike other settings, students expect feedback from their teachers. The lack of an F-move may be interpreted as a negative evaluation, and students may revise their responses (Willis, 1992). One IRF criticism is that the evaluation act in the F-move must be the head (obligatory) act. However, some teachers use non-evaluative expressions, such as "yes," "OK," or non-verbal gestures to signify that the reply was understood. Willis (1992) amends the IRF model to allow "acknowledge" as an alternative obligatory act in the F-move.

The IRF sequence was designated for a two-party discourse. As researchers work to apply it to multiple participants within an exchange, deficiencies arise. Malouf (1995) highlighted the issue of multiple listeners, where the teacher may or may not be addressing one particular learner, with all other students as peripheral listeners. He supports the Informative Hypothesis which claims that speech acts are directed to everyone and all potential hearers play an audience role (Clark and Carlson, 1992, cited in Malouf, 1995: 7). This hypothesis resolves one problem in the two-party discourse by allowing all potential listeners to share in the interaction (Jones, 2009).

Francis and Hunston (1992) also find the IRF model limiting and agree that more complex exchange structures are needed to accommodate larger discourse. Coding problems arise when labeling each act as only one move type (Ibid.; Malouf, 1995; Sinclair, 1992). This problem of an utterance having two possible functions simultaneously, known as multiple-coding or double-labeling, is addressed by Sinclair and Coulthard who see discourse analysis as a moment-to-moment analysis of the discourse, not the participants (Francis and Hunston, 1992; Malouf, 1995). For example, if a response is in the form of a question it is considered a challenge and thus, the start of a new exchange (Sinclair, 1992). Rather than giving the response a double-label of response/elicit, it would be considered a challenge, and labeled as an elicit. This demonstrates prospection, the power that each speaker has to steer the direction of the discourse (Ibid.).

One problem posed by Nassaji and Wells (2000) involves the information being shared within an exchange. McCarthy (1991) believes that in real-world exchanges the purpose of the exchange has to be achieved before the F-move can occur. If this information is not completed

13

within the IRF exchange, then the exchange becomes "bound" until participants are satisfied (Ibid.). Berry (1981) attributes this problem to the participant roles of primary and secondary knower (cited in Nassaji and Wells, 2000: 377). With teachers formulating the majority of their questions as display questions, they usually fill two roles, the initiator and the primary knower. Cullen (2000) verifies that display questions relate to an evaluative F-move, which could cause this situation. When students' contributions are unsupported or rejected by the teacher, exchanges are not complete. Rather, they expand until the teacher gives an F-move indicating students' utterances are acceptable. Wells (1996) solves this problem by placing conversational units into sequences rather than a limiting three-part exchange (cited in Nassaji and Wells, 2000: 378). These sequences involve nuclear and bound exchanges, where bound exchanges can be initiated by either speaker at any point, thus allowing a sequence to occur over many exchanges (Eggins and Slade, 1997, cited in Nassaji and Wells, 2000: 378).

The methodology involving the study participants, the research paradigm, and a description of research limitations will be explained in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 will then present the findings and discuss these teachers' educational beliefs. Analysis of specific F-move instances among the participants will occur in an effort to relate class practices to teachers' beliefs.

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

This chapter addresses the decisions to focus on three FLA participants (3.1), implement a triangulated research paradigm (3.2), and the problems that arose during this study (3.3).

3.1 Project Participants

All native-English speaking conversation teachers in a department at a South Korean university were invited to participate in this study. As only native-English speaking teachers were involved in this research, the term "teachers" will also be used to refer solely to this group. Of the 44 teachers who were sent the Teachers' Beliefs Questionnaire, 29 were completed and returned. Of those, 16 teachers consented to participate further with class observations and interviews.

To narrow the context of the classroom practices, two groups were chosen. The Freshmen Level A classes, or FLA, are intermediate level learners that take integrated classes of conversation, grammar & writing, along with reading & listening. They are taught by a core group of English teachers. The Sophomore Level A classes, or SLA, are similar in level, but a year ahead in their studies. They have integrated conversation, and reading & writing courses. These learners are taught by a different core group of teachers. These two groups met regularly to work toward common objectives, often sharing supplementary materials and lesson plans. From these groups, three FLA teachers and one SLA teacher consented to continue with this study.

3.1.1 Interest Group Reduction

After classroom observation and discourse transcription of these four participants, the one SLA teacher was deemed unneeded as a research participant and was omitted from further analysis. The three FLA teachers worked together and had succinct lessons that allowed for a more in-depth focus. Nanette, one of the FLA participants, elaborated on the dynamics and cohesiveness of FLA by stating,

Every time you walk into a classroom you have a set of parameters set for you that are not your own. Even in our group. If I was able to put these classes together on my own, there's stuff I'd do different. But we meet and discuss everything...The conversation classes are the least planned as a group. But everything created was shared with other teachers.

3.1.2 Three FLA Participants

Two female and one male teacher furthered this research by being observed twice in the classroom and participating in interviews. The female teachers were aged between 36-40 at the time of the study while the male teacher was between 26-30 years of age. For anonymity purposes, the female teachers will be called Nanette and Matilda; the male teacher, Archie. Archie had the least teaching experience at the university, less than two years, as well as the least overall teaching experience. He had TEFL certification and had taught only in South Korea. Nanette had been teaching EFL for six to ten years in more than three countries, but had been a teacher at this university for only two years. She lacked any formal teacher education or training. Matilda had the most EFL experience, more than ten years, and was the most qualified, with a completed Masters degree in English/Linguistics. She had taught in more than three countries and had been teaching at the university for four years.

All three teachers had participated in teacher professional development, including teacher in-service workshops, peer observation, and research committees. It should be noted that these three professional development opportunities were a requirement for foreign teachers at this Korean university. Archie and Matilda also participated in teaching conferences, which were opportunities in addition to the university's professional development requirements. A demographics summary is provided in Table 4.1.

3.2 Research Paradigm

To seek to understand the relationship among teachers' beliefs, intentions, and classroom actions of these English conversation teachers, a multi-methods approach was developed. As recommended by Munby (1984), traditional belief inventories must be combined with open-ended interviews and classroom observations of behavior (cited in Pajares, 1992: 327). It was

felt this triangulated approach would strengthen any inferences drawn on these relationships (Borg, 2003; Pajares, 1992; Yook, 2010). Figure 3.1 outlines the framework implemented in this study.

6 Page On-Line Survey
✳
Recruitment and Consent of 4 Study Participants
✳
Analysis of Survey Data
✳
Video Recordings of Class Observations (8)
✳
1st and 2nd Class Observation Transcriptions (8)
✳
Verifying the Class Transcriptions with 3 Study Participants
✳
Video Recording of Semi-Structured Retrospective Interviews with 3 Study Participants
✳
Transcription of 3 Interviews
✳
Analysis of Data from Class Observations and Interviews
✳
Presentation of Results

Figure 3.1:   Flowchart of Data Collection and Analysis

3.2.1 Format of Study

For this study the Teachers' Beliefs Questionnaire was created and administered using the on-line SurveyMonkey application (See Appendix I). This survey was a six-page multidimensional questionnaire seeking: (1) demographic information, including professional experience and teaching qualifications; (2) influences on and changes to teaching beliefs; (3)

beliefs on teachers' roles in the classroom; (4) teaching and learning educational beliefs; and (5) beliefs on teachers' behaviors in the classroom. Section (4) contained 15 Second Language Acquisition (SLA) statements, and Section (5) contained 20 classroom practice statements. Both were structured around a Likert-scale, from 1- *strongly agree* to 5- *strongly disagree*.

Statements created for Sections (4) and (5) were derived from four established SLA theories. Theory one, Behaviorism, is primarily a teacher-centered approach with active participation occurring as oral exchanges between teacher and learners (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). Teaching in a behaviorist method is focused on a presentation of information, emphasizing accuracy of language form (Nunan, 1999). Theory two, Innatism, is based on a psychological theory of learning whereby learners have an innate knowledge of language (Krashen, 1982, cited in Lightbrown and Spada, 1999: 38). Some innatist beliefs include subconscious language acquisition over conscious learning, natural stages of learning, self-correcting abilities, comprehensive input, and learner emotions serving as an affective filter (Brown, 2000; Lightbrown and Spada, 1999; and Nunan, 1999).

Theory three, the Sociocultural Theory, deviates from the belief that learning takes place primarily in the classroom. Education and cognitive development are seen as cultural processes that take place in any situation where people are jointly constructing knowledge (Rojas-Drummond et al., 2008). Theory four, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), uses language for meaningful interactions and to accomplish tasks (Krashen, 1982, cited in Lightbrown and Spada, 1999: 40). Communicative competence is paramount in CLT, with the emphasis being placed on fluency and content feedback. Teachers who endorse the CLT approach ultimately use materials that maximize student-speaking time, are authentic, and are function-based or task-based (Brown, 2000). In Korea, CLT has been the leading EFL teaching approach since 1995 (Yoon, 2004). The findings and discussion in Chapter 4 will refer to these theories.

After the survey, two class observations were videotaped, transcribed, and analyzed for each conversation teacher. The observations were pre-scheduled, and some teachers mentioned the research to their students while others conducted class without acknowledging the addition of a researcher and video camera. Due to the audio clarity during teacher-whole-class

interactions, the analysis was applied to only these parts of the lesson. Thus, while a total 16 hours of observation took place, only a portion of each class, 30 to 45 minutes, was transcribed for analysis. For the purposes of this study, the original transcriptions have been edited further to include relevant selections for this study (See Appendix II).

Finally, each participant had a semi-structured, retrospective interview focusing on their intentions during their lesson (Drever, 2003). Averaging an hour, these interviews between researcher and teachers began with structured questions that focused on particular segments of classroom interaction but concluded with an open-ended question: "Anything else you would like to add or discuss?" As portions of their video-taped lessons were played to help each participant elaborate on their teaching practices, these interviews also used stimulated recall (Chui, 2009). Teachers confirmed that the whole-class selections in Appendix II were typical of their teaching approach. All teachers verified their own transcriptions, with any corrections being noted in the discourse.

As these teachers spoke about their teaching and beliefs, the interviews became more than just data collection. There was an "accounting" of events situated in professional practice, as teachers were aware of their actions and in control of their interview talk (Baker and Johnson, 1998: 241; Baker, 2002, cited in Roulston, 2010: 218). Moreover, the "transformative" nature of the interviews allowed them to gain insights into their own teaching beliefs and methods (Roulston, 2010: 220).

3.3 Limitations of Research

There were several restrictions due to the format of this study. Nunan (1990) is a proponent of action research in the classroom for professional self-development (cited in Richards and Nunan, 1990: 75). However, as author of this study, I excluded myself from this project and maintained a role of teacher-researcher. Even though this eliminated any bias of researcher as participant, the insider research conducted allowed a small degree of bias toward those participants who knew the research goal. An example of this occurred when the male participant, after discussing the purpose for the class observation during class break, then proceeded to tailor the second-half of his lesson toward more whole-class interactions, to

19

meet the video-taping needs. He mentioned this after class had ended, saying "Was that better for you?" Though this may have biased the authenticity of his lesson and demonstrated that the researcher presence did effect his classroom teaching, he still verified his behavior as one of his own styles of teaching.

The sample size, three native-English speaking teachers, is not significant enough to make meaningful generalizations of the 29 teachers who completed the Teachers' Beliefs Questionnaire nor the 40 conversation teachers in this university department. As Johnson (1992) suggests, further research on larger samples is necessary to make any meaningful generalizations. Furthermore, a more in-depth survey targeting general belief systems, with educational beliefs as a subset, could allow for a stronger assessment of beliefs and practices. According to Chui (2009) and Pajares (1992), educational beliefs do not operate in isolation but rather are interrelated with other beliefs. The distinction between teachers' broader belief systems and their educational beliefs is sometimes not clearly distinguished. Researching teachers' beliefs usually implies this distinction, though educational beliefs must be recognized as being attached to a larger personal belief system. To better access these educational beliefs, they must be defined and conceptualized to some measurable degree. By establishing educational beliefs and their implications against broader belief structures, research findings and discrepancies may be clearer and more insightful (Pajares, 1992).

Class volume and the video-recording device used limited which parts of the lesson could be transcribed. Recording devices can be disruptive and have a limited range (Richards and Nunan, 1990; Richards and Lockhart, 1996). Multiple recording devices could have been placed at each table group, or on the teacher, but those would have been more encroaching than the already intrusive video camera. The method of video-taping classes for teacher observation limited the discourse analysis to teacher-whole-class interactions. Richards and Nunan (1990) note that the complexity of classroom observation increases as the number of students increases. In this study, the class sizes and volume of speaking practice did not permit the video camera to record pairwork or small group exchanges clearly. Also, teacher class management affected speaking-volume and prevented clear recording throughout sections of a lesson. For example, in Archie's class, the teacher-whole-class sections relevant

for transcription were further reduced by multiple students speaking simultaneously. This restricted comparison of beliefs and classroom practices to beliefs that relate to whole-class F-move exchanges, as students were silent while waiting for teacher feedback.

Chapter 4 will present the findings of the on-line Teachers' Beliefs Questionnaire and retrospective interview, as well as discuss the application of these beliefs to the class practices of these three teachers.

CHAPTER 4 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The Teachers' Beliefs Questionnaire was completed by the three conversation teachers (See Appendix I). Table 4.1 reviews the demographic data provided by the participants. Section 4.1 looks at the educational beliefs of the participants and 4.2 analyzes the F-move from discourse excerpts. Findings will be discussed in an effort to draw some conclusions between these teachers' beliefs and their classroom practices.

Table 4.1: Participants in the Study

Name	Gender and Age	Years Teaching at This University	Countries Taught In	Degree	Formal English Education Training
Archie	Male 26-30	1	1	BA	TEFL certificate
Nanette	Female 36-40	2	More than 3	BA	none
Matilda	Female 36-40	4	More than 3	BA / MA	CELTA Masters in English/ Linguistics

4.1 Educational Beliefs of the FLA Participants

When ranking their language teaching beliefs, these teachers felt they were most influenced by their own teaching experiences and their own language learning experiences, two beliefs discussed by Richards and Lockhart (1996). Socialization in the work environment, such as teacher interaction and collaboration, a belief concept proposed by Sato and Kleinsasser (2004), also ranked highly among teacher influences. While formal teacher training was chosen as least important in forming their teaching beliefs, it should be stressed that formal training varied among the participants, as seen in the education demographics. The question: "*Do you feel your teaching beliefs have changed over the course of your experience?"* was answered by the three FLA study participants, as presented here:

- *Yes, at many points along the way due to experience.   Archie*

- *I believe I am constantly learning and therefore my belief system shifts with my new experiences. I also believe a good teacher learns as much about teaching from their students as the students learn from them. Nanette*

- *(One example) I did CELTA before I started teaching and I taught ESL for a long time before I started teaching EFL. So I firmly believed that one should never use the local language in the classroom- I've become more accepting of other teachers doing this in the past eight years. Matilda*

As Pajares (1992) claims that the complexity, intensity, and importance of beliefs differ per individual, a more in-depth look at the teachers' stated educational beliefs is necessary. Though all three conversation teachers claimed to support Communicative Language Teaching, CLT was no more prominent than the other theories presented in the survey.

4.1.1 Archie - Educational Beliefs

Of the 15 educational belief statements in the survey, Archie agreed most strongly with the statement that students are influenced by their learning environment. He also believed in three other sociocultural statements. Archie seems to be a supporter of the Sociocultural Theory; however, he also agreed with three of the four Behaviorist Learning Theory statements and two of the three CLT Theory statements. Overall, Archie seems to have an eclectic, integrated approach to his teaching (Brown, 2001).

Specifically, he believes in the sociocultural view that learning happens in many environments, the classroom being one of them. These "learning spaces," such as on-line, libraries, and other student gathering areas, are equally as important for learning a new language, since learners are influenced by the learning environment that surrounds them (Savin-Baden, 2007). Archie seems to agree with Mercer, who stated, "Sociocultural research is not a unified field, but those within it treat communication, thinking, and learning as related processes which are shaped by culture" (2004: 138). Archie stressed the usefulness of English as a means for his students to be able to "*express their own culture as they meet people from outside* [the classroom]."

In the classroom, Archie feels it is very important to expose learners to natural and authentic English, using all available resources, like PowerPoint and on-line sources. Archie believes in helping students gain learner autonomy, both in and outside the classroom. He believes a teacher should model natural speech patterns as well as adapt teaching materials to meet students' needs. He supports allowing students some responsibility over their own learning, while keeping them on task toward meeting departmental objectives. Yet during his interview, Archie spoke about maintaining class control. He used display questions "*couched*" as reference questions, even when asking cultural questions of his learners. "*A lot of the time I know the answers already, but I'm sort of couching it a little bit as if they're teaching me and I'm also open to new information in a different way ...but I'm sort of going into the role of, hey guys, teach me something.*" This reinforces a more teacher-centered, rather than student-centered, learning environment, and fails to support his belief in CLT.

Archie strongly disagrees with the behaviorist belief that all errors become bad habits and need correcting. He believes that learning a new language is similar to learning a new behavior and that reinforcement and repetition are key to language acquisition. He supports the behaviorist view that learners contrast languages. Behaviorists believe that learners inherently compare and contrast the new language with the first language, coined Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH) (Brown, 2000; Lightbrown and Spada, 1999). These theorists "believe that cross-language similarities facilitate learning and that various levels of conflict exist that should be specifically addressed" (Jones, 2008: 6). More recently, Cross-Linguistic Influence (CLI) has evolved from CAH to help with understanding the significance of prior experience, such as a native language, in language learning (Brown, 2000).

Archie believes in the innatist concept of an affective filter, which affects students' language learning. He believes in "*setting the atmosphere so that people aren't afraid to speak, aren't afraid to make mistakes.*" An affective filter is an emotional barrier in a learner which interferes with language learning (Lightbrown and Spada, 1999). Archie is aware of this barrier and adds that when students make a mistake, he sometimes uses humor to make students feel more comfortable. He supports maximizing student-student interaction, common in CLT classrooms, through collective activities such as pairwork or groupwork. Archie spoke

about the importance of managing motivation before groupwork, "*so that when they go into their groups it's not just boom, boom, boom, dead time. Done. We're bored. But that* [the students] *are drawing* [the activity] *out a little bit, having fun with it, challenging themselves maybe, doing it twice sometimes.*" He believes that giving frequent feedback encourages participation. On his survey, he claimed that teacher feedback on content is important, and he spoke about the F-move in its evaluative form. During the retrospective interview, he spoke repeatedly about the role of an isolated F-move as contributing to the greater dynamic of the classroom. He explained,

> *You kind of use the corrective relationship and the modeling relationship*
> *with each individual student to feed the total energy of the class too. You key*
> *into somebody and you push that. Or in my teaching style, I push that*
> *student a little bit more and give them a little bit of a different edge to the*
> *feedback so that it keeps that energy up and feeds into the next activity.*

Archie realized feedback was layered, as decisions are being made simultaneously concerning the correctness of the individual's contribution, the level of appropriate nurturing needed, and the overall mood of the entire class. He considers a focus on form, affective filter, and classroom discourse in each F-move.

4.1.2 Nanette - Educational Beliefs

Nanette shared some integrated beliefs with Archie, but she supported Sociocultural and Innatist Theories slightly more. Nanette spoke repeatedly about humanizing her lessons, herself, and her classes. "*I can't be a machine, especially not as a teacher. So, I can't shut off my emotions when I walk into a classroom. I know there are teachers that are more stoic and can walk into a classroom and shut off their emotions, but I'm not that kind of person.*" She draws from her own learning experience, believing that students work harder for teachers they like and have a good relationship with. Nanette works to build a communicative atmosphere through sharing personal experiences. She believes language learning is a sociocultural event, meaning that socialization outside the classroom is as productive as language use in the classroom. She believes in helping students gain learner autonomy both in and outside of the classroom to become effective communicators. Innatist beliefs of affective filter and natural stages of learning are valued by Nanette as relevant in her classroom. Krashen (1982)

describes learners' stages of learning as predictable sequences, like building blocks (cited in Lightbrown and Spada, 1999: 39).

Nanette believes learning is endless. "*I think that everyone should learn in the classroom all the time. We're lifelong learners. We should learn as much from our students as they learn from us. Maybe not what's in the book, but I do want to learn something.*" Nanette supports the CLT Theory by tailoring her teaching materials to meet her students' needs and using authentic resources to expose her students to natural English. She models native speech patterns for her students to practice and believes that fluency is more important than accuracy.

> *And I really like to be part of my class. I don't like to just be an outside observer or one of those people who feels like I'm giving my students information. I feel that I'm helping them to find a way to the information. And they need to be really active in their pursuit of that information. Otherwise they're not going to learn anything.*

She strives to maximize student-speaking time, though in regards to students speaking to each other versus to her, a native-English speaker, she admitted: "*Probably they should be speaking more to each other.*" She allows her students to steer the direction of the class and to take responsibility for their learning. "*There are also times in the class where we go from having long conversations or feedback where the time frame is too long. We don't have much time, and what I planned to do we don't have time for. But I don't want to cut the kids off.*" She thinks feedback throughout a lesson is important to encourage participation.

Behaviorism believes that language learning follows the same principles of any other type of learning, meaning that stimulus, response, and reinforcement establish new habits (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). Nanette believes in Behaviorism. She believes in CAH, that errors can form bad habits if not corrected, and that reinforcement and repetition help language learning. She believes that students are influenced by their environment. Nanette summarizes her teaching beliefs succinctly with the following statement.

> *My philosophy for this kind of classroom, for all of the classes I teach in this Freshmen Level A, is to create an atmosphere in which the students want to speak as much as possible. Not just with each other. Because honestly, that doesn't happen as much for them as it will for someone who's*

foreign, a native-English speaker. It's rare that they're going to go out of school and speak in English to each other. I also think that an involved classroom where the students participate means that they're learning even if they're not speaking. If the energy is right in the classroom, then the students who are listening and waiting for their turn to speak, have to be thinking ahead.

Nanette believes strongly in the importance of rapport with learners as a means to energize them to speak. She commented that class participation was the highest grade component in the FLA conversation classes, and her students had little problem with contributing to the classroom discourse.

4.1.3 Matilda - Educational Beliefs

Matilda had the most experience and highest educational background in teaching. Though she shared an eclectic approach with Archie and Nanette, she least supported the CLT Theory statements. Matilda places strong focus on learner survival outside the classroom. She believes in the importance of sociocultural learning spaces and learner autonomy. In her interview, Matilda explained,

> [Students] *have to know that their instincts are right. And I have to work on making sure they they get to the point where one, their instincts are correct and two, and more importantly, they trust themselves. So it is a case of students learning and not the teacher teaching.*

She believes learners are influenced by their learning environment and wants her students to be able to socialize on their own outside the classroom. She believes in helping her students think for themselves and in teaching them English skills that will most help them outside the classroom.

Matilda supports Behaviorist CAH and believes that reinforcement and repetition are useful ways to help language acquisition. She believes in the Innatist Theory of natural learning stages. Matilda adapts her teaching materials to meet her students' needs, and feels that formal instruction and using precise grammatical structures are important. She feels maximum student-student interaction, through pairwork and groupwork, sometimes regardless of the

27

lesson plan, is necessary. She said she liked her students to be working in teams to build confidence. She believes her students should lead the direction of the class and be responsible for their learning. Whenever possible, Matilda tries to use authentic materials from various resources to expose her learners to native speech patterns. For Matilda, feedback throughout a a lesson encourages participation. She believes in whole-class feedback at the end of a task. However she believes in ignoring errors that do not affect the meaning of what a student is trying to say. Regarding corrective feedback, Matilda said,

> When they did get it wrong, I don't want the rest of the students to laugh at them. I don't want them to lose confidence... So I don't tend to say, um, 'Oh, you're wrong' so much as 'Okay...does anyone have another answer for me?' You know? And, 'Can anyone give me a different reason?' which gives the student the clue that, okay I didn't get this right. I need to think about this more. Now what could possibly be wrong? And makes all the students revise what they've done. But hopefully doesn't turn into just a 'You're wrong.' You know? So it's not singling the student out.

Though Matilda showed stronger affinity toward Socioculturalism, Behaviorism, and Innatism, she still saw value in the CLT approach. She links her beliefs in fluency practice and learner autonomy to her own experiences with language learning. She concluded her interview by stating,

> I'm not overtly focused on grammatical accuracy most of the time....I prefer to focus on fluency building. The accuracy, they'll get that as they learn to trust their instincts. They know the rules. They've learnt the rules so many zillions of times. But as they practice more and more [with the rules] in more naturalistic situations, they'll learn to get a feeling for it. I suppose it comes down to when I learn a language, I learn it through feelings. I mean I learn the rules and things but ultimately it comes down to a feeling, a judgment call.

Due to some limitations of this study (See 3.3), only teaching beliefs that relate to whole-class interaction and feedback can be further investigated. Discourse analysis of these teachers' F-moves will be used to link their teaching beliefs and classroom practices in an effort to demonstrate their level of association.

4.2 Function of the F-move in Discourse Analysis

Brief whole-class excerpts of discourse containing follow-up moves (F-moves) from the three FLA conversation teachers were selected (See Appendix II for complete transcripts). The application of Sinclair and Coulthard's Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) structure was used at the exchange, move, and act levels to determine teaching strategies regarding the F-move. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, 1992) limited the F-move to three purposes: accept, evaluate, or comment. Willis (1992) added "acknowledge" as an option to their original list. Cullen (2002) further distinguishes the F-move as discoursal or evaluative in function. F-move use, teaching strategies, and problems with discourse analysis will be discussed in this section. Links will be made to teachers' educational beliefs.

4.2.1 Archie - Teaching Strategy

Archie sees the F-move as a corrective form of feedback: "[A] *follow-up move, as an isolated follow-up move, is evaluative.*" He believes in using this aspect of teaching to encourage participation and create a positive learning environment among students. He said in his warm-up activities, he tries to get whole-class participation. Excerpt 4.1 below demonstrates Archie's use of an evaluative F-move in a warm-up activity. His belief in authentic teaching materials was evident. Archie used an on-line multiple-choice quiz, shown to the class with a projector, to introduce a new unit. Students volunteered to answer, and the quiz provided feedback on the correctness of the answer.

Archie Excerpt 4.1:	Evaluative Follow-up	
T:	Alright. Hmm...I have a female student here, HaeJu, sure.	**I**
S3:	A cat can climb trees.	**R**
T (F1):	**A cat can climb trees. Yeah. [aside] Alright. Correct. A cat can climb trees. Yeah. Good. Okay. Good.**	**F**
	Um. How about an elephant? Let's try someone else here, HeeJin.	**I**
S4:	B. Elephants can't climb trees.	**R**
T (F2):	**Elephants can't climb trees. Yeah. The tree would probably break, right? A very tiny elephant, maybe a super small elephant.**	**F**

Archie's follow-up strategies included repeating the students' contributions and accepting them, or offering praise. He ended his second follow-up move (F2) with a humorous comment on trees and elephants. He reflected on his own strategy, stating: "*I think a lot of what I'm doing when I'm checking like this here is making jokes, keeping the mood up so that the next time they go into the group activity they'll be motivated to actually use the time to practice. Stay focused.*" Cullen (2002) and Francis and Hunston (1992) define comments as being spontaneous, personal, and sometimes humorous. In conversation, such a comment or observation may naturally occur (Francis and Hunston, 1992). Using commenting as a teaching strategy helps to promote natural and communicative language use in the classroom setting (Cullen, 2002). Archie often implemented humor into his F-moves when trying to create motivation. Using humor to "keep the mood up" and create a comfortable learning environment supports his belief in the affective filter.

In this short excerpt, his use of praise seems excessive. As Archie stated, his intention is to build up some enthusiasm and interest in the new unit, yet his "*Yeah. Good. Okay. Good.*" may in fact do the opposite, according to Noor et al. (2010). Noor et al. (2010) discuss the use of quality versus quantity of feedback and that excessive praise can damage a discourse. In Archie's two class transcriptions, he used multiple-word positive feedback as often as singular-word praise. Perhaps Archie gives generous amounts of praise due to his beliefs in motivation, mood, and class energy, but he failed to comment on this during his retrospective interview.

Alternative to an evaluative F-move, the discoursal follow-up move is a method of incorporating students' contributions into the flow of the task or lesson (Cullen, 2002; Jarvis and Robinson, 1997). Archie employed a discoursal F-move when dealing with a breakdown in the flow of the class. Excerpt 4.2 occurred shortly before Excerpt 4.3. Using a PowerPoint presentation on celebrations, he showed a picture of a wedding to lead a discussion. In this excerpt, the learners were listing five additional actions, after the previous group had given

their five contributions (See Excerpt 4.3). Both groups were voluntarily participating for class participation stamps.

Archie Excerpt 4.2:	Discoursal Follow-up	
T:	Okay, you guys need one more for two stamps.	**I**
S5:	They are going to go to the bed. [*laughter*]	**R**
T (F1):	**Yeah.**	**F**
S5:	Ah, it's your, your, your. Sorry, sorry.	**I**
S1,S2:	Honeymoon.	**I**
T (F2):	**Oh, they said honeymoon. And they said kiss and hug. Yeah. It's good.**	**F**
	Can you think of a different one?	**I**
S5:	Thank you, thank you.	**R**
T (F3):	**No, they implied. It was implied.**	**F**
S5:	Ahh...they are going to divorce. [*laughter*]	**R**
T (F4):	**Okay. Maybe eventually. Maybe eventually they'll get divorced.**	**F**

In Excerpt 4.2 Archie navigated among different learners as he accepted the contribution from Student 5 while other students protested Student 5's contribution. The challenge made by Students 1 and 2 toward Student 5 forced Archie to use his F-move to summarize and negotiate between speakers. This was an anomaly in his class, as student initiated exchanges seldom occurred. So the teacher rarely played the role of interlocutor in student-student interactions. His strategies can be labeled as follows:

Archie Table 4.2: Discoursal Teaching Strategies

F-move	Function	Teacher strategy
(1) Yeah.	Discoursal	Acceptance of student's (S's) contribution.
(2) Oh, they said honeymoon. And they said kiss and hug. Yeah. It's good.	Discoursal	1 Reference to earlier contributions. 2 Praise.
(3) No, they implied. It was implied.	Discoursal	Rejection of earlier contribution.
(4) Okay. Maybe eventually. Maybe eventually they'll get divorced.	Discoursal	1 Acceptance. 2 Reformulation of S's contribution.

Archie's strategy of using his F-move to repeat earlier contributions demonstrates his ability

to make moment-to-moment decisions, with tact and consideration of both his learners and the structure of the lesson. Borg (2003: 81) states that "teachers are active, thinking decision-makers who make instructional choices by drawing on complex, practically-oriented, personalized, and context-sensitive networks of knowledge, thoughts, and beliefs." Archie comments on the complexity of these decisions by stating that: "*You sort of know... in the general class... this student's a joke or this student's a shy student or what-not... and the rest of the class know that about their classmates as well.*" Excerpt 4.2 further exemplifies Archie's above-mentioned belief in focusing on the individual, while maintaining and managing prospection.

Archie's consideration and concern for his learners could model what Cullen (2002) and Jarvis and Robinson (1997) refer to as "responsiveness." Jarvis and Robinson discuss two types of responsiveness. One entails how teachers deal with potential problems and either address or ignore them, according to classroom factors such as the learner and lesson structure (Ibid.) The other type of responsiveness deals with "minute-by-minute choice of contingent response to what the pupils have to say," and the teacher's ability to use and expand on it (Ibid.: 219). Archie's decision-making could be an example of the first responsiveness type, as he works to reiterate earlier contributions and encourage new contributions from Student 5. Alternatively, the students who disrupted the IRF exchange by initiating an exchange, could have forced Archie to change his teaching strategy and be responsive to the situation.

With a basic understanding of the distinction between evaluative and discoursal follow-up, it was not always apparent which F-move function was being implemented by the teacher. Just before the interaction in Excerpt 4.2, Archie had a table of students read their prepared sentences on what they are going to do at a wedding celebration.

Archie Excerpt 4.3:	Dual Function Follow-up	
T:	Okay, which group has five? Okay, yeah? What are they? Maybe you can go one by one.	**I**
S1:	They are going to go to honeymoon.	**R**
T (F1):	**Okay, they're going to go on a honeymoon.**	**F**
S2:	They are going to kiss and hug.	**R**
T (F2):	**They're going to kiss and hug. Yeah.**	**F**
S3:	She is going to throw bouquet.	**R**
T (F3):	**She's going to throw a bouquet.**	**F**

S4:	They're going to exchange rings.	**R**
T (F4):	**They're going to exchange rings. Yeah.**	**F**
	Do you have one more? Do you have at least five?	**I**
S1:	They are, they are going to meet cousin and many people.	**R**
T (F5):	**Meet cousins and many people from their family. Okay, good. Alright, excellent.**	**F**

In this excerpt, the teacher directed the students to list their compiled sentences. Then he gave a follow-up that repeated the students' contributions. Table 4.3 presents Archie's teaching strategies.

Archie Table 4.3:   Dual Function Follow-up Teaching Strategies

F-move	Function	Teacher strategy	
(1) Okay, they're going to go on a honeymoon.	Discoursal / Evaluative	1	Acceptance of student's (S's) contribution.
		2	Slight elaboration of S's contribution.
(2) They're going to kiss and hug. Yeah.	Discoursal / Evaluative	1	Repetition of S's contribution.
		2	Acceptance.
(3) She's going to throw a bouquet.	Discoursal / Evaluative		Repetition of S's contribution.
(4) They're going to exchange rings. Yeah.	Discoursal / Evaluative	1	Repetition of S's contribution.
		2	Acceptance
(5) Meet cousins and many people from their family. Okay, good. Alright, excellent.	Discoursal / Evaluative	1	Elaboration of S's utterance.
		2	Praise.

Without knowing Archie's intent, his use of the F-move as discoursal or evaluative was unclear. According to Cullen (2002), repetition as a teaching strategy can be evident in both types of moves. Repetition is sometimes known as a teacher "echo." It can be used to acknowledge, confirm, question, or express surprise at a student's contribution while ensuring it has been heard by all listeners (Ibid.). Cullen (1998) redefines repetition, formerly a feature of non-communicative teacher talk, as communicative within a classroom context for its pedagogic function. Repetition, an aspect of Behaviorism, is a component of Archie's educational beliefs. Perhaps by repeating the learners' contributions, he helps to reinforce language learning. Archie made no comment on his use of repetition during his interview.

In Excerpt 4.3, the teacher made no corrections to the students' contributions nor did he vary his F-move strategy. It could be argued that his F-moves were all evaluative as he wanted students to make "be going to" statements. Though there are multiple participants involved peripherally in this exchange (Malouf, 1995), the teacher is specifically addressing one table of participants. Contrarily, on a holistic-scale, he could have been addressing the whole class with his F-move to include them in the discourse he was carrying out at that one particular table. According to the teacher, he was: "*correcting, confirming, acknowledging. And also keeping the mood up.*" As such, he viewed his intentions as "layered," to use his term.

> *Maybe you want to correct what the student is saying or acknowledge what the student is saying but you also want to encourage that individual student's learning. So you don't want to be too hard or too soft, to push them or give them a little bit of nurturing. But then you also want to check the entire class rhythm and think about how the feedback that all the students are getting together as they're watching the individuals and as each of them sort of step up to bat is going to affect their total approach to the next activity. So I really like* [the layered aspect]. *So you're like boom, it is correct? Hey, is it what the individual needs right now in so far as you develop like a conversation modeling relationship with individual students? And then the third layer is like, is this feeding in for the whole class for the next activity? Is it keeping them motivated? Or is it challenging them to think about something a little different?*

Archie shows an awareness toward multiple listeners as discussed by Malouf (1995). He recognized that his individual F-move is peripherally heard by the entire class and considers this component of teaching as he contributes to the interactions. What he terms the "*layered*" quality of the F-move, could coincide with Cullen's definition of discoursal feedback, as he is seeking to sustain and build a discourse (2002). In Excerpt 4.3, the lack of tonal change by Archie made labeling the function difficult. His explanation of maintaining "the entire class rhythm" could be viewed as a proposal for a duality in the F-move function.

4.2.2 Nanette - Teaching Strategy

Excerpts 4.4 and 4.5 come from the same PowerPoint lesson on celebrations that Archie used in his observed lesson (See Excerpt 4.3). In Excerpt 4.4 Nanette projected a PowerPoint picture of a wedding and asked students to work in teams, listing what they might need for the

event. Students then shared their lists. The teacher asked: *"What do you need?"* She then nominated students who had raised hands. Nanette spoke about this type of activity, stating: *"Whenever we do PowerPoint it's to keep their focus and to get them to start talking. This was not specifically for them to form sentences the way they were supposed to from the book. They were brainstorming and we do a lot of brainstorming at the beginning of the chapters."*

Nanette Excerpt 4.4:   **Withholding Follow-up**

T:	Umm...Rhea.	**I**
S1:	Ring.	**R**
T (F1):	**Ring.**	**F**
	How many rings do you usually need?	**I**
S1:	Two.	**R**
S2:	As many as...	**R**
T:	In Korea, where do you wear your ring?	**I**
S1:	Four. Four. Four finger.	**R**
T:	On which hand?	**I**
Sts:	Left hand.	**R**
T:	On this hand?	**I**
Sts:	Yes.	**R**
S3:	Why?	**ST-I**
T:	I just wondered because I often see people who are married in Korea, but they don't always have... I wasn't sure which side... sometimes men don't wear their rings at all.	**R**
S3:	Ah. [*laughter*]	**ST-F**
S4:	So, what about America?	**ST-I**
T:	America is also on the left.	**R**
S4:	Oh.	**ST-F**
T (F2):	**Although men in America sometimes don't wear their rings either. But, that's a whole different story.**	**F**

Contrasting Excerpt 4.4 with Archie, Excerpt 4.3, Nanette rarely used the F-move, making the class interactions appear more like "genuine" communication (Nunan, 1987). Nunan suggests genuine communication involves:

> *uneven distribution of information, the negotiation of meaning (through, for example, clarification requests and confirmation checks), topic nomination and negotiation of more than one speaker, and the right of interlocutors to decide whether to contribute to an interaction or not... In genuine communication, decisions about who says what to whom are up for grabs.*
> (1987: 137)

In Excerpt 4.4, Nanette attempted to utilize many of these communicative qualities mentioned

by Nunan. Her focus was on the learner and the language negotiation, evident through her clarification and confirmation questions. Also, she withheld her F-move until the end of the interaction. Cullen (1998) argues that genuine communication in a classroom must be considered in context to the classroom, and not the settings outside the classroom. According to him, if teachers are using questions with clear pedagogic goals, then communicative aspects of discourse can be found in a classroom. Nanette tries to create a communicative classroom, as defined by both Nunan and Cullen.

According to Thornbury (1996) and Yu (2009), the traditional IRF model may fail to adapt to a more communicative classroom setting. Excerpt 4.4 shows a typical interaction in Nanette's class whereby the second exchange, represented by IRRIRIRIRF, could be considered a poor example of the triadic exchange. Instead of a triadic exchange, the excerpt starting from the teacher initiate "*How many rings to you usually need?*" up to teacher F-move (F2) could be considered a sequence. Nassaji and Wells (2000) believe sequences can occur over many exchanges. This concept would better suit the analysis of this excerpt.

Nanette believes her learners to be active listeners. The students in Excerpt 4.4 demonstrated this when making simultaneous contributions and initiating exchanges. Excerpt 4.4 showed the teacher's willingness share prospection, control over the direction of the discourse, sometimes to the detriment of her lesson plan (Sinclair, 1992). As she mentioned: "[Sometimes] *we don't have much time, and what I planned to do we don't have time for. But I don't want to cut the kids off.*" Nanette gave a brief F-move and rather than moving on to a new brainstorming item, she extended the IRF sequence by asking her learners questions that related the topic to their cultural background.

According to Nassaji and Wells (2000), this allowed for further F-move opportunities. They recognize two F-move options. The first is to ask a further question to get a more adequate answer. The second is to add a comment that extends the discussion, or to ask a question that invites a student to extend the discussion. The latter purpose encourages a more equal role of participation by recasting the learner into the role of primary knower (Ibid.). Of the three IRF exchanges in Excerpt 4.4, only one was dominated by the teacher. Nanette gave a concluding follow-up comment after a student F-move to regain control of the class and conclude the

36

sequence.

There were moments in Nanette's class when she gave more frequent F-moves and typical IRF sequences could be found. Further on in the same lesson, a picture of Christmas was shown using PowerPoint. Students raised hands and were nominated by Nanette to share their contributions of what they might need for this celebration. Nomination as an initiation move was commonly found in each of the teacher participants' whole-class observations.

Nanette Excerpt 4.5:		Discoursal Follow-up	
	T	Okay, Christmas. What do you have for Christmas? Chris.	**I**
	S10	Christmas Eve.	**R**
	T (F1):	**Christmas Eve. Ohh...I love Christmas Eve, it's my favorite. We always have dinner at my parents house and exchange gifts.**	**F**
		Who else is not...Osam.	**I**
	S11	Snow.	**R**
	T (F2):	**Snow, yes. I wish that we had snow. I always want to have snow.**	**F**
		But, Jack, what do you think we should have for Christmas?	**I**
	S12	Socks.	**R**
	T (F3):	**Socks. Okay.**	**F**
		We had this the other day. You know you guys I'm sorry about my drawing, but. You mean this, right?	**I**
	Sts	Yeah. Banana.	**R**
	T (F4):	**Well maybe it's a banana and a. It's called a. It's called instead of sock, it's called stocking.**	**F**
	S13	No, it seems like Captain Hook.	**I**
	T (F5):	**It's it's more rounded.**	**F**
		There is that better? So instead of sock, it's stocking.	**I**
	S13	Or an eggplant.	**R**
	T (F6):	**Oh no, I hate eggplant, I prefer banana. So the socks, well they did start out as socks. But yeah, we are, we say stockings. And usually more than one.**	**F**
		Um...Tom.	**I**
	S14	Rudolf.	**R**
	T (F7):	**Rudolf. Oh, yes.**	**F**
		You wanna sing the song for me?	**I**
	S14	[*laughter*] No...	**R**
	T (F8):	**Maybe closer to Christmas.**	**F**

In Excerpt 4.5, all F-moves except F4 were discoursal. Few of these F-moves were a repetition and acceptance of the learner's contribution. Nanette discussed her use of repetition

in her discoursal F-moves.

> *The reason that I like to* [repeat students' contributions] *is I think it helps to make sure everyone in the class understands before we move forward... Some the kids levels are really high, they understand immediately. Some of the other kids... it helps to hear it again even if it took them maybe ten seconds to pinpoint what was said. Then they're able to participate. If we keep going forward, they might not have a chance to understand and then no longer participate.*

Nanette sees repetition as a valuable teaching tool, rather than a negative aspect of teacher talk (Cullen, 1998, 2002). Her other main discoursal strategy was to make personal comments on students' contributions. Her strategies are listed in Table 4.4.

Nanette Table 4.4:   Discoursal Teaching Strategies

F-move		Function	Teacher strategy	
(1)	Christmas Eve. Ohh...I love Christmas Eve, it's my favorite. We always have dinner at my parents house and exchange gifts.	Discoursal	1	Repetition of student's (S's) contribution.
			2	Comment.
(2)	Snow, yes. I wish that we had snow. I always want to have snow.	Discoursal	1	Repetition of S's contribution.
			2	Praise.
			3	Comment.
(3)	Socks. Okay.	Discoursal	1	Repetition of S's contribution.
			2	Acceptance.
(4)	Well maybe it's a banana and a. It's called a. It's called instead of sock, it's called stocking.	Evaluative	1	Rejection of S's contribution with low rising intonation.
			2	Clarification.
(5)	It's it's more rounded.	Discoursal		Comment.
(6)	Oh no, I hate eggplant, I prefer banana. So the socks, well they did start out as socks. But yeah, we are, we say stockings. And usually more than one.	Discoursal		Comment.
(7)	Rudolf. Oh, yes.	Discoursal	1	Repetition of S's contribution.
			2	Praise.
(8)	Maybe closer to Christmas.	Discoursal		Comment.

Closer inspection of the eight follow-up moves in Excerpt 4.5 reveals that only two of Nanette's F-moves were exclusively repetition and acceptance or praise (F3, F7). She made comments in F1, F2, F5, and F6 which she believes personalized the dialogue and "humanized" herself as their teacher. Cullen (2002) finds authentic comments to assist a communicative classroom.

There was also a humorous tone found in these whole-class exchanges. To elaborate on Student 12's contribution of a sock, Nanette drew a stocking on the whiteboard. F4 became an evaluative F-move as students made fun of the drawing, and she had to clarify her stocking. Nanette gives participation credit for answers, even if the contribution is wrong. She believes that acknowledging all contributions encourages students to continue to raise their hands and try. F4 is one evaluative F-move where the student gave an insincere answer, but Nanette still used a low rising intonation to indicate his answer was incorrect. Her students returned the humor as well. Nanette spoke about how she controlled this aspect of her discourse. "*I think I wanted to diffuse him. I think that when you have someone in your class that's funny, you don't want to compete with them. So you should add but then be able to add and cut it off at the same time.*" She demonstrated this strategy in F5 and F6, with her comments that brought the discussion back to Christmas.

Nanette's final F-move (F8) in Excerpt 4.5 was to tease with one of her students about singing the Rudolf song. The rapport and humor found in her whole-class interactions helped maintain motivation in the dialogue. Nanette was attuned to not only the exchanges between her and the speaker but also Malouf's (1995) multiple party phenomenon. Nanette believed in active listening. "*It is just as important. And especially in a conversation classroom. Listening is equally important as speaking.*" She knew that all her listeners were peripheral to individual exchanges, but that they must be following the discussion to be able to contribute accordingly.

Excerpt 4.6 contrasts Nanette's claims for a communicative classroom. It occurred at the end of a whole-class discussion on rules and Korean tradition. In sharing her personal experiences and having these brainstorming sessions, Nanette could easily dominate the discourse in her teacher role. She admitted this fault herself when she said: "*Probably my students should be speaking more to each other. But I really like my classes.*" Her implied meaning was that she

liked *speaking* with her students, more than having them interact through pairwork or groupwork.

Nanette Excerpt 4.6:		Teacher Talk in the Follow-up	
	T	When you, pretend that you've married, you've had children and it's now about 20 years from now. Your children are going to university. Do you think any of these roles will change?	**I**
	S15	Yes.	**R**
	T	Why do you think they'll change? Why? Rowan.	**I**
	S1	Because long time ago, the girls can't go out and girls can't go to school but right now there's change. We can go to school. So I think after twenty years maybe things will be changed.	**R**
	T (F1):	**Good. I think so too. Even in the three years that I've been in Korea, many things have changed.**	**F**
		What about, um, for boys? What will change for men?	**I**
	S16	Many of, many woman is go to get some money and some man is housekeeper and, and nowadays many babysitter is a man.	**R**
	T (F2):	**Good. And that didn't used to happen, right. Even in American society, men didn't, um, work in elementary schools. They didn't stay home with their children. They weren't nurses. They were the doctors and CEOs, an.... And now, even though we still have a lot of work in America, to do, because there are not very many female CEOs and there's a lot of different things like that. That we are still striving for. It's better, there are, and men are given the choice to do things that maybe in the past they wouldn't let them do. And women the same. So, I think the same in Korea. I watch your generation, compared to the same generation, but even a few years older, and the women in my classes are very strong. You guys don't have problems speaking. You have no problems mixing, boys and girls. So I think that that's very exciting to watch those changes. Good. So roles are things that um, in society, when we talk about what a man, woman, child, and elderly person, especially in Korea or in Asian culture where you have different ways to treat people based on their age. Everyone has some sort of role to play. You guys have the role to play right now of university students. Most university students throughout the world have very similar lifestyles. Maybe because they're in a different country it's a little different, but for the most part, um, they have a similar type. In the**	**F**

> **United States, for example, my nephew and niece are
> just about your age and when I talk to them, they tell me
> all the same things they did this weekend. What you guys
> do and what they do is so, so similar.**

F2 was meant as a summary of the whole-class discussion, but it seems more like a monologue or lecture. These concluding remarks occurred over the span of a few minutes and could be considered a valuable source for comprehensible input for learners (Cullen, 1998). However, Nunan (1987) may find this teacher talk non-communicative. One feature of teacher talk, that of speech modification, including hesitations and rephrasing in the teacher's own words, is evident in this excerpt. Nanette admitted to modifying her rate of speech in class, though it should be mentioned that the rate of speech used by Nanette was much faster, and therefore seemly more authentic, than the other two participants.

This extreme example of teacher talk juxtaposes Nanette's use of some components of a communicative classroom. She stressed the importance of being a native-English speaker for her learners to interact with; however, the notion of quantity versus quality should be considered. Nanette stated a belief in maximizing student speaking-time, yet she spoke more than her learners in all three excerpts. Walsh (2002) succinctly identifies this dilemma as a teacher's ability to control their use of language and their ability to obstruct or construct learner participation. Cullen (1998) acknowledges that both communicative use of language and communicative teaching require a balance between the duality of teacher as instructor and teacher as interlocutor. Thus, a firm grasp of constructive teacher talk is needed. Though Nanette believed in allowing learners to steer the direction of the discourse and to take responsibility for their learning, she retained the dominating role in most exchanges.

In analyzing a teacher's summary in written form, it is difficult to distinguish between an inform act in the initiate move and a comment act in the follow-up move (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975, 1992). This concluding F-move (F2) could be seen as a candidate for multiple-coding or double-labeling, IRF coding issues covered by Francis and Hunston (1992) and Sinclair (1992). Sinclair and Coulthard (1992) address this confusion in their summary description of these acts. They explain that,

on the written page it is difficult to distinguish from an informative because the outsider's ideas of relevance are not always the same. However, teachers signal paralinguistically, by a pause, when they are beginning a new initiation and with an information as a head; otherwise they see themselves as commenting. (Ibid.: 20)

In Excerpt 4.6, Nanette made no such pause, but rather continued to share her personal experience and knowledge with her learners. Nanette enjoyed speaking to her students and her students seemed to be active listeners. She believed in modeling natural speech patterns for them.

4.2.3 Matilda - Teaching Strategy

Matilda believes in frequent F-move use to encourage participation. She utilized a discoursal F-move for various reasons, such as reviewing a previous lesson or generating ideas collectively. In Excerpt 4.7, multiple students volunteered to contribute to the discourse, so Matilda nominated them rather than repeating the original elicit question. Excerpt 4.7 shows Matilda using several discoursal F-moves to build a discussion on travel.

Matilda Excerpt 4.7:	Discoursal Follow-up	
T:	Okay. Um, what do you have to do if you are going to go on a trip somewhere? What do you have to do if you have to go overseas?	**I**
S1:	I have to pack.	**R**
T (F1):	**You have to pack. Okay.**	**F**
	What else do you have to do?	**I**
S2:	Get travel insurance.	**R**
T (F2):	**You have to get travel insurance.**	**F**
	DoGyeong?	**R/I**
S3:	And to immigration...ah, to fill out ah... to fill out immigration form.	**R**
T (F3):	**You have to fill out an immigration form, yes.**	**F**
	GyeongJoon?	**R/I**
S4:	Book a airline ticket.	**R**
T:	Sentence. [*whispered*] I have to.	**R/I**
S4:	I have to book a ticket.	**R**
T (F4):	**Very important, otherwise you can't go anywhere. Yes.**	**F**
	GonSoon.	**R/I**
S5:	I have to make a passport.	**R**

T:	You have to get a passport?	**I**
S5:	Get a passport.	**R**
T (F5):	**Okay.**	**F**

As Cullen (2002) explains, a teacher makes a choice with each type of follow-up, choosing either to address a learner's errors or their message content. "*Okay*" was a word Matilda used frequently with a mid-range intonation. It indicated an acceptance of the content of the contribution into the flow of discourse, rather than an evaluation of its form. Matilda commented: "[I was] *just checking that they knew the difference between can and have to. So anything they came up with was okay as long as it was grammatically correct and showed that they understood the meaning. So I wasn't overly focused on correcting them when they were wrong.*" According to the survey, Matilda wants her learners to be able to think for themselves and believes in ignoring errors that do not affect the meaning of what the student is trying to say. In her retrospective interview, she elaborated: "*I wanted the other students to get when they were wrong, and take responsibility for this.*" Cullen (2002) explains that these teaching decisions become strategies that are recurring. Matilda's F-move strategies did not vary much in this part of her lesson. She accepted her students' contributions, repeated their responses, made a comment, or reformulated what a student said. Each of these strategies were discoursal, as summarized in Table 4.5 below.

Matilda Table 4.5: **Discoursal Teaching Strategies**

F-move	Function	Teacher strategy
(1) You have to pack. Okay.	Discoursal	1 Repetition of student's (S's) contribution.
		2 Accept.
(2) You have to get travel insurance.	Discoursal	Reformulation of S's contribution.
(3) You have to fill out an immigration form, yes.	Discoursal	1 Reformulation of S's contribution.
		2 Accept.
(4) Very important, otherwise you	Discoursal	1 Comment.

can't go anywhere. Yes.		2 Accept.
(5) Okay.	Discoursal	Accept.

In Excerpt 4.7 it is evident that Matilda uses reformulation to model correct use of the language while still maintaining the flow of discourse (Cullen, 2002). After the first F-move (F1) the teacher asked: "*What else do you have to do?*" This allowed her to encourage multiple contributions without re-eliciting the original question. Through nominations in the initiation move, Matilda was able to provide discoursal F-moves to aid the turn-taking and direction of the discussion. This extended the IRF exchange slightly and bound the re-initiate move to the teacher elicit (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1992). The re-initiation after (F3) was a prompt on the form of the utterance ("*Sentence. I have to.*") and she withheld her F-move. Once Matilda received the contribution in the form she wanted, a sentence, she proceeded with a comment to help further the discourse.

An evaluative F-move commonly occurs with display questions (Cullen, 2002). Matilda believes that formal instruction and precise grammatical structures are an important component in a classroom. In Excerpt 4.8 Matilda is orally checking students' fill-in responses of "will" and "going to" to a written conversation they completed about a party. Though the display question is not overtly evident, the conversation reads: "*Well if you say so...*

_____ *(there) be a theme for the party?*" In this activity, the teacher expects specific linguistic and grammatical responses from her learners.

Matilda Excerpt 4.8:	**Evaluative Follow-up**	
T:	Alright. Well, if you say so...Yes?	**I**
S15:	Will be a theme for the party?	**R**
T:	[puts finger on mouth] It's a question.	**R/I**
S15:	Are there going to be a theme for the party?	**R**
T:	Are there or is there?	**R/I**
Sts:	Is there	**R**
T (F1):	**Is there going to be a theme for the party.**	**F**

Excerpt 4.8 represents a bounded, or extended, evaluative exchange. Recognized by R/I, this is a re-initiation exchange (Cullen, 2002; Sinclair and Coulthard, 1992). This example demonstrates how the original triadic exchange can be extended into a longer sequence

(IRIbRIcRF). To get the preferred student response to "*Is there going to be a theme for the party?*" Matilda withholds the F-move twice, by providing clues as to the form she is expecting. She did not comment on this strategy as being deliberate. Possibly Matilda withheld her judgment unintentionally as she worked with the students to help them self-correct. This could reinforce her belief that students should evaluate their own production. She believes in helping them "*to make sure that their own ideas...their own mental picture of where they're going with this, is correct.*"

Excerpt 4.9, from this same lesson, demonstrates how intonation and non-linguistic responses provide evaluative information about students' contributions.

Matilda Excerpt 4.9: Intonation and Paralinguistic Follow-up		
T	It's a definite plan. Well, a number of people haven't told me yet.	**I**
S5	But..but Peter and Mark will help out with the cooking.	**R**
T(F1):	[inhales and scrunches face] **Really?**	**F**
	What use of will do you think it is?	**I**
S5	Promise.	**R**
T (F2): Really?		**F**
S5	Promise.	**R**
T (F3): Okay, I'll accept that.		**F**
	Does anybody have a different answer?	**I**
S5	But Peter and Mark...	**I**
T	Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa. Gunsoo.	**I**
S6	Peter and Mark are going to help out with the cooking.	**R**
T	Why do you say going to?	**I**
S6	Definite plan.	**R**
T (F4): It's a definite plan?		**F**
	How do you know it's a definite plan?	**I**
S6	They Promised.	**R**
T (F5): They promised it earlier, but the party's organized.		**F**
	Some people haven't told me but. Okay. That's our clue.	
	We know it's a definite plan. But, these are going to.	
	Okay, good.	

Excerpts 4.8 and 4.9 contain some non-verbal F-move components which signified to the learners that there were problems with their contributions. Hewings (1992) and Francis and Hunston (1992) both acknowledge the significance of paralanguage, such as gestures and facial expressions, in the classroom. When interviewed, Matilda emphasized her belief that

students should learn rather than teachers teach. To her, this means that her F-move can help her learners improve their own instincts and build self-trust. Her gesture of placing her finger on her mouth in Excerpt 4.8 was her way of indicating that Student 15 needed to self-correct his response. Matilda commented: "*I don't want to say it's wrong because students will lose confidence.*"

In Excerpt 4.8 Matilda did not alter her intonation when she prompted Student 15 to make a question, but in Excerpt 4.9 she used high rising intonation to indicate an evaluative judgment. Matilda's teaching strategies in Excerpt 4.9 are further illustrated in Table 4.6.

Matilda Table 4.6:   Intonation and Paralinguistic Teaching Strategies

F-move	Function	Teacher strategy
(1) Really?	Evaluative	Rejection of student's (S's) contribution with high rising intonation.
(2) Really?	Evaluative	Rejection of S's contribution with high rising intonation.
(3) Okay, I'll accept that.	Evaluative	Acceptance.
(4) It's a definite plan?	Evaluative	Repetition of S's contribution with high rising intonation for emphasis.
(5) They promised it earlier, but the party's organized. Some people haven't told me but. Okay. That's our clue. We know it's a definite plan. But, these are going to. Okay, good.	Discoursal	1 Elaboration of S's contribution. 2 Acceptance of S's contribution. 3 Comment 4 Praise.

Hewings (2002) distinguished between three functions of intonation in evaluative feedback. He assigns the three roles of intonation to indicate a negative assessment, a positive assessment, or the withholding of an assessment. In three of Matilda's five F-moves high rising intonation accompanied her verbal evaluation. The high rising intonation in (F4) was used to emphasize the correct response and echo it for the benefit of all learners. Also, during the observation and transcription of Matilda's two classes, "*Really?*" was regularly used to signify a problem with learners' contributions. Matilda responded to her use of this word, as well as her gestures and intake of breath, by explaining that she does not like to say: "'*You got*

it wrong.' I'll give them points for trying, you know. When I do [use paralanguage or high intonation] *they know they have to rethink. But I don't have to say it.*" She explains that if a reason to support a response can be given, she'll acknowledge it, even if it is not the correct reason. This is evident in (F3) where she accepted the response from Student 5 even though she did not agree with it. Matilda acknowledged her concern for her learners' affective filters.

Her F-move strategy in this part of the excerpt supports her behaviorist view in the significance of reinforcement and repetition. She state: "*That's the bit where they need to know. So, reinforcing, this is a doubt area. What's the clue? Everybody, let's work on this. Let's get it.*" When Matilda received the correct answer, her final F-move (F5) became discoursal, as she attempted to reinforce a point that none of the students understood.

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION

In an effort to understand the relationship between teachers' educational beliefs and their classroom practices, this study investigated the follow-up move in whole-class interactions. Focusing on three native-English speaking conversation teachers at a South Korean university, a triangulated approach involving the Teachers' Beliefs Questionnaire, classroom observations, and retrospective interviews was implemented in an effort to provide sufficient evidence from which to make inferences. Pajares claims,

> *If reasonable inferences about beliefs require assessments of what individuals say, intend, and do, then teachers' verbal expressions, predispositions to action, and teaching behaviors must all be included in assessments of beliefs. Not to do so calls into question the validity of the findings and the value of the study.* (1992: 327)

To determine the existence of a connection between what teachers believe, intend, and do, an analysis of teaching strategies for evaluative and discoursal follow-up moves was conducted, using a modified version of the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, 1992) IRF model. All three teachers held eclectic beliefs which integrated the four SLA theories from the survey, Behaviorism, Innatism, Sociocultural Theory, and Communicative Language Teaching. This study concurs with Pajares (1992), finding that the intensity and complexity of these beliefs varied among participants. Several links between these beliefs and classroom practice can be inferred from analyzing the follow-up move in whole-class discourse.

Archie claimed to believe in a CLT approach, but during his whole-class discourse he kept his classes mostly teacher-centered, even disguising display questions as reference questions. As display questions are associated with evaluative feedback, he used mostly this type of F-move in his whole-class discourse. Archie believed in an affective filter and used his F-move to simultaneously address individual students' needs, as well as the entire mood of the class. He believed feedback, whether on form or function, was corrective, and could encourage participation. Archie's class analysis showed his use of humor, praise, and responsiveness to support his beliefs in affective filter and participation. However, his praise could be viewed as excessive and possibly damaging to his discourse (Noor et al., 2010). One excerpt

demonstrated a lack of distinction between F-move function, suggesting a possible duality could exist between discoursal and evaluative follow-up.

Nanette's class provided the most data, almost all with discoursal follow-up upon analysis. She commented on her own approach when she said: "*I don't know what is better. If it's better having the students speaking to each other the whole time or speaking the way we do. Most of my classes we speak so much....the students really like it.*" Nanette demonstrated responsiveness through discoursal F-moves which built a whole-class discourse. Her responsiveness made her discourse more authentic, as she could not predict students' responses but listened, exhibited interest, and worked for meaningful language negotiation (Cullen, 1998; Jarvis and Robinson, 1997; Nunan, 1987). Furthermore, she was not the primary knower in all exchanges as she tried to share prospection. Nanette made comments or asked questions to invite students to contribute more to the discussion (Nassaji and Wells, 2000). She believed in sharing personal experiences to build a communicative atmosphere and did so by withholding her F-move or using the F-move to generate more student contributions. This often extended the discourse, increasing participation and dialogue. Humor in her F-move also aided her communicative atmosphere. Repetition was used by Nanette as a teaching tool to keep all students together in the dialogue. However, Nanette also dominated the discourse with teacher talk when she used her F-move to summarize or transition into a new lesson. Her ability to construct or obstruct participation was questionable in these instances (Walsh, 2002).

Matilda acknowledged that both whole-class discourses illustrated more grammatical (can, have to, will, and going to) than conversational language lessons. She believes in learner autonomy both in and outside the classroom. She scaffolded structures on the board for students to reference. Overall, she encouraged them to trust their feelings and build their instincts. She claimed her follow-up move was intended for her learners to evaluate their own production. She let them check and verify if their instincts were correct or see if they needed to "*fine tune how* [they were] *feeling or thinking*" about a certain point. Her belief in helping her learners gain autonomy was supported by her use of paralanguage and intonation in the F-move. The use of non-verbal follow-up and intonation provided clues to her learners to re-

evaluate their contributions (Hewings, 1992: Francis and Hunston, 1992). Withholding her F-move further encouraged her students to discover the correct answer.

As the study progressed, a number of problems were discovered that restricted the inferences drawn from this research. The method of analyzing whole-class interaction limited which teacher beliefs could be compared. A second interview conducted after the initial analysis of class practices could have focused more on specific belief qualities that related to the F-move. Additionally, a follow-up interview could further investigate these teachers' beliefs derived from learning and language learning, an aspect mentioned by two of the participants. Further research is needed which would: (1) investigate a broader base of teachers' beliefs as a background for their educational beliefs, and (2) focus on beliefs about the follow-up move which would potentially create stronger inferences into teaching practices.

Aside from a few inconsistencies, these three FLA teachers practiced their teaching beliefs in the observed and analyzed portions of their classes. However, this study revealed a lack of integration between discoursal or evaluative F-moves among these participants. As Johnson states, teachers have control over what goes on in their classes primarily through the ways they use the language (1995, cited in Walsh, 2002: 5). The findings in this small-scale study support the importance of the F-move as described by Cullen (2002). An awareness of how teachers use their teacher talk and a reflection on F-move teaching strategies could lead to more effective teaching.

APPENDIX I TEACHERS' BELIEFS QUESTIONNAIRE

Section One: Demographics

1. Name _____

2. Male / female

3. Age:
20-25
26-30
31-35
36-40
41-45
46-50
51-55
over 55

4. Years spent teaching EFL:
Less than 2
3-5
6-10
More than 10

5. Years spent teaching at this university:
less than 2
3-5
6-10
More than 10

6. Number of countries taught in:
1
2
3
More than 3

7. Teaching qualifications (please choose all that apply):
TESL / TEFL certificate
CELTA certificate
Undergraduate degree
Undergraduate degree in teaching English
MA degree
MA degree in teaching English or Linguistics
Higher than an MA

Other _____

8. Have you participated in teacher professional development?   Yes   No
If yes, please specify:
Teacher in-service workshops
Teacher conferences
Peer observation
Research committees
Other _____

<div style="border:1px solid black; display:inline-block; padding:4px;">

Section Two: Influences on and Changes to Teaching Beliefs

</div>

9. What do you feel has most influenced your beliefs about language teaching? Rank
the following in order of importance. *1= Most Important* and *5= Least Important*

a.   Own second / foreign language (L2) learning experience
b.   Teaching experiences
c.   Initial teaching experiences, such as trial and error
d.   Socialization in work environment, such as teacher interaction and collaboration
e.   External teacher learning opportunities, such as workshops, teacher organizations
f.   Formal teacher training
Other (Please specify) _____

10. Do you feel your teaching beliefs have changed over the course of your experience?
Write yes or no in the box provided. If yes, could you briefly elaborate on when and why your
shift in teaching beliefs occurred?

<div style="border:1px solid black; height:80px; width:400px;"></div>

<div style="border:1px solid black; display:inline-block; padding:4px;">

Section Three: Beliefs on Teachers' Roles in the Classroom

</div>

11. How do you spend your class time? Rank the following in order of importance.
1= Most Important and *6= Least Important*

a.   1 on 1 student-teacher interaction
b.   Feedback
c.   In class homework correction
d.   Lecture / instruction n
e.   Listening comprehension activities
f.   Student pairwork / groupwork
Other (please specify) _____

12. What do you feel is your main role in the classroom? Rank your choices in order of

importance. *1= Most Important* and *4= Least Important*

a.   To provide a model of correct language usage.
b.   To help learners discover the rules and principles of language.
c.   To provide a useful learning experience.
d.   To make sure students do what they are supposed to do during activities.
Other (please specify) _____

Section Four: Teaching and Learning Educational Beliefs

"Belief" is defined as "an attitude consistently applied to an activity" (Eisenhart et al, 1988: 54). For the purposes of this survey, it is assumed that everyone has learned a first language, here referred to simply as "language." The language to be learned is a "new language."

Please answer each statement to accurately reflect your educational beliefs regarding teaching and learning. (*Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree*)

1.   Language learners inherently compare and contrast their language with the new language they are trying to learn.
2.   Helping students gain learner autonomy outside of the classroom is important when acquiring a new language.
3.   Positive results can come from students learning through a collective group effort.
4.   New language is acquired systematically over time like a sequence of building blocks.
5.   In the classroom, exposing learners to language beyond their ability to understand is not useful.
6.   Learner-initiated language socialization outside of the classroom is more productive than new language use in the classroom.
7.   Fluency is more important than accuracy in language learning.
8.   All new language learners' errors should be corrected as errors become bad habits.
9.   In the classroom, language is acquired most effectively through maximizing learner speaking-time, learner autonomy and genuine learner-interaction with pairwork and groupwork activities.
10.   Students are strongly influenced by the learning environment that surrounds them.
11.   For language learners to become effective communicators in the new language, teachers' feedback should focus on the content of students' responses.
12.   Learner emotions, motives, attitudes, and needs all affect what new language is acquired.
13.   Reinforcement and repetition helps language acquisition.
14.   New language can be learned through the environment and imitation only, just like the learning of a first language.
15.   New language learning takes place in spaces beyond the classroom, such as online, libraries, and student gathering areas. These learning spaces are equally as important as a classroom for learning a new language.

Section Five: Beliefs on Teachers' Behaviors in the Classroom

Please keep university and adult learners in mind when responding to these statements.

In your role as a teacher, choose a response for each of the following to qualify this statement: As an EFL teacher, I believe it is important to:
(*Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree*)

1.   Adapt teaching materials to meet the needs of my learners whenever possible.
2.   Speak as little as possible to maximize student to student interaction.
3.   Give my students as much speaking time as possible, regardless of the lesson plan.
4.   Correct students if they've made a grammatical mistake or error.
5.   To give whole class feedback at the end of each task.
6.   Correctly model natural English for my students to learn from.
7.   Teach solely from the book to best prepare them for the material they will be tested on.
8.   Use all available resources to expose students to natural and authentic English from native speakers of English.
9.   Model native speech patterns for my students to practice.
10.   Give feedback frequently throughout the lesson to encourage participation.
11.   Keep my students on task with the departmental syllabus and course objectives.
12.   Interrupt students if their responses deviate from the question or task.
14.   Teach my students communicative skills for use outside the classroom. (i.e. "survival English")
15.   Use students' native language to clear up misunderstandings or for clarity.
16.   Allow students to lead the direction of the class and take responsibility for their learning.
17.   Help my students think for themselves in English.
18.   Teach the class through formal instruction.
19.   Ignore oral errors as long as it is clear what the student is trying to say.
20.   Use precise grammatical structures during English language instruction.

APPENDIX II CLASS TRANSCRIPTS

Extended transcripts are provided to place the excerpts in context. Please refer to the lines in parentheses, for example Lines 11-15, to find the analyzed excerpt.

A. Archie: Excerpt 1 Transcription (Lines 11-15)

01	T	So, um, let's take a look up on the board here. Not that one, not that one, this one. Okay, so. I've got a little bit of a quiz here. Hmm...hmm...can, can't, could and couldn't. We're starting a new unit today, we're starting a new unit. Who can ah, who can tell me the answer to one of these here? What do I got? Sugyeong? Yeah, sure.
02	S1	A?
03	T	Yeah, could you read the sentence maybe?
04	S1	Um...I never learned how to swim so I can swim very well.
05	T	She says I never learned how to swim so I can swim very well. Oh..no...I'm sorry, what do we have? The correct answer is?
06	Sts	Can't.
07	T	Can't. Yeah. I never learned how to swim, yeah. I didn't learn, right? Okay, good. Remember, if you answer I'll give a stamp after, so remember, alright? So, stamp. Okay, good. No, I can't swim very well. Alright, okay. Hmm...Who's got this one? We have any male students here? Yeah? SoengSu?
08	S2	Woo.
09	T	SeongWoo?
10	S2	I can't speak Swedish but maybe I will learn someday.
11	T	Oh. So, which one is that? D? I can't speak Swedish. Good. I can't speak Swedish, maybe I'll learn someday. Okay. Alright. Hmm...I have a female student here, HaeJu, sure.
12	S3	A cat can climb trees.
13	T	A cat can climb trees. Yeah. Somebody's phone's ringing. Alright. Correct. A cat can climb trees. Yeah. Good. Okay. Good. Um. How about an elephant? Let's try someone else here, HeeJin.
14	S4	B. Elephants can't climb trees.
15	T	Elephants can't climb trees. Yeah. The tree would probably break, right? A very tiny elephant, maybe a super small elephant. Hmm...getting a little harder. Let's go right here. JiMin? Yeah, JiMin?
16	S5	D.
17	T	D. Can you read the sentence?
18	S5	When I was a child I couldn't drive a car.
19	T	Ooooow...starting to get a little harder. When I was a child I couldn't drive a car. That's correct. Good. I was too small. Okay. Hmm...okay I want any of these groups in the back. Got these groups in the front. Good make sure you can see.
20		[inaudible]
21	T	What's your name again?
22	S6	YoungEun.

23	T	YoungEun. In 18...
24	S6	In 1800 nobody couldn't travel to space.
25	T	In 1800, in 1800 nobody, you said couldn't, travel into space. Hmm, let's try it. Oh! Nobody...
26	S6	Could
27	T	Could travel. Nobody could travel, yeah? Yeah, good, okay. Awesome.

B. **Archie: Excerpt 2 and 3 Transcription (Lines 01-11 and 28-37)**

01	T	Okay, which group has five? Okay, yeah? What are they? Maybe you can go one by one.
02	S1	They are going to go to honeymoon.
03	T	Okay, they're going to go on a honeymoon.
04	S2	They are going to kiss and hug.
05	T	They're going to kiss and hug. Yeah.
06	S3	She is going to throw bouquet.
07	T	She's going to throw a bouquet.
08	S4	They're going to exchange rings.
09	T	They're going to exchange rings. Yeah. Do you have one more? Do you have at least five?
10	S1	They are, they are going to meet cousin and many people.
11	T	Meet cousins and many people from their family. Okay, good. Alright, excellent. This group had five. Do you guys have more than five?
12	S5	Yeah.
13	T	Do you have five different ones? I'll give you two stamps each if you have five different ones.
14	S5	Yeah, okay, go. [Laughter]
15	T	Do you have it? Do you have it?
16	S5	They are going to go...they're going to ride in a wedding car.
17	T	Ummm...they're going to ride in a wedding car with some decorations. Okay, good. Next one.
18	S6	They are going to hear ...[gesture]
19	S5	Okay, okay, pass.
20	T	Okay, okay, F. No.
21	S7	They are going to cry. They are going to cry. Uh, very, very, very happy.
22	T	Okay, JinSuh, what did he say? You guys are like planning. Okay three stamps...they're going to ah
23	S7	Cry.
24	T	Like Ahhh [T mimics cry]. Okay, good. Alright.
25	S8	They are drinking, ah, they're going to go drinking.
26	T	They're going to go drinking. Did you guys say that? No? Okay. They're going to go drinking, like partying. Okay.
27	S6	They are going to [Kr], wedding march.
28	T	They're going to do a wedding march. Okay, you guys need one more for two stamps.
29	S5	They are going to go to the bed. [laughter]

30	T	Yeah.
31	S5	Ah, it's your, your, your. Sorry, sorry.
32	S1,S2	Honeymoon.
33	T	Oh, they said honeymoon. And they said kiss and hug. Yeah. It's good. Can you think of a different one?
34	S5	Thank you, thank you.
35	T	No, they implied. It was implied.
36	S5	Ahh...they are going to divorce. [laughter]
37	T	Okay. Maybe eventually. Maybe eventually they'll get divorced. You guys are getting warmed up.

C.   Nanette: Excerpt 1 and 2 Transcription (Lines 01-18 and 34-50)

01	T	Umm...Rhea.
02	S1	Ring.
03	T	Ring. How many rings do you usually need?
04	S1	Two.
05	S2	As many as...
06	T	In Korea, where do you wear your ring?
07	S1	Four. Four. Four finger.
08	T	On which hand?
09	Sts	Left hand.
10	T	On this hand?
11	Sts	Yes.
12	S3	Why?
13	T	I just wondered because I often see people who are married in Korea, but they don't always have... I wasn't sure which side... sometimes men don't wear their rings at all.
14	S3	Ah. [laughter]
15	S4	So, what about America?
16	T	America is also on the left.
17	S4	Oh.
18	T	Although men in America sometimes don't wear their rings either. But, that's a whole different story. Sophia. A, sorry. Sophie.
19	S5	Veil.
20	T	Veil. Good. Good. Um, one more. Okay, Phillip.
21	S6	Kiss.
22	T	Kiss. [laughter]
23	S7	How, how, how?
24	T	Do you want to show us? Not me, him! You have 2 beautiful girls right there, you know. Alice would say no. Are you okay Phillip?
25	S8	Phillip, he has a girlfriend.
26	T	I know he has a girlfriend. Right? 3 mo... a hundred days.
27	S8	For over a hundred days.
28	T	I know, right. But Evan, Evan is working on a girlfriend, so. Yeah. Good. Okay. So, next one.

29	S9	Oh!
30	T	Remember when we did intonation? And we did "oh"? When you see this picture, which "oh" should you use?
31	S9	Oh?
32	T	Remember we did a we did a PowerPoint and we saw different pictures and you all went "oh, oh, oh." Which one when you saw the picture of the baby, which one would you use.
33	Sts	Oh
34	T	Yeah, so cute. Okay. Now, for Christmas, um, it can be Korean Christmas or it can be Christmas that you imagine in another country. So, go ahead and write whatever you think that you might need for Christmas. Okay, Christmas. What do you have for Christmas? Chris.
35	S10	Christmas Eve.
36	T	Christmas Eve. Ohh...I love Christmas Eve, it's my favorite. We always have dinner at my parents house and exchange gifts. Who else is not...Osam.
37	S11	Snow.
38	T	Snow, yes. I wish that we had snow. I always want to have snow. But, Jack, what do you think we should have for Christmas?
39	S12	Socks.
40	T	Socks. Okay. We had this the other day. You know you guys I'm sorry about my drawing, but. You mean this, right?
41	Sts	Yeah. Banana.
42	T	Well maybe it's a banana and a. It's called a. It's called instead of sock, it's called stocking.
43	S13	No, it seems like Captain Hook.
44	T	It's it's more rounded. There is that better? So instead of sock, it's stocking.
45	S13	Or an eggplant.
46	T	Oh no, I hate eggplant, I prefer banana. So the socks, well they did start out as socks. But yeah, we are, we say stockings. And usually more than one. Um...Tom.
47	S14	Rudolf.
48	T	Rudolf. Oh, yes. You wanna sing the song for me?
49	S13	[laughter] No...
50	T	Maybe closer to Christmas.

D.   Nanette: Excerpt 3 Transcription (Lines 61-67)

01	T	Rowan.
02	S1	To girls wearing a skirt and boys can't wearing a skirt.
03	Sts	Ahh..
04	S1	And that is also...
05	T	And what do we call that when boys do one thing and girls do another thing?
06	S2	Stereotype.
07	T	Stereotype, that's good. But that usually comes into play when you say things like girls can't play sports. Um. Only girls can bake. There's a different word and it sounds like rules but it's to explain male and female, um, actions in

society. Does anyone know the word?

08	S3	Is it start C?
09	T	R.
10	S3	R.
11	T	It sounds like when a person is an actor and they take on, they call it.
12	S4	Role.
13	T	Roles. Good. I don't know if you can see, I'll put this here. We discussed that there are certain roles in society that men and women are expected to perform, whether or not it's good or bad. In Korea, what kind of roles do you have in Korea. What are the stereotypes or preconceived notions of women or men in Korea? Rhea.
14	S5	Women is ah...silent.
15	T	Women should be silent.
16	S6	Man is loud. Can loud.
17	T	What else? What can men do? Tom? Or what? Anything, just go ahead.
18	S7	Just man, uh, man would be chairman.
19	T	Chairman. Chairman of the business or president of the country?
20	S7	Business.
21	T	Okay. CEO?
22	S7	Ah.
23	T	Okay, there are mostly male CEOs. Um..Ossam.
24	S8	Uh, woman is housekeeper.
25	T	Housekeeper. Okay. Good. Okay, what else? Laura.
26	S9	Mens are brave.
27	T	Brave? Okay. Remember these are thoughts, you know. Not always, Julia.
28	S10	Woman is weak.
29	T	Good. I'm mean not good that's she's weak, but...Andrew.
30	S11	Woman cannot smoke.
31	T	Okay, no smoking. Let's do one more for men if you have one and then we'll talk a little bit about these. Phillip.
32	S12	Men no cry. [laughter]
33	T	Okay, men can't cry.
34	S13	Only 3 times.
35	T	Do you think this is true?
36	Sts	Yes / no.
37	T	No, because I saw you last semester, when you knew our class was over, I saw you cry.
38	S12	Really? [laughter]
39	T	It was a joke. Okay. So, do you think that these things are true?
40	S12	No.
41	T	Do you think that only men can be loud?
42	Sts	No.
43	T	Sophia?
44	S13	No. [laughter]
45	T	Do you think that only men can be CEOs?
46	S14	No.

47	T	That only men are brave?
48	Sts	No.
49	T	I hear a lot of women. And that, do you believe that men can't cry?
50	Sts	No.
51	T	How 'bout women should be silent?
52	Sts	No.
53	T	Only women should be housekeepers?
54	Sts	No.
55	T	I'm a terrible housekeeper. Women are very weak?
56	Sts	No.
57	T	And women can't smoke?
58	Sts	Yes.
59	T	Really, no one should smoke, right. Smoking is really bad for you. If you're going to tell someone they can't smoke, everyone shouldn't smoke. But this is one, no smoking out in public, right? In Korea, do you think when your children...remember we talked about, one of the games that we played said in Twenty years.
60	Sts	Ahh.
61	T	When you, pretend that you've married, you've had children and it's now about 20 years from now. Your children are going to university. Do you think any of these roles will change?
62	S15	Yes.
63	T	Why do you think they'll change? Why? Rowan.
64	S1	Because long time ago, the girls can't go out and girls can't go to school but right now there's change. We can go to school. So I think after twenty years maybe things will be changed.
65	T	Good. I think so too. Even in the three years that I've been in Korea, many things have changed. What about, um, for boys? What will change for men?
66	S16	Many of, many woman is go to get some money and some man is housekeeper and, and nowadays many babysitter is a man.
67	T	Good. And that didn't used to happen, right. Even in American society, men didn't, um, work in elementary schools. They didn't stay home with their children. They weren't nurses. They were the doctors and CEOs, an.... And now, even though we still have a lot of work in America, to do, because there are not very many female CEOs and there's a lot of different things like that. That we are still striving for. It's better, there are, and men are given the choice to do things that maybe in the past they wouldn't let them do. And women the same. So, I think the same in Korea. I watch your generation, compared to the same generation, but even a few years older, and the women in my classes are very strong. You guys don't have problems speaking. You have no problems mixing, boys and girls. So I think that that's very exciting to watch those changes. Good. So roles are things that um, in society, when we talk about what a man, woman, child, and elderly person, especially in Korea or in Asian culture where you have different ways to treat people based on their age. Everyone has some sort of role to play. You guys have the role to play right now of university students. Most university students throughout the world have

very similar lifestyles. Maybe because they're in a different country it's a little different, but for the most part, um, they have a similar type. In the United States, for example, my nephew and niece are just about your age and when I talk to them, they tell me all the same things they did this weekend. What you guys do and what they do is so, so similar.

## E.	Matilda: Excerpt 1 Transcription (Lines 01-15)

01	T	Okay. Um, what do you have to do if you are going to go on a trip somewhere? What do you have to do if you have to go overseas?
02	S1	I have to pack.
03	T	You have to pack. Okay. What else do you have to do?
04	S2	Get travel insurance.
05	T	You have to get travel insurance. DoGyeong?
06	S3	And to immigration...ah, to fill out ah... to fill out immigration form.
07	T	You have to fill out an immigration form, yes. GyeongJoon?
08	S4	Book a airline ticket.
09	T	Sentence. I have to.
10	S4	I have to book a ticket.
11	T	Very important, otherwise you can't go anywhere. Yes GonSoon.
12	S5	I have to make a passport.
13	T	You have to get a passport?
14	S5	Get a passport.
15	T	Okay. Yes?
16	S6	I have to change the, change the money.
17	T	You have to change money. You have to get travelers checks. Okay.
18	S7	I, ah, we have to check our body, ah, because ah...something in...
19	S8	Terror. [laughter]
20	T	You have to walk through
21	S7	Pass
22	T	You have to walk through a security scanner. Okay? You have to walk through a security scanner. Good point. For reasons of terror. But a sentence is better than a word. Alright. Anything else you have to do to travel overseas? Yes Byul.
23	S9	Uh, we have to check our bag.
24	T	Ah, you have to check your bags in, yes. If you have big bags, heavy bags, you have to check them in. Alright. Easy.

## F.	Matilda: Excerpt 2 and 3 Transcription (Lines 62-68 and 19-33)

01	T	Okay, people. Times up. Let's check. Now. With this conversation, everybody will get a chance to give me one sentence. And you have a 50-50 chance of getting it correct. Okay? Now, when you tell me. When you read out the sentence with will or going to, you have to tell me Why. So if you say "I think um...it is going to be a sunny day today" you have to say oh it's because it's a definite plan. Alright? Okay. So, what horrible weather today... Yes?

02	S1	Our write...?
03	T	Yes, please. Read it. Yeah.
04	S1	What horrible weather today, I'd love to go out. But I think it will just continue raining.
05	T	Okay. What use of will?
06	S1	Prediction
07	T	Okay, very good. Easy. Thank you. Oh, I don't know. Yes?
08	S2	Oh I don't know. Because, perhaps the sun will come out later this afternoon.
09	T	Okay, what use of will?
10	S2	Prediction
11	T	Prediction or you'd also say not sure. Perhaps, maybe. So it's two uses. Okay. I hope you're right...yes?
12	S3	Listen, I'm going to have a party this Saturday. Would you like to come?
13	T	Okay. What use?
14	S3	Definite plan
15	T	Okay, good. Remember we said parties? Definite plan. Oh, I'd love to come. Thank you for inviting me. Hand down, you've already had a chance.
16	S4	Uhh..Who is going to come to the party?
17	T	Okay. Who is going to come to the party?
18	S4	Definite plan
19	T	It's a definite plan. Well, a number of people haven't told me yet. [21:49]
20	S5	But..but Peter and Mark will help out with the cooking.
21	T	[T inhales and scrunches her face] Really? What use of will do you think it is?
22	S5	Promise.
23	T	Really?
24	S5	Promise.
25	T	Okay, I'll accept that. Does anybody have a different answer?
26	S5	But Peter and Mark...
27	T	Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa. Gunsoo
28	S6	Peter and Mark are going to help out with the cooking.
29	T	Why do you say going to?
30	S6	Definite plan.
31	T	It's a definite plan? How do you know it's a definite plan?
32	S6	They Promised.
33	T	They promised it earlier, but the party's organized. Some people haven't told me but. Okay. That's our clue. We know it's a definite plan. But, these are going to. Okay, good. Alright. Next. Jae In, I'll give you another chance. You have a 50-50 chance of getting it correct.
34	S5	Hey, I'll help too. Sudden decision.
35	T	A sudden decision. Also, a promise. Okay, yes. Thank you. Would you? That'd be great. Yes?
36	S7	I'm going to make a lasana.
37	T	Lasagna?
38	S7	Lasagna. Definite plan.
39	T	Really? [puts finger on mouth]
40	S7	Yes?

41	S8	I will make lasagna.
42	T	Why do you say I will?
43	S8	Sudden decision.
44	T	It's a sudden decision.
45	S9	Promise.
46	T	It's also a promise. 'Cause she just decided I'll help too. I'll make lasagna. Okay? Sorry GyeongJoon. That sounds delicious. SoHyeon, you've already had a chance. Hands down. Yes?
47	S10	I know my Italian cousins are going to be there.
48	T	Okay.
49	S10	I'm sure.
50	T	Whoa, whoa, whoa, wait. I know my Italian cousins are going to be there. It's a definite plan. How do you know it's a definite plan?
51	S10	Because..I know.
52	T	I know. Know is your clue. I know they are going to be there. It's a definite plan. Next one. I'm sure...
53	S11	I'm sure they are going to love it.
54	T	[inhales] Close, but no banana. Ah, YeSon
55	S12	I'm sure they will love it. It's a prediction.
56	T	It's a prediction. Okay. I'm sure they'll love it. Prediction. Italians? Italians?
57	S13	Italian? Maybe I will bake a cake. Jane..Jane is not sure. Jane is not sure, she...she make a cake.
58	T	Okay. She's not sure and she's also a little bit scared. Italians? Maybe I'll bake a cake. Alright. No, no they're not like that.
59	S14	Um. They will love it.
60	T	Okay.
61	S14	Prediction.
62	T	Very good. They'll love it. It's a prediction. Alright. Well, if you say so...Yes?
63	S15	Will be a theme for the party?
64	T	[puts finger on mouth] It's a question.
65	S15	Are there going to be a theme for the party?
66	T	Are there or is there?
67	Sts	Is there
68	T	Is there going to be a theme for the party. Why. Why um is there going to be?
69	S15	Definite plan.
70	T	It's a definite plan. How do you know this? [Wait time but no response] We've been talking about this party for a while. The party's always been going to, going to. Okay. Martha has already planned the party. No I don't think so. Just a chance to get together and have fun.Young Joon you've had a go already. Hands down. Somebody who hasn't tried yet. Okay.

REFERENCES

Altan, M. (1997) "The culture of the English language teacher in an EFL context." **Annual Meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.** Orlando: 11-15 March 1997.

Baker, C.D. (2002) "Ethnomethodological analysis of interviews." In Roulston, K. (2010) "Considering quality in qualitative interviewing." **Qualitative Research**. 10/2. p. 218.

Baker, C.D., and Johnson, G. (1998) "Interview talk as professional development." **Language and Education.** 12/4: 229-242.

Berry, M. (1981) "Systematic linguistics and discourse analysis: a multi-layered approach to exchange structure." In Nassaji, H., and Wells, G. (2000) "What's the use of triadic dialogue? an investigation of the teacher-student interaction." **Applied Linguistics**. 21/3. p. 377.

Borg, M. (2004) "The apprenticeship of observation." **ELT Journal**. 58/3: 274-276.

Borg, S. (2003) "Teacher cognition in language teaching: a review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do." **Language Teaching**. 36: 81-109.

Brazil, D. (1995) **Classroom and spoken discourse**. Birmingham: The Centre for English Language Studies.

Breen, M., and Candlin, C. (1980) "The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching." In Cullen, R. (1998) "Teacher talk and the classroom context." **ELT Journal**. 52/3: 182.

Brown, A. (2009) "Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: a comparison of ideals." **The Modern Language Journal**. 93(i): 46-60.

Brown, H.D. (2000) **Principles of language learning and teaching.** 4th ed. New York: Longman.

Brown, H.D. (2001) **Teaching by principles**. 2nd ed. New York: Longman.

Burns, A. (1996) "Starting all over again: from teaching adults to teaching beginners." In Borg, S. (2003) "Teacher cognition in language teaching: a review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do." **Language Teaching**. 36. p. 94.

Clark, H.H., and Carlson, T. B. (1992) "Hearers and speech acts." In Malouf, R. (1995) **Towards an analysis of multi-party discourse**. [online] Available from: citeseerx.ist.psu.edu:7.

Choi, S.H. (2000) "Teachers' beliefs about communicative language teaching and their classroom practices." **English Teaching**. 55/4: 3-32.

Chui, H.W. (2009) **Practical understandings: teachers' beliefs and practice in pronunciation teaching**. [online] Dissertation. Arlington: University of Texas at Arlington. http://hdl.handle.net/10106/1651 [accessed February 4, 2011]

Cohen, A., and Fass, L. (2001) "Oral language instruction: teacher and learner beliefs and the reality in EFL classes at a Colombian university." [online] **ERIC database document**. [accessed April 28, 2010]

Cook, G. (1989) **Discourse**. Oxford: OUP.

Coulthard, M. (1985) **An introduction to discourse**. New edition. London: Longman.

Coulthard, M. (ed.) (1992) **Advances in spoken language discourse analysis**. London: Routledge.

Coulthard, M., and Brazil, D. (1992) "Exchange structure." In Coulthard, M. (ed.) (1992) **Advances in spoken language discourse analysis**. London: Routledge. pp. 50-78.

Cullen, R. (1998) "Teacher talk and the classroom context." **ELT Journal**. 52/3: 179-187.

Cullen, R. (2002) "Supportive teacher talk: the importance of the f-move." **ELT Journal**. 56/2: 117-127.

Drever, E. (2003) **Using semi-structured interviews in small-scale research: a teachers guide**. Glasgow: Scottish Council for Research in Education.

Eggins, S., and Slade, D. (1997) "Analysing causal conversation." In Nassaji, H., and Wells, G. (2000) "What's the use of triadic dialogue? an investigation of the teacher-student interaction." **Applied Linguistics**. 21/3. p. 378.

Eisenhart, M.A., Shrum, J.L., Harding, J.R., and Cuthbert, A.M. (1988) "Teacher beliefs: definitions, findings, directions." **Educational Policy**. 2/1: 51-70.

Farrell, T., and Lim, P. (2005) "Conceptions of grammar teaching: a case study of teachers' beliefs and classroom practices." **TESL-EJ** 9/2: 1-13.

Fenstermacher, G.D. (1979) "A philosophical consideration of recent research on teacher effectiveness." In Pajares, M. (1992) "Teachers' beliefs and educational research: cleaning up a messy construct." **Review of Educational Research**. 62/3. p. 307.

Fiemen-Nemser, S., and Floden, R.E. (1986) "The cultures of teaching." In Richards, J.C., and Lockhart, C. (1996) **Reflective teaching in second language classrooms**. Cambridge: CUP. p. 30.

Francis, G., and Hunston, S. (1992) "Analysing everyday conversation." In Coulthard, M. (ed.) (1992) **Advances in spoken language discourse analysis**. London: Routledge. pp. 123-161.

Freeman, D., and Johnson, K. (1998) "Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education." **TESOL Quarterly**. 32/3: 297-417.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1961) "Categorizes of the theory of grammar." In Brazil, D. (1995) **Classroom and spoken discourse**. Birmingham: The Centre for English Language Studies: 34.

Hewings, M. (1992) "Intonation and feedback in the EFL classroom." In Coulthard, M. (ed.) (1992) **Advances in spoken language discourse analysis**. London: Routledge. pp. 183-196.

Jarvis, J., and Robinson, M. (1997) "Analysing educational discourse: an exploratory study of teacher response and support to pupils' learning." **Applied Linguistics**. 18/2: 212-228.

Johnson, K.E. (1992) "The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices during literacy instruction for non-native speakers of English." **Journal for Literacy Research**. 24/1: 83-108.

Johnson, K.E. (1994) "The emerging beliefs and instructional practices of preservice English as a second language teachers." **Teaching & Teacher Education**. 10/4: 439-452.

Johnson, K.E. (1995) "Understanding communication in second language classrooms." Walsh, S. (2002) "Construction or obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom." **Language Teaching Research**. 61/1. p. 5.

Jones, S. (2008) **Teacher and student SLA beliefs at a South Korean university**. (unpublished) M2 paper. Centre for English Language Studies, University of Birmingham.

Jones, S. (2009) **Application of the Sinclair and Coulthard discourse model to a Korean university English course**. (unpublished) M4 paper. Centre for English Language Studies, University of Birmingham.

Karavas-Doukas, E. (1996) "Using attitude scales to investigate teachers' attitudes to the communicative approach." **ELT Journal**. 50/3: 187-198.

Krashen, S. (1982) "Principles and practice of second language acquition." In Lightbown, P.M., and Spada, N. (eds.) (1999) **How languages are learned**. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 38-40.

Krashen, S. (1985) "The input hypothesis: issues and implications." In Richards, J.C., and Lockhart, C. (1996) **Reflective teaching in second language classrooms**. Cambridge: CUP. p. 184.

Lightbown, P.M., and Spada, N. (eds.) (1999) **How languages are learned**. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lemke, J. L. (1985) "Using language in the classroom." In Wells, G. (1993) "Reevaluating the IRF sequence: a proposal for the articulation of theories of activity and discourse for the analysis of teaching and learning in the classroom." **Linguistics and Education**. 5. p. 29.

Lortie, D. (1975) "Schoolteacher: a sociocultural study." In Borg, M. (2004) "The apprenticeship of observation." **ELT Journal**. 58/3. p. 274.

Ma Xiao-yan (2006) **Teacher talk and EFL in university classrooms**. Dissertation, Chongqing Normal University & Yangtze Normal University.

Malouf, R. (1995) **Towards an analysis of multi-party discourse**. [online] Available from: citeseerx.ist.psu.edu.

McCarthy, M. (1991) **Discourse analysis for language teachers**. Cambridge: CUP.

McDonald, B., and Walker, R. (1975) "Case study and the social philosophy of educational research." In Powell, G. (1999) "How to be a fly on the wall." **The Teacher Trainer**. 13/1. p. 4.

Mehan, H. (1979) "Learning lessons: social organization in the classroom." In Nassaji, H., and Wells, G. (2000) "What's the use of triadic dialogue? an investigation of the teacher-student interaction." **Applied Linguistics**. 21/3. p. 379.

Mercer, N. (1995) **The guided construction of knowledge: talk among teachers and learners**. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Mercer, N. (2004) "Sociocultural discourse analysis: analysing classroom talk as a social mode of thinking." **Journal of Applied Linguistics**. 1/2: 137-168.

Munby, H. (1984) "A qualitative approach to the study of a teacher's beliefs." Pajares, M. (1992) "Teachers' beliefs and educational research: cleaning up a messy construct." **Review of Educational Research**. 62/3. pp. 326, 327.

Nassaji, H., and Wells, G. (2000) "What's the use of triadic dialogue? an investigation of the teacher-student interaction." **Applied Linguistics**. 21/3: 376-406.

Nespor, J. (1987) "The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching." In Pajares, M. (1992) "Teachers' beliefs and educational research: cleaning up a messy construct." **Review of Educational Research**. 62/3. p. 311.

Noor, N.M., Aman, I., Mustaffa, R., and Seong, T.K. (2010) "Teachers' verbal feedback on students' response: a Malaysian ESL classroom discourse analysis." **Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences**. 7(c): 398-405.

Nunan, D. (1987) "Communicative language teaching: making it work." **ELT Journal**. 41/2: 136-145.

Nunan, D. (1990) "Action research in the language classroom." In Richards, J., and Nunan, D. (1990) **Second language education research**. Cambridge: CUP. pp. 62-81.

Nunn, R. (2001) "Language learning across boundaries- negotiating classroom rituals." **TESL-EJ**. 5/2: 1-11.

Pajares, M. (1992) "Teachers' beliefs and educational research: cleaning up a messy construct." **Review of Educational Research**. 62/3: 307-332.

Powell, G. (1999) "How to be a fly on the wall." **The Teacher Trainer**. 13/1: pp. 3-5.

Raths, J., and McAninch, A.C. (eds.) (2003) **Teacher beliefs and classroom performance: the impact of teacher education**. Greenwich: Information Age Publishing. pp. 1-22.

Richards, J.C., and Lockhart, C. (1996) **Reflective teaching in second language classrooms**. Cambridge: CUP.

Richards, J., and Nunan, D. (eds.) (1990) **Second language education research**. Cambridge: CUP.

Richards, J., and Rodgers, T. (2001) **Approaches and methods in language teaching**. Cambridge: CUP.

Richardson, V. (2003) "Preservice teachers' beliefs." In Raths, J., and McAninch, A.C. (eds.) (2003) **Teacher beliefs and classroom performance: the impact of teacher education**. Greenwich: Information Age Publishing. pp. 1-22.

Rokeach, M. (1968) "Beliefs, attitudes, and values: a theory of organization and change." In Pajares, M. (1992) "Teachers' beliefs and educational research: cleaning up a messy construct." **Review of Educational Research**. 62/3. p. 314.

Rojas-Drummond, S.M., Albarran, C.D., and and Littleton, K.S. (2008) "Collaboration, creativity, and the co-construction of oral and written texts." **Thinking Skills and Creativity**. 3: 177-191.

Roulston, K. (2010) "Considering quality in qualitative interviewing." **Qualitative Research**. 10/2: 199-228.

Sato, K., and Kleinsasser, R. (2004) "Beliefs, practices, and interactions of teachers in a Japanese high school English department." **Teaching and Teacher Education**. 20: 797-816.

Savin-Baden, M. (2007) "Second Life PBL: liminality and liquidity and lurking." Keynote speech. **Reinventing Problem-based Learning Conference**. Republic Polytechnic, Singapore: 7-9 March 2007.

Seedhouse, P. (1996) "Classroom interaction: possibilities and impossiblities." **ELT Journal**. 50/1: 16-24.

Seedhouse, P. (2004) **The interactional architecture of the language classroom: a conversation analysis perspective**. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Inc.

Shim, J.H. (nd) "Teacher talk as strategies in the classroom." **Korea Education Research**. 25: 73-88.

Sinclair, J. (1992) "Priorities in discourse analysis." In Coulthard, M. (ed.) (1992) **Advances in spoken language discourse analysis**. London: Routledge. pp. 79-88.

Sinclair, J., and Brazil, D. (1982) **Teacher Talk**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, J., and Coulthard, M. (1975) **Toward an analysis of discourse: the English used by teachers and pupils**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, J., and Coulthard, M. (1992) "Toward an analysis of discourse." In Coulthard, M. (ed.) (1992) **Advances in spoken language discourse analysis**. London: Routledge. pp. 1-34.

Tardy, C., and Snyder, B. (2004) "'That's why I do it': *flow* and EFL teachers' practices." **ELT Journal**. 58/2: 118-128.

Thornbury, S. (1996) "Teachers' research teacher talk." **ELT Journal**. 50/4: 279-289.

Walsh, S. (2002) "Construction or obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom." **Language Teaching Research**. 61/1: 3-23.

Wells, G. (1993) "Reevaluating the IRF sequence: a proposal for the articulation of theories of activity and discourse for the analysis of teaching and learning in the classroom." **Linguistics and Education**. 5: 1-37.

Wells, G. (1996) "Using the tool-kit of discourse in the activity of learning and teaching." In Nassaji, H., and Wells, G. (2000) "What's the use of triadic dialogue? an investigation of the teacher-student interaction." **Applied Linguistics**. 21/3. p. 378.

White, A. (2003) **The application of Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF structure to a classroom lesson: analysis and discussion**. [online] Centre for English Language Studies, University of Birmingham. http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/AWhite4.pdf. [accessed January 1, 2011]

Willis, D. (1992) "Caught in the act: using the rank scale to address problems of delicacy." In Coulthard, M. (ed.) (1992) **Advances in spoken language discourse analysis**. London: Routledge. pp. 111-122.

Woods, D. (1996) "Teacher cognition in language teaching." In Borg, S. (2003) "Teacher cognition in language teaching: a review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do." **Language Teaching**. 36. p. 87.

Yang, N. (2000) "Teachers' beliefs about language learning and teaching: a cross-cultural comparison." **Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education**. 5/1: 39-52.

Yook, C.M. (2010) **Korean teachers' beliefs about English language education and their impacts upon the Ministry of Education-initiated reform**. [online] Dissertation paper 14. George State University Digital Archive. http://digitalarchive.gsu.edu/alesl_diss/14 [accessed February 4, 2011]

Yoon, K. (2004) "CLT theories and practices in EFL curricula: a case study of Korea." **Asian EFL Journal**. 6/3: 1-16.

Yu, W. (2009) "An analysis of college English classroom discourse." **Asian Social Science**. 5/7: 152-159.