UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

CREATING POSITIVE ENVIRONMENT THROUGH INTERACTION IN FINNISH EFL AND CLIL CLASSROOMS

A Pro Gradu Thesis in English

by

Annukka Rantala

HUMANISTINEN TIEDEKUNTA
KIELTEN LAITOS

Annukka Rantala
CREATING POSITIVE ENVIRONMENT THROUGH INTERACTION IN FINNISH EFL
AND CLIL CLASSROOMS

Pro Gradu-tutkielma
Englannin kieli
Huhtikuu 2008   95 sivua + 2 liitettä

Tämän tutkimuksen tarkoituksena on selvittää, kuinka opettaja ja oppilaat luovat myönteistä, kevyttä ilmapiiriä luokkaan vuorovaikutuksen tasolla. Tutkimuksen aineistona on yksi yläkoulun kaksoistunti CLIL (Content and language integrated learning) luokasta, jossa opetettava aine on biologia, sekä kaksi yläkoulun englannin kielen oppituntia, joissa oppilasryhmä opiskelee englantia toisena vieraana kielenään. Tutkimus pyrkii vastaamaan seuraavaan tutkimuskysymykseen: millaiset toiminnot luovat tai pyrkivät ylläpitämään myönteistä ilmapiiriä EFL ja CLIL luokkahuonevuorovaikutuksessa? Lisäksi tutkitaan myös seuraavaa: kuinka ne vuorovaikutussekvenssit, jotka sisältävät näitä toimintoja, ovat rakentuneet, ja miten ympäröivä konteksti vaikuttaa niihin?

Vuorovaikutussekvenssien laajempi rakenne, sekä yksittäisten vuorojen rakenne on analysoitu keskusteluanalyysin keinoin. Tutkimuksen laajemman taustan muodostavat luokkahuonevuorovaikutuksen tutkimus sekä tunnetutkimus. Myönteistä ilmapiiriä luovat toiminnot pyritään analysoimaan osana laajempaa institutionaalista kontekstia, tukeutuen tuntemukseen luokkahuonevuorovaikutuksen keskeisistä rakenteista. Myönteisen ilmapiirin tunnistamiseen käytetään tunnetutkimuksen tarjoamia elementtejä, joiden avulla voidaan tunnistaa ne vuorovaikutussekvenssit ja toiminnot, joilla myönteistä ilmapiiriä luodaan.

Tulokset osoittavat että tässä tutkimuksessa myönteistä ilmapiiriä luovat, aloitteelliset toiminnot voidaan jakaa oppilaiden oma-aloitteisiin toimintoihin, oppilaiden kysymyksiin ja vastauksiin sekä opettajan toimintoihin. Selvästi eniten esiintyi oppilaiden oma-aloitteisia toimintoja, kun taas opettajan toiminnot olivat vähäisiä. Tämä tutkimus ei kuitenkaan pyri tavoitteellisesti vertailemaan saatuja tuloksia, vaan keskittyy tulosten kuvailevaan analyysiin. Huomionarvoista kuitenkin on, että sekä oppilaat että opettajat osallistuivat myönteisen ilmapiirin ylläpitämiseen.

Osallistujat luovat kevyttä ilmapiiriä luokkaan vuorovaikutuksellaan, ja pyrkivät myös ylläpitämään sitä. Osallistujien aloitteelliset toiminnot kytkeytyvät vahvasti luokkahuonevuorovaikutuksen rakenteisiin, erityisesti kysymys-vastaus-palaute-rakenteisiin, mutta myös keskustelutilanteet synnyttävät aloitteellisia toimintoja. Keinoja myönteisen ilmapiirin luomiseen näyttävät olevan selvästi huumori ja leikittely, jotka ovat tilannesidonnaisia.

Lisätutkimuksilla voitaisiin esimerkiksi selvittää, onko luokkahuoneen myönteisellä ilmapiirillä ja oppimistuloksilla huomattavaa yhteyttä, ja voitaisiinko oppimisen hidasteita etsiä luokan ilmapiiristä? Myös yksittäisten tehtävien ja opetustapojen toimivuutta ja vaikutuksia voitaisiin selvittää tutkimalla niiden aikana vallitsevaa ilmapiiriä. Vuorovaikutustutkimusta voitaisiin näin soveltaa usealle tutkimuksen alalle.

Asiasanat: conversation analysis. classroom interaction. institutional interaction. emotion studies. positive environment

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

We all have a certain schema about classrooms in our mind, we know how one should behave at school and what the purpose of a school is. We also know that teachers and students have different kinds of roles in a classroom, that the teacher usually has the power to decide how the lesson proceeds and what kind of tasks there are. The context of a classroom is a specific one; an institutional one. A classroom is, however, also a place where the participants gain experiences, practise their social skills and establish relationships. A classroom is not a place where the students as a group learn mechanically, as the teacher stands in front of the classroom teaching, separately from the students. The aspect that makes classrooms social, is interaction. The participants interact with each other, and the interaction in classrooms serves different kind of purposes.

This study aims at analysing the emotional aspect of classroom interaction. The purpose is to reveal how positive environment is created through interaction in two different classrooms; EFL and CLIL (English as a foreign language and Content and language integrated learning). Though the data consists of two different kind of classrooms, the study does not have its main focus on comparing them with each other. More specifically, the aim is to find out what kind of *actions* the participants seem to employ when they create and maintain positive environment in the classroom, and what kind of reactions these actions invite in others. The interaction sequences containing these actions are examined carefully, in order to reveal their structure and see the possible influence of the classroom context.

Classroom interaction is a widely researched area, and both students' and teachers' interaction have been studied from different viewpoints and for different purposes. As the interaction in classrooms can be seen as institutional (see Heritage 2005), studies concerning the actual structure of the interaction have been made. This study relies on the existing knowledge about the structure of classroom interaction, and makes use of the basic IRF-patterning (Initiation-Response-Follow-up, see Sinclair and Coulthard 1975), as one of the main structural elements. Although the structure of classroom interaction, as well as the teachers' and students' roles and behaviour have been studied, the emotional aspects of classrooms have been neglected from research.

If classroom interaction studies have not considered emotional aspects, neither have emotions studies examined classroom interaction. Actually, emotional aspects of classrooms have not been studied, although emotions' effects on the individual's learning process have been considered. Specifically attitudes, motivation and different learner styles have interested researchers. Studies of the kind have been conducted mainly in order to identify the hindrances in learning processes (see Arnold 1999 and Ellis 1992, for example). Emotions in classrooms have interested researchers from the individual's point of view, concentrating on the individual's personal experiences, and no actual studies focusing on the environment of a classroom have been conducted, not to mention the interactional aspect of the phenomenon as such.

Emotions in interaction (though not specifically on classroom interaction), have been studied, and Planalp (1999), for example, represents cues to emotions, referring to ways in which emotions are expressed in interaction, and can be further analysed. In this study, the emotional aspect of the interaction, that is, the actual positive environment, is analysed with the help of Planalp's cues, as they help in identifying the markers of positive environment. Also Sandlund (2004), has studied emotional expression in academic interaction, and her study has indeed inspired this study, though the context here is not entirely same. However, emotions in interaction have proved to be an analysable phenomenon, and the present study will hopefully bring something new to the field of these studies, by concentrating on yet another context.

The method that I will use for analysing the interaction sequences is conversation analysis, and special attention is paid on the institutional aspects of the interaction (conversation analysis is widely used in classroom interaction studies, see Seedhouse 2004, for example). Conversation analysis has been chosen for this study, because it offers tools for detailed interaction analysis, and can be well adopted for studies concentrating on institutional contexts, such as the one here. The present study wishes to study the interactional level and the interest lies on the visible and audible evidence. Conversation analysis does not draw conclusions outside the data itself, neither does it abandon any features of the data as irrelevant beforehand. For these reasons it suits for the purposes of this study. However, also the aspects that the study of institutional interaction offers for identifying and analysing interaction, will be used in order to reveal the participants' institutional roles and their effect on the interaction.

Most importantly, this study wishes to employ the above mentioned areas of research and analytic method working towards the same goal. Emotion studies, classroom interaction studies and conversation analysis form the framework in which this study is situated. In the analysis, the interaction sequences where positive environment seems to be created and/or maintained, are studied carefully. The *key action* creating the positive environment, as well as the reactions to it, are analysed and the possible connections to the surrounding context and the roles of the participants are explored. The purpose is also to concentrate on the whole interaction sequence more broadly, and unearth the possible aspects of institutional interaction behind its structure. The choice of an emotional angle for the study has got its motivator in the pure lack of previous studies as well as in personal interest towards the issue. The absence of a comparable study makes the conducting of this study very interesting, and whatever the case, the results will be new and fresh.

The first part of the study concentrates on drawing the framework for this study. The following chapter introduces conversation analysis, dealing briefly with the development of the method, moving on to the foregrounding elements of the method itself. Sequence organisation and turn taking, as well as aspects of institutional interaction are discussed in more detail, and finally some remarks about conversation analysis in classrooms are made. In chapter three the basic features and structure of classroom interaction are discussed, in order to illustrate the already existing knowledge, that will be used in this study as well. Emotion studies, concentrating on classroom and learning, as well as emotions in interaction, are discussed in chapter four. The framework of this study is followed by the aims and motivation of the study in chapter five, and the methodology, as well the data and analytic process are represented thoroughly. Chapter six includes the actual analysis and results of the study, and they are further discussed in chapter seven, where also the implications of the results, as well as some suggestions for further research are made.

2 CONVERSATION ANALYSIS

2.1 Development, idea and method

This study relies on conversation analysis (CA) as the method of analysing the data. My purpose is to look at the interaction in the classrooms as a means of creating positive environment in the classroom. Doing this, conversation analytic tools will be used. In the following, I will firstly cover the principles and basic ideas of conversation analysis in order to clarify how it is relevant to this study. Sequential organisation as well as turn taking will be looked into in more detail. Secondly, I will look into institutional interaction and finally conversation analysis is discussed together with classroom interaction and hence linked directly to the present study. All of these aspects are of great importance in my study and help to build a coherent picture of the theoretical framework that this study builds on.

Conversation analysis started to develop in the late 1950's, early 1960's, as a result of the work of Harvey Sacks and Emanuel Schegloff, as well as Erving Goffman. The interest of these researchers laid on the everyday conversation among ordinary people, and was combined with interest towards social sciences. It was Harold Garfinkel, however, who is said to have been the major force behind the actual emerge of conversation analysis. Around the same time as Sacks and Schegloff studied the phenomena of everyday conversation, Garfinkel was developing an area of study called ethnomethodology. Garfinkel was interested in 'the procedural study of common-sense activities', and hence circled around the same kind of issues as Sacks and Schegloff (ten Have 1999:6.) When the work of Sacks, Schegloff and Garfinkel eventually came together, tools for an approach called conversation analysis were developed. Harold Garfinkel's ethnomethodological perspective on social analysis and especially Sacks' interest in practical reasoning created two major themes of analysing everyday conversation: categorisation and sequential organisation (ten Have 1999:6.) The main idea of these themes is that the meaning of an utterance in conversation or other interaction is actually much dependent on its sequential position, that is, how it is related to the other utterances (ten Have 1999:6). According to Sandlund (2004:35), conversation analysis, as it emerged, was "a radical break from tradition" and was heavily criticised especially in its early times. Some researchers criticised CA as having

unreliable data, as there were not enough examples of the same kind of instances, that is, the number of the studied phenomena seemed to be too small. The problem seemed to be that CA's results could not easily be generalised (Sandlund 2004:35). It was, then, in several ways that conversation analysis separated itself from the traditional sociological perspective (Sandlund 2004:35). In its early times, conversation analysis concentrated on studying non-institutional interaction, as this was perhaps considered as a more suitable source for research. Later on, researchers have studied institutional interaction in many different contexts, as well. Conversation analysis concentrating on non-institutional interaction is referred to as "pure CA" and studies examining institutional interaction as "applied CA" (ten Have 1999:8.) Institutional interaction will be discussed in more detail later on in this chapter, in section 2.3.

Conversation analysis studies social life and everyday situations at the level of talk and interaction. As Cameron (2001:87) points out, instead of using the term 'conversation', many practitioners talk about 'talk-in-interaction'. This perhaps gives a more concise picture about the issues that CA deals with, as CA was originally developed to analyse talk and more precisely interactive talk (Cameron 2001:87). As a term, conversation analysis can be treated even as misleading, as according to Psathas (1995:2), it would be better to talk about interaction analysis or talk-in-interaction, since it is the very units of interaction that conversation analysis is interested in. CA is interested in studying the sequential patterns in talk and interaction that are observable. The interest lies in the structures and units that everyday conversation consists of. According to Psathas (1995:1), conversation analysis concentrates on concrete details that are present in the interaction. He says that the very basic idea of conversation analysis is "to find the machinery, the rules and the structures that constitute the orderliness of conversation" (Psathas 1995:2). According to Psathas, there are some basic assumptions that govern conversation analysis. First of all, the order of conversation is produced by the very participants of that given situation, that is, the parties orient to the order themselves. The order is not governed by any outside party nor is it possible to give beforehand. In addition to this, Psathas reminds that the social actions and the interaction are meaningful to those who are present in the situation, and that the actions have a naturally proceeding order that can then be revealed and analysed through the means of conversation analysis (1995:2–3.) Order in interaction is repeatable and recurrent,

but the task of the analyst is not to study how often a phenomenon occurs, but in what way it is structured (Psathas, 1995:3).

Conversation analysis employs different stages in studying the data. According to ten Have (1999:48) the general outline of a research study involves at least getting or making recordings, transcribing the tapes, analysing selected episodes of the available data and then reporting the findings of the analysis. ten Have stresses that these 'steps' do not usually occur in a neat order, but mix with each other and rather than 'steps', one should talk about a cycle (ten Have 1999:48). The data itself should be naturally occurring, that is, not created for the purpose of the study itself. However, there is variation within the concept of 'naturally occurring', and for example in applied CA, some data may be treated as being created for a certain research project's purposes (ten Have 1999:50). Analysis of the data is conducted through recording and transcribing the data. CA uses fairly universal transcription conventions, but transcribing varies in relation to the nature of the study and some researches employ more detailed transcription than others. The idea of transcription is to capture not only what has been said or done but how things have been said and done (ten Have 1999:76). Transcription conventions used in this particular study can be found in the appendix 1.

Conversation analysis sets off examining data from the assumption that the orderliness of interaction is not dependent on the persons or the setting of the conversation. No preliminary expectations are set for the data that CA is looking at (Psathas 1995:45.) "No assumptions are made regarding the participants' motivations, intentions or purposes, nor about their ideas, thoughts, or understandings; nor their moods, emotions or feelings; except insofar as these can demonstrably be shown to be matters that participants themselves are noticing, attending to, or orienting to in the course of their interaction" (Psathas 1995:47). Also Atkinson and Heritage (1984:1) point out that the basic idea of conversation analysis is to study the competences the speakers use when attending interaction that is socially organised. The analysis should emerge from the observation; speculations about the background of the participants or their thoughts and actions outside the data are irrelevant (1984:1). Atkinson and Heritage (1984:4) also remind that nothing that occurs in the interaction (in the observable data) can be ruled out as insignificant. Anything can be important when analysing the conversation and as the data is analysed over and over again, the interpretation can get more detailed.

It can be said that the very core of conversation analysis consists of analysing the sequences in interaction. According to Psathas (1995:14), turn exchanges occur as units, and these units are dependent on each other and moreover, turns require certain kinds of turns as reactions. In this way interaction proceeds in a certain manner that can then be analysed. Everyday interaction employs several different patterns and procedures, as people try to survive different situations and accomplish goals (Psathas 1995:14). In conversation analysis, it is of utmost importance to look at turns and sequences within larger sequences instead of as separate units. The analyst should pay attention to the participants' orientations to the turns and sequences of the ongoing interaction. The way the interactants react and respond to the turns is important (Atkinson and Heritage 1984:5.) In the following, I will look into sequence organisation and turn taking in more detail, but still on a rather general level, as they form the basis of the analysis of the present study. Later in this chapter, in section 2.4, these issues are discussed from the viewpoint of classroom interaction.

2.2   Sequence organisation and turn taking

Conversation analysis sets off from the viewpoint that interaction is organised and this organisation can be studied and analysed. In this study, my interest lies on those sequences of interaction in the data where the participants seem to make efforts to create and maintain a positive environment. In identifying and analysing these episodes, I will draw on conversation analytic methods for describing the interactional structures. There are two main elements that deserve to be explained in a little more detail here, and those are sequence organisation and turn taking in interaction. They are essential when conducting a conversation analytic study, such as the present one.

Schegloff (2007), among others, has studied sequence organisation and turn taking. He states that turn taking organisation is a very fundamental phenomenon of interaction as it makes responsiveness in interaction possible. Participants in interaction inspect and analyse each others' turns and then react and respond to these. The cycle of interaction is based on turn taking and if one considers turn taking as sets or units in terms of action, one talks about "courses of action"- sequences of action which then form sequence organisation of interaction (Schegloff 2007:2.) In other words, sequence organisation concerns the courses of action which are realised

through turn taking. These courses of action are organised into sequences, in order to achieve something in the interaction (Schegloff 2007:2). It is then easy to see how turn taking and sequence organisation are attached to each other.

A more detailed look at turn taking shows how each turn steers interaction on. Every turn includes a message, an action that the speaker wishes to convey through that turn. It is then possible for the other participants to analyse the turn and predict what the speaker expects next. When we consider the sets of turns, we can analyse what kind of sequences are constructed via those turns and what actions are accomplished (Schegloff 2007:3.) Accordingly, as has been stated, turn taking itself is organised as well. This organisation means that basically only one speaker speaks at a time and if this basic organisation is disturbed (if two or more participants speak at a time) the participants make an effort to repair the conversation. According to CA, the talk goes along logically as the participants 'steer' it, and turns change fluently (Cameron 2001).

Sacks, together with Emmanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson produced a simple model of turn taking organisation. This model has two elements. Firstly, it suggests that speakers know that one speaker turn consists of one or more units. These units are called turn constructional units (TCU), usually characterised as units in grammatical terms (such as clause or sentence). Secondly, there are different ways of giving turns to other participants in a conversation (current speaker selects the next, next speaker self-selects or current speaker may continue) (Cameron 2001:91.) The places in interaction where speaker change is made possible (transition relevance places) are placed in the end of a turn constructional unit. It needs to be stressed, however, that these are places where speaker change is possible, but will not necessarily take place (Schegloff 2007:5). It is often the case that speakers overlap and the places where turns change are not clear. Some conversation analysts see these overlaps either as mistakes or violations of rules. Other analysts have disagreed with this view and argued that it is too simplified. For example Coates (1996) and Cameron (1997) have found examples of simultaneous speech that does not violate the conversation but is accepted by the participants.

ten Have (1999:111) deals with the issue of turn taking as well, and he also names it as one of the very core ideas of conversation analysis. He uses Sack's observations as the basis for his observations (Sacks et al. 1974). ten Have stresses that it is not any grammatical or structural elements that constitute a turn construction

unit, but rather the action the unit serves. It needs to be noted here, that some actions may need more than one turn constructional unit to be completed, and these are called 'multiunit turns'. Hence, the turn construction units contain some sort of action that the participants of the conversation wish to employ (ten Have 1999:112), as Schegloff (2007) stated as well. If one thinks about the classroom context considering the previous observations, it is only natural that every turn construction unit serves a specific purpose, often one related to the subject of teaching and learning. More about this will be discussed later on in this chapter, in section 2.4.

As was explained earlier, turn constructional units bear actions in them. There are various different actions that can be achieved, for example asking, answering, offering, complaining or agreeing. In turn taking organisation, it is most often the case that the previous turn expects something from the next turn. For example, a question expects an answer, and these 'pairs' of turns are called adjacency pairs (Schegloff 2007:9.) Schegloff draws up certain basic features that govern adjacency pairs and I will present them here. Firstly, an adjacency pair is constructed of two turns produced by different speakers and placed after another. Secondly, the two turns are ordered to 'first pair parts' and 'second pair parts' meaning that they have to appear in an order. First pair parts are typically initiative (such as a question) and second pair parts are responsive (such as an answer). Finally, adjacency pairs are pair-type related, meaning that not every first pair part can take any second pair part to follow it (Schegloff 2007:13.) Turn taking as a conversational phenomenon takes place also in the classroom and is indeed the very heart of the interaction. Turn taking in classroom can be well described and analysed through conversation analytical terms, but one should also bear in mind that classroom interaction has its own, special features that also mark the turn taking. I will discuss turn taking organisation in classrooms later on in section 2.4. Now I will turn to the issue of applied CA, to the area where my study is located more precisely. Classroom interaction can be described as institutional interaction in conversation analytic terms, and I will discuss this phenomenon in the following.

2.3   Applied CA: institutional interaction

The idea of institutional interaction is not to step totally out from the conversational analytic design, but to be an application of it. The study of institutional interaction is also described as applied conversation analysis, as it is conversation analysis done in specific institutional contexts. ten Have describes this distinction as "pure" and "applied" conversation analysis. According to ten Have, "pure" CA studies the general aspects of sociality, whereas "applied" refers to discovering interaction in specific contexts, for specific purposes (1999:162.) It is important to enlighten the concept of institutional interaction here, since it is related to the context of this study. I will bring up some of the basic features of institutional interaction as they are relevant for the present study. Institutional interaction as such is a broad field and this study will cover only a small piece of it.

To begin with, there are some features that make interaction institutional. Heritage (2005:106) has listed these in his article. Firstly, he says that the participants are normally oriented to a certain goal that is related to their institutional identities (for example a teacher and a student, as in the present study). Secondly, the interaction involves constraints regarding to what is considered to be suitable or expected in the given situation, and finally, there are frameworks and procedures that are particular to different institutional contexts. Though it is fairly straightforward to name features of institutional interaction, it is not always easy to draw the line between ordinary conversation and institutional interaction. The fact that institutional interaction is not bound to any specific context makes the separation difficult. Heritage (2005:108) writes, however, that it is reasonable to make the distinction though it might sometimes be difficult. According to him, although there would be ordinary conversation and institutional interaction in the same context (for example two colleagues talking about personal issues and work) it is usually possible to draw the line and study both types of interaction in their own respect.

Strongly related to the issue of separating ordinary conversation from institutional interaction is the active role of the participants. According to Heritage (2005:109) it is in the hands of the participants whether the interaction is institutional or not. Heritage (Atkinson and Heritage 1984:290) talks about "talking institution in and out of being", meaning that the participants actively build the context around them, and are capable of also changing it. The participants construct the context through their

talk (Drew and Heritage 1992:109). It is this process that specifically interests conversation analysts when studying institutional interaction.

As was explained earlier in this chapter, one of the principles of conversation analysis concerning the data being studied, is that it is naturally occurring, that is, not artificially produced. In institutional interaction, one has to bear in mind that although the context is stricter and more specific, in a sense, it can still be described as everyday interaction that is naturally occurring. Hence, the aspect of natural interaction is present. ten Have brings up the issue of asymmetry, as he writes that institutional settings can set stricter limits for the production of turns than other, so called normal settings. The participants may have very different roles and status in the institutional interaction and hence different possibilities for expressing themselves. There are certain norms and rules that govern the situation as well; it is generally agreed what can be said, when and by whom (ten Have 1999:164.) Classroom interaction and its structures are discussed in more detail in chapter 3. There I will bring up the three-part teacher-student interaction sequence where the asymmetry between the participants' turns can clearly be seen.

Though institutional interaction is in many ways similar to ordinary conversation, there are some differences that need to be recognised. Heritage (2005:115–137) introduces the major points and I shall briefly describe them here. Firstly, he brings up the turn taking pattern. Conversation analysis sees turn taking as the basis for interaction. In ordinary conversation, turn taking organisation is not (at least not usually) determined beforehand but in some institutional contexts it might be. This concerns the topics and order of turns, for example. The second point involves overall structural organisation. Heritage writes that some institutional talk has very specific structural organisation which allows little exceptions (as an example, a call to emergency, which follows a certain pattern). There are also differences in the sequence organisation; for example sequence-closings typical for ordinary conversation do not appear in institutional talk at all. Also turn design as a broader phenomenon can vary due to the different status of the participants, as the one usually has a higher status compared to the other. Yet another point worth mentioning is lexical choice, that is, the choice of vocabulary in interaction. Many institutional occasions invite certain lexical choices and this relates to the issue of what is considered as suitable for the given context (for example what kind of

language one is expected to use when attending an important business meeting or a wedding ceremony).

Arminen (2005:31) stresses the importance of knowing the context in which the interaction is being studied. If the knowledge about the context is poor, the analysis of the interaction will remain superficial and the analysis will suffer. "Institutional interaction is a particular type of social interaction in which the participants -- orient to an institutional context ---, such as medical, juridical or educational, in and for accomplishing their distinctive institutional actions"(Arminen 2005:32). The analyst's task is then to reveal how the participants build the context, in other words, in what methods and techniques are used to constitute the institutional context (Arminen 2005:56). Arminen (2005:57) reminds that when analysing and studying how contexts are built through different roles (realised by the participants), the element of power is present and becomes relevant. Therefore social roles and norms cannot be ignored from the analysis of institutional interaction.

2.4   A conversation analytic view to classroom interaction

The behaviour of teachers and learners, the actions and language of classrooms have been a major source for different social and linguistic studies. The classrooms are special contexts of their own and suitable for studying lots of different phenomena. Later on in this study I will look at classrooms from the point of view of emotion studies (chapter 4.1) but now the interest lies on communication in the classrooms, and the way conversation analysis studies classroom interaction. Classrooms are excellent sources for interaction studies. Although interaction and conversation in classrooms can indeed be described as everyday interaction, it is important to bear in mind that classroom interaction follows rules and patterns that are characteristic to that particular context.

When studying classroom interaction with the means of conversation analysis, it is essential to consider the special features of classroom interaction. Paul Seedhouse (2004) has taken a conversational analytic perspective on classroom interaction and I will here use his thoughts and observations as guidelines for understanding the context and grounds of the present study. First and foremost, Seedhouse (2004:183) reminds that classroom interaction is always led by a goal, and this particular goal directs the structure of interaction in the classroom. He concentrates on a language

classroom in his observations, when stating that the institutional goal remains the same whatever the pedagogical framework is (Seedhouse 2004:183). By this he means that in a language classroom, it is the ultimate goal to teach the language to the pupils. The case is different in CLIL-classrooms (content and language integrated learning) where both the language and the content taught via the language are seen as the main goals. Still, even in CLIL-classrooms the point about a core goal is accurate and I will bear it in mind when analysing my data. Related to the main focus of classroom interaction, Seedhouse presents three interactional properties that are universal in language classrooms: "language is both the vehicle and object of instruction, there is a reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction, the linguistic forms and patterns of interaction which the learners produce in the L2 are potentially subject to evaluation by the teacher" (2004:183-184). By a reflexive relationship between the pedagogy and interaction Seedhouse means that when the pedagogical focus changes, the organisation of interaction changes as well. This relationship works the other way round too, as the interactional organisation also transforms the pedagogical focus (Seedhouse 2004:184). It is then, of utmost importance to remember that classroom interaction always has a goal and the interaction is tied to that goal.

Conversation analysis tries to identify and analyse the sequential organisation of interaction. Seedhouse says that there is a basic structure, or sequence organisation, of a second language classroom interaction. Usually it follows the simple pattern: the pedagogic focus is introduced by the teacher and the learners react to it somehow. The learners analyse the situation and decide how to take action, and the teacher reacts to this. This cycle repeats itself and the interaction goes on. Exceptions to this pattern, or cycle, take place if the students do group work, for example, and are then able to analyse each others' reactions. It is of course also possible that it is a learner who introduces the pedagogical focus and the teacher has to analyse the situation and react to it (Seedhouse 2004:187-188.) This characterisation shows that classroom interaction can be said to follow different patterns but the exceptions to these patterns are just as relevant to the structure of the interaction.

The pedagogic focus of the lesson and the organisation of the interaction are strongly related to each other. Seedhouse (2004) has studied four different pedagogic contexts and the structure of turn-taking and sequence organisation in these contexts, and made observations concerning the variation in the patterns. I will here summarise

these observations. Firstly, in the form and accuracy context, the teacher controls the turn-taking firmly but of course there are exceptions to the teacher–question learner-reaction pattern. In meaning and fluency contexts the focus is not on the form and this reflects on the turn taking organisation – it is more free and varies greatly. In task oriented contexts the focus is naturally on completing the task and turn taking then tied to the task. Finally, a somewhat different context, a procedural context, where the teacher explains what will happen during the lesson and gives directions, results to very little turn taking, if any at all (Seedhouse 2004: 101–133.) It seems only natural that organisation of classroom interaction is related to the focus of the lesson and task at hand, and this point will be used when analysing the data of this study, as well.

Seedhouse describes the methodology; the ways of finding and analysing the patterns of classroom interaction and to identify the goal or goals of the interaction. The analyst should observe the participants' turns (the teacher's and the learners') and estimate, whether the pedagogical focus introduced by the teacher, is met in the reactions of the learners (2004:195.) Also Walsh (2006:51) states that CA as a method suits the classroom because it studies how the context is shaped by the participants and observes how they are heading towards a common goal. According to Seedhouse (2004:195), there are three types of evidence that can help the analyst to identify the goal of the interaction: text-internal evidence (the teacher says exactly what the pedagogical purpose of the lesson is), text-external evidence (what can be concluded from the surrounding context) and evidence in the details of interaction.

In classrooms, it is important to remember that not all interaction that takes place there is classroom interaction. It is the teacher and the learners that talk the institution (in this case school or classroom) in and out of being (see Atkinson and Heritage 1984). This is an extremely important point. The participants may talk about issues that do not relate to the institutional focus in any way. In classrooms, this means that students can talk about a movie that they saw earlier in the week, and though this conversation takes place in a classroom, it cannot be defined as classroom interaction. In a way, the participants can steer the interaction in the classroom in and out of the institutional context (Seedhouse 2004: 200–204.)

Finally, when talking about the context of classrooms, Seedhouse (2004) introduces a structural model that should be remembered when analysing classroom interaction via conversation analysis. He suggests that the analysis should start with

the micro context, that is the smallest possible units of the context, then move on the next level, that being the classroom context, and finally to the last level; institutional context (the school). Seedhouse sees these contexts as circles around each other - they are all present at the same time, but the participants concentrate on one level of context at a time. When analysing classroom interaction using conversation analytical methods, one should take all levels of context into account (Seedhouse 2004:209–214.) The different levels of analysis can be identified from this study as well. Walsh (2006:53) describes data as multi–layered as well, meaning that CA sees both the larger context and the single turns and sequences in the data. He reminds, however, that there is a possibility that the data remains unclear if CA concentrates only on the small details and single samples of data and leaves the context and data as a whole without attention. Walsh (2006:54) says as well that generalisation of the findings, or even attempting it, is not the purpose of CA studies. The aim is to make observations, not broad generalisations.

3   CLASSROOM INTERACTION

Classroom interaction is studied broadly in many different contexts and my purpose is to cover only some aspects of it. I will deal with some basic issues concerning classroom interaction as well as consider the specific features that classroom interaction has. In this way, a picture of the immediate context of this study can be drawn. First and foremost, when one studies interaction in a classroom context, it has to be remembered that it is always a special context in its structure of interaction. Classroom interaction is highly governed by rules and norms but every classroom is also unique, and there is variation within the structure of the interaction.

As stated by Seedhouse in the previous chapter (section 2.4, page 15), a classroom lesson always serves a purpose, it has a goal that is intended to be reached during the lesson. The goal-oriented nature is essential to bear in mind also when examining the structure of a classroom lesson and the structure of interaction in it. It can be said that classroom interaction always has a pedagogical purpose (however different this purpose may be in different lessons) and usually it is the teacher who 'steers' the interaction so that the purpose becomes clear to the students, and the lesson proceeds as planned. As is common knowledge, there also exists other kind of interaction than classroom interaction in classrooms, which cannot be ignored. Students may talk to each other about yesterday evening's events, for example, and unless it is part of an exercise it is not exactly pedagogically driven interaction. However, it is not an easy task to draw the line between classroom interaction and other kind of interaction taking place in classrooms. In this study, I have not strived for separating these modes of interaction very strongly, but as can be seen later on, my analysis concentrates mostly on the classroom interaction in its pedagogical meaning.

3.1   Features and structure of classroom interaction

Although there are many ways of describing the structure of classrooms and classroom interaction, there exist some fairly well known concepts concerning these structures. Mehan (1979) talks about sequential organisation and hierarchical organisation in his book about social organisation in a classroom. By sequential organisation he refers to the way the lesson proceeds and by hierarchical to the parts

of the lesson, and their order (Mehan 1979:35). To explain this division further, Mehan introduces phases of a classroom lesson that are strongly related to the type of the interaction. According to him, these phases are opening phase, instructional phase and closing phase. Basically, an opening consists of orienting to the lesson, instructional phase includes the 'core' of the lesson, that is, the instructive part, and the closing literally closes the lesson (1979:36.) Mehan has also noticed that directives and informatives appear in teacher's talk in the beginning of a lesson, whereas elicitations in the middle of the lesson, that is, in the core part. From these observations Mehan (1979:52) leads the discussion to the vary basic structure of classroom interaction, meaning the three-part structure. The three-part teacher student structure consists of initiation, reply and evaluation (also known as the IRF-sequence; initiation-response-feedback/follow-up). The IRF-structure was represented already by Sinclair and Coulthard in 1975, in the context of their study concerning classroom discourse. Sinclair and Coutlhard (1975:48) talk about acts and moves that take place during a lesson, and the IRF-structure consists of three moves: opening, answering and follow-up. They explain the structure thoroughly, representing the different possible types of moves that can occur within the structure, when it is modified. They claim (1975:51) that in those cases where the teacher elicit is the first turn (initiative), and some reaction from the students is then expected, a follow-up has to follow. By this Sinclair and Coulthard mean that if the teacher asks a question and a student answers, the students expect a follow-up to the answer; they need to know whether the answer was right or wrong, or even acceptable. In classroom interaction, the assumption is that the teacher holds the information and knows the answers, and it is his duty to share the information with the students. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975:51) give an example from a classroom where the teacher deliberately withheld the information and did not produce the follow-up turn. The result was that the students did not know how to take it, and confusion followed.

Also Arminen (2005:112), describes classroom interaction as highly structured, and argues that although some of the structures have been criticised over time, many of them have remained and will remain as the basic, grounding elements of classroom interaction. According to him, classroom interaction is mostly about transmitting knowledge and developing skills, and there are systems for this. He talks about the basic patterns of classroom discourse that all serve the purpose mentioned above. Arminen (2005:113) also mentions the pedagogic cycle (or the IRF) as the

best-known form of pedagogy in classroom interaction. Other basic patterns according to him are lecturing format, repair sequences, correctional activities and extra curricular activities, which I will not analyse in more detail here. Arminen pays special attention to the three-part structure and the modifying, changing nature of the teacher's evaluative turn (the Follow-up turn). He says that the turn can vary from plain acceptance to formulation of the student answer (Arminen 2005:114). This is an interesting and an important point which will show its relevance in this study as well.

The IRF-structure is indeed a very common feature of interaction in different classrooms. For example, in Mehan's study (1979) the three-part structure was by far the most common structure in the observed interaction. He also made observations concerning the strict structuring of the IRF-sequence, noting that if the second part (the student response) of the structure was not produced immediately, the teacher would ask for the reply again in order to maintain the 'balance' in the structure (Mehan 1979:54.) Also Van Lier (1996:149) suggests that classroom discourse is best characterised by the IRF-structure. He also acknowledges its high occurrence in different classroom data. Van Lier (1996:149) argues that the IRF-structure is very classroom-specific in its nature, and is in most cases odd and inapplicable when transferred outside the classroom context. Arminen points out that the difference between the classroom context and 'real-life' context becomes relevant in the third turn (in classroom the teacher's second turn/the Follow-up) (2005:124). In the classroom this turn is evaluative, which is not the case in everyday interaction. There are, however, studies that collide with the above mentioned, showing evidence that the three-part structure can be identified from other types of interaction as well. For example Tykkyläinen (2005), has studied the interaction between a professional and a client in speech therapy sessions. She has discovered that the interaction structure in these sessions can often be described as a three-part structure, where the therapist and client orient to the structure together. The three-part structure is also present, when children are taught outside the classroom context, for example at home. It is then perhaps wiser to talk about the three-part structure's frequent occurrence in *instructional* contexts, rather than limit it to the classroom context only.

Arminen (2005) also stresses the asymmetry that takes place in classroom interaction, realised through the pedagogic cycle. The teacher is in the position of evaluating the students, or as Arminen says, he is "a knowledgeable recipient"

(2005:124) who evaluates the students' turns and is in the position of judging the right and wrong in the classroom. As a conclusive remark, Arminen states that the pedagogical cycle is both about the teaching and learning of the pedagogic content of the lesson, and about the conventions and frameworks of the lesson (2005:129). Van Lier (1996) sees the IRF-structure as having both advantages and problems, when it comes to its functioning in the learning context. He suggests that the structure controls the chaos of a classroom, since everyone knows how the structure proceeds, it gives the students a chance to get immediate feedback and also the teacher an advantage of planning the lesson well beforehand. The problems concerning the IRF-structure are quite clear as well: first, Van Lier mentions the same point that Arminen (2005) makes: the nature of the structure is highly evaluative, because the teacher usually produces the evaluative turn. This can lead to the situation where the students do not feel comfortable answering, fearing the evaluation. Second, the IRF-structure can become artificial and as a result, the interaction take a form of pure performing (Van Lier 1996:150-151.)

Malamah-Thomas (1987) stresses, like Mehan (1979), the point that communication in classrooms serves a pedagogical purpose; that is to learn (1987:13). Malamah-Thomas (1987:17) writes that the actual pedagogic message of the lesson can be conveyed through "talking, lecturing, asking questions, giving definitions, reading aloud, giving instructions and so on". Similar to Mehan's observations concerning the 'balancing' of the interactional structure of a classroom, Malamah-Thomas (1987:7) describes classroom interaction as the type of action-reaction, but stresses that interaction in classrooms aims at keeping a flow of conversation going, and this means that the participants need to act with each other constantly. It is in the hands of the participants whether the interaction succeeds or fails. According to Malamah-Thomas (1987:8), the interaction can collide into a conflict if the participants do not co-operate and this may have a serious effect on the learning process. Whether the interaction succeeds or fails, depends greatly on the intentions and attitudes of the participants. These are issues that relate to my interest of study, as it is indeed the case that feelings and attitudes have an effect on the communication in the classroom. This is discussed in more detail in chapter 4.1 'Emotions, classroom and learning'.

Related to the IRF-structure, classroom lessons are often categorised as traditional or non-traditional lessons. For example Cazden (2001) discusses this kind

of division. According to her, there are culturally bound expectations concerning interactional contexts, such as classrooms, meaning that people have a certain image of the structure of interaction in classrooms. This image is commonly built on the IRF-structure. Similarly to the point made by Arminen (2005:129) earlier in this section, Cazden says that students are supposed to learn the rules that govern classroom interaction in order to be accepted in the interaction. Cazden reminds that there exists variation within the traditional lessons, and that one cannot assume the traditionally structured lessons to be identical. Non-traditional lessons aim at getting away from the traditional structure and accept alternative structures. This can mean that students may get more freedom in their productive work and also alternative answers are accepted. However, Cazden reminds that these issues are not so simple as they may seem and it is difficult to say what is a traditional and non-traditional structure of a lesson (Cazden 2005:30-51.) A noticeable difference is that in non-traditional lessons, interaction between students is usually encouraged (which indeed is the case in many lessons nowadays) whereas in traditionally structured lessons, peer-to-peer interaction may be considered as harmful (Cazden 2001:131). Similarly to Cazden (2001) and Arminen (2005), Mehan (1979) talks about the norms governing a classroom as well. He has studied the social organisation of a classroom and it is clear that to achieve a fully competent membership in the classroom, a learner must be able to be interactionally competent. This means that he must for example, introduce new information in a right place and choose relevant topics, otherwise he may be sanctioned (Mehan 1979:159.) A learner needs to master different communicative skills in order to manage in the interaction and be communicatively competent. A key idea of this is that a learner in a classroom is not a passive recipient of information but an active participant in interaction (Mehan 1979:169-170).

Malamah-Thomas reminds that other kind of interaction (other than for a pedagogical purpose) can take place for example in order to maintain social relationships and be a valuable source for observing attitudes and roles in the classroom. Malamah-Thomas states that interaction in classrooms can occur in various different ways, and does not always involve talk. Also gestures and movement are important when interacting, as in any interactional situation, but also the equipment can be relevant. By the equipment she means for example the blackboard, the CD-player or the text and exercise books used for studying. It is

important to remember that the books and other material play a part in classroom interaction as well (Malamah-Thomas 1987:13-17.)

Walsh (2006) writes about the importance of communication in a second language classroom environment. Walsh ties communication firmly into successful learning, and writes that interaction facilitates second language acquisition, increases opportunities for practise, and promotes reflection. He states that the teacher still plays a major part in creating a successful interactional environment (Walsh 2006:21–22.) Walsh (2006) describes second language classroom discourse with four characteristics, which I will summarise here. First, it is the teacher who controls the topic at hand as well as the turn taking (the three-part/IRF-sequence). Second, the teacher uses elicitation techniques such as questions, which can function in different ways (for example as support or guidance). The functions of teacher questions are discussed in the analysis of my data as well, later on in chapter 6. Third, the teacher uses many repair techniques and perhaps the most common is error correction. As the fourth and last point, Walsh mentions modified speech. This means that the teacher modifies his speech for the students in order to enhance understanding (Walsh 2006:5-12.) These four points give an overview on the importance of communication in classrooms.

3.2 Approaches to studying classroom interaction

There are several approaches for studying classroom discourse, just as any other kind of discourse. In order to understand the nature of classroom interaction it is useful to get to know the different approaches of study at least at some level. For this reason, that is, to draw a picture of the vast area of classroom interaction studies, I will deal with some approaches here. Reasons for choosing conversation analysis as a method in the present study will be discussed later in chapter 5.

Walsh (2006) touches upon some approaches in studying classroom interaction quite concisely. Approaches in question are interaction analysis, discourse analysis, conversation analysis and a dynamic approach. To put it briefly, interaction analysis offers ready made categories that are already existing, and interaction is observed in the light of these. According to Walsh, the problem with these categories is that they give too narrow and separate picture of the interaction, producing perhaps a too simplistic analysis (2006:41-43). Discourse analysis, in turn, may have problems

fitting in to the modern day classroom. The basic model of discourse analysis is the IRF-structure (teacher initiation, student response, teacher feedback/follow-up). Many see this model as inadequate for today's classrooms where there exists more variation in the interaction and more specifically in the roles of the participants. For this reason, the IRF model can be seen as outdated (Walsh 2006:47.) This opinion is, however, rather strong and one-sided, as the importance and applicability of the IRF-structure has been vastly acknowledged, and it is further used in research. For example, Nassaji and Wells (2000) have studied the IRF-pattern in teacher-student interaction (calling it the triadic dialogue), and concluded that although the teacher would try to achieve a more dialogic interaction with the students, the IRF-pattern tends to dominate (2000:400). The importance and occurrence of the IRF-pattern, and its relation to other interactional phenomena have also been studied by Dalton-Puffer and Nikula (2006), among others. The function and importance of the IRF-structure was discussed in the previous section of this study as well. In introducing conversation analysis as an approach, Walsh (2006:50) stresses mainly that CA concentrates on the context of the interaction, and the way it is built by the participants. He talks about how through careful analysis the 'building' of the context can be revealed, as the roles of the participants and the goal of the interaction and turn taking are taken into account as well (Walsh 2006:51). Finally, Walsh (2006:55-56) reminds that there has been a tendency to treat classrooms as static, unchangeable contexts, and the variable and dynamic nature of classrooms has been forgotten. This has been due to the fact that classroom interaction has too eagerly been compared with the 'real life interaction'. According to Walsh, the complex and changing nature of classrooms should be noted, and more variable ways of analysing should then be used.

Rampton et al. (2002) introduce and compare three different approaches in analysing classroom discourse in their article. These approaches are ethnography of communication (EC), conversation analysis (CA) and systemic-functional linguistics (SFL). These three approaches offer only a glimpse in the wide field of classroom discourse studies, but they can be considered as widely acknowledged and used approaches in the field. In ethnography of communication, the ethnographer (the researcher himself) is part of the group that is under inspection (in this case a participant in a classroom, for example), and this is an aspect that strongly marks this approach. Rampton et al. (2002) remind that in EC, the context needs to be taken into

account very carefully; even more thoroughly than what is considered in CA. The purpose is that the researcher familiarizes himself with the studied group and context. The extremely detailed and concise ethnographic study then requires a lot of time and space, and this can be also a limiting feature, as for example CA can be used in smaller, less comprehensive studies (Rampton et al. 2002:373-374.) Setting CA aside at this point, as it has been dealt in detail earlier in this study, a few words about systemic-functional linguistics. As Rampton et al. (2002:385-386) explain, SFL differs most notably from CA because it makes use of preliminary information and already existing knowledge about the studied phenomenon. SFL concentrates strongly on the linguistics, quite obviously, and "much of SFL analysis -- relies on, and attends to, categories pre-coded in the analyst's SF grammatical model, and indeed the availability of a ready made coding system lends itself to quantitative and statistical validation --" (Rampton et al. 2002:385-386). The difference between CA's data-driven approach and SFL's use of existing models is remarkable. Both of these approaches, as well as EC, can, however, be used when studying the same classroom contexts. All approaches in analysing classroom discourse are detailed in their own way, and they can be seen as complementing each other. Rampton et al. (2002:387) conclude that all three approaches mentioned above are suitable of studying different phenomena in classroom discourse, but that they probably offer the most when considered in cooperation with each other.

4   EMOTION STUDIES

4.1   Emotions, classroom and learning

Throughout the history, cognition has overruled affect when the learning process has been concerned. The reasons for learning problems and hindrances have been searched from the cognitive processes, as well as the causes for good learning results. It is not until a few decades ago when researchers of different fields started to pay attention to the affective side of learning processes. Today the affective factors are taken into account even in school curricula and there is a strong attempt of creating a safe and positive atmosphere in classrooms, in order to support the learning process as well as the development of social skills.

Most of the research done in the field of affect related to the school world and learning in particular, have concentrated on learning as a process. In Arnold's book (1999), affect is dealt with as a factor that has an effect on the language learning process. The book deals with second and foreign language learning, but the observations can quite well be made use of in studying other type of teaching and learning as well. The main idea is that cognition and affect should be treated as equals, and the suggestion is that learning will be most effective when both factors are taken into account. It is important to clarify that a concept defined as 'affect', can include emotions, feelings, moods or attitudes, which have some kind of effect on one's behaviour (Arnold 1999:1). In this sense, affect is a broad concept and covers a lot of different phenomena in different contexts. Affect is easily seen as the opposite of cognition, but Arnold stresses that this is not the case in a learning process. She says that cognition and affect work together, and therefore one should pay more attention to the affective factors in classrooms as well. She writes that one has to learn how to cope with the negative emotions as well as to create positive ones. She reminds that positive emotions are good for the learning process, whereas the presence of negative emotions can hinder learning (Arnold 1999:2). This is why positive emotions should be encouraged in classrooms. This relates strongly to the issue of atmosphere or environment of a classroom which is in the scope of this study. Arnold (1999:3) also states that classroom directs learners' emotional development and therefore emotions should not be forgotten. As a conclusive note, one could say

that taking emotions into account enhances the learning process, and then again, also positive classroom environment has an effect on learner's emotional development.

Learner attitudes and motivation have been studied greatly. Related to this, as different learner styles are concerned, also emotions and their influence on the learning are seen as relevant. Ellis (1992:203) touches upon learner styles in the area of second language acquisition, and one of these that is of relevance here, is affective orientation. It seems to be that learners are either active or passive in their relationship with learning. This division has to do with the personality of the learner and it also reflects the attitudes towards the target language as well as the teaching. The attitudes may be positive or negative and they may change along the learning process. According to Ellis (1992:203), cognitive orientation to learning is seen as relatively stable whereas affective orientation is unstable and reforming. It is important to notice that this inspection of attitudes and division into positive and negative emotions and attitudes is attached to the learning process; the way the learner approaches learning. It does not tell much about the environment or interpersonal relations in the classroom or other learning environments. However, Ellis mentions that the activity or passivity of a learner is tied to the personal factors and learning environment, and consequently the positive attitudes can be fostered in the learning environment as well (Ellis 1992:205). It seems to be that increasing of positive attitudes and good learning results are something that one should aim at.

In addition to learner styles, learner motivation towards learning in general has been studied very thoroughly in second language acquisition research, and various different aspects affecting motivation have been established. Learner motivation is seen as something that is driven partly from the inside: learner's emotions guide him in his motivation, and partly from the outside, from the surrounding environment. Motivation is most often characterised as either integrative or instrumental, as is the case in second language acquisition research (Larsen-Freeman and Long 1991:173). Integrative motivation means that the learner wishes to identify with a group. Contrast to the integrative is instrumental motivation, that is, learning is motivated by a goal other than the learning itself. Motivation is then seen both as a psychological and social phenomenon.

Attitudes in learning processes are also studied, both as separate from motivation and as a factor affecting it. Second and foreign language studies concerning attitudes have mainly been conducted in relation to the target language. Several aspects

affecting learner's attitudes towards the target language have been identified, such as parents, peers, teacher and learning situation (Larsen-Freeman and Long 1991:178). In this area, atmosphere of the classroom has been studied, but just in the scope of how it affects on an individual's attitudes, mainly towards learning and the target language. In addition to learner attitude, the personality of a learner has a major influence on the learning. The emotional side has been touched in this area by studying such features of personality as self-esteem, anxiety, tolerance of ambiguity and extroversion versus introversion, to set a few examples (Larsen-Freeman and Long 1992:184). These all are important factors, showing that the emotional side of a learner is acknowledged, but they are still very much concentrated on the individual, and hence I will not elaborate on them in more detail here.

Finally, related to the discussion about motivation and attitudes in language learning, a few words about theories in second language acquisition need to be added. There are obviously several theories but one that should be mentioned when talking about emotions is Krashen's monitor theory, and the affective filter hypothesis related to that. Though produced already a few decades ago (in the 1970s and 1980s), Krashen's model has been very influential in second language acquisition research. The basic idea of the affective filter hypothesis is that different affective factors play a part in second language acquisition. Negative things, such as low motivation to learn, low self-esteem or anxiety can raise the affective filter and hinder the acquisition. Then again, positive affect is good for the acquisition process and enhances it, lowering the filter (Larsen-Freeman and Long 1992:243). Krashen's idea is fairly straightforward and it has been influential in different teaching programmes. Krashen's monitor model has also received criticism over the years, most strongly on the division acquisition-learning that is the basis of the model, but also on the affective filter hypotheses in particular. The criticism has been targeted to the variables (the aspects of affect); whether they are reliable or even measurable (Larsen-Freeman and Long 1992:245). However, Krashen's theory is the most influential theory in SLA concerning affect in second language acquisition.

Cazden (2001:78) points out that affect is equally important as cognition, but it is still quite poorly appreciated in classrooms. Cazden (2001:60) says, however, that it is not easy to discuss or study the relationship between the inner world of a learner and the actions of a group. When talking about affect one always moves in an area that can never be studied exhaustively, as affect involves the inner processes of an

individual, which a researcher can never reveal thoroughly, especially if the focus is on the interaction and observable behaviour. According to Cazden (2001:61), in classrooms affect can be taken into account by giving enough support to the learners at the right time. She talks about scaffolding, that is, the support from an adult (also important at home by adults) to the learner. Scaffolding is an issue that is being studied and discussed a lot on its own these days. The right-timed support of others (the teacher and parents) is seen as important, even crucial to the learning process.

Studying affect in the learning environment has concentrated and still concentrates strongly on the individual. According to Arnold, there are several individual factors that affect language learning. These factors are anxiety, inhibition, introversion and extroversion, self esteem, motivation and learner style (Arnold 1999:8–17). As mentioned, studies concerning these factors are about the inner processes of an individual learner and do not tell much about the relationships, communication and interaction inside the classroom between the students. It needs to be mentioned, however, that the classrooms have been studied from the viewpoint of group dynamics, that is for example, how the participants in the group work together, what kind of problems they face and how the problems are handled, who leads the group and what kind of roles there are (Dőrnyei et al. 1999:155). These factors all relate to the atmosphere of the classroom but the focus of the studies is not mainly on the interaction itself, but more on the psychological processes and on the influence on the learning process.

There has also been discussion about the teacher's role in creating the atmosphere of a classroom and paying attention to the affective factors. For example, Stanley (1999:109) talks about the skill of self-reflection, meaning that teachers should reflect their own teaching and think about how to improve or develop it. According to Stanley, this is essential for the affective factors of teaching (1999:109). Also Underhill (1999:125) states that the teacher's role is important, and the development should be from a lecturer to a teacher and then on to a facilitator. In other words, the authority of a teacher should be diminished or formulated so that he would not stand above the learners, but amongst them.

The teacher is usually seen as the leader character in the classroom, and his position is therefore always different than the students'. From the viewpoint of emotional aspects, this can easily set the teacher aside from the group and have a harmful influence on the group dynamics as a whole. Although it has to be said that

it can make the feeling of belonging stronger among the students as well. However, adults and learners themselves often take a different stand on school as an institution. Bendelow and Mayall (2000:241) argue that adults tend to see school as the workplace for children and young, and the efficiency overrides the experiences of the learners themselves. They claim that children's emotions are not taken into account. Bendelow and Mayall (2000) have studied children's emotional experiences in schools, finding out what children feel about different tasks, environments and their peers. The environment in schools and classrooms has been studied, but yet again, from the individual's viewpoint, not concentrating on the interpersonal relationships and interaction specifically.

As a final remark, although classroom atmosphere and environment from an interactional point of view have been studied quite poorly, it needs to be mentioned that classroom environment as a factor affecting the efficiency of a classroom has been studied. Fraser (1986:1), states that classroom environment is a "potent determinant" of students' performing at school and should be taken into account when evaluating the efficiency of classrooms. Fraser (1986) prefers teacher's and students' perceptions over researcher's observations in studying classroom environment, and this suggests a rather heavy focus on the individual's experiences. He also represents different instruments and scales for assessing the environment. Fraser (1986) deals with different factors that can be considered when assessing the environment, but he does not concentrate on the interactional level per se, either. Now, it can be seen that classroom environment has been studied, but it also becomes clear that the ultimate purpose has been to reveal the function and role of classroom environment in order to see its relevance on the learning, and efficiency of the teaching. Studies are conducted in order to enhance the learning environments, so that an optimal environment could be created. This means taking into account the teacher's role, physical setting of the classroom, learning tasks and curricula in a broader sense. There is no doubt of the importance of this kind of studying as such, as it can reveal the preferences of both the students' and the teacher's, and make use of this information. However, as the knowledge about the teacher's and students' preferences, learning habits and styles etc. has mostly been gathered by using the participants' own reflections and experiences as the basis for studying, it would certainly be interesting to see what kind of results an interactional study would provide. This study aims at looking at the interactional level, revealing the markers

of positive environment by observing the data from the outside. The purpose is to see to what extent the interaction tells about the environment and creates it, and discuss where the results of the study can lead. Moreover, this study does not try to find reasons for good or bad learning results or evaluate the efficiency of teaching, but the focus is purely on the interaction.

4.2 Emotions and interaction

The studies about emotions and feelings have strongly concentrated on the inner processes of individuals, that is, the psychological and neurological processes that take place when emotions are experienced. As has become clear, the outcome or expression of emotions have been studied far less, and the focus in the studies has not been on interaction.

There have, however, also been studies conducted about emotion in communication and phenomena around it. Planalp (1999) has concentrated on emotions in communication. She takes different angles on emotions in communication, explaining how an individual expresses himself and his emotions in communication, how this affects other people around him and how emotions are both personal and social. These issues are close to my interest of study, and I will use Planalp's observations and thoughts as loose guidelines for my own analysis in this study. It can be mentioned that emotional communication has been studied in quite specific areas of interest as well. Fussell and Moss (1998) have analysed figurative language in emotional communication, investigating different aspects affecting figurative language use when communicating emotional states. Aspects such as the character of the emotional state, social relationships in the communication situation and channel of communication have been considered.

It makes perfect sense that what one says and does around other people has some sort of effect on others and on the surrounding atmosphere. One might express one's feelings quite strongly, for example laugh out loud or burst into tears, or quite the opposite, by keeping quiet. These kind of expressions are noticeable and cause some kind of reactions, thoughts or feelings in other people. In this way we have an effect on others around us when we express our feelings, thoughts or opinions. This is what emotions in communication are much about. The inner states that one has in his mind change into 'public' property as they are expressed through interaction. Sandlund

(2004:5) talks about doing with emotions. She means that when we express emotions (for example laughter, cry, shout) we convey something through that emotion and that is what is essential in emotions in interaction. Social scientific research has not studied how emotions are organised in mundane talk-in-interaction, and nor have institutional interaction and conversation analysis for that matter (Sandlund 2004:6).

As mentioned earlier, Planalp (1999) concentrates on the social side of emotions very thoroughly, and discusses the importance of emotion in everyday interaction. Planalp stresses that it depends greatly on the type of the conversation and the surrounding situation what kind of role emotions play in it. According to her, conversations can take place for example in order to evoke some certain emotion or to deal with an emotionally rich issue. These are conversations that exist for producing an emotion, that is, the conversation invites emotion somehow (Planalp 1999:35–36.) If one thinks about the school context, for example, it depends on the task at hand and its meaning to the participants involved how emotional it is, what kind of emotions it invites, how they are expressed and what kind of effect this has on the surrounding atmosphere. A classroom is usually not seen as a place for strong emotional expressions but the context may create suitable ground for expressing feelings, and these expressions can affect others. In this study there are cases where it is the discussion about the topic of the lesson that arouses actions in the interaction, that then again have an effect on the environment in the classroom. Planalp says that "normal patterns of interaction stop when emotion erupts, and everyone responds one way or another" (1999:9). This pictures the way the interaction is steered momentarily away from its course.

When studying emotion in communication, Planalp (1999) has separated different kinds of cues that can be used when identifying and analysing emotion in communication. These cues involve both verbal and non-verbal communication that are observable. Firstly, there are facial cues, such as smile or lifted eyebrows. Planalp says that positive facial cues are easier to see than negative ones. Also Sandlund (2004:81) argues that it is more difficult to distinguish between negative than positive emotions. Sandlund (2004:82) reminds that positive states include lots of gestures, often together with laughter, but it needs to be remembered that laughter as itself may be an unreliable marker. Laughter in interaction has been studied quite exhaustively (see Glenn 2003, for a comprehensive analysis), but I will not concentrate on it in more detail here. Secondly, Planalp (1999) names vocal cues,

meaning voice. Tone, fastness of speech, trembling speech and intonation all have something to tell about the emotional aspect of the communication. There are three basic dimensions: loudness, pitch and time. High pitch, loudness and speed are associated with arousing emotions such as anger, fear or joy. Lower pitch, quietness and slower speed are associated with such emotions as sadness or disappointment. Thirdly, there are physiological cues, that are mostly uncontrollable. These include such reactions as sweating, blushing or tears. Also gestures and body movements are cues of their own. They have not been studied much, but are equally relevant, according to Planalp. As opposite to physiological cues, action cues are purposeful and intended. These cues are based on choice and convey a message (for example slamming a door). Finally, there are verbal cues. It is very rare to express feelings straightforwardly by words, but indirect verbal cues are common. In addition to this, word choice, intensity of language, and vocabulary can tell much about the emotion in the message. Although there are lots of cues to be observed and analysed, it is equally important to remember that total lack of these cues does not mean lack of emotions. Some of us are more expressive than others, this does not mean that inexpressive people have no emotions (Planalp 1999:44–48.)

When analysing data that is video recorded we can analyse all the levels of cues that there exist in the interaction (when analysing telephone conversations for example, there is only the voice available). Especially important is that all the cues and channels can be combined in the analysis (Sandlund 2004:79). Physiological cues are mostly unobservable to others in the situation and therefore not so much in the scope of studies such as mine. They interest the psychological studies more. Sandlund criticizes the existing research of not taking enough into account the combinations of cues and channels and of concentrating the attention mostly on the basic emotions. She says that facial cues are the most studied area and reminds that they are somewhat unreliable as the sole source and therefore one should not rely on them only. It is important to observe the other participants' reactions in the situation because they can see all the cues and channels in the situation and are able to work from those (Sandlund 2004:83.)

Related to the issue of emotional cues, it is only natural that the interpretation of these cues vary due to the interpreter. Sometimes one can interpret a cue differently from what the producer of the cue meant it, and therefore misunderstandings in communication are common (Planalp 1999:60). One can never know the feelings of

another person if they are not communicated straightforwardly and even verbally. Therefore one should always bear in mind that when studying these kind of phenomena, no assumptions about the inner state of a person can be made, only suggestions and possibilities can be presented. In the present study, the analysis is based on the observable in communication, not on the assumptions about what goes on inside the participants' heads. I will discuss this in more detail in the method section later on (chapter 5).

Suffice it to say, the function of emotions in communication is an important aspect as well. Why does one communicate emotion? Planalp (1999) suggests different reasons. One might try to convey something; such as one's own goals, other persons' goals, joint goals (of a group, for example) or social goals. Most studied goals are solving problems, persuading, eliciting comfort, presenting yourself, enforcing social standards and managing social roles, positions or relationships (1999:68.) As is evident, there are many possible goals. In a classroom, there can easily be communication where a participant tries to achieve a personal goal, joint goal or social goal. These are all context dependent. A classroom can offer different contexts, for example group work or a personal test where goals can be very different. These issues are dealt in chapter 6 of this study as well.

In addition to the goals presented above, the purpose of communicating emotion can be spontaneous or strategic. Communication can reveal false or genuine feelings. Person's intentions may not be based on genuine emotion but serve a purpose. In other words, communicating emotion may be a means of accomplishing something, even though the emotions would not be real (Buck 1984, cited in Planalp 1999:71–72.) In a classroom, a teacher could act being angry at the students in order to calm them down, though he would not be angry in reality. There is a clear goal that one hopes to achieve through emotion. Sandlund (2004:79) talks about intentional and unintentional expressing of emotions, as well as points out that experiencing and expression do not always match. These are issues that are more related to psychological behaviour studies and are not that relevant in studies such as mine, since they go beyond the interactional level.

There are also rules governing the expressing of emotions. "Any group of people who spend time together have rules and norms about emotional expression" (Heise and O'Brien 1993, quoted in Planalp 1999:96). This means that the group in which the communication takes place dictates the frames for expression; what can be said

or done and what cannot, what kind of emotions are acceptable and what are not. The rules can arise from the communication itself, can be influenced by the task at hand or can be controlled by something or someone. For example, in a classroom, there may be a person who controls the rules and has more power than the others (Planalp 1999:97). This could be the teacher but sometimes also a student. In a broader sense, we all have a schema in our heads about school and the norms governing it; what can be said or done at school and what are the consequences of breaking the norms. There is variation inside the groups, such as classrooms, and some groups may have looser norms than others. Also the dynamics of the group in question plays a major part. These phenomena are in the scope of power studies, which are, however, aside from my interest in this study.

According to Planalp, emotions are both personal and social. The fact that we communicate our emotions makes them social. Emotions are very personal, but when they are expressed, they become social and are exposed to other people's interpretations and definitions and are hence both individual and interactional (Planalp1999:134-135). Planalp also stresses that it is not wise to talk about social and individual as separate, because individuals use emotional communication to maintain relationships with other people. Emotional communication functions as a way of establishing relationships and maintaining those (1999:136-137). Planalp (1999:138) writes that sharing emotions with others also generates the feeling of solidarity and belonging. In the present study, it is noticeable in the data how students in some cases form a unified group and in this way create a strong feeling of belonging. Also a good, positive and warm atmosphere is a potential ground for a feeling of togetherness to emerge. By expressing one's emotions, individual benefits but the group benefits as well (Planalp 1999:138–139). We define our own status in a group by expressing our emotions and enforce our own place. In most of the groups, as in a classroom, for example, we are led by our social roles. These roles define our expressions and actions. Emotions are a way of solving social problems as well (Planalp 1999:148–149). In my data this point becomes quite clear as the teacher and students discuss with each other.

5 THE STUDY

In this chapter, the specific research questions, aims and methods, data, as well as the analytic process of the present study are discussed. The theoretical framework that was described in the previous chapter, will now come together with the aims and methods of the study, forming the tools for analysis. In the following chapter, the actual analysis is presented together with the results.

5.1 Research questions

This study aims at focusing on the following research question:

What kind of actions create positive environment or maintain it in EFL and CLIL-classroom interaction?

Also the following question is considered: How are the interaction sequences including these actions structured, and how are they influenced by the surrounding context? The actions creating and maintaining positive environment in the lessons are looked at in their context. The interaction sequences which include these actions are analysed and their structure revealed. The analytic process makes use of conversation analytic tools, knowledge about classroom interaction and institutional interaction, as well as the immediate surrounding classroom context. The actions themselves are identified and analysed, and the emotional aspects of the interaction are considered. The creation and maintaining of positive environment through the actions are studied with the help of emotional cues (Planalp 1999) and knowledge about the context. The analytic process is described in more detail later in this chapter, in section 5.4 and the steps for the process are explained in detail. First, the aims and motivation of the study, as well as the data, are presented.

5.2 Aims and motivation of the study

The final focus for this study has formed itself from the broader initial interest towards classroom interaction and languages in general. From the very beginning it was clear that the study was going to be about a phenomenon taking place in classrooms, at the level of interaction. Interaction and its analysis interested me and the intention was to study something new, an area which was unfamiliar to me. The

idea of focusing on a phenomenon that would touch upon the affective side of classrooms came to me when I realised that I wanted to see what happens in classrooms via interaction, and what can be created through interaction. In other words, the interaction would be a tool in achieving something in a classroom. Considering the affective factors was an idea that developed quite suddenly after pondering around the issue, discussing and browsing the research done in the area of classroom interaction. The main push, however, came from Sandlund's (2004) dissertation, as I found her study very interesting and wanted to study similar kind of issues (Sandlund's study was discussed in more detail in chapter 4.2). Sandlund's study can then be described as one of the grounding motivators of my study. Before entering any data, I decided that I want to look into positive feelings or emotions, leaving the negative aspect out. As a future teacher myself, a great interest towards classroom environment and phenomena taking place there is quite naturally the driving force of this study.

Already in the first steps of the study, it became clear that there are not many previous studies done in the area of emotions and interaction, and especially not in such a specific context as classrooms. The affective factors have been studied in a pedagogical context (teaching and learning), but the focus has been on the individual and on the learning process itself. As was discussed in chapter 4, the feelings, attitudes and motivation have interested researchers but mostly when trying to find connections to learning results, learning problems or disabilities. The studies have been more or less psychological in their nature, and even the sociological aspect has been considered from the individual's point of view. Shared feeling, or communication of feeling, has not been researched in the classroom context, and the closest one gets is Sandlund's study, taking place in the academic interaction (Sandlund 2004).

As was explained in chapter 4, communication of emotion is still a quite modestly researched area. In addition to the attitude and motivation studies, pure psychological and neurological studies about the experiencing and expressing of emotions have naturally been conducted. However, they do not tell much about the interactional aspects of emotions, since the study of feeling expression has mostly concentrated on analysing the nature of the expression and its meaning for the individual, not on how feelings or emotions are shared with others. Quite recently, emotions have been brought up as an important part of working life as well, and studies about emotions

in organisations have been conducted. For example Fineman (2000, 2003) has analysed emotions as a factor affecting the efficiency of organisations and the well-being of the workers. These studies do not concentrate on the communication of emotions specifically, but study how emotions affect the working environment and hence one's performance at work. Interestingly, still not much research of the kind exists in the educational world. Sandlund (2004:89) sees the potential of emotion studies in talk and interaction, stressing that through such studies, one can see how emotions are a part of our social everyday life, that is, how relationships are maintained and roles built, for example. Language is a tool used in achieving this. She stresses that many of the studies done in this area have concentrated on recorded patient-doctor interaction in medical contexts or calls on the emergency stations, where the problem is that the data available often uses only one channel of communication (talk) and the analysis remains incomplete (Sandlund 2004:89.)

When considering the research done in the area of classroom interaction, emotions and their expression and sharing with others, have not been studied. This is perhaps due to the abstract nature of emotions and the difficulty of defining them, and also due to the fact that the concept of creating a certain kind of environment or atmosphere, is not very concrete either. The definitions tend to depend on the researcher and therefore vary greatly. However, there are numerous interactional studies of pedagogical nature, for example the IRF-structure alone has been studied vastly. Also, as the present study makes use of conversation analytical method, it needs to be said that this kind of study of a fairly abstract phenomenon is not typical for conversation analysis. CA studies the organisation of interaction and identifies the underlying structures in it. CA in its pure form stresses that all the relevant information is in the interaction and does not try to draw any conclusions outside the interaction. However, I feel that conversation analysis suits on the purposes of this study well, as it is the best means of identifying the turn taking and overall organisation of the interaction sequences, and hence see the detailed structuring of those sequences where positive environment is created and maintained. The very aim of this study is to analyse the interaction sequences and see what is achieved through the interaction. There is no attempt to go 'inside' the participants' heads or to make assumptions about their feelings or thoughts, but to look at the turn taking and see what is accomplished through it. The focus is then clearly on the interaction. Another remark about the aim of this study concerns the definition of 'environment'. It needs

to be clarified, that this study aims at studying environment as defined by the participants' actions. The interactional aspect drives the analysis, and the cues of emotion (Planalp 1999) are used to identify the markers of positive environment. This study does not rely on studies concerning environment from different perspectives, nor on studies concerning group dynamics or other socio-psychological frameworks for that matter.

5.3   Data

The data used in this study is from a corpus of classroom interaction collected at the Department of Languages/English in the University of Jyväskylä. The corpus offered several EFL (English as a foreign language) and CLIL (Content and language integrated learning) -lessons for inspection, and the actual process started by going through the available data which consisted of videotaped lessons and basic transcriptions made on the basis of the videos. I have a personal interest towards the EFL-lessons as a future English teacher, and mostly because of this, the starting point was to form the data from EFL-lessons. However, when going through the available data, an interest towards the CLIL-lessons arose as well. At this point it is essential to say that this study has not aimed at being a comparative study. The main focus has not been in comparing the EFL-lessons with the CLIL-lessons or in comparing any other aspects for that matter. However, throughout the analysis, detailed observations have been made and some of them concern the nature of the lessons as well, and for this reason some comparative elements occur.

When choosing the data, the specific research questions had not yet been formed, and the lessons were chosen on the basis of the fact that they seemed to offer instances where emotions or feelings were somehow involved. One double CLIL-lesson (biology, approximately 90 minutes in length) and two separate EFL-lessons (each approximately 45 minutes in length) were chosen, and there were several reasons for this. Firstly, it seemed sensible to choose small groups because they are easier to analyse in this kind of study, and there seemed to be more potential sequences for close inspection than in the lessons involving larger groups. Already the richness of interaction taking place in these lessons was exceptional if compared to the larger groups. There are nine students in the CLIL-lessons and seven in the EFL-lessons, which makes them rather unusual, at least in terms of today's group

sizes. The EFL-lessons were recorded in 1996 and the CLIL-lesson in 2003, which partly explains the smaller group sizes. Secondly, the teacher is male in the CLIL-class, and female in the EFL-class. This is an interesting point, though this study does not have its main focus on comparisons. However, as the study deals with emotional aspect of classrooms, it is undeniably interesting to see if the sex of the teacher plays a part. Thirdly, there is an age difference, as the students in the CLIL-lessons are 9th graders and in the EFL 7th graders. Moreover, the students in the EFL-lessons study English as their second foreign language, their first foreign language being German, which also sets an interesting aspect if compared to the CLIL-lessons, where English is used as a means of studying another subject. The plausible, final amount of data was difficult to estimate, but on the basis of the initial observations, four lessons altogether seemed suitable. The idea being to analyse the chosen sequences in detail, a larger amount of data would have been difficult to handle, and probably led to a more superficial analysis.

A few more words considering the themes and context of the lessons are in order. The EFL-lessons take place in a Finnish secondary school, both lessons involve the same group of a female teacher and seven students; four of them boys and three girls. The small size of the group leads to involvement of all students in the lessons, and there is very little chance of anyone being left outside the group. The group is also sitting in a semicircular shape so that everyone has an eye contact with the others. The main theme in the two EFL-lessons is verb forms and practising them. There are different kinds of tasks: group work, pair work, a test, a game, individual work around written and oral tasks. All the tasks can be considered as typical for language lessons.

The CLIL-lesson is a double lesson, with a short break between the two 45 minute lessons. Also this double lesson is from a Finnish secondary school. The participants are a male teacher and nine students: six girls and three boys. This group is a bit larger than the one in the EFL-lessons but it also has the small groups' advantages: nearly everyone is actively involved in the lessons and the teacher can more easily be in contact with everyone. The seating arrangement is conventional, the students are facing the teacher who mostly stands in front of the class. However, the students are sitting in pairs and the teacher also tends to move around in the classroom, among the students, so to say. The seating arrangements of both groups can be found in the appendix 2. The theme in the double lesson is heredity and issues

around that, such as genes and inherited versus acquired features. The tasks are somewhat alike those in the EFL-lessons; pair work and some individual work. The amount of teacher talk in front of the classroom is considerably bigger than in the EFL-lessons, however.

5.4   Analytic process

Defining of the research question as well as the analytic process started with observing the data. By watching the videotaped lessons and going through the basic transcription already available, I started identifying those sequences, or at first even more broadly phases of the lessons where positive environment or feeling seemed to be present somehow. When identifying the sequences, I tried to look at the markers of positive environment in the interaction; who says what, at what point of the sequence and what kind of reaction it invites in the other participants. In other words, I took a closer look on places where the emergence of a light environment seemed to be present, and often the markers of a light environment were laughter or smile, or both of these. I looked at those sequences, which seemed to create positive environment that involved all the participants, or most of them. There were sequences where the 'fun' seemed to be shared only by two people, and these were left out from the scope of this study. The purpose was to look at the sequences as a whole: what happened before the markers of positive environment, and what followed them. Already at this point it became clear that the closing of the sequences was equally interesting and relevant as the 'birth' of them, and that it would be important to analyse the interaction sequences in their context.

The focus of this study formed when observing the sequences that I had initially found as possible excerpts to be used in the study. When looking at the sequences in detail, the interest was focused on the structure of the sequence and the creation and maintaining of positive environment in it. In order to find the key turn creating the positive environment and to analyse the action that the turn performed, I needed to analyse also the turns around it. In this way it was possible to see the emergence of positive environment, the actions that maintained it and also the actions that closed the sequence. The main focus is on the key action that creates the positive environment in the sequence, but also on the reactions of others, since the others' actions define the key action. These turns and the actions that they perform need to

be analysed in their context; in the turn taking organisation of the sequence, as well as the broader context of the classroom interaction. When first categorising the sequences, it was essential to decide the extent of the sequence around the key action. As I said, it is of little meaning to study the key actions separately from the surrounding context. The defining of the sequence is not always simple, and I noticed that in classroom interaction, some interaction sequences can be very long and have their starting point far before the actions in focus take place. For this reason it is important to consider the broader context and not to have too narrow a view.

When the excerpts (that is, the interaction sequences) for closer analysis were chosen, I was forced to make some additions and alterations to the available transcription. The basic transcription was an excellent support for the videotaped lessons in the beginning of the process, but I needed a more detailed transcription of those sequences that were under closer analysis. The additions that I made concern mostly non-verbal communication, as I wanted to look at gaze, gestures and movement of the participants, as well as laughter, smiling and other expressions. Also tone and volume of the voice are important to the analysis and they were reconsidered as well. The purpose was to include all the information about the sequences that is relevant for the analysis of the excerpt in question.

The analytic process of the interaction sequences followed a certain 'pattern' that was applied throughout the analysis. It is essential to stress that this analysis did not always proceed in certain, neat order, but more in a cycle, where the different methodological aspects blend with each other. Therefore the analytic process is difficult to describe in a certain order. However, the same elements and methods were used throughout the analysis. Furthermore, this study does not aim at being quantitative, that is, there are no attempts to measure the results specifically, or to draw conclusions about the frequency of the sequences. However, when I have analysed the sequences, I have paid some attention to the frequency of the different categories in order to see which one of them includes roughly the most cases. This is because I am interested in seeing if some of these categories clearly outnumbers the others. There exists a quantitative element in this study, but the study is qualitative in its main aims.

Conversation analysis forms the basis of analysing the sequence structure, and the turn taking, as well as the broader sequence organisation were studied using CA methods. Sandlund (2004:98) points out that many scholars tend to take a "question

mark" approach to studying emotions, and reminds that though certain amount of cautiousness can be wise, there are clear markers of CA's applicability to studying emotions in interaction. Using conversation analytical methods, I identified the turn taking patterns in the sequences: who does what in the sequence and in what way, who does the sequence involve and where does the sequence begin and end. The main focus was on the key turn creating the positive environment and on the reactions to that turn. In other words, conversation analysis helped to identify the actions performed in the turns. I stress that the identification of the key turns as well as the reactive turns was targeted both to the teacher's and the students' turns, and no selection had been made beforehand. Using CA as a method in this kind of study, cautiousness should also be present. Sandlund (2004) reminds that when talking about emotions and their expression in interaction, clear cut, stable 'headings' should not be made hastily. The actions were then analysed further with the help of Planalp's (1999) cues for emotion, in order to reveal the creation and maintaining of the positive environment in interaction. Planalp's cues were mostly used to characterise the reactions to the key turn; to explain the markers of positive environment. Through the cues for emotion, it was also possible to analyse what the key action seemed to convey, and how it was produced. This means that I observed whether the key action seemed to convey for example joy or amusement, or whether is was neutral in its tone. The markers of positive environment (often laughter, smiling or other kind of sign) helped me to identify the key turn to which the turn or turns with the markers were a reaction. Laughter, as well as the other non-verbal markers needed to be analysed together with the verbal actions, and it needs to be remembered that the aim was not to study laughter as an interactional phenomenon per se. In this way the cues for emotion were used to analyse both the key actions and the reactions to them. This is the point of the process where conversation analysis and cues for emotional communication together enabled the identification and further analysis of the actions. The broader context of the sequence was analysed as well in order to see the 'birth' and structuring of the positive environment in more detail and in the context.

After clarifying the turn taking structure and the actions being performed in the interaction sequence, I looked at the possible interaction patterns related to the classroom context, such as the IRF-pattern or a simpler question-answer pattern. I wanted to see if the turn taking was formed around these typical classroom

interaction patterns, and how. These patterns were looked at in the light of the pedagogical goal (or focus) of the lesson, that is, how the sequence was structured in the pedagogical terms. For example, I looked at the task at hand during the sequence, how the interaction was built around it, and how the pedagogical focus changed, if it changed. At this point the features of classroom interaction and institutional interaction were looked at in detail, in order to reveal the influence of institutional roles and conventions in the interaction, concentrating both on the students' and the teacher's roles. The possible relation between the participants' roles and the pedagogical focus of the lesson was analysed. The interest laid on the different actions: who performed what action and why.

As a conclusive remark, it is very important to bear in mind that the analysis of the interaction sequences has taken into account several aspects at the same time, which all work together. The key actions and the reactions to them have not only been identified as certain actions, but have been analysed in relation to their content, the task at hand and the topic of the lesson, the conventions and rules governing classrooms, as well as the role of the speaker and the other participants. The analysis of the actions has first and foremost been conducted in order to see why these actions create positive environment or are able to maintain it.

6   CREATING AND MAINTAINING POSITIVE ENVIRONMENT

On the basis of the data being analysed in this study, the actions which create and/or maintain the positive environment through teacher and student interaction, can be divided under four main categories. These categories are: Students' unprompted actions, Students' questions, Students' answers and Teacher's actions. The categories most importantly represent the *actions* that the key turns perform, and the first turn of the interaction sequence is of great importance. However, also the reactions to the key action are studied and the creation and maintaining of positive environment are achieved in interaction between the participants. The reactions to the key actions are an essential part of the analysis.

In the following analysis, I will deal with twelve examples altogether. The examples that I have chosen here, represent sequences of interaction where the key action is clearly identifiable, and positive environment can be observed and analysed. All in all, the data provided 23 interaction sequences where positive environment is created. Most of the interaction sequences identified including creating and maintaining of positive environment fall under the category of Students' unprompted actions. This category includes different kinds of examples, but these actions can all still be identified as unprompted in their own way, and spontaneity characterises them. There were 14 examples in this category altogether, and I will present five of them in the section below. Also Students' answers as a category is rather frequent in the data, with five sequences altogether, but still clearly outnumbered by the unprompted actions. Students' questions is perhaps quite surprisingly the least frequent of the three student initiated categories, as it includes only two sequences. Both of these sequences are from the CLIL-lessons. Interestingly, the category of Students' answers includes excerpts from the CLIL-lesson as well, leaving the EFL-lessons outside. It is then only the unprompted actions that include excerpts from both types of the lessons (EFL and CLIL). It also became evident that the teacher initiated key actions are rare in the data, and only two sequences were identified in this category, both from the CLIL-lessons. Although I have chosen to use four main categories in my analysis, it is essential to say that they include different types of examples and are not in any sense homogenous in their nature.

6.1 Students' unprompted actions

Students' unprompted actions as a category includes most of the key actions in the data. In this section I will analyse five different sequences, which clearly represent the unprompted nature of the key actions. These actions arise from the context, and their spontaneous nature is of great importance in creating a light environment in the classroom. The structuring of the interaction in the first three examples has same kind of elements. The key turn (in these cases an unprompted comment) that seems to be creating positive environment is produced outside the question-answer and IRF-structures that are very often found in a central role in my examples. This becomes clear when looking at these three examples in more detail.

There is both English and Finnish used in the excerpts, and when the turn is produced in Finnish, a translation in English is given in italics, immediately after the Finnish equivalent. The excerpts themselves do not include translations, but they are given when necessary in the analysis. This is the case with all the excerpts presented in this study. In the transcript, an arrow before a line number marks the key action. The names of the students in the excerpts have been changed.

The first example is taken from the beginning of the EFL lesson, the students have been listening to a verb song about past tenses from a tape recorder and they have found the song amusing. There has been laughter and the students have been singing along with the tape. Right after the verb song, the teacher has started an exercise, a 'hot ball' where she throws a paper ball to the students, everyone in turn, and asks them to form a sentence in English using the past tense. The students are quite lively, talkative and the atmosphere is relaxed. It can be noticed, however, that the students may also be a bit nervous when waiting for their turn and this is probably because they wonder whether or not they are able to produce the correct past tense form. The students seem to be at ease with the teacher, however, and seem to make comments rather freely, as the following example demonstrates as well.

Example 1

```
282   T       are back at  ho↓me  I saw you uh (1) in the cinema
283   T       yester↓day [(1)  ] [I SAW YOU IN THE CINEMA]
              (stands in front of LF1 and looks at her)
284   LF1               [mitä]
285   LM4                        [se näki sut video video (xx)      ]
```

```
286  LF2    [(laughter)] [elokuvissa                        ]
287  T      [CINEMA] [WHAT FILM DID YOU ↓ SEE]
288  LF1    tä
289  T      what [film did you ↓see                ](.)at the cine↓ma
290  LF2          [se näki sut elokuvissa että mitä sää-  ]
291  T      (1)minkä elokuvan näit ei↓len
292  LL     [ (laughter and smiling)]
293  T      [at the ci-             ] in the movie theatre (.)[elokuvis↓sa]
294  LM2                                             [cable guy   ]
295  T      ↑keksi joku
            (gestures with her hand)


296  LF2    °ei mitään ensi iltaa (xx)°
→297  LM3   mut hei TOI OLI SIINÄ MIELESSÄ [tyhmä kysymys    ] et=
298  LF1                                   [°independence day° ]
299  T      =↑independence day I thought(.) so [I thought so ]
            (sits down on her chair)
300  LM3                                   [kyllähän sun]
301  LM3    pitäis sitten tota tietää jos sää kerta näit sen siellä elokuvissa
302  LM3    että [jos sää (xxx)       ]
            (gaze directed to T, smiles)
303  LL        [(laughter and smiling)]
304  T        [yeah but I (.) I wasn't ](.) I wasn't going to see the
305  T      same mo↓vie I just saw her outside actual↓ly
            (smiles and looks at LM3)
306  T      [mm u:h I saw you uh (2)]
307  LL     [(laughter) (xxx)        ]
```

In terms of turn taking, this excerpt follows simple rules: the teacher's initiative turn (the question on line 287) invites a turn from LF1 (an answer), to whom the question is addressed. The teacher selects LF1 as the next speaker, standing in front of her and gazing at her. The other students interfere between the turn-taking of T and LF1 by making their comments, but none of them produces the turn that LF1 is supposed to, and therefore the balance is kept and turn taking happens as it is supposed to. Teacher's and LF1's turns form a question-answer adjacency pair, despite LM3's interfering turn (line 297 onwards).

Looking at this example in more detail, one can see that it builds on the basic IRF-structure (see Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, Mehan 1979, for example), but that LM3's action makes an additional part to this structure. The 'hot ball' exercise, where the purpose is to practise the past tense has been going on for a while before this example here, and it has followed the structure teacher question-student answer-teacher follow-up (IRF). LM3's comment is in this sequence made in the middle of the IRF-sequence, at a point where only the Initiation-part has been produced by the

teacher. LF1's Response takes place in partial overlap with LM3's turn (line 298) and is followed by the teacher's Follow-up, when LM3's action is still taking place. We can see that after LM3's commenting, the teacher explains her question further (or even defends it) and after that immediately moves on to the next Initiation-turn (lines 304, 305 and 306).

Now, the light environment is here created through LM3's unprompted action that is related to the question-answer pattern between the teacher and LF1. The teacher asks LF1 a question on lines 282–287 and repeats her question on lines 289, 291 and 293. She tries to make LF1 to produce the answer as she faces LF1 and clearly directs the questions to her, in this way selecting LF1 as the next speaker. It can be seen that LF1 is not producing the correct answer (or any answer for that matter) and therefore the other students seize the opportunity to make comments (on line 285 "se näki sut video video (xx)"*she saw you in a video video (xx)*", on line 286 "elokuvissa""*in the movies*" and on line 290 "se näki sut elokuvissa että mitä sää-""*she saw you in the movies what did you-*" and further on line 296 "°ei mitään ensi iltaa (xx)°" "°*no premiere (xx)°*". Despite these comments from the other students, that can be interpreted as supportive and helpful, but also putting pressure on LF1, she is not able to produce the answer, but "tä" "*what*" works as a repair initiator on line 288, as she tries to react to the teacher's question, failing. After this, barely audibly, LF1 produces her answer "°independence day°" on line 298, so that it is only the teacher who hears it. The teacher repeats the answer (line 299), confirming it.

Just before LF1 produces her answer, LM3 makes a comment concerning the teacher's question, which partially overlaps with LF1's answer (line 297–) "mutta hei TOI OLI SIINÄ MIELESSÄ tyhmä kysymys et- kyllähän sun pitäs sitten tota tietää jos sää kerta näit sen siellä elokuvissa että jos sää (xxx)" "*but hey THAT WAS IN A SENSE a stupid question that you should-you should know if you saw her at the cinema that if you (xxx)*". This comment seems to criticize or evaluate the teacher's question. LM3 produces this action quite spontaneously, and it seems that he seizes the opportunity to point out the problem that is included in the question. Perhaps he thinks he is clever in the eyes of the others when doing this and wishes to invite amusement, or then he tries to draw the attention away from LF1 and her troubles with the answering. The atmosphere before LM3's action seems to be a bit tense, as LF1 struggles with the answer, and the other students are expecting her to say

something. Indeed, LM3's unprompted action seems to ease LF1' position and steer the attention away from LF1. LM3's comment steps out from the context first of all because it is made in Finnish, and it is also clear that the teacher's question does not involve him, and he should not be talking at all for that matter. It is worth noticing, that although it is clear that LM3 is speaking in a place where he should not be speaking, he is not sanctioned at all. The nature of the task; the 'hot ball' exercise, seems to be playful and allow these kind of comments. The 'hot ball' is a game, and perhaps the atmosphere is therefore more permissive than for example during individual, so called silent work. Indeed, there is laughter and smiling in the air already before LM3's comment (line 292), and the teacher is allowing the commenting of the students.

It can be seen that the immediate reaction to LM3's action is laughter and smiling by the other students (line 303). This can be interpreted as a marker of light environment among the participants; as a genuine outburst of amusement. Planalp (1999) says that these kind of positive facial cues are easily observable and often markers of joy and elation. The students laugh out loud and although the teacher tries to explain her question further on lines 304 and 305 "yeah but I (.) I wasn't going to see the same mo↓vie I just saw her outside actual↓ly" she is smiling too and her explanation has a bit of hesitation in it, and she does not sound convincing. As a result, the students do not seem to mind her explanation at all, as there is noise and laughter still going on. This shows that the situation allows playfulness and a bit of joking, without the teacher getting upset. It seems that LM3 is teasing the teacher a bit, and the teacher is allowing this to happen; she does not take it very seriously either.

However, it is the teacher who tries to control the situation and steer it back to the right tracks, so to say, after the deviation from the 'normal' IRF-pattern. The teacher uses her status as the leader of the group, and in spite of LM3's comment and the students' laughter, it is still clear that she is the one in charge. As Seedhouse (2004:183) suggests, classroom interaction is always led by a goal that directs the interaction, and here it is evidently the teacher who keeps the interaction in track towards the pedagogical goal of the lesson, and does not allow the fun to go on any further, although she has also been part of it herself. LM3 has been steering the activity away from the actual pedagogical focus, although his comment is in a sense related to the topic in question. It can be said that LM3 is moving off-task in the

interaction, creating light environment, whereas the teacher is keeping it on-task (Seedhouse 2004), continuing the 'hot ball' exercise and concentrating on the pedagogical goal.

   In the second example, the EFL class is still doing the 'hot ball' exercise concerning past tenses that was going on in the previous example as well, and the situation is therefore quite alike.

   Example 2

   226 T   u:m joo-jarkko [I saw you   ] with
   227 LM3   [°joojarkko°]
   228 T   [somebody (.) yester↑day   ] in church ↑park what did
   229 LL   [(laughter)   ]
   230 T   you do the↓re
               (smiles,rolls the paperball in her hands, then throws it to LM2, the ball
               falls in the ground)
   231 LM1   u:h
   232 LM2   siis mää en saa [kiinni   ] siis
   233 LM1   [mihin se meni]
               (picks up the ball and gives it to LM2)
   234 T   I saw you with somebody in church park last-
   235 T   yesterday evening it was (.) what did you do there=
               (gazing LM2)
 →236 LM3   =don't even ask=
   237 LL+T =(laughter and smiling, everyone looks at LM2)
   238 T   try to figure out something

Here the creating of positive environment is initiated with an action by LM3, a student who the exercise does not directly involve, meaning that he is not in turn of producing an utterance here. This situation resembles the one in the previous example, and interestingly, involves the same student as well (LM3). In this excerpt, the sequencing of turns follows a question-answer pattern that is characteristic to exercises like the 'hot ball' (teacher asks, students answer) and as was seen earlier, usually this pattern is completed by a follow-up turn from the teacher, making the IRF-sequence complete. However, this excerpt does not follow the IRF-pattern exactly. The teacher produces the Initiation on lines 226–230: "u:m joo-jarkko I saw you with somebody (.) yester↑day in church ↑park what did you do the↓re". This is a clear question addressed to LM2 (the teacher addresses the student by his name and looks at him). The teacher throws the ball to LM2 and then expects LM2 to react and answer the question using the correct past tense form. The ball falls into the ground,

however, and this leads to confusion as LM1 picks the ball up and gives it to LM2. The teacher repeats her question on lines 234–235, addressing it to LM2 but this is the place where the IRF-sequence is interrupted and LM3, surprisingly, makes his comment (line 236): "don't even ask". This comment is the key action that lightens up the environment in this interaction sequence. The teacher is expecting an answer from LM2, and the situation 'stands still' for a while, as everyone is waiting for the response. LM3's action is unprompted and hints something about the nature of LM2's possible actions in the church park. It is then the content of the action that is amusing here, but the sudden and surprising nature of the action also works as an accelerator for amusement. LM3's comment was not expected. It may be that LM3 has meant his comment to be funny, but it can also be that he has not thought about it much, it just comes out spontaneously - this is something we cannot know for sure. However, the following reaction is available for analysis; and the laughter and smiling, both from the teacher and students (line 237) signal that everyone is amused by LM3's comment. It is worth noticing here that the teacher laughs even more loudly than her students and looks genuinely amused in the situation. There are no signs showing that she would be irritated or upset by the comment. She is smiling, laughing and even bending down to her knees in the chair while laughing; these are markers of genuine joy (see Planalp 1999) and can hardly be interpreted as anything else in this case. The exercising of past tenses has suddenly turned into a playful scene, and it takes a few moments for the situation to calm down again. By making his sudden comment, LM3 is changing the tone of the task completely, as the serious exercise turns into a humorous situation amusing everyone. It is finally the teacher who takes her role as a group leader and steers the interaction back to its original tracks, saying to LM2 (line 238): "try to figure out something". It is easy to notice here that the teacher makes an effort to restore the peace in to the classroom and once again make the students work towards the pedagogical goal of the exercise (practising of the past tense).

It seems to be that in many cases the teacher is the one who puts an end to a moment of laughter and presence of light environment, and this is clearly due to her position in the classroom, as the leader of the group. These kind of actions are then strongly dependent on the social roles of the situation (see ten Have 1999, Heritage 2005). It is natural that it is the teacher who maintains the control in the classroom and produces the turns that in some way steer the interaction and tasks in the

classroom in the way the teacher has planned. It is a typical feature of classroom interaction as well, that all the tasks and activities taking place there are planned beforehand (see Mehan 1979, for example).

The following example is also from the EFL-class, but from a different lesson than the previous example. The students are doing a test about verb tenses. The lesson has started with the test and the students have been doing it at this point about five minutes. Although this is a test situation, the students are talking almost continuously. They are mainly making comments about the test and their own performance in it. There has been discussion about the third verb form just before the following discussion, and that has involved almost everybody in the class.

Example 3


```
275  LM2    mikä se on se apuver↑bi
             (hoarse voice)
276  T      niinku suomessaki siinä tarvitaan kaks osaa minä (.) OLEN
277  T      JUO↓NUT [(1)   ] sinä OLET TEH↓NYT ei se riitä sinä ol-
             (claps her hands together to stress the verb forms)
278  LL              [ai nii:n]
279  T      sinä teit koska sillonhan se on vaan imperfek↓ti (1)
280  T      kaks muoto↓a eik-kaks osaa
281  LM4   hmh no
282  LM3   uh onks tää sama
283  T      ihan se on sama: (.) saksassa↓kin tehän luette saksaa
284  LM2   nii (.) valitettavas↓ti
285  T      du hast das heute ge↓macht (. ) [hast(.)gemacht]
             (snaps her fingers)
286  LL                                     [(laughter)      ]
287  LM3   sano suomeks emmää ymmärrä [(xx)                  ]
             ( slight laughter in the voice)
288  LL+T                             [(LL laughter T smiles)]
289  T                                [nii                   ]
290  LM4    no (.) me ollaa kohta neljättä vuotta luetaan saksaa eikä silti
291  LM4   osata vielä mi↓tään=
292  LM3   =nii jus↓tiin=
293  LM2   =emmääe-mää en osaa saksaa >periaatteessa yhtään<=
294  LM3   [=emmääkään]
295  LM4   [emmääkään ]
296  LM1   [osaan mää sanoo että ich bin harri]
297  LM4   [mää ehkä oman nimeni          ] [osaan (xx)]
298  LM3                                    [nii justiin ]
299  LM3   [ich bin joonas siihen se sitte jääki]
300  T      [no niin kaks minuuttia mää       ]lasken
```
→287

This excerpt can be described as more of a discussion among the teacher and students, rather than a pure question-answer (or IRF) sequence like the previous examples. If we look at the beginning of the example here, on line 275 LM2 poses a question to the teacher: "mikä se on se apuver↑bi" "*what is the auxiliary ↑verb*", clearly seeking an explanation to this, most likely in order to improve his performance in the test. It is unusual that students ask questions in a testing situation, which most often requires silence. LM2 asks the question quite cautiously and the question seems to be genuine. However, the teacher reacts immediately by comparing the structure to Finnish (lines 276–280), and she does not seem to mind the fact that LM2 is speaking in a testing situation. This can signal to the students that the situation is perhaps not that serious at all, and it is okay to ask questions and talk. Indeed, after the teacher's turn, LM3 reacts by asking "uh onks tää sama" "*uh is this the same*" (line 282), addressing the question to the teacher and hereby selecting her as the next speaker. The teacher explains further by making a reference to German, perhaps because these students study German as their first foreign language and she expects this comparison to be helpful (line 283). Through her choice of words, the teacher addresses her turn to all the students, not just LM3, but it is LM3 who reacts next, however, and his tone of voice and choice of words indicating that he is perhaps not that enthusiastic about German. Immediately after this, the teacher produces an example of the correct verb forms in German (line 285), and attempts to help the students to produce the same forms in English. However, instead of showing signs of understanding, the students start laughing (line 286) and this indicates that they have found the teacher's turn funny. The teacher's turn on line 285 and the laughter following it create an atmosphere where it is easy for LM3 to comment (line 287): "sano suomeks emmää ymmärrä (xx)" "*say it in Finnish I don't understand (xx)*". It needs to be noted, that LM3's comment is the first turn in the sequence which seems to invite amusement and further reactions from the others. LM2's initial question (on line 275) as well as LM3's earlier question (line 282) are genuine, still quite serious questions concerning the content of the test, and the teacher's actions can be seen as purely explanatory, though her explanation in German makes the students laugh. This is why LM3's action on line 287 can be seen as the key action in inviting light environment. It is possible, of course, that LM3 has not at all understood what the teacher has just said and asks for clarification, but a more likely option is that he wishes to make a fun comment that invites laughter (this in the light

of the fact that he has studied German). The tone of LM3's voice suggests this, as well as the slight laughter in his voice. In this sense, one could say that creating of light environment is intentional in this case.

The other students react to LM3's comment by laughing, and the teacher smiles too (line 288). The group laughter may suggest that the others are sharing the feeling that LM3 expresses, that is, not really knowing German as well as the teacher expects, but it also is a sign of mutual amusement. Similarly to the previous example, here a humorous comment is made (by LM3) and it is followed by laughter and smiling which are markers of joy and positive environment. These expressions suggest that the students are all joined together in maintaining the situation and hence the light environment. Important here is that the class treats LM3's comment as funny, and so does the teacher. In the following turns, the students cooperate around the subject, supporting LM3's comment and easing his position, by agreeing with him. The boys try to prove their incompetence in German rather eagerly (lines 290–299). The teacher allows this turn taking to go on for a moment, but finally she closes this turn taking by saying "no niin kaks minuuttia mää lasken" "*okay two minutes I am counting*" on line 300. She takes her role as the leader and closes this on-going sequence by making the students concentrate on the task-at-hand. Her tone of voice is serious and it sends a message to the students that it is time to get on with the test. It is, then, the same kind of situation as it was in the Example 1, as the teacher tries to control the conversation and turn taking, steering it back on-task, whereas the students try to keep it off-task (see Seedhouse 2004).

Example 4 in this category is yet different from the previous ones. This sequence builds strongly on the context: the fact that there are outsiders present in the classroom who have brought unusual equipment (video cameras) with them, creates an opportunity for shared fun in this case. This excerpt is from the EFL classroom, and the students are doing a test about verb tenses (the very same test that took place in the Example 3). This sequence actually follows that of Example 3 almost immediately. Although it is a testing situation, the students are not completely silent but make some comments and ask questions during the test.

Example 4

312 LM2   katsotko opettaja ettei joonas ja harri nyt katso °minulta°

```
                (talks from under his desk grabbing his pencil)
      313  T        ↑joo
                (directing her gaze towards LM1 and LM3)
      314  LM2   ei siinä oo kyllä mitään kattomista
                (rises from under his desk)
      315        (1)
      316  LM     I: [I I              ]
  →317  LM2       [piilomainontaa]
                 (turns around in his seat facing the camera behind him and shows his
                 pencil to the camera, smiling)
      318  LM4    hmh
      319  LL+T  [(laughter,smiling,T directs her gaze to the students )]
      320  T       [kakskymmentä                              ]
      321  T       kaksyks °kakskaks kakskolme°
      322  LL     [(laughter) ]
      323  T       [kakskuus ]
      324  LM3   osaako opettaja laskee noin pitkälle
      325  LL     (laughter)
```

The students are somewhat restless and a bit noisy in this situation although they are doing a test. The key action in this sequence (on line 317) is tied to the equipment in the classroom, and this becomes evident when looking into the sequence. The sequence begins by LM2 dropping his pencil on the floor and then bending down in order to get it. While bending under his desk, he asks the teacher to keep an eye on Joonas and Harri (line 312), referring most likely to the testing situation and his paper on the desk. The teacher answers "joo", *"yes"* (line 313), gazing LM1 and LM3 (Joonas and Harri) as requested. LM2 makes another comment from under his desk (line 314) concerning his paper. Everybody else is silent and working on their tests at this point. When LM2 rises from under his desk, he takes a pencil in his hand from his desk and suddenly says "piilomainontaa" *"subliminal advertising"* turning his face towards the camera located behind him and showing the pencil to it (line 317). This is the key action in this excerpt, and it is produced very suddenly and spontaneously, as it seems. The class is silent and calm when LM2 bends under his desk and makes the comment, and this adds the surprising nature of the action. LM2's comment invites reaction from the others, and the reaction is loud laughter, involving everybody, also LM2 himself. The comment is short and sudden, but it creates a light environment that involves the whole class (in this case the observers recording the lesson are probably laughing as well, but this is not possible to prove since they are not clearly visible in the data). The students continue their laughing longer, but the teacher gets more serious in her impression and starts counting time

out loud (lines 320, 321). The counting leads to a new burst of laughter among the students and in this way the teacher is maintaining the light environment. Furthermore, LM3 makes a question that is actually more of a comment in a question form, on line 324 "osaako opettaja laskee noin pitkälle", "*does the teacher know how to count so well*" which is treated as amusing and responded by laughter by the other students. It can be seen then, how the light environment is maintained by the participants through interaction.

What makes this sequence different from the others in this category, is that its turn taking structure is out-of-ordinary. LM3 makes a comment that seems to come out of nowhere, that is, suddenly, and without a previous turn in which it would respond or react somehow. However, in this case the video camera is a participant. LM3 sees an opportunity for fun in a form of the video camera standing behind him, and seizes this opportunity spontaneously. Indeed, it seems most unlikely that LM2 would have planned this action beforehand. In chapter 3.1, the fact that the books, as well as different kind of equipment in the classroom can become a part of the interaction, was discussed. In this excerpt, this is demonstrated. LM2 produces his fun action using the video camera as a supportive element. In this way, the camera is taking part in the interaction, though it is naturally not producing a turn on its own. This example shows how the participants can make use of the equipment and material available in the classroom. In section 6.3 there is another example of materials taking part in the conversation (Example 10).

The final example in this category is different from the others, and is therefore presented last. Most clearly this difference can be seen in the structure of the sequence. In the previous examples, the structure of turn taking is strongly tied to the pedagogical task. In examples 1 and 2, the turn taking follows a clear IRF-pattern as the teacher practises verb forms with the students, and in examples 3 and 4 there is a testing situation. In this example, the turn taking is in form of a discussion, but nevertheless, the key action is unprompted, as in the previous examples.

The example is from the first CLIL-lesson, and from the very beginning of the lesson. The students and the teacher are discussing a test and they are disagreeing on the day the test is supposed to be held. The conversation about this has been going on for a few moments now and the participants have not reached a solution.

Example 5


```
129 LM3    can't can't we [rewind the videotape a little back and then]
                (gestures with his hand, imitating rewinding of the tape)
130 T                       [YEAH BUT I-IF IF WE WANT WE      ]
131 LM3    [come and find out]
132 T         [  WE WE HAVE  ] [AN EVIDENCE WE HAVE] we can always
133 LL                        [     (laughter)              ]
134 T         check that from these videota↓pes=
135 LM3    =yeah=
136 LF4     =but then we could just make a compromi↓se
                (smiles when talking)
137 LM1    now he got scared
→138 LF6    or then we could have no quiz at all  e↓ver
                ( gestures with her hands, smiles)
139 LL+T  [(laughter, T especially loud)]
140 LF5    [yeah                          ]
141 LM3    [yeah                          ]
142 LM3   it's even [better                  ]
143 LF5             [ <I like her thinking>]
                (points LF6 with a finger)
144 T         yeah and probably moon- the moon is made of chee↓se
```


The interactional structure of this sequence is interesting, as it does not follow a pattern typical of classroom talk. The participants are making comments and suggestions, and the teacher seems to be equal with the students in this sequence, in terms of interaction. This sequence could even be compared with a sequence of everyday talk where a suggestion is made and then reacted to. This kind of discussion could indeed take place for example over a dinner where a family is discussing plans for the evening, the turn taking following the pattern suggestion-alternative suggestion-response. Although the teacher and students are here talking about a test taking place at school, the nature of the talking does not follow patterns typical of classrooms.

In the beginning of the excerpt, LM3 is suggesting that there is a possibility to rewind the videotapes back in order to find out what date the teacher has given for the exam earlier (that being most likely some days before this lesson) (lines 129, 131). Nearly at the same time, the teacher has noticed this same possibility and points out that the videotapes are available for inspection (lines 130, 132 and 134). In this way, this sequence of interaction here is an example showing how the equipment that the gatherers of this data have brought in the classroom, become a part of the

interaction. This does not, however, play the main part in this sequence, as becomes evident.

The atmosphere in the classroom can be described as lively right from the beginning of the sequence, as nearly everyone is taking part in the discussion about the date of the test, and the students are talking simultaneously. There is noise, and from the teacher's turn one can see how he raises his voice in order to be heard (lines 130 and 132). The students are laughing at the comments that LM3 and the teacher are making (line 133) and it can be said that the nature of the conversation seems not to be very serious. LF4 is making a suggestion (line 136) that they could make a compromise, and she is smiling when talking, clearly adding her own opinion in to the conversation. After LF4's turn, LF6 makes a suggestion that is the key action in this sequence: "or then we could have no quiz at all e↓ver", on line 138. LF6 is gesturing with her hands and smiling to the others when making her comment, this suggesting that she is pleased with the comment (see Planalp 1999). It can be assumed that LF6 is not making this suggestion seriously, because it is unlikely that the teacher would not have the test at all, and one can assume that LF6 knows this. The suggestion can therefore be seen as ironic or playful, and LF6 seems to be 'throwing' this suggestion to the others just for fun, not intending it to be taken seriously. The environment in the classroom allows her to make this kind of a suggestion, as the turn taking has been rather free and vivid (T, LM3 and LF4 have made suggestions earlier, lines 129–136).

It is the reaction of the others that matters, however, reflecting the environment in the classroom followed by LF6's suggestion. The others are genuinely reacting to LF6's comment; reacting to the content of the comment and the way it is made. Although the environment has been rather light before LF6's suggestion, it can be seen how her suggestion creates a stronger reaction than the earlier actions in the sequence. LF6's suggestion seems to be 'better' or more powerful than the previous suggestions, and is produced as a spontaneous, unprompted reaction to the on-going conversation. There is a loud group laughter involving everyone (line 139) and interestingly, the teacher laughs the loudest an his laughter is free, sounding genuine. The suggestion is also supported verbally. Both LF5 and LM3 say "yeah" at the same time (lines 140 and 141), and they are showing their support to LF6's suggestion. Also LM3 says "it's even better" (line 142), referring to LF6's suggestion, as well as is LF5, by commenting (line 143), even pointing at LF6. These following turns are

important in the maintenance of the light environment after the actual key action in the sequence and from the others' reactions we can see that the comment creates a fun and positive environment. Also Sandlund (2004) argued in her study that the other participants' reactions are crucially important when analysing the key turn (see chapter 4.2).

The teacher seems to be a part of the group in this example. He is making a suggestion just like any of the students, and he reacts to LF6's comment by laughing, as the others do as well. The sequence ends with his comment on line 144, which is also a funny comment, clearly not seriously made. However, though it is funny, it also signals to the students that he may have found LF6's suggestion funny and has enjoyed the discussion, but it does not mean that the students would really get to decide about the issue. In other words, he indirectly signals, by using humour, that he is the one who decides and has the control over the issue. In this sequence, it is the teacher who closes it and this is a feature that has been present in the previous examples as well. Although this interaction sequence resembles everyday talk in its structure and is more 'free' in its nature, the teacher's role as a leader shows in the end.

In the following section, the focus is turned into the students' questions and their function as key actions, with the help of two examples.

6.2   Students' questions

Sequences including a question that works as the key action in creating positive environment are rare in my data. In the previous section, different kinds of examples concerning students' unprompted actions were analysed and both similarities and differences between the examples were found. In the category of Students' questions, the case is somewhat different. In this section, I present two examples where a student's question works as the key action creating positive environment. There are only two examples included here simply because the data did not offer more for analysis. However, in the next section of this chapter, I will analyse students' answers, and questions naturally play an important part there, only not as the key action. Though questions as key actions are not very frequent in the data, it does not mean that they could be left outside the analysis. As it will become evident from the following excerpts, questions seem to be a fruitful source for creating positive

environment in the classroom, and therefore it is relevant to take these cases into account here. The two examples that will be looked at in detail here are also interestingly very similar in their structure, and are both from the double CLIL-lesson.

   In the following, the creating of positive environment is realised by a question that is produced by a female student. This discussion takes place in the CLIL-classroom and in the first half of the lesson. The teacher and the students have been discussing about an upcoming test just before, and the topic has now turned to heredity. Heredity is not the topic of the on-going lesson but has been brought up by a student a few turns before.

   Example 6

   467 T   [(laughs)] yeah it has something to do with the [um   ]
   468 LM1   [genes]
   469 T   divide of the cells. (0.8) [and] and the heredi↓ty
   470 LM   [(xx)]

→471 LF1   °can there be bl<u>ue</u>: peop↓le°
            (cauciously, with a serious face, gaze directed to T)
   472 LL   (1) [(laughter and smiling)]
   473 LM3   [>yeah if you get if you] [kind of go (xx)<   ]
   474 T   [if somebody p<u>ai</u>nts] you
            (stands in front of the class, gaze has been directed firmly to LF1,
            still is, nods to LF1)
   475 T   [I guess   (xx)   ]
            (gazing towards LF1)
   476 LM3 [or if you go somewhere really] cold
   477 LF   (xx)
   478 LF1   >no [but can (xx)] be born [blue<]
   479 T   [okay   ]   [now] before [this is going to get out]
   480 LF6   [(xxxx)   ]
   481 T   [of hand [(.) I mean] I mean this whole lesson please take   ]
            (laughter in the voice)
   482 LF6   [(xxxx)   ]
   483 LM3   [(laughs)]
   484 T   the page one hundred and fifty se↓ven

A closer look to the structure of this interaction sequence reveals that there is a question-answer pattern started by a student (LF1 on line 471). LF1 poses a question to the teacher, which is followed by an answer both from the teacher and from LM3. This kind of structure is very common in classrooms, that is, student question for

clarification or explanation, and teacher answer (Malamah-Thomas, 1987:7, describes these kind of structures in classrooms as action-reaction), but here the content of the student question is the feature that makes this question-answer pattern a bit unusual.   The teacher has just explained about heredity to a student who has asked about it (lines 467,469), when LF1 asks a question: ""°can there be bl<u>ue</u>: peop↓le°" (line 471). LF1 is gazing at the teacher, clearly addressing her question to him. The tone of LF1's voice is serious and she speaks quietly, almost cautiously, but so that everyone can hear her. The tone of her voice and the serious expression in her face suggest that the question is genuine and that she is seeking for information by asking the question (Planalp 1999: 44–48). However, the content of the question is somewhat strange, as it is a well-known fact that there are no blue people, and one could assume that LF1 is aware of this fact. Therefore the nature of LF1's question is a bit contradictory, but relevant here is that it is the action that invokes positive reactions in other participants, whether she was seeking that or not when posing the question. In other words, the others find LF1's question as funny and therefore the emergence of positive environment is possible.

It is interesting to notice that the immediate reaction to LF1's action from others is silence (line 472). It may be that the silent moment is due to the astonishment that her question invites in others; they do not know how to react and this is likely because of the contradictory nature of LF1's question. The silence is total, but the students are looking at LF1 and the teacher, standing in front of the class and right in front of LF1, is staring at her. The teacher seems to stare LF1 very firmly, and he also nods, which is interesting. These non-verbal actions are most likely reactions to LF1's funny question. The silence does not last long, however, and after the silent moment, everyone starts smiling, including LF1 herself. LM3 and the teacher react almost at the same time in their turns. The answers that LM3 and the teacher give, are similar to their nature. If one looks at LM3's turn on line 473 first, it can be noticed that he starts explaining: ">yeah if you get if you kind of go (xx)<". He is speaking rapidly, as if trying to get his opinion about the matter said as quickly as possible. However, the teacher reacts as well by starting a sentence, speaking on top of LM3 (line 474):"if somebody paints you". LM3 produces the end of his turn on line 476 "or if you go somewhere really cold", hereby completing his explanation to LF1's question. The teacher also finishes his turn simultaneously: "I guess" (line 475). I already stated that these two answers to the question are similar, and by that I

refer to their humorous nature. After the first astonishment has vanished and the teacher and LM3 start to speak, they both produce rather ironic reactions to the question, which seem suitable answers to the question in the situation. If the teacher or LM3 had considered LF1's question as serious, the responses would have been different. They would perhaps have tried to explain why there cannot be blue people, instead of reacting like they did. It can be assumed that both of them trusted LF1's knowledge about the actual state of things, and automatically interpreted her question as intentionally silly. The teacher's and LM3's reactions are humorous answers to a humorous question, and in themselves maintain a humorous mode in the classroom. It is clear that these answers are meant to be funny and not to be taken seriously at all.

After LM3's and the teacher's turns, LF1 still tries to continue the discussion about the issue repairing her previous question (on line 478): ">no but can (xx) be born blue<". However, her question is overridden by the teacher's following directive turn (lines 479–484). This is a clear instructive and even commanding turn from the teacher to the students to get back in order and follow his instructions, although this instructive turn is made in a friendly voice and the teacher has still laughter in his voice. It seems to be in this excerpt as well, that the closing turn of the interaction sequence is made by the teacher, and its purpose is to turn the students' attention to the task at hand. It is then interesting to notice that the teacher is both maintaining the positive environment in the classroom (with his reaction to LF1's question) and putting an end to the funny-natured discussion (by directing it back to the original, pedagogically driven direction).

Especially in the light of this example, it seems that in some way unusual, out-of-ordinary actions are often creators of positive environment in classrooms. Maybe it is exactly because of their exceptional nature; they step out of the surrounding context so strongly that they create a 'surprise element', which then again creates positive environment. In this excerpt, the immediate, short pause following LF1's turn is a sign of the astonishment or surprise that the others feel at that moment, as well as the non-verbal actions produced by the teacher and the students. It is because of the surprising nature of the question that the answers following it are out of ordinary as well; they are produced as impulsive reactions to the previous turn.

Example 7 is also from the first half of the double CLIL-lesson, and the class is discussing child birth.

Example 7


```
1041  T                              [it has] to breathe. (0.8) and that's why
1042  T      it is very important that is SCREAMS (.) when it comes to
1043  T      this ↑world
1044  LF1   what if it [   smiles              ]
1045  LM1             [>cause then (it'll) be] (xx)<
1046  T      because um if it doesn't scream (1.1) if the baby doesn't
1047  T      scream (.) um it may have some problems with its ↓lungs
→1048 LF1   what if it starts smiling and laughing
             (moves in her chair, has crossed her arms on her chest)
1049  LL    (1) [(smiling and laughter)            ]
1050  T     (1) [(smiling and laughter, rolls eyes)]
             (T has moved and is leaning on a desk beside LF1 just before LF1's
              turn, and his gaze is directed to her)
1051  LF6   a very [happy] person
1052  T            [yeah ]
1053  T      u:m
1054  LM3   what if it [starts (xx)              ]
1055  LM2             [the baby's not (xx) now]
1056  T             [then I guess it's          ]happy
1057  LF1    yeah
1058  T      but but um [what I've heard] is that when a baby's smiling
1059  LM1              [     (xxxx)     ]
1060  T     (0.8) so um it means that it has a stomach ache
1061  LF1  okay
             (laughter in the voice)
```

The teacher is explaining to the students how important it is that a baby screams when it is born and there has been discussion about other issues related to child birth before this. LF1 produces a question for the first time already on line 1044 "what if it smiles", but it is ignored by the teacher, and it is unclear who LF1 is addressing the question to. Also LM1 is speaking at the same time as LF1 and this makes it difficult to hear LF1's question. The teacher is explaining to the students the screaming of the baby (lines 1046–1047). When the teacher produces this turn, the students are listening to him (their gaze is directed to the teacher and there is not much talking or other activities going on at the time) and the atmosphere in the classroom is calm. The teacher slowly walks towards the desk where LF1 is situated and stops beside it. He leans on a desk behind him and directs his gaze to LF1 and at the same time LF1 repeats the question (line 1048) that she has asked earlier. This question seems to be fairly genuine in its nature; LF1 is using a normal, polite tone of voice and is looking at the teacher when asking. In this turn it is the same element that has come up in

some of the previous examples making the turn funny or odd, that is, the pure content of the turn. LF1's question can be said to be different from many other student questions expressed during the lesson only by its content. The outer appearance of the question is not in any way exceptional, meaning that she does not use exceptional body language or tone of voice, for example. In the previous example presented in this section, it was LF1 who asked the silly question "can there be blue people", which is very similar to this example. It is interesting that it is the same student who is making these funny questions, but it is not in the scope of this study to focus on that phenomenon more specifically. It is evident, however, that LF1 is on her own behalf strongly contributing to the positive environment of the classroom, whether it is intended or not.

This example shows again how the reactions of the others are equally important as LF1's question in creating positive environment. If the others would have been silent or made strange looks towards LF1, the situation could have been analysed as tense or even embarrassing. However, the spontaneous laughter and smile on the faces prove otherwise. It takes a moment before anyone reacts verbally, though. It is not the teacher, to whom the question was addressed, but LF6 who says: "a very happy person" (line 1051), and this can be interpreted as a comment or opinion on the question. The teacher is agreeing with LF6 on line 1052 and comments further on line 1056. The structure of this example is in the form of question-answer, as was the case in the previous example. One cannot be sure whether LF1 asks the question genuinely in order to get an explanation from the teacher or in order to invite amusement in others. It can be assumed that the question is meant to be funny, since babies do not tend to smile or laugh right after they are born. Crucial here is, however, that the others interpret LF1's question as funny and react accordingly. This is where the light environment is being evoked in this sequence.

This example differs from the previous one in the maintaining of the light environment. Here the others do not make very strong attempts to maintain the light environment very long, as was the case in the previous example. LF6's comment "a very happy person" (line 1051) can be seen as continuing the conversation about the issue and perhaps inviting more comments from the others. This comment is still creating light environment. However, the teacher's comment on line 1056 is made in a rather neutral tone of voice, suggesting that he is not going to go on 'the funny business' any longer. LF1 reacts to the teacher's turn by saying "yeah" (line 1057),

and this could signal that she accepts the teacher's conclusive comment, and does not continue the discussion any further. The teacher, quite suddenly, continues and gives another explanation to LF1's question, and this can be interpreted as a 'more serious' answer (lines 1058, 1060). In this turn, the teacher is directing the conversation on track again, into a more serious tone, steering the focus to the next pedagogical goal.

As can be seen in this example, the teacher maintains the positive environment but is also the one directing the conversation away from the exceptional, 'fun' turn taking and makes an effort to move on. It seems that the teacher is often in a key role when building the structures that create light environment. In most of the cases that I have found in the data, it is a student who produces the initiative key action but it is the teacher who more or less directs the discussion after that. On one hand, the teacher can be seen as having the power over the students and using this to control the direction of the conversation. On the other hand, the teacher seems to be in the same level with the students when cooperating in maintaining the light environment. Underhill (1999:125) talks about the teacher's role in the language classroom and the development of it. He categorises a teacher in three different terms: Lecturer, Teacher and Facilitator. These roles have different features and they act differently in a classroom. In the example in question, it could be said that the teacher moves between these categories, more specifically between Teacher and Facilitator, because in this case Lecturer does not seem suitable. Underhill (1999:126) says that Facilitator adds Teacher "the sensitivities for managing the intra-and interpersonal experiencing of the group". In other words, in this example, he is being flexible and moves momentarily away from his role as a teacher to be almost an equal participant of the group and take part to the discussion that creates positive environment to the classroom. It seems to be the case then, that when positive environment is created in classrooms, these situations make the teacher step momentarily aside from his traditional role as the leader of the group, and become a member of it. However, the situation may change quite rapidly and the teacher can take his role as the leader and superior in the group again. Usually this happens when the sequence is getting to its end.

6.3 Students' answers

The third category found in the data is Students' answers. Also the answers that function as the actions creating positive environment are in this data produced by students. Interestingly, a common feature among the answers in these sequences of interaction is that they are in some way out-of-ordinary. By this I mean that it is their nature that invokes the positive environment as they step out from the surrounding context as 'odd' and funny. These answers are usually reactions to the teacher's turn which is a question. In most of the cases, the teacher question is of pedagogical nature, that is, the cases represent classroom interaction in form of teacher question, student answer (teacher follow-up), in other words IR(F).

The following excerpt is from the first half of the double CLIL-lesson, and the participants are discussing about child birth and the changes the baby experiences when it is born. The teacher is standing in front of the classroom facing all students and posing questions to them.

Example 8

```
897  T     when the baby is born (1.2) how does the life life of of the
898  T       baby chan↓ge
899  LM2  thanks
900  T     when when it is↓born
901        (1.5)
902  LM1  luck
903  T     what have you found out (5.9) jaa↑na
             (T is gazing Jaana who has raised her hand)
→904  LF5   life gets har↑der
             (seriously)
905  LF6  [(laughs)              ]
906  T    [(smiles and laughs)] we- [we-]
907  LF5                          [° it ] it has to breathe and [(xx)°]
908  T                                                          [life   ]
909  LF6   oh my [g(h)o:d]
910  T            [ gets    ]=
911  LF5  =°and grow teeth and learn°
912  T    harder this (2) this reminds me about one
913  T    blues song↓ (1.1) by charlie pat↓ton
             (has laughter in his voice)
914        (1.1)
915  LF5  °okay°
             (smiling)
916  T     life is hard and then you'll ↓die (1.1) [okay]
917  LM3                                           [   (x]x)=
```

```
918  LF5   =but it still has many years ahead of [it ]
919  LM1                                       [of] c(h)our↓se
920  LM1   [       °(xxxx)°              ]
921  T      [OH YEAH [THAT'S TRUE ] life gets harder (2.5) ↑okay
922  LF5              [°(xx) baby°      ]
923  LF5   °it does°
924  T       in what ways it is getting har↓der(.) matthew
```

The situation here is typical for classrooms and the interaction here follows the IRF-pattern. The teacher is asking the students a question on lines 897–898 and continues it on line 900. This is the Initiation-turn of the IRF-sequence. There is a small pause before the teacher is forced to continue because nobody is answering to the question. On line 903 he asks "what have you found out (5.9) jaa↑na". There is nearly a six second pause before the teacher addresses Jaana (LF5). This is because he is still waiting for an answer and addresses LF5 because she has raised her hand. LF5 answers after she has clearly been chosen as the next speaker by the teacher, line 904: "life gets har↑der". The tone of LF5's voice is serious, she is looking at the teacher with a serious face and her turn is then on the surface an ordinary Response to the teacher Initiation. It is true that LF5 is giving an answer to the teacher's question as requested. However, what makes the turn humorous is again the content of it. LF5 does not probably realise the humorous nature of her answer when producing it. What LF5 has probably meant is that the child goes through many changes and its life gets more complicated when it is born. She puts this in a very straightforward form in her answering "life gets harder", but the answer is not wrong in a pedagogical sense. The first person to react LF5's turn is LF6 who is sitting next to her. LF6 laughs quite spontaneously, and it can be assumed that it is LF5's answer that is making her laugh. The teacher starts also smiling and laughing after LF5's turn and this is in the beginning of his Follow-up turn (line 906). He then tries to start a sentence with the words "we-we" but does not get any further. He has laughter in his voice. LF5 then reacts to the laughter and amusement that her previous turn has created by saying: "°it it has to breathe and (xx)°" (line 907). With this turn she is explaining her answer "life gets harder" in order to make clear what she has meant with it. Her turn is very quiet and barely audible. She continues this turn on line 911 still with a quiet voice, further explaining her answer. The teacher does not pay much attention to these explanations given by LF5, but speaks between LF5's turns, still reacting to the Response turn. He starts on line 908, continues on line 910 and 912.

This turn is followed by a brief pause and LF5 reacts quietly and cautiously with a smile on her face (line 915). Then the teacher completes what he wants to say (on line 916), referring most likely to the name of the blues song in question.

When looking at the turn construction of the sequence in more detail, further notions concerning the creation of positive environment can be made. First, it is without a doubt LF5's turn on line 904 that is the initiative key action in creating positive environment in this sequence. The answer that she gives is correct to the question asked, but it holds a 'surprise element' in it, meaning that it steps out as a different answer than what was expected (by the teacher and probably by the students as well). This can be concluded from the reactions following the turn. LF5's turn invites laughter and smiling, and they are markers of positive environment here. Most important is also the teacher's following turn. He has found LF5's answer humorous and is reacting to it by producing an out-of-ordinary turn as well. The teacher could produce a Follow-up turn where he would ask for more clarification from LF5 to her answer, but instead he draws a connection between LF5's answer and a blues song that he knows. In this way, he produces an unexpected turn that is maintaining the positive environment in the classroom as well. One could argue, that the teacher wishes then to continue the unexpected nature of the discussion by producing his turn.

It can be noticed, however, that in this sequence as in many other cases in my data, it is the teacher who wishes to close the deviant, fun phase in the interaction. In the end of his turn on line 916, he changes the tone of his voice as a marker of a change in the course of the interaction as well. The beginning of the turn here is produced with a monotonous tone of voice ending with a falling intonation. Then there is a small pause and after that the "↑okay" is produced with a higher pitch, different from the beginning. The discussion around the issue at hand does not cease immediately after the teacher's turn on line 916, but LF5 makes a further remark as a reaction to the teacher's turn. The teacher responds to this on line 921 and by producing this turn he makes a conclusive statement and refers back to LF5's initiative turn (on line 904). After this, LF5 is producing a comment in a quiet voice (line 923), as if justifying her initial answer. On line 924 the discussion finally moves on as the teacher asks a question, addressing it to another student. This is the clarification question that the teacher could have asked already after LF5's answer (on line 904) but instead he produced a different kind of Follow-up, as was discussed.

The sequence in this example is clearly created around the IRF-sequence, in which the Response and Follow-up function as creators of positive environment in the classroom.

The interaction of this sequence pictures also the different roles in the classroom interestingly. As in the majority of the examples in my data, it is a student who produces the key action in the creation of positive environment. It seems here that this is unintentional, that is, LF5 does not plan her answer to be humorous or try to invite amusement in others. It is interesting that the teacher is both maintaining the light-hearted environment as well as closing the sequence. It could be said that he is using his role as the group leader exercising his right to steer the conversation to a certain direction. Perhaps, and even likely, when making his comment about the blues song, he was trying to be funny and invite amusement. However, it is also his choice to steer the conversation into a different direction after this. In his comment about the blues song, the teacher steps out from the institutional context and is participating in a discussion outside the pedagogical focus (that being the learning about child birth) (see Heritage 2005).

The following excerpt resembles example 8 in its structure, but the sequence is not as long as in the previous case. Example 9 has been taken from the second half of the double CLIL-lesson and the lesson is getting close to its end. The participants are discussing the heredity and issues related to that. The topic in question is the colour and nature of the hair of newborn babies.

Example 9

```
1797  T      (0.8) what about the hair (.) of every children they could have
1798  T      (1.5) could these people have the (.) have (x) children with (.)
1799  T      with straight hair. (1) olli
             (looks at Olli who has raised his hand eagerly)
1800  LM1  yes
1801         (1.2)
1802  LM2  °↑what°
1803  T       how is it possib↓le
             (looks at LM1)
→1804  LM1   I don't know cause (1) >god works in mysterious ways<
1805  T       that w(h)as a good an- answer of course mar↓ja
             (laughs loudly )
1806  LL     (smiling)
```

The teacher is standing in front of the classroom pointing at letters in the blackboard which represent genes. He is making a question concerning a gene combination. Olli (LM1) has raised his hand very eagerly, and this can be interpreted as a sign of willingness to answer. The question is then clearly addressed to LM1, as the teacher addresses him by his name. LM1 answers without hesitation "yes" (line 1800), and his answer is followed by LM2's quiet question, or remark "°↑what" on line 1802, after a brief pause. The teacher may be reacting to LM2's turn when asking "how is it possib↓le" (line 1803), looking at LM1 when asking. This is a question for clarification. The following turn is of special interest here. LM1 produces his answer (line 1804) quickly and starts with "I don't know", this strongly suggesting that he is not sure why it is so, and cannot find explanation to support his previous answer. Interestingly, he continues his answer further, the whole turn being: "I don't know cause (1) >god works in mysterious ways<". The latter half of the answer is out-of-ordinary and funny. It seems to be the case that LM1 does not know the answer what the teacher is seeking for, and produces a funny, unexpected answer instead. The funny nature of the answer is quite similar to the one in the previous example (example 8) but in this case I would argue that the turn is meant to be funny and invite amusement in the others, at least to some extent. This can be seen from LM2's turn. LM2 has to know that "god works in mysterious ways" is not the answer the teacher is waiting to hear, and yet he produces it. He wants to say something though he does not have the right answer. The answer seems to be impulsive. This is because it is produced quickly; LM2 takes only a brief pause in the middle of his turn before completing it. The possibility that LM2 has been planning this answer longer cannot be totally ignored, but it seems unlikely here. The end of the turn is produced very rapidly, and it underlines the spontaneous nature of it. If turning the attention from the LM2's initiative turn, and looking at the reactions more carefully, one can see how LM2's answer affects others. LM2 is answering to the teacher's question and therefore it can be said that he addresses his answer to the teacher. However, this does not mean that the others would not react.

In this sequence it is interesting to see that the teacher is the only one reacting verbally to LM2's turn, but this is probably because he is the other party of the turn taking here. The teacher's question on line 1803 can be interpreted both as the Follow-up for LM2's Response on line 1800 and Initiation starting a new IRF-sequence, Response being LM2's answer on line 1804. In any case, the teacher

produces Follow-up on line 1805 which is a reaction to LM2's humorous answer. Several observations can be made concerning the teacher's turn on line 1805. The turn seems to accomplish two different actions. The first part of the turn is the Follow-up for LM2's answer. The teacher seems to accept the answer as correct, but the fact that he is laughing when producing the turn implies that he has understood it as a funny and not so serious answer. His Follow-up is nevertheless accepting and friendly in its tone, and he smoothly moves on addressing Marja in the end of his turn. He is most likely wishing that Marja would produce the answer he had expected from LM2. By addressing another student at the end of his turn, the teacher closes this sequence and informs the students that the conversation goes on.

In addition to the teacher's soft Follow-up, the other students are showing their amusement as well. They are all smiling clearly at LM2's answer, and hence he has succeeded in creating positive environment in to the classroom and inviting amusement in others. In this case, none of the participants makes an effort to continue this sequence longer, and everyone lets the teacher steer the conversation onwards as he addresses Marja with a question. The students are showing their amusement and creating positive environment by smiling, but nobody is producing anything verbally. This is a short sequence, but it is clearly seen how positive environment is created with a few turns and how it involves everybody, although not many of the participants are actually involved verbally.

The following excerpt is again different from the other examples and quite an interesting case of how positive environment can be created without consciously inviting it. The teacher has given each of the students two pieces of paper which each contain a letter. The letters mark a gene combination as the class is doing an exercise about genes. The students have been studying their letters for a while, and making announcements about the genes that they have to the others.

Example 10


```
1317  T      and it's brown eyes u:m with a big (1) b you you got
             (LM2 holds his pieces of paper in his hand and T notices this)
1318  T      something funny
1319  LM2    yeah
             (holds one piece of paper in his hand, showing it to T)
1320         (1.5) ( T walks towards LM2)
1321  T      what's the other ↓one
```

          (takes the piece of paper from LM2's hand and looks at it**)**
→1322 LM2 >nothing<
  1323 T   ok(h)↓ay
  1324 LL+T **(**laughter and smiling**)**
  1325 T   OKAY [YOU GOT NOTHING]
           (smile in the voice, walks towards the blackboard**)**
  1326 LF6 [you are left with   ]one gene[(xx)   ]
           (looks at LM2, smiles**)**
  1327 LM2   [>told you I was
                       special<   ]
           (streches his arms and smiles**)**
  1328 LL   **(**laughter**)**
  1329 LM1 is ↑this an a

There is a question-answer pattern identifiable in this sequence, and it is realised through LM2's answer (line 1322) to the teacher's question (line 1321). The sequence does not, however, begin with the teacher question, but the initiation from LM2. This initiation is the holding of the paper in the air so that the teacher notices that he has something to show or say to him. The sequence can be interpreted as an IRF-sequence as well. Teacher Initiation on line 1321 is followed by a student response (LM2) on line 1322 and the sequence is closed with a teacher Follow-up on line 1323. The light environment is maintained by the comments on lines 1324 and 1325, produced by the teacher and LF6, respectively. This means that the sequence does not build solely on an IRF-structure but that the structure is included in the sequence.

    More specifically, on lines 1317-1318 the teacher is explaining a letter combination to a student on the blackboard when he notices that LM2 has something to show to him. LM2 holds one of the two pieces of paper in his hand, and says "yeah" (line 1319) in a normal tone of voice. The teacher walks towards LM2 and the others are looking at them. The teacher takes the piece of paper from LM2 into his hand and looks at it. He then asks what is the other letter that LM2 has got (line 1321), and that turn is followed by an answer by LM2: ">nothing<" (line 1322). LM2 speaks rapidly and the answer is unexpected, as the purpose was that everyone has got two different letters to mark two genes in the pieces of paper. In this case the other piece of paper is blank, however, and this creates a surprise element here. It is LM2's answer that is unexpected, and therefore funny. It is most likely the case that LM2 produces this answer not intending it to be funny at all. Others' reactions are yet again in the central role here. The teacher's first reactive turn on line 1323 shows

that he is a bit surprised, having laughter in his voice. He is surprised by LM2's answer, and his turn gives the others a chance, or even permission to react as well. The reaction is loud group laughter, which then clearly indicates that the students have found LM2's answer funny as well as the teacher's commenting to it. In some of the previous examples I have talked about the surprise element in the sequence that is important in creating the positive environment. In the previous cases it has been the nature of the turn that has been surprising. In this sequence, LM2's answer is fun in its nature, but this is strongly connected to the piece of paper. It is the paper that directs LM2's answer; he simply answers the teacher's question truthfully. A result of this, an action inviting amusement is created.

After the loud burst of group laughter, the teacher comments on LM2's situation, (line 1325) with a louder voice. He is still clearly amused, having laughter in his voice and smile on his face when walking away from LM2 to the blackboard. This is a positive reaction and signals positive feeling. If the teacher would have produced this response with a different tone of voice, for example very monotonous, low or dull voice, the signal would have been different. The response would have been unlikely to invite further commenting or laughter. After the teacher's response, LF6 comments on the situation (line 1326), facing LM2. She is smiling when saying this, and her comment is a spontaneous reaction to LM2's preceding turn. LM2 reacts to this comment as well on line 1327. He speaks again very fast, stretching his arms above his head, smiling. This comment tells about LM2's possible feelings in the situation. He is probably as amused by the 'one gene incident' as the others, but he may also feel good about the fact that he has created this light environment to the classroom and made others laugh, including the teacher. His body language suggests this, as he is stretching his arms and looking pleased with himself, smiling to the others. His comment on line 1327 is produced almost proudly, and this comment is as well meant to be light and maintain the light, positive environment. This comment leads indeed to group laughter again (line 1328).

This sequence is especially interesting because the emergence of light environment is so tightly tied up with a concrete element, that is the small piece of paper that is different than expected (see also example 4 for a comparable situation). The piece of paper then sets off the discussion and the creation of light environment through interaction. It is, indeed, important to remember that classroom interaction is always strongly connected with the teaching and learning materials available in the

given situation. This enables sequences of interaction such as the one in this example to emerge.

It needs to be noted, that in this excerpt, it is not the teacher who closes the sequence. He does not in any words try to get out of the situation or direct it to another way, but in this case the interaction sequence dies out quite naturally. The teacher does walk away from LM2 after seeing the paper but he is making his comment (line 1324) when walking away, and this comment together with the smile and laughter in the voice do not suggest intentions of closing the sequence, quite the contradictory actually. It is LM1 who produces the next turn, asking about a letter in a paper (line 1329). This turn directs the interaction away from the topic that was being discussed (LM2's blank paper) and closes the sequence.

6.4 Teacher's actions

In the following two examples, the key action is produced by the teacher, and therefore the excerpts are different from the other examples. In the data, key actions produced by a teacher were extremely rare. These two examples here are the only ones found that clearly include a teacher's action as the key action. These two sequences are from the CLIL-lesson were the teacher is producing an action that is somehow surprising, and therefore invites reactions in the students and creates positive environment.

In the first example, the teacher and the students are talking about heredity and genes, and this particular sequence involves hair colour.

Example 11

```
953  T     [yeah but] um what's the natural colour]
954  LM1   [it used to be  (xx) now it's  (xx)      ]
955  LF1   se on se [sellanen        ]
956  LF              [tai semmonen ] kullan vaalean [ruskee]
957  LM2                                            [same  ]
958  LF1   [se on niinku jaanalla] (2.3) tai [jotain ehkä] [vähän]
           (gestures with her hand towards Jaana and looks at her)
959  LM2   [ (as)    (xx)        ]
960  LM1                                     [ (x) brown ]
961  LM2                                                [dark  ] [light  ]
962  LF3                                                         [vähän]
963  LF3   vaaleempi
964  LM1   are they (x[x] )
```

```
965 LF1              [nii]
966 LM2   yeah
967 LM1   damn
968 T      [yeah but if we] compare
969 LM1   [     (xxxx)   ]
970 LM1   (xx[xx)      ]
971 T          [marja's] hair and jaana's so we can say that (.) jaana has
972 T      dark hair=
           (points towards Marja and Jaana with his hand, gazing at them)

973 LF2   =but if [we compare] my hair with jaana's hair she's got
974 T              [  °(x)°      ]
975 LF2   blonde ↓hair
           (turns around to look at Jaana)
976        (1.1)
977 LL    laugh[ter) ]
978 LM2        [yeah]
979 LF5   °my hair's not blonde°
980 LF1   [pistä siihen ruskee että]niinku [  (x)   ]
           (gestures towards the blackboard)
981 LF2   [         °(xxx)°          ]
→982 T                              [this has ]NEVER BEEN THIS
983 T      DIFFI↓CULT
           (laughter in the voice)
984 LL    (laughter and smiling)
985 LF1   but there [but      ]
986 LM2            [they're ]wo↓men
987 LF1   put one [more] [thing there]
988 LM3         [yeah]
989 T                  [that        ] that [that's what]
990 LF4                            [hey        ]
           (seriously, facing T, serious tone of voice)
991 LF5                              [hey       ]
           (seriously, facing T, serious tone of voice)
```

Turn taking in this sequence does not follow the IRF-pattern, but resembles the previous interaction sequence in its structure (example 10) by being more of a discussion. In the beginning of the sequence, it seems that the turn taking initially involves only T and LF1, but this changes rapidly as the others start to make their comments and the structure of the turn taking gets more complicated. The teacher poses a question in the beginning of the sequence, and LF1 indeed produces an answer to that, but the sequence is best characterised as discussion and commenting rather than question-answer patterning as such.

The sequence builds on the fact that the teacher wishes to know what LF1's natural hair colour is. He asks LF1 directly about her hair colour on line 953, and

LF1's reacts by answering (lines 955 and 958). It can be seen how the others participate eagerly into the discussion making their comments concerning LF1's hair colour throughout the sequence. The teacher suggests that Jaana has dark hair when compared with Marja's (lines 968, 971 and 972) and LF2 reacts immediately to this commenting that Jaana's hair is blonde when compared with hers (line 973, 975). At this point there is laughter in the classroom and the participants are looking at Jaana's (LF5), Marja's (LF6) and LF4's hair, probably evaluating their hair colours. There is a lot of noise in the classroom as the participants are talking simultaneously and laughing as well. The teacher turn on lines 982–983 is the key action in this sequence. He raises his voice commenting: "this has NEVER BEEN THIS DIFFI↓CULT", suggesting that practising the genes earlier with other classes and students has not been that difficult as it is at the moment. The teacher is hereby assessing the present situation. He has laughter in his voice but at the same time the volume of his voice and choice of words (this has *never* been this *difficult*) could suggest that he is tired of the situation and wishes to put an end to it, getting a bit annoyed actually. However, as the preceding turns as well as the following reactive turns are considered, the case seems to be different.

Before the key action taking place, there have been several students participating in the turn taking, making their comments heard, and all this has happened in a friendly manner: there has been laughter and the tone of the discussion has not been very serious. The teacher has not showed any signs of frustration before his comment on lines 982–983, and therefore his comment can be seen as surprising as he quite suddenly raises his voice over the others. The reaction to the teacher's comment is not silence, and the students do not seem to get upset, but start laughing instead. There are several markers that signal to the students that it is appropriate to laugh and treat the comment as funny. First of all, the preceding turn-taking has already been playful in its tone and there have been several suggestions about Jaana's hair colour. As the teacher makes the comment, he has laughter in his voice which certainly implies that he is not irritated or upset in his students. More likely, his action is sudden and unprompted, produced on the spur of the moment. It seems that the teacher has found the situation funny, as the girls cannot decide what the hair colour is, and speaks his mind. The students' reaction (laughter) proves that they have understood that the teacher meant his comment as a funny statement about the events. It has become evident that the atmosphere in the class can be described as light

already before the teacher's comment, but I argue that the teacher's unprompted comment is the key action in this sequence. Similarly to the previous example, the key action seems to be powerful and more effective than the comments preceding it, inviting a strong reaction in the others. The group laughter is here the most obvious marker of shared fun and positive environment that covers the whole class, including the teacher.

As the sequence is analysed, the change in the environment from positive to less positive towards the end of the sequence, can be seen easily. The discussion around the issue of LF1's hair colour is friendly, and the teacher's key comment allows the fun to emerge. The basic, clear signs of positive feeling and joy are present as a reaction to the key action (laughter, smiling) and produced most likely genuinely, as the tone of laughter is in no sense sarcastic or otherwise artificial. Also the smile on the participants' faces tells about a genuine reaction. After the group laughter has settled a bit, LF1 still tries to continue about the issue (lines 985, 987), but she is interrupted by LM2, who partially speaking in top of LF1, suggests that the reason for the problems in defining the hair colour is that the ones involved are women (line 986). LM3 and the teacher show their support to this suggestion (lines 988, 989) and by doing this, upset the female students. LF4 and LF5 show their irritation (lines 990, 991), having serious faces and tone of voices. Interestingly, the teacher's key action on line 982 does not specifically refer to the female students. He does not directly suggest that it is their fault that the discussion about the hair colour does not get to an end, even if that would be the case. It is LM2 (line 986) who suggests that the difficulties are due to the gender of the ones discussing, and with this short comment he moves to a risky area in the discussion. The female students do not react to LM2's comment right away, however, but it is after the teacher's comment (line 989) that they get upset. It is clear that by bringing up the issue of gender, LM2 changes the tone of the discussion, and by agreeing with him, the teacher reinforces this risky tone. If the teacher would not have made his agreeing comment, LM2's turn might have passed unnoticed. However, as the teacher chooses to continue the discussion around the risky topic, the female students get irritated. There is a very sudden, noticeable difference from shared fun and positive environment to a serious tone in the turn taking. The shared fun has come to an end because the female students seem to get upset. The setting in the classroom enables this kind of commenting to emerge. The male students are outnumbered by the females, and may therefore at times feel a

bit 'cornered' in the discussions, and most importantly, the teacher is male. One might argue that the teacher's following comment to LM2's turn might have had very different content and tone if the teacher was a female. After making these observations, I can agree with Planalp's (1999) and Sandlund's (2004) observations that the basic feelings, such as joy and sorrow are most easily identifiable, and therefore also the change from one to another, as well as the difference itself, are so notable. Interestingly, in this example, the teacher is not closing this sequence, but the girls are (LF4 and LF5), when reacting to LM2's and the teacher's comments, quite rapidly.

In the following example, the key action is also quite surprising for a teacher to produce, and the students react accordingly. This example is the only one in my data where the key action is a pure joke (lines 979, 980).

The teacher is talking about child birth with the students, and they are discussing how to know whether the baby is healthy when it is born.

Example 12

```
959  LM3           [(x) still (could) explain I think ] it's really unfair
960  LM2            [           °(xxxx)°         ]
961  LM3    that in america [they hold babies upside down and smack]
962  LM2               [           °(xxxx)°              ]
963  LM3    [their up] the bums see if everything's working
964  LM2    [ °(xx)° ]
965  LM2    °(x[x)°                   ]
966  T         [is that what the-] they are doing in ame- [merica ]
967  LF6                                      [  (x)   ]
968  LM3   [yeah [I think that's unfair they    ] hold the baby upside down]
969  LM    [                 °(xxxx)°                       ]
970  LF5        [that (xx)  (movies)         ]
971  LM3   [by its leg]
972  LM    [°(xxx)°   ]
973  T     [okay     ]
974  LM    [°(xx)°]
975  LM3   [and then they smack their bums [to see if they start crying]
976  LM    [                °(xxxx)°                    ]
977  LF5                          [          °(xxxx)°         ]
978  LM3    to make sure all their senses are work[ing and]
→979  T                                   [now I  ] understand
980  T      george bush a bit bet↓ter
981  LL+T (laughter)
982  LF5   (xx) that explains [a lot    ]
983  T                        [ok(h)ay] [yeah     ]
984  LF6                      [   °(xx)°] [  °(xx)° ]
```

```
985  T                                          [I'm sorry] that was very
986  T        uncorrect political joke(h) (1.1) what else hap[pens   ]
987  LF6                                                    [wow   ]
988  LF5                                                    [    jo ]king
989  T        the temperature changes olli
```

The structure of the sequence is again somewhat similar to the two previous examples, but here one student is more dominant with the turn-taking. It can be seen how LM3 is almost telling a story, or sharing information with the others, as he is explaining how it is unfair that the babies in America are held upside down and smacked in their bums when they are born (line 959 onwards). There is some talking going on when LM3 is talking, but it not possible to really hear what the other students are saying. LM3's talking is audible to everyone in the situation, but it seems to be the teacher who listens to him most carefully, and asks for confirmation from LM3 (line 966), and reacts then affirmatively ("okay" on line 973) to his answer. LM3 does not produce a question to anyone in the sequence, but perhaps tries to invite some reactions with his 'story'. Indeed, the teacher is the one to react to the given information by telling a joke "now I understand george bush a bit bet↓ter" (lines 979, 980) rising from LM3's turns. This joke is sudden and surprising, cutting LM3's turn (line 978) and it is not predictable behaviour from the teacher to tell a political joke. The students seem to find the joke funny, as they start to laugh, and the teacher laughs at his own joke as well (line 981). In this sequence, the positive environment and shared fun rise clearly as a result from the teacher's joke, because the discussion before the key action can be described as ordinary talking around a topic of the lesson. The joke is sudden and steps out of the context, creating a 'surprise element' in the interaction.

The first, spontaneous reaction to the joke is laughter, but the students react verbally as well. LF5 states that a lot can be explained if the person in question indeed has been held upside down when being born (line 982), and this comment is funny too, whether LF5 meant it or not. Some other students are talking as well, and the class is a bit restless after the joke. The teacher seems to take the joke back a little, by apologising to the students that he told such as political joke (lines 985, 986). Interestingly, he still has laughter in his voice and a smile in his face, which suggest that he is perhaps not that sorry at all. However, as he is the leader of the group, he seems to remember this role and steers the discussion back to the actual topic of the

lesson (in the very same turn in which he apologises as well) (lines 985, 986, 989), addressing a question to Olli. The teacher behaves as if he would be a bit embarrassed of the joke he told, and tries to get the discussion into a more serious issues, towards the pedagogical goal. Also the comments that LF6 and LF5 make in the end of the sequence, as a reaction to the joke (lines 987, 988), signal the exceptional nature of the situation. LF6 and LF5 seem to be amused of the fact that their teacher has told a joke during the lesson.

This sequence is the only one in the data that includes a joke as the key action. There is playfulness, irony and teasing involved in many of the sequences, but not in this way. It is extremely interesting that it is the teacher who tells the joke, and not a student. Of course, it can be that the students do not feel that they are in a position to tell jokes in a lesson, but I argue that here the students found the joke quite surprising..

In the next and final chapter, the results will be summarised and discussed further.

7   CONCLUSION

The final chapter first summarises the results, concentrating on the features and structures of interaction represented in the four different categories (presented in the previous chapter). After this, the study and the results are discussed in more detail. Some implications concerning previous research are made, as well as suggestions for future research.

7.1   Summary of findings

The findings of this study have shown that positive environment can indeed be created and then further maintained through interaction in classrooms. Both the EFL and CLIL-lessons proved to be fruitful sources of such interaction, though they seemed to have their own characteristics as well. In general, when comparing the categories that arose from the data with each other, Students' unprompted actions outnumbered Students' questions and answers, as well as Teacher's actions clearly in frequency. All in all, there were 23 sequences where positive environment seemed to be created, an hence also the same number of key actions. 14 of the key actions were students' unprompted actions, two students' questions, five students' answers and two teacher's actions. It is interesting that the students' questions as key actions were very rare in the data, but the most striking result was, however, the fact that there were only two teacher initiated key actions, and both of them in the CLIL-lessons. It needs to be said, however, that the teachers were maintaining the positive environment actively. It also became clear that both female and male students were producing the key actions in the sequences. There were some students that seemed to be involved in several different sequences, and those students also tended to be the lively students of the class, specifically in the EFL-classroom. However, this study did not aim at being a comparative or quantitative study as such, and the main focus lies away from such issues. Comparative notions are made, however, to the extent they seem relevant for the study an offer interesting points for consideration.

Students' unprompted actions seemed to create positive environment easily in interaction. Students' unprompted actions as key actions occurred in all the lessons, and sequences including them seemed to be 'easy' to find right from the early stages of the analysis, meaning that there seemed to be lots of places where some kind of

unprompted actions lead to amusement or otherwise positive environment. It needs to be said, however, that the category of Students' unprompted actions in this study is the most flexible one, and has also the most variation inside it. The findings showed that students' unprompted actions as the key actions can be opinions about the previous turn, about one's own performance, about others' actions, suggestions, or even reactions to the surrounding physical context. In other words, there are various kinds of unprompted key actions, which all are treated as occasions for creating positive environment. The unprompted key actions , as well as the other key actions, were not always intentionally amusing, but the others' treated them as amusing anyhow, and positive environment was created. In some cases, however, the key actions were clearly meant to be funny and invite amusement.

The students seemed to produce unprompted key actions quite evenly in both EFL and CLIL-lessons, but the contexts of these actions varied. In general, they were produced during several tasks, but in the EFL-lessons, they took place in sequences during shared, involving exercises (the 'hot ball'), and during a verb test. In the CLIL-lesson, the sequence analysed in section 6.1 was attached to a discussion among the participants more than to a specific exercise. There were two cases in the data where a question worked as the key action. Interestingly, both of the sequences were from the CLIL-lesson, and the action was produced by the same female student. Common to these actions was that they can be described as 'funny' questions in their nature, and they seemed to be unexpected as well. The questions were in both cases strongly connected to the pedagogical focus of that specific time. Also answers as key actions had a funny nature. They were all produced by a student, and most of them took place in the CLIL-lesson. The answers were strongly connected to their context, that is, the interaction was very on-task, concerning the pedagogical issue. Two of the examples that I analysed in section 6.3 of this chapter, were clear answers to the teacher's question (see examples 8 and 9). The third example (example 10) was as well, but in addition it was strongly attached to the physical context - the pieces of paper representing genes. Rather interestingly, in several sequences where positive environment was created, the key action was somehow attached to the physical context. From the excerpts that were represented in the previous sections, two were closely attached to the video cameras in the classroom (examples 4 and 5) and one to pieces of paper, as was mentioned (example 10). This is a reminder of the special nature of classroom interaction, where the material setting also plays a part.

Similarly to the various nature of the key actions, also the reactions to them varied. As was discussed earlier in this chapter, the others' reactions to the key actions are of great importance since they define the key action, and are hence the basis of the analysis. It seemed to be the case that both the students and the teachers were producing the reactions, and those turns most often maintained the positive environment that the key action had created. It is worth noticing that also the participants producing the key actions were in many cases producing other turns later in the same sequence. These turns were specifications or additive turns to the key turn, or reactions to other, previous turns.

When the key action was unprompted, the reactions varied greatly. Since the key actions were often surprising, also the reactions to them seemed to be spontaneous and natural as well. There were verbal reactions, but there were also laughter and smiling along, clearly marking the positive environment. Also the students' answers as key actions created a lot of laughter and amusement in general. This was due to the 'funny' nature of the answers. The answers were a part of an IRF-sequence where an answer is indeed an expected action (Response), but it was their funny nature that was surprising and created positive environment. In all the cases, it was the teacher who produced the reaction (Follow-up) to a student answer as a key action, hereby completing the IRF-sequence. Quite naturally, the reactions to the questions as key actions were answers. These answers were usually produced with laughter or smile, marking the amusement. Both the students and the teachers produced these reactions, and they were often tied to the IRF-sequence, as was the case with answers as key actions as well. A unifying feature of all the key actions was that they were almost every time somehow surprising or out-of-ordinary in their context, and therefore created fun, positive environment and invoked reactions in others. This is what I called 'a creation of a surprise element' in the analysis.

The markers, or signs of positive environment being created and/or maintained in the interaction sequences, were in all cases most strongly laughter and smiling. These cues to the environment in the classrooms cooperated with the verbal cues that followed the key actions. Laughter and smile were interpreted as markers of positive environment by looking at them in their context. Laughter or smile could not be analysed as markers of positive environment without looking at the turns in which they occurred. Closely together with the verbal messages (and possibly gaze, gestures and other aspects of interaction), laughter and smiling formed a reaction that

could be interpreted as marking positive environment. The analytic process showed that the realisation of positive environment, as well as the creation and maintaining of it, never followed the exactly same pattern, although the features were alike. As can be expected, the role of the immediate context proved to be an essential one.

The structure of the analysed sequences was often connected to the features of classroom interaction. The IRF-sequence could be identified in the majority of the sequences. In some cases the IRF-sequence was represented in its 'ideal' form: teacher initiation - student response - teacher follow-up, but variations to this structure were identified as well. In some cases the IRF-sequence was present in the interaction sequence, but the actual key action was produced outside it, as an unprompted action. This was most often the case with student's unprompted actions, as the action came outside the IRF-sequence, usually from a student who the structure did not involve (see examples 1 and 2 in section 6.1). Also simpler question-answer patterns were found in the analysed interaction sequences, and it was a student who produced the question, and the teacher or student(s) who answered it (examples 6 and 7). These turn takings reflect well the classroom context and the interaction typical of it. A question-answer pattern was present also in the sequences where the teacher proposed a question to the students (or a student) and the answer was the key action. The majority of these cases the pattern was broadened into a IRF-sequence, the teacher producing the follow-up (examples 8 and 9).

It became clear in the analysis that the students were the most active in the attempts to create positive environment to the classroom by producing the key actions. However, in addition to the key action, the positive environment was maintained further in many sequences. Both the students and the teachers produced the reactions and were involved in the maintaining. In some cases, the others used the previous turn as an occasion to build amusement. As was discussed earlier in this chapter, the teacher's role in the classroom is different from his students, and his job is to keep the pedagogical focus of the lesson and steer the interaction accordingly. This is probably why the teacher produced far less key actions in the data. However, he participated in maintaining the positive environment several times, and this makes his role flexible: the teacher moves in his role, being at times more an equal participant of the group and at times more a leader (see Underhill 1999:125). The fact is, however, that the moments of positive environment were created in cooperation, and they also reached most of the people in the classroom. It was not

possible for one person to create a positive, light environment on his own, the key actions needed reactions to support them.

It has been established that the openings of the sequences where positive environment was created and maintained, were produced mostly by the students. Just as clearly the closings of these sequences were realised by teacher turns. Nearly all the studied sequences ended with a teacher turn, meaning that the teacher produced the initiation to move on to a next topic, or at least to close the one in question. This is also probably due to the teacher's role as the leader and controller in the classroom. He needs to decide when to end the sequence, or even stop the 'fun', and move on to the next topic.

Altogether, the analysis has shown that positive environment can be created and maintained through interaction in classrooms, and that there are different ways of doing this. The key actions creating the positive environment seemed to be either unprompted actions or funny-natured questions and answers, produced often by the students. The reactions to the key actions were often laughter and smiling, accompanied with verbal reactions. The signs of positive environment need to be considered in their context in order to form a concise picture of the interaction sequence, to identify the key action and the actions that seem to maintain the positive environment.

7.2   Discussion

This study succeeded in identifying sequences from the interaction where positive environment seemed to be created or maintained. One double CLIL-lesson and two EFL-lessons included quite a significant number of these interaction sequences, (23 altogether) and this was particularly interesting, since the data is fairly small. However, as the data involved two classrooms where the English language played a major part, further research would be needed in order to reveal the occurrence of equivalent sequences in other kind of data. Since the data of this study consisted of both EFL-lessons and CLIL-lessons, there was an initial interest concerning the possible differences between these two types of lessons, although the main focus of the study was not on comparisons. However, some aspects of the results suggest that there are some differences between these lessons. These differences have been acknowledged, and will be discussed here. Also some other features of the analysed

interaction sequences, the implications of the results, as well as applications for future research are discussed below.

The phase of the lesson (beginning, middle and end) did not seem to play a significant part in relation to the analysed sequences, that is, the key actions did not seem to occur in a certain phase of the lesson. The task, however, seemed to be more meaningful for the creation and maintaining of positive environment. It became evident that in the EFL-lessons, the sequences were tied to a pedagogical task (rehearsing of verb tenses or taking a test), whereas in the CLIL-lesson there were also cases which occurred in discussion-like turn taking. On the whole, the students were more active than their teachers to produce the key actions, and the unprompted actions seemed to be the most frequent way of creating positive environment. The frequency of unprompted actions tells about the surprising and rather sudden nature of the key actions. The unprompted key actions did not seem to be tied into any specific interaction pattern, but occurred both in IRF-patterns, as well as in discussion-type sequences. However, questions and answers as key actions were usually tied to an IRF-or at least IR-pattern, and seemed to be more context dependent in that sense. It needs to be noticed, however, that this study has not focused on revealing the factors behind the key actions and reactions to them as such, and therefore only some suggestions can be made. It can be noted, however, that the immediate context seemed to give the opportunity for light environment to emerge, and indeed, the key actions were very much connected to the situation. Further studies could show, whether some key actions would concentrate on issues outside the classroom itself, and in what kind of data these would occur.

Also the students' answers and questions, as well as the teacher's actions as key actions can be described as surprising to the others in the situation. The key actions seemed to step out from the surrounding turn-taking when analysed in the light of the reactions that they created. The CLIL-lesson included slightly more key actions than the EFL-lessons, on the whole. It can be that the CLIL-students' age affects this, allowing more playful sequences to emerge, as the students' mastering of the language is on a different level than in the EFL-class, as is their competence in the subject of study as well. The teacher can also use language differently with older students. Further analysis about the teachers' possible differences with each other (for example gender or age as affective factors) is not possible in this study. A more careful analysis of the participants' backgrounds and the framework of the lessons

would bring another level into the study. Indeed, there are several factors which can affect the emergence of positive environment in interaction, which are outside the scope of this study, but would offer a fruitful base for further research. A remark that can be made by observing purely the interaction, is that the participants in all of the lessons were quite talkative, and the lessons can be described as lively. The case could have been very different in lessons where the interaction would have been less rich and less talking allowed in the first place.

The structure of the sequences where positive environment is created, seemed to reflect the participants' roles very clearly. The institutional setting, the concept of a school and classroom, defines the grounding roles for the participants, and that schema sets limits for the behaviour in classrooms. The features of institutional interaction were recognisable from the analysed sequences, and the institutional roles seemed to control the teachers' and students' behaviour in the classroom throughout the data. It can be assumed that the teacher knows his own institutional role and the students know theirs, and these roles steer the turn-taking as well. The key actions were produced mainly by the students, and this can imply that the teacher realises his role as the leader of the group, as the adult and as the teacher, with a mission to teach and direct. In the light of this, he can be less eager to produce such actions that would distract the 'normal' turn-taking in the classroom, and further distract the pedagogical goal of the lesson. Seedhouse's (2004) remark about the pedagogical goal as the driving force of every lesson, seems to prove its accuracy here.

The participants' roles do not seem to be totally stable, however. The teacher, in particular, seems to move in his role, shifting from teacher to more of a facilitator or even equal participant of the group. This shifting is naturally dependent on the context, and it may well be that the teacher chooses the best possible role to be used in the situation. In some sequences, the turn taking resembled very much an ordinary, everyday conversation (CLIL-lesson), and in others, followed the IRF-pattern typical of classrooms. In the sequences including an IRF-pattern, the teacher was one party of the turn-taking, filling his more 'conventional' role as a teacher. In the discussion-like sequences, he seemed to be one equal party in the discussion, and move away from his role as a teacher. However, in most of the sequences, it was the teacher who closed the sequence, and this is where he takes the institutional role of a leader whose responsibility is to keep the lesson going into the right direction. It seems to be that at least on the basis of my data, the teacher is capable of modifying and

adjusting his role and behaviour according to the situation. It can be argued, even, that the teacher has less authority, or *appears* to have, when acting like an equal with the students in certain situations, creating or maintaining the positive environment. When modifying his role, the teacher may aim at better teaching methods or at supporting his students by giving the impression that he is more equal with them (see Underhill 1999, Stanley 1999, for discussion). Especially the one sequence where the teacher produces the key action (example 12 in section 6.4), which is a joke, he surprises his students by telling a political joke which is neither expected nor conventional, when considering the institutional context and the role of the teacher. There would be a place for further research in studying especially the teacher's key actions, if he seems to produce them in order to achieve something, if he has a goal? After all, he is in the leading position most of the time, and could make use of this.

The realisation of positive environment in the interaction sequences was possible to identify and analyse by using the cues to emotion (Planalp 1999), as well as making use of conversation analysis and the knowledge about the institutional context. The cues were applicable into the classroom context, both as marking the positive environment as well as analysing the key actions more carefully. Conversation analysis proved to be a suitable method for analysing the interaction, and enabled a detailed enough analysis. It seemed that the key actions were not always intentionally 'funny' or 'silly', but many times the speaker originally intended them to be serious (most often the case with students' answers or questions). The creation of positive environment seemed to happen quite spontaneously and almost 'by accident', and the reactions seemed genuine as well. Laughter and smile, possibly followed by verbal reactions, marked the positive environment. The interpretation of these markers needed careful analysis, because the line between a genuine reaction and even mean irony can be thin. This does not mean that for example irony could not be present in those sequences where positive environment was established, but that the tone of the interaction sequence needed close inspection in order to see whether positive environment was created. In this study, the analysis relied on conversation analysis and concentrated on the interactional level. I trusted in the visible and audible evidence, and did not go beyond it. Sometimes the results gathered by an outside observer can perhaps be even more reliable than the participants' reflections about the situation afterwards. It is worth mentioning, that when students' attitudes and learner styles, for example, have been studied,

interviews and self-reflection have overridden the observation method (see Fraser 1986, for example). The research has concentrated on the individual; what the individual feels, what he tells about the situation afterwards. These reflections and interviews combined with actual observation about these situations could have fruitful results. First of all, it would be very interesting to see whether the students' reflections would be in line with the observer's interpretations of the same situation. Secondly, these kind of studies could be used to find possible connections between good learning results and positive environment in the classroom; to be used aside with the results gathered by interviewing. Naturally, reasons for poor learning results could be searched from the environment as well (see Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991, and Ellis, 1992, for example). It is then important to underline that this study has presented one angle of studying, concentrating on the interaction and focusing on the key actions and their affect on the immediate environment. I see no reason why this approach could not be combined with the others, and studies concentrating on the interactional level could bring a lot into psychology and emotion studies, which have concentrated much on the individual's personal experience so far.

This study has revealed how different types of actions can create and maintain positive environment through interaction in EFL- and CLIL-classrooms. Previous studies have examined similar kind of issues, for example Tainio (2007) has studied classroom interaction by focusing on the participants' roles, and looked into such issues as power relations, gender and humour in the classroom. Also Cekaite and Aronsson (2004) have studied playful recycling and repetitions in invoking amusement in children's second language conversations, discussing also the participants' roles in the conversations. Moreover, they have examined language play in peer conversation in children's second language learning, as well (Cekaite and Aronsson 2005). However, the previous studies have not focused on the same kind of phenomena as this study has, and not from the same perspective (see Sandlund 2004, for academic context), and therefore this study can bring some new insights in to the field of interaction studies, as well as emotion studies. However, this study has its limitations due to the fairly small data sample and a specific, rather narrow scope of interest. Only after multiple studies concerning different kind of classroom interaction data, some further suggestions about the nature of the results in this particular study could be made, and their possible contributions to other studies considered more carefully. However, these kind of interaction studies as the present

one, can have a lot to offer for research done in emotion studies, for example, and therefore the interactional level should not be neglected from emotion research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arminen, I. 2005. *Institutional interaction: studies of talk at work.* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Arnold, J. (ed.) 1999. *Affect in language learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Atkinson J. M and J. Heritage (eds.) 1984. *Structures of social action – studies in conversation analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bendelow, G. and B. Mayall. 2000. How children manage emotion in schools. In S. Fineman (ed.) *Emotion in organizations.* London: Sage, 241–254.

Cameron, D. 2001. *Working with spoken discourse.* London: Sage.

Cameron, D. 1997. Performing gender: young men's talk and the construction of heterosexual masculinity. In Sally Johnson and Ulrike Meinhof (eds.), *Language and Masculinity.* Oxford: Blackwell, 47–64.

Cazden, C. B. 2001. *Classroom discourse – the language of teaching and learning.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cekaite, A. and K. Aronsson. 2004. Repetition and joking in children's second language conversations: playful recyclings in an immersion classroom. *Discourse Studies* 6 (3), 373– 392.

Cekaite, A. and K. Aronsson 2005. Language play, a collaborative source in children's L2 learning. *Applied Linguistics* 26 (2), 169–191.

Coates, J. 1996. *Women Talk: Conversation between women friends.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Dalton-Puffer, C. and T. Nikula 2006. Pragmatics of content-based instruction: teacher and student directives in Finnish and Austrian classrooms. *Applied Linguistics* 27 (2), 241–267.

Drew, P. and J. Heritage 1992. *Talk at work: interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dőrnyei, Z. and A. Malderez 1999. The role of group dynamics in foreign language learning and teaching. In J.Arnold (ed.) *Affect in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 155–169.

Ellis, R.1992. *Second language acquisition and language pedagogy.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Fineman, S. (ed.) 2000. *Emotion in organizations.* London: Sage.

Fineman, S. 2003. *Understanding emotion at work*. London: Sage.

Fraser, B. 1986. *Classroom environment*. New Hampshire: Croom Helm.

Fussell, S. R. and M. Moss 1998. Figurative language in emotional communication. In S. R. Fussell and R. J. Kreuz (eds.) *Social and cognitive approaches to interpersonal communication*. Mahwah NS.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 113–141.

Glenn, P. 2003. *Laughter in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. 2005. Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In K. L. Fitch and R. E. Sanders (eds.) *Handbook of language and social interaction.* Mahwah NS.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 103-141.

Larsen-Freeman, D. and M. H. Long 1991. *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. New York: Longman.

Malamah-Thomas, A.1987. *Classroom Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mehan, H. 1979. *Learning lessons – social organization in the classroom.* Cambridge: Mass.

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

Planalp, S.1999. *Communicating emotion: social, moral and cultural processes.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Psathas, G. 1995. *Conversation analysis: the study of talk-in-interaction. Qualitative research methods series 35.* London: Sage.

Rampton, B., C. Roberts, C. Leung and R. Harris 2002. Methodology in the analysis of classroom discourse. *Applied Linguistics* 23 (3), 373–392.

Reid, J. 1999. Affect in the classroom: problems, politics and pragmatics. In J. Arnold (ed.) *Affect in language learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 297–306.

Sacks, H., E. A. Schegloff and G. Jefferson.1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation. *Language* 50, 696–735.

Sandlund, E. 2004. *Feeling by doing. The social organization of everyday emotions in academic talk-in-interaction.* Karlstad University Studies 2004:36. Karlstad University.

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

Schegloff, E. A.2007. *Sequence organization in interaction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sinclair, J. McH. and R. M. Coulthard 1975. *Towards and analysis of discourse. The English used by teachers and pupils.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stanley, C.1999. Learning to think feel and teach reflectively. In J. Arnold (ed.) *Affect in language learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 109–124.

Tainio, L. (ed.) 2007. *Vuorovaikutusta luokkahuoneessa. Näkökulmana keskusteluanalyysi.* Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

ten Have, P.1999. *Doing conversation analysis. A practical guide.* London: Sage.

Tykkyläinen, T. 2005. *Puheterapeutti ja lapsi puheterapiatehtävää tekemässä. Ohjailevan toiminnan tarkastelua* [online]. Helsingin yliopiston puhetieteiden laitoksen julkaisuja. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:952-10-2382-1

Underhill, A.1999. Facilitation in language teaching. In J. Arnold (ed.) *Affect in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 125–141.

Van Lier, L. 1996. *Interaction in the language curriculum. Awareness, autonomy & authenticity.* New York: Longman.

Walsh, S.2006. *Investigating classroom discourse.* London: Routledge.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Transcription conventions

[words]	
words]	overlapping speech
↑	rising intonation
↓	falling intonation
(xx)	unidentified word or short utterance
(xxx)	unidentified longer utterance
(words)	probably the word in brackets
(gestures)	transcriber's comments, non-verbal communication, laughter
(.)	short pause, less than one second
(3.5)	timed pause, length in brackets
°words°	quiet speech
WORDS	loud speech
emphasis	emphasis on the underlined syllable
> words<	quicker than surrounding speech
<words>	slower than surrounding speech
no:	extension
words=	
=words	latching speech
eik-kaks	self-repair

Symbols marking the participants

T	teacher
LL	whole class
LF	unidentified female learner
LM	unidentified male learner
LF3	identified female learner
LM2	identified male learner

Appendix 2: Seating arrangements

The EFL-classroom:

                TEACHER

    LM1   LF3
    LM2   LF2
     LM3   LF1
         LM4

The CLIL-classroom:

                TEACHER

                      LF2   LF1

         LF6 LF5   LF4   LF3

           LM3   LM1 LM2